



Minnesota Regional Transit
Board: Records.

Copyright Notice:

This material may be protected by copyright law (U.S. Code, Title 17). Researchers are liable for any infringement. For more information, visit www.mnhs.org/copyright.



REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD
270 Metro Square Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
612/292-8789

MEETING OF THE REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD
Monday, May 4, 1987, 4:00 p.m.
Metropolitan Council Chambers

AGENDA

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes of April 13, 1987
4. BUSINESS ITEMS
 - ✓A. Oath of Office, George Isaacs
 - B. Resolutions of Appreciation for:
Ken Bedeau, Resolution No. 87-07
Todd Lefko, Resolution No. 87-08
Bernie Skrebes, Resolution No. 87-09
 - C. Committee Chairs and Memberships
 - D. Office Space Lease Extension
 - E. Authorization for Request for Proposal for Evaluation of Metro Mobility Program
 - F. Public Officials Liability Insurance
6. REPORT OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE Alison Fuhr,
Vice Chair
 - A. Proposed Strategies to Improve Metro Mobility Safety, Communications and Training
7. REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE Ruth Franklin,
Chair
8. OTHER BUSINESS
 - A. Chairman's Report
 1. Transportation Handicapped Advisory Committee Appointments
 - B. Members' Reports
 - C. Advisory Committee Reports
 - D. Staff Reports
9. PUBLIC COMMENT

Elliott Perovich
Chairman

An Equal Opportunity Employer

Bertrand
 de Vries
 Weaver
 B. Hopkins
 Burke
 Entzel

D. Remy
 Kurt Strom
 Dig

Staff
 JH MK
 KT JH
 RD KC
 HP RR

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD
ROLL CALL AND ATTENDANCE SHEET

GB

DATE: May 4, 1987
 BOARD OR COMMITTEE Board

MEMBER NAME	PRESENT	VOTE	VOTE	VOTE	VOTE	VOTE
Chairman	✓	87-07 Bertrand ✓	87-08 Remy ✓	87-09 Shreber		
Doris Caranicas	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Ruth Franklin	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Alison Fuhr	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Rochelle Graves	4:22					
George Isaacs	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Paul Joyce						
Edward Kranz	4:20					
Fair				✓		

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

270 Metro Square Building, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Minutes of the Meeting of the
REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD
Metropolitan Council Offices, Room E
April 13, 1987

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Elliott Perovich, Chairman; Doris Caranicas; Carole Faricy; Ruth Franklin; Alison Fuhr; Rochelle Graves; Paul Joyce; Edward Kranz and Bernard Skrebes

OTHERS PRESENT: Gregory Andrews, Tom Beaver, Mary Fitzgerald, Ed Kouneski, Mike Kuehn, Mark Ryan, Regional Transit Board Staff; Arnie Entzel, Amalgamated Transit Union; Natalio Diaz, Metropolitan Council; Lyle Frerichs, Joyce Dingman and Greg Failor, Metropolitan Transit Commission; Charles Weaver, legal counsel; Mary O'Hara-Anderson and John Clausen, State Council for the Handicapped; Jodie Hauer, Citizens League; Leroy Marshall, Rosanne Severance and Jerry Hagen, Transportation Handicapped Advisory Committee; Matt Peterson, Suburban-Morley

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. and roll taken. Fuhr moved approval of the agenda; Caranicas seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Graves said the meeting was called to give the board an opportunity to prepare a public statement on Metro Mobility in response to the ongoing negative press. The board made a good faith effort to live up to its charge but that fact is not being disseminated to the larger community.

Fuhr said she is concerned about complaints that the board does not care, does not have leadership and is alienating the governor and lieutenant governor. Some users are concerned about the Metro Mobility providers' drivers. There are complaints that the Transportation Handicapped Advisory Committee (THAC) is not being used, although the board has had extensive testimony from THAC. She questions whether the evaluation contract could be done locally for less money.

Graves said other areas of concern relate to legislation now on the floor. The board should determine the direction it will take. She had requested the presence of legal counsel to address issues of liability for safety problems.

Beaver distributed a draft of a public statement and asked members to review it and give him their comments. Caranicas said it is important to act quickly. She noted that the Minnesota Center for Independent Living could provide sensitivity training. Lyle Frerichs, Manager of the Metro Mobility Administrative Center, described how the on-site investigations are conducted.

In response to Faricy's questions about the two serious accidents, Ryan said in each case the driver involved had completed company-sponsored training; one had over 40 hours and the other, over 80 hours training, although neither had the 12 hours required by our contract and state regulations. In both cases the drivers were immediately suspended and subsequently dismissed. Each company

was put on 60-day probation. The provider companies thought the drivers had received the proper training because they had received safety training. Since April 1 every driver has taken the required state training.

Weaver said the board should discuss the subject of board liability in executive session. There was discussion of a recent accident in which a passenger tipped out of a wheelchair. Frerichs said the administrative center heard of the incident second-hand and investigated although no complaint was filed by the passenger.

Franklin said the meeting was called to discuss communications. The draft by Tom Beaver is a good start, but should be shorter. The statement should note the improved scheduling of trips. In the past people were frustrated by long waits. It is no longer necessary to transfer vehicles on long trips. Since October we have had a reduction in the cost of service and expanded the transit service area, which is important to people who have been waiting for service for many years. Service increased 25-percent in 1987 with at the same level of funding. Service will be expanded to the outer ring suburbs in 1988. The goal is to meet the legislative mandate to supply service to the whole area and we could only do that by restructuring the program. The board needs to get out the positive information. Joyce said the service needs fine tuning, as does any new program.

In discussing the proposed legislation, Graves asked if the board feels 12 hours minimum training requirement is adequate for severely handicapped people or should the Legislature mandate more training?

O'Hara-Anderson said the state council proposes one or two days of sensitivity training for drivers. Providers should check to see if prospective employees have a "rap sheet." This is a good program, but quality assurance must be in place. She said there have been other accidents.

In response to Faricy's question, O'Hara-Anderson said there should be a committee of three people who will spend a day airing the concerns. The legislative audit commission will decide April 14 whether to investigate the Metro Mobility program. Quality assurance is the most immediate concern. The providers want the program to work and the handicapped community wants to work with them for quality assurance. THAC should be given more attention and responsibility. Before the state operating standards are amended, the board could set more stringent standards. Fuhr suggested that reports from the committees be on all the board agendas.

Severance said she has been active in designing and implementing sensitivity training. It would help the whole system if this can be implemented as soon as possible. More training and information is essential. The chairman said he has asked O'Hara-Anderson to pull together a program for the board to review. The board will work with the providers to assist them in driver selection. Caranicas said sensitivity training can be done now.

There was discussion of the cost of the evaluation program. The chairman said the third party evaluation funding does not come from service funds. Leroy Marshall asked why the program was not phased in slowly. Entzel said if a portion of the money had been spent to correct the old system it would have been a better project. Entzel maintained that MTC had disqualified many drivers from Metro Mobility service because they did not have the requisites to do this type of work.

Graves suggested the following language for the statement:

The Regional Transit Board continues to work together to increase the workability for users, providers and the RTB in the provision of Metro Mobility services.

We continue in our effort to review and revise policy and contract concerns of the users and the RTB. We look to the Legislature to assist us in strengthening the state operations standards and training requirements that now exist by state statute for handicapped providers.

That would be following by Franklin's points and come to closure. It should include the legislative request and the work with the providers. Fuhr suggested that the statement be placed in the Op Ed sections, preferably in the Saturday editions. Franklin said she would accept the Graves statement and take page 6 and 7 from Ryan's testimony to the Legislature, adding a brief statement about what has been accomplished, and highlighting the information in the second to last paragraph on Page 7 regarding subsidy experience. Graves said the statement is part of an on-going effort. The board acknowledges its responsibility on how the contracts were laid out.

(The members discussed the tone of the proposed draft.)

Franklin added the following language:

The Regional Transit Board is in the process of revising the guidelines for the Metro Mobility safety program. The RTB has asked the advice and counsel from the Minnesota State Council for the Handicapped and the RTB's Transportation Handicapped Advisory Committee on the following items:

1. Contract violation procedures and penalties for non-compliance.
2. Changes in the driver training courses certified by the Minnesota Department of Transportation that would include sensitivity training.
3. Strengthening the role of the Metro Mobility Administrative Center in monitoring provider performance, developing checklists and hours for street and spot safety checks.
4. Analysis of the need for modifications of vehicle standards.

The question of liability was discussed; legal counsel suggested that an executive session would be most appropriate to discuss that issue. Weaver said he is concerned about making statements about who is liable; there is no problem with saying what we want to accomplish.

Matt Peterson described a concept for a long-range plan.

John Clauson said he supports the comments on the thrust of the press release. The disabled community draws no satisfaction from the situation, despite the fact that everything they asked for is now being compelled to take place. They do not want their name used in communications like this. Severance said the board should back the legislation and make an announcement that it will do things better.

Members discussed when the statement should be released. Perovich directed Tom Beaver to pull the statement together and give it back to members for review.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Kuehn discussed the progress of the board's legislation. Graves asked about Metro Governance. Kuehn said H.F. 1043 passed out last week and went to the House floor. The amendments make the MTC chair a part of MAFAC and says the Metropolitan Council will report in 1988 on process for regional coordination of LRT. The money implications are at the Appropriations Committee. There was discussion of the roles and responsibilities of the board.

Joyce moved that the board go into executive session; Graves seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Fitzgerald
Secretary



REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

270 Metro Square Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
612/292-8789

OATH OF OFFICE

I, GEORGE ISAACS, DO SOLEMNLY SWEAR THAT I WILL SUPPORT THE
CONSTITUTIONS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND OF THE
STATE OF MINNESOTA AND DISCHARGE FAITHFULLY MY DUTIES AS A
MEMBER OF THE REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD TO THE BEST OF MY
JUDGMENT AND ABILITY.

George Isaacs

Subscribed and sworn to before
me this 4th day of May 1987

Elliott Perovich, Chairman
Regional Transit Board



270 Metro Square Building, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101
612/292-8789

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION

RESOLUTION NO. 87-08

WHEREAS, Todd Lefko has served on the Regional Transit Board with distinction and honor; and

WHEREAS, Todd Lefko also served the Regional Transit Board as Chair of the Policy Committee; and

WHEREAS, Todd Lefko has provided focus to the work of the Policy Committee; and

WHEREAS, Todd Lefko has provided effective, candid advice to the Regional Transit Board.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

1. THAT the Regional Transit Board recognizes the contributions of Todd Lefko.
2. THAT the Regional Transit Board expresses its appreciation and gratitude to Todd Lefko for his insight and helpfulness on transit issues.
3. That the Regional Transit Board also hopes he will continue to assist the Board as a private citizen in the years to come.

Adopted this 4th day of May 1987.

Elliott Perovich, Chairman

Mary Fitzgerald, Secretary



270 Metro Square Building, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101
612/292-8789

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION

RESOLUTION NO. 87-07

WHEREAS, Ken Bedeau has served on the Regional Transit Board with distinction and honor; and

WHEREAS, Ken Bedeau was instrumental in relaying the issues and concerns of the Rideshare Advisory Committee to the Regional Transit Board; and

WHEREAS, Ken Bedeau has given freely of his time and energy to the Regional Transit Board to accept membership on the Board; and

WHEREAS, Ken Bedeau has shown perception, sound knowledge and fairness in carrying out his duties as a member of the Regional Transit Board;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

1. THAT the Regional Transit Board recognizes the debt of gratitude it owes Ken Bedeau for his contributions to the Board and wishes him continued success in the future.
2. THAT the Regional Transit Board also hopes he will continue to assist the Board as a private citizen in the years to come.

Adopted this 4th day of May 1987.

Elliott Perovich, Chairman

Mary Fitzgerald, Secretary



270 Metro Square Building, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101
612/292-8789

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION

RESOLUTION NO. 87-09

WHEREAS, Bernard Skrebes has served on the Regional Transit Board with honor and distinction; and

WHEREAS, Bernard Skrebes has represented the concerns of the elderly and disabled to the Regional Transit Board;

WHEREAS, Bernard Skrebes has given freely of his time and energy to the concerns and causes he believes in; and

WHEREAS, Bernard Skrebes has served as the liaison to the Transportation Handicapped Advisory Committee;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

1. THAT the Regional Transit Board expresses its sincere gratitude and appreciation to Bernard Skrebes for his personal contribution and commitment to the efforts of the Regional Transit Board during his membership; and
2. THAT the Regional Transit Board hopes he will continue to assist the Board as a private citizen in the years to come.

Adopted this 4th day of May 1987.

Elliott Perovich, Chairman

Mary Fitzgerald, Secretary

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Suite 270 Metro Square Building, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101

DATE: April 27, 1987
TO: Regional Transit Board
FROM: Elliott Perovich, Chairman
SUBJECT: Committee Chairs and Memberships

The Bylaws state "The board chair shall, at the first meeting in January of each year, or at such other time as the chair may deem necessary, appoint the chairs and members of standing committees, subject to board confirmation."

At our January 5, 1987, meeting the members agreed that these appointments should be delayed until all of the new members had been appointed to the board. All of our members have now been appointed; therefore, I am recommending the following appointments:

Policy Committee

Doris Caranicas, Chair
Alison Fuhr, Vice Chair
Rochelle Graves
George Isaacs

Administration and Finance Committee

Ruth Franklin, Chair
Paul Joyce, Vice Chair
Carole Faricy
Ed Kranz

EP/mff
bdlas1

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Suite 270 Metro Square Building, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101

DATE: April 27, 1987
TO: Regional Transit Board
FROM: Mark Ryan, Senior Project Administrator
SUBJECT: Metro Mobility Evaluation Contract

ACTION REQUESTED

That the Regional Transit Board (RTB) authorize the executive director to issue the attached Request for Proposal for the purpose of retaining a consultant to evaluate the changes to the Metro Mobility program implemented by the RTB in October 1986.

BACKGROUND

As part of the plan adopted for restructuring the Metro Mobility program, the RTB directed its staff to evaluate the effectiveness of the changes. In November 1986, the THAC discussed a draft outline of the topics to be addressed in the evaluation and how the topics could be evaluated. At the RTB's Administration and Finance Committee meeting on April 2, staff presented a memorandum that outlined the major focus of the evaluation, the issues to be studied, the timing of the evaluation and the process for involving THAC in developing the RFP. The committee recommended to the board that the executive director issue a Request for Proposal (RFP) to evaluate Metro Mobility. At the RTB meeting on April 6, the board acted to table the action recommended by the Administration and Finance Committee and directed staff to report back to the board with comments from THAC members.

A draft of the RFP was distributed and discussed briefly at the THAC meeting on April 16 and was reviewed in more detail at a special THAC meeting held on April 23. A copy of the RFP that includes comments from THAC is included with this memorandum.

DISCUSSION

There were many comments on the draft RFP made by committee members and other interested parties at the THAC meetings held April 16 and 23. Outlined on the following pages is a summary of those comments and the action taken by staff to address the comments.

April 27, 1987

Page 2

Comments

It would be helpful for the consultant to have access to the MTC's Metro Mobility user survey made in late 1985.

Under "Scope of Services," issues raised during the implementation of the service should be mentioned.

It is important that drivers have input.

MTC drivers should be asked about the former service.

Administrative procedures of the providers should be reviewed.

Standards should be developed for both lift and non-lift equipped vehicles.

Door height should be included in vehicle specifications.

Need to make sure that the selected consultant carries out the required work tasks.

Consumer input is very important.

Response

The MTC survey was added to the background section as a document available for reference.

Issues raised during the implementation were added to the scope of work section.

The responsibility sections under work task 3.0 and work task 12.0 were amended to include drivers' input.

Previous studies and reports on Metro Mobility will be available to the consultant(s). If consultants determine that it is necessary to meet with former drivers, this may be arranged.

Work task 9.0 was amended to include administrative procedures.

The product under work task 11.0 was amended to specify lift and non-lift vehicles.

The product under work task 11.0 was amended to include door height.

The consultant selection process will focus on the consultant's ability to perform. The contract will also include remedies that the RTB can take in the event of non-performance.

Throughout the RFP, emphasis has been placed on input from people that use the service and the role of THAC. This will be accomplished through surveys of users, focus groups of users, regular meetings with THAC and THAC representation on the consultant selection committee.

Comments

Response

Completion of the report should be sooner.

The dates for the completion of specific activities of the report will be finalized once a consultant is chosen. It is important to remain consistent with the RTB's original intent of evaluating a full year of operation. In reviewing proposal completion dates, deadlines were actually extended to provide a reasonable work period for the consultant(s) to complete the work.

It is not necessary to evaluate the Metro Mobility program.

It is helpful to have an objective third party evaluate the program so that changes that will benefit the program can be made with confidence.

Consultant that is selected should have awareness of unique local needs, along with Minnesota laws and regulations.

Background information will be available to all consultants and selection criteria for consultants will include experience with transit needs of people with disabilities and understanding the key components of Metro Mobility.

Description of THAC committee not included in RFP (staff comment).

Paragraph was added in background section that describes the THAC.

Need to plan for reaching budget limits and is there a relationship between service quality and available funding?

Issues like this will be identified through work tasks 6.0 and 7.0.

In reviewing the detailed work tasks, staff also clarified additional details. The expectations for the interim report were clarified through language changes in the scope of services and in the product for work task 5.0. Also, work tasks 6.0 and 7.0 were developed to differentiate between input from Metro Mobility riders and Metro Mobility providers. Work task 10.0 was also added to detail the work tasks for evaluating the effectiveness of the MMAC. The scope of services section was expanded to include the goals for implementing the changes to Metro Mobility and also to detail the expectations of the study.

The expense for this evaluation is included in the RTB's 1987 budget and represents approximately 1.5% of the total annual Metro Mobility budget. Funding for this evaluation will be drawn from handicapped planning grants in place at the RTB and not from funds budgeted for the operation of Metro Mobility.

April 27, 1987

Page 4

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

- o As part of the plan adopted to restructure the Metro Mobility program, the RTB directed staff to evaluate the effectiveness of the changes.
- o In November 1986, the RTB's Transportation Handicapped Advisory Committee (THAC) discussed a draft outline of the topics to be addressed in the evaluation and how the topics could be evaluated.
- o A draft Request for Proposal (RFP) was distributed and discussed briefly at the THAC meeting on April 16 and was reviewed in more detail at a special THAC meeting on April 23.
- o Comments were made on the draft RFP by committee members and other interested parties at the THAC meetings held April 16 and 23.
- o The expense for this evaluation is included in the RTB's 1987 budget and represents approximately 1.5 percent of the total annual Metro Mobility budget. Funding for this evaluation will be drawn from handicapped planning grants in place at the RTB and not from funds budgeted for the operation of Metro Mobility.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Regional Transit Board (RTB) authorize the executive director to issue the attached Request for Proposal for the purpose of retaining a consultant to evaluate the changes to the Metro Mobility program implemented by the RTB in October 1986.

MER:jmo
Attachment

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
for Consultant Services
on the
Evaluation
of the
METRO MOBILITY PROGRAM

May 5, 1987

Regional Transit Board
270 Metro Square Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
612/292-8789

BACKGROUND

The Regional Transit Board (RTB) has responsibility for mid-range planning, policy-making and coordination of transit services for the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area. Formed in 1984, at the direction of the state legislature, the RTB assumed responsibility for all transit programs formerly administered by the Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT) in the metropolitan area. One of these programs is Metro Mobility, a special transportation program that began in 1979 and for 1987 has an annual budget of over \$5.5 million that is capable of providing over 600,000 one-way trips annually to people with disabilities that are unable to use the regular bus service.

In an attempt to identify the steps necessary to increase the amount of service and improve the cost-effectiveness of Metro Mobility services, Mn/DOT initiated a comprehensive evaluation of the Metro Mobility program in late 1983. The Urban Institute, retained by Mn/DOT as the consultant to the project, completed its evaluation of the Metro Mobility program and developed recommendations for actions to be taken to improve service. Mn/DOT took no action on these recommendations, considering that the RTB would soon be assuming responsibility for the Metro Mobility program.

The RTB began its review of the Metro Mobility program in December 1984. The RTB's review of Metro Mobility continued with a series of public meetings at which Metro Mobility users and interested parties presented testimony about their experiences with the service. Additionally, regular meetings of citizen advisory committees were held during which the Metro Mobility service was discussed. Currently the RTB has a citizen advisory committee which meets on a regular basis that advises the RTB on issues relating to transportation for people with disabilities. The committee, called the Transportation Handicapped Advisory Committee (THAC), is composed of 21 members representing users, providers, agencies and other interested parties.

The RTB extensively reviewed the results of Mn/DOT's evaluation and the public input and in December 1985, adopted recommendations for reorganizing the program. A detailed implementation plan to carry out these recommendations was adopted by the RTB in June 1986 and the changes took effect on October 4, 1986.

Prior to the changes that took effect on October 4, 1986, Metro Mobility services were provided by nine providers that included six taxicab companies, a private for-profit company, a private non-profit company and the Metropolitan Transit Commission (MTC).

The MTC also was under contract to the RTB to administer the daily operations of the program that included a centralized dispatching system. Under this system, Metro Mobility users requested trips by calling a single number for their trip requests. MTC staff was then responsible for assigning trip requests to one of the nine providers.

Metro Mobility users were required to call in their requests for service the day before they wished to travel, between 6:00 AM and 1:00 PM. On weekends and holidays, the call-in period was from 8:00 AM to 1:00 PM.

The fare to the users of the service ranged from \$.60 to \$.90; this depended on the time of travel and whether or not the trip required a transfer to another vehicle. Metro Mobility service was available in an area of approximately 280 square miles that generally included Minneapolis, Saint Paul and the first ring suburbs.

The changes that took place on October 4, were intended to reduce the cost of the service, improve the quality of the service and to expand the service to the entire transit taxing district.

One of the first steps the RTB took was to establish a process that allowed all qualified providers to participate in the program. This began in April 1986, when the RTB invited over 100 providers to a meeting at which the planning efforts were discussed.

Guidelines were adopted and applications were then sent out to approximately 50 providers. The RTB received 23 applications from operators that were interested in providing Metro Mobility service.

Each of the applications was evaluated by a panel that included representatives from the Minnesota Department of Transportation, the Metro Mobility Transportation Center, the Metropolitan Council and the Regional Transit Board.

The evaluation of each application was based on criteria that included; related experience, the applicant's driver selection and training process, fleet capacity, compliance with applicable state and local regulations and ability to commit themselves to serving the Metro Mobility program.

On October 4, nineteen providers were under contract with the RTB to provide Metro Mobility service. (One additional provider has since joined the program and two providers have merged their operations.) These providers are certified to be reimbursed under the Metro Mobility program and compete with each other based on service quality and to a lesser extent, cost to users.

This group of providers includes seven of the former Metro Mobility providers and twelve providers that are participating in Metro Mobility for the first time. The twelve providers that are new to the program brought a wide range of experience to the program that included service to school-age children for special education classes, participants in the state's Medical Assistance program and service to many of the area's hospitals and nursing homes.

When the changes took effect on October 4, there were also some changes that affected the people that used the service. However, the eligibility guidelines for people that wished to use the service remained the same. Prior to using Metro Mobility services, a person must be registered and certified. The guidelines for certification are generally that an individual is unable to use regular bus service. Specifically, the guidelines are that a person must be unable to use the steps of a mainline bus, unable to wait outdoors for more than 10 minutes, unable to maneuver themselves for more than one-fourth of a mile or unable to use or learn to use mainline bus service as verified through a physician, physical therapist or an orientation and mobility specialist.

For the first time, Metro Mobility users had a choice of providers to select from. Users select the provider of their choice and then call them directly to request their trip. Also, if there is a problem with the service, users can speak directly to the provider.

To help reduce the amount of public subsidy for Metro Mobility services, additional costs for Metro Mobility users were implemented on October 4. One of those areas was the passenger's fare. The fare for a trip up to 8 miles was increased to \$1.00 and if a person wished to travel over 8 miles, providers can charge up to an additional \$2.75. Also, an annual \$10.00 registration fee for Metro Mobility users was introduced along with a one-time fee of \$10.00 for establishing a standing order and a fee of \$5.00 for each change to a standing order.

There continues to be a Metro Mobility administrative center that is operated by the MTC. Its responsibilities include verifying the billings submitted by the nineteen providers, monitoring the performance of the providers, certification and registration of people to use Metro Mobility, maintenance of a computer system and addressing users' concerns. The administrative center also employs a full-time rider representative who is available to assist Metro Mobility users with the service and to act as a liaison between users and providers. The rider representative has also met with many groups to explain how the Metro Mobility program operates.

Since these changes took effect on October 4, there have been some very positive results and the program has experienced some unexpected problems.

One of the big disappointments has been with the computer system that was developed for the new program. The computer system was an upgrade of the existing system and plays a key role in monitoring trips and maintaining certification records. Since the equipment was delivered, it has not worked properly and it is being returned to the manufacturer. Currently RTB and MTC staff are working together to develop an alternative system that is expected to be operational by early fall.

Some disabled people and their representatives have raised several issues with the changes to the program. These have included concerns that the operating standards, established by the Minnesota Department of Transportation for vehicles providing special transportation service like Metro Mobility, do not adequately protect the safety of disabled passengers. Additionally, there has been opposition to the establishment of higher passenger fares and the initiation of users fees. In fact, several people have filed complaints with the Minnesota Department of Human Rights contending that the Metro Mobility program discriminates against people with disabilities.

Some Metro Mobility providers have also indicated that the rates that they are being paid for the Metro Mobility service are not adequate and have requested the RTB to increase the reimbursement rates.

There have also been some very encouraging results since October 4. Users noticed immediately, for example, the ease of scheduling their trips. Under the former system, users were often frustrated with the long time it took for them to schedule a trip. With the changes that took place last fall, this problem has been significantly reduced.

As mentioned earlier, providers may charge an additional \$2.75 for longer trips. As a result of competition between providers, very few are charging this additional fare. Another benefit that users have noticed, is that when taking a long trip, it is no longer necessary to transfer and wait for a second vehicle to complete their trip.

Since October, the program has experienced a significant reduction in the cost of the service and as a result, service will be expanded to the entire transit taxing district by 1988. Also, with the same level of funding that was available to the former system, the number of trips to Metro Mobility users will be increased by approximately 23 percent.

The first phase of expansion occurred on January 1, 1987, when service was expanded from 280 square miles to approximately 633 square miles. This expansion included western and northern Hennepin County, southern Anoka County and northern Ramsey County.

On January 1, 1988, service will expand to western Washington County, northern Dakota and Scott Counties and eastern Carver County. Once this occurs, Metro Mobility service will be available to all residents within the 980 square miles of the transit taxing district.

Prior to October 4, the RTB was paying an average of \$10.27 for each Metro Mobility trip. During the first three months of the program, an average of \$8.79 has been paid for each trip and the average subsidy per trip in 1987 is expected to be approximately \$8.30.

For further background information, the RTB has available the following documents as reference:

- o An Evaluation of Metro Mobility with Proposals for Improvements Prepared for the Minnesota Department of Transportation by the Urban Institute - December 1984.
- o RTB Staff Recommendations for Improving Metro Mobility Service - Adopted on December 16, 1985.
- o Metro Mobility Implementation Plan - Adopted on June 16, 1986.
- o Metropolitan Transit Commission User Survey - December 1985.

SCOPE OF SERVICES

The purpose of this study is to conduct a comprehensive review and evaluation of the Metro Mobility program to determine how well the goals for implementing the changes to the program have been met. The goals for implementing the changes are to:

- o Improve the quality of the service;
- o Reduce the cost of the service; and
- o Expand the service to the entire transit taxing district.

The study will address three major categories: service quality and safety, cost effectiveness and operational issues.

Service Quality and Safety

Service quality and safety will be evaluated through responses from the people that use Metro Mobility by means of focus groups and surveys. People that use Metro Mobility will be asked to evaluate items such as safety of the service, Metro Mobility communication efforts, ride time, the trip scheduling process, service reliability, courtesy of providers and the MMAC, the use of vouchers, responsiveness to rider concerns, vehicle comfort, and passenger cost. Data collected by the Metro Mobility Administrative Center (MMAC) will also be used to evaluate service quality and safety.

Cost Effectiveness

To determine the cost effectiveness of the changes, the study will evaluate the average total cost for each trip, the average RTB subsidy for each trip, the costs associated with administering the program, and the impact of new revenue sources on the program (i.e. user fees, provider fees). This information will be compared to costs under the former program along with the costs experienced by similar types of programs both locally and nationally.

Operational Issues

Along with service quality, safety and cost effectiveness, the study will also explore many of the issues that have been raised during the planning and implementation of the changes to Metro Mobility. This section of the study will include a review of the possibility of permitting trips to be scheduled on the same day, safety concerns that have been raised, the extension of the service hours in the expansion area, and effectiveness of the MMAC.

One of the major changes that was implemented on January 1, 1987, was the first phase of service area expansion. The plan adopted by the RTB called for expansion to the entire transit taxing district by January, 1988. This part of the study will focus on trip lengths from the expansion area and how well Metro Mobility is meeting the needs of the disabled in the expansion area.

Several issues related to Metro Mobility providers will also be explored and will include input from the providers. This section of the study will include a review of the current reimbursement rates for providers and whether different rates should be considered, an analysis on the optimal number of providers for the program and identification of ways to streamline administrative requirements for the providers.

Another issue that will be explored is the possibility of financial participation from agencies whose clients use Metro Mobility service. At the time the changes were implemented to the program, it was estimated that 40 percent of all Metro Mobility trips were for the purpose of serving agencies that operate programs for persons with disabilities. As part of the changes implemented by the RTB, a policy direction was set to explore the possibility of agencies providing financial participation for their client travel and set January 1988 as a target date to implement a plan. This policy direction will be evaluated to determine if it is feasible and to identify the steps necessary for a successful implementation. This portion of the evaluation will work closely with agencies that use Metro Mobility for their client travel.

Through a comprehensive review and evaluation of these issues, the RTB will be able to identify appropriate changes that will benefit the program.

The consultant's responsibilities will include an oral and written interim status report that will be completed and presented to the THAC and RTB in September 1987. Additionally, a comprehensive oral and written report on the first year of operation will be made to the RTB and THAC in January 1988.

A significant part of this study will include citizen participation through regular meetings with the Regional Transit Board's Transportation Handicapped Advisory Committee (THAC), provider forums, and direct input from Metro Mobility riders.

The RTB will be responsible for overall management of the consultant contract with Linda Ehlers serving as the project manager. The consultant firm will conduct major elements of the work program at the direction of the project manager, and on a regular basis will report to the project manager on progress towards accomplishing the work tasks.

WORK TASKS

- 1.0 The consultant will develop and present a detailed work plan and time schedule for conducting the study to the project manager and the RTB's THAC.

Product: Detailed Work Plan

Responsibility: Consultant, RTB staff and THAC will collectively develop the work program and timetable.

Timing: Completed by July 24, 1987

- 2.0 The consultant will review existing data provided by the RTB and by the MMAC and will identify data deficiencies. The consultant will be assisted by RTB and MMAC staff.

Product: Identification of Data Deficiencies

Responsibility: RTB and MMAC staff will provide background information and statistical information.

Timing: Completed by July 31, 1987

- 3.0 The consultant will identify the key user, provider and administrative issues associated with the program.

Product: Written Report: User, provider and administrative issues documented for evaluation.

Responsibility: Consultant will meet with THAC, RTB staff, Metro Mobility providers (including drivers) and solicit input from users through focus groups. RTB and MMAC staff will assist by providing a listing of all certified Metro Mobility users and Metro Mobility providers. Consultant will produce a written report.

Timing: Completed by August 28, 1987

4.0 The consultant will develop a detailed work plan to investigate the feasibility of agencies participating in the cost of their client travel.

Product: Detailed work plan and establishment of an agency participation committee.

Responsibility: RTB staff will provide background information on this topic. Consultant, along with RTB staff and the THAC, will collectively develop work plan. Consultant will facilitate meetings of agency committee.

Timing: Completed by August 14, 1987

5.0 The consultant will present an oral and written interim status report to the Regional Transit Board and Transportation Handicapped Committee (THAC).

Product: Written and oral interim status report that summarizes the project's activities and findings to date and outlines upcoming activities.

Responsibility: Consultant will present reports to joint meeting of THAC and RTB.

Timing: Completed by September 7, 1987

6.0 The consultant will solicit information from people that use Metro Mobility.

Product: Written Report: Findings and conclusions from user survey regarding user satisfaction, service safety and quality.

Responsibility: RTB staff and MMAC staff will provide complete listing of people certified to use the service.

Consultant will design and administer user survey.

Consultant will prepare written reports.

Timing: Completed by October 8, 1987.

7.0 The consultant will solicit information from operators under contract to provide the service and administrators of the service.

Product: Written Report: Compilation and analysis of statistical data on operations of Metro Mobility.

Responsibility: RTB staff, MMAC staff and Metro Mobility operators will provide statistical information on the operations of the service.

Consultant will prepare written reports.

Timing: Completed by October 8, 1987.

8.0 The consultant will compare the characteristics of the current program with the former program and similar programs in other areas of the country.

Product: Written Report: Comparisons of Metro Mobility characteristics with the former program and similar programs in other areas of the country.

Responsibility: RTB and MTC staff will provide information on former program. RTB staff in conjunction with THAC and the consultant will identify similar types of programs in other areas of the country. Consultant will research other programs and prepare the written report.

Timing: Completed by September 11, 1987

9.0 The consultant will conduct an operational audit of Metro Mobility providers to determine adequacy of safety programs, training programs, administrative procedures, driver selection process, vehicle maintenance and standardization.

Product: Written Report: Operational evaluation of Metro Mobility providers, overview of training, selection and safety programs, vehicle maintenance programs and vehicle inventory (including specifications). Report shall identify specific areas for improvements.

Responsibility: Consultant will meet with THAC, RTB staff and Metro Mobility providers. Consultant will prepare the written report.

Timing: Completed by September 18, 1987

10.0 The consultant will conduct an operational audit of the Metro Mobility Administrative Center to determine adequacy of staffing levels, administrative procedures, provider monitoring, trip verification, complaint resolution process and rider certification process.

Product: Written Report: Operational evaluation of MMAC including specific areas for improvements.

Responsibility: Consultant will meet with THAC, RTB staff, Metro Mobility providers and MMAC staff. Consultant will prepare written report.

Timing: Completed by September 18, 1987.

11.0 The consultant will recommend standard Metro Mobility vehicle specifications.

Product: Written Report: Recommended standards for lift and non-lift vehicles that includes specialized equipment, interior head room and door height.

Responsibility: Consultant will review specific equipment needs of people with disabilities and will prepare a written report in conjunction with THAC, RTB staff and Metro Mobility providers.

Timing: Completed by October 8, 1987

12.0 The consultant will develop a standardized driver training manual and written tests for all Metro Mobility providers for use in their company sponsored training programs.

Product: Metro Mobility driver training manual.

Responsibility: Consultant will meet with THAC, RTB staff and Metro Mobility providers (including drivers). Consultant will prepare the driver training manual.

Timing: Completed by October 15, 1987

✓
analy
out to
move
ahead

- 13.0 The consultant will determine the feasibility of the RTB policy direction to encourage agencies to participate in the cost of their clients travel and recommend a process to implement the policy (if feasible).

Product: Written Report: Issues associated with this policy direction and a determination if this policy direction is feasible.

Written Report (if feasible): Detailed implementation plan.

Responsibility: Consultant will meet with THAC, RTB staff and agency participation committee. RTB staff will provide background information on this policy direction. Consultant will prepare a written report.

Timing: Completed by October 15, 1987

- 14.0 The consultant will recommend specific changes with their associated costs and recommended actions that will benefit the program.

Product: Written Report: Description of recommended actions that will benefit the program and justifiable evidence for the recommended actions.

Responsibility: Consultant will develop a draft report in consultation with THAC, RTB staff and Metro Mobility providers.

Timing: Completed by November 16, 1987

- 15.0 The consultant will present an oral and written final report to the Regional Transit Board and Transportation Handicapped Advisory Committee.

Product: Written and oral final report.

Responsibility: Consultant will present reports to joint meeting of THAC and RTB.

Timing: Completed by January 4, 1988.

PROPOSED GUIDELINES AND SCHEDULE

A. Time Schedule

The anticipated starting date for consultant work on the Evaluation of the Metro Mobility Program is July 9, 1987. The timeline for completion of the various work elements is outlined in the RFP, with completion of the final reports to be completed by November 16, 1987.

B. Maintenance of Records and Reports

The selected consultant will be required to maintain records necessary to complete monthly reports on the contract activity which shall include the kind of service delivered, the period of time involved and the products provided.

C. Requested Proposal Content and Format

The consultant proposal should include the following:

- 1) Cover letter. This should include the name and address of the lead consultant and the names of other firms or individuals participating in the proposal.
- 2) Introduction. The consultant should indicate their understanding of the project, its goals and key elements.
- 3) Project Organization. This should include the proposed approach, the identification and roles of the lead consultant and any sub-consultants and anticipated interaction with the RTB and its committees.
- 4) Work Plan. This should include a detailed outline of the tasks, target dates, responsibilities, hours, hourly rates, professional classifications, expenses, and a description of the products for each task. Consultants are encouraged to suggest innovative or alternative approaches to the work elements outlined in the RFP.
- 5) Project Staffing. This should include identification of the individuals directly responsible for executing the project. A brief summary of their experience and education should be provided. Of key importance will be the qualifications of the project manager.
- 6) Experience and Qualifications. This section should include a brief description of each firm, area of expertise, work on similar projects and location.

- 7) Project Budget. This section should include the proposed budget for the project. Included should be person-hours per task, hourly rates, classification, equipment and expenses.
- 8) Client References. Five client references, from projects of similar scope, should be provided for each of the major firms.
- 9) Project Timeline. The consultant should provide a timeline for completion of each of the work tasks and the total project.
- 10) The proposer must demonstrate utilization of affirmative action employment policies by supplying the current composition of employees by race, ethnic group and gender.

Proposers should also include a plan to utilize disadvantaged and women-owned business enterprises (DBE/WBE). No goal is established for the value of work to be subcontracted to disadvantaged and/or women business enterprises, but the lead consultant shall make every reasonable effort to subcontract work through good faith negotiations in advance of contract award. The RTB's DBE/WBE UMTA Section 8 goal is 10% DBE and 3.7% WBE.

D. Proposal Submission and Consultant Selection Process

1) Schedule

Requests for Proposals on the Evaluation of the Metro Mobility Program will be issued by the RTB on May 5, 1987. A pre-proposal conference will be held on May 19 and proposals must be received by 2:00 p.m. on June 12, 1987. The consultants selected as finalists will be notified by Tuesday, June 16, and will be interviewed on Friday, June 19. The selection process will be completed by July 8, 1987.

2) Submission of Proposals

All proposals must be sent to:

Linda Ehlers, Project Administrator
Regional Transit Board
270 Metro Square Building
Seventh and Robert Streets
St. Paul, MN 55101

Proposals must be received no later than 2:00 p.m., June 12, 1987. Late proposals will not be accepted. Please provide ten copies of the proposal. One copy must contain an original signature of an authorized member of the lead firm.

3) Selection Process

The RTB will utilize a Consultant Selection Committee to review the proposals, interview the finalists and select the consultant. The committee will be composed of representatives from the Regional Transit Board, and the Transportation Handicapped Advisory Committee.

4) Evaluation

The consultant will be selected based on the following evaluation criteria:

- a) Project cost detail, including person-hour commitment, billing rates, and commitment to complete the project within the proposed budget and timeline.
- b) Expressed understanding of the project objectives, including issues, problems, approach and team concept.
- c) Qualifications of firm and personnel, including relevant firm experience, project team composition, management structure, qualifications and experience of key personnel and commitment of time to project.
- d) Project work plan, including comprehensive approach to proposed elements, innovative approaches, understanding of the key components and overall structure.

5) Cancellation of Solicitation

This Request for Proposal does not obligate the RTB to complete this project. The RTB reserves the right to cancel the solicitation if it is considered to be in its best interest and may reject any and all proposals.

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Suite 270 Metro Square Building, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101

DATE: April 28, 1987
TO: Regional Transit Board
FROM: Robert Dietrick, Administrative Aide
SUBJECT: Renewal of Public Official's Liability Insurance

Action Requested

It is requested that the Board authorize the executive director to renew the Regional Transit Board's Public Official's Liability Insurance policy with Lloyd's of London at an annual premium of \$68,000.

Background

The Regional Transit Board's Public Official's Liability policy with Lloyd's of London expired on January 8, 1987. The RTB's insurance agent, R. L. Youngdahl and Associates, was unable at that time to secure a renewal quote from Lloyd's and we have been granted monthly extensions of our present coverage since that time. The latest extension binder expires on May 8. At no time has there been a lapse of coverage.

The present quote of \$68,000 for renewal of the policy was delivered to the RTB on April 24 and is substantially higher than the premium that we are now paying, which is \$7,027.50. The quote is for a \$1,000,000 coverage with a deductible of \$25,000. The RTB's present policy provides the \$1,000,000 coverage with a deductible of \$5,000. Our agent had a meeting with myself, Greg Andrews and Kathy Christopherson, and explained that the huge increase is due to several factors. These factors are:

- o The RTB is a public transit authority in a large metropolitan area.
- o The policy had been underpriced in the past.
- o Few insurance companies will write this coverage.
- o The longer an agency is in existence the greater the likelihood of potential claims.

Three options were presented to us and they are:

1. Attempt to find coverage through other markets besides Lloyd's.

Our agent has identified three other insurance companies which stated that they would look into the possibility of writing coverage for us. These companies are:

- a. Tudor - no Best's insurance rating.
- b. National Union - rated A+
- c. International Surplus Lines - rated A+

Tudor was not recommended due to the fact that they are not rated by Best's and there is no guarantee of their financial base. The other two companies would need a minimum of 30 days in order to give us a quote, which will run us past the expiration date of our extension binder, which is May 8. It is our intent to provide continual coverage to the Board with no lapse in coverage and thus this option was ruled out. In addition, our agent feels that neither company could do better than Lloyd's, who is the premier insurer for public official's liability coverage.

Another factor which must be considered if we choose to change companies is that this policy is a claims-made policy which means that it only provides coverage for claims incurred from the inception of the policy. This means that the policy will not pick up coverage for pre-existing claims which were in effect before the policy's inception. It was felt that this was not a suitable option for the RTB.

2. Renew the coverage with Lloyd's effective May 8 with an expiration date of October 24 which coincides with our other policies.

We have the option of renewing this policy with an expiration date in October which would coincide with the expiration date of our other insurance policies. It was our feeling, and shared by our agent, that we would have difficulty renewing at that date and we may face an even higher premium at that time. It was felt that we would be better off to renew for one year and lock in the rates that we were quoted.

3. Renew the coverage with Lloyd's effective May 8 for one year.

This option was felt to be the best one because we would not be suffering any lapses in coverage, and we won't have to face the renewal market again for a year. Our agent feels that, while we may face a higher premium upon renewal, it should not be anywhere near the magnitude of this increase.

The Board should be aware that this coverage starts on May 8, 1987 and the payment for the extension from January 8 to May 8 is on a pro-rated basis of the previous policy, which was \$7,027.50. The RTB's pro-rated premium payment for January 8 - May 8 will be at this old premium rate, and will come to \$2,342.52.

We will work with our agent in the upcoming months to determine if there is anything that we can do to keep any future premium increases at a reasonable rate, and we will explore every option available.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Board authorize the executive director to renew the Regional Transit Board's Public Official's Liability Insurance policy with Lloyd's of London effective May 8, 1987, for one year at a premium of \$68,000. Coverage limits are \$1,000,000 with a deductible of \$25,000.

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Suite 270 Metro Square Building, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101

DATE: April 30, 1987
TO: Regional Transit Board
FROM: Policy Committee, Alison Fuhr, Vice-Chair
SUBJECT: Report of the Policy Committee

BACKGROUND

At its meeting on April 22, 1987, the Policy Committee discussed proposed strategies to improve Metro Mobility safety, communications and training, and the following recommendation was approved:

RECOMMENDATION

That the Regional Transit Board direct its staff to pursue specific actions to improve the Metro Mobility program in three areas: safety, communications, and training. A comprehensive range of strategies should be analyzed and brought back to the Policy Committee for review and determination of the most effective strategies chosen for implementation.

At both the April 8 and April 22 meetings, the committee also reviewed and discussed two draft versions of an RTB position statement on light rail transit. Based on those discussions, staff was asked to modify the statement for presentation to the full board. A revised draft statement is enclosed for additional discussion at the May 4 board meeting. Policy Committee members felt that the position, if adopted by the RTB, should be sent to the Metropolitan Council for its review.

A competitive transit update was also provided at the April 22 meeting, but no action was required.

jmo
bdlas5

Recommended RTB Position Statement on Light Rail Transit

As recently concluded by the Metropolitan Council in their Long Range Transit Analysis, "transit capital investments can have a significant impact on highly traveled corridors in terms of increasing transit ridership; alleviating roadway congestion; serving the needs of persons dependent on transit; and providing attractive, convenient alternatives to the private automobile," and, "transit capital investments in certain corridors have the potential to achieve long-term transit operating cost savings which would offset the initial capital investment."

Furthermore, the Council cites in this same report, "No single transit capital improvement is appropriate for application across the entire region. Preferential access, busways, high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lanes, and light rail transit (LRT) are appropriate transit alternatives which are applicable to certain patronage levels, corridors and alignments." (Source: A Study of Potential Transit Capital Investments in Twin Cities Corridors: Long Range Transit Analysis, December, 1986.)

The Regional Transit Board endorses these findings and has formulated the following position statement on light rail transit to incorporate the Metropolitan Council conclusions.

Light rail transit can offer an efficient and cost-effective transit option in certain transportation corridors in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. Light rail transit should become an integral component of the area's coordinated transportation system. The Regional Transit Board will take a key role in conducting or coordinating planning, engineering and financial studies that will determine the optimal circumstances for deploying light rail transit in this metropolitan area and to promote a coordinated, balanced transportation system.

The Regional Transit Board endorses the findings of the Metropolitan Council's Long Range Transit Study which indicate that University Avenue and Minneapolis South corridors are the top priority corridors for transit capital improvements in the region; and Hiawatha Avenue, Northwest, North and Southwest/Nicollet alignments form a second priority category. As suggested by the Metropolitan Council, these priorities reflect regional policies and objectives and should not be construed as an implementation schedule for specific projects which are subject to funding opportunities and constraints, and social and economic-impact reviews.

The Regional Transit Board will work closely with all metropolitan counties and municipalities to coordinate their activities with regional planning for LRT. Based on the results of various LRT-related activities, which may be accomplished by the RTB or a regional rail authority, and include preliminary engineering, financial feasibility planning and alternative analyses, the board will determine or assist in determining the most appropriate method, circumstances and timing for implementing light rail transit in one or more corridors. The board's approach for dealing with light rail transit can be characterized by the following specific positions and subsequent actions for the following corridors:

* University Avenue

* Light rail transit is the preferred fixed guideway alternative in the University Avenue corridor.

* Preliminary engineering should be conducted for light rail transit in the University Avenue corridor, including logical connections to other corridors through the two downtowns and connections to maintenance yards and shops, as well as site specific development planning for corridor stations in the University Avenue corridor. The University Avenue corridor has been defined to include University Avenue between the downtowns of Minneapolis and St. Paul, the Hiawatha corridor to Lake Street.

* A financial feasibility plan should be developed to identify the strategy to fund the operating and capital requirements necessary to construct light rail transit. The financial feasibility plan will identify the strategy to fund these requirements, with an emphasis on maximizing private sector financial participation.

* The RTB should support the Metro Council in its completion of the Alternative Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement including the separation of the Southwest Corridor from the AA/DEIS to facilitate UMTA approval. A state environmental statement should then be completed for the Southwest Corridor.

* The final decision on implementation of light rail transit will be made after preliminary engineering, additional development planning, and the financial feasibility plan are completed.

* South Corridor

* The RTB should support the Metropolitan Council and the Minnesota Department of Transportation in their completion of the I-35W study. Upon completion of this study, the RTB will review the results and proceed with the steps necessary, including any additional alternative analysis that may be required, to make major transit improvements in this corridor.

* Hiawatha Avenue

* Preliminary engineering activities should be conducted to Lake Street in conjunction with the University Avenue corridor efforts; other limited preliminary engineering activities will be done to facilitate maximum coordination with the roadway preliminary engineering activities for the Hiawatha corridor. This work will include LRT trackwork definition, civil works engineering and station development planning

* Southwest Corridor

* The RTB supports efforts toward light rail transit development by the Hennepin County Railroad Authority, provided these efforts are consistent with regional goals, plans and policies. The RTB will work closely with Hennepin County to coordinate their activities with regional system planning for light rail transit.

* North and Northwest Corridors

* Alternative analyses should be conducted in the North and Northwest corridors in conjunction with Hennepin and Anoka counties and the Metropolitan Council.

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Suite 270 Metro Square Building, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101

DATE: April 27, 1987
TO: Regional Transit Board
FROM: Policy Committee, Alison Fuhr, Vice-Chair
SUBJECT: Report of the Policy Committee

BACKGROUND

At its meeting on April 22, 1987, the Policy Committee discussed proposed strategies to improve Metro Mobility safety, communications and training, and the following recommendation was approved:

RECOMMENDATION

That the Regional Transit Board direct its staff to pursue specific actions to improve the Metro Mobility program in three areas: safety, communications, and training. A comprehensive range of strategies should be analyzed and brought back to the Policy Committee for review and determination of the most effective strategies chosen for implementation.

Other topics that were discussed but for which no action was requested included:

- o Competitive Transit Update
- o RTB Position Statement on Light Rail Transit--Revision

jmo
bdlas5

*Amended
remove Item 12.*

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Suite 270 Metro Square Building, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101

DATE: April 27, 1987
TO: Regional Transit Board
FROM: Linda Ehlers, Project Administrator
SUBJECT: THAC Response to Proposed Strategies to Improve Metro Mobility Safety, Communications and Training

A list of strategies to address concerns about Metro Mobility safety, communications and training was presented to the Policy Committee on April 22. On April 23, RTB staff received comments from the Transportation Handicapped Advisory Committee (THAC). The attached strategy document has been revised to incorporate the suggestions made by THAC. In addition, THAC members raised the following general issues:

- o The proposed strategies focus primarily on the responsibilities of the Metro Mobility Administrative Center (MMAC) and Metro Mobility providers. THAC emphasized that service users, the RTB, MMAC and providers each have a role and responsibility in assuring a safe, effective service.
- o THAC described the proposed strategies as a "living document" reflecting their view that the strategies will change as needed to improve Metro Mobility.
- o THAC expressed concern over the additional financial and staffing requirements that might be necessary for MMAC to implement some of the proposed changes.
- o THAC commented that drivers' perception of safety is important and should be considered along with other measures of passenger safety.

The list of strategies will be reviewed next with Metro Mobility providers at a meeting scheduled for May 6.

Specific changes made to the "Metro Mobility Strategies for Improving Safety, Communications and Training" are as follows:

<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>
Providers should have ongoing, safety training responsibilities.	Under Safety Strategy B, to incorporate specific requirements in the contract, such as service quality standards and driver selection procedures, staff added "frequency of safety training and meetings."

Comment

Response

Inspections should be performed by appropriately trained persons.

Under Communications Strategy O which calls for a memorandum of understanding between MTC and RTB on the responsibilities of the MMAC, add "Additional inspection training requirements."

Providers should consider using incentives for good safety performance, in addition to using penalties for non-compliance.

In Safety Strategy B, staff added, "Incentives to providers for good performance."

Dates for achieving safety strategies F and G and Training Strategy D are contingent upon the evaluation study and need to be changed.

Change dates on Safety Strategies F and G from June 1987 to September 1987. Change Training Strategy D from July 1987 to October 1987.

The Riders' Guide should include more specific cost information for users.

In Communications Strategy E 1. which describes revisions to the Riders' Guide, add, "The revised Riders' Guide will contain information clarifying the cost to users of Metro Mobility trips."

The proposed rider satisfaction survey card should not only solicit complaints but also positive comments about Metro Mobility service.

In Communications Strategy M, staff added that feedback "both positive and negative" would be sought.

THAC suggested that a more accurate term for "sensitivity training" would be "customer service training."

Throughout the Training Strategy section, "sensitivity" was replaced with "customer service."

It was stated that the training course proposal submitted by the Metropolitan Center for Independent Living is part of the human relations curriculum used by the State Department of Education.

No change was made to the document, but it should be noted that Training Strategy A, which refers to state certification of training refers to certification by the Minnesota Department of Transportation.

Drivers should receive training on such topics as first aid on an ongoing basis.

To address this issue, Training Strategy C was added, "Review ongoing training needs of drivers, including proficiency in first aid techniques."

Regional Transit Board

METRO MOBILITY STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVING
SAFETY, COMMUNICATIONS, AND TRAINING

April 1987

I. SAFETY

Objective

Implement a strong quality assurance program to ensure that Metro Mobility providers conform with safety, training, and equipment standards.

Strategies

A. In the contracts with Metro Mobility providers, clarify existing provisions, as necessary, including:

1. Safety policies and procedures.
2. Incident and accident reporting requirements.
3. Complaint handling and reporting requirements.

Lead Responsibility: RTB
Timing: Ongoing

B. With input from providers and the Transportation Handicapped Advisory Committee, incorporate specific requirements in the contracts on topics such as the following.

1. Service quality standards.
2. Driver selection procedures and training curriculum.
3. Frequency of safety training meetings.
4. Scheduled preventive maintenance inspection intervals.
5. Vehicle specifications.
6. Incentives to providers for good performance.
7. Other, as determined.

Lead Responsibility: RTB
Timing: July 1987

C. For contract enforcement, to deter contract violations, establish a schedule of penalties for noncompliance.

Lead Responsibility: RTB
Timing: July 1987

D. Strengthen the MMAC's role in monitoring provider performance.

1. Develop field monitoring checklists.
2. Establish minimum number of hours dedicated to spot checks.
3. Schedule visits to provider facilities to obtain vehicle tours for the follow-up spot checks, and to inspect vehicle maintenance records and personnel files including drivers' certificates of training and license classification.

Lead Responsibility: MMAC

Timing: May 1987

Costs: \$10,000 to \$50,000--depending on the need for increased staffing and vehicle travel expenses beyond the current MMAC budget.

E. Issue appropriate directives to providers such as those recently distributed:

1. Safety bulletins published on the mandatory use of seat belts and door-through-door passenger assistance.
2. Safety meetings with drivers on specified topics.
3. Comprehensive report of each provider's safety and training program.
4. Assurance that all drivers are trained and certified before assigned to operate service.

Lead Responsibility: RTB/MMAC

Timing: Ongoing

F. As part of the Metro Mobility evaluation study, analyze need for development of vehicle specifications and safety standards: the types of vehicles, safety features, and specialized equipment permitted to be used for Metro Mobility service. To aid in dispatching a vehicle that meets the specific equipment needs of a disabled person, the existing wheelchair code in the rider's certification number can be refined.

Lead Responsibility: Consultant

Timing: September 1987

Costs: Covered in planning grant

G. Evaluate additional service quality and safety issues in the Metro Mobility evaluation study, through the consumer research and operations audit phases of the study.

Lead Responsibility: Consultant

Timing: September 1987

Costs: Covered in planning grant

II. COMMUNICATIONS

Objective

Implement a comprehensive communications plan which ensures that Metro Mobility riders fully understand the system, their rights within the system, and how complaints and concerns will be handled.

Strategies

- A. Refine complaint procedure including the following elements: who takes complaints (at MMAC and providers' offices), time it takes to resolve complaints, who will respond to complaints, and what kind of resolution can be expected.

Lead Responsibility: MMAC

Timing: May 1987

- B. Prepare direct mailing by MMAC to riders that explains and encourages riders to use the complaint process. The Metro Memo newsletter may be the vehicle for communicating this information along with other topics such as safety tips and riders' rights.

Lead Responsibility: MMAC

Timing: May 1987

Costs: Covered in existing MMAC budget.

- C. Continue safety awareness efforts such as the current placement of signs regarding mandatory seat belt use in all vehicles assigned to Metro Mobility service--buses, taxis, and vans.

Lead Responsibility: MMAC

Timing: Ongoing

Costs: Covered in existing MMAC budget.

- D. Incorporate provider quality ratings into the reports issued from the daily, random telephone surveys now used to verify tripmaking.

Lead Responsibility: MMAC

Timing: May 1987

Costs: Covered in existing MMAC budget.

E. Prepare new and refine existing communications materials that inform users about the Metro Mobility system, their rights as riders, safety procedures, the complaint process, and other topics.

1. The Rider's Guide, incorporating safety tips and the riders' bill of rights, will be modified. The revised Riders' Guide will contain information clarifying the cost to users of Metro Mobility trips.
2. Brochures explaining the Metro Mobility program, safety procedures, the complaint process, and the choice of providers based on equipment needs, will be developed and made available to Metro Mobility riders, disabled agencies, providers and the general public. The brochures will be distributed at various targeted locations.
3. The Metro Memo newsletter issued to riders will be published monthly or bi-monthly and its circulation increased to elderly and disabled organizations and community news media sources.

Lead Responsibility: MMAC

Timing: July 1987

Costs: Riders' Guide--revision currently a part of MMAC budget

Brochures--\$15,000 to \$20,000

Newsletter--estimate to be developed

F. Translate revised and new printed communications materials into braille and onto tape for distribution to visually-impaired persons. Publicize use of the MTC's TTY/TDD line for communications with hearing-impaired persons, coordinating call handling with the MTC Telephone Information Center staff; or install a separate TTY/TDD line at the MMAC.

Lead Responsibility: MMAC

Timing: Concurrent with the publication of the revised and new printed materials

Costs: Estimated to be developed

G. Place articles about Metro Mobility in newsletters serving the elderly and disabled community, Metro Mobility riders, and the general public.

Lead Responsibility: MMAC

Timing: Ongoing

H. Develop a Metro Mobility display for use at meetings held for the elderly and disabled community and at special events and community fairs.

Lead Responsibility: MMAC
Timing: September 1987
Costs: \$2,000 to \$3,000

I. Conduct transit forums on special topics to inform the general public and the elderly and disabled community about Metro Mobility -- the first forum, on safety, to be held in conjunction with the second annual Metro Mobility Exposition.

Lead Responsibility: RTB/MMAC
Timing: September 1987
Costs: \$1,000 to \$3,000

J. Develop speaker's bureau and materials for Metro Mobility presentations at community group meetings.

Lead Responsibility: MMAC
Timing: Ongoing
Costs: Will depend on MMAC staffing needs analysis

K. Develop radio and television public service announcements to explain Metro Mobility service focusing on rider certification, safety issues, the rights and responsibilities of riders, the complaint system, and the choice of providers based on equipment needs.

Lead Responsibility: RTB
Timing: October 1987
Costs: \$6,000 to \$8,000

L. Modify Metro Mobility rider identification cards, if feasible, to include a statement of riders' rights and an explanation of the complaint process.

Lead Responsibility: MMAC
Timing: October 1987
Costs: Estimate to be developed

M. Redesign vouchers to incorporate a rider satisfaction survey card (self-addressed prepaid postage) or implement another mechanism to facilitate ongoing feedback, both positive and negative, about the service provided.

Lead Responsibility: MMAC
Timing: October 1987
Costs: Estimate to be developed

N. In the event of proposed major changes to the Metro Mobility program:

1. Develop news releases on changes in the Metro Mobility program, distribute to news media sources.
2. Set up and hold public meetings to seek comments from rider groups and the general public. The community meetings will be convened with participation by the designated RTB board and THAC representatives present.

Lead Responsibility: RTB
Timing: Ongoing, as needed

O. Prepare memorandum of understanding between MTC and RTB regarding the specific responsibilities of the Metro Mobility Administrative Center (MMAC), including:

1. Role and duties of the Rider Representative.
2. Content and frequency of MMAC reports on issues, complaints, and service performance statistics.
3. Spot check and site inspection procedures and schedule.
4. Additional inspection training requirements.
5. After hours emergency call handling.
6. Authority to impose penalties specified for contract violations.
7. Communications responsibilities and budget implications.

Lead Responsibility: RTB/MTC
Timing: April 1987

P. Clarify with providers the roles and responsibilities of the RTB and the MMAC at the next providers' meeting.

Lead Responsibility: MMAC
Timing: May 1987

Q. Address additional communications issues in the Metro Mobility evaluation study through the consumer research phase of the study. For example:

1. Awareness of the telephone information and complaint service and telephone number.
2. Simplicity, ease-of-comprehension of existing communications materials.

Lead Responsibility: Consultant
Timing: June 1987
Costs: Covered in planning grant

III. TRAINING

Objective

Develop and implement a comprehensive customer service training program designed to enhance understanding of the special needs of the elderly and disabled riders of Metro Mobility among drivers assigned to operate special transportation service in the metropolitan area.

Strategies

- A. Set up meetings with providers to discuss training course deficiencies. Review recommendations from State Council for the Handicapped and Metropolitan Center for Independent Living (MCIL) for a customer service training course. Encourage MCIL to develop a training course, to be certified by the state, and offered to Metro Mobility drivers.

Lead Responsibility: MMAC/RTB
Timing: June 1987

- B. With input from the Transportation Handicapped Advisory Committee, current course instructors, and Minnesota Department of Transportation personnel, develop recommendations for changes in the course outline and incorporate these changes in the rulemaking process for the state operating standards governing all special transportation services.

Lead Responsibility: RTB
Timing: September 1987

- C. Review ongoing training needs of drivers, including proficiency in first aid techniques.

Lead Responsibility: RTB
Timing: September 1987

- D. Develop standardized driver training manual and written tests as an aid to all Metro Mobility providers for use in their company sponsored training, to supplement the state certified course.

Lead Responsibility: Consultant
Timing: October 1987
Costs: \$10,000 to \$15,000

- E. Modify RTB contracts with providers to incorporate anynew training curriculum requirements, including minimum number of hours designated for individual topics.

Lead Responsibility: RTB
Timing: October 1987

IV. OTHER ACTIVITIES

Objective

Continually seek solutions to identified problems, as they arise, in order to respond quickly to and effectively meet the mobility needs of the elderly and disabled population in the metropolitan area.

Strategies

- A. Gather details and investigate complaints received by MCIL that have not been formally reported to the MMAC. In cooperation with MCIL, develop a process for regularly transmitting complaint forms and detailed information to the MMAC for follow-up.

Lead Responsibility: MMAC
Timing: April 1987

- B. Analyze change in the number of individuals certified for Metro Mobility.

Lead Responsibility: MMAC
Timing: May 1987
Costs: Estimate to be developed

- C. Conduct special meeting with SCH and MCIL to discuss and resolve problems related to miscommunication.

Lead Responsibility: RTB
Timing: May 1987

- D. Obtain from SCH and MCIL information and opinions regarding known Metro Mobility riders who cannot afford the \$10.00 certification fee; investigate alternatives for payment.

Lead Responsibility: RTB
Timing: May 1987
Costs: Undetermined

Revised
4/28/87
bdlas4

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Suite 270 Metro Square Building, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101

DATE: May 4, 1987
 TO: Regional Transit Board
 FROM: Elliott Perovich, Chairman
 SUBJECT: Appointments to the Transportation Handicapped Advisory Committee

Background

On January 1, the terms of 13 THAC appointees expired and additional positions became vacant because of resignations. In February, the RTB distributed 433 press releases to solicit persons interested in serving on THAC. The press release was sent the metropolitan daily and community newspapers; Metro Mobility providers; organizations of and for disabled people; and newspapers, newsletters and other periodicals printed for older persons in the metropolitan area. A total of 38 applications were received. At the April 6 RTB meeting the Board approved eight of the chosen appointments. Since that meeting, Carole Faricy (district A) and I have chosen our appointments. They are as follows:

<u>District</u>	<u>RTB Member</u>	<u>THAC Appointee</u>	<u>Representing</u>
A	Carole Faricy	Mary Ziegler (new)	Metropolitan Council for Independent Living and MN State Council for the Handicapped
A	" "	Darlene Morse (new)	Metropolitan Council for Independent Living
At-large	MN State Council for the Handicapped (Elliott Perovich)	Kurt Strom (new)	MN State Council for the Handicapped
At-large	" "	Steve Bertrand (reappointed)	United Handicapped Federation
At-large	" "	Malcolm MacKay (new)	Courage Center
At-large	MN State Council for the Handicapped (Elliott Perovich)	Mary Jo Nichols (new)	Metropolitan Center for Independent Living

Regional Transit Board
May 4, 1987
Page 2

There still remains a vacancy for District H. RTB staff is currently soliciting persons to fill this vacancy.

Recommendation

That the Regional Transit Board approve the above appointees as members of the Transportation Handicapped Advisory Committee.

cc: G. Andrews
J. Hollander
E. Kouneski
L. Ehlers
T. Beaver
J. Hennings
M. Kuehn

JGelli
RTBTX1



OATH OF OFFICE

I, GEORGE ISAACS, DO SOLEMNLY SWEAR THAT I WILL SUPPORT THE
CONSTITUTIONS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND OF THE
STATE OF MINNESOTA AND DISCHARGE FAITHFULLY MY DUTIES AS A
MEMBER OF THE REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD TO THE BEST OF MY
JUDGMENT AND ABILITY.

George Isaacs

Subscribed and sworn to before
me this 4th day of May 1987

Elliott Perovich, Chairman
Regional Transit Board

Handout 5/4/87

1 senate and the committee on
 2 appropriations of the house of
 3 representatives.

4 Subd. 10. Contingent Appropriations

5 (a) The commissioner of transportation,
 6 with the approval of the governor after
 7 consultation with the legislative
 8 advisory commission, may transfer all
 9 or part of the unappropriated balance
 10 in the state airports fund to an
 11 appropriation for state airports
 12 purposes in order to meet an emergency
 13 or to take advantage of an
 14 unanticipated receipt of income to the
 15 state airports fund. The amount
 16 transferred is appropriated for the
 17 purpose of the account to which it is
 18 transferred.

19 (b) The commissioner of transportation,
 20 with the approval of the governor after
 21 consultation with the legislative
 22 advisory commission, may transfer all
 23 or part of the unappropriated balance
 24 in the trunk highway fund to an
 25 appropriation for trunk highway
 26 purposes in order to meet an emergency
 27 or to take advantage of an
 28 unanticipated receipt of income to the
 29 trunk highway fund. The amount
 30 transferred is appropriated for the
 31 purpose of the account to which it is
 32 transferred.

33 Subd. 11. Budget Reduction Transfer

34 Notwithstanding any other law to the
 35 contrary, the commissioner of finance
 36 shall reduce the distribution of the
 37 motor vehicle excise tax transfer as
 38 provided by Minnesota Statutes, section
 39 297B.09, subdivision 2, paragraph (c),
 40 by \$900,000 for the biennium ending
 41 June 30, 1989.

42 Sec. 3. REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD 20,126,500 20,126,500

43 Summary by Fund

44 General \$ 15,526,500 \$ 15,526,500

45 Transit Assistance \$ 4,600,000 \$ 4,600,000

46 The amounts that may be spent from this
 47 appropriation for each program are
 48 specified in the following subdivisions.

49 Subdivision 1. Regular

50 Route Service 11,721,500 11,721,500

51 Subd. 2. Metro

52 Mobility 6,000,000 6,000,000

53 Subd. 3. Small Urban,

54 Rural, and Replacement Services 730,000 730,000

1	Subd. 4. Test Marketing		
2	of New Services	400,000	400,000
3	Subd. 5. Light Rail Transit		
4	Studies	200,000	200,000
5	Subd. 6. Planning and		
6	Programs	750,000	750,000
7	Subd. 7. Administration	325,000	325,000

8 The board may not reduce the amounts
 9 available for expenditure under
 10 subdivisions 1 to 4 or spend any money,
 11 except money received from federal
 12 grants and private contributions, for
 13 the purposes of subdivisions 5 to 7 in
 14 addition to the amounts appropriated.

15 During the biennium ending June 30,
 16 1989, the board may not transfer funds
 17 among categories, may not be a
 18 recipient of federal capital or
 19 operating assistance for transit, and
 20 may not alter fare policies or allow
 21 the metropolitan transit commission to
 22 alter fare schedules existing on
 23 January 1, 1987, until: (1) the board
 24 has satisfied statutory planning
 25 requirements by (i) adopting plans and
 26 policies on fares, as required by Laws
 27 1985, First Special Session chapter 10,
 28 section 30, (ii) adopting an
 29 implementation plan under Minnesota
 30 Statutes 1986, section 473.161, that
 31 has been approved by the metropolitan
 32 council and includes any revisions
 33 required by the council under Minnesota
 34 Statutes 1986, section 473.161, (iii)
 35 adopting an approved financial plan
 36 under Minnesota Statutes, section
 37 473.38, subdivision 2, and (iv)
 38 submitting the implementation and
 39 financial plans adopted under items
 40 (ii) and (iii) to the legislature with
 41 its request for state financial
 42 assistance; and (2) the legislature has
 43 acted on the board's request for state
 44 financial assistance submitted under
 45 clause (1).

46 The board may supplement any of the
 47 appropriations made in subdivisions 1
 48 to 7 from its fund balance reserve.

49 The board shall study and report to the
 50 legislature on the effects, advantages,
 51 and disadvantages of transferring the
 52 authority to receive federal capital
 53 and operating assistance from the
 54 metropolitan transit commission to the
 55 board and on how and for what purpose
 56 the board would use the funds
 57 differently than the commission.

58 Sec. 4. TRANSPORTATION

59	REGULATION BOARD	531,500	531,500
----	------------------	---------	---------