



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 2, 1988
Metropolitan Council Chambers
4:00 p.m.

AMENDED AGENDA

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes of the Committee of the Whole Meeting of February 25, 1988
4. REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE Ruth Franklin,
Chair
5. REPORTS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE Doris Caranicas,
Chair
 - A. Regional Transit Board Role in the New Metropolitan Council Process for Review of Comprehensive Plan Amendments
 - B. Request from Medicine Lake Lines on Proposal for County Road 18 Transit Service Comprehensive Plan Amendments
 - C. Metro Mobility Provider Contract
6. OTHER BUSINESS:
 - A. Chairman's Report
 - B. Members' Reports
 - C. Advisory Committee Reports
 - D. Staff Reports
7. PUBLIC COMMENT

Elliott Perovich
Chairman



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

Minutes of the Meeting of the
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
RTB offices
February 25, 1988

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: George Isaacs

OTHERS PRESENT: Gregory Andrews, Mary Fitzgerald, Judy Hollander, Mike Kuehn, Regional Transit Board Staff; Gregory Korstad, legal counsel; Karen Lyons, Metropolitan Council; Joel Alter, Legislative Audit Commission;

The meeting was called to order at 4:20 p.m. and roll taken. The meeting was called to resume discussion of the Legislative Audit Commission's January 1988 report, Metropolitan Transit Planning, which was begun at a meeting on February 11. Draft copies of the minutes of that meeting were distributed.

The chairman said he has written to local officials inviting them to apply for membership on the Chairman's Advisory Committee. At a recent meeting of the Association of Metropolitan Municipalities, officials said RTB and the Metropolitan Council are not responsive to them and local officials should be appointed to the board. They think local government officials should be more directly involved and have a greater role to play. They also think the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) should play a larger role and that some of our issues should be run through the TAB.

Franklin said there are ten mayors and seven county commissioners on TAB and those interested in transit issues serve on the subcommittee. They would not be interested in creating another board. RTB should work with TAB to start with and then consider creating another entity, but since it is already in place it seems logical to run RTB issues through it. TAB Chair Gasper created a new Transportation Issues Committee and that committee could work on some of these issues. These city officials are very vocal and could work well with us. A group of local officials would be more parochial, which is one of the reasons elected officials cannot serve on the Metropolitan Council. It is important that members of the RTB and Metro Council look at the needs of the whole region.

Perovich said that is the reason the Metropolitan Reorganization Act was passed in 1975. A large number of officials from the exurban area have expressed interest in the Chairman's Advisory Committee and it might be interesting to have an advisory committee of exurban representatives. He asked Franklin to consider taking this issue to TAB. Discussion then turned to the report's recommendations.

Page 44: Hollander said the report recommends that the RTB role in Rideshare and traffic management organizations be clarified. (Kranz arrived.) Staff is

developing more recommendations on policy decisions on Rideshare. Perovich said there are two hearings scheduled on the draft Capital Plan next week. In response to his question on Metropolitan Council oversight, Alter said the council will have to take the initiative in reviewing plans. Fuhr said the report faults the council for not working with RTB and asked why there have not been more joint meetings. She also feels the board should hold joint meetings with the Metropolitan Transit Commission and the council's Metropolitan Systems Committee.

Page 59: Franklin asked members to develop issues that could be taken to the Transportation Advisory Board for their input and asked staff to put together a 1989 budget adding an employee to work strictly with local units of government. Graves asked if that could be an assignment for Mike Kuehn; Perovich said it would be technical assistance. Alter said local governments could prepare plans and present them to RTB staff. RTB is active now in planning local service and that is a legitimate role either way. Kranz said several cities in Dakota and Scott counties are considering at opting out and they have indicated to him that RTB staff opposes opt-out. They want to create their own plans with financial assistance from RTB.

Franklin said providing financial assistance would be a change of philosophy and would have to go through the Policy Committee. Kranz said he is referring to the entire attitude they have about RTB assistance. They see us as a hostile, take-over organization. He agrees it should go through proper channels no matter how it is financed. This is an opportunity to assist them with transit planning.

Franklin said we should determine whether there is enough staff to spend time with local units of government, develop rapport with the communities and find out why they think our staff is hostile. She has received reports that the staff has been very helpful to the communities. The board needs to build morale rather than tear it down further. Kranz said depending on the approach, we may or may not need more staff. If we encourage cities to augment local planning we may not need additional staff. We should be a review agency. Franklin agreed, but said it takes staff time to encourage cities to develop this. Fuhr agreed with Kranz because RTB funds are limited. The cities should be encouraged to pay or get matching funds. The Transportation Policy Plan of the Council has never called for local transit plans. In the course of addressing the transit element the board can be more involved. Perovich said any plan would have to be reviewed by staff, which will also take time.

Franklin said there is a conflict between encouraging opt-out and avoiding fragmented service. Alter said the Legislature should clarify the RTB role. Opt-out makes sense for certain cities and has to go hand in hand with standards. The law is ambiguous about whether RTB can enforce standards. Franklin said when RTB was created many people felt that new innovative service in the suburbs would mean that opt-out would not be needed any longer. Alter said there are practical limits to what RTB might accomplish. If funding constraints limit new service, opt-out might be more attractive. RTB has standards for fare recovery rates and opt-out services have to meet the standards or, if not, cities have agreed to reimburse. They have not contested the standards, but there has been some tension and he can foresee a time when they may say the RTB does not have the authority. Kranz said the board should analyze the Plymouth opt-out program from the time they started the study and implemented the service, comparing it to Shakopee and other cities. Is RTB, with its various other responsibilities, capable of absorbing and taking the

lead in planning some of those complex issues? It would be better to review the plans submitted by local units of government as opposed to designing the service. Franklin said she is also interested in finding out who paid for the plans because most cities do not have their own transit planners. Hollander said the Minnesota Department of Transportation paid for them because they do not have a planning staff.

Alter referred to Page 58, which shows that information. Fuhr said there should be no reason to opt-out. It is contingent on being last or next to the last on line. Perovich said it is not "their" money; it comes to RTB and the plan is reviewed based on the Transit Service Needs Assessment. The city has to leave 10 percent for their share of the metro system. Kranz said feathering and property taxes are issues; we have not followed through on abolishing property taxes. Alter said the concern is that people should not have a service where they have to transfer several times to get downtown. That could be a part of the criteria. Perovich said the legislators do not unanimously support continuation of the opt-out program.

Referring to Page 74, Perovich said everyone understands the conclusions. Kranz asked Alter to comment on the issue of RTB as a policy body, which is an operating agency in the case of Metro Mobility. Alter said he is not sure RTB is the operating body of Metro Mobility. Tension is created when RTB comes in to change a program and appear to get involved in operations, but he is comfortable with RTB taking that role while a program is being restructured because some detailed decisions have to be made that could be construed as putting in place policies on how the program will work. At the same time there is concern about getting bogged down in details. He has seen people coming to the board because they cannot get a ride. The board has to deal with how to be responsive in putting in place a good system, but it must not get bogged down. The board played an appropriate role in 1986 and made decisions that had to be made. The Metro Mobility Administrative Center did not exist at that time, but the board must be careful.

Franklin asked for Alter's reaction to the consultant's suggestion that the MMAC be a separate entity with which the board contracts for service. They would be held responsible and questions would be directed there instead of constantly coming to the RTB. Alter said that is the goal: to have MMAC deal with those problems and get away from complaints coming to the board. MMAC should get the message that they will do the job or it will go somewhere else. The question is, if in two years the RTB is not satisfied, what will happen to the computer?

Referring to Page 85, Competitive Bidding, Hollander said that from the staff point of view there is an understanding of which services cannot be bid out. They were informally established by the interim task force. One of the goals of the Competitive Transit project is to help develop a complete set of guidelines. At this point we control through interim standards and impact assessment. Franklin said the criticism came from MTC and if they had agreed, they have forgotten. Alter said the interim standards state that service will be considered by cancellation or rebidding. LAC was not sure about the good routes--will they be considered? A clarifying statement is needed. Franklin said if the subsidy is under \$2.45 the route is not eligible. Perovich said the board is on record that it will not rebid those routes. Franklin said the board reached that conclusion with MTC so she does not understand why there is confusion.

Kranz referred to Route 52. Sometime ago we agreed to hold quarterly meetings with MTC and have fallen behind. Andrews said he and Capell are trying to work out a date that is convenient for both agencies.

Fuhr said it is inconsistent that on light rail transit MTC would be the major provider. The board may want to amend the process. Perovich said that from the competitive bidding standpoint, rail is different. Faricy said that since the board's action, Hennepin County asked MTC to run the system. Kranz said the major concern was the lack of public discussion and the lack of staff input. Most of the discussion was at a retreat and not a regular board meeting. Alter said it may be too early to have a position on this issue, but his real concern is the method used to arrive at the conclusion. Arnie Entzel said there is bipartisan support at the Legislature for this position. The Legislature does not want a mixed system. The board took the right position. Portland has one of the best jointly operated systems and ridership is five times higher than expected. One entity doing all the planning is the most effective. Franklin said it was a mistake to discuss this at a retreat. At the time she felt it was premature. The Legislature said the RTB is not allowed to be involved in planning light rail. Fuhr said she still wants it on the agenda. Caranicas said perhaps another alternative should have been considered, but it may not make sense to bring it up again at this late date.

Page 92, Transit Tax Feathering: Perovich said if the MVET bill passes we may be able to avoid reliance on property tax.

Page 104, Agency Coordination: Perovich said Schreiber is one of our authors to repeal the Schreiber amendment, which would allow the board to work with other rail authorities. Standards would be on a voluntary basis. Caranicas said if the amendment is repealed, the board can work on light rail transit. Perovich said the counties and cities have the authority to reject any plan they do not like. Fuhr said in county officials are concerned about knowing what the other communities are doing.

Fuhr asked that the issue of emergency plans be put on the agenda. Franklin said MTC already has an emergency plan.

Fuhr said Alter emphasized to the Metropolitan Council the importance of transit in land use planning.

Perovich said this completes review of the recommendations. The board wanted to express its opinion of the report and staff will develop its reactions to the recommendations and develop a plan of action. If the board disagrees it must discuss the issues with staff. A meeting should be scheduled to discuss how the board will address this. A working retreat should be scheduled to develop a work plan and timeline. The work plan would be the board's response to the Legislative Audit Commission report. Christopherson said in the next two months staff will start the budget process and the work plan should be incorporated in it. Perovich said the June 1 date is absolutely the final date for responding to LAC.

Franklin said, referring to Page 85, that MTC wants a formal contract with RTB. She asked if the board should be working on that. She has gotten the message that MTC considers itself different from other providers. Perovich said if they are the same, they have to submit a service plan each year. Andrews said there is a legal opinion on this and we should do further research on the question.

There being no further business, Franklin moved and Faricy seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The meeting was adjourned at 6 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Fitzgerald
Secretary

MEDICINE Lake LINES



835 DECATUR AVE. NO., GOLDEN VALLEY, MN 55427 (612) 545-9417

August 24, 1987

Mr. Elliott Perovich, Chairman
Regional Transit Board
270 Metro Square Building
St. Paul, Mn 55101

Dear Elliott:

After reflecting on our experience with Metro Link and transit service in our franchise area I realized there was a major opportunity for demonstrating some new suburban service. This service would be designed to serve the fastest growing trip market in the region, the suburban to suburban work trips.

I thought you, the RTB Board and staff might like to consider the attached proposal for County Rd 18 service at this early development stage as the thoughts and assistance of the RTB will be indispensable to starting the service.

I look forward to quickly cooperating with your staff in developing and implementing this demonstration.

Sincerely,
MEDICINE LAKE LINES

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "James A. Johnson".

James A. Johnson
Vice President

JAJ/jw

cc: Judith Hollander
Katie Turnbull
Doris Caranicas
Ruth Franklin



While the same precise elements of this demonstration will not be known until route planning is complete it is possible it would utilize 24 mini-buses operating to three time transfer stations. Some buses would provide express service from the first to the third station while others would connect all three stations. A peak hour service operating six hours per day each work week of the year might cost approximately one million dollars. The choice of expanding service hours to provide midday service would add to the total cost. Ridership fares, however, could significantly reduce the subsidies needed as ridership builds over time.

Medicine Lake Lines is interested in starting this service within six to eight months. I believe all of the necessary planning, purchase of buses, marketing, selection and development of bus transfer stations, and hiring of staff and drivers can be done in six to eight months.

Medicine Lake Lines has a franchise to provide transit service in most of this area. However, as with similar services it is unlikely to recover all of the planning and operating costs from the farebox. Medicine Lake Lines is therefore asking the RTB to enter into an agreement to reimburse expenses in connection with developing a detailed implementation and marketing plan for this proposed new service. Medicine Lake Lines would propose a 24 month demonstration period with 6 month performance reviews.

- c). Identify and check with employers in the territory to determine the total number of employees, hours of employment, and the home locations. Preferably obtain the names and home locations of employees in the service territory for subsequent marketing.
 - d). Concentrate a piece of market research on employees within 2 miles of the intersection of Co. Rd 18 and proposed I-394. This might be done as part of I-394 transit planning. Research might focus on questions of customer performance and attributes of a service they would need before they would leave their cars at home or drive less frequently.
 - e). Obtain a sample of persons who live and work in the service territory and survey them about their attitudes and willingness to use this service.
- 4). Determine the kind of service to be provided and the possible level of service. While most of the service would be initially designed for peak hour movement the mini-buses and some of the drivers would be available for midday service. Alternatives might be to contract with taxi companies during regular low patronage periods or possibly for midday and "after hours" service to employment areas receiving only peak hour service to reduce the need for an automobile. Another alternate includes providing midday service with mini-buses or taxis to other destinations including commercial areas, shopping centers or medical centers.
- 5). Develop a marketing plan: Effective ways of communicating the availability and the desirability of this service need only to be developed. This information program needs to communicate not only the details about schedules but illustrate the ease of transfer at time-transfer stations. Support from the community and employers should also be obtained as part of this program.

Some possible marketing approaches include:

- a). Identify all employees in the service area.
- b). Identify all households in the area, preferably with names of occupants for a mass mailing campaign.
- c). Develop one or two brochures describing the service, how it operates, schedules, fares, etc.
- d). Distribute brochures to all employees.
- e). Develop a general promotional campaign, obtain support of city officials and business organizations in the area. Obtain publicity in local and regional newspapers.
- f). Develop use of any midday service by seniors and youth. Identify senior citizen organizations in the community, at churches and recreational areas. Solicit support of retailers in the area for transportation of customers by transit.

The keys to successful demonstration include:

- 1). Identifying and obtaining sufficient well located space for time transfer stations.
- 2). Effective marketing of the service at the home end and at work destinations served by the route.
- 3). Effective management of the service to insure extremely short transfer times that minimize the transfer wait period.

The overall market area appears very attractive. It is an excellent example of suburban to suburban trip movement. This movement is not presently served by practically any of the existing transit service as almost all of it is oriented for express movement to downtown Minneapolis.

Route Planning

The specifics of a possible demonstration of new service need to be further developed and refined. At this point, work to finalize the route plan should:

- 1). Determine service territory: Service should start at least in Maple Grove, Brooklyn Park, Osseo and possibly Champlin on the north and extend south to Hopkins, and possibly Edina and Eden Prairie. The service territory, two to three miles on either side, needs to be determined based on an assessment of population, destinations, ease of access for circulation and the possible number of customers.
- 2). Identify locations for transfer stations, preferably in existing large parking lots of churches and shopping centers, or at existing Park 'n ride lots. Negotiate the use of these lots for the duration of the possibly two year demonstration.
- 3). Perform a market assessment to determine the possible number of users. This can be either fairly simple or more sophisticated. It can include steps such as:
 - a). Review Needs Assessment data regarding jobs and population and start the service based on this information.
 - b). Survey license plates in employer lots within possible service area to determine how many live in the service territory.



August 24, 1987

HENNEPIN COUNTY ROAD 18 - DEMONSTRATION PROPOSAL
Prepared by James Johnson - Medicine Lake Lines

Setting

Co. Rd 18 from its connection to T.H. 169 north of Osseo to Bloomington is one of the major arteries of the Twin Cities. It carries a growing volume of commuters who live in the northern suburbs of Anoka, Champlin, Brooklyn Park, Maple Grove and the exurban portions of Wright and Anoka counties to jobs located in western suburbs such as Plymouth, St. Louis Park, and Minnetonka and to the southwestern suburbs of Hopkins, Edina, Eden Prairie and Bloomington.

A significant portion of existing and of new jobs in Hennepin County are located within two miles on either side Co. Rd 18. In many ways it resembles TH12/I-394 from Golden Valley to Wayzata and I-494 from the airport to Eden Prairie as a linear job magnet.

Co. Rd 18 is beginning to experience severe congestion during peak commuter hours. This condition is expected to become more severe as job formation and population continues to settle along this route. The three fastest growing communities in Hennepin County- Eden Prairie, Plymouth and Maple Grove border Co. Rd 18.

No additional highway lane capacity is planned for Co. Rd 18 even as congestion increases. The County, in fact, is attempting to turn over the road to the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MNDOT) while MNDOT is reluctant to accept it due to their lack the resources to maintain and eventually re-build it.

Proposal

This proposal is designed to attract some of the growing number of suburban to suburban commuters who use Co. Rd 18.

It would be a demonstration utilizing mini-buses and possibly taxis collecting users within two to three miles on either side of Co. Rd 18. Customers would be able to transfer at three time transfer stations for vehicles going to their destination.



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

REPORT OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE

At its meeting of April 18, 1988, the committee reviewed and approved the following:

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD ROLE IN THE NEW METROPOLITAN COUNCIL PROCESS FOR REVIEW OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS

That the Regional Transit Board approve the process for reviewing comprehensive plan amendments as outlined in the April 1, 1988, staff memorandum.

REQUEST FROM MEDICINE LAKE LINES ON PROPOSAL FOR COUNTY ROAD 18 TRANSIT SERVICE

That the Regional Transit Board direct staff to continue working with Medicine Lake Lines on implementing the I-394 timed-transfer and consider the ideas raised in this proposal in the planning for the I-394 timed-transfer system. *of note delid*

The committee discussed but took no action on:

- o Metropolitan Council's Transportation Development Guide/Policy Plan
- o Exurban Funding Guidelines

Doris Caranicas
Chair

PCtoBD
RTBTX1

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

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

DATE: April 7, 1988
TO: Policy Committee
FROM: Katherine Turnbull, Planning Manager
SUBJECT: Request from Medicine Lake Lines on Proposal for County Road 18
Transit Service

SUMMARY

This memorandum reviews and evaluates the demonstration proposal from Medicine Lake Lines for County Road 18 transit service. The proposal is evaluated based on the Transit Service Needs Assessment and the Test Marketing of New Services criteria. Based on this evaluation, it is recommended that the proposal not be considered for demonstration funding at this time.

BACKGROUND

Medicine Lake Lines has submitted a demonstration proposal for transit services on County Road 18 in Hennepin County. A copy of this proposal is attached. The proposal presents the generalized service concept to be used. The proposal focuses on using mini-buses and possibly taxis as feeder service to three timed-transfer stations to be located along County Road 18 for connections to other services. No specifics are provided on the location of the timed-transfer stations, the exact nature of the service or the costs associated with the different elements.

The proposal indicates that the following activities would need to be conducted:

- o Determine the service territory.
- o Identify location of timed-transfer stations. This would include not only the location, but design, cost and lease or purchase arrangements.
- o Determine a market assessment to determine the possible number of users.
- o Develop a marketing plan.

The proposal indicates that:

"Medicine Lake Lines is interested in starting this service within six to eight months. ...that the necessary planning, purchase of buses, marketing, selection and development of bus transfer stations, and hiring of staff and drivers can be done in six to eight months. Medicine Lake Lines has a

franchise to provide transit service in most of this area. However, as with similar services, it is unlikely to recover all of the planning and operating costs from the farebox. Medicine Lake Lines is therefore asking the RTB to enter into an agreement to reimburse expenses in connection with developing a detailed implementation and marketing plan for this proposed new service. Medicine Lake Lines would propose a 24 month demonstration period with 6-month performance reviews."

Analysis

RTB staff has spent a good deal of time examining this request based on the criteria developed in the Transit Service Needs Assessment for the Test Marketing of New Services Program. The results of this analysis are briefly presented below and will be discussed more thoroughly at the Policy Committee meeting.

- o Transit Service Needs Assessment. The strategies identified in the Transit Service Needs Assessment for this area focused on tying into the I-394 timed-transfer system, expanding express service to downtown Minneapolis, and focusing service on transit hubs at Ridgedale, Brookdale, and Southdale.
- o Indicators of transit needs. The following categories were used in the Transit Service Needs Assessment for identifying areas of transit needs. The characteristics for the County Road 18 area are discussed for each.
 - Population and employment concentrations. The population density per acre was mapped for census tracts in the proposed service area. In general, the area is characterized by low to moderate density population densities. Higher concentrations do exist in parts of Hopkins, St. Louis Park and Crystal. Employment concentrations follow a similar low to moderate density development pattern, with major concentrations in Hopkins, St. Louis Park and parts of Minnetonka.
 - Transit dependent market segments.
 - Elderly. Most of the communities in the area have low to moderate levels of elderly populations. Higher concentrations are found in parts of Hopkins, St. Louis Park and Crystal.
 - Youth. The area also exhibits moderate levels of individuals under 18 years of age.
 - Low income. There are concentrations of both high and low income levels within the area. Concentrations of lower income levels are identified in parts of Hopkins, St. Louis Park and Brooklyn Center.

- Households with no automobile available. Most households within the area have at least one automobile per household. Concentrations without an automobile are identified in parts of Hopkins, St. Louis Park, New Hope and Brooklyn Center.
- Travel Desires. Extensive mapping was done of the travel desires within, between, and outside communities in the area. The strongest travel desires are to downtown Minneapolis, Edina, Brooklyn Center, and Minnetonka. The travel desires within and between communities show a very dispersed trend.
- Highway Congestion. According to Mn/DOT, County Road 18 currently exhibits levels of moderate congestion. These are forecast to increase to severe levels by the year 2000. Currently there is no preferential treatment for high occupancy vehicles on County Road 18 and none is planned at this time.
- Existing and planned transit services. Existing transit services in the area are primarily oriented to downtown Minneapolis, although there are some crosstown services in the area. Improvements planned for the timed-transfer system on I-394 will greatly improve services within the communities of Hopkins, St. Louis Park, Minnetonka and Golden Valley.
- o Need. While the Transit Service Needs Assessment did not specifically identify the need for this service, the need to improve transit services within and between suburban communities was identified. The I-394 timed-transfer system should meet this need in many of the communities in this proposal. However, there may be a need to continue to examine other services in the northern communities.
- o Market potential. The proposal does not identify the market potential for the proposed service. It does indicate that this needs to be done.
- o Learning potential. Without a more detailed proposal, it is difficult to judge the learning potential for the proposal. While it is similar to the I-394 timed-transfer system, it is not exactly the same.
- o Uncertainty/Success. Without a more detailed market potential analysis, it is difficult to judge the uncertainty/success of the proposed project. Given the experience with other suburban services, it is known that this is a very difficult market to serve. Before service is implemented, the market must be thoroughly researched and the service tailored to the needs. Also, given the experience on I-394, the identification, location and design of transit stations needs to be well thought out and involve area residents and community staff and officials. The lack of any HOV facilities on County Road 18 also means that the service will be more difficult to both provide and attract riders. The ability to offer time savings over automobile travel is a major incentive for people to use transit.

- o Impact. Without a more detailed plan, it is difficult to judge the impact of the proposal.
- o Cost/Effectiveness. Without a more detailed plan, it is not possible to identify the cost/effectiveness of the proposal.
- o Technical Feasibility. The proposed service is technically feasible; however, schedule reliability and on-time performance may suffer due to the lack of HOV facilities on County Road 18.
- o Local Support. To date no local support has been indicated for the proposal.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

- o The RTB has received a request from Medicine Lake Lines for a demonstration on County Road 18.
- o The RTB has evaluated this proposal based on the Transit Service Needs Assessment and the Test Marketing of New Services criteria.
- o This evaluation indicates that the proposal has some merits and meets some of the criteria established for evaluating proposals for test marketing of new services. However, given the limited information provided in the proposal and the analysis presented, it does not appear to be the best utilization of the limited funding available for new services.
- o The I-394 timed-transfer system should address many of the within and between community travel desires in the southern portion of the area. The I-394 system will also provide additional experience on the use of a timed-transfer system.

RECOMMENDATION

That the RTB direct the staff to continue working with Medicine Lake Lines on implementing the I-394 timed-transfer system and consider the ideas raised in this proposal in the planning for the I-394 timed-transfer system.

KT:jmo
Attachments
KT/PC/Tx2

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

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

DATE: April 1, 1988
TO: Policy Committee
FROM: Howard Blin, Planner
SUBJECT: RTB Role in the New Metropolitan Council Process for Review of
Comprehensive Plan Amendments

SUMMARY

The Metropolitan Council has recently adopted new guidelines and procedures for the review of amendments to local comprehensive plans. These new procedures call for Regional Transit Board (RTB) review of plan amendments with potential transit impacts. This memorandum outlines the proposed process to be followed in the RTB's review of these amendments.

BACKGROUND

The Metropolitan Land Planning Act of 1976 required local units of government to prepare comprehensive plans. These plans were reviewed and approved by the Metropolitan Council prior to adoption by the local governments. Any amendments to these plans must also receive Council approval. Most of these plans were adopted in the late 1970's and early 1980's and are now in need of updating and revision. In anticipation of an increasing number of plan amendments, the Council has established guidelines for its review of proposed amendments.

The primary purpose of the guidelines is the establishment of separate procedures for the submission and review of major and minor plan amendments. Major amendments are generally defined as involving extensive revisions to a plan or changes to urban service area boundaries of 40 acres or more. Minor amendments involve routine revisions which are less significant or urban service area changes of 40 acres or less. More information is required in the submission of a major plan amendment.

The key element of the guidelines affecting the RTB is the requirement that amendments with potential transit impacts are now to be submitted to the RTB for review and comment. These will primarily involve major plan amendments or revisions to those plans containing separate transit chapters. Copies of the guidelines are available for review. The proposed process and criteria to be used in the RTB review are as follows.

RTB Review Process

Plan amendments are to be submitted directly to the RTB from the local government. Those not submitted, but which are determined by the Council staff to have transit impacts, would be transmitted by the Council to the RTB. Review of plan amendments would closely follow the current process for handling project referrals. After staff review, this process provides for Board action in the following manner:

- Plan amendments having no significant impacts will be presented for Board action on the consent list.
- Amendments with significant transit impacts will be presented to the Policy Committee for discussion before Board action.

Council guidelines call for the RTB to submit comments on plan amendments to the Council, which would then transmit them to the local government with the Council's comments.

Evaluation of Amendments

The evaluation for plan amendments will be similar to that used for project reviews. The Implementation and Financial Plan (IFP) and related RTB policies will serve as the basis for the review. Key elements to be considered in the reviews are:

- Overall goals and policies contained in plan amendments will be evaluated for consistency with the Implementation and Financial Plan and other RTB policies.
- Impact on existing transit services.
- Impact on proposed or planned transit services.
- Consistency of proposed transit improvements with those contained in the Implementation and Financial Plan and other RTB plans.

ACTION REQUESTED

That the Regional Transit Board approve the process outlined in this memorandum for reviewing comprehensive plan amendments.

HB:jmo
HB/PC/TX2



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

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLICY COMMITTEE

At its special meeting of April 25, 1988, the committee reviewed and approved the following:

METRO MOBILITY PROVIDERS CONTRACT

1. That the Regional Transit Board add to the Metro Mobility provider contract effective May 1, 1988 a complaint procedure that:
 - a. Identifies types of complaints to be handled in the proceeding;
 - b. States time frames within which complaints should be made and complaints should be handled;
 - c. States the type of response required for complaints and advises complainants of other available remedies and procedures.
2. The attorney will work with the Metropolitan Center for Independent Living to develop the complaint procedure.
3. That the Regional Transit Board direct staff to establish a process with the Metro Mobility Administrative Center for development of performance standards, i.e., minimum levels of expectation, by September 1, 1988.

Doris Caranicas
Chair

pc4bd
RTBTX1

Kortel
Werner.
addr
J Johnson
Bertrand

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD
ROLL CALL AND ATTENDANCE SHEET

CA
MT
UH
ER
LE
TB
MK

DATE: 5/2/88

BOARD OR COMMITTEE: Board Mtg

MEMBER NAME	PRESENT	VOTE	VOTE	VOTE	VOTE	VOTE
Chairman	✓					
Doris Caranicas	✓					
Ruth Franklin						
Carole Faricy	✓					
Alison Fuhr	✓					
Rochelle Graves	✓ late 4:20					
George Isaacs	✓					
Paul Joyce	✓					
Edward Kranz						