



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 NOTICE

**REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD and
METROPOLITAN TRANSIT COMMISSION**

**Metropolitan Waste Control Commission
Metro 94 Facility*
455 Etna, Suite 32
St. Paul, Minnesota**

**Friday, December 18, 1992
1:00 to 4:00 p.m.**

The members of the Regional Transit Board and Metropolitan Transit Commission will meet for the purpose of continuing their discussion of the roles and responsibilities of the respective agencies.

No action will be taken.

Michael J. Ehrlichmann
Chair

mff
12/11/92

12/16/92

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD
ROLL CALL AND ATTENDANCE SHEET

DATE: _____

Member Name Present Vote Vote Vote Vote Vote Vote Vote Vote

ISSUE

Mike Ehrlichmann

Maryann Campo

Doris Caranicas

Sharon Feess

Ruth Franklin

Val M. Higgins

Sandra Hilary

Ruby Hunt

Tom Sather

Don Scheel

Tom Workman

Visitors

Staff

ae

gh, sh, rf, sm

MTC - CD

tu me

Em

AH

TP

mff



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

MEETING NOTICE

**REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD and
METROPOLITAN TRANSIT COMMISSION**

**Metropolitan Waste Control Commission
Metro 94 Facility*
455 Etna, Suite 32
St. Paul, Minnesota**

**Friday, December 18, 1992
1:00 to 4:00 p.m.**

The members of the Regional Transit Board and Metropolitan Transit Commission will meet for the purpose of continuing their discussion of the roles and responsibilities of the respective agencies.

No action will be taken.

Michael J. Ehrlichmann
Chair

mff
12/11/92

MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 10, 1992

TO: Members of the Regional Transit Board and the Metropolitan Transit Commission

FROM: Andrews, Auld, Hollander, Johnson

SUBJECT: Proposed Process for Discussion and Resolution of Outstanding Organizational Issues between the RTB and MTC

In an effort to better understand and resolve some of the outstanding issues between our two agencies, we, offer for your consideration a process to identify and resolve our differences. This memorandum is a preliminary effort toward accomplishing that. We look forward to the opportunity to jointly present this memorandum to you at Wednesday night's meeting and hope that you will find it helpful in your discussions.

PROCESS

We have briefly discussed the process for carrying out this effort.

1. Make a commitment to resolve differences in order to create a more productive working environment and to ensure that transit funding is the topic that gets the focus during the upcoming legislative session.
2. Identify issues including "gray" areas of roles and responsibilities, activities where there have been disappointed expectations, and areas where we understand roles and responsibilities but feel that there may be a "better way."
3. Prioritize issues in recognition that we are not able to deal with everything at once.
4. Work closely with members of our respective boards both in agency work sessions, but also jointly. Report back regularly and bring key items for approval.
5. Set up regular meetings of senior staff and other knowledgeable and affected staff members.
6. Establish timetable and maintain it to the best of our ability.

PRELIMINARY IDENTIFICATION OF ISSUES

We have made a preliminary effort to identify some of the issues that regularly create conflict between the two agencies. These are not listed in any particular order of priority. Priorities are yet to be established. Input from the two boards would be helpful in establishing these priorities.

1. **Capital Planning and Implementation**

There has been some questions about respective roles and responsibilities for capital planning and implementation, e.g. decisions about size of buses to purchase, who should construct transit hubs, development of the transit facilities plan.

2. **Service Planning**

Legislation prohibits the RTB itself from conducting service planning (i.e., determination of specific routing and timing of transit services), but requires the board to contract with the MTC or others to perform this function. While the RTB has made an effort to focus on the broader function of "establishing service specifications," there have been times when our efforts may have exceeded our authority. On the other hand, the MTC has not had the resources during the past several years to conduct this work. Furthermore, it also needs to be determined if it is appropriate for the MTC to perform service planning for other providers with whom it may compete and/or who do not have an ongoing relationship with them.

3. **Service Evaluation**

Issues relating to service evaluation include the establishment of performance standards and the process for dealing with high subsidy routes. Concerns have been expressed about whether or not standards are imposed for non-MTC providers and which agency should make the recommendations regarding high-subsidy service.

4. **Financial/Budgetary Oversight**

MTC have felt that the RTB exercises inappropriate oversight over their financial matters, i.e., instead of dealing with specific operational items, the RTB should focus its attention on policy matters. RTB, on the other hand, has felt that the MTC have not always made decisions that were financially consistent with RTB policies. MTC has also raised issues about the appropriate uses of regular route transit funds.

5. **Communications**

Generally, there have not been well established lines of communications between the two agencies. Even though a number of efforts have been made (including Executive Director/Chief Administrator meetings, monthly RTB/MTC staff meetings, joint board/commission meetings), there seems to be a difference in opinion and/or expectation regarding the important items to discuss and/or obtain approvals and/or the level of detail about which to communicate.

6. **Special Services**

The MTC contracts with the RTB to provide both Metro Mobility Administrative Center and Minnesota Rideshare services. The RTB has the legislative mandate to set policy direction for these programs and the MTC has served as contractor.

Currently, there are discussions about restructuring both programs in order to maximize results and better control costs. The MTC and the RTB need to consider the future direction of these programs and the appropriate role of each agency.

7. Implementing Vision for Transit

The MTC embraces the concepts set forth in the Vision for Transit, yet urges that their specific role in carrying out the plan be established. Specifically, they have indicated an interest in building transit hubs and operating the service. The RTB is anxious to include the MTC in these efforts, but also feels that there are multiple methods for accomplishing the Vision.

8. Marketing

The MTC's marketing strategy and structure has gone through a great deal of transition in the last year. The RTB supports the MTC's efforts in marketing trial use of service. Unfortunately, marketing issues have been confused with other transit policy issues. Greater communication between the MTC, the RTB and other transit providers could result in greater marketing efficiencies. The MTC's Marketing Plan is scheduled to be presented to the RTB's Marketing Committee in December.

9. Special Events

Over the past year, there have been several occasions when the MTC and the RTB have had differences in opinion about the level of public subsidy that should be utilized for special events. When the MTC should provide special event service, how it should be paid for, and how fares are determined are some of the issues that need to be resolved and/or acknowledged. A draft policy is now being developed with input from both agencies.

10. Competitive Contracting

The RTB has promoted competitive contracting of various services in order to maximize cost-effectiveness of service delivery. In many cases, the MTC has seen this effort to promote competition as threatening the integrity of the MTC system and its long-term viability.

10. Legislative Program

Legislative initiatives will include, but are not limited to: establishing a dedicated source of transit revenues; traffic congestion management; priority fuel status for public transit providers; restriction of parking in transit loading/unloading zones to ensure access; and right-of-way for buses to enter flow of traffic.

Organizational Issues
November 10, 1992
Page 4

NEXT STEPS

Following discussion and concurrence from the RTB and MTC at Wednesday evening's meeting, staff will meet on a regular basis (every two weeks) to discuss these matters. In December, we would suggest that another joint RTB/MTC meeting be scheduled so that we can review our progress and get necessary board input.

12/18/92

TRANSIT FUNCTIONS

- PLANNING
- PROGRAMMING
- CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION
- FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT
- OPERATIONS

TRANSIT ISSUES

- SERVICE PLANNING
- SERVICE EVALUATION
- CAPITAL PLANNING
- FINANCIAL/BUDGETARY OVERSIGHT
- COMMUNICATIONS
- SPECIAL SERVICES
- MARKETING
- IMPLEMENTING VISION FOR TRANSIT
- SPECIAL EVENTS
- COMPETITIVE CONTRACTING
- LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

TRANSIT OPTIONS

A. STRENGTHEN EXISTING STRUCTURE

- FINE TUNE (WITHOUT LEGISLATION)
- MODIFY WITH LEGISLATION

B. OVERHAUL EXISTING STRUCTURE

RTB

- AGENCY OF THE COUNCIL
- MN/DOT
- HYBRID
- RTB/MTC COMBINATION

MTC

- NO BOARD
- SMALL BOARD
- SAME BOARD

STATUS OF SERVICE PLANNING ISSUES

RTB and MTC planning staff have begun discussions on the four key areas identified below:

1. Respective service planning roles and responsibilities.
2. Implementation plan for the "Vision for Transit".
3. Special Event Procedures and Policies
4. Service Evaluation Procedures.

The discussions thus far have focused on the service planning responsibilities for each agency. One those roles have been identified, the other issues (items 2-4 above) should fit into the agreed upon overall planning framework.

A timeline for completion has been identified between the RTB and MTC staff. The final recommendations will be completed prior to January 31, 1993.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 10, 1992

TO: Members of the Regional Transit Board and the Metropolitan Transit Commission

FROM: Andrews, Auld, Hollander, Johnson

SUBJECT: Proposed Process for Discussion and Resolution of Outstanding Organizational Issues between the RTB and MTC

In an effort to better understand and resolve some of the outstanding issues between our two agencies, we, offer for your consideration a process to identify and resolve our differences. This memorandum is a preliminary effort toward accomplishing that. We look forward to the opportunity to jointly present this memorandum to you at Wednesday night's meeting and hope that you will find it helpful in your discussions.

PROCESS

We have briefly discussed the process for carrying out this effort.

1. Make a commitment to resolve differences in order to create a more productive working environment and to ensure that transit funding is the topic that gets the focus during the upcoming legislative session.
2. Identify issues including "gray" areas of roles and responsibilities, activities where there have been disappointed expectations, and areas where we understand roles and responsibilities but feel that there may be a "better way."
3. Prioritize issues in recognition that we are not able to deal with everything at once.
4. Work closely with members of our respective boards both in agency work sessions, but also jointly. Report back regularly and bring key items for approval.
5. Set up regular meetings of senior staff and other knowledgeable and affected staff members.
6. Establish timetable and maintain it to the best of our ability.

PRELIMINARY IDENTIFICATION OF ISSUES

We have made a preliminary effort to identify some of the issues that regularly create conflict between the two agencies. These are not listed in any particular order of priority. Priorities are yet to be established. Input from the two boards would be helpful in establishing these priorities.

1. Capital Planning and Implementation

There has been some questions about respective roles and responsibilities for capital planning and implementation, e.g. decisions about size of buses to purchase, who should construct transit hubs, development of the transit facilities plan.

2. Service Planning

Legislation prohibits the RTB itself from conducting service planning (i.e., determination of specific routing and timing of transit services), but requires the board to contract with the MTC or others to perform this function. While the RTB has made an effort to focus on the broader function of "establishing service specifications," there have been times when our efforts may have exceeded our authority. On the other hand, the MTC has not had the resources during the past several years to conduct this work. Furthermore, it also needs to be determined if it is appropriate for the MTC to perform service planning for other providers with whom it may compete and/or who do not have an ongoing relationship with them.

3. Service Evaluation

Issues relating to service evaluation include the establishment of performance standards and the process for dealing with high subsidy routes. Concerns have been expressed about whether or not standards are imposed for non-MTC providers and which agency should make the recommendations regarding high-subsidy service.

4. Financial/Budgetary Oversight

MTC have felt that the RTB exercises inappropriate oversight over their financial matters, i.e., instead of dealing with specific operational items, the RTB should focus its attention on policy matters. RTB, on the other hand, has felt that the MTC have not always made decisions that were financially consistent with RTB policies. MTC has also raised issues about the appropriate uses of regular route transit funds.

5. Communications

Generally, there have not been well established lines of communications between the two agencies. Even though a number of efforts have been made (including Executive Director/Chief Administrator meetings, monthly RTB/MTC staff meetings, joint board/commission meetings), there seems to be a difference in opinion and/or expectation regarding the important items to discuss and/or obtain approvals and/or the level of detail about which to communicate.

6. Special Services

The MTC contracts with the RTB to provide both Metro Mobility Administrative Center and Minnesota Rideshare services. The RTB has the legislative mandate to set policy direction for these programs and the MTC has served as contractor.

Currently, there are discussions about restructuring both programs in order to maximize results and better control costs. The MTC and the RTB need to consider the future direction of these programs and the appropriate role of each agency.

7. Implementing Vision for Transit

The MTC embraces the concepts set forth in the Vision for Transit, yet urges that their specific role in carrying out the plan be established. Specifically, they have indicated an interest in building transit hubs and operating the service. The RTB is anxious to include the MTC in these efforts, but also feels that there are multiple methods for accomplishing the Vision.

8. Marketing

The MTC's marketing strategy and structure has gone through a great deal of transition in the last year. The RTB supports the MTC's efforts in marketing trial use of service. Unfortunately, marketing issues have been confused with other transit policy issues. Greater communication between the MTC, the RTB and other transit providers could result in greater marketing efficiencies. The MTC's Marketing Plan is scheduled to be presented to the RTB's Marketing Committee in December.

9. Special Events

Over the past year, there have been several occasions when the MTC and the RTB have had differences in opinion about the level of public subsidy that should be utilized for special events. When the MTC should provide special event service, how it should be paid for, and how fares are determined are some of the issues that need to be resolved and/or acknowledged. A draft policy is now being developed with input from both agencies.

10. Competitive Contracting

The RTB has promoted competitive contracting of various services in order to maximize cost-effectiveness of service delivery. In many cases, the MTC has seen this effort to promote competition as threatening the integrity of the MTC system and its long-term viability.

10. Legislative Program

Legislative initiatives will include, but are not limited to: establishing a dedicated source of transit revenues; traffic congestion management; priority fuel status for public transit providers; restriction of parking in transit loading/unloading zones to ensure access; and right-of-way for buses to enter flow of traffic.

NEXT STEPS

Following discussion and concurrence from the RTB and MTC at Wednesday evening's meeting, staff will meet on a regular basis (every two weeks) to discuss these matters. In December, we would suggest that another joint RTB/MTC meeting be scheduled so that we can review our progress and get necessary board input.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 10, 1992

TO: Members of the Regional Transit Board and the Metropolitan Transit Commission

FROM: Andrews, Auld, Hollander, Johnson

SUBJECT: Proposed Process for Discussion and Resolution of Outstanding Organizational Issues between the RTB and MTC

In an effort to better understand and resolve some of the outstanding issues between our two agencies, we, offer for your consideration a process to identify and resolve our differences. This memorandum is a preliminary effort toward accomplishing that. We look forward to the opportunity to jointly present this memorandum to you at Wednesday night's meeting and hope that you will find it helpful in your discussions.

PROCESS

We have briefly discussed the process for carrying out this effort.

1. Make a commitment to resolve differences in order to create a more productive working environment and to ensure that transit funding is the topic that gets the focus during the upcoming legislative session.
2. Identify issues including "gray" areas of roles and responsibilities, activities where there have been disappointed expectations, and areas where we understand roles and responsibilities but feel that there may be a "better way."
3. Prioritize issues in recognition that we are not able to deal with everything at once.
4. Work closely with members of our respective boards both in agency work sessions, but also jointly. Report back regularly and bring key items for approval.
5. Set up regular meetings of senior staff and other knowledgeable and affected staff members.
6. Establish timetable and maintain it to the best of our ability.

PRELIMINARY IDENTIFICATION OF ISSUES

We have made a preliminary effort to identify some of the issues that regularly create conflict between the two agencies. These are not listed in any particular order of priority. Priorities are yet to be established. Input from the two boards would be helpful in establishing these priorities.

1. Capital Planning and Implementation

There has been some questions about respective roles and responsibilities for capital planning and implementation, e.g. decisions about size of buses to purchase, who should construct transit hubs, development of the transit facilities plan.

2. Service Planning

Legislation prohibits the RTB itself from conducting service planning (i.e., determination of specific routing and timing of transit services), but requires the board to contract with the MTC or others to perform this function. While the RTB has made an effort to focus on the broader function of "establishing service specifications," there have been times when our efforts may have exceeded our authority. On the other hand, the MTC has not had the resources during the past several years to conduct this work. Furthermore, it also needs to be determined if it is appropriate for the MTC to perform service planning for other providers with whom it may compete and/or who do not have an ongoing relationship with them.

3. Service Evaluation

Issues relating to service evaluation include the establishment of performance standards and the process for dealing with high subsidy routes. Concerns have been expressed about whether or not standards are imposed for non-MTC providers and which agency should make the recommendations regarding high-subsidy service.

4. Financial/Budgetary Oversight

MTC have felt that the RTB exercises inappropriate oversight over their financial matters, i.e., instead of dealing with specific operational items, the RTB should focus its attention on policy matters. RTB, on the other hand, has felt that the MTC have not always made decisions that were financially consistent with RTB policies. MTC has also raised issues about the appropriate uses of regular route transit funds.

5. Communications

Generally, there have not been well established lines of communications between the two agencies. Even though a number of efforts have been made (including Executive Director/Chief Administrator meetings, monthly RTB/MTC staff meetings, joint board/commission meetings), there seems to be a difference in opinion and/or expectation regarding the important items to discuss and/or obtain approvals and/or the level of detail about which to communicate.

6. Special Services

The MTC contracts with the RTB to provide both Metro Mobility Administrative Center and Minnesota Rideshare services. The RTB has the legislative mandate to set policy direction for these programs and the MTC has served as contractor.

Currently, there are discussions about restructuring both programs in order to maximize results and better control costs. The MTC and the RTB need to consider the future direction of these programs and the appropriate role of each agency.

7. **Implementing Vision for Transit**

The MTC embraces the concepts set forth in the Vision for Transit, yet urges that their specific role in carrying out the plan be established. Specifically, they have indicated an interest in building transit hubs and operating the service. The RTB is anxious to include the MTC in these efforts, but also feels that there are multiple methods for accomplishing the Vision.

8. **Marketing**

The MTC's marketing strategy and structure has gone through a great deal of transition in the last year. The RTB supports the MTC's efforts in marketing the use of service. Unfortunately, marketing issues have been confused with other transit policy issues. Greater communication between the MTC, the RTB and other transit providers could result in greater marketing efficiencies. The MTC's Marketing Plan is scheduled to be presented to the RTB's Marketing Committee in December.

9. **Special Events**

Over the past year, there have been several occasions when the MTC and the RTB have had differences in opinion about the level of public subsidy that should be utilized for special events. When the MTC should provide special event service, how it should be paid for, and how fares are determined are some of the issues that need to be resolved and/or acknowledged. A draft policy is now being developed with input from both agencies.

10. **Competitive Contracting**

The RTB has promoted competitive contracting of various services in order to maximize cost-effectiveness of service delivery. In many cases, the MTC has seen this effort to promote competition as threatening the integrity of the MTC system and its long-term viability.

10. **Legislative Program**

Legislative initiatives will include, but are not limited to: establishing a dedicated source of transit revenues; traffic congestion management; priority fuel status for public transit providers; restriction of parking in transit loading/unloading zones to ensure access; and right-of-way for buses to enter flow of traffic.

NEXT STEPS

Following discussion and concurrence from the RTB and MTC at Wednesday evening's meeting, staff will meet on a regular basis (every two weeks) to discuss these matters. In December, we would suggest that another joint RTB/MTC meeting be scheduled so that we can review our progress and get necessary board input.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 10, 1992

TO: Members of the Regional Transit Board and the Metropolitan Transit Commission

FROM: Andrews, Auld, Hollander, Johnson

SUBJECT: Proposed Process for Discussion and Resolution of Outstanding Organizational Issues between the RTB and MTC

In an effort to better understand and resolve some of the outstanding issues between our two agencies, we, offer for your consideration a process to identify and resolve our differences. This memorandum is a preliminary effort toward accomplishing that. We look forward to the opportunity to jointly present this memorandum to you at Wednesday night's meeting and hope that you will find it helpful in your discussions.

PROCESS

We have briefly discussed the process for carrying out this effort.

1. Make a commitment to resolve differences in order to create a more productive working environment and to ensure that transit funding is the topic that gets the focus during the upcoming legislative session.
2. Identify issues including "gray" areas of roles and responsibilities, activities where there have been disappointed expectations, and areas where we understand roles and responsibilities but feel that there may be a "better way."
3. Prioritize issues in recognition that we are not able to deal with everything at once.
4. Work closely with members of our respective boards both in agency work sessions, but also jointly. Report back regularly and bring key items for approval.
5. Set up regular meetings of senior staff and other knowledgeable and affected staff members.
6. Establish timetable and maintain it to the best of our ability.

PRELIMINARY IDENTIFICATION OF ISSUES

We have made a preliminary effort to identify some of the issues that regularly create conflict between the two agencies. These are not listed in any particular order of priority. Priorities are yet to be established. Input from the two boards would be helpful in establishing these priorities.

1. Capital Planning and Implementation

There has been some questions about respective roles and responsibilities for capital planning and implementation, e.g. decisions about size of buses to purchase, who should construct transit hubs, development of the transit facilities plan.

2. Service Planning

Legislation prohibits the RTB itself from conducting service planning (i.e., determination of specific routing and timing of transit services), but requires the board to contract with the MTC or others to perform this function. While the RTB has made an effort to focus on the broader function of "establishing service specifications," there have been times when our efforts may have exceeded our authority. On the other hand, the MTC has not had the resources during the past several years to conduct this work. Furthermore, it also needs to be determined if it is appropriate for the MTC to perform service planning for other providers with whom it may compete and/or who do not have an ongoing relationship with them.

3. Service Evaluation

Issues relating to service evaluation include the establishment of performance standards and the process for dealing with high subsidy routes. Concerns have been expressed about whether or not standards are imposed for non-MTC providers and which agency should make the recommendations regarding high-subsidy service.

4. Financial/Budgetary Oversight

MTC have felt that the RTB exercises inappropriate oversight over their financial matters, i.e., instead of dealing with specific operational items, the RTB should focus its attention on policy matters. RTB, on the other hand, has felt that the MTC have not always made decisions that were financially consistent with RTB policies. MTC has also raised issues about the appropriate uses of regular route transit funds.

5. Communications

Generally, there have not been well established lines of communications between the two agencies. Even though a number of efforts have been made (including Executive Director/Chief Administrator meetings, monthly RTB/MTC staff meetings, joint board/commission meetings), there seems to be a difference in opinion and/or expectation regarding the important items to discuss and/or obtain approvals and/or the level of detail about which to communicate.

6. Special Services

The MTC contracts with the RTB to provide both Metro Mobility Administrative Center and Minnesota Rideshare services. The RTB has the legislative mandate to set policy direction for these programs and the MTC has served as contractor.

Currently, there are discussions about restructuring both programs in order to maximize results and better control costs. The MTC and the RTB need to consider the future direction of these programs and the appropriate role of each agency.

7. **Implementing Vision for Transit**

The MTC embraces the concepts set forth in the Vision for Transit, yet urges that their specific role in carrying out the plan be established. Specifically, they have indicated an interest in building transit hubs and operating the service. The RTB is anxious to include the MTC in these efforts, but also feels that there are multiple methods for accomplishing the Vision.

8. **Marketing**

The MTC's marketing strategy and structure has gone through a great deal of transition in the last year. The RTB supports the MTC's efforts in marketing trial use of service. Unfortunately, marketing issues have been confused with other transit policy issues. Greater communication between the MTC, the RTB and other transit providers could result in greater marketing efficiencies. The MTC's Marketing Plan is scheduled to be presented to the RTB's Marketing Committee in December.

9. **Special Events**

Over the past year, there have been several occasions when the MTC and the RTB have had differences in opinion about the level of public subsidy that should be utilized for special events. When the MTC should provide special event service, how it should be paid for, and how fares are determined are some of the issues that need to be resolved and/or acknowledged. A draft policy is now being developed with input from both agencies.

10. **Competitive Contracting**

The RTB has promoted competitive contracting of various services in order to maximize cost-effectiveness of service delivery. In many cases, the MTC has seen this effort to promote competition as threatening the integrity of the MTC system and its long-term viability.

10. **Legislative Program**

Legislative initiatives will include, but are not limited to: establishing a dedicated source of transit revenues; traffic congestion management; priority fuel status for public transit providers; restriction of parking in transit loading/unloading zones to ensure access; and right-of-way for buses to enter flow of traffic.

NEXT STEPS

Following discussion and concurrence from the RTB and MTC at Wednesday evening's meeting, staff will meet on a regular basis (every two weeks) to discuss these matters. In December, we would suggest that another joint RTB/MTC meeting be scheduled so that we can review our progress and get necessary board input.



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

**Minutes of the Joint Meeting of the
REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD AND
METROPOLITAN TRANSIT COMMISSION
December 18, 1992**

MEMBERS PRESENT: RTB Members: Maryann Campo, Ruth Franklin, Val Higgins, Ruby Hunt, Tom Sather, Don Scheel; RTB staff: Gregory L. Andrews, Judy Hollander, Sherry Munyon, Mary Fitzgerald; MTC Members: Robert Mairs, Allyson Hartle, Christine Dean, Todd Paulson; MTC staff: Mike Christenson, Tom Johnson, Beverly Auld and Thomas Weaver

MEMBERS AND COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED: Michael J. Ehrlichman, Sandra Hilary, Sharon Feess, Tom Workman, Frank Snowdon

OTHERS PRESENT: Arnie Entzel, Amalgamated Transit Union

A joint meeting between the Regional Transit Board and the Metropolitan Transit Commission was held at the Metro 94 offices. The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. The members and staff discussed outstanding organizational issues between the two agencies. No action taken and the meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing constitutes a true and accurate record of the joint meeting of the Regional Transit Board and Metropolitan Transit Commission on December 18, 1992.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Fitzgerald
Secretary of the Board

Approved by the Regional Transit Board on this twenty-eighth day of December 1992.