



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](http://www.mnhs.org/copyright).



REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Mears Park Centre  
230 East 5th Street  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101  
612/292-8789

*Amended*

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Monday, September 26, 1988  
Mears Park Centre Chambers  
4:00 p.m.

AGENDA

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Board Discussion of Legislative Program for 1989 Session
4. Legislative Strategy

*A - Advisory Committee for leg. affairs*  
*B - Relationship with Leg. Larkin + reporting to board.*  
Note: The agenda items above are for discussion only. No action will be taken.

Elliott Perovich  
Chairman

Bertrand  
Atter  
Tabor  
Sofone  
Weaver  
Pagel

TB  
MK  
GA  
JH  
E.K.

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD  
ROLL CALL AND ATTENDANCE SHEET

DATE: 9/26/88  
BOARD OR COMMITTEE: Board

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

02/02/88

[REVISOR ] HMW/MM 88-3722

Introduced by A. Johnson, Morrison, Schreiber,  
Kostohryz, Simoneau  
February 29, 1988  
Referred to Committee on METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS

H.F. No. 2320

Companion S.F. No. \_\_\_\_\_

Reproduced by PHILLIPS LEGISLATIVE SERVICE

1

A bill for an act

2 relating to metropolitan government; regulating  
3 financing and duties of the regional transit board;  
4 amending Minnesota Statutes 1986, section 473.39, as  
5 amended; and Minnesota Statutes 1987 Supplement,  
6 section 473.446, subdivision 1; repealing Minnesota  
7 Statutes 1987 Supplement, sections 473.393 and 473.398.

8

9 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA:

10 Section 1. Minnesota Statutes 1986, section 473.39, as  
11 amended by Laws 1987, chapter 278, sections 17 and 18, and  
12 chapter 358, section 120, is amended to read:

13 473.39 [BORROWING MONEY.]

14 Subdivision 1. [GENERAL AUTHORITY.] The council, if  
15 requested by vote of at least two-thirds of all of the members  
16 of the transit board, may issue general obligation bonds subject  
17 to the volume limitation in subdivision 1a to provide funds to  
18 the board for expenditure to implement the board's approved  
19 implementation plan and may issue general obligation bonds not  
20 subject to the volume limitation set forth in subdivision 1a for  
21 the refunding of outstanding bonds or certificates of  
22 indebtedness of the council, the board or the commission, and  
23 judgments against the board or the commission. The council may  
24 not unreasonably withhold the issuance of obligations for an  
25 implementation plan that has been approved by the council. The  
26 council may not issue obligations pursuant to this subdivision,

1 other than refunding bonds, in excess of the amount specifically  
2 authorized by law. Except as otherwise provided in sections  
3 473.371 to 473.449, the council shall provide for the issuance,  
4 sale, and security of the bonds in the manner provided in  
5 chapter 475, and has the same powers and duties as a  
6 municipality issuing bonds under that law, except that no  
7 election is required and the net debt limitations in chapter 475  
8 do not apply to the bonds. The obligations are not a debt of  
9 the state or any municipality or political subdivision within  
10 the meaning of any debt limitation or requirement pertaining to  
11 those entities. Neither the state, nor any municipality or  
12 political subdivision except the council and board, nor any  
13 member or officer or employee of the board or council, is liable  
14 on the obligations. The obligations may be secured by taxes  
15 levied without limitation of rate or amount upon all taxable  
16 property in the transit taxing district and transit area as  
17 provided in section 473.446, subdivision 1, clause (c). The  
18 council shall certify to the transit board before October 1 of  
19 each year the amounts necessary to provide full and timely  
20 payment of the obligations. As part of its levy made under  
21 section 473.446, subdivision 1, clause (c), the board shall levy  
22 the amounts certified by the council and transfer the proceeds  
23 to the council for payment of the obligations. The taxes must  
24 be levied, certified, and collected in accordance with the terms  
25 and conditions of the indebtedness.

26 Subd. 1a. [OBLIGATIONS.] (a) The council may issue  
27 certificates of indebtedness, bonds, or other obligations under  
28 this section in an amount not exceeding \$17,000,000 for  
29 financial assistance to the commission, as prescribed in the  
30 implementation plan of the board and the capital program of the  
31 commission.

32 (b) The council may issue certificates of indebtedness,  
33 bonds, or other obligations under this section in an amount not  
34 exceeding \$1,500,000 for land acquisition and capital  
35 improvements for park and ride lots and transit transfer  
36 stations planned for the interstate highway described in section

1 161.123, clause (2), commonly known as I-394. These facilities  
2 may be constructed and maintained by the metropolitan transit  
3 commission. The board shall require, as a condition of  
4 financial assistance to the commission, that the commission make  
5 facilities it constructs, acquires, or improves for I-394 with  
6 funds provided under this provision available to all transit  
7 providers on a nondiscriminatory basis, as the board defines  
8 these terms. The limitation contained in this subdivision does  
9 not apply to refunding bonds issued by the council.

10 Subd. 1b. [TEMPORARY BORROWING.] The transit board may  
11 borrow money which it may use or spend for any purpose,  
12 including but not limited to current expenses, capital  
13 expenditures and the discharge of an obligation or indebtedness  
14 of the board, or, with the prior consent of the council, an  
15 obligation or indebtedness of the council incurred under  
16 subdivision 1 or an obligation or indebtedness of the  
17 commission. The board's indebtedness must be represented by  
18 notes with a maximum maturity of three years. They may be  
19 issued from time to time in any denomination and sold at public  
20 or private sale pursuant to a resolution authorizing issuance.  
21 The resolution must set forth the form and manner of execution  
22 of the notes and contain any other terms and conditions the  
23 board deems necessary or desirable to provide security for their  
24 holders. The notes are payable from committed or appropriated  
25 money from taxes levied by the board under section 473.446,  
26 subdivision 1, clause (a), grants or loans of the state or  
27 federal government to the board, or other revenues of the board  
28 or, if the commission has given prior approval to the pledge of  
29 them, grants or loans made to or other revenues of the  
30 commission, and the money may be pledged to the payment of the  
31 notes. To the extent the notes are not paid from the grant or  
32 loan money pledged for their payment, the principal of and  
33 interest on the notes must be paid from any taxes levied by the  
34 board pursuant to section 473.446, subdivision 1, clause (a) and  
35 any other money of the board lawfully available for the purpose.  
36 Notes issued under this subdivision are not a debt of the state

1 or any municipality or political subdivision within the meaning  
2 of any debt limitation or requirement pertaining to those  
3 entities. Neither the state nor any municipality or political  
4 subdivision except the board, nor any member or officer of the  
5 board, is liable on the notes.

6 Subd. 2. [LEGAL INVESTMENTS.] Certificates of  
7 indebtedness, bonds, or other obligations issued by the council  
8 or the board to which tax levies have been pledged pursuant to  
9 section 473.446, are proper for investment of any funds by a  
10 bank, savings bank, savings and loan association, credit union,  
11 trust company, insurance company, or public or municipal  
12 corporation, and may be pledged by any bank, savings bank,  
13 savings and loan association, credit union, or trust company as  
14 security for the deposit of public money.

15 Sec. 2. Minnesota Statutes 1987 Supplement, section  
16 473.446, subdivision 1, is amended to read:

17 Subdivision 1. [TAXATION WITHIN TRANSIT TAXING DISTRICT.]  
18 For the purposes of sections 473.401 to 473.451 and the  
19 metropolitan transit system, except as otherwise provided in  
20 this subdivision the regional transit board shall levy each year  
21 upon all taxable property within the metropolitan transit taxing  
22 district, defined in subdivision 2, a transit tax consisting of:

23 (a) an amount up to two mills times the assessed value of  
24 all such property, based upon the level of transit service  
25 provided for the property, the proceeds of which shall be used  
26 for payment of the expenses of operating transit and paratransit  
27 service and to provide for payment of obligations issued by the  
28 commission under section 473.39, subdivision 1b, or 473.436,  
29 subdivision 6;

30 (b) an additional amount, if any, as the board determines  
31 to be necessary to provide for the full and timely payment of  
32 its certificates of indebtedness and other obligations  
33 outstanding on July 1, 1985, to which property taxes under this  
34 section have been pledged; and

35 (c) an additional amount necessary to provide full and  
36 timely payment of certificates of indebtedness, bonds, including

1 refunding bonds or other obligations issued or to be issued  
2 under section 473.39 by the council for purposes of acquisition  
3 and betterment of property and other improvements of a capital  
4 nature and to which the council or board has specifically  
5 pledged tax levies under this clause.

6 The county auditor shall reduce the tax levied pursuant to  
7 this subdivision on all property within statutory and home rule  
8 charter cities and towns that receive full peak service and  
9 limited off-peak service by an amount equal to the tax levy that  
10 would be produced by applying a rate of 0.5 mills on the  
11 property. The county auditor shall reduce the tax levied  
12 pursuant to this subdivision on all property within statutory  
13 and home rule charter cities and towns that receive limited peak  
14 service by an amount equal to the tax levy that would be  
15 produced by applying a rate of 0.75 mills on the property. The  
16 amounts so computed by the county auditor shall be submitted to  
17 the commissioner of revenue as part of the abstracts of tax  
18 lists required to be filed with the commissioner under section  
19 275.29. Any prior year adjustments shall also be certified in  
20 the abstracts of tax lists. The commissioner shall review the  
21 certifications to determine their accuracy and may make changes  
22 in the certification as necessary or return a certification to  
23 the county auditor for corrections. The commissioner shall pay  
24 to the regional transit board the amounts certified by the  
25 county auditors on the dates provided in section 273.1394.  
26 There is annually appropriated from the general fund in the  
27 state treasury to the department of revenue the amounts  
28 necessary to make these payments in fiscal year 1987 and  
29 thereafter.

30 For the purposes of this subdivision, "full peak and  
31 limited off-peak service" means peak period regular route  
32 service, plus weekday midday regular route service at intervals  
33 longer than 60 minutes on the route with the greatest frequency;  
34 and "limited peak period service" means peak period regular  
35 route service only.

36 Sec. 3. [REPEAL.]

1 Minnesota Statutes 1987 Supplement, sections 473.393 and  
2 473.398 are repealed.

3 Sec. 4. [EFFECTIVE DATE.]

4 The act applies in the counties of Anoka, Carver, Dakota,  
5 Hennepin, Ramsey, Scott, and Washington and is effective the day  
6 following final enactment.

Handout 9/2

**DRAFT**

1990-1991 Biennial Budget

AGENCY:

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

AGENCY PURPOSE:

The mission of the Regional Transit Board (RTB) is to plan, prioritize, coordinate and administer a system of cost-effective transit services in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area which are responsive to and meet the needs of area residents. The RTB was created by the Minnesota Legislature in 1984 to consolidate metropolitan transit planning, financing and the arranging of transit services. The RTB is responsible for short- to mid-range transit planning, policy making, administration and facilitation of new and alternative transit services. The major functions and activities of the RTB, as specified in the enabling legislation, include:

- o To prepare transit implementation plans;
- o To prepare and present required transit budgets, financial plans and staffing plans;
- o To execute and administer transit project contracts and to assume rideshare program responsibilities;
- o To appoint members to the Metropolitan Transit Commission (MTC);
- o To request, review and approve the MTC budget;
- o To assume Replacement Services (Opt-Out) program responsibilities; and
- o To conduct research and render advice on transportation issues.

OPERATION AND CLIENTELE:

The Regional Transit Board is comprised of eight board members and a chairman. The Board, which represents the eight metropolitan districts, is appointed by the Metropolitan Council. The Regional Transit Board Chairman is appointed by the Governor. The RTB has 27 employees organized into two major divisions-- Planning and Programs/Administration and Finance--in addition to a Public Information Office reporting to the Executive Director.

\_\_\_\_\_ providers in the metropolitan area are under contract to the RTB to provide a variety of different public transit services. Transit programs are typically described by the following categories:

- o Regular Route
- o Metro Mobility
- o Rural/Exurban
- o Small Urban
- o Opt-Out
- o Rideshare
- o Jobseekers
- o New Services
- o Exurban

**DRAFT**

# DRAFT

The RTB establishes its direction, priorities, timing and funding for various elements of the metropolitan transit system in its five-year Implementation Plan for transit services, capital facilities and transit financing in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. Although this Implementation Plan is currently being revised to be in conformance with the Metropolitan Council's new Transportation Policy Plan, its basic premise will remain the same--service needs should be satisfied through a variety of methods and modes, each designed to serve the needs of specific market groups. This "family of transit" should include regular route services, local circulation services, paratransit services such as carpooling, vanpooling and dial-a-ride, and the fixed facilities necessary to support and enhance these services.

Regular route transit services which include local express, crosstown, and local circulator services, will continue to be the backbone of the system. Paratransit services, including rideshare strategies such as carpooling and vanpooling and a wide variety of dial-a-ride services, may be focused on special groups such as the elderly or handicapped, as in the case of Metro Mobility, or can be oriented to the general public. Light rail transit promises to be a cost-effective and efficient transit option in certain transportation corridors in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area and should become an integral component of the area's coordinated transportation system.

## BUDGET ISSUES:

It is an important time for major transportation decisions in the Twin Cities. Major trends point to a period of stress for the region's transportation system and increasing travel needs of transit dependents. Transit is considered an essential part of the solution to deal with the difficult transportation issues facing the region. The RTB, thus, has many challenges:

- o ensuring that transit and travel demand management strategies are integrated as important elements of the transportation system;
- o advancing new and improved transit services to meet the needs of urban, suburban and exurban areas;
- o optimizing the capacity and performance of transit services to meet the travel needs of the elderly and disabled;
- o ensuring that existing services are operated cost-effectively and responsive to changing travel needs; and
- o advancing light rail transit as an integral component of the area's coordinated transportation system.

To meet these challenges, the RTB is taking aggressive steps to:

- o implement new transit services in suburban areas where typically such service has been unavailable but where the need continues to grow;
- o increase local involvement in RTB activities including establishment of a community grant program whereby communities could qualify for RTB funding to plan new transit services, and establishment of two Chairman's Advisory committees, composed of local policymakers;

**DRAFT**

**DRAFT**

- o promote RTB as a regional partner in solving transportation issues by becoming involved in the development of transit and travel demand management strategies for major transportation corridors, acting as a resource on light rail transit regional coordination and offering transit technical issues to transit operators;
- o provide better transit service through better information management by developing and applying performance and financial standards and improving data collection and analytical capabilities in order to identify trends and issues early so that appropriate action can be prescribed; and
- o continue to oversee refinements to the Metro Mobility system in order that its users will provide better and expanded service.

Specific issues that impact the 1990-91 biennial budget are as follows:

A. Light Rail Transit

In the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area, the county regional railroad authorities are responsible for developing and implementing light rail transit. The Metropolitan Council and the Regional Transit Board closely cooperate with the regional railroad authorities in the study, planning and design of LRT systems and review and comment on county light rail transit plans and funding proposals. In each of the seven counties, discussion on the topic of light rail transit has taken place and in the case of Hennepin, Ramsey and Anoka counties, aggressive planning efforts have been made.

Light rail transit can offer an efficient and cost-effective transit option in certain transportation corridors in the Twin Cities when deployed as part of the area's coordinated transportation system. It is essential that light rail transit planning and implementation be coordinated among the county rail authorities and that LRT be integrated into the existing transit system.

Use of MVET funds and any other funds used for transit services to support LRT development must be considered in relation to the region's ability to fund existing and future transit needs. MVET funds have previously been identified by the RTB to support transit operating costs for a range of regional transit programs including regular route service, Metro Mobility and the New Transit Services program. When (If?) the additional burden of funding LRT operating costs is added to these existing needs, use of current levels of MVET funding for purposes other than financing transit operating costs becomes problematic. Additional funding sources for light rail transit, including federal and private monies, must be considered in order that all modes of transit can be adequately funded.

B. Capital Funding

Financing a broader range of capital needs and increasing the level of local transit capital funding are key capital funding issues during this biennium. Traditionally, the MTC, and more recently, the RTB/Metropolitan Council have issued bonds to finance transit capital costs not funded through federal grants. The amount of federal funding has steadily decreased in recent years, requiring a greater share of local funding to provide the vehicles and facilities necessary to operate the regional transit system. This increased reliance on local bonds, supported by property tax levies, adds to an already heavy burden on local support for transit exceeding 50% of total revenue sources.

**DRAFT**

Currently, RTB capital funding is provided exclusively to the MTC. The 1988 RTB Capital Plan identified capital needs of other transit providers as well as the need to develop transit facilities which provide passenger amenities and, thereby, increase the attractiveness of transit to potential riders. The MTC, as the principal transit provider in the region, will continue to be the focus of capital planning and largest recipient of capital funding. In order to meet the capital needs of the entire regional transit system, however, in 1989, the RTB will also provide capital funding for additional providers and for facilities such as the Transit Hub program and I-394 transit facilities.

C. Metro Mobility

Metro Mobility, the regional public transportation service for disabled persons, underwent major changes in October 1986 in an effort to make its services more cost-effective and responsive to user needs. As a result of these changes, the number of Metro Mobility passenger trips has doubled and the subsidy per trip has decreased 30 percent. Service has also been expanded to cover the entire metropolitan taxing district and operating hours have been uniformly extended. After a year of operation, the RTB financed an independent evaluation study to identify service problems associated with the restructured service and devise strategies to address those problems.

Despite the cost savings that have occurred, unprecedented ridership increases have resulted in significant budgetary impacts. In 1988, the RTB requested a supplemental state appropriation of \$7.2 million to meet the increased demand for Metro Mobility. Six million was appropriated. The RTB is seeking to make up the difference for the rest of 1988 and deal with the longer range funding issues for Metro Mobility through examining a number of alternatives. The RTB continues to investigate the impact and feasibility of raising fares, limiting the number of rides, modifying certification criteria, reducing the costs of and/or increasing revenues for agency transportation.

Standing Metro Mobility orders oriented to health and human service agencies comprise 40-45 percent of the rides, overall, and nearly 80 percent during the peak travel hours. The RTB is aggressively pursuing the opportunity to achieve cost savings associated with human service agency travel while maximizing revenue from federal and state sources.

Even given these projected savings and potential new sources of revenue, additional funding for the Metro Mobility program may be required for the following reasons:

- o The number of eligible participants for Metro Mobility service continues to increase by over \_\_\_\_\_ percent annually. This trend is expected to continue based on the increasing percentage of the population that is over the age of 65.
- o Despite the increases in the number of passenger trips provided, market research results indicate that 41 percent of existing users expect to use the service more often in the future.
- o There is strong resistance to participate financially on the part of agencies that serve disabled people. Although the RTB plans to work with each agency individually to determine how their transportation needs can be met and the costs of Metro Mobility can be reduced, a variety of barriers may prevent the RTB from the successful accomplishment of this task.

**DRAFT**

D. Federal Funds

Federal operating funds continue to decline as a percentage (7%) of operating expenses in real terms. This decline has a direct impact on state and local sources of revenue to support transit. The result of this reduction has been greater reliance on the local property tax to fund the regular route transit system, which is estimated to provide 53% of the operating costs in 1989.

AGENCY FISCAL SUMMARY - BIENNIAL BUDGET

AGENCY: REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

\*\*\* Dollars in Thousands \*\*\*

SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURES AND REQUEST	ACTUAL F.Y. 1988	ESTIMATED F.Y. 1989	F.Y. 1990 REQUEST LEVELS			GOV. REC. F.Y. 1990	F.Y. 1991 REQUEST LEVELS			GOV. REC. F.Y. 1991
			SAME	CHANGE	TOTAL		SAME	CHANGE	TOTAL	
Expenditures by Program:										
Regional Transit Board	23,488.0	27,442.0	27,442.0	-0-	27,442.0		27,442.0	-0-	27,442.0	
TOTAL	23,488.0	27,442.0	27,442.0	-0-	27,442.0		27,442.0	-0-	27,442.0	
Expenditures by Category:										
Local Assistance	23,488.0	27,442.0	27,442.0	-0-	27,442.0		27,442.0	-0-	27,442.0	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	23,488.0	27,442.0	27,442.0	-0-	27,442.0		27,442.0	-0-	27,442.0	
Sources of Financing:										
Direct Appropriations:										
General	14,770.0	14,525.0	14,525.0	-0-	14,525.0		14,525.0	-0-	14,525.0	
Transit Assistance	8,718.0	12,917.0	12,917.0	-0-	12,917.0		12,917.0	-0-	12,917.0	
TOTAL FINANCING	23,488.0	27,442.0	27,442.0	-0-	27,442.0		27,442.0	-0-	27,442.0	

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

**DRAFT**

1990-1991 Biennial Budget

ACTIVITY:

Program: METRO TRANSIT ASSISTANCE

Agency: REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

OBJECTIVES:

1. Provide a basic level of mobility for all persons in the seven county metropolitan area.
2. Arrange for a comprehensive, coordinated set of transit and paratransit services to meet the needs of all people in the metropolitan area.
3. Cooperate with private and public providers to assure the most efficient and coordinated use of existing and planned transit resources.
4. Maintain public mobility in the event of emergencies or energy shortages.

DESCRIPTION:

1. Rural and Small Urban Program. Statutory Ref: M.S. 473.384

This program provides state financial assistance, both operating and capital, to any legislatively established public transit commission or authority (except the MTC), any county or statutory or home rule charter city and any private operator of regular route transit (except private operators in the metro area) or any combination of the above when the local financial effort is inadequate to assure continuation of the public transit service. This actively provides funding for home-to-work, elderly and handicapped or general purpose travel.

State Asst. Funds (Rural and Small Urban combined)	<u>FY 1988</u>	<u>FY 1989</u>	<u>FY 1990</u>	<u>FY 1991</u>
	730,000	730,000	900,764	936,794
<u>Service Effectiveness Measures: Rural</u>				
Cost/Passenger	\$6.56	\$6.20	\$5.78	\$5.83
Subsidy/Passenger	\$6.32	\$5.94	\$5.50	\$5.55
Cost/Hour	\$18.28	\$18.41	\$19.52	\$20.83
Cost/Mile	\$1.16	\$1.24	\$1.32	\$1.38
Revenue/Cost	3.61%	4.26%	4.77%	4.82%
Passengers/Hour	2.79	2.97	3.38	3.57
Passengers/Mile	0.18	0.20	0.23	0.24
<u>Service Effectiveness Measures: Small Urban</u>				
Cost/Passenger	\$3.74	\$4.58	\$4.79	\$4.74
Subsidy/Passenger	\$2.95	\$3.77	\$3.98	\$3.93
Cost/Hour	\$20.57	\$23.49	\$25.84	\$27.02
Cost/Mile	\$1.51	\$1.69	\$1.92	\$2.00
Revenue/Cost	21.28%	17.76%	16.91%	17.05%
Passengers/Hour	5.49	5.13	5.40	5.70
Passengers/Mile	0.40	0.37	0.40	0.42

**DRAFT**

# DRAFT

2. Regular Route Program. Statutory Ref: M.S. 473.384  
Metropolitan Transit Commission.

State financial assistance is provided to the Metropolitan Transit Commission to augment revenues received from the federal government, fare revenues and metropolitan property taxes. The MTC exists to provide safe and efficient transportation services for the movement of people by bus, vanpool and carpool throughout the seven-county metro region. On the regular route bus system, MTC annually services approximately \_\_\_ passengers on \_\_\_ million service miles using a fleet of over \_\_\_ vehicles. Annually, over 3,800 metro area residents are organized into vanpools and carpools for commuting purposes. Operating assistance from the state enables MTC to maximize service levels to meet consumer demand, yet maintain fares and property taxes below the actual cost of providing the service in conformance with state statutes and regional policies.

Private Operators.

The Private Operators activity provides state financial assistance to Medicine Lake Lines, North Suburban Lines and Airport Express, who provide regular route public transit within the Metropolitan Transit Taxing District. This assistance is intended to pay 100 percent of the operating deficit to supplement operating revenues. Public funds are justified on the basis that private operators do not have access to federal capital assistance or local taxing authority, but provide service in a market place dominated by a public system which does receive this assistance.

	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991
State Asst. Funds	12,759,500	13,113,500	12,086,867	10,219,657
<u>Service Effectiveness Measures:</u>				
Cost/Passenger	\$1.42	\$1.50	\$1.54	\$1.59
Subsidy/Passenger	\$0.90	\$1.01	\$1.04	\$1.08
Cost/Hour	\$45.35	\$46.13	\$46.27	\$48.71
Cost/Mile	\$3.58	\$3.57	\$3.69	\$3.84
Revenue/Cost	36.62%	33.11%	32.89%	31.74%
Passengers/Hour	31.88	30.65	29.99	30.66
Passengers/Mile	2.51	2.37	2.39	2.42

# DRAFT

# DRAFT

3. Replacement Service Program. Statutory Ref: M.S. 473.388  
Legislation allows eligible cities or a group of cities that filed with Mn/DOT July 1, 1984 to replace their MTC service with an alternative transit service. Communities that elect to "opt-out" enter into a contract with the RTB. Funding for the new service is made available by the RTB to fund the replacement services. Currently, the cities of Shakopee, Plymouth, Chanhassen, Eden Prairie and Chaska are providing transit services to their communities as part of this program. The communities of Apple Valley, Burnsville, Eagan, Prior Lake, Rosemount, Savage as well as Maple Grove are analyzing transit needs to determine if they will provide opt-out services.

	<u>FY 1988</u>	<u>FY 1989</u>	<u>FY 1990</u>	<u>FY 1991</u>
State Asst. Funds	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
<u>Service Effectiveness Measures:</u>				
Cost/Passenger	\$5.56	\$5.38	\$5.48	\$5.45
Subsidy/Passenger	\$4.66	\$4.48	\$4.57	\$4.54
Cost/Hour	\$58.57	\$61.13	\$58.59	\$62.74
Cost/Mile	\$2.93	\$2.98	\$3.04	\$3.25
Revenue/Cost	16.25%	18.74%	16.69%	16.76%
Passengers/Hour	10.54	11.10	10.69	11.50
Passengers/Mile	0.53	0.54	0.55	0.60

4. Metro Mobility. Statutory Ref: M.S. 473.386  
The Metro Mobility program provides special transportation services for disabled persons in the metropolitan area. Demand-responsive, door-through-door service is now provided throughout the transit taxing district. In early 1987, service was expanded to northern Ramsey, southern Anoka, and northern and western Hennepin counties, and in April of 1988, service was expanded to western Washington, northern Dakota, northern Scott and northern Carver counties. Metro Mobility underwent major changes on October 4, 1986 to improve the cost-effectiveness and quality of service and expand the geographic service area. Users now have the opportunity to select the provider of their choice. \_\_\_\_\_ private providers are participating in the program. The RTB has initiated a major effort to achieve cost savings while maximizing revenue from federal and state sources for agency related transportation. Fares for the service are \$1.00 for trips to eight miles; additional mileage costs up to \$1.00 per mile are charged for trips longer than eight miles, although user fares never exceed a total amount of \$3.75 for any trip.

	<u>FY 1988</u>	<u>FY 1989</u>	<u>FY 1990</u>	<u>FY 1991</u>
State Asst. Funds	8,250,000	10,250,000	13,354,369	14,685,549
<u>Service Effectiveness Measures:</u>				
Cost/Passenger	\$8.72	\$9.22	\$9.59	\$9.99
Subsidy/Passenger	\$7.59	\$8.11	\$8.48	\$8.88
Revenue/Cost	12.91%	12.09%	8.48%	11.10%

# DRAFT

**DRAFT**

5. New Services/Test Marketing Program.

This program provides a structured environment to plan and implement new service concepts, service delivery methods and other new or innovative approaches to transit. The program is accomplished within a process which provides for an open, systematic, multi-step approach to implementing, monitoring and evaluating transit services. A wide variety and number of service strategies were developed in the Transit Service Needs Assessment to meet indentified unsatisfied needs. Many of these strategies focus on the transit needs in suburban communities. The implementation of new weekend circulation services in the communities of Anoka, Blaine, Coon Rapids and New Brighton in the summer of 1988 represents the first of these service improvements.

Other new services in the planning stages include local circulation services focusing on Rosedale, St. Louis Park internal circulation, crosstown and reverse commute services in the I-494 corridor and local services in the Lakeville-Farmington area. It is anticipated that these will be implemented in 1989. The RTB's Transit Hub program also focuses on improving transit services. In conjunction with implementation of new service in Anoka county, transit hub improvements have been made at Northtown and are being examined for Rosedale, the proposed Mega Mall, Southdale and Maplewood.

	<u>FY 1988</u>	<u>FY 1989</u>	<u>FY 1990</u>	<u>FY 1991</u>
State Asst. Funds	448,500	2,048,500	-0-	-0-

6. RTB Transit Planning and Programs. Statutory Ref: M.S. 473.377

The RTB is involved in a variety of planning, program management and evaluation efforts. The RTB will be involved in many short and mid-range transit planning efforts that will build upon the efforts of the Transit Service Needs Assessment, participate in major corridor studies to ensure that transit issues are adequately addressed, conduct specific transit studies and activities related to planning and implementation of transit improvements, and carry out evaluation studies of existing transit programs to determine where improvements could result in more cost-effective services.

As part of these ongoing planning and programs efforts, the RTB is involved in a number of activities related to light rail transit. The RTB is legislatively authorized to review and comment on LRT comprehensive plans and grant applications and to undertake special studies in conjunction with these responsibilities. Additionally, the RTB is actively involved in technical and policy committees set up by the regional railroad authorities and plans, as appropriate, to conduct and/or participate in projects dealing with regional coordination issues associated with light rail transit.

	<u>FY 1988</u>	<u>FY 1989</u>	<u>FY 1990</u>	<u>FY 1991</u>
State Asst. Funds	950,000	950,000	750,000	1,050,000

**DRAFT**

**DRAFT**

7. RTB: Administration. Statutory Ref: M.S. 473.375

This activity exists to provide administrative support to the planning and programs activities of the RTB. Specific responsibilities include:

- o certify property tax levy
- o prepare financial plans (budgets)
- o maintain financial management systems
- o review and approve MTC budget
- o convene annual transit conference
- o appoint members to MTC
- o prepare staffing plans
- o perform audits of provider contracts
- o provide office facilities to RTB and staff
- o prepare federal grant applications and required reimbursement reports
- o develop contract policies and procedures
- o provide public with information on current RTB activities
- o assist Metropolitan Council in the sale of bonds to support capital program

Expenses incurred in administrative support of the Board's programs such as financial services, personnel, contract administration and office services are allocated to those programs based upon a cost allocation system.

State Asst. Funds	<u>FY 1988</u>	<u>FY 1989</u>	<u>FY 1990</u>	<u>FY 1991</u>
	350,000	350,000	350,000	550,000

**DRAFT**

AGENCY FISCAL SUMMARY - BIENNIAL BUDGET

BUDGET ACTIVITY: METRO TRANSIT ASSISTANCE

PROGRAM: REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

AGENCY: REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

\* \* \* Dollars in Thousands \* \* \*

SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURES AND REQUEST Expenditures by Category: -----	ACTUAL F.Y. 1988	ESTIMATED F.Y. 1989	F.Y. 1990 REQUEST LEVELS			GOV. REC. F.Y. 1990	F.Y. 1991 REQUEST LEVELS			GOV. REC. F.Y. 1991
			SAME	CHANGE	TOTAL		SAME	CHANGE	TOTAL	
Local Assistance	23,488.0	27,442.0	27,442.0	-0-	27,442.0		27,442.0	-0-	27,442.0	
TOTAL	23,488.0	27,442.0	27,442.0	-0-	27,442.0		27,442.0	-0-	27,442.0	
-----										
Sources of Financing:										
Direct Appropriations:										
General	14,770.0	14,525.0	14,525.0	-0-	14,525.0		14,525.0	-0-	14,525.0	
Transit Assistance	8,718.0	12,917.0	12,917.0	-0-	12,917.0		12,917.0	-0-	12,917.0	
TOTAL FINANCING	23,488.0	27,442.0	27,442.0	-0-	27,442.0		27,442.0	-0-	27,442.0	
-----										

**DRAFT**

**DRAFT**

**DRAFT**

Memo:

Date: September 26, 1988

To: Greg Andrews

From: Tom Beaver

RE: Chairman's breakfast meetings with local officials

Chairman Elliott Perovich held six breakfast meetings with local elected officials beginning September 8, 1988 and ending September 22, 1988. The meetings were held in various locations around the metropolitan area.

The first meeting was held on September 8, 1988 at the White Hat Restaurant in Lake Elmo. The following people (excluding RTB staff and board members) attended the meeting:

Russ Larkin	Washington County Commissioner
Dave Scheel	Washington County Commissioner
Mary Hauser	Metropolitan Council
Sally Evert	Washington County Commissioner
Donald E. Moe	Lake Elm Council member
Doug Swenson	State Representative 55 A
Maurice Stenern	City of Stillwater
Pat Morrison	City of Lake Elmo
Glenn Olson	Metropolitan Transit Commission (MTC)
Gretchen Davidson	Birchwood Mayor
Carl Mussner	Cottage Grove
Steve Russell	City of Stillwater
Gary Laidig	State Senator

On September 14, 1988, Chairman Perovich met with officials in Shoreview Holiday Inn. The following people attended the meeting:

Mary Hauser	Metropolitan Council
Steve Gatlin	Roseville
Roger Goswitz	St. Paul
Hank Sinda	New Brighton
Chuck Wiger	Metropolitan Council
Dick Wedell	Shoreview
Tom Diamond	St. Paul City Council
Hal Norgarrd	Ramsey County
Carolyn Cochrane	Metropolitan Transit Commission (MTC)
John Finley	Ramsey County
Jerry Hughes	Dist. 54
Mark Voerding	For St. Paul Councilman Bill Wilson
Dwight Johnson	Shoreview
Bill Wilson	St. Paul Council member

On September 16, 1988, the following people attended the Chair's meeting in Eagan at the Yankee Square Inn:

Marcy Waritz	Metropolitan Council
Jim Danskz	Mendota Heights
Don Bartho	Lilydale Council
Barbara Savanick	Apple Valley Council
Dan McElroy	Burnsville Mayor
Glenn Olson	Metropolitan Transit Commission (MTC)
Tom Hedges	Eagan
Betty Sindt	Lakeville
Clarence Sindt	Transportation Handicapped Advisory Committee
Bill Koniarski	Scott County
Eileen Tompkins	State Representative 37 A
Pat Scully	Metropolitan Council

The September 20, 1988 meeting was held at the Hopkins House in Hopkins. The following people attended:

Bob Anderson	Hopkins Council
Diann Goetten	Orono
Don Milbert	Hopkins Mayor
Bob DeGhetto	Minnetonka Council
Sally Olson	State Representative
Gertrude Ulrich	Metropolitan Council
Harold Trunda	Carver County
John Burger	State Representative 43 A
Phyllis McQuaid	State Senator
Craig Rapp	Hopkins
Marcy Waritz	Metropolitan Council
Mary Anderson	Golden Valley Mayor
Gen Olson	State Senator
Barb Peterson	Orono
Glenn Olson	Metropolitan Transit Commission (MTC)
John Himle	State Representative 41 A
Randy Johnson	Hennepin County Commissioner
Gloria Segal	State Representative
John Pidgeon	Bloomington City Manager
Peggy Kelly	Edina Council
Earl Renneke	State Senate 35
(unreadable name of one person)	

On September 21, 1988, the following attended the meeting in Coon Rapids at the Season's Restaurant:

Paul McCarron	Anoka County Commission
Glenn Olson	Metropolitan Transit Commission (MTC)
William Bohjanen	Lino Lakes Council
Walter Neumann	Centerville Council
Jo Nunn	Metropolitan Council
Bill Ottensmann	Coon Rapids
Gordan Jans	State Representative
Jerry Cotten	Anoka City Council
Gene Meriam	State Senate
Don Busch	Spring Lake Park
Don Malhrowtz	Spring Lake Park Council
Alice Johnson	State Representative
John Conde	St. Louis Park Council
Natalie Haas Steffen	Anoka County Commission
Dan Elhart	Anoka County Commission
Ernie Larsen	State Representative

On September 22, 1988, the following attended the meeting in Brooklyn Park at the Sheraton Northwest:

Bud Setzler	Osseo
Lyall Schwarzkopf	Minneapolis Clerk
Jerry Dalgren	Crystal
Dan Gustafson	Brooklyn Park
Rich Engh	Brooklyn Park
Bob Zitur	Plymouth
Tom Markus	Brooklyn Park
Ann Rest	State Representative 46 A
Betty Herbes	Crystal
Dan Donahue	New Hope
Jerry Spleuter	Brooklyn Center
Bill Barnhart	Minneapolis
Glenn Olson	Metropolitan Transit Commission (MTC)
Jo Nunn	Metropolitan Council
Jim Heap	State Representative 45 B
William Haas	Champlin Mayor
Walt Fehst	Robbinsdale City Manager
Bill Schreiber	State Representative

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Mears Park Centre  
230 East Fifth Street, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101  
292-8789

DATE: September 20, 1988  
TO: Regional Transit Board Members  
FROM: Elliott Perovich, Chairman  
SUBJECT: Legislative Issues for 1989 RTB Program and  
1989 Legislative Session

Discussion items for the special board meeting on Monday, September 26, 1988:

1. Short-Term Borrowing Authority for the Regional Transit Board:

This issue has been around for a number of years with the RTB first having the authority and then not having it. The last two years Peter McLaughlin has not been willing to agree to giving us the authority, but did promise us last year that he would work with us to take care of it this coming session.

2. Transit Funding for Fiscal 1990 and 1991:

Our regular funding package to fund all transit services in the Metropolitan Area for the biennium.

3. The RTB Role in LRT:

What do we want to see our role become in LRT planning and development?  
Do we need legislation to promote that?

4. Metro Mobility Issues That May Need to be Addressed Legislatively:

One suggestion is a fine for falsifying information in the certification approval by medical doctors, chiropractors and special counselors similar to the fine for handicapped parking.

-- Certification?

-- Legislative intent of the service?

Individual board members may have some additional items they would like to discuss at the meeting.

EP/mf