



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
REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD**
Mears Park Centre Chambers
June 15, 1992
4 p.m.

AGENDA

- A. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
- B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
- C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - 1. Legislative Committee Meeting, May 18, 1992*
 - 2. Policy Committee Meeting, May 26, 1992
 - 3. Regional Transit Board Meeting, June 1, 1992*
- D CHAIR'S REPORT**
- E. MEMBERS' REPORTS**
- F. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**
- G. ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTS**
- H. REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCE COMMITTEE
(Ruth Franklin, Chair)**
 - 1. Financial Statements - April 1992
 - 2. Resolution Authorizing the Filing of A Grant Application by the Regional Transit Board with U.S. Department of Transportation for Central Corridor Alternative Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as Amended, Resolution No. 92-04, and Amendment to Unified Planning and Work Program
 - 3. 1992 Contract Amendment for Columbia Heights
 - 4. 1992 Contract Amendment for Roseville Area Circulator
 - 5. Contract Amendment for Sister Kenny Institute
 - 6. 1992 Contract for Metro Mobility Administrative Center
 - 7. Metro Mobility Service Planning Request for Proposals
- I. OTHER BUSINESS**
- J. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Michael J. Ehrlichmann
Chair

* Will be mailed separately.



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
May 26, 1992**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Sandra Hilary, Chair; Maryann Campo; Ruby Hunt; Val M. Higgins; Tom Workman

OTHERS PRESENT: Michael J. Ehrlichmann, Ruth Franklin, Don Scheel, Tom Workman, Sharon Feess; RTB Members; Mike Robertson, RTB Legal Counsel; John Schatzlien, Sister Kenny Institute; Mary O'Hara Anderson; Coleen Wieck, Mary Jo Nichols; Steven Billings, Rideshare Advisory Committee; Morgan Grant, Transportation Accessibility Advisory Committee; Randy Rosvold, Judy Hollander, Mike Opatz, Dave Jacobson, Howard Blin, Assata Brown, Gregory L. Andrews, Mary Fitzgerald, RTB staff

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Committee Chair Hilary called the meeting to order at 4 p.m. and roll was taken.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The chair said Agenda Items 9 and 10 will be considered first. Approval of the agenda, so amended, was moved, seconded and carried.

PROVIDERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Rosvold reviewed the staff report dated May 18, 1992. Workman moved and Caranicas seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board adopt the revised structure for the Providers Advisory Committee as outlined in the staff report dated May 18, 1992.

The motion was unanimously approved.

ROSEVILLE AREA CIRCULATOR FARE DEMONSTRATION

Opatz reviewed the staff report dated May 5, 1992. Maps for Routes 100, 101, 102, 103, 104 and 105 were distributed. Workman questioned the increased cost resulting from reducing the fare to fifty cents. Opatz said this is a test case to determine if lower fares should be charged for these short, local trips. With this lower base fare there will be less discount fare use. If it makes the service more attractive, more people may be induced to use it. Higgins asked if a study was done on who is served by this system. Opatz said only 10,000 to 11,000 people use it monthly, but in the past 14,000 to

16,000 people used it and staff believes the riders are out there and they stopped using transit when the service was reduced and fares increased. It was moved and seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board authorize staff to implement a Roseville Area Circulator fifty-cent base fare demonstration for the period of one year commencing June 15, 1992 and the restructured service plan as outlined in the staff report dated May 5, 1992.

The motion was unanimously approved.

METRO MOBILITY ELIGIBILITY TASK FORCE REPORT

Schatzlein reviewed the work of the task force and Wieck discussed the chart on Page 9. Early indications are that the test works, but it will take time to implement and a pilot run should be made. RTB staff is looking for an outside source of funds that may or may not become available. In response to Ehrlichmann's question, Schatzlein said between 200 and 300 people would be assessed in the test group.

Chair Hilary said it is becoming clear that a lot of people like the system exactly as it is. How will that issue be dealt with? Schatzlein said people have not yet decided that the existing mainline service is more accessible and we have to show them the different kinds of vehicles that will be available. There is no way to totally satisfy them. Hilary asked who will benefit from the cost savings realized under this approach, how we can capture the savings and make people aware of it.

Hunt said in the near future a lot of people will have to be recertified so the savings will only be realized in the long-term. Ehrlichmann said a complete recertification has never been done. The goal of the program is not to cut costs. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requires certification to be determined by function. The process will reassure people that the system is used appropriately by the people who need it. Higgins said people are calling him, complaining this is unnecessary and too expensive. He has not yet received figures on what it will cost. A "best estimate" should be developed. Hollander said the issue of whether this is required arose during the legislation session. The ADA requires that RTB be able to certify people according to ADA eligibility guidelines. The next step is to develop cost estimates. Now that we have the tool and the process, we need to put it into the RTB process with a timeline and costs. Staff wants to do the field test to see if it is workable. Ehrlichmann said that at some point the board must deal with more detailed eligibility criteria. Caranicas said the work done so far on this project has been excellent. Franklin agreed. The flow charts are helpful and logical. Early debates in the blind community involved factions that did not want the service and others who felt they needed it. This guide is likely to help decide which portion of the community should be certified. She asked if it is correct to assume people can be certified for certain rides but not for others. If so, work will have to be done on implementing it. Schatzlein said the task force did not have to solve all those problems.

O'Hara Anderson added that in 1988 Metro Mobility users only had to be certified once every five years so everyone since then has merely re-registered on their birthdays. It is not true that this plan puts people through a new certification. Hollander said there is about one million dollars available in Project Action and staff expects to have a good chance of receiving a grant. Hunt moved:

That the Regional Transit Board:

1. Accept the Report of the Eligibility/Certification Task Force, dated April 28, 1992, which specifies an eligibility process flow chart and a functional assessment tool for certification of Metro Mobility riders.
2. Authorize the executive director to submit a grant application to Project Action for \$75,000; this would be used to field test the functional assessment tool during 1993 as recommended by the task force.

The motion was unanimously approved.

METRO MOBILITY SERVICE CONCEPT--STATUS REPORT

Hollander reviewed the staff report, dated May 19, 1992 by Edward Kouneski. The chair said it is important to approach this slowly because it was clear at the I-35W hearing that people can be reassured and it is appropriate to take our time. Hollander said the program is under a deadline of sorts because of the deficit problem. That has been the daily struggle.

METRO MOBILITY BACKGROUND

Hollander said that in response to board members' comments Jane Fitz prepared a history of the Metro Mobility program, which was distributed at the start of this meeting. Franklin commented that there will never be a time when everyone is comfortable with whatever choices the board makes, but the longer we delay, the greater the shortfall will be.

MINNESOTA RIDESHARE OVERVIEW

Jacobson reviewed his memorandum dated May 18, 1992. A graph showing the actual annual cost from 1985 to 1991 was distributed, along with information on registered can/van pools and the size of the data base. Copies of a letter from Steven Billings, dated May 22, were also distributed. Franklin questioned the increased budget since the annual actual costs have dropped. The data based has increased dramatically and less money has been spent, so it might be well to cut the budget. Jacobson said that in the past few years the annual budgets have been about \$700,000 and have come in under budget. Ehrlichmann said staff is looking at some alternatives. The Rideshare program exists in a large organization with a different mission. Jacobson said Rideshare has always been on the back burner, which was also a comment from the Legislative Audit Committee (LAC), and staff is expected to analyze whether this is optimum use of funds. Hilary asked for a comparison of how our Rideshare program ranks compared to other states.

Fees questioned whether the advisory committee is used appropriately. Jacobson said the committee is expected to provide input to the board. From a staff perspective, he values their input. Responding to Hunt, he said the committee is holding a special meeting in two days; this information is preliminary. The May 18 memorandum was given to advisory committee members the day of their last meeting.

Franklin asked if goals, objectives and criteria have been established for this program. Hollander said each year RTB and MTC negotiate a contract and management plan, which may not have been as aggressive as it could be. Both the Marketing Study and the LAC report point out that Rideshare is one element of Travel Demand Management (TDM) strategy and it no longer makes sense to maintain it as a separate program. There is a feeling that the program should be updated and integrated with other TDM activities.

Steve Billings, a member of the Rideshare Advisory Committee appointed by Sharon Feess in October 1991, said this is now something the committee will look at. It was brought in as an informational item with an indication that it would go to the Policy Committee at its June meeting (June 22); the advisory committee will review it on June 4. It seems staff has no intention of getting input from the advisory committee. He believes that other members have the same perception. The committee was told staff would prepare a memo and during the next 30 days they will evaluate recommendations made to the committee and develop three alternatives. Hollander said it was never the intention to bring a Request for Proposal to the committee in June, although there is some urgency to moving forward. The advisory committee will have an opportunity to provide input in June and again in July after the responses are received.

There was extensive discussion on the role of advisory committees. Feess suggested that the board hold joint meetings with the advisory committees to get acquainted with those members. Higgins said many people on Transportation Accessibility Advisory Committee feel they are expected to rubber-stamp everything. Whether or not that is true, if people think it is, there is a problem. Advisory committees must have an opportunity to give the board their input prior to the presentation of a staff recommendation. Ehrlichmann said much of the criticism at the May 7th Metro Mobility public meeting and open house centered on not having specific information on how things will work, even though that meeting was to solicit suggestions at the beginning of the process. If you don't put something specific on the table, there is nothing to react to. People sometimes assume that if it is on the table, it is cut and dried. Higgins said our own committees should be given an opportunity for input before any recommendations are made. Staff can react to that and then develop recommendations. Hollander said this is a real struggle for staff who also get in trouble for not bringing things to the board first. It is simply untrue that staff tries to bypass the advisory committees. Hilary said it is important that the board demonstrate that it values the committees. People dislike not being taken seriously. This is not a staff problem, it is a matter of how to get proper help from these advisory committee members.

FIVE-YEAR TRANSIT PLAN

It was agreed to lay this item over until another meeting.

COMMENTS ON I-35W RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Blin reviewed the staff report dated May 19, 1992. Hilary said people may not have understood all the ramifications of this project. Some homes will be taken with or without building light rail transit. Ehrlichmann asked that the item be progressed to the full board since Member Campo feels very strongly about it. Hunt moved and Workman seconded:

That the Policy Committee forward the comments on I-35W Reconstruction Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement to the full board without recommendation.

The motion was unanimously approved.

OTHER BUSINESS

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:07 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing constitutes a true and accurate record of the Regional Transit Board's Policy Committee meeting of May 26, 1992.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Fitzgerald
Secretary

Approved this 15th day of June 1992.



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

REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

At its meeting of June 8, 1992, the committee approved the following recommendations:

Financial Statements - April 1992

That the Regional Transit Board receive the April 1992 financial statements and direct that they be placed on file.

Resolution Authorizing the Filing of A Grant Application by the Regional Transit Board with U.S. Department of Transportation for Central Corridor Alternative Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as Amended (Resolution No. 92-04); and Amendment to Unified Planning and Work Program

That the Regional Transit Board approve:

1. An application to the Federal Transit Administration for \$2 million in funding for an Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the Central Corridor (Resolution No. 92-04); and
2. An amendment to the Unified Planning and Work Program.

1992 Contract Amendment for Columbia Heights

That the Regional Transit Board authorize the executive director to amend the contract with the City of Columbia Heights (Contract No. 91/18/11-31) by \$20,092, from \$63,615 to an amount not to exceed \$83,707.

1992 Contract Amendment for Roseville Area Circulator

That the Regional Transit Board authorize its executive director to amend the Roseville Area Circulator Contract with National School Bus Company, Inc. (Contract No. 91/03/11-01) by \$165,768, from \$2,070,948 to \$2,236,716, for the contract term of March 15, 1991 through March 14, 1995.

Contract Amendment for Sister Kenny Institute

That the Regional Transit Board approve an increase in expenditures of \$382.50, from \$1,785.00 to \$2,167.50, as final payment for Sister Kenny Institute's participation in revising the Metro Mobility eligibility and certification process.

1992 Contract for Metro Mobility Administrative Center

That the Regional Transit Board authorize the executive director to enter into a contract with the Metropolitan Transit Commission to provide Metro Mobility Administrative Center services during calendar year 1992 in an amount not to exceed \$760,751.

Metro Mobility Service Planning Request for Proposals

That the Regional Transit Board:

1. Authorize the executive director to issue a Request for Proposals for consulting services to perform Metro Mobility operations planning tasks, as described in the June 2, 1992 memorandum; and ;
2. Amend the Regional Transit Board's 1992 Operating Budget to transfer \$50,000 for professional and technical services from Project No. 92-23 to Project No. 92-10.

Other Business

The committee reviewed an additional research proposal from the Center for Transportation Studies for development of a remote sensing system capable of measuring transit vehicle emissions during actual operations. Such a system would be valuable in evaluating alternative fuel vehicles and emerging "clean diesel" technologies. No action was requested.

The next committee meeting will be July 13, 1992.

**Ruth Franklin
Chair**

6/8/92
mff

6/15/92

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

ROLL CALL AND ATTENDANCE SHEET

DATE: June July 15, 1992

92-04

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

ISSUE

Mike Ehrlichmann *in LA*

Maryann Campo ✓

✓

Doris Caranicas ✓

✓

Sharon Feess ✓

✓

Ruth Franklin ✓

✓

Val M. Higgins ✓

✓

Sandra Hilary ✓

✓

Ruby Hunt ✓

✓

Tom Sather *ex.*

Don Scheel ✓

✓

Tom Workman ✓

✓

Visitors

Staff

M Christem

ga, du, ss, sm

Entzel

mk,

O'Hara Anderson

mff