



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
229-2700

MEETING OF THE REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Monday, December 2, 1991
Mears Park Centre Chambers
Following 4 p.m. Legislative Committee Meeting

AGENDA

- A. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
- B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
- C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - 1. Regional Transit Board Meeting, November 4, 1991
 - 2. Policy Committee Meeting, November 13, 1991
 - 3. Regional Transit Board Meeting, November 18, 1991
- D. CHAIR'S REPORT**
 - 1. Driver of the Month Award - Jim Anderson, Wilder Transportation
- E. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**
- F. REPORT OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE**
Sandra Hilary, Chair
 - 1. City of Plymouth Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element
 - 2. Options for Metro Mobility Service
- G. REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**
Ruth Franklin, Chair
 - 1. 1992 MTC Budget Approval
- H. OTHER BUSINESS**
- I. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Michael J. Ehrlichmann
Chair

**REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD
ROLL CALL AND ATTENDANCE SHEET**

DATE: 12/2

BOARD OR COMMITTEE: Bd

Member Name	Present	Vote							
-------------	---------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

ISSUE

Mike Ehrlichmann	✓								
Maryann Campo	✓								
Doris Caranicas	✓								
Sharon Feess	✓								
John Finley	—								
Ruth Franklin	✓								
Val M. Higgins	✓								
Sandra Hilary	—								
Don Scheel	✓								
Richard Wedell	✓								
Tom Workman	✓								

Visitors

Staff

	<i>[Signature]</i>



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

Minutes of the Meeting of the
REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD
Mears Park Centre Chambers
November 4, 1991

MEMBERS PRESENT: Michael J. Ehrlichmann, Chair; Maryann Campo; Ruth Franklin; Ruby Hunt; Don Scheel and Richard Wedell

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Doris Caranicas, Sharon Feess, Val Higgins, Sandra Hilary, Tom Workman

OTHERS PRESENT: Michael Robertson, Legal Counsel; Arnie Entzel, Amalgamated Transit Union; Gregory Andrews, Dale Ulrich, Judy Hollander, Howard Blin, Stephanie Eiler and Mary Fitzgerald, Regional Transit Board Staff

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A quorum being present, the chair called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m. and roll was taken. A number of members had called and said they could not attend this meeting because of extremely poor driving conditions, an aftermath of the Halloween Snowstorm. Scheel moved and Campo seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Franklin moved and Hunt seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board approve the following minutes:

Administration and Finance Committee Meeting of October 14, 1991
Regional Transit Board Meeting of October 17, 1991
Regional Transit Board Meeting of October 21, 1991
Policy Committee Meeting of October 21, 1991

The motion was unanimously approved.

CHAIR'S REPORT

Driver of the Month Award

The October recipient of the award was also unable to attend this meeting because of the traffic congestion caused by the snowstorm. The award will be made at the next meeting.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Andrews said the opening ceremony of the B-Line service has been rescheduled to Thursday, November 7, at 1:30 p.m.

A signed copy of the conciliation agreement has been received from the Department of Human Rights; this concludes the issue of Metro Mobility fares.

Members were asked to provide information to Mike Kuehn on their contacts with elected officials in order to satisfy the reporting requirements

Resolution of Appreciation to Metropolitan Transit Commission Employees and Fellow Transit Providers, Resolution No. 91-16

The chair distributed a resolution acknowledging the extraordinary efforts of the transit providers to maintain service during the worst snowstorm ever experienced in this area. Wedell moved and Campo seconded approval of the resolution. Hunt added that it was extremely important and valuable that transit was in operation and gave employers the option of keeping their businesses open. They would not have had that opportunity if MTC had shut down. Ehrlichmann said he also discovered that the MTC chief administrator was handling bags of sand on Saturday to keep buses moving and expressed regret that there is no tangible reward we can offer. The motion and resolution were unanimously approved.

Entzel added that the drivers and mechanics did an extraordinary job during those three days. He watched people arrive at the garages covered in snow and having spent two or more hours arranging to be taken to work whatever way they could. Most drivers who could get there kept on driving regardless of when their shifts were supposed to end.

REPORT OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE

Wedell reported on the October 28 Policy Committee actions.

Free Regular Route Fares for Metro Mobility Riders

Wedell moved and Hunt seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board endorse the concept of a free ride program on Metropolitan Transit Commission (MTC) service for all certified Metro Mobility riders and direct staff to work with the Transit Accessibility Advisory Committee, the Metro Mobility Administrative Center, and the Metropolitan Transit Commission in developing the specifics of the program for presentation to the appropriate board committees in January 1992 and implementation in April 1992.

Wedell said the Senior Federation is concerned about creating a permanent program for free fares, but it is important that focus be shifted from Metro Mobility to regular route accessible service. The motion was unanimously approved.

Five-Year Transit Plan Amendments:

Wedell moved and Hunt seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board approve the following recommendations:

- That that Regional Transit Board approve the Metro Mobility Strategies planning direction as outlined in the staff report dated October 15, 1991 for submittal to the Metropolitan Council in response to their requests on the RTB Five-Year Transit Plan
- That the Regional Transit Board amend the Five-Year Transit Plan to include the following:
 1. Two paratransit service classifications: 1) community-based public paratransit services, and 2) specialized paratransit services.
 2. A paratransit performance standard of a \$5.00 ceiling subsidy per passenger for community-based public paratransit services and a \$9.00 ceiling subsidy per passenger for specialized paratransit services beginning in 1993. These standards will be reviewed at each update of the Five-Year Transit Plan.
 3. The paratransit service performance monitoring and evaluation process contained in the staff memorandum dated October 21, 1991.
- That the Regional Transit Board amend the 1991-1995 Five-Year Transit Plan to include the service delivery priorities proposed in the staff memorandum dated October 21, 1991; and submit this amendment to the Metropolitan Council for approval.
- That the Regional Transit Board amend the Five-Year Transit Plan to include the information included in the October 21 staff report regarding Local Bus Service Evaluation and that this be forwarded to the Metropolitan Council for approval.
- That the Regional Transit Board transmit the Future Capital Bonding Needs as outlined in the staff report dated October 21, 1991 to the Metropolitan Council for approval.

Franklin asked that the language be understandable regarding the Opt-Out communities and ensure that their changes are included. Blin said Barry Stock raised the question of how the standards apply. They apply to Opt-Out communities, which can use up to 90-percent of property taxes to subsidize their paratransit programs. These standards will not be implemented until 1993 and staff will monitor them in the meantime. The motion was unanimously approved.

Anoka County Traveler New Service Evaluation

Wedell moved and Franklin seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board:

1. Accept the staff evaluation of the Anoka County Traveler project, dated October 8, 1991; and
2. Incorporate the described changes into the 1992 Anoka County Traveler Management Plan.

The motion was unanimously approved.

OTHER BUSINESS

The chair said the Joint Light Rail Transit Advisory Committee has received the recommendations on the LRT Corridor Reevaluation and will meet on November 6 to consider them (that meeting was later rescheduled to November 13).

Franklin announced that the Administration and Finance Committee will meet on November 12.

There being no other business, Scheel moved and Franklin seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was unanimously approved and the meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing constitutes a true and accurate record of the Regional Transit Board's meeting of November 4, 1991.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Fitzgerald
Secretary

Approved this 18th day of November 1991.



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 Chambers
November 13, 1991**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Sandra Hilary, Chair; Maryann Campo; Val M. Higgins; Ruby Hunt and Richard Wedell

OTHERS PRESENT: Michael J. Ehrlichmann, RTB Chair; Ruth Franklin, Don Scheel, Tom Workman, Sharon Feess, RTB Members; Judy Hollander, Howard Blin, Stephanie Eiler, Mary Fitzgerald, Regional Transit Board Staff

Chair Hilary was delayed by traffic and Wedell called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. and roll was taken. Higgins moved and Hunt seconded approval of the agenda. The motion was unanimously approved (Hilary not present).

LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT (LRT) CORRIDOR REEVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Blin used slides to review the earlier recommendations. The RTB Proposed Preliminary Recommendations (Exhibit A) and the Joint Light Rail Transit Advisory Committee Recommendations (Exhibit B) were distributed. The recommendations of the Joint Light Rail Transit Advisory Committee (JLRTAC) approved at their meeting earlier in the day differ in some respects. Chair Hilary arrived and apologized for being delayed because I-94 has only one lane open. She invited board members to share their perceptions of the earlier meeting.

Ehrlichmann asked that someone make a motion and discussed his perceptions of the meeting. Staff does not have a problem with the staging recommendations from the advisory committee. The financing recommendation reflects Commissioner John Finley's concern that RTB should not eliminate the possibility of state funding for the Central Corridor. Staff has attempted to identify the least expensive alternative for this project and professional staff has indicated the first two corridors can work without a tunnel. The main differences are in modified staging for additional corridors, financing, and tunnel recommendations. The surface alignment recommendation for the first phase is an important difference.

Hunt said she thought it was a good meeting and the end result was a unanimous position. She agreed with Derus that federal funds should not be ruled out for the Central Corridor because there are some circumstances under which projects can bypass the long federal Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process.

Franklin commented that people seemed to be pleased with the work of the RTB staff. The report on ridership and capital costs showed figures that vary widely, which could be expected to have a negative effect on legislators. She suggested that staff clarify how numbers are developed and explain that those figures include amortization costs. As

figures are currently presented, capital equipment (cars, rails, tunnels, and things of that nature) would be free, in a sense, after the 20th year until they reach the point that they have to be replaced.

Ehrlichmann asked for a motion to approve the staff recommendations and then make amendments. The chair said it would make more sense to move the Joint LRT Advisory Committee (JLRTAC) report's recommendation, which already contains the advisory committee amendments. Ehrlichmann said he would argue against that.

The chair noted the differences between the RTB and the JLRTAC recommendations, particularly with respect to tunnels. Ehrlichmann said the JLRTAC definitely said there should be a tunnel in Minneapolis and other areas as appropriate. Members discussed at length their perceptions of the intent of the JLRTAC and the background of the major issues on financing, staging and tunnels.

Hilary asked if the statement in the third bullet (JLRTAC recommendations) regarding staging is firm or something that can be interpreted. It seems open-ended. Blin said he understood they recommended tunnels for Downtown Minneapolis, Washington Avenue through the University of Minnesota and possibly other areas, which differs from the RTB staff preliminary recommendations. Eiler added that the difference in recommendations was done by staff between the two meetings today; but the new financing wording is exactly Commissioner Finley's wording. Franklin said Finley was concerned about the federal EIS. She asked if seeking federal funding would slow down the process and cause the cost of the project to rise. She questioned whether it is realistic to change RTB's recommendation because of his concerns? Eiler said the federal EIS process is longer than the state EIS process and delay does make the project much more expensive. Staff is recommending that RTB get something in the works because after nearly three years nothing has been started. Ehrlichmann said completing a federal EIS would take 18 to 24 months. This plan would remove \$120 million more, which would be paid with federal funds, bring the cost to \$250 million to be financed by the Region, with potential assistance from the state.

Chair Hilary said issues should be dealt with one at a time. It is sensible to ask for federal money because it takes so much off the top and we have been waiting so long. Hilary moved the staff recommendation; Wedell seconded the motion.

RECOMMENDATION

CORRIDOR STAGING:

- **Central Corridor and I-35W/South Corridor Two-Phase System**

Initial system with both regional core and home-based trip service features. Highest performance characteristics in the Region.

1. Central Corridor linking Downtown Minneapolis, University of Minnesota, State Capitol, and downtown St. Paul
2. I-35W/South Corridor eventually linking Dakota County with Minneapolis and St. Paul

Corridor segments to be constructed as funding becomes available.

- **Surface alignment through both downtowns, the State Capitol area, and the University of Minnesota**
- Proposed Corridor Staging
 1. Central Corridor
 2. I-35W/South

Two additional corridors have attractive performance characteristics. These corridors should be considered for implementation either after Central and I-35W, or if neither Central nor I-35W can be started in the near future:

3. Minneapolis Northwest
4. Minneapolis Northeast

Remaining corridors will be reexamined in updating the Regional 20-Year Plan.

- Preserve Right-of-way for corridors with identified potential for LRT.

FINANCING:

- Financing goal of a minimum of 30 percent federal funds, and a maximum of 70 percent Regional Transit Board bonding authority (property tax) for the Central Corridor. System upgrades such as tunnels could be provided by individual jurisdictions. Federal Environmental Impact Statement/Alternative Analysis procedures to begin immediately.

GOVERNANCE:

- Final design and construction to be directed by a Joint Powers Board as described in LRT Regional Coordination Plan.

Campo Said that based on discussion at the JLRTAC meeting earlier in the day, their recommendations were more flexible than those of staff. She asked for assurance that the board is not boxed in and she suggested looking for the financing that offers the most flexibility.

Hunt asked if this would mean that state funds would be available if LRT is included in reconstruction of I-94; that would be the main concern.

Hilary said the first bullet point refers only to staging and she offered a substitute motion approving the Corridor Staging recommendation. Vote was taken on the substitute motion and it was unanimously approved.

The committee moved on to the remaining sections of the staff recommendations. After discussing how to assure that the language in the Financing Section would not restrict options for funding, Hilary suggested the members consider accepting the JLRTAC

language and insert that into the board's report, deleting reference to the 10-year plan. The members concurred.

Campo said she has a problem with not factoring in the tunnel because she does not want to leave out anything or give an impression that the board is recommending that the tunnel be removed. Hilary said it does not say that. The Financing Section is the issue currently on the table. The second sentence says "system upgrades such as tunnels could be provided by individual jurisdictions." The chair said that should be clearer.

Higgins questioned whether the words "30-percent federal funds" should be included because failure to get the federal funds could ruin the whole thing. Hilary said it only refers to "goals."

In response to Feess' question, Hilary said that if federal funds are requested, we have to ask them to start the EIS process.

Blin recommended a financing goal of 30-percent federal funding with 70-percent to be paid by state and local funds, i.e., RTB funds. Ehrlichmann said he could support that.

Hilary said the tunnel language should be less definitive. Franklin said the Financing paragraph should retain the second sentence and eliminate reference to tunnels except in the Financing section. She asked staff if that would be satisfactory so the board will not be faced with saying it has to be surface alignment.

Ehrlichmann said this has to be submitted to the Metro Council and the Legislature. Council staff has made it clear and dealing with the Legislature, we need to separate the tunnel from the Central Corridor and do a surface alignment. To get this through we can drop \$250 million from the project, which will greatly improve the chances of getting financing. We need to make a statement that RTB recommends surface alignment.

Hilary said she is trying to preserve that which makes the most sense from a planning standpoint. If we do not allude to tunnels but add that if someone wants to pay for a tunnel it could be included in the system, what does that do? Ehrlichmann said we are saying in the best of all possible worlds a tunnel is the best choice but the first two corridors can run on the surface. We have tried in the past two legislative sessions to get approval for this project. If we can get it down to a smaller dollar amount and present something different we might have a better chance.

In response to Hilary's question on how much control the Legislature exerts on the plans, Ehrlichmann said that in a sense they exert control over the plans by choosing to fund at a certain dollar amount. Campo said the high cost of the project has been mentioned many times at the Legislature, but more often lawmakers say we have to come to them with consensus. We must have an agenda and stick to it and we must support the Joint Powers Board.

Hunt said the points Ehrlichmann made are not reflected in the recommendations. The written material must state that surface alignment is possible with two lines only, not with more. Ehrlichmann said he would like the committee to make a statement supporting the basic system and would not object to saying that a tunnel would be required if we build additional lines.

Wedell said we need to point out that surface alignment will work for two lines. It is clear that the cost of \$250 million is a major issue with the Legislature and it will cost \$250 million to build in the flexibility. In the end the legislators can make the cuts.

Hilary stated that she continues to believe the tunnel is the best long-term solution. Staff was directed to work on the appropriate language and present it to the board at its November 18 meeting. Hilary said the committee could approve (move) everything but the tunnel. The motion was unanimously approved.

Note: following this meeting the staff developed the recommendations shown below to reflect the direction provided by the committee. The recommendations were presented to the full board on November 18.

CORRIDOR STAGING:

- The RTB proposes a Central Corridor and I-35W/South Corridor two-phase system .

The initial system has both regional core and home-based trip service features, and the highest performance characteristics in the region.

1. Central Corridor linking downtown Minneapolis, University of Minnesota, State Capitol, and downtown St. Paul
2. I-35W/South Corridor eventually linking Dakota County with Minneapolis and St. Paul

Corridor segments will be constructed as funding becomes available.

- Additional corridors have attractive performance characteristics. Additional corridors should be considered for implementation either after Central and I-35W, or if neither Central nor I-35W can be started in the near future, particularly Minneapolis Northeast.
- Right-of-way for corridors with identified potential for LRT should be preserved.

FINANCING:

- The RTB recommends a financing goal of 30 percent federal funding, with the remaining 70-percent to be paid by state and local (i.e., RTB bonding). Federal EIS/Alternative Analysis procedures should begin immediately.

GOVERNANCE:

- Final design and construction should be directed by a Joint Powers Board as described in the LRT Regional Coordination Plan.

***ALIGNMENT:**

The tunnel vs. surface alignment section was omitted from the material passed by the Policy Committee on November 13, with the intention of reinserting new

language at the November 19 RTB Board meeting. Language to address this issue is suggested below.

The RTB recommends the construction of a two-corridor LRT system on a surface alignment. While the RTB recognizes that additional corridors would require the construction of a tunnel, the proposed project offers the least expensive, functional, transit legislative initiative possible.

This recommendation would not preclude the construction of a tunnel for the first two corridors financed by individual jurisdictions independent of federal, state or regional funding.

MINNEAPOLIS NORTHEAST CORRIDOR LRT PRELIMINARY DESIGN PLANS

Eiler reviewed the staff report dated October 31, 1991. A professional engineer was also retained and he also reviewed the plans and his comments are incorporated in the staff report.

Chair Hilary asked if the comments from other jurisdictions have been incorporated in the review. The concerns of people who attended the neighborhood meetings in Northeast Minneapolis should be addressed. Eiler said she is not aware that they were included. Hilary said there must be some sort of addendum to the report because she promised people who attended those meetings that would be done. Eiler said the comments will be addressed in the Final EIS.

Hilary moved and it was seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board approve the Findings and Conclusions, Items 1 through 10, on the Minneapolis Northeast Corridor Preliminary Design Plans, for submission to Anoka County Regional Railroad Authority and Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority.

The motion was unanimously approved.

OTHER BUSINESS

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing constitutes a true and accurate record of the Regional Transit Board's Policy Committee meeting of November 13, 1991.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Fitzgerald
Secretary

Approved this 2nd day of December 1991.



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
November 18, 1991

MEMBERS PRESENT: Michael J. Ehrlichmann, Chair; Maryann Campo; Doris Caranicas; Sharon Feess; Ruby Hunt, Ruth Franklin; Val Higgins; Sandra Hilary; Don Scheel; Tom Workman

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Richard Wedell

OTHERS PRESENT: John T. Finley, Ramsey County Commissioner; Michael Robertson, Legal Counsel; Ken Stevens, Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority; Kathy DeSpiegelaere; Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority; Bob Rossman, Amalgamated Transit Union; Gregory Andrews, Dale Ulrich, Judy Hollander, Howard Blin, Stephanie Eiler and Mary Fitzgerald, Regional Transit Board Staff

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A quorum being present, the chair called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. and roll was taken. Caranicas moved and Scheel seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously. (Campo not present.)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Franklin moved and Hunt seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board approve the following minutes:

Administration and Finance Committee Meeting of October 22, 1991
Regional Transit Board Meeting of November 4, 1991

The motion was unanimously approved. (Campo not present.)

CHAIR'S REPORT

Driver of the Month Award - Alfred Foster, Ebenezer Society

Caranicas presented the October Driver of the Month Award to Alfred Foster. This is the first time that a Metro Mobility driver has been selected twice to receive the award.

REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Committee Chair Franklin reported on the action taken at the committee's November 12, 1991 meeting.

Financial Statements - September 1991

Franklin moved and Workman seconded:

The Administration and Finance Committee recommends:

That the Regional Transit Board receive the September 1991 financial statements and direct that they be placed on file.

The motion was unanimously approved. (Campo not present.)

Anoka County Traveler 1991 Contract Amendment

Franklin moved and Caranicas seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board authorize the executive director to amend the Anoka County Traveler 1990-1991 contract with Anoka County for an amount not to exceed \$683,000, an increase of \$33,000.

The motion was unanimously approved. (Campo not present.)

Approval of 1992 Provider Contract Services

Franklin moved and Feess seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board authorize the executive director to renew annual operating assistance contracts effective January 1, 1992 with the following transit service providers in amounts not to exceed those listed below.

Replacement (Opt-Out) Service

City of Maple Grove	\$658,680
Minnesota Valley Transit Authority	2,815,810
City of Plymouth	1,158,381
City of Shakopee	236,360
Southwest Metropolitan Transit Commission	1,352,623
	<hr/>
	\$6,221,854

Regular Route

North Suburban Lines	\$879,134
Valley Transit	110,117
	<hr/>
	\$989,251

County/Rural Special Transportation Services

Anoka County Traveler	\$458,824
Anoka Volunteer Program	23,708
Carver County	128,177
Dakota County Volunteer	14,432
DARTS (Dakota County)	431,437
Human Services, Inc. (Washington County)	234,069
Lakeville (Dakota)	30,513
Linwood Volunteer (Anoka)	17,792
Scott County	124,445
Senior Community Services	50,021
Senior Transportation Program	24,927
Westonka Rides	32,696
	<hr/>
	\$1,571,041

Small Urban Communities

City of Columbia Heights	\$63,615
City of Hastings (TRAC)	82,172
City of Hopkins	34,752
Northeast Suburban Transit (NEST)	111,434
St. Louis Park Emergency Program (STEP)	11,286
White Bear Area Transit	90,626
	<hr/>
	\$393,885

Grand Total, All Categories \$9,176,031

The motion was unanimously approved. (Campo not present.)

Elwyn Tinklenberg, Mayor of the City of Blaine and Anoka Deputy County Administrator, thanked the board on behalf of those working on suburban transit. The board has worked a long time to address their concerns and Anoka County appreciates those efforts. He quoted a number of statistics demonstrating the level of service and the demographics of the population it serves. The service is fully accessible and the farebox recovery rate is now 16-percent, a 42-percent increase. The per passenger subsidy was reduced 35-percent over the past 17 months. The Anoka County Traveler provides a great deal of service at a lower cost to people who would otherwise be using Metro Mobility service. (Campo arrived.)

North Suburban Lines 1991 Contract Amendment

Franklin moved and Scheel seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board authorize the executive director to amend the North Suburban Lines 1991 contract (Contract No. 90/12/17-35) to an amount not to exceed \$891,694, an increase of \$57,940.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Southwest Metro 1991 Contract Amendment

Franklin moved and Feess seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board authorize the executive director to amend the Southwest Metro 1991 contract (Contract No. 90/12/17-34) to an amount not to exceed \$1,347,227, an increase of \$386,977.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Jobseekers 1992 Contract

Simich said the committee had approved a \$50,000 increase for expansion of the program, but in discussion with the comptroller he found that the increase would have a negative effect on the budget. Therefore, staff is recommending that the 1992 budget amount for this program be kept at the current level of \$500,000. Franklin moved and Feess seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board approve a Jobseekers Program budget of \$500,000 for calendar year 1992 to offer discounted convenience fares through participating agencies.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Franklin announced that the committee will meet on November 19 to review the MTC 1992 budget. She encouraged as many members as possible to participate.

REPORT OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE

Committee Chair Hilary reviewed the actions taken at the November 13, 1991 Policy Committee meeting.

LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT (LRT) CORRIDOR REEVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Hilary said the corridor staging and financing received the most attention. The discussion on alignment focused on the tunnels. Since the November 13 meeting, the wording at the top of page two of the committee report was changed. She asked members to read it carefully and asked if the language is exactly correct. Eiler said, with the exception of the tunnel language, she took the wording from the two different documents that were used at the committee meeting and blended it into one, which represents staff understanding of the intent of the committee. Hilary said recommendations should not come back as something different from the language that the committee argued over and resolved. Ehrlichmann said the language in the Corridor Staging, Financing, and Governance is the committee's language. Hilary said that with that assurance, the members can agree to everything except the Alignment language on page 2.

Eiler distributed copies of the recommendations approved by the Joint Light Rail Transit Advisory Committee on November 13 (pink) and the RTB's Proposed Preliminary Recommendations dated October 28 (blue). The RTB proposed language recognizes that ultimately if the project went beyond two corridors a tunnel would have to be constructed and surface alignment reflects the least expensive and functional system we

could offer, but does not preclude individual jurisdictions from financing a tunnel for the first two corridors with other than state, federal and regional dollars.

Hilary said that is not her recollection of how the motion was supposed to read. The discussion was: first sentence the same. The committee said a total system requires a tunnel. That is not reflected in the current version. One can be penny-wise and pound-foolish, but a system that works requires a tunnel.

Hunt agreed with Hilary and proposed the following:

It is the view of the Regional Transit Board that a tunnel in Downtown Minneapolis is required for a regional system.

Hilary said that is a well-defined statement of purpose and that she objects to anyone else changing sentences after the Policy Committee argued for hours and after amending the document; what is said is what should be passed on to the board.

Hollander said the changes were converting statements into full sentences and adding verbs. The chair said he does not want to bring anything to the board that is not a reflection of committee intent. The tunnel issue was left open. Campo agreed with Hunt and Hilary and suggested adding the words "temporary measure." Franklin said the discussion on the 13th was at times confusing and the staff did a good job putting down what it seemed was the consensus. As much as everyone seems to want a tunnel, we have to come up with a less expensive formula that can get legislative support. She approves the new language because it says the same things but makes a case for the tunnel. It does say that RTB recognizes the need.

Hunt moved:

It is the view of the Regional Transit Board that a tunnel in Downtown Minneapolis is required for a regional system; however, a surface alignment for the first two corridors is a less expensive alternative.

The chair said RTB must make a recommendation to the Metro Council. One of the problems of the Central Corridor, which is a problem for any alignment, is that the added cost of a tunnel is included in the cost of the project and the cost needs to be understood relative to its system-wide need. The staff was trying to propose a system that could operate at a minimum cost.

Campo moved and Workman seconded:

We recommend the construction of a two-corridor light rail transit system on the surface at this time because...

Campo said the current language does not point out it would have to be redone or that it is a way to get a system started. Hunt withdrew her motion and moved:

That the Regional Transit Board recommend the construction of a two-corridor system on a surface alignment. However, it is the view of the RTB that a tunnel is required in downtown Minneapolis for a regional system.

Hilary said, looking at the second sentence (Alignment Section), the following should be added:

While the RTB recognizes that a regional system would require construction of a tunnel, the proposed recommendation offers the least expensive transportation alternative possible.

Hunt accepted that language. Workman seconded.

Higgins said it seems the intent of the discussion is to clarify. To say that a tunnel is needed for a regional system adds nothing. A reference should be made to a regional system rather than additional corridors. We have argued this for 20 years and are at the point where we have to fish or cut bait. Continuing to get involved in these arguments will destroy the entire project.

Hunt said it was quite clear to legislators from other than Hennepin County that Hennepin was proceeding with a system that was not regional in nature and they made it clear they want a regional system. Lawmakers made their intentions very clear in establishing the Joint LRT Advisory Committee and restructuring the RTB. She does not agree that two lines constitute a regional system. Higgins agreed, but said no one can define exactly what a "regional system" consists of.

Hilary re-read the recommendation that had been moved by Hunt and seconded by Workman:

The Regional Transit Board recommends the construction of a two-corridor system on a surface alignment. While the RTB recognizes that a regional system would require construction of a tunnel, the proposed recommendation offers the least expensive transportation alternative possible.

Hilary moved and Caranicas seconded that the second paragraph be included:

This recommendation would not preclude the construction of a tunnel for the first two corridors financed by individual jurisdictions independent of federal, state or regional funding.

The Alignment Section as shown in the two paragraphs immediately above was unanimously approved.

Before the vote on the all the recommendations, as amended, Hunt said she wants to be clear that this wording would not preclude the Central Corridor being funded with state and local funds. The chair said it does not preclude that.

In response to Workman's question about I-35W, Hilary said it is not a given that the first stage would cross the Minnesota River. Some other county might ask for the first phase of their piece to be built. Blin added that the EIS for I-35W is currently underway. The segment south of the river is included in the planning but the Hennepin County recommendation was to take it to 96th Street. It is unlikely the first stage would cross the Minnesota River. Workman said a river crossing would make it a more effective line and he will continue to support that. Hunt said that is one of the reasons the plan will be reevaluated regularly to address the changing demographics. It could happen sooner rather than later. Workman said the demographics are changing, but

there is also an issue of geography. Blin said the 35W Corridor segments will be constructed as funding becomes available, eventually crossing the river. The first sentence under Corridor Staging was reworked to clarify the proposed phasing.

Scheel moved and Hunt seconded the complete LRT proposal, as amended:

CORRIDOR STAGING:

- The RTB proposes a two-phase system: a Central Corridor and an I-35W/South Corridor.

The initial system has both regional core and home-based trip service features, and the highest performance characteristics in the Region.

1. Central Corridor linking Downtown Minneapolis, University of Minnesota, State Capitol, and downtown St. Paul
2. I-35W/South Corridor eventually linking Dakota County with Minneapolis and St. Paul.

Corridor segments will be constructed as funding becomes available.

- Additional corridors have attractive performance characteristics. Additional corridors should be considered for implementation either after Central and I-35W, or if neither Central nor I-35W can be started in the near future, particularly Minneapolis Northeast.
- Right-of-way for corridors with identified potential for LRT should be preserved.

ALIGNMENT

The Regional Transit Board recommends the construction of a two-corridor system on a surface alignment. While the RTB recognizes that a regional system would require construction of a tunnel, the proposed recommendation offers the least expensive transportation alternative possible.

This recommendation would not preclude the construction of a tunnel for the first two corridors financed by individual jurisdictions independent of federal, state or regional funding.

FINANCING:

- The RTB recommends a financing goal of 30 percent federal funding, with the remaining 70 percent to be paid by state and local (i.e., RTB bonding). Federal EIS/Alternative Analysis procedures should begin immediately.

GOVERNANCE:

- Final design and construction should be directed by a Joint Powers Board as described in the LRT Regional Coordination Plan.

The motion was unanimously approved.

MINNEAPOLIS NORTHEAST CORRIDOR LRT PRELIMINARY DESIGN PLANS

Hilary moved and Caranicas seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board approve the Findings and Conclusions, Items 1 through 10, on the Minneapolis Northeast Corridor Preliminary Design Plans, for submission to Anoka County Regional Railroad Authority and Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority.

The motion was unanimously approved.

OTHER BUSINESS AND PUBLIC COMMENT

The chair invited John Finley to speak. Finley said that for those not involved in the EIS process and engineering studies, a deliberate decision was made two years ago on whether there would be a federal or state EIS for the central corridor. Under the federal EIS process an Alternatives Analysis is required and it is a long drawn out process. If federal funds are needed an Alternatives Analysis must be done. He tried to make the point at the JLRTAC meeting that the bodies made the decision two years ago not to do a federal EIS. The plan called for state and local funds so if there is a change made now and RTB goes for federal funding there will be a two-year delay in the Central Corridor which is not what anyone envisioned. Federal funds can be sought for 35W. It was a consensus decision that had to be made in an attempt to coordinate construction with the reconstruction of I-94

The Central Corridor is in the second phase of preliminary engineering at a cost of several million dollars and it is not worth doing if it has to be re-done. They cannot go back now because the Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority (RCRRA) has contracts out for the next phase of engineering and it will not include a federal Alternatives Analysis. RCRRA would have to find a way to break its contract with BRW. In response to Campo's question, Finley said all the parties have the same intent, but it would be clearer to state that the Central Corridor should be funded by state and local funds.

Ehrlichmann said he would not support that because it detracts from the potential for getting legislative funding. By setting a generic goal for 30-percent the chances for getting legislative support are improved. Finley said he realizes that legislators will not understand. They will ask why we are not getting federal funds. A consensus decision was made not to do that and he does not want anyone telling legislators that we are going to get 30-percent federal funds for the Central Corridor because it cannot legally be done. There has to be a federal EIS.

Hilary said the members understand Finley's concerns and tried to be as non-specific as possible. It is still the sense of the body and will preclude the fiasco of all those people running to Washington asking for funds for a different piece of the system.

Finley said he wants members to be aware that this is the plan adopted last year. Older members will remember, but new members are now faced with this issue. Ehrlichmann said that if federal funds are involved in the project it will be delayed for 18 to 24 months. This reflects our limited opportunity to get approval by the Legislature.

Higgins said that in light of the statement of Commissioner Finley and his own statements at the Policy Committee meeting, he would moved to reconsider the vote for deleting reference to the 30 percent federal funds from the recommendations and clarifying the issue. The board is building in another one-and-a-half-year delay. Hilary seconded the motion.

Hunt asked Higgins if he intends to strike reference to federal funding. Higgins said the reference is in the Financing Section of the recommendation, delete the reference to 30-percent federal funds. Ehrlichmann said a two-thirds majority is required to approve a motion to reconsider. On a roll call vote, the motion failed. (Hilary, Scheel, Franklin and Ehrlichmann voted nay.)

There being no other business, Caranicas moved and Workmen seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was unanimously approved and the meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing constitutes a true and accurate record of the Regional Transit Board's meeting of November 18, 1991.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Fitzgerald
Secretary

Approved this second day of December 1991.



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

REPORT OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE

At its meeting of November 25, the committee approved the following recommendations:

City of Plymouth Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element

That the Regional Transit Board approve the comments contained in the November 14, 1991 staff memorandum to the Policy Committee for transmittal to the City of Plymouth and to the Metropolitan Council.

Options for Metro Mobility Service

That the Regional Transit Board approve Option III as outlined in the staff report dated November 13, 1991 for more detailed analysis and for inclusion in the Americans with Disabilities Act Paratransit Plan.

Other Business

The committee also reviewed the November 15 staff report on Opt-Out Capital Options. No formal action by the committee was requested at this time.

Sandra Hilary
Chair