



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

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

MEETING OF THE REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Monday, March 6, 1989
Mears Park Centre Chambers
4:00 p.m.

AMENDED AGENDA

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Approval of Agenda
- ok 3. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes of January 30, 1989 and February 21, 1989
- ok 4. Consent List
- Mo ok 5. Results of LRT Public Opinion Poll
6. Amendment to 1989 Legislative Program - Agency Transportation
7. Route 52 MTC Impact Assessment
8. **REPORT OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE**
Doris Caranicas, Chair
9. **REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**
Ruth Franklin, Chair
10. **OTHER BUSINESS**
 - A. Chairman's Report
 - B. Members Reports
 - C. Advisory Committee Reports
 - D. Staff Reports
 - E. Public Comment
11. Position on Proposal to Sunset the Regional Transit Board

Elliott Perovich
Chairman



REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

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

MEETING OF THE REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Monday, March 6, 1989
Mears Park Centre Chambers
4:00 p.m.

AGENDA

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes of January 30, 1989 and February 21, 1989
4. Results of LRT Public Opinion Poll
5. Amendment to 1989 Legislative Program - Agency Transportation
6. Route 52 MTC Impact Assessment
7. **REPORT OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE**
Doris Caranicas, Chair
8. **REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**
Ruth Franklin, Chair
9. **OTHER BUSINESS**
 - A. Chairman's Report
 - B. Members' Reports
 - C. Advisory Committee Reports
 - D. Staff Reports
 - E. Public Comment

Elliott Perovich
Chairman



REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

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

REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

At its meeting of February 13, 1989, the committee discussed and approved the following recommendations:

Application by the Metropolitan Transit Commission (MTC) to the U.S. Department of Transportation for Grants Under the Urban Mass Transportation Act, Resolution No. 89-04

That the Regional Transit Board approve the Metropolitan Transit Commission's application to the Urban Mass Transportation Administration for fiscal year 1989 funding under the Section 9 program.

1987 Refunding Bond Issue, Resolution No. 89-05

That the Regional Transit approve Resolution No. 89-05, Cancelling Transit Tax Levy for Certificate of Indebtedness.

Compensation Study

That the Regional Transit Board accept the Compensation Audit Proposed Recommendations, dated January 1989.

1989 Compensation and Benefits Package

That the Regional Transit Board approve Resolution No. 89-03, establishing compensation and benefits for 1989.

Route 52 MTC Impact Assessment

That the Route 52 MTC Impact Assessment be referred to the full board at its meeting of February 21, 1989; and

That the executive director be directed to request that MTC provide written response to the MTC Impact Assessment staff recommendation dated February 8, 1989.

Other Business

The board also received a status report on the RTB contract with the Center for Transportation Studies. The next meeting of the committee will be March 6, 1989.

Ruth Franklin
Chair

J. Johnson Saylor T Todd
 Entzel Ding
 Huss Brantt
 Cochran Weaver
 Kille Capull
 Piacenti
 M. M. Saylor

SIT CA
 V# RR
 HB JO
 LC
 RT
 DU
 EK
 GG
 CF

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD
 ROLL CALL AND ATTENDANCE SHEET

DATE: 3/6/89

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	✓					



REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

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

Minutes of the Meeting of the
REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD
Mears Park Centre Chambers
January 30, 1989

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Gregory Andrews, Judy Hollander, Mary Fitzgerald, Dale Ulrich, Ed Kouneski, Liz Carpenter, Dave Jacobson, Mike Kuehn; Regional Transit Board staff; Charles Weaver, legal counsel; Mary Jo Nichols and Michael Ehrlichman, Metropolitan Center for Independent Living (MCIL); Christopher Gran and Tom Vida, Metro Mobility Administrative Center; Greg Failor, Metropolitan Transit Commission (MTC); Dirk deVries, Steve Wilson, Emil Brandt and Natalio Diaz, Metropolitan Council; Steve Bertrand, Transportation Handicapped Advisory Committee (THAC)

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. and roll was taken. Isaacs moved and Fuhr seconded that the agenda be approved; the motion carried unanimously.

TRANSPORTATION HANDICAPPED ADVISORY COMMITTEE BYLAWS REVISION

Andrews reviewed the January 12, 1989 report of the committee chair. Fuhr moved and Caranicas seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board approve the revised bylaws of the Transportation Handicapped Advisory Committee dated January 1989.

It was suggested that the committee consider changing its name.

TRANSPORTATION HANDICAPPED ADVISORY COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Joyce moved and Caranicas seconded :

That the Regional Transit Board approve the appointments to the Transportation Handicapped Advisory Committee as outlined in the January 20, 1989 memorandum.

The motion carried unanimously.

REPORT OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE

Committee Chair Caranicas reviewed the committee's report of its January 17, 1989 meeting.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION'S
(MN/DOT) I-94 REHABILITATION BETWEEN I-394 IN MINNEAPOLIS AND TRUCK HIGHWAY 61
(MOUNDS BOULEVARD) IN ST. PAUL

Caranicas moved and Fuhr seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board notify the Metropolitan Council that it has completed its review of the I-94 Rehabilitation Controlled Access Highway Project between I-394 in Minneapolis and T.H. 61 (Mounds Boulevard) in St. Paul and presents the following comments:

1. Ensure that the programmed improvements will not preclude the future use of ramp metering of HOV bypass lanes at the eastbound Snelling Avenue entry and other ramps.
2. Pursue the potential of an HOV bypass ramp at the University of Minnesota westbound entry ramp.
3. That Mn/DOT and the Metropolitan Council continue to work with the RTB on short-term transit impacts and the role transit can play in helping to manage traffic during the reconstruction period.
4. Encourage Mn/DOT to continue communications with the Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority (RCRRA) on the status of the RCRRA's consideration of the I-94 alignment alternative for LRT in the Midway Corridor and the overall timing of the I-94 improvements with implementation of LRT in the corridor.

The motion was unanimously approved.

METRO MOBILITY ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

Caranicas moved and Isaacs seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board:

1. Adopt the following new proposed eligibility criteria for Metro Mobility riders upon considering THAC comments and clarifying the policy questions raised during public testimony.
2. To be eligible for Metro Mobility service, a person must meet one of the following six criteria:
 - a. A permanent physical functional mobility limitation that prevents a person from walking independently for a distance of 1,000 feet without the aid of an assistive device such as a walker, cane, crutches, braces, a prosthetic device, or a wheelchair; or from negotiating the steps of a standard transit vehicle; or
 - b. A medically demonstrable condition that seriously impedes or prevents a person from walking a distance of

- 1,000 feet; or that affects coordination and stability to the extent that it presents a risk of falling; or
- c. An arterial oxygen tension (PAO2) of less than 60 mm/hg in room air at rest; or
 - d. A cardiac condition that is therapeutically classified according to standards set by the American Heart Association in one of the following areas:
 - Class D: Persons with cardiac disease whose ordinary physical activity should be markedly restricted.
 - Class E. Persons with cardiac disease who should be at complete rest, confined to bed or chair; or
 - e. A sensory impairment(s) that prevents a person from independently using, or learning to use, an alternative mode of public transit. If a person is unable to learn or apply the transportation skills, permanent certification will be granted; or
 - f. A mental functional limitation that prevents a person from independently using, or learning to use, an alternative mode of public transit. If a person is unable to learn to apply the transportation skills, permanent certification will be granted.
2. Establish a limited mobility program for persons conditionally certified to use Metro Mobility.
 3. Direct staff to instruct the Metro Mobility Administrative Center to develop detailed implementation procedures for the recertification process to commence.

Franklin distributed a proposed amendment to the language in order to clarify the board's intent and address the concerns expressed by a number of people. She moved and Caranicas seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board:

- A. Adopt the following new proposed eligibility criteria for Metro Mobility riders upon considering THAC comments and clarifying the policy questions raised during public testimony.

To be eligible for Metro Mobility service, a person whose travel needs cannot be accommodated by other public transit alternatives must meet one of the following six criteria:

1. A permanent physical functional mobility limitation that prevents a person from walking independently for a distance of 1,000 feet without the aid of an assistive device

such as a walker, cane, crutches, braces, a prosthetic device, or a wheelchair; or from negotiating the steps of a standard transit vehicle; or

2. A medically demonstrable condition that seriously impedes or prevents a person from walking a distance of 1,000 feet; or that affects coordination and stability to the extent that it presents a risk of falling; or
3. An arterial oxygen tension (PAO₂) of less than 60 mm/hg in room air at rest; or
4. A cardiac condition that is therapeutically classified according to standards set by the American Heart Association in one of the following areas:
 - Class D: Persons with cardiac disease whose ordinary physical activity should be markedly restricted.
 - Class E. Persons with cardiac disease who should be at complete rest, confined to bed or chair; or
5. A sensory impairment(s) that prevents a person from independently using, or learning to use, an alternative mode of public transit. If a person is unable to learn or apply the transportation skills in circumstances which are not routine, permanent certification will be granted; or, permanent certification will be granted; or
6. A mental functional limitation that prevents a person from independently using, or learning to use, an alternative mode of public transit. If a person is unable to learn to apply the transportation skills in circumstances which are not routine, permanent certification will be granted.

- B.. Direct staff to instruct the Metro Mobility Administrative Center to develop detailed implementation procedures for the recertification process to commence.

Isaacs spoke against the motion because Metro Mobility is an alternative to public transit if need cannot be accommodated by mass transit. Franklin said orientation and mobility training cannot help a blind person traveling to a new destination on regular route service. The amended language is intended to provide flexibility for people under those circumstances.

Kranz suggested that the proposed changes be referred to the Policy Committee for further consideration.

Caranicas said people were fearful that the criteria were unclear; this clarifies them and will also apply to people with mental disabilities.

The chairman spoke for the original language and expressed concern about deleting Item B (Limited Mobility program).

Kranz said he had voted in committee to support the original language; it appeared at the time that no blind people would be eliminated from use of the system. On January 26 and 27 he reviewed the issue and is not sure that is the case. If the blind wish to use the Metro Mobility system they should be able to use it without exceptions. After discussion, Kouneski was asked to discuss the effect of the proposed amendment.

Kouneski said the proposed revision was an attempt to declare that a person who cannot learn to use an alternative mode for routine and non-routine trips would be certified. People who cannot travel independently on regular route service for any trip would be eligible to use metro mobility when needed. The amendment would remove the requirement for conditional certification. Caranicas said it is unlikely that people would abuse the system and use Metro Mobility at those times that they could use main line service because main line is more convenient. Joyce said the number of blind people is very small in relationship to the overall disabled community.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion to amend the original motion. The motion carried (Perovich, Fuhr and Isaacs voted no.)

A roll call vote was taken on the original motion as amended; the motion carried (Perovich and Isaacs voted no).

Franklin said the next meeting of the committee is February 13, 1989.

OTHER BUSINESS:

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT:

Perovich asked the members to respond to his memorandum regarding the choice of APTA conferences they wish to attend in 1989. Kuehn noted upcoming meetings of the legislative committees and discussed the previous week's activity.

MEMBERS' REPORTS:

Fuhr reported that she and Turnbull have been invited to a meeting in Bloomington to discuss improving transit.

Graves attended the State of the City address last week, transit was not mentioned.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Andrews noted that reports from the Transportation Handicapped Advisory Committee, the Rideshare Advisory Committee and the Providers Advisory Committee were included in the packet.

STAFF REPORTS:

Andrews announced that the Governor proclaimed February 5 as the start of Disability Week. Kouneski has worked with providers to arrange pickup for people interested in attending the speech at the Capitol.

By February 21 the Mears Park Centre ramp should be available for parking.

The RTB Affirmative Action Plan was submitted to the Department of Employee Relations. They have made a number of suggestions that will be received by staff and then presented to the board for action on February 21.

Suzanne Hanson, the new Public Information Officer, was introduced.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Bertrand questioned the THAC appointments. Perovich said two appointments are made by the State Council on Disability, which will submit names to the RTB.

There being no other business, Caranicas moved and Franklin seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Fitzgerald
Secretary

Approved by the Board on _____, 1989.



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

Minutes of the meeting of the
REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD
Mears Park Centre Chambers
February 21, 1989

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Carole Faricy

OTHERS PRESENT: Gregory Andrews, Judy Hollander, Mary Fitzgerald, Mike Kuehn, Ed Kouneski, Mark Ryan, Bob Dietrick, Howard Blin, Suzanne Hanson, Mike Kuehn, Katie Turnbull, Dale Ulrich, Regional Transit Board staff; Christopher Gran, Metro Mobility Administrative Center; Arnie Entzel, Amalgamated Transit Union; Carolyn Cochran, Greg Failor, John Capell Metropolitan Transit Commission (MTC), Steve Bertrand, Transportation Handicapped Advisory Committee (THAC); Roger Huss, University of Minnesota; Jim Johnson, Medicine Lake Lines; Emil Brandt, Metropolitan Council

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m. and roll was taken. Fuhr moved and Caranicas seconded approval of the agenda; the motion carried unanimously.

Graves moved and Caranicas seconded approval of the minutes of the January 3, 1989 meeting. Fuhr noted that the seconder of Resolution No. 89-02 should be corrected. The minutes were unanimously approved as amended.

Caranicas moved and Fuhr seconded that the minutes of the January 17, 1989 meeting be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

Fuhr moved and Graves seconded that the minutes of the January 30, 1989 meeting be approved. Joyce said some pages were missing from some of the sets and he would prefer that these minutes be approved at the next meeting. The minutes will be recopied and mailed in the packet for the March 6 meeting.

CONSENT LIST

Authorization for the Executive Director to Enter into an Agreement with the Minnesota Department of Transportation for the Publishing of the Proceedings of the Third National HOV Facilities Conference: Caranicas moved and Graves seconded that the consent list of February 13, 1989 be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

REPORT OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE

METRO MOBILITY POLICY ACTIONS ON AGENCY TRANSPORTATION

Committee Chair Caranicas moved and Graves seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board:

1. Issue the following policy statements in an effort to clarify the definition and purpose of Metro Mobility service:
 - a. Metro Mobility is a demand-responsive service intended to serve individuals going from a variety of origins to a variety of destinations whose travel needs cannot be accommodated by other public transit services.
 - b. As a substitute travel method, contract subscription route service is best suited to bring individuals from a variety of origins to a single location, or conversely, to transport a large group of individuals from a single location to a variety of destinations.
 - c. Given RTB budget constraints, the Department of Human Services should add or restore funding to arrange transportation for individuals traveling to developmental achievement centers to best provide for their needs.
 - d. Metro Mobility can respond to the needs of developmentally disabled persons who live on their own and participate in community-supported employment programs when regular route service cannot accommodate their needs.
 - e. Travel skills training must be emphasized for developmentally disabled persons in extended employment programs who are able or can learn to use regular route bus service instead of Metro Mobility.
2. Seek inter-agency agreements and legislative support to define the purpose of Metro Mobility and to clarify the role of the Regional Transit Board in relation to:
 - a. The arrangement of substitute special contract service oriented to or from developmental achievement centers by the Department of Human Services; and
 - b. The coordination and expansion of regional travel skills training programs by the Department of Jobs and Training.
3. Adjust the Metro Mobility provider reimbursement rates to compensate more for individual demand-responsive trips as a measure to increase service capacity and availability.

4. Instruct the Metropolitan Transit Commission to develop a program to offer free or discounted bus passes to persons who complete travel skills training.
5. Modify the RTB capital plan to provide funding to developmental achievement centers for the purchase of vans to operate their own services.

Isaacs said some members of the THAC committee had been concerned about RTB furnishing vans to organizations that may not have enough funds to operate them. He said Item 4 is redundant and he disagrees with giving free programs. The committee did not come to a strong consensus. The motion carried (Isaacs abstained).

REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Committee Chair Franklin reported on the actions taken by the committee at its February 13, 1989.

APPLICATION BY THE METROPOLITAN TRANSIT COMMISSION TO THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FOR GRANTS UNDER THE URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT, RESOLUTION NO. 89-04

Franklin moved and Isaacs seconded

That the Regional Transit Board approve Resolution No. 89-04, approving the Metropolitan Transit Commission's application to the Urban Mass Transportation Administration for fiscal year 1989 funding under the Section 9 program.

On a roll call vote, the motion and resolution were unanimously approved.

1987 REFUNDING BOND ISSUES, RESOLUTION NO. 89-05

Franklin moved and Graves seconded:

That the Regional Transit approve Resolution No. 89-05, Cancelling Transit Tax Levy for Certificate of Indebtedness.

On a roll call vote the motion and resolution were unanimously approved.

COMPENSATION STUDY

Franklin moved and Caranicas seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board accept the Compensation Audit Proposed Recommendations, dated January 1989.

The motion carried unanimously.

1989 COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS PACKAGE, RESOLUTION NO. 89-03

Franklin moved and Caranicas seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board approve Resolution No. 89-03, establishing compensation and benefits for 1989.

Roll call vote was taken and the motion and resolution were unanimously approved.

ROUTE 52 MTC IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Franklin said the committee did not take action on the recommendation, referring it instead to the full board. She complimented Mark Ryan on the staff report and expressed her regret that he has resigned.

In discussing her concerns about the effect on employees of MTC, Franklin said it appears that normal attrition will take care of all but three or four mechanics. The savings to the taxpayer that would be realized by bidding out the route are roughly estimated to be in excess of \$6,000,000. She moved:

That the Regional Transit Board adopt the staff report dated February 8, 1989 staff report and the finding contained therein, as its assessment of the potential impact on the Metropolitan Transit Commission if the University of Minnesota were to enter into a contract with a provider other than the Metropolitan Transit Commission to operate Route 52 service; and

That the board direct the Metropolitan Transit Commission to retain the three or four equipment maintenance employees until such time as attrition occurs.

Franklin said the law requires that the RTB take no action that would cost MTC jobs; however, the commission has talked about improving maintenance and she suggested these people be used in a preventive maintenance program. Caranicas seconded the motion. Members discussed the intent of the statute, board involvement in operational issues, and whether the law applies in this situation.

Entzel said the intent of the law would be circumvented if the motion were approved and said RTB does not have the authority to direct MTC on its number of employees. He asked if the board would enter into a contract to assist the University or a provider. Perovich said the board would contract with the University.

Capell discussed the MTC's concerns about precedent and said it is legislative intent that MTC should be the provider of regular route service in this area. The action of awarding Route 52 service to Medicine Lake Lines would result in laying off MTC employees, which is not permitted under the statute. Regarding the estimated savings, the capital costs were included in the bid so the fully allocated costs are included in the bid. Perovich said four mechanics represent one percent of the equipment and maintenance staff; he asked how fluctuations in ridership are handled and whether MTC tries to maintain a certain level. Capell said personnel levels are related to the number of miles and peak hour vehicles, rather than ridership. The service plan calls for personnel to be tied to the level of service. If service is reduced by 500,000 miles there will be an impact and for a period of nine months MTC would be overstaffed. Ten people were laid

off when MTC lost the Metro Mobility program. A chart was distributed that showed work hours per 1,000 miles.

Joyce called the question. Jim Johnson said Medicine Lake Lines has been designated by the University as the preferred provider. The issue is whether this service is eligible for competitive bidding. The people who participated have been embarrassed and the taxpayer loses. The legislation is intended to protect present employees of the MTC. He urged the members to vote in favor of the motion. Kranz asked why audits are pending since 1980. Isaacs called a point of order. Franklin restated the motion.

Graves said the data received indicates there would be layoffs at MTC. Franklin said the people can be retained; RTB approves their budget and supplies the funds needed to run the system and should ensure that the funds are adequate. This is a good way to get extra funds for suburban service. Vote was taken; motion failed (Graves, Isaacs, Joyce and Kranz voted no).

Isaacs moved:

That the Regional Transit Board has determined that the Metropolitan Transit Commission will be negatively impacted by the loss of Route 52. Such loss would result in the dismissal of three or four mechanics, violating Minnesota Statute 473.384, Subdivision 7, entitled "MTC Impact Assessment."

*Motion
of 3/6*

Joyce seconded the motion. Graves offered a friendly amendment that "Although there is an increased savings to the taxpayer, due to the statute..." Isaacs did not accept the friendly amendment.

At Isaacs' suggestion, Kranz moved that a brief recess be taken to allow time to frame the motion clearly. Graves seconded the motion. Recess was taken at 5:25 p.m.

At 5:30 p.m. the meeting was reconvened. Isaacs restated the motion.

Paul Houck asked if the board should comply with this law if the law prohibits someone from doing it better and suggested that the board should challenge the law. Graves said the law is five years old and has not been challenged.

Vote was taken; the motion failed (Perovich, Caranicas, Franklin and Fuhr voted no).

The chairman instructed staff to put the item on the agenda of the March 6 meeting.

Franklin said the next meeting of the Administration and Finance Committee will be March 6, 1989.

REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT

HENNEPIN COUNTY REGIONAL RAILROAD AUTHORITY (HCRA) SYSTEM STANDARDS

Committee Chair Isaacs noted that the report of the committee of its February 16, 1989 meeting had been distributed before the meeting. He moved and Fuhr seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board approve the proposed system standards for the Hennepin County Light Rail Transit System, with the exception of

the standard design of station platforms, which should be determined after further examination of various platform designs in all the proposed corridors.

The motion carried unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Isaacs said the Transportation Handicapped Advisory Committee was unhappy about the broadening of the Metro Mobility eligibility standards. Franklin said there was no consensus of the advisory committee; their vote on the issue was split. She moved:

That the Regional Transit Board will not reconsider the issue of Metro Mobility conditional certification for the blind.

Graves seconded the motion. The motion carried (Fuhr and Perovich voted no).

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Perovich said members should contact the secretary to arrange a special meeting for discussion of the agency's future. In his meeting today with the chair of the Metropolitan Transit Commission, it was agreed that a joint meeting should be held in the first part of April.

MEMBERS' REPORTS

In response to Fuhr's question about the federal budget, Perovich said he, Kuehn and Joyce are attending a meeting of the American Public Transit Association in Washington next month on that subject. Fuhr said she had been invited to participate in a Richfield State of the City meeting. She attended a 494 meeting where BRW reported that the Environmental Impact Statement will cost \$1.1 million rather than the \$900,000 originally planned. The RTB may be assessed for a greater amount as its contribution. The Minnesota Future Resources Commission is looking for ideas; Fuhr asked if transit can be construed as falling into the environmental area.

Isaacs said the results of the poll on light rail transit have been compiled and members will receive a copy of the results before the study is released.

Graves attended the light rail public hearing regarding the Northwest Corridor. People were concerned about noise and the rumor that 40 homes would be removed. She will be in Washington until the end of the week talking with congressmen.

STAFF REPORTS

Hollander said staff has been discussing the proposals on the agency's future and they feel they have something to offer on how to deal with planning and programs issues. They would like to present to the board their statement on the principals of planning and programs that should be retained regardless of any new structure the Legislature may put together. Fuhr said staff should be commended for their hard work and is sorry they are being subjected to this uncertainty.

Andrews said the Port Authority proposed last week that there be a trade-off of rent not paid for various long-term savings. The Office Space Policymakers group will meet to decide whether the proposals are worth pursuing. The ramp is still not ready and the

parking configuration has to be decided. The landlord is proposing valet parking and that the agencies buy the building. Isaacs commented that the sound system in Chambers is greatly improved.

There being no further business, Joyce moved and Graves seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried and the meeting was adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Fitzgerald
Secretary

Approved by the board on _____, 1989

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

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

DATE: March 6, 1989
TO: Regional Transit Board
FROM: Elliott Perovich, Chairman
SUBJECT: Consent List

The following referral has been reviewed by the staff and chairman of the Regional Transit Board (RTB). In my opinion, the referral meets the standards of consent referrals adopted by the board in its bylaws.

Authorize Executive Director to Enter Into Agreement With Strgar-Roscoe-Fausch, Inc., to Conduct Analysis of Rosedale Transit Staging Area and Park-and-Ride Lot

Authorize the executive director to enter into an agreement with Strgar-Roscoe-Fausch, Inc., in an amount not to exceed \$5,000 to conduct an analysis of the Rosedale Transit circulation system, staging area, and park-and-ride lot. This analysis is necessary due to the construction of the new Dayton's store, which will result in the disruption of the current transit circulation and staging area.

EP:jmo



REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

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

Handout 3/6 Bd

For Immediate Release
March 6, 1989

For More Information Contact:
Suzanne Hanson, RTB
612-229-2720

Public Opinion Survey Shows Metro Residents Favor Light Rail Transit Construction

Regional Transit Board Chairman, Elliott Perovich announced today that an independent poll commissioned by the agency showed that 71 percent of metro area residents surveyed supported construction of a light rail transit (LRT) system.

Among the more interesting survey results, Perovich remarked, were that 47 percent of the metro area respondents said they were knowledgeable about LRT, and yet a majority of those surveyed said LRT was most like the Minnesota Zoo monorail and least like a streetcar.

Perovich said that some of the other survey findings were:

- Metro area residents are most concerned about how LRT will be paid for and that it will be environmentally safe and maintained to ensure public safety.
- 56 percent thought that the Minnesota Department of Transportation should be responsible for LRT planning; while 30 percent said it should be a regional agency. Only 11 percent felt LRT planning should be the responsibility of local government.
- A majority of those surveyed felt that building LRT or widening existing highways were the best ways to reduce traffic congestion. Building new highways or buying more busses were the least favored ways to reduce traffic congestion.
- Only 17 percent of the respondents felt that LRT should be built underground.

"In addition to the survey results, the survey firm recommended that the Regional Transit Board (RTB) initiate several public education activities," Perovich remarked.

Perovich summarized the important consultant recommendations:

- "The RTB should initiate a public education effort that addresses the planning, design, construction and ridership phases of the project."
- "Target media to promote and discuss LRT at the neighborhood level and within the work force."
- "Spark debate about the cost of LRT, how it will be paid for and deliver the message that LRT is less costly to maintain than busses or highways."

The findings and recommendations of the LRT public opinion survey were conducted by MPA Consultants, an independent, St. Paul-based polling firm. The RTB commissioned the survey which was conducted through telephone interviews with metro area residents in December, 1988. Copies of the findings or the full report can be obtained by calling the RTB at 612-292-8789.

Handout 3/6 Bd

BASELINE STUDY
OF
PUBLIC ATTITUDES AND OPINION TOWARDS LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT

MPA CONSULTANTS
1227 MARION STREET
ST. PAUL, MN 55117

FEBRUARY 1989

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FINDINGS.....1
RECOMMENDATIONS.....2
METHODOLOGICAL NOTES.....3
ABSTRACT.....4
TABLES.....6
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS.....8
CROSS TABULATION TABLES.....23
CREDENTIALS.....29

FINDINGS

1. Generally, the public believes that LRT is a modern form of mass public transportation. Beyond that, they have very little specific information or knowledge about what a LRT system is like or how it would operate.
2. The overall attitude towards LRT is positive and people believe that overcrowding of the metropolitan highway system is a growing problem and that LRT is the best alternative for reducing traffic congestion.
3. Even though respondents state that the metropolitan area is ready for change and a modern mass transit system is needed, the acceptance of LRT is not because "they will use it", but rather for "others to use". In other words, the majority state that they do not, or may not use public transportation, but they believe that they will be able to drive on highways that are less congested because "others" will use LRT.
4. Respondents believe that the planning for metropolitan wide transportation should not be decentralized. Rather, planning should be done by a governing body or organization that has a much broader range of responsibility.
5. At this point in time, informants believe the the cost and method of paying for the system are the two most important decision factors that must be addressed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Develop a public education program that addresses the planning, design, construction and ridership phases of the project.
2. Educate opinion leaders and those in a position to influence opinion leaders so they can reinforce the message about LRT to the general public.
3. Promote the personal benefits "what is in it for me, personally" aspects of LRT.
4. Emphasis how LRT and the existing bus service fit together and complement one another thereby providing a improved public transportation system, Specifically, how LRT will improve the bus system.
5. In addition to emphasizing the environmental and mobility impact LRT will have on the metropolitan area, it is also important to define the economic benefit in LRT and promote LRT as an effective development tool that will bring new jobs to the area and will concentrate development in certain areas or corridors.
6. Target media and message to promote and discuss LRT at the neighborhood level and within the work force. In general terms, explain "routing", that is where LRT will go, how pickup stations will be located, the elimination of parking problems and the convenience and comfort of a LRT ride.
7. Be consistent in the use of terminology and vocabulary in the promotion of LRT.
8. In order to overcome the "street car syndrome" do not market LRT as a modern day street car. Rather, provide demonstrations, visuals and hands on experience addressing what LRT is and what it is not in time, space and motion terms.
9. Spark public debate about the cost of LRT, how it will be paid for and deliver the message that LRT is less costly to maintain than are busses or highways.

METHODOLOGICAL NOTES

1. This report is the result of a random sample survey conducted in the seven county metropolitan area. The data was collected by telephone during the third week of December, 1989. A total of 403 individuals were interviewed.
2. The purpose of the survey was to determine attitudes, awareness and disposition towards the planning and construction of a light rail transit system in the seven county metropolitan area.
3. These statistics do in our opinion, reflect the relative distribution of characteristics and attitudes measured by the questionnaire and within a few percentage points, we believe the data to be accurate and representative.
4. The data has been analyzed in percentages and also with the use of a weighted scale which reflects the positive or negative character of an issue or attitude.
5. The tables are a rank order listing of all the questions in the study measured on the weighted scale. You may find the use of the scaling technique confusing at first. Think of the scale value as a grade point average, though sometimes, a very low score is positive, depending on the nature of the issue and the direction of the scale. The range of scores is 4.00 to 1.00. Overall, a score of 3.0 is high, a score of 2.0 is low and everything else is pretty average. The scale values are crude scales which provide a simple means of inspecting major differences in the data. Similar inspections can be made by consulting percentages, but with a loss of the "shorthand" notation quality and a loss in sensitivity.
6. We believe the findings hold for the general population as a whole as well as for the many sub-populations.

ABSTRACT

Our major findings are:

- (1) 43% of those interviewed said that they had on some occasion ridden on an LRT system. However when asked in what city they rode LRT, it was discovered that less than 10% had actually experienced LRT. The type of system that they had actually been on was heavy rail, mono-rail, or some other form of trolley or street car system.
- (2) 47% (2.37) indicated that they were knowledgeable about LRT. However the system that they reported to have ridden on usually was not LRT and when asked what they thought LRT was most like, informants felt that it was most like the mono-rail at the state zoo and least like the street car system that the area had until about 1950.
- (3) 71% (3.12) are favorably disposed to building a LRT system in the metro area and the reason most often given is that it will help to reduce traffic congestion. Those who do not support building LRT most often state that the high cost of building and maintaining the system as the reason for not building LRT.
- (4) Even though 71% indicate support for building LRT, only 54% (2.60) believe that LRT will ever be built.
- (5) Only 15% (1.59) of those interviewed indicate that they are familiar with the RTB.
- (6) 17% felt that if a system is built, it should go underground.
- (7) Generally, people feel that building LRT, followed by widening existing highways as the best ways of reducing highway congestion. Building more highways and buying more busses are viewed as the poorest ways of reducing congestion. Keeping trucks off of the existing highway system is not viewed as being at all realistic.
- (8) 66% believe that building more freeways is not a viable option. The reasons most often given is that this would only add to the 2 congestion problem and that there is not enough space to build more freeways.
- (9) 56% say that the Minnesota Department of Transportation should be responsible for planning the LRT system, 30% say that a regional governing body should do the planning and only 11% feel that it should be planned at the local level.
- (10) People are most concerned about how the system will be paid for and that it be environmentally safe and maintained in a manor that assures the safety of the public.

(11) 32% (2.01) indicate that they believe the area population is not dense enough to support a LRT system.

(12) Generally, people believe that LRT will be environmentally safe and is a safe, reliable, inexpensive mode of traffic that will reduce highway congestion.

(13) 30% (2.81) say that they would use LRT frequently and 31% indicate that they would use it occasionally. However, when asked how often they would use LRT for a specific purpose i.e. going to work (1.95), shopping (2.55), the positive response level is considerably less. It is also important to note that people generally feel the rest of the public, on the average, (3.31) would use LRT more frequently than they would.

(14) 51% of all respondents said that they never ride on the current bus system and 28% stated that they ride the bus less than 1 time per month.

(15) 44% (2.65) rate the existing bus system as good and 8% rate it as excellent even though 79% never or almost never ride on a bus.

(16) 66% have 2 or more automobiles in their households and 29% said that they travel more than 10 miles one way to work each day.

(17) 22% indicated that they would not use the service very often and 13% would not use it at all. Non users feel that driving is more convenient, or they believe that they are located too close or too far away from their work to make LRT practical for them.

(18) Cross tab analysis of selected questions against question 4, which asks respondents to indicate their support for LRT, profiles the segment that is most likely to be supportive of LRT as those who:

- * Believe that they are more knowledgeable of how such a system operates.
- * Indicate that LRT is most like a subway system and least like a street car system.
- * State that they would ride LRT on a somewhat frequent basis.
- * Live 1 to 5 miles or more than 10 miles from where they work.
- * Tend to be mid-level professionals or white collar workers.
- * Were born after 1950.
- * Are more mobile in terms of their length of residency.
- * Resides in Minneapolis or a Minneapolis suburb.

(19) Those who state that they are least likely to ride LRT are:

- * People who admit that they are uneducated about the issue.
- * People who think that LRT is like the street car system of the 1950's.
- * People who feel that they would not use the system.
- * Those who have to travel more than 10 miles each way to their work place.
- * Are more likely to be in middle income blue collar jobs
- * Are those who are married with children living at home.
- * Live in the city of St. Paul

TABLE 1

Table 1 is a rank order listing of all questions in the study, based on the weighted scale value of each question.

SCALE	QUESTION
3.81	(34) LRT is a safe method of transportation
3.69	(37) LRT will relieve traffic congestion
3.59	(38) LRT will be easy for passengers to use
3.58	(30) LRT will reduce air pollution
3.46	(31) LRT will be more reliable than busses
3.41	(40) LRT will be good for the economy and will provide jobs
3.37	(48) Believe that the public would use LRT
3.31	(50) Public would use LRT more than they do the bus
3.14	(20) How to pay for LRT
3.12	(04) Should LRT be built
3.10	(35) LRT will be cheaper than highways to build
2.98	(33) LRT will not be as noisy as busses
2.81	(41) Will ride LRT instead of driving
2.70	(19) Who should be responsible for planning LRT
2.69	(39) LRT fares will not be higher than current bus fares
2.65	(53) Rating of the current bus system
2.64	(32) LRT will not disrupt neighborhoods
2.60	(06) Will LRT be built
2.56	(36) LRT will improve neighborhood property values
2.55	(45) Will use LRT for going shopping
2.49	(21) Where should the tracks be located
2.41	(46) Will use LRT for social or recreational purposes
2.37	(03) Knowledge of LRT
2.16	(44) Will use LRT for going to the doctor
2.29	(47) Will use LRT for doing personal business
2.01	(16) Build more highways
2.01	(29) Population is too small to justify LRT
1.95	(43) Will ride LRT to and from work
1.70	(22) Who should operate the system after it has been built
1.59	(09) Familiarity of RTB

TABLE 2

Table 2 is a ranking of issues that people feel are important for policy makers to address.

SCALE	QUESTION
3.14	(20) How to pay for LRT
2.70	(19) Who should be responsible for planning LRT
2.49	(21) Where should the tracks be located
1.70	(22) Who should operate the system after it has been built

TABLE 3

Table 3 is a rank order listing of questions 30 through 40, based on the weighted scale value of each question.

SCALE QUESTION

3.81	(34)	LRT is a safe method of transportation
3.69	(37)	LRT will relieve traffic congestion
3.59	(38)	LRT will be easy for passengers to use
3.58	(30)	LRT will reduce air pollution
3.46	(31)	LRT will be more reliable than busses
3.41	(40)	LRT will be good for the economy and will provide jobs
3.10	(35)	LRT will be cheaper than highways to build
2.98	(33)	LRT will not be as noisy as busses
2.69	(39)	LRT fares will not be higher than current bus fares
2.64	(32)	LRT will not disrupt neighborhoods
2.56	(36)	LRT will improve neighborhood property values

TABLE 4

Table 4 is a rank order listing of questions 43 through 47, based on the weighted scale value of each question.

SCALE QUESTION

2.55	(45)	Will use LRT for going shopping
2.41	(46)	Will use LRT for social or recreational purposes
2.16	(44)	Will use LRT for going to the doctor
2.29	(47)	Will use LRT for doing personal business
1.95	(43)	Will ride LRT to and from work

QUESTIONNAIRE WITH DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

(1) Have you ever ridden on a light rail transit system?

173/43% (1) Yes
224/56% (2) No
3/01% (5) Not sure/don't know
3/01% (0) Refused/no response

(2) If "yes", Where?

29/07% Chicago
25/06% San Francisco
17/04% Washington D.C.
13/03% Disneyland
12/03% Europe
11/03% New York
09/02% Minnesota Zoo
08/02% Boston
06/01% Atlanta
05/01% Twin City street car system
09/02% Areas not identified
26/06% Misc. areas
 3 Philadelphia
 2 Cleveland
 2 Pittsburgh
 2 San Diego
 2 Toronto

2 Tokyo
 1 Detroit
 1 Duluth
 1 Georgia
 1 Hawaii
 1 Iowa
 1 Japan
 1 Mexico
 1 Miami
 1 Moorhead
 1 Portland
 1 Seattle
 1 West Virginia
 1 Yellowstone

(3) Recently there has been a great deal of publicity about light rail transit. Would you say that you are _____ about light rail?

43/11% (4) Knowledgeable
145/36% (3) Somewhat Knowledgeable
131/33% (2) Not Vary knowledgeable, or
82/20% (1) Not knowledgeable at all
1/-- (5) Not sure/don't know
1/-- (0) Refused/no response

2.37 = SCALE VALUE

(4) Do you believe that we should _____ build a light rail transit system in the metro area?

126/31% (4) Definitely
159/40% (3) Probably
37/09% (2) Probably not, or
25/06% (1) Definitely not
52/13% (5) Not sure/don't know
04/01% (0) Refused/no response

3.12 = SCALE VALUE

(5)-4-Why do you say that we should definitely build a light rail system?

66/16% Will help reduce traffic congestion
26/06% Convenience
13/03% The existing bus service is inadequate
10/02% Is more economical than building and maintaining more highways
06/01% Will help protect the environment
11/03% Misc. responses

(5)-3-Why do you say that we should probably build a light rail system?

68/17% Will help reduce traffic congestion
22/05% Convenience
19/05% The existing bus service is inadequate
14/03% Is more economical than building and maintaining highways
11/03% Support light rail, but question the feasibility
16/04% Misc. Responses

(5)-2-Why do you say that we should probably not build a light rail system?

12/03% It is too costly to build
11/03% It is just not needed
12/03% Misc. responses

(5)-1-Why do you say that we should definitely not build a light rail system?

13/03% It is too costly to build
10/02% Misc. responses

(6) In your opinion, how likely is it that a light rail transit system will ever be built in the Metro area? Would you say that it will _____ be built?

32/08% (4) Definitely
184/46% (3) Probably
133/33% (2) Probably not, or
24/06% (1) Never be built
27/07% (5) Not sure/don't know
02/01% (0) Refused/no response

2.60 = SCALE VALUE

(7) Do you think that light rail is most like?

55/14% (1) The street cars that we had until about 1950
145/36% (2) The mono-rail like at the Minnesota zoo
115/29% (3) A subway like those in Washington D.C. or Chicago, or
53/13% (4) The people mover that was proposed for St. Paul Several years ago
27/07% (5) Not sure/don't know
06/02% (6) Is not like any of those listed
02/01% (0) Refused/no response

(8) Which of those do you feel light rail is least like?

168/42% (1) The street cars that we had until about 1950
64/16% (2) The mono-rail like at the Minnesota Zoo
92/23% (3) A subway like those in Washington D.C. or Chicago, or
43/11% (4) The people mover that was proposed for St. Paul Several years ago
27/07% (5) Not sure/don't know
03/01% (6) Is not like any of those listed
06/02% (0) Refused/no response

(9) In 1984, the State Legislature set up a Regional Transit Board or RTB to plan public transportation in the metro area. Would you say that you are _____ with this board?

12/03% (4) Familiar
47/12% (3) Somewhat familiar
107/27% (2) Not very familiar, or
236/59% (1) Not familiar at all
--/--% (5) Not sure/don't know
01/--% (0) Refused/no response

1.59 = SCALE VALUE

People who are experts in transportation, say that by the year 2000, the average commute time on metro freeways will double. We would like to know what you feel are the best ways to eliminate freeway congestion. Please rank the following list 1 to 5 with 1 being what you feel is the best way and 5 being the poorest way of solving freeway congestion? the 5 ways are:

- _____ (10) Building light rail transit
- _____ (11) Keeping trucks off the highways
- _____ (12) Building more highways
- _____ (13) Widening existing highways, or
- _____ (14) Buying more busses

	10	11	12	13	14
1 Best	200/50%	22/06%	28/07%	103/26%	43/11%
2	70/17%	41/10%	62/15%	127/32%	97/24%
3	58/14%	48/12%	109/27%	95/24%	84/21%
4	42/10%	86/21%	120/30%	50/12%	94/23%
5 Poorest	27/07%	197/49%	76/19%	21/05%	80/20%
No response	06/02%	9/02%	8/02%	7/02%	5/01%

(15) If a light rail transit system is built, should it be:

- 164/41% (1) Above the ground
- 104/26% (2) At ground level, or
- 67/17% (3) Underground
- 48/12% (4) A combination of above ground and underground
- 19/05% (5) Not sure/don't know
- /--% (0) Refused/no response

(16) Some people say that building more freeways is the best way to reduce traffic congestion? What is your opinion, do you:

- 52/13% (4) Agree
- 81/20% (3) Somewhat agree
- 83/21% (2) Somewhat disagree
- 183/45% (1) Disagree
- 04/01% (5) Not sure/don't know
- /--% (0) Refused/no response

2.01 = SCALE VALUE

(17)-4-Why do you agree that building freeways is best?

- 33/08% We need more/wider freeways
- 8/02% Freeways are more convenient
- 11/03% Misc. responses

(17)-3-Why do you somewhat agree that building freeways is best?

- 49/12% Freeways are the best way to handle traffic
- 28/07% Misc. responses

(17)-2-Why do you somewhat disagree that building freeways is best?

- 31/08% More freeways will not solve congestion problem
- 13/03% There is not enough space to build more freeways
- 10/02% It is not economical to build and maintain more freeways
- 26/06% Misc. responses

(17)-1-Why do you disagree that building freeways is best?

- 52/13% More freeways will only create more congestion problems
- 43/11% There is not enough space to build more freeways
- 30/07% We already have enough freeways
- 16/04% There are better existing alternatives i.e. busses & car pooling
- 08/02% It is not economical
- 06/01% Need to update existing roads
- 06/01% It takes to long to build more highways
- 06/01% More highways will be harmful to the environment
- 11/03% Misc. responses

(18) Assuming that a light rail transit system were going to be built throughout the entire metro region, who should be responsible for planning it? Should it be:

- 119/30% (1) A regional board or governing body, or should
- 17/04% (2) Each city or town plan for their area , or should
- 30/07% (3) Each county board plan for their county, or should
- 226/56% (4) The Minnesota, Department of Transportation do the planning
- 08/02% (5) Not sure/don't know
- 03/01% (0) Refused/no response

With 1 being the most important and 4 being the least important, would you rank the following 4 items in terms of what you feel policy makers should view as most important as they discuss light rail transit? The 5 are:

- ____(19) Who should plan it
- ____(20) How to pay for it
- ____(21) Where to locate the line or tracks
- ____(22) Who should run it after it is built
- ____(23) -----

	19	20	21	22
1 Most Impt.	110/27%	194/48%	86/21%	22/06%
2	115/29%	108/27%	108/27%	63/16%
3	116/29%	61/15%	127/32%	86/21%
4 Least Impt	52/13%	37/09%	77/19%	222/55%
no response	09/02%	-----	-----	10/02%
SCALE VALUE	2.70	3.14	2.49	1.70

Now I am going to read a list of 5 concerns that many people have about light rail transit. We would like to know the importance of these concerns to you. Would you rank them 1 to 5 with 1 being the most important and 5 being the least important? The 5 concerns are:

- _____ (24) Neighborhood noise
- _____ (25) Safety
- _____ (26) The quality of the ride
- _____ (27) Location of the tracks
- _____ (28) How much taxes will go up

	24	*25	26	27	28
1 Most Impt.	24/06%	165/41%	18/05%	87/22%	112/28%
2	47/12%	83/21%	59/15%	110/27%	100/25%
3	76/19%	85/21%	90/22%	83/21%	64/16%
4	102/25%	49/12%	107/27%	78/19%	62/15%
5 Least Impt.	149/37%	18/05%	125/31%	41/10%	64/15%

(29) Some say that there are not enough people living in the metro area to use and support a light rail transit system. Do you:

(17)-1-Why do you disagree that building freeways is best? 57/14% (4) Agree

- 73/18% (3) Somewhat agree
- 75/19% (2) Somewhat disagree, or
- 182/45% (1) Disagree with that
- 14/04% (5) Not sure/don't know
- 02/01% (0) Refused/no response

Now I am going to read you a series of statements about light rail transit. Would you tell me if you (4) Agree, (3) Somewhat agree, (2) Somewhat disagree, or Disagree with each statement? If you (5) don't have an opinion or don't know, just say so. Light rail transit:

(30) Will reduce air pollution

- 246/61% (4) Agree
- 64/16% (3) Somewhat agree
- 20/05% (2) Somewhat disagree, or
- 13/03% (1) Disagree with that
- 60/15% (5) Not sure/don't know
- (0) Refused/no response

3.58 = SCALE VALUE

(31) Is more reliable than busses

- 196/49% (4) Agree
- 86/21% (3) Somewhat agree
- 30/07% (2) Somewhat disagree, or
- 14/04% (1) Disagree with that
- 77/19% (5) Not sure/don't know
- (0) Refused/no response

3.46 = SCALE VALUE

(32) Will not disrupt neighborhoods

102/25% (4) Agree
78/19% (3) Somewhat agree
100/25% (2) Somewhat disagree, or
63/16% (1) Disagree with that
60/15% (5) Not sure/don't know
----- (0) Refused/no response

2.64 = SCALE VALUE

(33) Will not be as noisy as buses

198/49% (4) Agree
59/15% (3) Somewhat agree
32/08% (2) Somewhat disagree, or
29/07% (1) Disagree with that
85/21% (5) Not sure/don't know
----- (0) Refused/no response

2.98 = SCALE VALUE

(34) Is a safe method of transportation

305/76% (4) Agree
47/12% (3) Somewhat agree
07/02% (2) Somewhat disagree, or
03/01% (1) Disagree with that
41/10% (5) Not sure/don't know
----- (0) Refused/no response

3.81 = SCALE VALUE

(35) Is cheaper to build than highways

97/24% (4) Agree
54/13% (3) Somewhat agree
34/08% (2) Somewhat disagree, or
21/05% (1) Disagree with that
197/49% (5) Not sure/don't know
----- (0) Refused/no response

3.10 = SCALE VALUE

(36) will improve neighborhood property values

71/18% (4) Agree
45/11% (3) Somewhat agree
92/23% (2) Somewhat disagree, or
45/11% (1) Disagree with that
71/18% (5) Not sure/don't know
----- (0) Refused/no response

2.56 = SCALE VALUE

(37) Will relieve traffic congestion

308/76% (4) Agree
66/16% (3) Somewhat agree
12/03% (2) Somewhat disagree, or
11/03% (1) Agree with that
06/02% (5) Not sure/don't know
----- (0) Refused/no response

3.69 = SCALE VALUE

(38) Is easy for passengers to use

233/58% (4) Agree
86/21% (3) Somewhat agree
17/04% (2) Somewhat disagree, or
07/02% (1) Disagree with that
60/15% (5) Not sure/don't know
----- (0) Refused/no response

3.59 = SCALE VALUE

(39) Fares will not be higher than current bus fares

91/23% (4) Agree
40/10% (3) Somewhat agree
70/17% (2) Somewhat disagree, or
49/12% (1) Disagree with that
153/38% (5) Not sure/don't know
----- (0) Refused/no response

2.69 = SCALE VALUE

(40) Is good for the economy and will provide jobs

213/53% (4) Agree
86/21% (3) Somewhat agree
41/07% (2) Somewhat disagree, or
13/03% (1) Disagree with that
213/50% (5) Not sure/don't know
----- (0) Refused/no response

3.41 = SCALE VALUE

(41) If a light rail transit system were built, instead of driving,
would you ride it:

120/30% (4) Frequently
126/31% (3) Occasionally
87/22% (2) Not very often, or
54/13% (1) Not at all
16/04% (5) Not sure/don't know }DO NOT READ
--/--% (0) Refused/no response }DO NOT READ

2.81 = SCALE VALUE

(42)-4-Why do you say that you would frequently ride light rail?

65/16% Convenience
28/07% To avoid congestion/dislike driving because of the traffic
11/03% Already commute by public transportation and would continue
08/02% I don't drive
07/02% It is more economical than driving
06/01% Misc. responses

(42)-3-Why do you say that you would ride light rail once in a while?

54/13% Convenience
20/05% Usually drive own transportation
11/03% Would use light rail to go down town in order to avoid parking problems
08/02% I don't drive
06/01% I live too close to where I work
06/01% I do not work
05/01% Work outside of the metro area
10/02% Misc. responses

(42)-2-Why do you say that you would not ride light rail very often?

27/07% Driving is convenient/job requires that I drive
09/02% Live or work outside of the city
09/02% Live in an area that is not close to public transportation
08/02% Live close to work therefore would not use public transportation
08/02% Never go down town
09/02% Misc. responses

(42)-1-Why do you say that you would not ride light rail?

23/06% It is more convenient to drive
14/03% Public transportation is inconvenient
07/02% Do not like to ride on public transportation
05/01% Live outside of the city where public transportation is not available
10/02% Misc. responses

Now I am going to read you a list of 5 reasons why you may choose to use light rail. Would you tell me if you would use it (4)On a regular basis, (3)Once in a while, (2)Not very often, or (1)Not at all for:

(43) Going to work

138/34% (4) On a regular basis,
43/11% (3) Once in a while,
33/08% (2) Not very often, or
182/45% (1) Not at all for:

1.95 = SCALE VALUE

(44) Going to the doctor

74/18% (4) On a regular basis,
96/24% (3) Once in a while,
53/13% (2) Not very often, or
180/45% (1) Not at all for:

2.16 = SCALE VALUE

(45) Going shopping

113/28% (4) On a regular basis,
117/29% (3) Once in a while,
50/12% (2) Not very often, or
123/31% (1) Not at all for:

2.55 = SCALE VALUE

(46) For a social or recreational trip

87/22% (4) On a regular basis,
117/29% (3) Once in a while,
72/18% (2) Not very often, or
127/32% (1) Not at all for:

2.41 = SCALE VALUE

(47) Doing personal business

76/19% (4) On a regular basis,
112/28% (3) Once in a while,
68/17% (2) Not very often, or
147/37% (1) Not at all for:

2.29 = SCALE VALUE

(48) If It were built, do you feel that the public would use a high quality transportation system such as light rail:

192/48% (4) A lot
164/41% (3) Somewhat
28/07% (2) Not very much, or
09/02% (1) Not at all
09/02% (5) Not sure/don't know
01/--% (0) Refused/no response

3.37 = SCALE VALUE

(49) If we had light rail and if you chose to ride it, would you be willing to walk _____ in order to get to the ride?

56/14% (1) One block or less, or
201/50% (2) Up to 3 blocks, or
113/28% (3) Up to 6 blocks, or
28/07% (4) More than 6 blocks
04/01% (5) Not sure/don't know
01/--% (0) Refused/no response

(50) Compared to the existing bus system, do you feel that the public would use light rail:

184/46% (4) More than they use the bus
139/35% (3) About the same as the bus
38/09% (2) Somewhat less than they ride the bus, or
14/04% (1) Considerably less than they ride the bus
28/07% (5) Not sure/don't know
--/--% (0) Refused/no response

3.31 = SCALE VALUE

(51)-4- Why do you feel the public would use LRT more than they do the busses?

62/15% Light rail is faster and more reliable
60/15% Light rail will be core convenient
24/06% The current bus service is inadequate
11/03% Will be more economical
11/03% Will be something different/new
20/05% Misc. responses

(51)-3-Why do you feel the public would use LRT about the same as they use busses?

44/11% It will still be the same riders
36/09% Location will be more convenient
08/02% People favor cars and will not use public transportation
07/02% Public transportation is very popular
07/02% Public will adjust to using LRT
06/01% Light rail will be faster
17/04% Misc. responses

(51)-2-Why do you feel the public would use LRT somewhat less than they do the bus?

12/03% The bus system is better
11/03% Will not be as local as the a bus service
07/02% Misc. responses

(51)-1-Why do you feel the public would use LRT considerably less than the bus?

09/02% Will not be as local as the bus service
05/01% Misc. responses

(52) Do you typically ride the bus:

33/08% (1) Every day, or
24/06% (2) More than 3 times a week
18/05% (3) Once a week
115/28% (4) Once a month or less, or
205/51% (6) Do you never ride the bus
01/--% (7) Not sure/don't know
03/01% (0) Refused/no response

(53) Would you rate the bus system in the metro area as:

34/08% (4) Excellent
177/44% (3) Good
105/26% (2) Fair
23/06% (1) Poor
60/15% (5) Not sure/don't know
02/01% (0) Refused/no response

2.65 = SCALE VALUE

(54)-4-Why do you rate the current bus service as being excellent?

19/05% Is a well ran system/have had no problems with it
06/01% Convenience
06/01% Misc. responses

(54)-3-Why do you rate the current bus service as being good?

100/25% Is a good system
16/04% Poor 'quality of service
18/05% Goes where it is needed
13/03% Convenience
11/03% Misc. responses

(54)-2-Why do you rate the current bus service as being fair?

28/07% Poor scheduling
26/06% Poor buses
10/02% It gets you where you go
09/02% I don't ride the system
08/02% Inconvenience
07/02% Availability
10/02% Misc. responses

(54)-1-Why do you rate the current bus service as being poor?

13/03% Poor scheduling
06/01% Poor buses
05/01% Misc. responses

(55) Do you travel _____ one way to work?

- 44/11% (1) Less than a mile
- 97/24% (2) 1 to 5 miles
- 83/21% (3) 5 to 10 miles
- 118/29% (4) More than 10 miles
- 22/06% (5) Not sure/don't know
- 38/09% (0) Refused/no response

(56) How many working cars, motorcycles, trucks and vans are being used in your household?

- 121/30% (1) One
- 189/47% (2) Two
- 51/13% (3) Three
- 22/06% (4) Four or more
- 15/04% (5) None
- 03/01% (0) Refused/no response

_____(57) Do you live in a:

- 293/73% (1) Single family dwelling
- 20/05% (2) Townhouse
- 09/02% (3) Condominium
- 53/13% (4) Apartment
- 23/06% (5) Duplex, or
- 03/01% (6) Mobile home
- 01/--% (7) Other, _____
- /--% (8) Not sure/don't know
- 01/--% (0) Refused/no response

_____(58) What type of work does the head of the household on your home do?

- 37/09% (1) high level professional
- 76/19% (2) mid-level professional
- 35/09% (3) Manager/foreman
- 37/09% (4) Sales/proprietor
- 40/10% (5) white collar worker
- 47/12% (6) skilled laborer
- 44/11% (7) Semi or unskilled laborer
- 13/03% (8) student
- 12/03% (9) homemaker
- 62/15% (0) retired

(59) As I read the following list of possible family compositions, would you please tell me which one best describes your household?

- 139/35% (1) Married with children under 18 years of age
- 35/09% (2) Married with adult children living at home
- 102/25% (3) Couple with no children or no children living at home
- 17/04% (4) Single parent
- 67/17% (5) Single
- 19/05% (6) widowed
- 17/04% (7) divorced
- 01/--% (8) Other, LIST _____
- 06/02% (0) Refused/no response

____(60) In what decade were you born?

- 08/02% (1) 1970
- 78/19% (2) 1960
- 113/28% (3) 1950
- 74/18% (4) 1940
- 55/14% (5) 1930
- 39/10% (6) 1920
- 21/05% (7) 1910
- 09/02% (8) 1900
- 06/02% (0) refused/no response

____(61) Have you lived in the neighborhood where you do:

- 101/25% (1) 1 to 3 years
- 64/16% (2) 3 to 5 years
- 71/18% (3) 5 to 10 years
- 88/22% (4) 10 to 20 years, or
- 72/18% (5) More that 20 years
- 02/01% (6) not sure/don't know
- 04/01% (0) refused/no response

____(62) For statistical purposes, would you please tell us your approximate total family income for 1987? Was it:

- 17/04% (1) under \$10,000
- 22/06% (2) \$10,000 to \$15,000
- 29/07% (3) \$15,000 to \$20,000
- 65/16% (4) \$20,000 to \$30,000
- 65/16% (5) \$30,000 to \$40,000
- 120/29% (6) over \$40,000
- 23/06% (7) not sure/don't know
- 53/13% (8) refused/no response

____(63) Was the interviewee:

- 205/51% (1) male
- 198/49% (2) female

____(64) Location

55/14% Mpls.
69/17% St. Paul
112/28% West/Mpls suburbs
49/12% East/St. Paul suburbs
89/22% Far west/Mpls suburbs
25/06% Far east/St. Paul suburbs

CROSS TABULATION TABLES

The following percentage tables are the result of cross tabulation analysis of selected questions with question 4, which asks respondents to indicate their support for LRT. (Explanation: Using question 3 as in example, 19% of all those who are definitely in favor of LRT say that they are knowledgeable of LRT while 8% say that they are not knowledgeable at all).

QUESTION (3)--Recently there has been a great deal of publicity about light rail transit. Would you say that you are (4)Knowledgeable (3)Somewhat Knowledgeable (2)Not Vary knowledgeable, or (1)Not knowledgeable at all about light rail?

QUESTION 4 \\/\	4	3	2	1
4 Definitely	19%	42%	31%	08%
3 Probably	06%	35%	35%	24%
2 Prob. not	08%	38%	30%	06%
1 Defin. not	25%	29%	21%	25%

QUESTION--(7) Do you think that light rail is most like? (1)The street cars that we had until about 1950 (2)The mono-rail like at the Minnesota zoo (3)A subway like those in Washington D.C. or Chicago, or (4)The people mover that was proposed for St. Paul Several years ago (5)Not sure/don't know

QUESTION 4 \\/\	1	2	3	4	5
4 Definitely	12%	35%	38%	11%	04%
3 Probably	11%	39%	29%	11%	07%
2 Prob. not	16%	35%	19%	22%	05%
1 Defin. not	29%	29%	25%	13%	04%

(41) If a light rail transit system were built, instead of driving, would you ride it: (4)Frequently (3)Occasionally (2)Not very often, or (1) Not at all

QUESTION 4 \\ /	4	3	2	1
4 Definitely	46%	33%	14%	04%
3 Probably	29%	35%	25%	09%
2 Prob. not	05%	27%	32%	32%
1 Defin. not	08%	08%	25%	50%

(55) Do you travel (1)Less than one mile (2)1 to 5 miles (3)5 to 10 miles or (4)More than 10 miles one way to work?

QUESTION 4 \\ /	1	2	3	4	5	0
4 Definitely	---	32%	19%	37%	05%	08%
3 Probably	11%	23%	23%	28%	06%	10%
2 Prob. not	14%	27%	19%	32%	---	08%
1 Defin. not	17%	17%	04%	38%	08%	17%

(58) What type of work does the head of the household on your home do?
 (1)High level professional (2)Mid-level professional (3)Manager/foreman
 (4) Sales/proprietor (5)White collar worker (6)Skilled laborer
 (7)Semi or unskilled laborer (8)Student (9)Homemaker (0)Retired

QUESTION

4 \\//	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
4 Definitely	04%	20%	08%	10%	15%	10%	10%	04%	03%	15%
3 Probably	11%	16%	10%	10%	08%	15%	13%	02%	03%	13%
2 Prob. not	16%	32%	08%	11%	---	11%	16%	---	---	05%
1 Defin. not	08%	08%	13%	08%	04%	08%	08%	04%	---	38%

(59) As I read the following list of possible family compositions, would you please tell me which one best describes your household? (1)Married with children under 18 years of age (2)Married with adult children living at home (3) Couple with no children or no children living at home (4)Single parent (5)Single (6)Widowed (7)Divorced (8)Other

QUESTION

4 \\//	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
4 Definitely	27%	11%	27%	03%	18%	04%	09%			
3 Probably	37%	06%	26%	06%	16%	03%	03%			
2 Prob. not	51%	11%	14%	03%	14%	08%	---			
1 Defin. not	22%	15%	33%	---	19%	07%	04%			

(60) In what decade were you born? (1)1970 (2)1960 (3)1950 (4)1940
 (5)1930 (6)1920 (7)1910 (8)1900

QUESTION
4
\\/\

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
4 Definitely	03%	19%	29%	12%	15%	15%	05%	02%		
3 Probably	01%	22%	29%	23%	08%	08%	05%	02%		
2 Prob. not	---	08%	35%	27%	19%	05%	03%	---		
1 Defin. not	---	24%	12%	08%	24%	16%	12%	04%		

(61) Have you lived in the neighborhood where you do (1)1 to 3 years (2)3 to 5 years (3)5 to 10 years (4)10 to 20 years, or (5) More that 20 years?

QUESTION
4
\\/\

	1	2	3	4	5	6
4 Definitely	28%	14%	19%	18%	21%	---
3 Probably	23%	19%	16%	22%	16%	02%
2 Prob. not	30%	14%	19%	22%	16%	---
1 Defin. not	13%	17%	17%	29%	25%	---

(62) For statistical purposes, would you please tell us your approximate total family income for 1987? Was it: (1)under \$10,000 (2)\$10,000 to \$15,000 (3)\$15,000 to \$20,000 (4)\$20,000 to \$30,000 (5)\$30,000 to \$40,000 (6)over \$40,000 (7)not sure/don't know

QUESTION

4 \\/\	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	0
4 Definitely	06%	06%	07%	19%	12%	36%	06%	08%	01%
3 Probably	04%	06%	08%	17%	16%	31%	04%	11%	03%
2 Prob. not	05%	---	03%	19%	35%	27%	03%	08%	---
1 Defin. not	04%	08%	04%	08%	04%	17%	08%	42%	04%

(63) Was the Interviewee (1)male (2)female

QUESTION

4 \\/\	1	2
4 Definitely	60%	40%
3 Probably	46%	45%
2 Prob. not	49%	51%
1 Defin. not	63%	37%

(64) Location: (1)Mpls. (2)St. Paul (3)West/Mpls suburbs
 (4)East/St. Paul suburbs (5)Far west/Mpls suburbs (6)Far east/St. Paul suburbs

QUESTION

4 \ /	1	2	3	4	5	6
4 Definitely	20%	16%	29%	13%	19%	04%
3 Probably	13%	15%	25%	12%	28%	07%
2 Prob. not	03%	17%	32%	14%	32%	03%
1 Defin. not	13%	33%	33%	13%	04%	04%

BIOGRAPHY
LARRY J. KITTO

LARRY J. KITTO, is currently the president of a management consultant firm, providing professional services in the areas of public affairs, public opinion research, and political campaign development. He is a registered lobbyist in the state of Minnesota and has represented various interests either as an employee or consultant during the last ten legislative sessions. Kitto is a certified minority contractor with the state of Minnesota.

Kitto has had professional experience in management, program development and public affairs at both the state and federal level. Kitto's major area of concentration has been with Indian tribal governments and resource development in the public sector. In 1983, the Governor of Minnesota appointed Kitto to serve as the legislative coordinator for a major state agency. Currently he is the chairperson of the Metropolitan Parks and Open Space Commission.

In 1985, Kitto was a Bush Fellow and attended the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA. where he received a masters degree in public administration. He is a graduate of Bemidji State College, Bemidji, MN and of Haskell Institute, a Bureau of Indian Affairs boarding school in Lawrence, Kansas. At Harvard, his course work included political analysis, public opinion, statistics, and leadership in the public sector.

Since 1984, Kitto has worked on numerous local, state, and presidential campaigns doing public opinion polling. In addition he has conducted a number of public sector random sample public opinion surveys. This work requires intensive surveys of local areas to determine public attitudes, disposition of voters and possible action strategies.

He resides in St. Paul, Minnesota, where he manages his consultant business. He is an enrolled member of the Santee Sioux Tribe, Santee, Nebraska. Kitto is married and has two children.

HOUSE RESEARCH

Bill Summary

H.F. _____ 506 _____ S.F. _____

SUBJECT: Transit: Metropolitan reverse-commute service

AUTHORS: McLaughlin, Otis, Vellenga, Kalis, Battaglia

COMMITTEE: Transportation **DATE:** 2-28-89

Directs the Regional Transit Board to establish a program to demonstrate "reverse commute" transit services --between suburban areas with high concentrations of employment and training institutions and urban areas with high unemployment and transit dependent populations.

Legislative Analyst: Tom Todd (296-5048)

Research Department . Minnesota House of Representatives . 600 State Office Building

Senators Purfeerst, Schmitz, Vickerman, Lantry and Bernhagen introduced--

S.F. No. 729 Referred to the Committee on Transportation

1 A bill for an act

2 relating to transportation; providing continued
3 special transportation service for persons with
4 permanent sensory or mental impairment; requiring
5 coordination between regional transit board and
6 department of human services to maximize federal
7 reimbursement; requiring adoption of transit voucher
8 program for persons with permanent impairments;
9 providing for appeals of decisions of regional transit
10 board; appropriating money; amending Minnesota
11 Statutes 1988, sections 174.29, subdivision 2;
12 256B.04, by adding a subdivision; and 473.386,
13 subdivision 1, and by adding a subdivision; proposing
14 coding for new law in Minnesota Statutes, chapter 256B.

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

16 Section 1. Minnesota Statutes 1988, section 174.29,
17 subdivision 2, is amended to read:

18 Subd. 2. [DIRECTION.] In order to provide more adequate
19 access to transportation service for the elderly, handicapped
20 and disabled with special transportation needs and to more
21 efficiently utilize public and private funds expended for that
22 purpose, all state agencies that assist, provide, reimburse or
23 regulate special transportation services shall promote, support
24 and facilitate coordination of those services with other special
25 services and with regular transportation services offered to the
26 general public. A person with a permanent sensory or mental
27 impairment is eligible for transportation service until a
28 reasonably accessible transportation service is available to the
29 person.

30 Sec. 2. Minnesota Statutes 1988, section 256B.04, is

1 amended by adding a subdivision to read:

2 Subd. 17. [COORDINATION WITH REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD.] The
3 commissioner shall cooperate with the regional transit board to
4 maximize federal financial participation in the reimbursement of
5 transit services for persons eligible for medical assistance.

6 Sec. 3. [256B.0626] [TRANSPORTATION VOUCHER PROGRAM.]

7 The commissioner shall adopt rules to establish a transit
8 voucher program for persons with permanent physical, sensory, or
9 mental impairments who are not eligible for medical assistance
10 or who have no reasonably accessible transportation alternative.

11 Sec. 4. Minnesota Statutes 1988, section 473.386,
12 subdivision 1, is amended to read:

13 Subdivision 1. [SERVICE OBJECTIVES.] The transit board
14 shall implement a special transportation service, as defined in
15 section 174.29, in the metropolitan area. The board has the
16 primary responsibility for arranging special transportation
17 service. The service has the following objectives:

18 (a) to provide greater access to transportation for the
19 elderly, handicapped, and others with special transportation
20 needs in the metropolitan area, regardless of the type of
21 disability or purpose of the trip;

22 (b) to develop an integrated system of special
23 transportation service providing transportation tailored to meet
24 special individual needs in the most cost-efficient manner; and

25 (c) to use existing public, private, and private nonprofit
26 providers of service wherever possible, to supplement rather
27 than replace existing service, and to increase the productivity
28 of all special transportation vehicles available in the area.

29 Sec. 5. Minnesota Statutes 1988, section 473.386, is
30 amended by adding a subdivision to read:

31 Subd. 8. [APPEALS.] A person aggrieved by a decision of
32 the board may appeal to the commissioner of transportation under
33 chapter 14. An appeal may be based on a board decision to
34 reduce or eliminate special transportation service including,
35 but not limited to, a decision involving trainer dislocation,
36 standing orders, or certification.

02/20/89

[REVISOR] XX/AH 89-1990

1 Sec. 6. [APPROPRIATION.]
2 \$..... is appropriated from to the
3 commissioner of human services for the transit voucher program
4 established under section 3.

HOUSE RESEARCH

Bill Summary

H.F. _____ 484 _____ S.F. _____

SUBJECT: Railroads: Joint powers agreements of regional rail authorities

AUTHORS: A. Johnson, Simoneau, Weaver, K. Nelson, Janezich

COMMITTEE: Transportation

DATE: 2-28-89

Clarifies the authority of regional rail authorities to enter into joint powers agreements with other authorities.

