



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.



MEETING OF THE REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD
Monday, March 19, 1990
Mears Park Centre Chambers
4:30 p.m., or Immediately After Meeting of
Administration and Finance Committee

AGENDA

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes:
 - A. Policy Committee, February 26, 1990
 - B. Administration and Finance Committee, March 5, 1990
 - C. Regional Transit Board, March 5, 1990
4. **CHAIR'S REPORT**
5. **ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT**
 - A. Workslope, Schedule and Budget for Preparing Light Rail Transit Regional Coordination Plan
 - B. Consultant Contract Amendment with Strgar-Roscoe-Fausch and BRW, Inc. for Assistance in Preparing Light Rail Transit Regional Coordination Plan
 - C. Authorization to Issue Request for Proposal for Subconsultant for Assistance in Preparing Light Rail Transit Regional Coordination Plan
 - D. Community Transit Planning Grant Program
 - E. Medicine Lake Lines Contract Assignments
 - F. Contract to Operate Transit Service in the Cities of Crystal, Golden Valley, and New Hope
 - G. Metro Mobility Administrative Center 1990 Contract
6. **LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT**
7. **OTHER BUSINESS**
 - A. Public Comment

Michael J. Ehrlichmann
Chair

An Equal Opportunity Employer

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD
ROLL CALL AND ATTENDANCE SHEET

DATE: March 19, 1990

BOARD OR COMMITTEE: Board

Member Name	Present	Vote							
Mike Ehrlichmann	✓								
Doris Caranicas (P)	✓								
John Finley (A&F)	WDC								
Ruth Franklin (A&F)	✓								
Ed Kranz (A&F)	✓								
Sandra Hilary (P)	✓								
Terry O'Toole (P)	✓								
Jeff Spartz (Chair-P)	WDC								
Norbert Theis (P)	✓								
El Tinklenberg (Chair-A)	✓								
Richard Wedell (A&F)	✓								

Visitors

Weaver

Fair

Capell

Staff

SH EK, JA

PM GA



REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Mears Park Centre, 230 East 5th Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
612/229-2700

Minutes of the Meeting of the
POLICY COMMITTEE
Mears Park Centre, Room A
February 26, 1990

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jeff Spartz, Chair; Doris Caranicas; Sandra Hilary; Terrance O'Toole and Norbert Theis

OTHERS PRESENT: RTB Chair Michael J. Ehrlichmann; Charles Weaver, RTB Legal Counsel; Greg Failor, Metropolitan Transit Commission (MTC); Mary O'Hara Anderson, Transit Accessibility Advisory Committee (TAAC); Arnie Entzel, Amalgamated Transit Union; Greg Andrews, Judy Hollander, Howard Blin, Suzanne Hanson, Mary Fitzgerald, Regional Transit Board Staff

The meeting was called to order at 4 p. m. and roll taken. Theis moved and O'Toole seconded that the agenda be approved; the motion was carried unanimously.

Report to the Legislature on Methods to Improve the Delivery of Transportation Services for the Elderly, Handicapped and Disabled

A staff report, dated February 26, regarding the comments received on the report, and Draft No. 2 of the report was distributed. Hollander commented that the TAAC comments have been incorporated in the report. The record is open until February 28 and any significant comments will also be incorporated before the board takes action on the report at its March 5 meeting. O'Toole moved and Theis seconded:

That the Policy Committee recommend:

That the Regional Transit Board approve the submittal of the report entitled Methods to Improve the Delivery of Transportation Services for the Elderly and Disabled, Draft No. 2, issued February 26, 1990:

The motion was unanimously approved.

Review and Comments for the Minneapolis-Northeast Corridor Scoping Documents (Anoka County Regional Railroad Authority and Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority)

Blin reviewed the staff report dated February 14, 1990. O'Toole moved and Theis seconded:

That the Policy Committee recommend:

That the Regional Transit Board approve the staff recommendation contained under the "Discussion" section of the February 14, 1990 staff report and forward them to the Anoka County and Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authorities.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Review and Comments for the Midway Corridor Scoping Documents (Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority and Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority)

Blin reviewed the staff report dated February 14, 1990. O'Toole moved and Theis seconded:

That the Policy Committee recommend:

That the Regional Transit Board approve the staff comments contained in the "Discussion" section, Items 1 through 5, and forward them to the Ramsey County and Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authorities.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Other Business:

There being no other business, O'Toole moved and Theis seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was unanimously approved and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Fitzgerald
Secretary

Approved by the Board: _____, 1990.



REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Mears Park Centre, 230 East 5th Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
229-2700

DATE: March 19, 1990
TO: Members of the Regional Transit Board
FROM: Michael J. Ehrlichmann
SUBJECT: Minutes of the March 6, 1990 Regional Transit Board Meeting

The March 5 minutes were inadvertently omitted from the mailing of the board packet although they were shown on the agenda.

It is up to the board whether you wish to approve them at this meeting or include them in the mailing and agenda of the next board meeting.

MJE/mf



REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD
Mears Park Centre, 230 East 5th Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
612/229-2700

Minutes of the Meeting of the
REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD
Mears Park Centre Chambers
March 5, 1990

MEMBERS PRESENT: Michael Ehrlichmann, Chair; Doris Caranicas; John T. Finley; Ruth Franklin; Ed Kranz; Terrance O'Toole; Norbert Theis; Elwyn Tinklenberg; Jeff Spartz and Richard Wedell

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Sandra Hilary

OTHERS PRESENT: Charles Weaver, RTB Legal Counsel; Alan Sharrach and William Johnson, Laidlaw Transit, Inc.; Ron Bernstrom, Medicine Lake Lines; Bob Rossman, Amalgamated Transit Union; Mary O'Hara Anderson, Transit Accessibility Advisory Committee; Kathy DeSpeigelaere, Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority; Greg Andrews, Dale Ulrich, Sherry Munyon, Howard Blin, Ed Kouneski, Garneth Peterson, David Minister, Len Simich, Mary Fitzgerald, Regional Transit Board staff

The meeting was called to order at 5:10 p.m. and roll taken. O'Toole moved and Caranicas seconded approval of the amended agenda. The motion was unanimously approved.

O'Toole moved and Tinklenberg seconded approval of the following minutes:

Administration and Finance Committee Meeting, February 12, 1990
Legislative Committee Meeting, February 15, 1990
Special Board Meeting, February 15, 1990
Regional Transit Board Meeting, February 20, 1990

Kranz said that the Audit Advisory Committee report made to the Administration and Finance Committee on February 20 referred to a Deloitte Touch recommendation that the audit function report directly to the board. The chair directed that the matter be placed on the agenda of the Administration and Finance Committee. The motion to approve the minutes was unanimously approved.

Production of Light Rail Transit Videos and Public Service Announcements

Hanson said this issue was tabled at the last board meeting. Caranicas moved and Franklin seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board authorize the executive director to enter into a contract with FutureView Productions for an amount not to exceed \$24,700, for the production of two light rail transit videos and six public service announcements.

The motion was approved (O'Toole voted nay and Spartz abstained).

CONSENT LIST:

Caranicas moved and Franklin seconded approval of the February 27, 1990 consent list regarding the City of Woodbury I-494 Access Improvement Study. The motion was unanimously approved.

CHAIR'S REPORT:

The chair announced that Medicine Lake Lines has sold certain assets to Laidlaw Transit, a Canadian firm, and introduced representatives of that organization.

On March 7, 1990 Representative Carruthers bill will be heard and members were encouraged to attend the meeting.

TRANSIT ACCESSIBILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT

The chair said Mary O'Hara Anderson, chair of the committee, had to leave because of a conflict in her schedule. A written report had been mailed in the board meeting packet.

POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee Chair Spartz reviewed the committee's report of its February 26, 1990 meeting.

Report to the Legislature on Methods to Improve the Delivery of Transportation Services for the Elderly, Handicapped and Disabled

Spartz moved and Finley seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board approve the submittal of the report entitled Methods to Improve the Delivery of Transportation Services for the Elderly and Disabled, Draft No. 2, issued February 26, 1990.:

The motion was unanimously approved.

Review and Comments for the Minneapolis-Northeast Corridor Scoping Documents (Anoka County Regional Railroad Authority and Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority)

Spartz moved and Finley seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board approve the staff recommendation contained under the "Discussion" section of the February 14, 1990 staff report and forward them to the Anoka County and Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authorities.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Review and Comments for the Midway Corridor Scoping Documents Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority and Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority)

Spartz moved and Finley seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board approve the staff comments contained in the "Discussion" section, Items 1 through 5, of the February 14, 1990 staff report and forward them to the Ramsey County and Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authorities.

The motion was unanimously approved.

ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

Adoption of Ratifying Resolution of \$26,000,000 General Obligation Transit Bonds, Resolution No. 90-01

Tinklenberg moved and O'Toole seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board approve Resolution 90-01, Ratifying Resolution of Regional Transit Board Providing for Issuance of General Obligation Transit System Bonds, Series 1990A and Related Matters.

On a roll call vote, the motion was unanimously approved.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Minister reviewed the staff response to the UMTA report on transit.

There being no other business, Tinklenberg moved and Caranicas seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried and the meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Fitzgerald
Secretary

Approved by the Board: _____, 1990.



REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD
Mears Park Centre, 230 East 5th Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
612/229-2700

Minutes of the Meeting of the
ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE
Mears Park Centre, Room A
Monday, March 5, 1990

MEMBERS PRESENT: Elwyn Tinklenberg, Chair; John T. Finley, Ruth Franklin, Ed Kranz and Richard Wedell

OTHERS PRESENT: Michael Ehrlichmann, Doris Caranicas, Terrance O'Toole, Jeff Spartz, Norbert Theis, RTB Members; Charles Weaver, RTB Legal Counsel; Bob Rossman, Amalgamated Transit Union; Mary O'Hara Anderson, Transit Accessibility Advisory Committee; Kathy DeSpiegelaere, Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority; Greg Andrews, Dale Ulrich, Sherry Munyon, Howard Blin, Ed Kouneski, Garneth Peterson, David Minister, Len Smich, Mary Fitzgerald, Regional Transit Board staff

The meeting was called to order at 4 p.m. and roll taken. Franklin moved and Wedell seconded approval of the agenda. The motion was unanimously approved.

General Obligation Transit Bonds, Ratifying Resolution No. 90-01

Ulrich distributed a revised resolution. Franklin moved and Wedell seconded:

The Administration and Finance Committee recommend:

That the Regional Transit Board approve Resolution 90-01, Ratifying Resolution of Regional Transit Board Providing for Issuance of General Obligation Transit System Bonds, Series 1990A and Related Matters.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Workscope, Schedule and Budget for Preparing Light Rail Transit Regional Coordination Plan

Minister reviewed the February 26 staff report. In response to Ehrlichmann's question, Minister said Items 1 and 2 were the recommendation of the LRT technical staff task force. Spartz said the study should leave latitude on the implementation strategy rather than become a de facto standard for the Metropolitan Area. The prescriptive language should be removed and a preamble added to tasks 1 and 2. Franklin moved and Tinklenberg seconded:

That the Administration and Finance Committee recommend:

That the Regional Transit Board approve the 1990 Workscope, Schedule and Budget, dated March 6, 1990, with the following amendments:

1. Add an introductory preamble stating the autonomy and authority of the county regional railroad authorities to implement light rail transit within their respective jurisdictions; and
2. Modify the language in the Executive Summary, Tasks 1 and 2, stating that the Regional Transit Board will not prescribe or mandate any particular implementation strategy or organization plan for light rail transit implementation that is binding on the county regional railroad authorities.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Consultant Contract Amendment with Strgar-Roscoe-Fausch and BRW, Inc. for Assistance in Preparing Light Rail Transit Regional Coordination Plan

Simich reviewed the staff report dated February 26. Finley moved and Wedell seconded:

That the Administration and Finance Committee recommend:

That the Regional Transit Board authorize the executive director to amend the existing contract with Strgar-Roscoe-Fausch and BRW, Inc. for work in preparing the Light Rail Transit Regional Coordination Plan for an amount not to exceed \$200,000 and based on the Workslope, Schedule and Budget, dated March 6, 1990 with the following changes to the workslope:

1. Add an introductory preamble stating the autonomy and authority of the county regional railroad authorities to implement light rail transit within their respective jurisdictions; and
2. Modify the language in the Executive Summary, Tasks 1 and 2, stating that the Regional Transit Board will not prescribe or mandate any particular implementation strategy or organization plan for light rail transit implementation that is binding on the county regional railroad authorities.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Authorization to Issue Request for Proposal (RFP) for Subconsultant for Assistance in Preparing Light Rail Transit Regional Coordination Plan

Tinklenberg said Finley had suggested that this recommendation also include the amendment that was made to the motion regarding the workslope for preparing the light rail transit coordination plan. In response to Finley's question, Ehrlichmann said the RTB will select the vendor. There was discussion of the date that the work must be completed. Minister said that three companies that do not do final design have expressed interest in submitting a proposal. Finley moved and Wedell seconded:

That the Administration and Finance Committee recommend:

That the Regional Transit Board authorize the executive director to approve and issue an Request for Proposal for a subconsultant who would become part of the Strgar-Roscoe-Fausch and BRW, Inc. Team assisting the Regional Transit Board and the Joint Light Rail Transit Advisory Committee in preparing the Light Rail Transit Regional Coordination Plan.

That the Regional Transit Board amend the subconsultant workscope to include the following changes:

1. Add an introductory preamble stating the autonomy and authority of the county regional railroad authorities to implement light rail transit within their respective jurisdictions; and
2. Modify the language in the Executive Summary, Tasks 1 and 2, stating that the Regional Transit Board will not prescribe or mandate any particular implementation strategy or organization plan for light rail transit implementation that is binding on the county regional railroad authorities.

That the Scope of Services (Appendix B-2) be amended to stipulate that the subconsultant be required to forego participation in any turnkey consortium or final design team for the LRT project in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area for a period of three years following the letting of the first contract for construction of one or more light rail segments in the Metropolitan Area.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Community Transit Planning Grant Program

Peterson reviewed the staff report dated February 26. Tinklenberg said the board should receive periodic work plan updates on the results of planning projects. Wedell said there is a strong likelihood that local government assistance will be cut back and communities will have to react. Members discussed the requirement for a ten-percent local match. Franklin moved and Tinklenberg seconded:

That the Administration and Finance Committee recommend:

That the Regional Transit Board authorize staff to solicit proposals from communities within the seven-county area for the purpose of planning transit services responsive to their needs and approve the proposed guidelines for evaluating applications.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Other Business

Members discussed the language to be used in the LRT Workslope. There being no other business, Kranz moved and Wedell seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Fitzgerald
Secretary

Approved by the Board: _____, 1990.



REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Mears Park Centre, 230 East 5th Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE -REPORT

At its meeting of March 5, 1990, the committee discussed and approved the following recommendations:

Workscope, Schedule and Budget for Preparing Light Rail Transit Regional Coordination Plan

The Administration and Finance Committee recommends:

That the Regional Transit Board approve the 1990 Workscope, Schedule and Budget, dated March 6, 1990, with the following amendments:

1. Add an introductory preamble stating the autonomy and authority of the county regional railroad authorities to implement light rail transit within their respective jurisdictions; and
2. Modify the language in the Executive Summary, Tasks 1 and 2, stating that the Regional Transit Board will not prescribe or mandate any particular implementation strategy or organization plan for light rail transit implementation that is binding on the county regional railroad authorities.

Consultant Contract Amendment with Strgar-Roscoe-Fausch and BRW, Inc. for Assistance in Preparing Light Rail Transit Regional Coordination Plan

The Administration and Finance Committee recommends:

That the Regional Transit Board authorize the executive director to amend the existing contract with Strgar-Roscoe-Fausch and BRW, Inc. for work in preparing the Light Rail Transit Regional Coordination Plan for an amount not to exceed \$200,000 and based on the Workscope, Schedule and Budget, dated March 6, 1990 with the following changes to the workscope:

1. Add an introductory preamble stating the autonomy and authority of the county regional railroad authorities to implement light rail transit within their respective jurisdictions; and
2. Modify the language in the Executive Summary, Tasks 1 and 2, stating that the Regional Transit Board will not prescribe or mandate any particular implementation strategy or organization plan for light rail transit implementation that is binding on the county regional railroad authorities.

Authorization to Issue Request for Proposal (RFP) for Subconsultant for Assistance in Preparing Light Rail Transit Regional Coordination Plan

The Administration and Finance Committee recommends:

That the Regional Transit Board authorize the executive director to approve and issue an Request for Proposal for a subconsultant who would become part of the Strgar-Roscoe-Fausch and BRW, Inc. Team assisting the Regional Transit Board and the Joint Light Rail Transit Advisory Committee in preparing the Light Rail Transit Regional Coordination Plan.

That the Regional Transit Board amend the subconsultant workscope to include the following changes:

1. Add an introductory preamble stating the autonomy and authority of the county regional railroad authorities to implement light rail transit within their respective jurisdictions; and
2. Modify the language in the Executive Summary, Tasks 1 and 2, stating that the Regional Transit Board will not prescribe or mandate any particular implementation strategy or organization plan for light rail transit implementation that is binding on the county regional railroad authorities.

That the Scope of Services (Appendix B-2) be amended to stipulate that the subconsultant be required to forego participation in any turnkey consortium or final design team for the LRT project in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area for a period of three years following the letting of the first contract for construction of one or more light rail segments in the Metropolitan Area.

Community Transit Planning Grant Program

The Administration and Finance Committee recommends:

That the Regional Transit Board authorize staff to solicit proposals from communities within the seven-county area for the purpose of planning transit services responsive to their needs and approve the proposed guidelines for evaluating applications.

General Obligation Transit Bonds, Ratifying Resolution No. 90-01

Because of schedule demands, Resolution 90-01 was approved by the committee and placed on the agenda of the March 5, 1990 meeting of the board. The board approved the resolution at that meeting.

Elwyn Tinklenberg
Chair

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

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

DATE: March 7, 1990

TO: Regional Transit Board

FROM:  David Minister, Director of LRT Development

SUBJECT: Workscope, Schedule and Budget for Preparing the
LRT Regional Coordination Plan

SUMMARY

The Regional Transit Board's 1990 Budget contains \$250,000 for preparing the LRT Regional Coordination Plan. Action is requested to approve the attached Workscope, Schedule and Budget.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

See attached Workscope, Schedule and Budget.

The Joint Light Rail Transit Advisory Committee reviewed and adopted this workscope, schedule and budget at their February 21, 1990 meeting.

The RTB A & F Committee reviewed and approved with modifications this workscope, schedule and budget at their March 5, 1990 meeting. The modifications are:

1. Add an introductory preamble stating the autonomy and authority of the county Regional Railroad Authorities (RRA) to implement LRT within their respective jurisdictions; and
2. The RTB will not prescribe or mandate any particular implementation strategy or organization plan for LRT implementation which is binding on the county RRA's. Modify language in the Executive Summary, Task 1 and Task 2 to so reflect this.

The attached workscope has now been revised to reflect the A & F Committee's recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Regional Transit Board approve the attached Workscope, Schedule and Budget for preparing the LRT Regional Coordination Plan.

RDM:cm

Attachments

WORKSCOPE FOR PREPARING THE REGIONAL COORDINATION PLAN FOR LRT

Executive Summary

The Minnesota statutes of 1987 empowered the county regional railroad authorities (RRA's) with the responsibility to plan, design and implement light rail transit lines within their respective jurisdictions. Since then, the county RRA's have prepared and adopted countywide comprehensive LRT system plans and begun the engineering and environmental clearance process on their highest-priority LRT corridors. The Minnesota statutes of 1989 empowered the Regional Transit Board (RTB) with the responsibility of preparing and adopting a Regional Light Rail Transit Plan to ensure the coordination and compatibility of the various county RRA LRT plans. The RTB is also empowered to review and approve preliminary and final plans for LRT implementation before construction can begin. In summary, it is therefore the responsibility of the county RRA's to design and build the light rail system in their respective counties, and it is the RTB's responsibility to review, coordinate and facilitate the implementation of the various county RRA plans.

In light of the above, the RTB will provide a thorough and balanced analysis and evaluation of the various contracting methods for implementing LRT in the Twin Cities (i.e., traditional, design-build, turnkey, etc.), but will not prescribe or mandate a particular method that would be binding on the individual county RRA's. Each RRA would evaluate the information provided by the RTB and make their own decision regarding the most appropriate implementation method for their county. Similarly, each RRA would likewise draw their own conclusions regarding the proper organization and staffing plan for carrying out LRT implementation plans in their jurisdiction.

The 1989 Minnesota Legislature charged the Regional Transit Board with preparing a regional Light Rail Transit (LRT) plan for the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. This plan includes two components; the first, termed the "Light Rail Transit Regional Development and Financial Plan", was completed in December 1989 and is scheduled to be submitted to the 1990 Legislature on February 15, 1990. It addresses the issues associated with staging and financing mechanisms.

The second component of the regional LRT plan, termed the "Light Rail Transit Regional Coordination Plan", is to be prepared under the auspices of the Joint LRT Advisory Committee and delivered to the RTB by July 1, 1990. The Coordination Plan will pick up where the Development and Financial Plan left off, and will address several key institutional and organizational issues regarding LRT design, construction, ownership and operation. It will also address a common set of general design criteria, performance specifications and an operating plan for implementing LRT on a coordinated regional basis for the seven-county metro area.

Task 1 of the LRT Coordination Plan work program will address which overall approach should be used to implement a regional LRT system in the Twin Cities, starting with the Group 'A' implementation package (Phase One). Alternatives include: Traditional; Design-Build; Turnkey; Super-Turnkey; and hybrids or combinations of the above. The prior work done on this issue by the Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority will be drawn upon and used as a starting point. The alternative approaches will be directly related to and influenced by Task 2 below.

Task 2 will address which public agency or agencies would be best suited to implement a regional LRT system, starting with Group 'A' (Phase One) which lies in both Hennepin and Ramsey Counties. The capabilities and capacities of the various county regional railroad authorities, state Department of Transportation, Regional Transit Board, Metropolitan Transit Commission, etc., will be examined relative to the skills and resources needed to implement a multi-hundred-million-dollar rail transit project. An organizational chart and staffing plan will be developed for each alternative.

Task 3 will develop an overall master program schedule and budget by line item and fiscal year for implementing Group 'A' and all or a portion of the Group 'B' lines. A detailed schedule and budget will be developed for the next two years, 1990 and 1991, and will identify critical-path activities, milestone events and dates, and responsible agencies/parties.

Tasks 4 and 5 will set forth a summary of the general design criteria, performance specifications and operating plan characteristics that are needed to define the kind of LRT system desired by the Twin Cities' region from a policy makers' perspective.

Tasks 6 and 7 will address planning processes and procedures for:

- 1) Changing and updating the regional LRT plan; and
- 2) Reviewing and providing input on proposed new land and transportation developments that may impact the viability and success of the regional LRT system.

Tasks 8, 9, and 10 deal with the necessary draft and final report preparations, a required peer group review by "national transit and light rail experts", and a required public hearing.

The current schedule calls for a first draft of the Coordination Plan to be reviewed by the Joint LRT Advisory Committee in July, a second draft to be delivered to the RTB in August, public and agency reviews during August and September, and a final report prepared by November 2, 1990.

The overall recommended budget for this effort is \$250,000, funded by the RTB, of which approximately \$200,000 would be used for consultant assistance.

Workscope for Preparing the Regional Coordination Plan for LRT

Legislative Mandate from Subdivision 3, Section 12 (473.399)-Coordination Plan.

TASK 1-IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

Under this task, several possible strategies for implementing a light rail transit system in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area will be formulated, described, analyzed and evaluated. The RTB will not prescribe or mandate a particular implementation strategy that would be binding on the RRA's. Rather, each RRA is expected to take this information and make their own decisions on which implementation strategy is best for them. Such strategies should include the following:

- 1) Traditional-100% Design Packages (multiple); competitive bid process:

In the traditional method, the project manager or engineer specifies the system elements (vehicles, electrification, signals, communications, fare collection, etc.) or components of the system elements (substation equipment, catenary network, track material, etc.) and issues separate detailed specifications for bid. At the same time, the civil design is advanced to 100 percent drawings. Contracts are awarded for the system elements and components, and the contractors fabricate and furnish the equipment. The civil contract drawings are also issued for bid and awarded to the lowest responsible bidders; the contractors construct the LRT infrastructure. These construction contractors (or other contractors) could also install the electrification, signals, communication equipment, and fare collection. Upon completion, an operations contractor or a public agency operates the system.

Traditional contracting provides maximum control to the project owner, but also maximizes the number of interfaces which the owner must successfully coordinate.

- 2) Design-Build package-30% Design Packages (or Performance Specs for Systems/Elements), multiple packages; competitive bid process:

In the design/build method, the project manager or engineer advances the design to the performance specification level in the case of the systems elements and to 30 percent in the case of the civil design. The system elements each are awarded to contractors who design, furnish, and install the equipment. The 30 percent civil designs are issued for bid as design/build sections. Upon completion, an operations contractor or a public agency operates the system; the operations decision is made independently of the design and construction.

The design/build method sacrifices a modest degree of owner control, but enables suppliers to tailor final design to their own "off-the-shelf" products rather than having to "reengineer" to the owner's exact specifications. Unless properly specified and managed, this approach can have the effect of limiting competition, thus affording an advantage in subsequent extensions to those firms successful in the initial stage.

- 3) Full Turnkey—Design-build the entire Starter System in Group A, plus negotiate with MTC to operate for a minimum of 5 years; negotiated bid process:

In the turnkey method, the project manager or engineer advances the design as would be done in the design/build method, but the performance specifications and 30 percent design are issued for competition as one entire bid package. Having the project manager or engineer advance the design to 30 percent establishes the basic system parameters, allows for definitive cost estimation, and keeps the contingency margin reasonable.

The winning turnkey contractor completes the design in all areas and fabricates and furnishes the equipment for an agreed-upon price. The turnkey operator also operates the system, at an agreed-upon price, for a prescribed period to ensure reliability. A minimum period of 5 years is usually suggested as a reasonable time period to see if any problems develop.

Turnkey further lessens owner control, but transfers the responsibility for successful system operation to the turnkey contractor. Properly specified and managed, this approach focuses responsibility for cost and schedule performance, quality, and achievement of performance standards in a single entity. Properly done, this approach can remove many interface-related problems and claims.

- 4) Super Turnkey—Same as 3) above, but with the addition of financing all or part of the Starter System; negotiated bid process:

The super turnkey method is the same as the full turnkey approach, except that the super turnkey contractor is also made responsible for partial or total system financing and is usually involved in related land development "value-capture" projects. Financing might take the form of loans (e.g., vendor financing) or lease/buy-backs. There also could be a relationship of funding portions of the system, particularly at or around stations, through joint development.

The super turnkey approach makes one "super" contractor responsible for financial and land development arrangements, but is likely to require that public agencies cede substantial control over the precise details of the technical and physical solution to the super turnkey contractor.

- 5) Combinations of the above

There may be variations of the above strategies that are determined to have merit upon further investigation. If so, they will be brought forward to the LRT Advisory Committee for a decision as to their inclusion in the study.

The evaluation of the applicability of the alternative implementation methods will include the following criteria:

- Contractual, construction, and performance risk;
- Time schedule;
- Responsibility/accountability;
- Budget control/cost; and
- Quality.

All previous research and findings in this area, including the two previous conferences held in the Twin Cities to discuss the viability of "turnkey" and "super-turnkey" approaches to LRT implementation, will be made use of, so as not to duplicate previous efforts.

The experiences of other transit guideway turnkey projects will be drawn upon and the similarities and differences with the Twin Cities' situation and political organization assessed.

An honest, unbiased appraisal of the benefits, costs, risks, opportunities and obstacles to employing each of the various implementation strategies to design and construct a regional light rail transit system in the Twin Cities' Metropolitan Area will be presented. An assessment will be made of the assignment of liabilities/risks under the various alternatives.

The alternative strategies above are directly related to and influenced by Task 2 below.

TASK 2-ORGANIZATIONAL PLAN

Given the alternative overall implementation strategies in Task 1 above, the optimum organizational plan to carry each alternative out will be analyzed and evaluated. The RTB will not prescribe or mandate a particular organization and staffing plan that would be binding on the RRA's. Rather each RRA is expected to take this information and make their own decisions on which organizational and staffing plan is best for them.

The capabilities and capacities of the current agencies responsible for LRT planning and engineering, including the counties' Regional Railroad Authorities, the Minnesota Department of Transportation, the Regional Transit Board, and the Metropolitan Transit Commission (the region's major transit operator) will be assessed to determine the advantages and disadvantages of assigning specific LRT implementation functions to each organization.

With the guidance of the Joint LRT Advisory Committee and their staff committee, several organizational scenarios will be identified for study. Several scenarios shall be formulated, developed and evaluated, which may include, but are not necessarily limited to the following:

- 1) Regional Railroad Authorities-multiple (current status quo);
- 2) One Regional Railroad Authority acting on behalf of all the others through a joint exercise of powers agreement(s);

- 3) Minnesota Department of Transportation-a new section within the existing Mn/DOT organization.
- 4) Regional Transit Board, with Joint LRT Advisory Committee as policy oversight committee;
- 5) Metropolitan Transit Commission;
- 6) New Transit Construction Authority;
- 7) Combinations of the above.

Organizational structures and staffing plans for carrying out the following major implementation functions will be described and evaluated:

- 1) Overall Program Management
- 2) Right-of-way Acquisition
- 3) Final Design
- 4) Construction/Construction Management
- 5) Operations
- 6) Quality Assurance/Quality Control
- 7) Program Management Oversight (PMO)
- 8) Financing and Grants Management
- 9) Program Administration and Accounting
- 10) Public Information, Outreach and Marketing

A preferred organizational structure, governing board, both policy and technical advisory committees as may be appropriate, and a staffing plan, including position types and requirements for each overall implementation strategy, will be recommended to the Joint LRT Advisory Committee.

Recommendations on a number of ownership issues, including but not necessarily limited to the following, will also be made:

- 1) Rights-of-way; Easements
- 2) Physical Improvements (Civil Works)
- 3) Light Rail Vehicles (LRV's)
- 4) Yards and Shops; Tools and Equipment
- 5) Non-Revenue Vehicles
- 6) Stations
- 7) Park-n-Ride Lots

Recommendations with regards to the need for, timing and contents of various master cooperative agreements necessary for implementing a light rail transit system in a multi-jurisdictional environment will also be made. Various responsible agencies having needed approval authority may include:

- 1) Mn/DOT
- 2) RTB
- 3) MTC
- 4) Counties
- 5) Cities
- 6) Park boards and commissions
- 7) Railroads
- 8) Utility companies
- 9) Federal agencies-e.g., Army Corps, Coast Guard, etc.
- 10) State Agencies-DNR. etc.

Cost participation policies for aspects of the light rail system, such as utilities, bridges, sidewalks, landscaping and other betterments or modifications, will be addressed.

TASK 3-DEVELOP IMPLEMENTATION PLAN, SCHEDULE AND BUDGET

Based on input from and decisions reached in both Tasks 1 and 2 above, and on the Regional LRT Development and Financial Plan as recommended to the state legislature on February 15, 1990, an overall implementation plan listing key work tasks and milestone events will be developed. An overall master program schedule for the implementation of Group 'A' plus all or part of the Group 'B' LRT corridors in a 10 year timeframe will be produced. The critical path items will be identified.

Based on the overall master program schedule above, a detailed schedule for the first two years of the implementation program, 1990 and 1991, will be prepared. Any required UMTA Alternatives Analysis/DEIS studies and subsequent federal requirements and approvals will be included.

Based on the two schedules developed above, a budget by calendar years for carrying out the implementation plan (Group 'A' plus all or part of the Group 'B' corridors) will be developed. Appropriate amounts for escalation will be calculated.

The following major line items will be included at a minimum:

- 1) Planning and Environmental Studies;
- 2) Preliminary Engineering;
- 3) Final Design;
- 4) Rights-of-Way;
- 5) LRV Procurement;
- 6) Yards and Shops, non-revenue line(s);
- 7) Construction-Revenue Lines
A, B, C (and D if necessary);
- 8) Start-up and Pre-Revenue Testing;
- 9) Overall Program Management and Administration;
- 10) Contingency Reserve.

TASK 4-GENERAL DESIGN STANDARDS AND PERFORMANCE SPECIFICATIONS

The General Design Standards and System Performance Specifications, which are now being developed by consultants for the various regional railroad authorities, will be summarized and referenced here. A statement describing the overall system's purpose, goals and objectives shall be included. The overall LRT system's design philosophy-e.g., a "Ford" vs. a "Cadillac" design; high-speed, grade-separated, private right-of-ways vs. medium-speed, mostly at-grade, shared right-of-ways; single vs. double track; etc.-will be clearly articulated from a policy-maker's perspective.

The following is an outline of the sections which will be summarily defined and described for recommendation and approval by all agencies involved in light rail planning, funding and implementation:

- 1) General System Design Parameters and Performance Specs
- 2) Overall Design Philosophy
- 3) Light Rail Vehicles
- 4) Yards and Shops (including maintenance philosophy), and rationale for selecting the site for the yards and shops
- 5) Stations
- 6) Park-n-Ride Lots
- 7) Bus Transfer Facilities
- 8) Track System (including cathodic protection)
- 9) Electrification System (including primary power supply points)
- 10) Train Signal System

- 11) Traffic Signal System
- 12) Communications System
- 13) Fare Collections System
- 14) Elderly and Disabled Access Provisions
- 15) Signage/Graphics
- 16) Landscaping
- 17) Architectural Design Treatment
- 18) Others as may be appropriate

TASK 5-OPERATING PLAN AND PHILOSOPHY

This section will address numerous issues associated with the long-term operations and maintenance of the regional LRT system. Like the previous task, it will describe in general terms the key organization, operational and policy issues and indicate a work plan, process and schedule for the further detailed development and refinement of these as the implementation of LRT unfolds.

The following areas will be included:

- 1) LRT Operations and Maintenance
 - a) Organization within MTC; private vs. public management; separate division; union contract arrangements and issues; etc., etc.
 - b) Service Policies
 - c) Fare Policies
 - d) Maintenance Policies
 - e) Operators' Rule Book/Standard Operating Procedures
 - f) Safety Plan; Emergency Plans
 - g) Start-up Plan
 - h) Security Plan
 - i) Others as may be appropriate

- 2) Bus Operations
 - a) Guidelines for re-structuring bus service with LRT in place
 - b) Bus System Back-up Plan in Emergencies when LRT line is blocked or shut down
 - c) Others as may be appropriate
- 3) Public Information and Marketing Plan
 - a) During Design
 - b) During Construction
 - c) At Start-up
 - d) In Revenue Service
- 4) RTB/MTC Responsibilities
 - a) Funding of Net Operating Costs
 - b) Budget Reviews
 - c) Audits
 - d) Policies regarding service hours, fares, elderly & handicapped accessibility, parallel bus service, marketing, etc.

TASK 6-PROCESS FOR UPDATING THE REGIONAL LRT DEVELOPMENT, FUNDING AND COORDINATION PLANS

This section will address a process for updating and amending the Regional LRT Plan, including the:

- Development/Staging Plan
- Financial Plan
- Coordination Plan

The Regional LRT Plan is planned to be reviewed annually and formally updated every two years as part of the RTB's Five-Year Transit Plan. The process and schedule for accomplishing this will be developed and described.

**TASK 7-PROCESS FOR REVIEWING AND PROVIDING INPUT
TO PROPOSED NEW LAND DEVELOPMENTS,
IMPACTING THE REGIONAL LRT SYSTEM**

This task will develop and describe a process whereby cities will automatically refer proposals for new developments that may impact the regional LRT system to the implementing agency, the RRA's, MTC, RTB and the Metropolitan Council, as may be appropriate, for review and comment. This procedure will build off of existing procedures whereby the cities refer development plans to affected agencies.

The Metropolitan Council may wish to establish some suggested guidelines for the type and form of development that would be most supportive of the region's investment in the LRT system.

The following issue areas will be included:

- 1) New developments within 2,000 feet of proposed LRT station sites
- 2) Protection/Preservation of R/W needed for LRT Implementation
- 3) Projects of region-wide significance (e.g., Mega-Mall, new airport, etc.)
- 4) Coordination with municipalities, counties and Metropolitan Council—need to review and update as may be appropriate existing land development review requirements and procedures

TASK 8-REPORTS

The following reports are envisioned to document the Regional Coordination Plan for LRT as it moves along in the development and review process:

	<u>Report</u>	<u>Due Date</u>	<u>Quantity</u>
1.	Drafts of Chapter(s) covering Task 1	June 8	100
2.	Drafts of Chapters covering Tasks 2 and 3	June 22	100
3.	Revised Drafts of Chapters covering Tasks 1, 2 and 3, plus First Draft of Complete Report (all chapters)	July 13	250
4.	Second Draft of Complete Report (following review by Joint LRT Advisory Committee)	TBD	250

	<u>Report</u>	<u>Due Date</u>	<u>Quantity</u>
5.	Pre-Final Report (revised based on input received from a Peer Review, a public hearing, and RTB Policy Committee review)	TBD	250
6.	Final Report (Revised based on reviews by the Metropolitan Council, the Mn/DOT Commissioner and the RTB)	TBD (~Sept.)	400

TASK 9-PEER GROUP REVIEW

As specified in the legislation, a peer review group of "transit and light rail experts" will be selected with the help of the Joint LRT Advisory Committee and will review the Draft Coordination Plan. This will be scheduled for mid-July.

TASK 10-PUBLIC HEARING

As specified in the legislation, a public hearing will be advertised and held to receive comments from the public at-large and interested public agencies, businesses and civic groups. This will be scheduled for mid-July.

REVISED DRAFT (3/8/90)

PROPOSED SCHEDULE
FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF
THE REGIONAL COORDINATION PLAN FOR LRT

	<u>Milestone</u>	<u>Start Date</u>	<u>Finish Date</u>
1.	Develop Outline of Workscope and Plan Contents	Jan. 5	Jan. 18
2.	Assign Workscope Responsibilities	Jan. 12	Jan. 18
3.	Select and Hire Consultant(s)	Jan. 18	Mar. 19/May 8
4.	Draft Implementation Strategy Paper	May 8	June 8
5.	Review and Comments by LRT Advisory Committee	-----	June 20
6.	Draft Organization Plan Paper	May 8	June 22
7.	Draft Implementation Plan, Schedule and Budget	May 8	June 22
8.	Draft LRT Design Standards and Performance Criteria	Already Started	June 22
9.	Draft Operating Plan and Philosophy	Already Started	June 22
10.	Process for Updating the Regional LRT Plan	Mar. 19	June 22
11.	Process for Reviewing and Inputting to New Land Developments Impacting the Regional LRT System	Mar. 19	June 22
12.	Review and Comments by LRT Advisory Committee	TBD in Detailed Work Plan	TBD in Detailed Work Plan
13.	Prepare First Draft Coordination Plan Report	TBD in Detailed Work Plan	TBD in Detailed Work Plan

Revised Draft
Proposed Schedule for the Development
of the Regional Coordination Plan for LRT
Page 2

Milestone	Start Date	Finish Date
14. Review by LRT Advisory Committee	TBD in Detailed Work Plan	TBD in Detailed Work Plan
15. Revise Coordination Plan as appropriate (Second Draft)	TBD in Detailed Work Plan	TBD in Detailed Work Plan
16. Conduct Peer Review	TBD in Detailed Work Plan	TBD in Detailed Work Plan
17. Conduct Public Hearing	TBD in Detailed Work Plan	TBD in Detailed Work Plan
18. Review by LRT Advisory Committee	TBD in Detailed Work Plan	TBD in Detailed Work Plan
19. Review by RTB Policy Committee	TBD in Detailed Work Plan	TBD in Detailed Work Plan
20. Revise Coordination Plan as appropriate (Pre-Final Report) and submit to the RTB	TBD in Detailed Work Plan	TBD in Detailed Work Plan
21. RTB Reviews Plan and also submits it to the Metropolitan Council and Mn/DOT Commissioner for review and comments	TBD in Detailed Work Plan	TBD in Detailed Work Plan
22. Revise Coordination Plan as appropriate. Prepare Final Plan Report	TBD in Detailed Work Plan	TBD in Detailed Work Plan
23. Distribute Final Plan to State Legislature and all affected agencies	-----	Nov. 1990

**Budget
For Preparing the
Regional Coordination Plan for LRT**

Element	Recommended Budget
1. Consultant Team to do Tasks 1, 2, 3 and 8	\$200,000
2. Peer Review Group Expenses (Travel, Per Diem, Consultant Fees, etc.)	35,000
3. Miscellaneous and Contingencies (Advertising for Public Hearing, Out-of-Pocket Expenses, Etc.)	<u>15,000</u>
 Total Recommended Budget	 <u>\$250,000</u>

3/7/90

PREPARATION OF
REGIONAL COORDINATION PLAN
FOR LRT

ASSIGNMENT OF RESPONSIBILITIES

<u>Task</u>	<u>Lead Responsibility</u>	<u>Support Responsibility</u>
1. Implementation Strategy	Consultant	LRT Staff Committee
2. Organizational Plan	Consultant	LRT Staff Committee
3. Implementation Plan, Schedule and Budget	Consultant	LRT Staff Committee
4. General Design Standards and Performance Specs	HCRRRA	LRT Staff Committee
5. Operating Plan and Philosophy	MTC	LRT Staff Committee
6. Process for Updating the Regional LRT Plan	RTB	LRT Staff Committee
7. Process for Reviewing New Land Developments Impacting LRT	Metropolitan Council	LRT Staff Committee
8. Reports	Consultant	LRT Staff Committee
9. Peer Group Review	RTB	LRT Staff Committee
10. Public Hearing	RTB	LRT Staff Committee



REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Mears Park Centre, 230 East 5th Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
229-2700

DATE: March 19, 1990
TO: Members of the Regional Transit Board
FROM: Michael J. Ehrlichmann
SUBJECT: Minutes of the March 6, 1990 Regional Transit Board Meeting

The March 5 minutes were inadvertently omitted from the mailing of the board packet although they were shown on the agenda.

It is up to the board whether you wish to approve them at this meeting or include them in the mailing and agenda of the next board meeting.

MJE/mf



REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Mears Park Centre, 230 East 5th Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
612/229-2700

Minutes of the Meeting of the
REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD
Mears Park Centre Chambers
March 5, 1990

MEMBERS PRESENT: Michael Ehrlichmann, Chair; Doris Caranicas; John T. Finley; Ruth Franklin; Ed Kranz; Terrance O'Toole; Norbert Theis; Elwyn Tinklenberg; Jeff Spartz and Richard Wedell

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Sandra Hilary

OTHERS PRESENT: Charles Weaver, RTB Legal Counsel; Alan Sharrach and William Johnson, Laidlaw Transit, Inc., Ron Bernstrom, Medicine Lake Lines; Bob Rossman, Amalgamated Transit Union; Mary O'Hara Anderson, Transit Accessibility Advisory Committee; Kathy DeSpeigelaere, Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority; Greg Andrews, Dale Ulrich, Sherry Munyon, Howard Blin, Ed Kouneski, Garneth Peterson, David Minister, Len Simich, Mary Fitzgerald, Regional Transit Board staff

Michy

The meeting was called to order at 5:10 p.m. and roll taken. O'Toole moved and Caranicas seconded approval of the amended agenda. The motion was unanimously approved.

O'Toole moved and Tinklenberg seconded approval of the following minutes:

Administration and Finance Committee Meeting, February 12, 1990
Legislative Committee Meeting, February 15, 1990
Special Board Meeting, February 15, 1990
Regional Transit Board Meeting, February 20, 1990

Kranz said that the Audit Advisory Committee report made to the Administration and Finance Committee on February 20 referred to a Deloitte Touch recommendation that the audit function report directly to the board. The chair directed that the matter be placed on the agenda of the Administration and Finance Committee. The motion to approve the minutes was unanimously approved.

Production of Light Rail Transit Videos and Public Service Announcements

Hanson said this issue was tabled at the last board meeting. Caranicas moved and Franklin seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board authorize the executive director to enter into a contract with FutureView Productions for an amount not to exceed \$24,700, for the production of two light rail transit videos and six public service announcements.

The motion was approved (O'Toole voted nay and Spartz abstained).

CONSENT LIST:

Caranicas moved and Franklin seconded approval of the February 27, 1990 consent list regarding the City of Woodbury I-494 Access Improvement Study. The motion was unanimously approved.

CHAIR'S REPORT:

The chair announced that Medicine Lake Lines has sold certain assets to Laidlaw Transit, a Canadian firm, and introduced representatives of that organization.

On March 7, 1990 Representative Carruthers bill will be heard and members were encouraged to attend the meeting.

TRANSIT ACCESSIBILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT

The chair said Mary O'Hara Anderson, chair of the committee, had to leave because of a conflict in her schedule. A written report had been mailed in the board meeting packet.

POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee Chair Spartz reviewed the committee's report of its February 26, 1990 meeting.

Report to the Legislature on Methods to Improve the Delivery of Transportation Services for the Elderly, Handicapped and Disabled

Spartz moved and Finley seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board approve the submittal of the report entitled Methods to Improve the Delivery of Transportation Services for the Elderly and Disabled, Draft No. 2, issued February 26, 1990.:

The motion was unanimously approved.

Review and Comments for the Minneapolis-Northeast Corridor Scoping Documents (Anoka County Regional Railroad Authority and Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority)

Spartz moved and Finley seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board approve the staff recommendation contained under the "Discussion" section of the February 14, 1990 staff report and forward them to the Anoka County and Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authorities.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Review and Comments for the Midway Corridor Scoping Documents Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority and Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority)

Spartz moved and Finley seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board approve the staff comments contained in the "Discussion" section, Items 1 through 5, of the February 14, 1990 staff report and forward them to the Ramsey County and Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authorities.

The motion was unanimously approved.

ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

Adoption of Ratifying Resolution of \$26,000,000 General Obligation Transit Bonds, Resolution No. 90-01

Tinklenberg moved and O'Toole seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board approve Resolution 90-01, Ratifying Resolution of Regional Transit Board Providing for Issuance of General Obligation Transit System Bonds, Series 1990A and Related Matters.

On a roll call vote, the motion was unanimously approved.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Minister reviewed the staff response to the UMTA report on transit.

There being no other business, Tinklenberg moved and Caranicas seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried and the meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Fitzgerald
Secretary

Approved by the Board: _____, 1990.