



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
612/229-2700

Meeting of The
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
Monday, June 18, 1990
Mears Park Centre Chambers
3:00 p.m.

Agenda

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT) Light Rail Transit Funding Guidelines ** D. Minister
4. Memorandum of Understanding with Mn/DOT, Metropolitan Council and Regional Transit Board D. Jacobson
5. Five-Year Transit Plan: H. Blin
 - Fare Issues
 - Funding Issues **

Jeff Spartz
Chair

** Item will be mailed under separate cover.

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD
ROLL CALL AND ATTENDANCE SHEET

DATE: 6/10

BOARD OR COMMITTEE: C.W.

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

Visitors

Entzel, E. Bratt
N. Diaz
C. Ohm

Zanker
Richard Chi
M.B. Darden
DeSpeigler

Staff

guzh, hb, dj, sh
dm, rs.

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

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

DATE: June 12, 1990
TO: Committee of the Whole
FROM: Howard Blin, Planning Manager *HB*
SUBJECT: Five-Year Transit Plan – **Fare Issues**

SUMMARY

This memorandum presents background information on transit fare policies. Specific fare levels are not addressed.

BACKGROUND

Acting under a statutory requirement, the RTB in 1987 adopted fare policies and procedures for transit services in the metropolitan area. These policies were included in a report that incorporated earlier studies conducted by the Metropolitan Transit Commission (MTC) and Metropolitan Council.

Fare policies included in the existing RTB Five-Year Transit Plan were based on policies adopted earlier. These policies are attached.

DISCUSSION

Fare Policies

The following summarizes the key fare policies, with emphasis on regular route fares.

1. **Uniform Fare System.** This calls for all regular route providers to use a common fare structure, as well as reciprocity in convenience fares and transfers. Currently, all regular route providers charge the same fares. The RTB, MTC, and other providers have worked to further coordinate fares with the goal of achieving a uniform regional system of fare collection and marketing of convenience fares.
2. **Simple Fare Structure.** The fare structure should be understandable and easy to administer. To accomplish this, regular route fare simplification was implemented in 1989. This reduced the number of fares from 16 to 6.

3. Equity. Fare equity is to be maintained through distance-based zone fares and pricing differentials by service type, including express and local, and peak and off-peak regular route services.
 - Zone Charges. Currently, a \$.25 surcharge is applied to trips crossing the zone boundary. This additional fare is based on the higher cost of serving longer trips. Distance-based fares are common to large metropolitan transit systems.
 - Express Charges. An additional \$.25 increment is charged for higher level of service provided on express routes.
 - Peak-Period Charges. Peak-period service is more costly to provide than off-peak service. This is due to work rules included in labor contracts and the need to operate roughly three times the number of buses in the peak than in the off-peak. To cover this higher cost, a \$.25 surcharge is collected during the peak periods. Studies have shown that peak-period passengers are least sensitive to higher fares, resulting in little ridership loss from this surcharge.
4. Social Fares. Existing policy calls for discount fares for seniors, youth, and persons with disabilities. This complies with federal law that limits fares during non-peak hours for seniors and the disabled to one-half the base fare. Federal law also stipulates that fares charged for special services for the disabled, such as Metro Mobility, must be comparable to those charged for comparable trips on regular route service.
5. Farebox Recovery. The following minimum farebox recovery ratios for various types of services have been established:

• Regular Route	35%
• Community Circulator and Dial-a-Ride	15%
• Metro Mobility	10%
6. Regular Fare Review. Review of fare levels and necessary adjustments to maintain farebox recovery ratios are scheduled on a biennial basis to coincide with development of the Five-Year Transit Plan.

Other Issues

- Downtown Reduced Fare Zone. A reduced fare of \$.10 is charged within the downtown "dime zones." This fare zone encourages use of regular route service for circulation within the downtowns. These reduced fares do, however, strain capacity on some routes, particularly from passengers traveling to and from fringe parking. The boundaries, fares charged and operational characteristics of the downtown zones should be further examined by the RTB, service providers, and Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul.

- Fare Payment Methods. Fares are collected through cash or by use of convenience fares, which include tokens and passes. Passes can be either punch cards for a set number of rides or unlimited monthly passes. Experience in other cities has shown that promotion of and discounting of convenience fares can lead to ridership gains. Use of passes also results in operating efficiencies by reducing the need to handle coins.
- Fare Collection. Currently, the MTC and other regular route providers use older fareboxes, which limits the types of fare that can be collected. For example, dollar bills cannot be accepted with the existing collection system. The potential benefits of retrofitting the regular route fleet with newer, advanced technology fareboxes.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Regional Transit Board adopt the enclosed fare policies for inclusion in the 1991-1995 Five-Year Transit Plan.

RTB FARE POLICIES
5 Year Transit Plan

D. FARES

Since the MTC was formed in 1970, fares for regular route service have increased four times, clustered in the years 1979 to 1982. During this four-year period, the price customers paid for regular route service more than doubled. No additional fare changes were made between 1982 and 1989.

In 1987, the RTB developed fare policies to allow for a simplified fare structure and for more consistently spaced, incremental increases to occur over time. In this way, farebox recovery standards can be met without large fare increases which often negatively affect ridership. In 1988, the MTC proposed a fare simplification plan which was approved by the RTB and implemented in April 1989.

GOAL

- To maintain a uniform regional fare structure that is equitable, convenient, and efficient.

STRATEGIES

- Design a regional fare structure that is simple to understand, easy to administer, and allows for regularly spaced incremental changes in pricing levels.
- Establish fare equity with distance based zone fares and pricing differentials by service type, including express, local, peak and off-peak.
- Require a common fare structure, pricing levels, and convenience fare items to be used by regular route service providers.
- Institute changes in the pricing levels, when needed, to generate enough revenue to exceed the minimum farebox recovery standard for at least a two- to three-year period.
- Maintain discount fares to help alleviate economic hardship for targeted socioeconomic and transit dependent market groups.
- Encourage flexibility in pricing to attract riders through promotional and experimental fares, subject to RTB approval.
- Permit community based and county paratransit programs which contribute a local share of funding to set fares at the local level.
- Require new services to meet the designated farebox recovery ratio standards within a 12- to 18-month period.
- Maintain a basic fare for Metro Mobility service that is comparable to that established for regular route service, with flexibility in pricing permitted within RTB guidelines for long distance trips.

ACTIONS

1. The RTB will monitor minimum farebox recovery ratio standards in the various categories of transit service, as follows:
 - a. Regular route (system wide) 35%
 - b. Community circulator 15%
 - c. Community dial-a-ride 15%
 - d. Metro Mobility 10%
2. The regular route fare structure and pricing levels will be analyzed by the RTB every two years in preparation for the biennial budget request and in conjunction with the update of the Five-Year Transit Plan, at which time the RTB will examine fare increase scenarios and timing and initiate plans for necessary changes.
3. With the cooperation of the MTC, regular route, and community based transit providers, the RTB will develop and institute the next regular route fare increase projected to occur in early 1991.
4. Before implementation, recommended changes in the fare structure or pricing levels for regular route or community based transit services will involve a public participation process with adequate public notice and public hearing(s).

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

<u>Task</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1991</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1994</u>
Monitor farebox recovery ratios of providers	•	•	•	•	•
Analyze regular route fare structure and pricing levels	•		•		
Institute regular route fare increase with public participation process		•			

Heulout

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

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

DATE: June 12, 1990

TO: Committee of the Whole

FROM: Dave Jacobson, Planner *df. DJ*

SUBJECT: Memorandum of Understanding Between the Metropolitan Council, Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT), and the Regional Transit Board (RTB).

BACKGROUND

Attached is a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding developed by the staffs of Mn/DOT, Metropolitan Council, and RTB regarding intergovernmental review between the three agencies. This type of memorandum was called for in the Metropolitan Council's Transportation Policy Plan to ensure that the RTB's and Met Council's ranking of highway improvements would be incorporated into Mn/DOT's priority-setting process.

DISCUSSION

The Memorandum of Understanding provides various mechanisms by which the Council's and RTB's ranking can get adequate recognition so as to influence Mn/DOT's priorities. The memorandum also provides procedures to allow coordination between Mn/DOT, the Met Council, and the RTB. These procedures are intended to facilitate the sharing of information used in transportation planning efforts for the metropolitan area.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

- This is a recommendation of the Metropolitan Council's Policy Plan.
- This Memorandum of Understanding ensures that the RTB's and Metropolitan Council's ranking of highway improvements will be incorporated into Mn/DOT's priority-setting process.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Regional Transit Board authorize its chairman to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding between the Minnesota Department of Transportation, the Metropolitan Council, and the Regional Transit Board concerning Intergovernmental Review.

Intergovernmental Review
Memorandum of Understanding

This Memorandum of Understanding is entered into by the Minnesota Department of Transportation, Regional Transit Board and the Metropolitan Council regarding intergovernmental cooperation for planning and implementation of highway facilities and services. It outlines the principles and mechanics that will contribute to cooperation between the Metropolitan Council, Regional Transit Board, and Mn/DOT. These efforts will focus on the metropolitan highway system as designated in the Metropolitan Council's 1988 Transportation Policy Plan (TPP). This agreement may also be applied to projects not on the metropolitan highway system, as need is identified by the participating agencies.

PRINCIPLE 1. RESPONSIBILITIES

Each participating agency has separate responsibilities concerning metropolitan highways that include research, planning, review, approval and project implementation. Effective coordination is dependent upon familiarity with and respect for each agency's role and responsibilities within the transportation planning and implementation process. The participating agencies are committed to improve coordination by agreeing to use the general process as outlined here. Throughout this process, the Metropolitan Council will review highway projects for consistency with its Transportation Policy Plan. The RTB will review highway projects in terms of their relationship to and impact on the transit system.

PRINCIPLE 2. MUTUAL BENEFITS

Each agency is concerned with doing a conscientious and effective job when carrying out their responsibilities to the public. Therefore, the methods and processes for coordination outlined here are designed to assist and benefit each participating agency in improving the identification and implementation of highway needs and priorities.

PRINCIPLE 3. INFORMATION SHARING

Information sharing is one key to successful coordination. Although the need for types of data varies somewhat among the participating agencies, the data that is shared should be provided by one of the three designated agencies in order to ensure consistency. The Metropolitan Council and Mn/DOT will share data on the basis of the metropolitan highway sections identified in the Metropolitan District's 20 year plan.

PRINCIPLE 4. WORK COMMITMENT

Each agency should be willing to commit resources and to schedule work so that time is available for the coordination of data, analysis of needs, and discussion of issues and priorities. Included in the regular schedule of agency assignments should be the periodic review and update of lists of highway needs and priorities.

MECHANICS

- A. Mn/DOT's Metropolitan District will invite staff of the other two agencies to participate in the periodic review and update of the 20 year plan. This participation will include: discussion of the goal/objective statements; discussion of data requirements, application and availability; and other matters as appropriate to the 20 year plan.

The district will transmit the final 20 year plan to the other two agencies. The agencies shall have 60 days to review and comment on the plan.

- B. Mn/DOT's Metropolitan District will invite staff of the other two agencies to participate in the working sessions to identify highway program candidate projects. The Program Management Division will transmit the final list of candidate projects to the other two agencies for review and transmit comments when the list is transmitted to the Program Management Division. The agencies will have 60 days to review and comment on the candidate projects to the Program Management Division.
- C. Mn/DOT's Program Management Division will transmit the final Highway Improvement Program and the Highway Improvement Work Program to the other two agencies for review and comment. The agencies will have 60 days to complete their review and submit it to the Program Management Division. The Council will also notify Mn/DOT which projects in the highway programs should later be submitted for individual project review/approval in consultation with the RTB, under Minn. Statutes 473.167, 473.168 and such other state statutes the legislature may pass empowering the Council to review and approve highway projects.
- D. Mn/DOT-initiated interchange modifications on the Metropolitan Highway System will come to the Council via the referral process for review and comment. The Council will complete its review within 90 days. Mn/DOT and the Council will jointly review proposals for new or modified interchanges on the Metropolitan Highway System submitted by counties or local units of government. Whenever either agency receives such a proposal it will alert the other agency and necessary arrangements will be made to conduct a joint review, following the procedures in Appendix H of the Transportation Policy Plan.
- E. Mn/DOT's Metropolitan District will transmit draft and final project design study reports on those projects identified under paragraph "C" above to the other two agencies for review and comment. The agencies will have 60 days to complete their review.

As changes to projects transmitted under Paragraph C are considered proposed changes which significantly modify the project's cross section; modify intersections; add ramps; or lengthen the project over 1500 feet, will be transmitted by the Metropolitan District to the agencies prior to final approval by Mn/DOT. The agencies will have 30 days to notify the District if they will comment on the changes. Should review be requested, the agency will complete within 45 days.

- F. The Metropolitan Council will invite staff of the other two agencies to participate in periodic updating of the Transportation Policy Plan and the metropolitan highway priorities. This participation will include: discussion of data requirements, the prioritizing process and other appropriate matters. The Council will transmit the draft of the policy plan and revisions of the regional priorities to the other two agencies. The agencies will have 60 days to review and comment unless other agreements supersede this procedure.
- G. The Metropolitan Council will prepare with the assistance of the other two agencies an annual transportation planning status report. A primary objective of this report will be to monitor progress made toward implementing Transportation Policy Plan priorities. Included in the report will be the status of Council priorities within Mn/DOT's planning and programming process. This report may be included in the annual Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

AUTHORIZATION

Mn/DOT, RTB and the Metropolitan Council hereby execute this agreement through their authorized representatives.

FOR THE MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

By: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

FOR THE REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

By: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

FOR THE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL

By: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

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

DATE: June 12, 1990

TO: Committee of the Whole

FROM: Dave Jacobson, Planner *DJ. DJ*

SUBJECT: Memorandum of Understanding Between the Metropolitan Council, Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT), and the Regional Transit Board (RTB).

BACKGROUND

Attached is a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding developed by the staffs of Mn/DOT, Metropolitan Council, and RTB regarding intergovernmental review between the three agencies. This type of memorandum was called for in the Metropolitan Council's Transportation Policy Plan to ensure that the RTB's and Met Council's ranking of highway improvements would be incorporated into Mn/DOT's priority-setting process.

DISCUSSION

The Memorandum of Understanding provides various mechanisms by which the Council's and RTB's ranking can get adequate recognition so as to influence Mn/DOT's priorities. The memorandum also provides procedures to allow coordination between Mn/DOT, the Met Council, and the RTB. These procedures are intended to facilitate the sharing of information used in transportation planning efforts for the metropolitan area.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

- This is a recommendation of the Metropolitan Council's Policy Plan.
- This Memorandum of Understanding ensures that the RTB's and Metropolitan Council's ranking of highway improvements will be incorporated into Mn/DOT's priority-setting process.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Regional Transit Board authorize its chairman to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding between the Minnesota Department of Transportation, the Metropolitan Council, and the Regional Transit Board concerning Intergovernmental Review.

Intergovernmental Review
Memorandum of Understanding

This Memorandum of Understanding is entered into by the Minnesota Department of Transportation, Regional Transit Board and the Metropolitan Council regarding intergovernmental cooperation for planning and implementation of highway facilities and services. It outlines the principles and mechanics that will contribute to cooperation between the Metropolitan Council, Regional Transit Board, and Mn/DOT. These efforts will focus on the metropolitan highway system as designated in the Metropolitan Council's 1988 Transportation Policy Plan (TPP). This agreement may also be applied to projects not on the metropolitan highway system, as need is identified by the participating agencies.

PRINCIPLE 1. RESPONSIBILITIES

Each participating agency has separate responsibilities concerning metropolitan highways that include research, planning, review, approval and project implementation. Effective coordination is dependent upon familiarity with and respect for each agency's role and responsibilities within the transportation planning and implementation process. The participating agencies are committed to improve coordination by agreeing to use the general process as outlined here. Throughout this process, the Metropolitan Council will review highway projects for consistency with its Transportation Policy Plan. The RTB will review highway projects in terms of their relationship to and impact on the transit system.

PRINCIPLE 2. MUTUAL BENEFITS

Each agency is concerned with doing a conscientious and effective job when carrying out their responsibilities to the public. Therefore, the methods and processes for coordination outlined here are designed to assist and benefit each participating agency in improving the identification and implementation of highway needs and priorities.

PRINCIPLE 3. INFORMATION SHARING

Information sharing is one key to successful coordination. Although the need for types of data varies somewhat among the participating agencies, the data that is shared should be provided by one of the three designated agencies in order to ensure consistency. The Metropolitan Council and Mn/DOT will share data on the basis of the metropolitan highway sections identified in the Metropolitan District's 20 year plan.

PRINCIPLE 4. WORK COMMITMENT

Each agency should be willing to commit resources and to schedule work so that time is available for the coordination of data, analysis of needs, and discussion of issues and priorities. Included in the regular schedule of agency assignments should be the periodic review and update of lists of highway needs and priorities.

MECHANICS

- A. Mn/DOT's Metropolitan District will invite staff of the other two agencies to participate in the periodic review and update of the 20 year plan. This participation will include: discussion of the goal/objective statements; discussion of data requirements, application and availability; and other matters as appropriate to the 20 year plan.

The district will transmit the final 20 year plan to the other two agencies. The agencies shall have 60 days to review and comment on the plan.

- B. Mn/DOT's Metropolitan District will invite staff of the other two agencies to participate in the working sessions to identify highway program candidate projects. The Program Management Division will transmit the final list of candidate projects to the other two agencies for review and transmit comments when the list is transmitted to the Program Management Division. The agencies will have 60 days to review and comment on the candidate projects to the Program Management Division.
- C. Mn/DOT's Program Management Division will transmit the final Highway Improvement Program and the Highway Improvement Work Program to the other two agencies for review and comment. The agencies will have 60 days to complete their review and submit it to the Program Management Division. The Council will also notify Mn/DOT which projects in the highway programs should later be submitted for individual project review/approval in consultation with the RTB, under Minn. Statutes 473.167, 473.168 and such other state statutes the legislature may pass empowering the Council to review and approve highway projects.
- D. Mn/DOT-initiated interchange modifications on the Metropolitan Highway System will come to the Council via the referral process for review and comment. The Council will complete its review within 90 days. Mn/DOT and the Council will jointly review proposals for new or modified interchanges on the Metropolitan Highway System submitted by counties or local units of government. Whenever either agency receives such a proposal it will alert the other agency and necessary arrangements will be made to conduct a joint review, following the procedures in Appendix H of the Transportation Policy Plan.
- E. Mn/DOT's Metropolitan District will transmit draft and final project design study reports on those projects identified under paragraph "C" above to the other two agencies for review and comment. The agencies will have 60 days to complete their review.

As changes to projects transmitted under Paragraph C are considered proposed changes which significantly modify the project's cross section; modify intersections; add ramps; or lengthen the project over 1500 feet, will be transmitted by the Metropolitan District to the agencies prior to final approval by Mn/DOT. The agencies will have 30 days to notify the District if they will comment on the changes. Should review be requested, the agency will complete within 45 days.

- F. The Metropolitan Council will invite staff of the other two agencies to participate in periodic updating of the Transportation Policy Plan and the metropolitan highway priorities. This participation will include: discussion of data requirements, the prioritizing process and other appropriate matters. The Council will transmit the draft of the policy plan and revisions of the regional priorities to the other two agencies. The agencies will have 60 days to review and comment unless other agreements supersede this procedure.
- G. The Metropolitan Council will prepare with the assistance of the other two agencies an annual transportation planning status report. A primary objective of this report will be to monitor progress made toward implementing Transportation Policy Plan priorities. Included in the report will be the status of Council priorities within Mn/DOT's planning and programming process. This report may be included in the annual Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

AUTHORIZATION

Mn/DOT, RTB and the Metropolitan Council hereby execute this agreement through their authorized representatives.

FOR THE MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

By: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

FOR THE REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

By: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

FOR THE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL

By: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

Bladon 6/18

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

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

DATE: June 18, 1990

TO: Regional Transit Board Committee of the Whole

FROM:  David Minister, RTB-LRT Development

SUBJECT: Priorities for the Use of 1990-91 MVET Funds for Regional LRT Development

SUMMARY/BACKGROUND

Mn/DOT's guidelines for the application and use of MVET funds for regional LRT development activities state that "following the adoption of the Regional plan (the LRT Regional Development and Financial Plan), each regional railroad authority or other developer of light rail transit in the metropolitan area shall act in conformity with the plan." The guidelines also state that the Regional Transit Board must approve any application for the use of MVET funds for LRT. Please refer to the attached memorandum dated June 12, 1990 for additional background.

Given the adoption of the LRT Regional Development and Financial Plan in February 1990 which prioritizes potential LRT corridors into three groups based on their anticipated cost-effectiveness, corridor congestion and need, etc., it seems prudent to establish similar priorities for the use of MVET funds for regional LRT development activities. Therefore the following policy is recommended to the RTB by the RTB's staff and the Staff Committee to the Joint LRT Advisory Committee.

ACTION REQUESTED

That the Regional Transit Board approve the following policy for allocating 1990-91 MVET funds for regional light rail transit development:

Priorities for the Use of MVET Funds for Regional LRT Development-FY 1990-91

1. First Priority for MVET funds shall be for the further engineering definition and determination of firm ridership and cost estimates for Group 'A'-the Central Corridor-between downtown St. Paul and downtown Minneapolis.

Memorandum to: Regional Transit Board Committee of the Whole
June 18, 1990
Page Two

Within this category, the highest priority will be given to preliminary engineering activities, followed by: 2) final design; 3) R/W acquisition activities; and 4) planning.

2. Second priority for the use of MVET funds shall be for the further engineering definition and determination of firm ridership and cost estimates for the Group 'B' corridors (5 corridors).

Within this category, the highest priority will be given to those corridors and activities that advance the region's goal of receiving federal funds for LRT development.

3. Third priority for the use of MVET funds shall be for the further engineering definition and determination of firm ridership and cost estimates for the Group 'C' corridors (3 corridors) and corridor extensions (2 extensions).

RDM:cm

Attachment

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

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

DATE: June 12, 1990

TO:  Regional Transit Board Committee of the Whole

FROM: David Minister, LRT Development

SUBJECT: Policies/Priorities for Use of 1990-91 State MVET Funds in Support of Regional LRT Development Goals

Mr. Randy Halvorson, Director of the State's Office of Transit, recently announced that he was seeking input and guidance on updating the state's guidelines that would be used to allocate \$2.75 million in MVET funds for further LRT development in the Twin Cities' metropolitan area during the 1990-91 fiscal year. He handed out copies of the existing guidelines established for this purpose last year dated August 1, 1989-see copy attached-to the county regional railroad authorities and RTB LRT staffs.

At the meeting, I made the comment that, in light of the now adopted Regional LRT Development and Financial Plan, the RTB may want to establish clear priorities for the use of this year's MVET funds. First priority for MVET funds might be for Group 'A'-Central Corridor-preliminary engineering activities. Second priority might be for the three Group 'B' corridors that the region wishes to qualify for federal (UMTA) discretionary capital funding (Hiawatha, I-35W and Minneapolis-Northeast). Third priority might be for activities for the remaining Group 'B' corridors.

Ken Stevens asked Mr. Halvorson if Mr. Minister's proposal to have RTB establish funding priorities for the use of MVET funds for LRT development would be acceptable to Mn/DOT. Mr. Halvorson said that Mn/DOT would probably look to the RTB to set policy and establish priorities for the use of MVET funds for regional LRT development. Mr. Halvorson also confirmed my comment that several state legislators seemed to want to concentrate state funding for LRT on one "demonstration line"-namely the Group 'A'-Central Corridor.

In light of the above, staff will prepare a draft RTB policy statement for establishing clear priorities for the use of MVET funds for regional LRT development projects in FY 1990-91 and review it with the County Regional Railroad Authorities and Mn/DOT staffs on Thursday, June 14th. A final draft will then be brought before the RTB's Committee of the Whole on Monday, June 18th for discussion and potential action/adoption by the full RTB.

RDM:cm
Attachment

cc: G. Andrews
J. Hollander
H. Blin
S. Munyon

MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
ALLOCATION OF STATE LRT FUNDS
GUIDELINES - AUGUST 1, 1989

I. TIME SCHEDULE

- | | | |
|----|---|-------------------------|
| 1. | Solicit requests from regional rail authorities | August 1 - September 29 |
| 2. | Review and approval of requests by Regional Transit Board (RTB) | October 3 - November 3 |
| 3. | Distribution of funds by Mn/DOT | November 13 |

II. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

Governor Perpich signed legislation which appropriates \$6,816,000 for the 1990-1991 biennium to the Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT) for the following purpose:

1. The law provides that the "commissioner shall request applications from all eligible regional railroad authorities. The commissioner shall establish a reasonable deadline for submittal of applications. The commissioner may not distribute more than 60 percent of the available funds to a single recipient. Before distributing money to any regional railroad authority, the commissioner shall submit the applications to the regional transit board for approval. The commissioner may distribute funds only with the approval of the board. Before approving any applications for funds for construction, the board shall report to the legislature on the use and planned distribution of construction funds."
2. The law provides that the transit board shall adopt a regional light rail transit plan, as provided in this section, to ensure that light rail transit facilities in the metropolitan area will be acquired, developed, owned, and capable of operation in an efficient, cost-effective and coordinated manner as an integrated and unified system on a multicounty basis in coordination with buses and other transportation modes and facilities. To the extent practicable, the board shall incorporate into its plan appropriate elements of the plans of regional railroad authorities in order to avoid duplication of effort.

The regional plan required by this section must be adopted by the board before any regional railroad authority may begin construction of light rail transit facilities and before any authority is eligible for state financial assistance for constructing light rail transit facilities. Following adoption of the regional plan, each regional railroad authority or other developer of light rail transit in the metropolitan area shall act in conformity with the plan. Each authority or proposer shall prepare or amend its comprehensive plan and preliminary and final design plans as necessary to make the plans consistent with the regional plan."

III. APPLICATION PROCEDURES

1. Submit four (4) complete copies of your application no later than 4:30 p.m. on September 29, 1989.
2. Include a cover letter with the application that identifies the name, title, address and telephone number of the person who is to be contacted to address the concerns and questions of persons who will be reviewing applications.
3. Submit applications directly to:

Randy Halvorson
Director, Office of Transit
Minnesota Department of Transportation
815 Transportation Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

4. If you have any questions on these application procedures and guidelines contact Randy Halvorson at 296-1615.

IV. ALLOCATION POLICIES

1. Eligible recipients include any metropolitan regional railroad authority. Any regional railroad authority that received a previous state allocation must have completed the final product identified in its approved first or second round application by October 3, 1989. Applications may not exceed 60% of the fiscal year 1990 appropriation of \$3,408,000.
2. Allowable project expenses incurred between October 3, 1989 and the effective date of the grant agreement will be eligible to be included as project costs. Expenses for LRT related activities incurred after October 3, 1989 can be included as part of the total project cost in applications submitted to Mn/DOT. However, the regional railroad authority will assume the risk that its application may not be approved for funding, or that if approved such costs may not be eligible expenses. Funds will be awarded in a single block grant; state audit requirements will be specified in the grant agreement with each railroad authority.
3. State funds for distribution to regional railroad authorities in the metropolitan area must be matched by other funds on a dollar for dollar basis for planning, preliminary engineering, and design of light rail transit facilities. Staff time and expenses will be eligible costs in determining the railroad authority's local matching funds.
4. State funds made available for LRT by the 1989 Legislature may be used for the purchase of right of way under the final design and construction category. However, state funds available for the purchase of abandoned railroad right of way under the State Rail Bank Program (Minn. Stat. 222.63) may be applied for at any time.

The State Rail Bank (SRB) program may be used for 50 percent of the cost of acquisition of abandoned railroad right of way (property purchase only) by regional railroad authorities. However, the SRB program's highest funding priority is for the rehabilitation of railroad lines that are currently in use. For further information on the SRB program contact Cecil Selness, Director, Office of Railroads and Waterways, Minnesota Department of Transportation, 810 Transportation Building, St. Paul, MN 55155, telephone number 296-4888.

* (5)

Priority rankings for the funding of applications will be: 1) preliminary engineering, 2) final design, and 3) planning. Minnesota Statutes stipulate that the Regional Transit Board must adopt a Regional LRT Plan before any regional railroad authority is eligible for state financial assistance for construction of light rail transit facilities.

6. Mn/DOT will deliver applications to the Regional Transit Board for review and approval the first working day after the applications are received by Mn/DOT.

V. /APPLICATION GUIDELINES

Applications for funds may be submitted in one of three categories; planning, preliminary engineering, and final design. Applications shall include discussions of the analysis processes to be used to perform the activities and produce the final products required for the applicable funding category.

1. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Applications in this category must address, but are not limited to, the topics that follow:

- * Discussion of the purpose, goals and objectives for LRT within the county and region
- * Discussion of the analysis process that will be used to address each topic listed below
 - planning process which ensures consideration of a regional transportation perspective
 - local transportation needs
 - identification of potential LRT corridors and right of way availability
 - public benefit to be derived from each corridor selection
 - LRT ridership projections for each corridor
 - identification of linkage with other county LRT projects
 - LRT relationship to highway system for each corridor
 - LRT relationship to transit system for each corridor
 - LRT impact on local development for each corridor
 - estimated preliminary engineering costs
 - estimated construction costs
 - estimated operational costs and revenues

- * Discussion of the project management structure including identification of all public jurisdiction, private sector and consultant involvement
- * Discussion of the projected sources of estimated funds to pursue preliminary engineering, design and construction
- * Work plan for comprehensive planning project that illustrates the time frame for completion of tasks
- * Comprehensive plan project budget that at a minimum includes items listed below
 - personnel expenses
 - fringe benefit expenses
 - indirect charges (office, phone, mailing, etc.)
 - consultant/contractual expenses
 - printing/document production expenses
 - travel expenses
 - supply expenses
 - other expenses
 - source and amount of local match
 - amount of state LRT funds
 - total project cost

The final product of a planning project shall be a comprehensive LRT plan that at a minimum includes detailed analyses and discussions of all topics in the planning application guidelines. The comprehensive LRT plan shall be adopted by the regional railroad authority and reviewed and commented on by the Metropolitan Council and Regional Transit Board.

The production of a comprehensive LRT plan may be accomplished in phases. A final comprehensive LRT plan as discussed in the previous paragraph shall be required before a regional railroad authority can apply for funding for a preliminary engineering project.

2. PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING APPLICATIONS

As a prerequisite to receiving preliminary engineering funds, an LRT comprehensive plan must be reviewed by the Metropolitan Council and Regional Transit Board, and adopted by the regional railroad authority.

Preliminary engineering applications shall include discussions of the analysis processes to be used to perform the activities and produce the final products required for preliminary engineering.

Minnesota Statutes define Preliminary Design Plan to mean a light rail transit plan that identifies:

- "(1) preliminary plans for the physical design of facilities, including location, length, and termini of routes; general dimension, elevation, alignment, and character of routes and crossings; whether the track is elevated, on the surface, or below ground; approximate station locations; and related park and ride, parking, and other transportation facilities; and a plan for handicapped access; and
- (2) preliminary plans for intermodal coordination with bus operations and routes; ridership; capital costs; operating costs and revenues; funding for final design, construction, and operation; and an implementation method."

Applications in this category must address, but are not limited to, the following:

- * Identification and resolution of issues raised during review of comprehensive LRT plan
- * Proposed LRT system
- * Specific corridor selection and routes advanced to preliminary engineering
 - corridor and route identification
 - scoping process used to select corridor and routes
- * Identification of required environmental impact/assessment statements
- * Establishment of appropriate government roles and responsibilities (municipal, county, region, state, federal)
- * Discussion of the project management structure
 - identification of all public jurisdiction and private sector involvement
 - identification of all consultant involvement
 - identification of system operator involvement
 - establishment of fiscal and administrative processes
- * Identification of appropriate standards and specifications
- * Identification of system implementation strategy (e.g., traditional, design-build, turnkey)
- * Discussion of public participation and special interest group involvement in preliminary engineering

- advisory committee or other types of involvement not stipulated by law
- public hearing requirements for preliminary design plans as provided in Minnesota Statutes.
- * Discussion of the projected sources of estimated funds to pursue final design and construction
 - including preparation of a financial plan sufficient to determine stability of capital and operating fund sources
- * Discussion of the completion of prerequisites for further implementation, such as to meet federal funding requirements, if those funds are anticipated
- * Work plan for preliminary engineering project that illustrates the time frame for completion of tasks
- * Preliminary engineering project budget that at a minimum includes items listed below:
 - personnel expenses
 - fringe benefit expenses
 - indirect charges (office, phone, mailings, etc.)
 - consultant/contractual expenses
 - printing/contractual expenses
 - travel expenses
 - supply expenses
 - other expenses
 - source and amount of local match
 - amount of state LRT funds
 - total project cost

The final products of preliminary engineering shall include the documents listed below.

- * Scoping Document
 - identifies but does not evaluate all alternative corridors and/or routes
- * Scoping Decision Document
 - identifies issues and alternatives to be evaluated in environmental impact/assessment statement
- * Draft Environmental Impact/Assessment Statement
- * Final Environmental Impact/Assessment Statement
- * Preliminary Geometric Layout
- * Conceptual Relocation Plan

* Study Report

- including identification of appropriate design standards

3. FINAL DESIGN APPLICATIONS

As a prerequisite for final design funds, applicants must have the following:

- * Final comprehensive LRT plan as discussed as final product of planning application funding category
- * Completed documents listed as final products in preliminary engineering, including all appropriate environmental and regulatory approvals

Minnesota Statutes define Final Design Plan to include:

"Final design plan" means a light rail transit plan that includes the items in the preliminary design plan for the facilities proposed for construction, but with greater detail and specificity. The final design plan must include, at a minimum:

- (1) final plans for the physical design of facilities, including the right-of-way definition; environmental impacts and mitigation measures; intermodal coordination with bus operations and routes; and civil engineering plans for vehicles, track, stations, parking, and access, including handicapped access; and
- (2) final plans for civil engineering for electrification, communication, and other similar facilities; operational rules, procedures and strategies; capital costs; ridership; operation costs and revenues; financing for construction and operation; an implementation method; and other similar matters.

The final design plan must be stated with sufficient particularity and detail to allow the proposer to begin the acquisition and construction of operable facilities. If a turn-key implementation method is proposed, instead of civil engineering plans, the final design plan must state detailed design criteria and performance standards for the facilities."

Final design applications shall include discussions of the analysis and engineering processes to be used to perform final design activities.

Applications in this category must address, but are not limited to, the following:

- * Identification and resolution of issues raised during review of preliminary engineering plans
- * Right of Way (acquisition and final relocation plan)
- * Final Geometric Layout
- * Civil engineering (e.g. roadbed, tracks, etc.)
- * Systems (e.g. vehicles, electrification, communications and support services, fare collections, etc.)
- * Stations (e.g. platform, parking, shelters, etc.)
- * Operation (development of operational rules, procedures and strategies)
- * Plan for capital requirements for maintenance and security
- * Discussion of public participation and special interest group involvement in final design and construction
 - advisory committees or other types of involvement not stipulated by law
 - public hearing requirements for final design and construction as provided in Minnesota Statutes
- * Discussion of the projected sources of estimated funds to pursue final design and construction
 - including preparation of a financial plan sufficient to determine stability of capital and operating funds sources
- * Discussion of the completion of prerequisites for further implementation, such as to meet federal funding requirements, if those funds are anticipated
- * Work plan for final design that illustrates the time frame for completion of tasks
- * Final design project budget that at a minimum includes items listed below
 - personnel expenses
 - fringe benefit expenses
 - indirect charges (office, phone, mailings, etc.)
 - consultant/contractual expenses
 - printing/document production expenses

- travel expenses
- supply expenses
- right of way acquisition and relocation expenses
- construction expenses, including personnel, fringe, indirect, consultant/contractual, supplies, equipment expenses
- other expenses
- source and amount of local match
- amount of state LRT funds
- total project costs

The final products of design shall include the products listed below.

- * Final design plans sufficient to construct a light rail transit line