



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](http://www.mnhs.org/copyright).

# COMMENTS WELCOME

If you prefer to write your comments about the fare change, please do.

Start 2 Buss circulator & eliminate downtown

zone

Mike Gish Top HAT  
DCC Trans.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_

# COMMENTS WELCOME

If you prefer to write your comments about the fare change, please do.

I favor dropping the zone. I use Metro Mobility  
I live in Zone 2. Just about everywhere  
I go, I pay an extra 50¢, which I  
don't see as fair.

Thank you for having the hearing at  
Brookdale

Name

Barb Kane

City

Brooklyn Center

Pls. on Reg. if  
Not on the side

# COMMENTS WELCOME

Also wld like to see Bus Shelters put up on Univ, so we don't get wet.  
If you prefer to write your comments about the fare change, please do.

- ① Buses Run from Brookdale - N. town so you don't have to go  
bk downtown + to get a #10 + then bk out the way you came when you're  
only 7 mis. from Brook +
- ② Better Bus Serv. that'll run later than 11: PM out in subbs. So you  
don't have to wlk 3-4 mis. home from the Bus because it doesn't go out  
after a certain time.
- ③ Better ~~Transp~~ <sup>Transportation</sup>, Buses are always never on time, I can wlk  
it + the bus is either late or doesn't show at all, I can beat the Buses most of  
the time.
- ④ We get some Lousy driver's + mean one's, they (some do alot of flirting with  
young ones, also alot are going faster than spd limit is.

Name John Jacobson

City Fridley

# COMMENTS WELCOME

If you prefer to write your comments about the fare change, please do.

- 1) I ~~at~~ think we more than pay for fares (going by 1992  
Rea: Route Funding chart provided at RTIS mtg). We pay  
→ ~~101.5~~ ~~104.76~~ !! And you want to increase the fares?  
2) It's agreed that we need better transportation,  
raising the fares isn't one of them. Increased fares  
means people might not choose to ride the bus - meaning more  
cars to add to the rush hrs + add monoxide to the air.

There's just too much to lose!  
Name Nancy Mergold

City Mpls

Pretty soon it'll be cheaper to pay for parking  
than taking the bus.

Bruce Smith

2316 Madison St. NE

MPLS

- foul language on the bus  
sometimes is like noise  
pollution and it gets loud  
on the bus and loud irritating singing
- other than that great service

# COMMENTS WELCOME

If you prefer to write your comments about the fare change, please do.

1. When considering a fare increase look to the  
city (mpls + St Paul). If mpls residents get taxed  
to pay for the Target Center that tax would be  
better spent on transportation.
2. Lower the fare, get more people to ride  
there for increasing revenue.
3. Cut the 94B's run from ever 5 min to every 15 min.

Name

marcie O'neal

City

Minneapolis

# COMMENTS WELCOME

If you prefer to write your comments about the fare change, please do.

I will be writing letters  
to the MTC

Name

Janice Dietz

City

Mpls 3

9/21 - Brookdale Mtg

### Sign Up to Testify

(please PRINT your name, address and phone number)

Sheila Miller, daytime 540-7242  
Audrey Oye 330 Oak Grove St Mpls, MN 55403

Blank lined area for additional sign-ups, consisting of 10 horizontal lines.

TO: ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE  
REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD  
MEARS PARK CENTER, 232 E. FIFTH ST.  
SAINT PAUL, MN 55101



COMMENTS ON 'REGULAR ROUTE PREFERRED FARE OPTION' PROPOSALS

Corbin S. Kidder  
442 Summit Avenue, #2  
Saint Paul, MN 55102-2268  
612/227-5171

21 SEP 1992

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the 1993 Fare Option Proposals.

My brief recommendations follow - an extended discussion of each is included:

I concur with the MTC's recommendation that no fare increase be imposed on January 1, 1993, and that the Minnesota Legislature consider available funding sources before any fare adjustments are imposed. This deferment should occasion no more than a three-month delay in fare adjustments if needed. On the other hand, imposition of new fares, even if they are soon accompanied by drastic reductions in ridership may occasion a feeling on the part of legislators that funding needs can be met from farebox returns under the new fares and that a dependable and stable source for transit funding is unneeded. I see no evidence that this is the case.

Assuming, however, that the proposed fare hikes are considered by the RTB, my recommendations are as follows:

The base fare increase to \$1.00 should be adopted.

The present peak fare increment of \$.25 should be retained.

The zone fare of \$.25 should be retained.

The express fare increment of \$.25 should be retained - but not increased.

The present social (elderly, youth and mobility impaired) fare of \$.25 should be retained, except that a .25 zone charge should now apply off-peak.

Convenience fares should be rationalized to \$.75 per dollar of cash fare equivalent.

The elimination of downtown zone fares at the \$.25 rate during peak periods is conditionally endorsed; the downtown zones should be served by circulator services in both cities, however, eliminating the need for downtown zones on line-haul routes.

Principles governing fare planning should include:

Progressive pricing (i.e. distance-based fares, peak period increments, no transfer charges, express increment to apply to peak period express service only).

MTC budget assumptions (except as related to high-subsidy services) should be accepted. The I-394 services are a direct tie-in to MN DOT construction activities, and operating costs of these services are properly a highway-related MN DOT cost item.

Legislative support should be sought for a return to 'true' social fares, to the extent that these fares are lower than those permitted under FTA guidelines. Transit service is fully as important as housing to disadvantaged classes, but should be similarly funded from human services and community development sources, rather than as a transit operating cost.

Tokens (at the proposed reduced rate) should be made more widely available through social service agencies at cost, and should be packaged in quantities of three or less. A greatly expanded distribution network should be sought for all convenience fare items.

RTB staff is to be commended for the time and effort spent in developing these proposals.

The proposed base fare increase will be required if adequate State funding is not promptly enacted, and is compatible with previous projections of revenue needs. We would hope that this increase can be deferred, but if it cannot, the amount of the increase restores previous fare simplification goals and is in lines with price trends in other services..

With somewhat less certainty, I support elimination of the downtown zone fare during peak hours. The arguments adduced by RTB staff have merit, but the major argument for this change is that downtown zone fares are simply unenforceable under the standing load or crush load conditions often encountered. It is unrealistic to expect drivers to be able to identify downtown zone passengers under these conditions, and (except on peak direction expresses) impossible for them to prevent the exit outside the downtown area of persons who have paid only the downtown fare.

The peak fare differential, a significant progressive element of the fare structure, is slated for retention. While peak services are often slower and more crowded than off-peak services, these conditions can be corrected by changes in service frequency, and by the use of articulated buses; peak service costs more to provide and is patronized primarily by employed riders. This differential should be retained, as recommended by staff.

### Other recommendations merit rejection:

While school-age children are riding more, possibly because of changes in school bus service or to the Mall of America, ridership by senior citizens has remained low. A doubling of these fares is uncalled for based on cost of service and on time since the last fare increase. It does not reflect ability to pay. The only justification for such an increase would be the fact that it is permissible under the new \$1.00 base fare in accordance with Federal Transit Agency guidelines. Ridership losses which will result appear to be vastly underestimated by the RTB. It should not be implemented. If enacted, it seems likely to encourage greater micromanagement of transit by the Legislature; an undesirable effect.

Peak period, peak direction express service (inbound in the morning, outbound at night from the central cities) is, as RTB staff suggests, a premium service deserving a premium fare, but only as a single \$.25 increment. It provides a low-cost alternative to a second car for suburban office employees working downtown, usually at a cost which is but a fraction of the direct cost of driving.

The few off-peak express services presently available are, on the other hand, vital links in an overly extended transit service area, and should become the modal type of service (without premium pricing) for routes carrying through passengers 3 1/2 miles or more. This is implied in the Vision for Transit; we should not penalize off-peak users of this low-cost, more efficient express service within the central cities and first-ring suburbs.

By contrast, distance-based fares (although used by only a small percentage of riders) have an inherent justification. The MTC's service area, with that of the private providers, has maximum dimensions greater than that of first-zone service in New York City, and nearly as great as the maximum trip length on the Chicago Transit Authority, both of which have higher fares and far greater ridership.

To eliminate any customer confusion about second zone limits, they should be coterminous with the I-694/I-494 ring. This would bring the "Dales" within the first zone and once again restore meaning to the MUSA (Metropolitan Urban Service Area) concept.

Transit operators and regulatory agencies tend to base fare levels on a purely economic model which which considers only the cost of providing service, present demand level, and degree of risk. A more appropriate pricing model would consider other factors, even though some are less quantifiable. These include social equity; land/use and development; environmental impact; automobile congestion; geographic boundaries; and the availability of government funding for transit. We would like to hope that the pricing structure finally adopted at the time of the next Twin Cities

area fare increase gives as much weight to these factors as to the economic considerations.

Riders want from their transit provider the 'four C's': Coverage (area and hours of service); Confidence; Connectivity; and Communication. Fare structure has little effect on connections. Fare levels could, however, affect coverage of transit service and riders' confidence in having it available at an affordable price. And unless the fare structure adopted is adequately communicated to both the legislature and to the riding public, the effect on transit ridership could be disastrous.

With the many questions that have arisen during 1992 about other transit related issues (downtown bus service coverage, dedicated funding, politicization of transit management, potential service reductions, safety concerns) it is essential that a simple, equitable and understandable fare structure be adopted and continued. It is to this end that these suggestions are submitted. I will be available to discuss them with RTB and/or MTB staff or officers at any time.

To: Members of the Regional Transit Board.  
From: The persons signing below.

We are opposed to the proposed 25% increase in off-peak bus fare for seniors, youth and those with limited mobility; as this 100% increase will create a hardship for many who have very limited income and for whom buses are a necessity, not an option.

We also oppose elimination of the "downtown zone" during peak hours as this will increase automobile traffic into downtown and increase pollution of the air we, as downtown residents, must breathe.

page 1  
Exchange

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>
Phoebe McNeill	10 W. Exchange #1100
Nancy Dene	10 West Exchange # 301
Lillian Linton	10 West Exchange 401
Dorothy Pappas	10 West Exchange # 1107
David Bailey	10 " " 708
Juan Connolly	10 W Exchange # 1407
Mary Hoffmiller	10 W Exchange 402
Clara Hill	10 W Exchange apt 1004
Mary Thiede (see)	" " # 300
Ella Storch	" " 707
Debra Kay Patrick	10 West 704
Frank R. Moore	10 West 300

Bus

petition  
Name

Page 2

Exchange

Address

Name Ryan  
Mary Thibodeau - #306-10W Exchange St  
Clara Jents  
Maureen Mikelson  
Domitila Anaya 10 W. Exchange # 511  
Jan L Ditt 10 W Exchange Apt 4070  
Eleanor Eschner 10 W. Exchange Apt. 611  
Dorothy Sarn 10W Exchange Apt 311  
M Beckman - being paid 34 on Webster  
Bernice Anderson 10 W. Exchange # 908  
Muriel Wypson - 10 W. Exchange # 904  
Joy M Pujol - employed @ 10 W. Exchange # 402  
Mary Harbaway 10 W. Exchange # 200  
Al Quilinderino 10 West Exchange # 911  
Dina B. Quilinderino 1 1 1 # 911  
Karee Libu PHA, 10 W. Exchange  
Bernard & Arlene Heikle 10 W. Exchange # 1311  
Luille M. Lundgren 545 no. West St. # 210  
Bernice Schimschok 811 Corner Ave # 7  
Florence Schmitt 1101 Hester Ave  
Betty Kofoid 148 Forbes Ave  
Goldie Nalmshtam, 10 W. Exchange, Apt. 1112  
Janice Holbrook 10 W. Exchange St. # 1402  
Mala Sidi 10 W. Exchange # 710  
Marion Diell 10 W. Exchange  
Cathy Ajimian 10 W. Exchange # 1500  
Zoune Douglas 10 W. Exchange  
DEBRA KAYPATRICK 10 West. Exchange Apt 70

Petition - page 3 Exchange

Sign if you oppose raising the 25¢ fare for seniors, disabled and youth to 50¢ and the elimination of the downtown zone during peak hours:

NAME

ADDRESS

@ Albert H. Lake

10 W Exchange St apt 508

Annette Ogle 10 W Exchange 1604

Peter Savlin (Jake)

10 W. Exchange St. #1011

Jim Teller 10 W.

St. Paul 55102

O. Roger Allen 20 E Exchange 55101

MN.

To: Members of the Regional Transit Board.

From: The persons signing below.

We are opposed to the proposed 25¢ increase in off-peak bus fare for seniors, youth and those with limited mobility; as this 100% increase will create a hardship for many who have very limited income and for whom buses are a necessity, not an option.

Page 1  
Wabasha

We also oppose elimination of the "downtown zone" during peak hours as this will increase automobile traffic into downtown and increase pollution of the air we, as downtown residents, must breathe.

Name

Address

Mary Ann McKinnon

545 Wabasha N.

Earlene Johnson

545 N. WABASHA

Tony Larson

545 N. Wabasha 506

Shelly Thompson

11 11

Helene Simon

11

Everna Hull

545 N Wabasha apt 406

Nancy Reel

Bernie Schimshack 811 Com Ave. #7

Lucille M. Lundgren 545 N. Wabasha #210

Bob McLeod 148 Forbes St. O'Fallon

NAME

ADDRESS

Wendell Paer

Tom Wahn

Lee Olson

Erica Russell

Elvena Hull

Diana Reese

Luville M. Lundgren 545 no. Wabasha # 210

Bernie Schumacher 811 Como ave. #7

Betty Kofoid 148 Forbes

Esther Johnson

Loretta B.

545 Wabasha St

545 N. WABASHA

545 N Wabasha apt 406

## R.T.B. - Fare change suggestions

Discounts on prepaid fares should be eliminated. This policy is unfair to many who can't afford the purchase and also to the riders, who do not understand money. We have a number of riders that pay a full cash fare, each day, because they don't understand money.

Cash or card fares could be;  
\$.75 base, add \$.25 for rush hours and express rides. Have 3 zones, which add \$.25 each, instead of two zones. Rides to the far suburbs are far too cheap. Maybe reinstate the suburban zone fare, as the elimination of this, cost ridership.

Keep the downtown zone as is and create an additional extended zone for an extra \$.25. This zone in mpls could be from Groveland + Henn to Central and Henn. For example. Charge an extra \$.25 for this. No transfers and it could be

For A.M. rush hour service only.  
An extra enticement to get people on the bus in the A.M. When in a hurry to get to work, these people may in turn ride the bus after work for the regular fare and find it a good way to commute. I've heard Seattle has a fare system that includes a \$.50 zone to downtown all day, the buses are full.

Metro Mobility should have their eligibility requirements tightened. A neighbor of mine, who is blind, tells me a woman, with a drivers license, rides with him regularly, because its cheaper than driving downtown + parking. Many ex main line riders have been lost because of loose requirements for M.M. Certification.

New signs should be placed along the Nic. Mall and at the Mall of America, with the bus fare on them.

Signs

80 EXPRESS SERVICE TO or FROM  
MALL of America \$1.35 add \$.25  
between 6:00/9:00 A.M. and 3:30/6:30 P.M.  
Coins only for bus fare

Passengers, from out of town, do not know what to pay, from reading the fare schedule's, as posted and many are trying to use paper money.

Changing the bus fares, as noted in the beginning, would be very newsworthy. It could bring enough new passengers, to offset any fare increase.

Hopefully, these suggestion's, will be considered.

Ken Small  
Driver 624, Heywood

Ms Sheila M. Miller  
3535 Irving Ave No  
Mpls., MN 55412

cc Board  
GLA  
UH  
HB

Regional Transit Board  
230 East 5th street  
St. Paul, MN 55101

September 17, 1992

Attn: Ms. Mary Fitzgerald, Secretary

I strongly oppose any transit fare increase in the near future, and especially the proposal outlined in the St. Paul Pioneer Press, September 16, 1992.

Just as the fare increase of March, 1991, this proposal has the greatest negative impact on those riders who use the MTC system strictly within the St. Paul and Minneapolis proper. The working poor, those subsisting on limited incomes, and riders with no other options will be most effected.

The plot to reduce fares yet again for those who travel farthest is ludicrous. Common sense dictates that the farther you travel, the greater the cost. Airlines price tickets based on distance traveled, as do trains, over-the-road buses, and taxi-cabs. The private vehicle costs more to operate the further one drives. Transit users can understand and accept costs based on distance.

The 'complicated' zone system was simplified with the 1991 fare restructuring. The cumbersome four tier zones, with varying charges, was reduced to zone 1 and zone 2, costing an additional 25¢. Confused? In 1977, a 10¢ charge for travel between our two cities was eliminated. Reinstating an intercity charge, and increasing it to 25¢ by raising the express fare to 50¢ while at the same time eliminating the zone charge for suburban express riders is voodoo math. Many of our riders who travel between St. Paul and Minneapolis are state employees. Consider them.

Additionally, this fareincrease places an unfair burden on the front-line transit providers: the bus driver. The driver is expected to explain and collect the increased fare, and also blamed for the necessity to increase fares, due to an anticipated pay raise currently being negotiated/arbitrated.

Drivers wages have risen slowly but steadily for the past two decades, while bus fare remained the same throughout most of the same period. Operating expenses and bus fare have only been linked in recent years. In fact, bus fare has been reduced twice in the past 15 years, costs of providing service has not!

Your MTC bus drivers are highly trained professionals providing a public service in an increasingly stressful, hostile, violent arena. Give the riding public and the transit providers a break.

DON'T RAISE BUS FARES!

Sincerely,



Sheila M. Miller, Driver #112

cc: Gov. Arne Carlson

Regional Transit Board  
Mears Park Center  
230-East 5th Street  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Sept. 1, 1992

To The Members of the RTB:

In light of recent newspaper articles revealing funding problems and possible fare increases, please accept my letter and I will add my two cents.

I am a 20 year veteran MTC Driver. I work at the Shingle Creek Garage in Brooklyn Center. A large number of the Creek's senior drivers have banded together and wish it be known by the RTB that we may have some positive suggestions to help the transit company out of its doldrums and perhaps increase ridership. To begin with:

**The base fare is too high.** To increase the fare will guarantee loss of riders. If a merchant has a product that doesn't sell, he wisely lowers the price to attract more buyers. The bus company sells transportation to everywhere, why not make it more affordable to the riders? The MTC has too much competition from cheap parking downtown. Why not make the fare at a competitive level to attract driving public away from the loop parking lots?

**The base fare could be 50¢ or 75¢.** This will be for a one way trip from any terminal. Eliminate the suburban fare zone charges, sometimes these are too hard to collect in cash & the drivers will forgo any argument with the passenger. Most passengers will take the bus to one destination in the morning and return back in the afternoon, with no transfers. Think of it, for a round trip fare of \$1.00 or \$1.50 more people may leave their autos and pools for the bus. It would be cheaper than parking downtown. The cheapest parking lot downtown is \$3.00.

**Eliminate the transfers or allow only ONE transfer per ride.** This is probably the single worst waste of transit money. From my experience I have found more than half of the transfers are invalid. Rather than argue and fall behind schedule, I will accept the transfer or give a new one if requested. I will have given a free ride away. How many driver does the MTC have? 2100? 2500? How many don't argue about misused transfers and give away a free ride? If transfers are to be used, make them good **only for one extra ride.** Don't charge for transfers like other cities. That will only lead to other problems.

**Eliminate the Student fare(25¢) & the Student I.D. Card.** This policy is a total joke. Students under 18 and over 12 are suppose to show a student I.D. card and pay 25¢ **during off peak** hours. Yeah, right! The students will abuse this policy and ride **all day long** for 25¢. More violence against drivers have resulted in trying to collect more fare from the students. Want to ride with me at night and pick up 15-20 kids at Nicollet or Hennepin and only see 1 or 2 cards and only a handful pay 25¢? More and more drivers are finding it easier to let them ride and give them whatever they want. Listen, most of those students have more money in their pocket than I carry on the bus. Besides we think it would be easier to get two quarters (50¢ fare) than see a student I.D.

**Maintain and extend the discount for Seniors.** Not only would this be a hit with all of the Seniors, but it would be good for public relations. These Senior are the most honest and easygoing people we deal with. By extending the 25¢ fare for Seniors...**all day long**, more will make use of the busses. **This same policy can extend to all physically disabled passengers.** The MTC can use a boost of P.R. to the handicapped community. Make it more cheaper for them to get around.

**Charge 25¢ for hand-schedules.** When we hand out schedules, most people do take them and make use of them. But sometimes we find them stuffed along side the seats or tossed away on the floor. A waste of paper sometimes. So why not try to eliminate the cost of supplying schedules? 25¢ for a pocket schedule is cheap.

These are the most important points of a better fare structure. We drivers are in the front lines and we deal with the problems and situations every day. We see things that never gets reported back to management or to you. So many drivers are finding the current fare structure a hassle and would rather let some people ride for free and avoid the hassles.

I will try to gather up some drivers and attend the Brooklyn Center RTB Meeting scheduled for Sept. 21st. At that meeting I will try to elaborate more on these and other suggestions. We do know that at other times ideas are presented or suggestions made to our superiors, we get the usual ..."we'll pass it on and we'll get back to you" and it usually takes too long or we never hear from anybody.

The last page is a summation of what we proposed. I have taken enough of your time. If there is any questions or comments please contact me at your convenience. Perhaps you may wish to stop by the Shingle Creek Garage and visit for a short time with **just** the driver's. We'd like that. Thank you so very much for taking time with my two cents.

Very Sincerely Yours;

*Bill Larson*  
Bill Larson, Driver #1540  
Shingle Creek Garage  
Driver's Phones: 561-9801/560-9979  
Garage Phones: 349-7385/7386/7394/7395

**A Base fare of 50¢ or 75¢.** With no transfers. One round trip for a bus rider would be \$1.00 or \$1.50. Everytime anyone wanted a bus, just pay the proper base fare. Cheaper than driving to downtown and parking. A \$1.00 or \$1.50 from Wayzata or Apple Valley or Anoka? What a deal!!! This will definately increase ridership!

**Eliminate transfers or limit transfers to one extra ride only.** This will eliminate problems with expired and invalid transfers. No more free rides. If transfers are going to be used, limited them to **one time only**. Eliminate the time requirement and directional requirement on the transfer. Again, this will stop the freebies from riding.

**Eliminate the Student card & 25¢ ride.** This will increase revenue from a growing ridership. Two quarters are easier to get than an I.D. card. Even though we do have some near poverty kids riding, we think we can still get 50¢ out of them.

**Maintain & extend the Seniors discount.** This will boost P.R. with another growing segment of the MTC. And their ridership will increase to the downtown area (Shoppers!) if they can ride for 25¢ all day long.

**Charge for Pocket Schedules.** Why not? This will help defray the cost of paper or printing. With a base fare of 50¢ and 25¢ for a schedule, it's still cheaper than a parking lot downtown.

SEPT 21, 1992

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD  
230 E 6TH ST  
ST PAUL MN 55101

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

THIS IS IN REGARD TO THE BUS  
FARE INCREASE.

I RIDE THE BUSES USING A MONTHLY  
PASS FOR THE PURPOSE OF SAVING  
MONEY.

BEFORE THE DECISION TO RAISE BUS  
FARES IS FINALIZED, PLEASE CONSIDER  
THE FOLLOWING:

- 1) ELIMINATE UNPROFITABLE ROUTES
- 2) LAYOFF THOSE DRIVERS WITH  
LEAST SENIORITY.

IT ALSO SHOULD BE UNDERSTOOD  
THAT MOST COMMUTING TRIPS ARE  
MADE BETWEEN TWO POINTS EN-  
TIRELY IN THE SUBURBS AND THAT  
MOST PEOPLE DRIVE THEIR CAR.  
IF MTC HAS TO BE PROFITABLE,  
THEY SHOULD CONCENTRATE, OR COM-  
TINUE TO CONCENTRATE, ON SERVING  
AREAS WITH THE GREATEST NO.

OF POTENTIAL USERS - CENTRAL CITY RESIDENTS, MTC SHOULD DISCONTINUE PERSUADING THE MORE AFFLUENT TO GET OUT OF THEIR CARS AND USE THE BUS. SINCE RIDERSHIP HAS DECLINED SINCE 1980, THIS MARKETING TECHNIQUE HAS PROVEN INEFFECTIVE,

IF THESE ARE CONSIDERED FIRST THEN A FARE INCREASE COULD BE DEFERRED FOR A WHILE

SINCERLEY,  
Joe Wirth

P.S.: IF YOU USE THIS LETTER AT A PUBLIC HEARING, PLEASE DO NOT USE ~~OF~~ MY NAME.

September 24, 1992



Regional Transit Board  
Mears Park Centre  
230 East Fifth Street  
St. Paul, MN 55101

MTC  
ATTN: Mike Christiansen  
560 6th Ave. N.  
Minneapolis, MN 55411

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

We are opposed to the increase in bus fares for the following reasons:

1. Increase in bus fares will not benefit the lower or middle class, your consumers. The upper class will not be affected, since they do not take the bus. The middle and lower classes, already negatively affected by the decline in the economy, will further be negatively affected in an increase in bus fare.

2. Increasing the bus fares will decrease ridership. Support in this lies in the theory that it is possible to obtain parking ramp rates for between \$1 to \$4 per day. In many cases, it will be cheaper to park than to ride the bus! As a result of the increase in regular fares, many more of my co-workers will choose to drive to work and park downtown rather than ride the bus.

2. Decreased ridership will cause increase traffic congestion and air pollution.

3. Increasing the quarter zone to a regular minimum fare level will negatively impact students, single mothers and the elderly. All of whom are on a limited budget as well.

September 28, 1992  
Page 2

3. Decreased ridership will lower profits for the MTC.

Therefore, it benefits no one to increase the the bus fare.

It would be better to find other alternative methods for increasing ridership such as sponsorship through various companies to promote ridership among professionals.

Many professionals who work in the suburbs are reluctant to take the bus because of possible emergency at home during off-peak hours. Perhaps an on-line emergency shuttle service could be combined with the MTC to provide access home to these individuals if such an emergency arose.

One last consideration which should be addressed is that the MTC should implement a cooperative response team to handle customer complaints. Quite frequently, riders have problems i.e., late busses, buses that don't arrive on time, etc. It would ease the aggravation caused by these occurrences if riders were provided with some type of system to address problems and see that MTC is correcting the problems.

Yours very truly,

Dam J. Green  
37 Crestwood Rd Rt 3  
Osseo Mn 55369

Thonda Burling  
913 Crown Court  
Mendota Hts MN 55118

Dwyan Cusi  
1811-13th Ave. So.  
Mpls MN 55404

Sharon Th. Heather  
11824 Vintage St. N 36  
Minneapolis, MN 55433

Susan Portogue  
3931 158th Ave NW  
Andover MN 55304

0071k

M. Owens  
5960 Hodgson Rd.  
Shoreview, Minn 55126



Q. T. B.  
Regional Transit Board  
230 East 5<sup>th</sup> St. Mears Park Centre  
St. Paul, Minn 55101

Metro Med

Dear Sir

In your letter I received about Metro Mobility, I think it is the best program ever. I enjoy taking the metro yellow cab when I go to the Doctor and for various reasons. the Drivers are all so kind and helpful.

I would pay from 50cents to a dollar more if need be as that is my only transportation to get anywhere.

I do hope the program will continue for years to come I am 81 years old and I depend on Metro Mobility. Please let me know if or when there is any changes.

Thank you for a wonderful Program.

Mildred Owens

5960. Hodgson Rd.

Shoreview Mn. 55126

Metro Mobility Number - 35-0946

RECEIVED  
SEP 29 1992

PTP



8421 Wayzata Blvd.  
Golden Valley, MN 55426  
Phone (612) 544-0315  
Fax (612) 544-9406

Regional Transit Board  
Mears Park Centre  
230 East 5th Street  
St. Paul, MN 55101

To Whom It May Concern:

The Client Advisory Board of Becklund Home Health Care is comprised of clients and health care professionals. The Board represents over 500 hundred individuals with disabilities. The Board is concerned with raising the level of awareness and increasing the quality of care for any individual receiving home care.

We, the Client Advisory Board of Becklund Home Health Care, would like to go on record for supporting both the proposed \$1.70 fare, which is designed to eliminate increased fares for zone crossing, and the \$2.20 fare proposed for peak hours. These fares will benefit more people by increasing accessibility.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Jeff Bangsberg", written in dark ink.

Jeff Bangsberg, Chairman  
Client Advisory Board  
Becklund Home Health Care



An Advocacy Organization  
For People With Disabilities

## United Handicapped Federation

1821 University Ave. W.  
Suite 284 S.  
St. Paul, MN 55104  
612/645-8922 (V/TDD)  
612/649-3073 FAX

TO: Michael Ehrlichmann, RTB Chair, RTB Board Members,  
TAAC Members

FROM: Roger Blohm, Chair, United Handicapped Federation  
Transit Committee

DATE: 9-22-92

RE: Metro Mobility Fare Increase

Information regarding the consideration of MTC and Metro Mobility rate increases was discussed at the September 14th meeting of the UHF Transit Committee.

A motion was made and passed unanimously by the Committee that a fare raise on Metro Mobility rides is not acceptable. The present fares have caused a great deal of hardship on Metro Mobility riders. Remember, many users are at the "low end" of the income scale.

UHF has a standing position of opposition to any fare increase for public transportation at this time.



**Minnesota Senior Federation**  
METROPOLITAN REGION

Iris Park Place  
1885 University Ave. W., Suite 190  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55104  
PH: (612) 645-0261  
FX: (612) 641-8969

WHEREAS: Senior ridership overall is declining due to factors such as fear and intimidation on buses and proposed increases will only provide greater disincentives to ride the bus; and

WHEREAS: Doubling senior and disabled fares opens up the possibility of increasing Metro Mobility fares which many users have difficulty currently affording; and

WHEREAS: Accessible bus ridership has increased which saves approximately \$8.00 - \$9.00 over Metro Mobility rates and regular fare increases would provide a disincentive to ride regular routes; and

WHEREAS: We understand that the MTC did not request fare increases of this type and these increases will provide an overall negative impact on bus ridership; and

WHEREAS: Overall bus ridership has been increasing and this proposed increase in fares would have an adverse effect on this trend,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: The Minnesota Senior Federation opposes the proposed fare increases at this time.

*Bernie Skrebes*  
Bernie Skrebes, Chair  
Transportation Committee

*T & Jerry Hayes*  
Jerry Hayes, Vice Chair  
Transportation Committee

“Action for a Bright Future”

899 So Cleveland - 608  
St Paul, Mn 55116

Regional Transit Board  
Mears Park Centre  
230 E. 5th St  
St Paul, Mn 55101

Dear Sir,

I have your latest brochure  
Sept 4th in front of me.

I am handicapped and walk with two  
canes; so I do worry about Metro Mobility.  
I use Metro Mobility, only for business  
purposes. To the bank and for medical  
appts.

I would be willing to pay an extra  
one or two dollars for card renewal  
each year. For each ride I would be  
willing to pay <sup>#</sup>2.50.

This is my opinion to add a  
little more in your fund.

Yours Truly,  
Beatrice Kenter

Card # 33-5843

RECEIVED

SEP 28 1992

R.T.B.

R

B. Kenter  
899 S. Cleveland 3608  
Saint Paul, MN 55116

29  
USA

Wood Duck



REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD  
MEARS PARK CENTRE  
230 E 5TH ST  
ST PAUL MN 55101

JOHN T. LEACH  
33-6TH AVE. No. #208  
Hopkins, MN.  
55343

PK#  
1-612-938-1850

Tuesday September 22, 1992

Dear Regional Transit Board,

I am a Disabled American  
and I use the Transit quite  
frequent My money is very  
limited what I have found  
that is that during the off  
Peak Hours - is that my  
imbursement of Life is increased  
By the rate of 25¢ that  
I have been able pay towards  
the Ride Saving from  
this fare really does help  
me. I am going to ask you to  
please Not Raise the  
fare 100%

Really Penny's Nickle's

A Dime is Peanuts to some  
But is what I Budget from

I am again am asking you to  
Not Raise the Ride  
John T Leach

R.I.B.  
SEP 2 1992  
RECEIVED

John T. Smith  
33:6 TH AV. NO 1208  
Hopkins, MN.

55343



Howard

Regional Transit Board  
Mears Park Center  
230 E. 5TH  
ST Paul, MN

55101

Healy 9/22/92

Jan Dietrick

If you eliminate the quarter zone you will lose a sizeable number of riders. I work in downtown in the old courthouse. Many people I work with park a ways out and take the bus in for a quarter. I pay \$30 a week for parking and \$2.50 a week for the bus. If total transportation costs for bus gets up there and the gap closes between what I pay now and what I'm saving, I would pay the difference to park closer and have the convenience.

In terms of public policy, the quarter zone keeps heavy traffic out of downtown. If it went to \$1.25 each way those traffic patterns would change dramatically.

Seems backward to raise quarter zone to \$1.25 when you are trying to get people to bus into downtown.

Ken Small (add to written comments he submitted)

Suggestion for the Youth Fares for ages 14 - 17. Those fares should be 25 cents more than for the kids 13 and under. That's where most of the fare abuse is, so at least we can get some money out of the kids who cheat all the time.

# COMMENTS WELCOME

If you prefer to write your comments about the fare change, please do.

Everytime MTC raises fares, it seems that ridership

drops off. I was in San Antonio recently, and city bus

fare was 40¢; the downtown bus was 10¢. They had new

buses, excellent service, and a driver told me the fares

were subsidized by taxes. Why can't we do something

like that here? Riding the bus is environmentally a

better choice.

Name

*Reino Fries*

City

*Minneapolis*

# COMMENTS WELCOME

If you prefer to write your comments about the fare change, please do.

- ~~for what we pay now~~
- ① We get Lousy Bus Service to begin with. ② Buses are rarely on time, they're either early or late or they no show. ③ We always end up having to stand all the way downtown & it's gets hot, hot & driver's won't turn the heat down. ④ Wld like buses to run later to 53rd + Univ, than what they do now. It's dark out + you have to walk 3 mi's home. ⑤ have some type of Policeman on Bus especially at Jites & Wlinds, because of all the trouble + rowdiness by alot of kids + teens.
  - ⑥ Put Bus Shelters on Univ, Not just on the Side Rds, We get splashed by cars + BUSES TOO, We don't need to get any wetter than we are having to stand out in the rain without a Bus Shelter, if snow (wet) comes hit with especially by alot of Buses wholl do it on purpose.
  - ⑦ We get alot of Crabby Bus Driver's, you ask them about where do you get a # 2 Bus & they dont know, There's alot of flirting with some of the younger girls on the #10 + #25 + sometimes the 24. ⑧ They (driver's) tell us no eating or drinking on Buses, yet they're doing it all the time, even smoking if they're sitting & waiting before time to leave, It says right on Bus NO SMOKING, NO FOOD or DRINK

Name

J. Jacobson

City

Lindley

9/30/92

Kunarda Rajtar

Are you nuts. Service is lousy and you want to raise rates are you nuts.

And you want more ridership - please.

I want you people who are making the decisions to get on the buses to ride and see what is happening before they raise any rates. The way it is now they don't serve the public and I can't see how they are serving the public.

Get away from your PCs and get among people before you make any decisions.

I want the whole board to hear this.

RECEIVED  
SEP 22 1992

R.T.B.