



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).

January 5, 1994

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

ROLL CALL AND ATTENDANCE SHEET

DATE: Board 2/22/94

Member Name Present Vote Vote Vote Vote Vote Vote Vote Vote

ISSUE

Michael Beard ~~was~~ left at 4

Sharon Feess ✓

Ruth Franklin ✓

Morgan Grant ✓

Val M. Higgins ✓

James Hovland ✓

Gary Humphrey ✓

Ruby Hunt ✓

Harry Mares ✓

Chair ✓

Visitors

see notes

Ben Miller

K. Lyons

Kathy DeSperanza

Dina Harbort

mff Arnie Eitzel

Bill Stenard

Greg Koschul

Carl Rauer

Staff

RL [signature] [signature]



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

## Meeting Notice

The members of the Regional Transit Board will receive a briefing on the background and issues related to Light Rail Transit and the Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the Central Corridor at the time and place shown below.

Mears Park Centre, Room 2A  
230 East Fifth Street  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101  
Tuesday, February 22, 1994  
2:00 p.m.

No action will be taken.

**Sally Evert**  
Chair

mff  
February 15, 1994



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

**Meeting of the  
REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD  
Mears Park Centre, Room 2A  
Tuesday, February 22, 1994  
4:00 p.m.**

**AMENDED AGENDA**

- ✓ 1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
- ✓ 2. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**
- ✓ 3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
  - A. Legislative Committee Meeting, January 24, 1994
  - B. Regional Transit Board Meeting, January 24, 1994
  - C. Public Hearing Minutes, January 24, 1994
  - D. Regional Transit Board, February 7, 1994
- ✓ 4. **CHAIR'S REPORT**
- ✓ 5. **MEMBERS' REPORTS**
- ✓ 6. **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**
- ✓ 7. **REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE  
(Ruth Franklin, Chair)**
  - A. Minnesota Valley Transit Authority Capital Funding Request for Construction of Burnsville Transit Hub
  - B. Chair's Benefits
  - C. Metro Mobility Rear Heater Vehicle Installation
- ✓ 8. **OTHER BUSINESS**
  - A. Central Corridor Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement
  - B. Metro Mobility Update
  - C. Executive Session - Discussion of Metro Mobility Litigation
- ✓ 9. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Sally Evert  
Chair**

22 February 1994

## RTB Board Meeting

### Metro Mobility Update:

- Seek additional means to track and validate data. Can do this with RTB staff or outside consultant assistance
- Establish an addtl means to track actual operational experience - ride time and late pick-ups/distributions
- Consumer satisfaction survey.
- ATE contract compliance report

All this activity being contingent on resolution of the class action settlement agmt.

Board member Mares asks to look more closely at efficiency of routing/scheduling.



RTB Board Executive Session

2.22.94

Three types of injunctive relief proposals:

- 1) Contract discretion
- 2) ATE discretion
- 3) Policy discretion of RTB - Policy Matters  
90+ min rides free

Back-up vehicles  
Free fare if 30 min late

Ombudsperson

Four Policy Matters

- 1) Money contribution to settlement by RTB  
Not acceptable to Board
- 2) Relationships w/ Providers - Does RTB give providers more funds. Who covers cost (lost revenue) of free fares  
Does Board give them a change order?  
Board willing to talk about reopening.
- 3) Contract Amendment - RTB willing to talk
- 4) Indemnification - RTB - keep this →



**Minutes of the  
REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD  
February 22, 1994**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Sally Evert, Chair; Sharon Feess; Ruth Franklin; Morgan Grant; Val Higgins; James Hovland; Gary Humphrey; Ruby Hunt; Harry Mares

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Gregory Korstad, legal counsel; Arnie Entzel, Amalgamated Transit Union Local 1005; Beverley Miller, Minnesota Valley Transit Authority; Karen Lyons, Metropolitan Council; Kathy DeSpeigelaere, Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority; Carl Rauer; Diane Harberts, Southwest Metro Transit Commission; Gregory L. Andrews, Judy Hollander, Howard Blin, Bob LaShomb, Mary Fitzgerald, RTB staff

**CALL TO ORDER**

The chair called the board meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. in Room 2A at the above address and roll was taken. At 2:00 p.m. the members had received a briefing on light rail transit and the Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the Central Corridor.

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

The chair asked that the order of the amended agenda items be revised, moving "Public Comment" to the top of the agenda and scheduling an executive session to discuss Metro Mobility litigation. Franklin so moved and Hovland seconded. The motion carried unanimously (Grant not present).

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Hunt moved and Feess seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board approve the following minutes:

Legislative Committee Meeting, January 24, 1994  
Regional Transit Board Meeting, January 24, 1994  
Public Hearing, January 24, 1994  
Regional Transit Board Meeting, February 7, 1994

The motion was unanimously approved (Grant not present).

**CHAIR'S REPORT**

The chair reminded members of the legislative transportation reception at the St. Paul Radisson on February 23. She has scheduled a number of personal visits with legislators over the next few weeks.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Andrews reviewed the schedule of upcoming legislative meetings and distributed a draft of the bill on metro governance.

**REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**

**MINNESOTA VALLEY TRANSIT AUTHORITY CAPITAL FUNDING REQUEST FOR CONSTRUCTION OF BURNSVILLE TRANSIT HUB**

Franklin moved and Feess seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board authorize the executive director to execute a funding agreement with the Minnesota Valley Transit Authority to provide RTB capital funds in an amount not to exceed \$2,850,000 for construction of the Burnsville Transit Hub.

The motion was unanimously approved (Grant not present).

**CHAIR'S BENEFITS**

Franklin moved and Mares seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board establish the chair's benefits as follows:

- Medical and Dental Insurance: the Regional Transit Board will contribute to the cost of this coverage at the level of a full-time employee.
- Vacation and Sick Leave will be accrued at the same rate as other part-time employees.
- Expense allowance not to exceed \$750 per year.

The motion was unanimously approved (Grant not present).

**METRO MOBILITY REAR HEATER VEHICLE INSTALLATION**

Franklin moved and Feess seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board:

1. Instruct ATE Management Company, Inc. to competitively procure installation of 149 rear heaters for the Metro Mobility programs demand vehicles with completion of installation no later than September 1, 1994; and

2. Allocate an amount not to exceed \$67,050 from the provider portion of the Metro Mobility budget to complete the installation of the rear heaters for the 149 Metro Mobility demand vehicles.

The motion was unanimously approved (Grant not present).

#### OTHER BUSINESS

#### **CENTRAL CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS/DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

Evert confirmed that the Minnesota Department of Transportation agreed to extend the deadline and accept the board's comments. Higgins moved and Hunt seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board forward the findings recommended in the staff memorandum of January 19, 1994 to the Joint Lead Agencies.

Hovland said a few months ago he doubted the wisdom of this, but now believes there are many non-quantifiable factors that should be considered; he now favors the project. It cannot stand alone. Grant said he remains skeptical of the data, particularly the cost/benefit figures and the ridership statistics. Evert said the earlier meeting might have resolved some of those doubts. Humphrey said he, like Hovland, had severe reservations, but now feels members should look at the overall picture. This project is not merely intended to move people; the associated economic development should be considered. The motion was unanimously approved.

#### **PERSONAL RAPID TRANSIT**

Evert said Maddox asked the board to consider sending members and staff to Chicago. Maddox said the board should look at the economic benefit of developing the technology and putting it on the world market.

#### **METRO MOBILITY UPDATE**

The February 22 status report by Judith Hollander was distributed. Because of the lawsuit, there are some restrictions on communication. She reviewed the steps that staff believes could be taken at this point. Feess said she is concerned about customer satisfaction. The survey might not get at that because people are afraid that they will be penalized. She would like something to address that. Evert said we will continue on this path with the understanding that timing is not resolved.

Entzel asked Andrews if there will be a discussion of the NBA service. Andrews said staff can contact MTC and get the information. Entzel said there had been much discussion on whether the public sector should be involved in providing service for the NBA All-Star Weekend. The private sector did not live up to the promises. On Friday, three vehicles from Lorenz were not furnished and MTC had to cover it. On Saturday, six vehicles from Minnesota Coaches and two from

Ready did not appear and MTC provided eight vehicles. Medicine Lake Lines did not cover 10 of the promised 35 vehicles. On Sunday, Medicine Lake Lines did not provide five promised vehicles and MTC covered it. RTB always comes back to the public sector to pull its chestnuts out of the fire. It should be noted that when ATE first started paratransit service here, others had to pick up much the service.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Carl Rauer commented that a friend called and said he had a Metro Mobility ride scheduled to a dance. In the meantime the event was moved across the parking lot. When he called to change the ride, the passenger was told he had to get a new pick-up time. Rauer said he received a letter about two vehicles scheduled to pick up riders at the same time and place. ATE's letter did not respond to his question about the two vehicles taking two people from the same location to the same address.

Rauer asked if RTB has established an Appeals Board in the event someone is not certified under the new eligibility process. Grant said the Transportation Accessibility Advisory Committee discussed that and will probably recommend some kind of peer review committee for that purpose. Evert said the board may wish to consider that in its action plan.

There being no other comment, Grant moved and Humphrey seconded that the board go into executive session. The motion carried unanimously and the meeting was recessed to order to go to executive session. At the conclusion of the closed session, the meeting was adjourned.

I hereby certify that the foregoing constitutes a true and accurate record of the Regional Transit Board's meeting of February 22, 1994.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Fitzgerald  
Secretary of the Board

Approved by the Regional Transit Board on this 21st day of March 1994.



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

## REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

At its special meeting of February 14, 1994, the committee approved the following recommendation:

### **MINNESOTA VALLEY TRANSIT AUTHORITY CAPITAL FUNDING REQUEST FOR CONSTRUCTION OF BURNSVILLE TRANSIT HUB**

That the Regional Transit authorize the executive director to execute a funding agreement with the Minnesota Valley Transit Authority to provide RTB capital funds in an amount not to exceed \$2,850,000 for construction of the Burnsville Transit Hub.

### **CHAIR'S BENEFITS**

That the Regional Transit establish the chair's benefits as follows:

- Medical and Dental Insurance: the Regional Transit Board will contribute to the cost of this coverage at the level of a full-time employee.
- Vacation and Sick Leave will be accrued at the same rate as other part-time employees.
- Expense allowance not to exceed \$750 per year.

π

### **METRO MOBILITY REAR HEATER VEHICLE INSTALLATION**

That the Regional Transit:

1. Instruct ATE Management Company, Inc. to competitively procure installation of 149 rear heaters for the Metro Mobility programs demand vehicles with completion of installation no later than September 1, 1994; and
2. Allocate an amount not to exceed \$67,050 from the provider portion of the Metro Mobility budget to complete the installation of the rear heaters for the 149 Metro Mobility demand vehicles.

**Ruth Franklin**  
Chair



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

**Minutes of the Meeting of the  
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE  
January 24, 1994**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mike Beard, Chair; Sally Evert; Morgan Grant; Val Higgins; James Hovland; Gary Humphrey; Harry Mares

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Sharon Feess, Ruth Franklin, Ruby Hunt

**OTHERS PRESENT:** George Bentley, Opt-Out Communities; Corbin Kidder; Greg Korstad, legal counsel; Melanie Benson, Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 1005; Gregory L. Andrews, Bob LaShomb, Judy Hollander, Randy Rosvold, Dale Ulrich, Suzanne Hanson, Mary Fitzgerald

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Chair Beard called the meeting to order at 2:40 p.m. in Mears Park Centre Room A; roll was taken.

The chair explained that Diane Harberts had called earlier to notify him that she could not attend this meeting. Therefore, the agenda should be amended to delete the presentation by the Minnesota Public Transit Association. The order of the agenda items was changed. A quorum was not yet present.

**REVIEW OF JOINT MEETING WITH METROPOLITAN COUNCIL**

Evert said that one of the suggestions made at the Joint RTB/Metropolitan Council meeting was that a small working group, composed of members from both agencies, be formed. She asked members to notify her if they are available to take part in those meetings.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Mares moved and Grant seconded that the agenda be approved as amended. The motion was unanimously approved.

**CONTINUING DISCUSSION OF LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVES**

**Supplemental Funding Request**

The "Regional Transit Board Biennial Financial Plan" was distributed. In discussing the outlying areas that are no longer served by Metro Mobility, Grant

said the community-based service does not have the same hours. He asked what it would cost to reinstate the previous level of service. Blin said within the ADA service area this funding level requested would provide paratransit service comparable to regular route service.

In discussing funding for Vision projects, Andrews said the question before the committee is whether that funding should be included in the request for a supplemental appropriation. LaShomb said the whole issue is tied into other transportation funding. This needs to be a two-tier approach. RTB first has to collect on the promise to reconsider the dollar amounts (\$10.9 million) to honor the Vision for Transit. The \$5.5 million package is a reasonable approach. The board must support the \$10.9 million request, but also note that the Vision for Transit requires additional funding. Grant said RTB must be very clear with the legislators that expanded service requires an on-going commitment. Mares said if he were a legislator he would want assurance that the Vision for Transit is working. We must do a good sales job on it, but otherwise he would support the two-tier approach. Members discussed suburb-to-suburb service.

Beard cautioned that some legislators feel the Southwest Quadrant is getting all the attention.

#### **Dedicated Funding for Transit**

LaShomb said the board should be on record in support of dedicated funding and can look at options later when we get an idea of what is possible. Higgins and Mares concurred.

Beard pointed out that the supplemental appropriation request is increasing from \$8.7 to \$10.9 million. Grant said that until the figures are developed on the cost of restoring service for Metro Mobility in the outlying areas, the board should not commit to the \$10.9 million request. LaShomb warned against waiting too long. Grant said RTB has been criticized for years for not having stable figures, asking for a certain amount, and then shortly after changing the request. When that happens, you lose the ear of the legislator. He would like to commit to one number and stay with it. Some members said the overall program should not be jeopardized in favor of the area that is no longer in the ADA service area.

Beard asked if there are any funds available for extending community-based service and to make Scott County whole. LaShomb said the clock is running and things are moving forward quickly now. We need to start making appointments and getting text into the program. Beard said he would like the committee to come to agreement at the next meeting.

#### **Overview of 1993 and 1994 Vision for Transit**

Higgins moved and Humphrey seconded that the Regional Transit Board support the priorities in the Five-Year Plan. Humphrey agreed that some re-prioritizing should be done in cooperation with the opt-out communities. Mares said it would

be useful to have a list of achievements, with dates, to show that some objectives of the Vision have been achieved. The motion was clarified by the chair:

That the Regional Transit Board endorse the Vision for Transit.

The motion was unanimously approved.

With the understanding that the options on how to fund it would be left open, Mares moved and Grant seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board support dedicated funding for transit.

The motion was unanimously approved.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p. m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing constitutes a true and accurate record of the Regional Transit Board's Legislative Committee meeting of January 24, 1994.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Fitzgerald  
Secretary of the Board

Approved by the Regional Transit Board on this 22nd day of February 1994.



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

**Minutes of the  
REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD**  
Mears Park Centre Chambers  
Monday, January 24, 1994  
4:00 p.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Sally Evert, Chair; Michael Beard, Sharon Feess; Morgan Grant; Val Higgins; James Hovland; Gary Humphrey; Harry Mares

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Ruth Franklin, Ruby Hunt

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Melanie Benson, Amalgamated Transit Union Local 1005; Beverley Miller, Minnesota Valley Transit Association; Eddie Maddox; George Bentley, Opt-Out Communities; Gregory L. Andrews, Howard Blin, Mark Fuhrmann, Robert LaShomb, Dale Ulrich; Mary Fitzgerald, RTB staff

**CALL TO ORDER**

The chair called the hearing to order at 3:45 p.m., and roll was taken.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mares moved and Grant seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board approve the following minutes:

Legislative Committee Meeting, December 13, 1993  
Regional Transit Board Meeting, December 13, 1993  
Committee of the Whole Meeting, December 13, 1993  
Legislative Committee Meeting, December 20, 1993  
Regional Transit Board Meeting, December 20, 1993  
Nominating Committee Meeting, January 6, 1994  
Legislative Committee Meeting, December 27, 1993  
Committee of the Whole Meeting, December 27, 1993

The motion was unanimously approved.

**CHAIR'S REPORT**

**Appointment of Standing Committee Chairs and Members**

The chair reviewed her memorandum dated January 10, 1994. Grant moved and Beard seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board appoint the following chairs and members to the standing committees.

**Administration and Finance Committee**

Ruth Franklin, Chair  
Michael Beard  
Sharon Feess  
Harry Mares  
District D Member

**Policy Committee**

Val Higgins, Chair  
Morgan Grant  
James Hovland  
Gary Humphrey  
Ruby Hunt

The appointments are effective immediately.

The motion was unanimously approved.

**Appointment of Chair of Litigation Committee**

The chair reviewed her January 10, 1994 memorandum. Beard moved and Grant seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board appoint James Hovland to chair the ad hoc Litigation Committee, effective immediately.

The motion was unanimously approved. Evert briefly reviewed the status of the standing committees. Some are not currently active and some, like the Audit Advisory Committee, will be restructured to meet changing needs. The liaisons to advisory committees and other agencies will remain the same.

**NOMINATING COMMITTEE REPORT**

Beard moved approval of the recommendations made by the Nominating Committee at its January 6, 1994 meeting; Mares seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board appoint James Hovland to the office of Vice Chair, effective immediately.

That the Regional Transit Board appoint Sharon Feess to the office of Treasurer, effective immediately.

That the Regional Transit Board appoint Mary Fitzgerald to the office of Secretary, effective immediately.

The motion was unanimously approved.

**MEMBERS' REPORTS**

Beard reported on the legislative meeting sponsored by the Opt-Out communities on January 19. He distributed his memorandum, dated January 24, regarding

contacts for the legislative session; and the Minnesota Senior Federation, Metro Region's proposed 1994 legislative program.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Andrews reviewed the schedule of upcoming legislative committee hearings.

The group of people involved with the St. Paul Cultural Area Trolley project would like to return to the board with revised numbers on their request for capital. They still hope to be running service this spring.

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE REPORT**

Hovland moved that the board approve the following recommendations made by the Committee of the Whole at its meeting of January 10, 1994:

**FINANCIAL STATEMENTS, NOVEMBER 1993**

That the Regional Transit Board receive the November 1993 financial statements and direct that they be placed on file.

**ANOKA COUNTY TRAVELER 1994 CONTRACT AMENDMENT**

That the Regional Transit Board authorize its executive direct to amend Anoka County Traveler's 1994 Transit Funding contract by \$48,619, from \$587,324 to \$635,943.

**METROPOLITAN TRANSIT COMMISSION (MTC) FEDERAL GRANT APPLICATIONS**

That the Regional Transit Board approve the following Metropolitan Transit Commission grant applications:

1. Federal Transit Administration's Section 3 grant application for fiscal year 1994;
2. Federal Transit Administration's Section 9 grant application for fiscal year 1994; and
3. Federal Transit Administration's Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality grant application for fiscal year 1993.

**CONTRACT FOR BROOKDALE TRANSIT HUB PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING**

That the Regional Transit Board authorize the executive director to negotiate and enter into a contract with LSA Design, Inc. for preliminary engineering and design of the Brookdale Transit Station at a cost not to exceed \$35,000.

**NORTH SUBURBAN LINES 1993 CONTRACT AMENDMENT**

That the Regional Transit Board authorize its executive director to amend the 1993 contract (Contract No. 92/09-11-38) with North Suburban Lines by \$11,678, to a total amount not to exceed \$839,496.

**VALLEY TRANSIT 1993 CONTRACT AMENDMENT**

That the Regional Transit Board authorize its executive director to amend the 1993 contract (Contract No. 92/09/11-39) with Valley Transit by \$465, to an amount not to exceed \$110,582.

The motion was unanimously approved.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

The chair asked Franklin to place review of the RTB per diem policy on a committee agenda.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing constitutes a true and accurate record of the Regional Transit Board's meeting of January 24, 1994.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Fitzgerald  
Secretary of the Board

Approved by the Regional Transit Board on this 22nd day of February.



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

**Minutes of the Public Hearing of the  
REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD  
Regarding Draft 1994 Paratransit Plan  
for the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area  
January 24, 1994**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Sally Evert, Chair; Michael Beard, Sharon Feess; Morgan Grant; Val Higgins; James Hovland; Gary Humphrey; Harry Mares

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Ruth Franklin, Ruby Hunt

**CALL TO ORDER**

The chair called the hearing to order at 5 p.m., January 24, 1994, in Mears Park Centre Chambers. This hearing had originally been scheduled for January 18, but had to be postponed because of dangerously cold weather.

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requires public agencies that operate fixed route public transit service to submit a plan annually on how and when complementary paratransit service requirements will be met. Federal law requires that a hearing be held to receive comments on the Draft 1994 Paratransit Plan for the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. The hearing record will remain open until January 31, 1994.

John Walsh, Executive Director of the Metropolitan Center for Independent Living, Inc., read his statement (Exhibit A) into the record. He said Pages 27 and 28, Items 18, 19, and 20, are inaccurate. ATE counts a request as a trip cancellation even when the ride is so late the passenger cannot get to the appointment.

Rosanne Severance, a member of the Transportation Accessibility Advisory Committee (TAAC), spoke on behalf of the people from Seward neighborhood in Minneapolis. Her complex has 81 accessible apartments and she speaks on behalf of the approximately 60 Metro Mobility riders in the complex. Regarding the statistics on on-time rides, Severance said that counting the rides taken by people in her building, the figures in the report cannot possibly be correct. There are many late pickups and she has been on routes where two vans are scheduled to take two people to the same address at the same time.

Referring to Item 19 on trip denials, Severance said she tried to arrange a ride today but departure was scheduled for rush hour. She could not schedule the

ride in the middle of the day but could get one home again from another address during rush hour. Generally people who travel during rush hour are late.

The information in Item 20 cannot be right. Even if a passenger is picked up on time, he or she rarely gets to the destination on time. Sometimes it takes two hours to go from home to Downtown Minneapolis. That is excessive. People who complained about these kinds of rides have received insulting form letters. She described a circuitous trip that was so long she missed her appointment. She asked the driver to take her back home but was rudely refused. That driver should have been taken off the road. People are not riding the system any more. The Transportation Accessibility Advisory Committee is supposed to be advisory to the board. ATE has said TAAC does not talk to the board. Members are not supposed to talk to the board members. TAAC said it is like putting information down a black hole. It would be nice to know someone is listening.

Exhibit B, a letter from the Governor's Planning Council on Developmental Disabilities, is attached.

There being no others who wished to speak, the chair declared the meeting closed at 5:25 p.m., The public record will remain open until 5 p.m., January 31, 1994.

I hereby certify that the foregoing constitutes a true and accurate record of the Regional Transit Board's public hearing of January 24, 1994.

Respectfully submitted,



Mary Fitzgerald  
Secretary of the Board

**Governor's Planning Council  
on Developmental Disabilities**

Minnesota Department of Administration

300 Centennial Office Building  
658 Cedar Street  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155  
(612) 296-4018 voice  
(612) 296-9962 TDD  
(612) 297-7200 fax

*Hearing Record*  
*cc Board*  
*Ex. B*

January 26, 1994

Mr. Gregory L. Andrews  
Executive Director  
Regional Transit Board  
230 East 5th Street  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Dear Mr. Andrews:

The purpose of this letter is to submit comments concerning Americans with Disabilities Act Updated Paratransit Plan for the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area (Draft).

1. Pages 9 and 22: Do the tables projecting costs and ridership estimates take into account how the numbers of users may vary over time depending upon how the service is perceived in light of the initial difficulties encountered when ATE took over the service? There are persons certified to use the service who are using it less than under the previous arrangement, are going out less than under the previous arrangement, and/or are using more costly means of travel, taxis because of the belief that there are still problems with the new arrangement. This may result in high/low costs/ridership depending on how quickly real and perceived difficulties are addressed.
2. Page 11: Who will determine and under what circumstances an eligible Metro Mobility user must use accessible regular route? Transit for a particular trip? Who has and is there sufficient information about trip destinations such as the location of the accessible entrance in relationship to the nearest bus stop in either direction? Who has knowledge about the nature of the terrain and the distance which must be traveled between the bus stop and the accessible entrance to make an accurate judgement about whether a particular individual could be expected to use an accessible regular route bus to reach the trip destination and/or return from it?

Mr. Gregory L. Andrews

Page 2

January 26, 1994

- Page 12: Regarding Accessible Regular Route Transit Service: The snow removal problem is a major deterrent to winter public transit travel for people with disabilities. We suggest increasing collaborative and creative efforts in and among communities to improve bus stop snow removal and working to assure that bus stop snow removal ranks on a par with snow clearance on designated city streets.
- Page 30: ADA Paratransit Plan Timetable: Concerns about Metro Mobility eligibility vs. ADA eligibility should be addressed. These concerns will surface when the ADA functional assessment procedures are finalized and recertification begins. It would be helpful to build an educational component into the recertification process.
- Page 33: ADA Paratransit Timetable: A "seamless" transit system depends on ongoing efforts to work with county programs to improve their services, and encourage efficient and effective linkages between transit and paratransit systems throughout the metro area.

Your careful consideration of the comments outlined above is appreciated.

Cordially,



Colleen Wieck, Ph.D.  
Executive Director

CW/rf



*Hansant 1/24  
Public Hearing  
E & A*

Testimony  
Regarding the 1992 ADA Paratransit Plan  
presented to the  
Regional Transit Board  
January 24, 1994

My name is John Walsh. I am the Executive Director of Metropolitan Center for Independent Living.

I appreciate the opportunity to add our testimony to the comments regarding the ADA Paratransit Plan

Those who use the system regularly have reason to seriously question the summary data on the rides provided. Several riders have witnessed drivers recording false information on the manifest. The information on which the Board bases its plan is not accurate. We have the same concern about the Mobile Data Terminals. What safeguards does ATE have to ensure that the data is recorded accurately or will be in the future?

One illustration of the manipulation of the data is the process followed to count the late rides. After all the manifests are in for a given day, ATE personnel select twenty-five percent of the routes. A route is counted as late if three or more rides on that route are late (outside the window). The number of late routes is then extrapolated to reflect the whole system for that day. With this practice a route would not be counted if one or two rides were late. The information is presented as if those late routes represent an accurate analysis or percentage of the actual rides, not the "late" routes.

The basic concern is that the RTB is basing its conclusions on false information.

*handout*

## REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

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

**DATE:** February 22, 1994  
**TO:** Members of the Regional Transit Board  
**FROM:** Judith G. Hollander  
Director of Planning and Programs  
**SUBJECT:** Metro Mobility Status Report

I have spoken to many of you during the past several weeks about the status of the Metro Mobility program. Many of you, like the staff, continue to receive serious complaints and have inquired about improvements in service quality. On one hand, we review statistics that show consistent, improved service. On the other hand, we all continue to hear about cold vehicles, circuitous routing, late pick-ups, etc.

Because of the lawsuit, we have been somewhat constrained about providing certain types of analysis or correspondence. However, in our ongoing efforts to continually improve service, staff is proposing that some additional steps be taken to determine why users continue to experience a variety of service problems and yet the statistics indicate that service quality is better.

Key service problems that we continue to hear about are:

- Cold vehicles
- Circuitous routing
- Late pick-ups/drop-offs
- Reservationist/Dispatcher/Driver Insensitivity

During the past month, there have been several improvements made to the system. As a result, we have seen ridership continue to edge upward. These improvements include:

- Completed retrofitting of vehicle heating system January 16, 1994 to boost heat output in the 150 vehicle fleet;
- Hard-coding of standing orders was done on January 24, 1994. Modifications continue to be made in an effort to improve routing, on-time performance and system productivity.
- MMSC has hired Independent Crossroads to re-emphasize critical importance of reservationist sensitivity to customers.
- MMSC customer service representatives are riding Metro Mobility vehicles.
- More people in MMSC and at providers are manually reviewing the manifests each night.

**Metro Mobility Status Report**  
**February 22, 1994**  
**Page 2**

- The revised Metro Mobility Customer Guide was mailed to all eligible users last week.

As a result, we have seen signs that ridership is continuing to increase and that on-time performance is steady, except during the most severely cold and/or snowy days during January and February.

Even given these improvements, however, problems in the system persist. In order to better understand what is happening with the system and why users' perceptions vary from statistical reports, staff is proposing to undertake the following activities in addition to actions that may be required under a court approved settlement agreement.:

- I. Identify independent means by which to validate data and/or experiences at ~~three~~<sup>four</sup> different levels: (A) Provider/User; (B) Provider/MMSC and (C) MMSC/RTB and (D) User/MMSC
  - A. RTB staff, familiar with metropolitan area and transit, will independently review schedules to examine for logical routing.
  - B. RTB staff will either ride vehicles and/or be at key origins/destinations to verify on-time performance.
  - C. Ecosometrics will make a return visit to determine if scheduling improvements have been made and identify additional steps that should be taken
  - D. Department of Administration will assist RTB by conducting management analyses of MMSC and RTB oversight. Recommendations are expected to be made that would help to fortify future course of action.
- II. Establish additional means of reporting operating experience in an effort to be able to better analyze problems
  - A. Distribution of ride times
  - B. Distribution of late rides
  - C. *Sched*
- III. Conduct consumer satisfaction survey
- IV. Carry out contract compliance measures
  - A. Compile current ATE contract compliance report
  - B. Assess penalties
  - C. Schedule meeting with ATE for a discussion about the state-of-the service.

**Metro Mobility Status Report**  
**February 22, 1994**  
**Page 3**

Timing of the above activities will depend on progress toward reaching a resolution of the pending class action lawsuit. We would intend that progress in implementing the activities would involve an "open process" with regular updates to the Board and its Transportation Accessibility Advisory Committee.



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

**Minutes of the  
REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD  
February 7, 1994**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Sally Evert, Chair; Michael Beard, Ruth Franklin; Morgan Grant; Val Higgins; James Hovland; Gary Humphrey; Ruby Hunt; Harry Mares

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Sharon Feess

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Arnie Entzel, Amalgamated Transit Union Local 1005; Eddie Maddox; Paul Ridgeway; George Bentley, Opt-Out Communities; Gregory L. Andrews, Judy Hollander, Howard Blin, Mark Fuhrmann, Robert LaShomb, Barb Quade, Dale Ulrich, Mary Fitzgerald, RTB staff

**CALL TO ORDER**

The chair called the hearing to order at 4:07 p.m. and roll was taken. The chair welcomed Dede Wolfson, the Metropolitan Council's newly appointed liaison to the Regional Transit Board.

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

The chair asked that the order of the agenda items under "Other Business" be revised and that the following new items be added:

- National Basketball Association Special Event Service
- Approval of the RTB 1994 Legislative Package
- Approval of Updated 1994 Americans with Disabilities (ADA) Paratransit Plan

With those amendments, Franklin moved and Hovland seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Hunt noted that she attended the January 3 Legislative Committee meeting. With that correction, Grant moved and Hovland seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board approve the following minutes:

Legislative Committee Meeting, January 3, 1994  
Regional Transit Board Meeting, January 3, 1994

Legislative Committee Meeting, January 10, 1994  
Committee of the Whole Meeting, January 10, 1994  
Committee of the Whole Meeting, January 19 1994

The motion was unanimously approved.

**CHAIR'S REPORT**

**Appointment of Chair and Vice Chair of Transportation Accessibility  
Advisory Committee**

The chair noted her January 28 memorandum. Higgins moved and Grant seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board make the following appointments to the Regional Transit Board's Transportation Accessibility Advisory Committee:

Dianna Krogstad, Chair  
Roger Blohm, Vice Chair

The appointments are effective immediately.

The motion was unanimously approved. Evert asked members to complete and return the evaluation form on the executive director. In response to Hunt's request, the chair directed the secretary to send a copy of the position description to all members.

**MEMBERS' REPORTS**

Hunt said she had been unable to attend the last meeting of the Legislative Committee because the seven metro counties met with the Association of Metropolitan Municipalities to discuss metropolitan governance. Senator Carol Flynn attended the meeting. The group agreed that, while they have some differences, they have much in common and want to work together on legislation. The counties have engaged John Boland to follow the metropolitan legislation that might be introduced.

In reference to the NBA All-Star Game, Higgins said he has been quite involved in working with various agencies to get the transportation problems resolved. The chair said the issue is quite new.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORTS**

**Chair's Benefits**

The chair removed herself from the discussion, but noted that there has been a change in the chair's status from full- to part-time so an adjustment is necessary. The recommendation was not tailored specifically for her.

Andrews reviewed his memorandum, dated February 1, 1994, and said the chair is an employee of the RTB and is entitled to the same benefits as other employees. In this case, he recommends that the board approve benefits for the chair that exceed the Personnel Code. The chair's expense allowance is used for miscellaneous costs incurred within the agency. According to statute, the chair's benefits may not exceed those of the chair of the Metropolitan Council.

Mares said he has reservations on whether there is precedent to giving full-time benefits at this layer of government. Andrews said the only similar position is the part-time chair of the Metropolitan Waste Control Commission, but he does not know what the level of benefits is. Mares said the board might be making new policy and he would like to know what the precedent has been. Franklin said it might be more appropriate to place the matter on the agenda of the Administration and Finance Committee and provide the members with more information before the next meeting. Mares moved and Hunt seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board refer the issue of the chair's benefits to the Administration and Finance Committee.

The motion was unanimously approved. Evert asked if there are any questions the staff should prepare for. Hunt said staff should check with other agencies and keep in mind that at this level there has been a lot of scrutiny. Evert said staff should also show the cost differences in the various alternatives.

### **Metro Mobility Update**

Andrews reported on the meeting in federal district court with the plaintiffs in the class action suit to discuss reaching a settlement agreement on items for injunctive relief to get the system up and running. On Friday, February 11, there will be a day in court with the judge magistrate where he hopes to reach a final agreement with the plaintiffs and defendants. Staff is working with ATE and the providers to identify what needs to be done.

Franklin noted that the budget approval should be moved to the "Other Business" portion of the agenda.

### **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE REPORT**

Higgins reviewed the actions taken at the committee's January 24, 1994 meeting.

### **Comments on Central Corridor Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement**

Blin said the board is asked to restate its earlier position. Hunt said Blin has prepared a balanced report which confirms and concurs with the process up to this point. She moved to support the staff comments. Hovland said he wanted to see the comments in writing. The matter was left open until staff made copies of the report for the board.

**Minnesota Valley Transit Authority Capital Funding Request**

Hovland moved and Humphrey seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board authorize the executive director to enter into a capital funding agreement with the Minnesota Valley Transit Authority for an amount not to exceed \$918,417 for the projects described in the staff report dated January 19, 1994.

The motion was unanimously approved.

**Public Hearings for Americans with Disabilities (ADA) Eligibility Certification**

Hovland moved and Grant seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board direct staff to schedule three public hearings on the Americans with Disabilities Act Eligibility Certification.

The motion was unanimously approved.

**Comments on Central Corridor Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement**

Returning to this item, Blin distributed a sheet showing the "Findings and Conclusions" and the recommendation. The comment period will close on February 18. Higgins said this flies in the face of the numerous letters received from the people living in downtown Minneapolis who object to surface alignment of light rail. There was a mistake in the address on his letters that appeared in all of the letters, indicating that they were orchestrated by one source. That may not be pertinent because these people have a sincere concern about light rail at ground level. One group of letters was from Central Lutheran Church and another from residents of high rises. Grant said he has a great deal of concern about surface alignment through downtown Minneapolis as well. If the region is going to spend the money the system should be built right. He will not support the recommendation as written. Franklin said she also favors a tunnel and will not support the staff recommendation at this time. She had hoped that light rail and tunnels would be discussed at a board workshop. Hunt pointed out that the last bulleted item in the staff handout does not close the door on a tunnel. Ramsey and Hennepin County recently completed public hearings and proponents of the tunnel attended in great numbers. It is not a dead issue and the recommendation illustrates that. The agencies that have been studying this over the past several years were told by the Legislature that funding for the tunnel is out of the question, which is why the recommendation of the Joint Powers Board was changed. She urged the board to support this recommendation on the basis that it does not rule out a tunnel. Being new to this issue, Hovland said it would be helpful if Hunt would explain why a central corridor line would be beneficial to the area at the projected cost. Hunt said only a few people have been through the entire laborious process. The study was laid

out by the Legislature. LaShomb has suggested that the board have someone from the light rail group make a presentation on their legislative package.

Hovland asked if there is a need for immediate action on the recommendation; he does not feel prepared. He asked if there is data supporting the second finding regarding enhanced service quality and its ability to focus development in the region's core areas.

Evert said the problem is timing. Higgins said the region has been dealing with this for 20 years and the project has never progressed. Humphrey said that over 20 years the dynamics of transit have changed dramatically. He questions what focus light rail will put on development in the core area. The minor increase in ridership would be achieved at dramatic increases in cost. Grant said there are many people who still have reservations about whether light rail should be built and there are other proposals, such as high speed bus, that have merit. If LRT is built, it should be done with citizen involvement. Beard said he has watched this issue for 20 years and reiterated Grant's point that if it was a good deal it would have been done before now. There has been a lot of foot dragging, and if the issue is put to the voters it might very well fail. Instead, it has been given to yet another study group. He does not need any more presentations on light rail.

Mares said this governor's administration has a strong interest in development of the core cities. He proposed spending half this amount for an improved bus way, which offers flexibility and the ability to respond quickly to the marketplace. He is interested in other options for this board.

Wolfson said the Metropolitan Council did not discuss the tunnel option. She is unclear why Minneapolis' tunnel is the only one being discussed; whatever holds true for Minneapolis would also hold true for St. Paul. Hunt said the option for a tunnel was discussed and some preliminary engineering was done. It was deemed not feasible and the surface congestion in St. Paul would not pose a problem. That was part of an on-going discussion with various agencies about whether it would be absolutely necessary to have a tunnel in Minneapolis. This only came up in the last couple of months. If you visit a city with surface light rail downtown, it is not at all detrimental. The Twin Cities is the last of the major metropolitan areas in the country that does not have a light rail system. She suggested that if board members do not want to uphold the actions of the past boards, it would be appropriate to hear more about it before casting their votes.

The chair said a special meeting can be arranged. Higgins moved and Hovland seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board table action to approve the proposed comments on the Central Corridor Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement until after the board has received a briefing on the issues.

Mares said the information distributed earlier should be sent out again and he would like to see the information from the Minnesota Department of Transportation. The motion was unanimously approved.

OTHER BUSINESS

National Basketball Association (NBA) Special Event Service

Rosvold reviewed the February 4 staff report. Higgins said the NBA contacted only four carriers. If not for RTB staff, those would have been the only contacts made. This is an extremely difficult issue for private operators who resent competition with public agencies that have huge subsidies. They were upset about the handling of the service for the Super Bowl. Ridgeway explained that the NBA received bad information from the convention bureau and was under the impression they had a complete list of carriers. The private operators are responding and there are 61 vehicles scheduled to for the weekend of February 11. The transportation director of the NBA explained that in the past the NBA contracted with an outside firm to arrange transportation but this year decided to bring the function in-house. He was hired last month and there was not enough time to make appropriate arrangements. The situation will be rectified next year.

Entzel asked why RTB is concerned about bus operators from outside the metro area performing this choice service when the Twin Cities has the capacity to provide it. He questioned the big push to get someone from so far away who does not care what happens here. Higgins said it is the law. MTC was left with a deficit after the Super Bowl and the taxpayers had to absorb the loss. Over the past ten days he has been talking to all the parties. Planning was not started until a few weeks ago and the problems have to be resolved without embarrassing the region. At this point there is no time to meet all the legal requirements on the operators.

There are plans to expand the convention center and the question is how future special events will be handled. Higgins said he has the Transportation Regulation Board, the Minnesota Department of Transportation, the Regional Transit Board and the charter operators working together to develop a plan for future events. He moved that the board grant the requested waiver for the three days with a cap authorizing no more than 50 units from the MTC and with a clear understanding that only when the private sector vehicles are exhausted will MTC start to furnish equipment. Franklin seconded the motion, but asked if there is a problem with setting a number. Evert said there is; Franklin withdrew the second.

Hovland moved the following, saying he did so reluctantly because the charter operators had not been notified of the opportunity to provide service; however, no one wants to be embarrassed and give our community a bad name. Humphrey seconded the motion:

Due to the demand for charter buses for the National Basketball Association (NBA) All-Star weekend, which exceeds the capacity of private charter operators, the Regional Transit Board (RTB) grants the Metropolitan Transit Commission (MTC) a waiver to the RTB special events policy to provide temporary charter service in Minneapolis during the NBA All-Star weekend on February 11-13, 1994, based on the following conditions:

1. All private Minnesota permit carriers having available equipment that meets the vehicle requirements and standards specified by the NBA be deployed first.
2. The MTC is granted a waiver to the federal charter bus rules by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).
3. That the MTC shall satisfy the conditions of the State of Minnesota's Transportation Regulation Board.
4. That the MTC, in accordance with existing RTB special events policy, recoup 100-percent of the operating costs associated with the temporary charter service operated during the NBA All-Star weekend.

The motion was unanimously approved. Higgins said no motion is needed regarding future action and he would be glad to put it together. Hunt said staff should be asked to consider this for future discussion with the convention bureau. Evert said it is a matter of getting everything together. Mares said Entzel made a good point. He also respects the private sector, but our experience with Metro Mobility indicates that familiarity with the area must be considered.

#### **Approval of the Updated 1994 Americans With Disabilities Paratransit Plan**

Quade reviewed the February 7 staff report. The chair said the issues raised by the Transportation Accessibility Advisory Committee and at the public hearing were about data and they have been covered. Hunt moved and Hovland seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board approve the 1994 Paratransit Plan for immediate submission to the Federal Transit Administration.

The motion was unanimously approved.

#### **Capital Funding Request from Southwest Metro Transit Commission**

Blin reviewed the February 7 staff memorandum distributed before the meeting. The issue did not go through the Administration and Finance Committee because Southwest Metro was misinformed about the board's meeting schedule. He suggested changes to the staff recommendation.

Bentley discussed the staff recommendations. Regarding Item 3, SMTC does not yet have a final determination on the storage facility. He asked for clarification of Item 4. He assumed it does not include any request for necessary work on the vehicles such as engine reconstruction. Blin said it means if the bus has a 12-year life they SMTC cannot approach the board in the eighth year for replacement.

Beard asked Andrews about the \$6.5 million in capital funding. When does that authority expire so it can be replaced. Andrews said the level of funding never

expires. It is in state law and we have it until we decide to use it all. The board, in its 1995 legislative program, will review this to determine how much money we really need. The Legislature directed us to come back in the 1995 session and show results and they expect us to request additional bonding authorization. Responding to Beard's question, Andrews said there are potentially many uses for the \$3.5 million left. Beard moved and Mares seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board authorize the executive director to negotiate and enter into a capital funding contract in an amount not to exceed \$3 million in capital funding to the Southwest Metro Transit Commission for the purchase of 22 buses. Before the funds will be released, Southwest Metro must meet the following conditions:

1. Provide to the RTB a cost/benefit analysis for the vehicle purchase.
2. Provide the RTB with analysis on the need for the additional seating capacity.
3. Provide the RTB with a detailed plan and cost estimate for storage and maintenance of the vehicles. This plan must be approved by the RTB executive director prior to release of funds.
4. Apart from loss or destruction of these vehicles, Southwest Metro may not reapply for funds to replace them until the end of their useful life of six years for small buses and 12 years for the large buses.

The motion was unanimously approved.

#### **1994 METROPOLITAN TRANSIT COMMISSION BUDGET**

Franklin reported recommendations approved by the Committee of the Whole on February 4, 1994. She moved and Mares seconded:

That the Regional Transit:

1. Approve the Metropolitan Transit Commission's 1994 operating subsidy of \$66,400,000 to be apportioned as follows:
  - a. \$65,224,463 to operate regular route service in conformance with existing RTB policies;
  - b. \$650,000 to fund the Minnesota Rideshare service operated by the Metropolitan Transit Commission under separate contract with the Regional Transit Board to be approved by RTB at a later date; and

- c. \$525,537 to fund the Jobseekers Program as approved by the RTB on December 13, 1993.

Furthermore, the identified \$1.2 million projected subsidy shortfall in 1994 shall be fully funded by MTC's available working capital balance in their operating budget. The RTB will ensure that the \$1.2 million is included in the 1994 supplemental appropriation request to the Legislature.

2. Approve the MTC's 1994 capital budget of \$61,741,000, consisting of \$22,100,000 new authorizations for new and amended capital projects and 1994 disbursements of \$61,457,000.
3. Approve MTC's 1994 debt service budget of \$1,693,000.
4. Support MTC's request to seek an additional \$19 million of legislative bonding authorization in the 1995 legislative session for projected 1995 and 1996 capital projects.

The motion was unanimously approved.

#### **LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT**

##### **1994 RTB Legislative Package**

Committee Chair Beard said that in the Legislative Committee meeting held immediately before this meeting the committee approved the opt-out communities' proposed change to the bonding statute and the MTC's 1994 proposed legislative program. The committee agreed to incorporate the \$1.2 million projected shortfall into the RTB request for \$6.3 supplemental shortfall request for regular route service. The committee approved the \$1.9 million for MTC's quality improvements with the understanding that the RTB's Vision for Transit previously approved will take priority. Beard moved and Hovland seconded:

That the Regional Transit Board support the Metropolitan Transit Commission's legislative request for \$3.9 million for quality improvements with the following stipulations:

1. If the Legislature approves the \$3.9 million it should only do so after funding the Regional Transit Board's \$5.6 million request for the "Vision for Transit;"
2. That the \$3.9 million be appropriated to the RTB so that the board can review the request in terms of the overall "Vision" strategy.

Further, with regard to the downtown Minneapolis shuttle, the RTB will remind the Legislature of the agreement between the RTB and the City of Minneapolis; the cost-sharing policy which is normal for these kinds of projects; and, finally, that the Legislature fund the "Vision for Transit" request before it provides funding for the shuttle.

That the Regional Transit Board support the proposed legislation to amend the bonding statute as shown in the draft bill dated January 19, 1994.

The motion was unanimously approved.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Eddie Maddox reported on the Senate committee hearing on Personal Rapid Transit (PRT). He is attempting to determine the background and policy formulation process. He has had a difficult time finding it and has representatives from three agencies working on this for him.

There being no other business, Hunt moved and Mares seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was unanimously approved and the meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing constitutes a true and accurate record of the Regional Transit Board's meeting of February 7, 1994.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Fitzgerald  
Secretary of the Board

Approved by the Regional Transit Board on this 22nd day of February 1994.

I hereby certify that the foregoing constitutes a true and accurate record of the Regional Transit Board's meeting of February 7, 1994.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Fitzgerald  
Secretary of the Board

Approved by the Regional Transit Board on this 22nd day of February 1994.

P.C. 1/24/94

## REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

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

DATE: January 19, 1994  
TO: Committee of the Whole (Policy)  
FROM: Howard Blin, Planning Manager *HB*  
SUBJECT: Comments on Central Corridor AA/DEIS *HB*

### SUMMARY

This memorandum presents recommended comments on the Central Corridor Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (AA/DEIS). The principal recommendation is for the RTB to endorse the light rail transit (LRT) alternative.

### BACKGROUND

The Central Corridor between downtown St. Paul and downtown Minneapolis has been studied for transit improvements for well over a decade. Most of these studies have focused on constructing LRT within the corridor.

The Central Corridor has also been designated as the region's priority corridor for major transit capital investments. In 1989, the RTB developed the *LRT Development and Financial Plan* which identified the Central Corridor as the region's priority for LRT development. When this plan was reevaluated in 1991, the RTB reaffirmed the priority status of the Central Corridor. Using the RTB's recommendation, the Metropolitan Council produced the *Regional Transit Facilities Plan in 1992*. The Facilities Plan also listed the Central Corridor as the region's priority. The Metropolitan Council also recommended that a federally sponsored alternative analysis be conducted in the Central Corridor. Work on the AA/DEIS began in mid-1992, with the draft document being completed in December 1993.

### ALTERNATIVES

Four alternatives received extensive analysis in the AA/DEIS:

- No Build. Retains existing bus service and adds new services included in the RTB's Five-Year Transit Plan (Vision '97).
- Transportation System Management (TSM). Includes all service improvements, identified in the No-Build alternative, plus greater frequency of service, route extensions, and several new routes.
- Busway. Provides all improvements identified in the TSM alternative, plus exclusive busway lanes between the downtowns.

- LRT. Includes construction of a light rail line in and between the downtowns. Bus service improvements which are part of the TSM alternative would also be included.

## DECISION PROCESS

An AA/DEIS is required for any major capital project seeking federal funds. The local joint lead agencies are the Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT), the Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority and the Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority. A Corridor Management Committee provided advice to the joint lead agencies throughout the study. This committee included representatives of the joint lead agencies, as well as other county rail authorities, cities, the Metropolitan Council, MTC, University of Minnesota and Capital Area Board. The Chair of the RTB served as chair of the committee.

At the conclusion of the public comment period on February 18, 1994, the joint lead agencies will select a locally preferred alternative. This must then be approved by the Metropolitan Council and Federal Transit Administration.

The Ramsey and Hennepin County Railroad Authorities have already passed resolutions calling for selection of the LRT alternative. The Corridor Advisory Committee also recommended LRT. Mn/DOT has yet to announce a decision.

If one of the build alternatives is selected, work would begin on preliminary engineering and a final environmental impact statement. Assuming funding is available, it would be two years before construction could begin.

## DISCUSSION

In evaluating alternatives, the primary considerations include: cost, ridership, service quality, financial feasibility, and environmental and land use impacts. Each of these is discussed in the following.

### COST

Capital and operating costs for each alternative are summarized below:

<u>Alternative</u>	(cost in \$millions)	
	<u>Capital Cost</u>	<u>Annual Corridor* Operating and Maintenance Cost</u>
No Build	\$50.0	\$45.5
TSM	\$72.7	\$57.3
Busway	\$217.7	\$67.1
LRT	\$474.1	\$68.0

\*Includes annual operating and maintenance cost for Central Corridor bus routes.

In addition to the costs listed above, additional costs would be incurred to rebuild the section of I-94 between downtown St. Paul and Fairview Avenue. Highway-related costs for the No-Build and TSM alternatives are estimated at \$21 million. For the Busway and LRT alternatives, the highway cost is \$66 million.

Some of the facilities constructed for a Central Corridor line could also be used by an I-35W LRT line. In particular, the yards and shops facility and downtown Minneapolis segment of the corridor could be used at no additional cost.

Another way of comparing capital costs is to look at the annual cost of servicing the debt required for each alternative. The following shows the annual debt for 50 percent of the capital cost (federal funding is assumed for the remaining 50 percent).

Annual Debt Services for 50 percent Local  
Share for 20 year Bonds at 6 percent

No-Build	-	\$2.2 million
TSM	-	\$3.2 million
Busway	-	\$9.6 million
LRT	-	\$21.0 million

This annual debt service would be in addition to that needed to retire bonds sold for routine transit capital needs. Currently the RTB levies approximately \$15-million per year. This is expected to increase to about \$25 million annually in the near future as capital needs for replacement and facilities grow.

**RIDERSHIP**

Ridership forecasts for the year 2010 were prepared by the Metropolitan Council for each alternative. The following shows ridership for the entire transit system, for each alternative, and the number of new transit riders generated.

2010 Ridership

	<u>Daily System Boardings</u>	<u>Daily Guideway Boardings</u>	<u>Daily Boardings Generated by New Riders</u>
No-Build	239,600	N/A	N/A
TSM	244,000	N/A	N/A
Busway	246,500	33,000	2,500
LRT	247,000	33,700	3,600

Ridership forecasts do not provide a compelling reason to select either the busway or LRT alternatives. They carry about the same numbers of passengers and provide only marginal increases over the No-Build or TSM alternatives.

Given these ridership forecasts, a large difference in cost per rider exists between the Busway and LRT alternatives. The capital cost per passenger for a busway is about \$2.00 per boarding. The same figure for LRT is about \$4.00 per boarding.

## SERVICE QUALITY

Only a few other areas of the region can match the level of transit service provided in the Central Corridor. Routes 16 and 21 offer high-frequency local service, while Route 94 provides all-day express service between the downtowns. A key consideration in evaluating the alternatives is whether the investment results in a significant improvement in service quality.

The No-Build and TSM alternatives would both improve service frequency by adding buses and routes. The TSM alternative would also provide somewhat faster service through use of freeway bypass ramps. Both alternatives, however, share street and highway space with other vehicles and are subject to growing traffic congestion.

By offering exclusive right-of-way, the Busway and LRT alternatives provide a means of bypassing congestion. This improves not only the speed, but also the reliability of transit use. If traffic levels continue to rise, these could be important factors in attracting transit riders.

A Busway and LRT line each has advantages and disadvantages. Buses can enter the busway after collection of passengers in neighborhoods. Passengers riding feeder buses to LRT stations must transfer in order to complete their trip. The ride in a LRT vehicle is smoother and quieter than that of a bus. LRT lines also have greater reliability than buses in bad weather. Finally, because LRT cars can be trained, an LRT line offers greater capacity when needed.

## FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY

Whether the region can afford either the Busway or LRT alternatives is a critical consideration. It is assumed that federal funding can be obtained for a minimum of 50 percent of construction costs. This would require local funding of \$109 million for a busway and \$237 million for an LRT line. No source for this funding currently exists. Funding for a Central Corridor Busway or LRT line would be in addition to other so-called "mega projects" in the region such as rebuilding I-35W and I-494.

## ENVIRONMENT AND LAND USE

An electricity powered LRT line offers the advantage of reducing the numbers of buses in the downtowns. This would improve downtown air quality. This advantage could be lessened over time as transit buses begin to use cleaner burning engines. The differences in other environmental impacts between the alternatives are relatively slight.

The Metropolitan Council's *Transit Facilities Plan* and recent draft *Blueprint* both call for using transportation improvements to strengthen the downtowns and focus development along transportation corridors. The fixed guideway alternatives offer the greatest opportunity for achieving this goal. Both would improve access to the downtowns and provide development opportunities at stations.

This ability to focus development has been demonstrated in cities with LRT such as San Diego and Portland and in Ottawa, which has developed an extensive busway. When comparing busways and LRT, it is generally thought that a rail line had an advantage in attracting development. This advantage is attributable to the perceived permanence of a

rail line. People can see where it comes, where it is going, and can be assured it will always be there.

## ANALYSIS

On the basis of cost and ridership, it is difficult to make a compelling case for either of the high cost, fixed guideway alternatives. It could be argued that the money spent on a Central Corridor busway or LRT line could be better spent on other transit improvements elsewhere in the region.

When issues of service quality and the ability to focus development are considered a major transit capital investment in the Central Corridor can be justified. This corridor is a central link in the regional transit system. It also serves one of the highest concentrations of transit dependent people in the region. To ensure the long-term vitality of the regional transit system, an investment in improved transit within the Central Corridor is needed at this time.

Choosing between a busway or LRT line is a more difficult decision. On the basis of its greater quality of service, greater potential to shape land use in the core of the metro area, and the excess people moving capacity of a LRT line, the LRT alternative is recommended. While a busway is a viable option, the added cost of an LRT line may be returned in higher levels of investment along the corridor. In addition, by adding cars or shortening headways, LRT provides the most excess capacity for the future. In a static environment, this is not a key consideration. Given future uncertainties regarding congestion and fuel availability and price, an investment in LRT would expand the people moving capacity in the corridor.

## OTHER ISSUES

Two issues raised in the AA/DEIS and discussions surrounding it need to be addressed. The first is reference in the document to plans for future LRT development. Specifically the AA/DEIS states that the "*Transit Facilities Plan* scaled back long-term plans for a comprehensive, multi-corridor LRT system until the operation of one or two initial corridors could be evaluated".

In fact, the Facilities Plan, and the RTB's reevaluation of LRT corridors which was part of it, both concluded that LRT was only feasible in the Central and I-35W corridors over the next twenty years. It was further recommended that no further work, beyond preservation of right-of-way, be conducted in other corridors. This may appear to be a small point, but it was intended to focus regional efforts on the two primary corridors.

The second issue relates to efforts by downtown Minneapolis residents and business to construct a tunnel rather than the currently proposed at-grade alignment through downtown. Problems cited with an at-grade line include pedestrian safety, traffic impacts, noise and vibration. It's further argued that since a tunnel would be necessary if more than two or three LRT lines are linked to downtown Minneapolis, it would be a better investment to build a tunnel now.

When the RTB decided in 1991 to drop a tunnel from the regional LRT plan it was based on analysis that an at-grade alignment was feasible. Some have argued that a surface line is preferable in that the lower speed of surface operations is more than offset by the time necessary for passengers to travel up and down to tunnel stations. Furthermore, since no more than two lines are being considered at this time, a surface alignment will be adequate into the future.

Further study of a tunnel option might be considered in the preliminary engineering phase of the project. It is estimated that a tunnel would add \$200 million to the cost of the LRT alternative. This would call into question the feasibility of even building LRT.

#### FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

- The RTB's Vision for Transit and Metropolitan Council's Transit Facilities Plan both call for a major capital investment in the Central Corridor.
- LRT is recommended as the preferred alternative on the basis of enhanced service quality, its ability to focus development in the region's core area and the excess people moving capacity it provides.
- The RTB restates its earlier position that LRT planning should be conducted only in the Central and I-35W corridors.
- A tunnel alignment in downtown Minneapolis is not necessary for the successful operation of a Central Corridor LRT line. Additional study of a tunnel may be appropriate in the preliminary engineering phase of the project.

#### RECOMMENDATION

That the findings recommended in this memorandum be forwarded to the Joint Lead Agencies.

# Light rail's popularity astounds critics

Sunday, January 16, 1994  
The Kansas City Star

*Handout  
2/24  
Comm.*

## They're taking the train

**MetroLink, St. Louis' light rail system, is all aboard for riders.**

By PRINGLE PIPKIN  
St. Louis Correspondent

ST. LOUIS — Dressed in a wool overcoat, Fred Rowe stood in a light mist outside Union Station, waiting for a train to take him home to East St. Louis.

After glancing down the tracks, Rowe said the new 18-mile light rail system was much better than he had imagined.

"I had my doubts about it before it opened because of all the negative publicity," said Rowe, a regular rider. "I started thinking this is going to be something that's not going to work out in the end, a failed idea."

"But I like it a lot. It has proved to be much more positive than negative."

In its first six months, MetroLink has surprised supporters as well as critics with its success. About 6,000 more people than expected ride the trains each month. In November, 23,000 people rode MetroLink, paying \$1 a ride

"It's beyond our wildest expectations," said Tom Shroul, executive director of Citizens for Modern Transit in St. Louis. "The ridership is astounding."

"When I got on the train this morning to go to work, it was standing room only."

Former bus riders are not the only passengers on the new light rail system. Bus ridership has also increased, meaning light rail is bringing in people who previously didn't use public transportation.

Shroul thinks the mix of people — blacks, whites, women, men, people in three-piece suits, others in bib overalls — is good for the community.

"There's always been a lot of discussion here, among blacks and whites, about how we treat people," Shroul said. "I think it's been positive because white people see black people riding and going to work, and that dissolves some stereotypes."

At rush hour, the ridership ratio breaks down to about 50-50 between blacks and whites. The racial makeup of riders fluctuates during off-peak hours.

Before MetroLink started running in July, critics feared crime and racial tensions would stop white people from riding the line, which starts in impoverished East St. Louis. Instead, hundreds from small towns in Illinois park their cars in East St. Louis and catch the train into work in downtown St. Louis.

The East St. Louis station is the busiest one on the line, with about 4,300 riders a day. That stunned Delores Lysakowski, chairwoman of the St. Clair County Transit District in Illinois that includes East St. Louis and a cluster of rural townships.

"I just didn't think it would work," Lysakowski said. "I didn't think anyone would go to East St. Louis."

"We opened with one park-and-ride lot, and we've had to lease two more. Now we've got 800 parking spaces, and they're usually full."

In fact, people in St. Clair County like light rail so much, they voted by a 2-to-1 margin in November for a half-cent sales tax increase. They'll raise \$8.5 million a year to help extend light rail 18 miles, from East St. Louis to Scott Air Force Base.

"Prior to MetroLink, all of us felt we didn't have a chance" at passing the tax increase, Lysakowski said. "But as soon as MetroLink opened and people started riding it, the tide turned."

Congress has granted an additional \$8.5 million for the first phase of studies on extending the line. If the federal money continues to flow, light rail should open its second leg in western Illinois in 1999, Lysakowski said.

"When MetroLink was first talked about, I was really against it," Lysakowski said. "Then as it progressed, I was very skeptical."

"Now, it has really changed my mind. It's clean, it's dependable, it's safe."

Each station has TV monitors for security, plus guards popping on and off the trains at random. Some stations, such as East St. Louis, always have security guards posted.

Since its opening, MetroLink has carried more than 1 million people, but only two crimes — both robberies — have been reported, according to Linda Han-

cock, a spokeswoman for the Bi-State Development Agency, which operates light rail.

In some ways, MetroLink's success was even more surprising because Bi-State had well-publicized snags while building light rail. Plans called for a line to pass through a graveyard near the airport, and relatives of the deceased sued to stop them.

The courts gave permission to remove about 2,500 to 2,800 bodies. With more than half the work completed, Bi-State should open the airport station this summer, Hancock said.

A second problem is more difficult: Bi-State doesn't have enough money to run the system. Even with increased riders, MetroLink needs tax money to break even because it's underpriced to serve the poor.

Originally, planners thought local sales taxes would be enough to make up the difference, but the tax revenue hasn't grown as quickly as predicted, leaving Bi-State millions in the hole. Recently, Bi-State received a \$10 million loan from the state to keep MetroLink running until July.

A longer-range answer could come from the General Assembly during the current session; transit backers are trying to get state money for public transportation programs, including light rail in Kansas City. Without such help, Bi-State officials say they'll have to cut bus and perhaps train service.

Getting state funding won't be easy. But Shroul said MetroLink's popularity will help.

"It has obviously removed the doubt among some members of the General Assembly that no one would use this," he said.

## REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

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

DATE: February 8, 1994

TO: Chair and Members of the Committee of the Whole

FROM: Howard Blin, Planning Manager *HB* *OK*

SUBJECT: Capital Funding Request from Minnesota Valley Transit Authority  
for Construction of Burnsville Transit Hub

### SUMMARY

The Minnesota Valley Transit Authority (MVTA) has requested \$2,850,000 to construct a transit hub and park-and-ride lot on land it owns in Burnsville. Action is requested to approve the funding request.

### BACKGROUND

In 1992 the MVTA completed a park-and-ride lot study for its service area. This study identified the need for additional park-and-ride capacity in northern Burnsville, near I-35W. The MVTA currently operates a 125-car lot at the southwest corner of Highway 13 and Nicollet Avenue. This lot is consistently over capacity, with cars parking on nearby streets.

In May 1993 the RTB approved \$799,000 in funding to MVTA to acquire a 15.9 acre parcel across Highway 13 from the existing lot for development of a larger lot. The current funding request of \$2,850,000 is to develop a transit hub/park-and-ride lot at that location.

### Coordination with I-35W Project

The Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT) has let a contract for construction of high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes along I-35W between Highway 13 and I-494. This "interim third lane" will be in use until the complete reconstruction of I-35W is completed. The lane is scheduled for completion in late 1994. By 1997 Mn/DOT hopes to have this interim HOV lane extended to downtown Minneapolis.

The HOV lane will offer a tremendous travel-time advantage for buses and carpools along I-35W. The Team Transit group, including the MTC, MVTA and RTB, have developed a plan for improving transit service within the I-35W corridor. A key element of this plan is construction of a transit hub and park-and-ride lot near Highway 13 and I-35W. The facility proposed by MVTA would serve that purpose and offer nearly direct access to the HOV lane.

## DISCUSSION

The MVTA is proposing to develop the site in phases, with a combination of transit and commercial uses. MVTA's request and a site plan are attached. Funding is requested at this time for Phase 1 development, which is described below:

### PHASE 1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

- Park-and-Ride Lot. Initially, 550 spaces would be constructed. The site could be expanded in the future with another 250 spaces.
- Bus Transfer Area. Buses would operate in this area, with space for up to eight buses at one time.
- Passenger Waiting Area/MVTA Offices. Located immediately adjacent to the bus transfer area, the two-story Passenger Center structure would include a 3,600 square foot passenger waiting area on the first floor and the MVTA offices on the second floor. MVTA staff would move from office space it currently leases to this facility.

### FUTURE PHASES

The MVTA is exploring the potential for developing commercial uses at the site. The City of Burnsville supports the project, provided some commercial development occurs at this site.

Possible commercial uses include: convenience retail adjacent to the passenger center, an auto mall on the fringe of the site and other possible uses. The MVTA is reserving four acres on the easterly part of the site for future commercial development.

Questions regarding the use of public transit funds for commercial development remain unanswered. Discussions among the RTB, MVTA, Metropolitan Council and bond attorneys for the Council are continuing. Until these issues are resolved, future commercial development at the site will remain on hold.

### CONSISTENCY WITH THE RTB'S FIVE-YEAR TRANSIT PLAN

The Five-Year Plan (Vision '97) calls for constructing nine large park-and-ride lots on the periphery of the regular route service area. These lots are to have capacity for 500+ cars, and are larger than those built in the past. The plan envisioned a lot in Burnsville near I-35W. The MVTA proposal is consistent with that concept.

In addition, the plan called for construction of transit hubs to serve as transfer points between community circulation service and line-haul service. The proposed Burnsville facility would serve that function.

#### OPPORTUNITY FOR IMPROVED SERVICE

The existing lack of park-and-ride spaces in northern Burnsville has limited the MVTA's ability to expand service to meet a growing commuter express market. The additional spaces this project provides would allow MVTA to expand I-35W express service and initiate express service to the I-494 corridor. In addition, this facility will allow convenient transfers between local and express service.

#### COST

MVTA estimates the total cost for this phase of the facility at \$2.85 million. Of this cost, \$1.2 million is directly attributable to construction of park-and-ride spaces. The cost per space is \$2,430. This is comparable to the cost of the recent Coon Rapids park-and-ride lot constructed by the MTC. The Coon Rapids facility will have space for 700 cars at a cost per space of \$2,010, excluding land costs.

The cost of the bus transfer area, passenger waiting area, and MVTA offices is estimated at \$1.1 million. This cost also appears reasonable.

#### FUNDING

RTB capital funding is available from the proceeds of the 1993 sale of transit capital bonds.

#### CONCLUSION

The transit hub facility proposed by the MVTA is consistent with the RTB's plan to expand park-and-ride capacity in the region. The facility will also be located at a key point along the I-35W corridor. This will provide a further incentive for use of the interim HOV lanes that Mn/DOT will begin constructing in 1994. The facility will also allow MVTA to serve the increasing demand for commuter express service to downtown Minneapolis and initiate service to the I-494 corridor.

#### RECOMMENDATION

That the Regional Transit Board authorize the executive director to execute a funding agreement with the Minnesota Valley Transit Authority to provide RTB capital funds in an amount not to exceed \$2,850,000 for construction of the Burnsville Transit Hub.

HB  
Attachments

15025 Glazier Avenue • Suite 213 • Apple Valley, MN 55124  
Ph: (612) 431-4311 • Fax: (612) 431-2828

TO: Greg Andrews  
FROM: Beverley Miller  
SUBJECT: Request For Capital Funding  
Construction Transit Hub In Burnsville  
DATE: February 1, 1994

### **Summary**

In June, 1993 MVTA purchased two parcels of land at the northeast corner of Hwy 13/Nicollet Avenue in Burnsville. A large park and ride facility is needed to expand capacity as well as contribute to the success of the interim third lane on I-35W when it is completed late Fall 1994. The proposed development will provide 550 parking spaces and 3600 s.f. of waiting area for passengers and space for MVTA offices.

### **Discussion**

An analysis of MVTA's five year needs for park and ride lots indicated an immediate and continuing need for expansion in park and ride capacity in response to ridership growth. Bus ridership has increased as much as 18% since MVTA began providing service in 1991. The study found a strong reliance on park and ride lots which allow access to MVTA service. In addition to better serving existing transit needs, development of this facility will also allow for an increase in service to further encourage transit ridership in the corridor to new destinations such as I-494 and the Airport.

MnDOT is strongly supportive of the project and have agreed to process a limited use permit which will allow construction of the parking lot and transit hub on excess highway right of way. The proposed park and ride lot will initially accommodate 550 vehicles with a growth potential for 250 more spaces. We are working in cooperation with the City of Burnsville, the RTB and others toward development of a joint-use commercial and park and ride development on the same site. The joint use development of a park and ride lot can do more than simply serve as a means to increase transit services and parking spaces for commuters. Sharing land use

with other interests such as daycares, convenience stores, banks and restaurants allows for shared parking and will reduce the number of auto trips. It also allows for greater convenience for the transit user. People may travel to the workplace on transit knowing that convenience shopping is located close to the beginning or end of a transit trip and not have to worry about making additional trips at the end of the work day or before the start of their work day. The proposed facility would include protection from the weather, walking distances of no more than 400 feet, accessibility for the disabled, well lit areas to improve pedestrian safety and security and information on transit services. Locating our offices on site will foster greater awareness and information of transit service in the area.

### **Budget/Timeframe**

Concept plans are currently under development working closely with the City of Burnsville and MnDOT. The P.U.D. submittal is scheduled to be completed and presented to the City of Burnsville Planning Commission in February 1994 with subsequent approvals by the City Council in March 1994. We anticipate that a contract to build the transit hub will be let by May/June 1994 with completion in December 1994 of the parking surfaces and March 1995 of the Passenger Service Center.

The following is a cost breakdown of all estimated expenses:

Passenger Service Center & Bus Transfer Area	\$1,100,000
500 Parking Spaces @ \$2,430/Space	\$1,215,000
Administrative Costs (Fees, Surveying, Plat)	\$ 307,000
Contingency 8%	<u>\$ 228,000</u>
TOTAL	\$2,850,000

### **Project Request**

MVTA is requesting \$2,850.00 capital funding to construct a transit hub in Burnsville to accommodate current park and ride users and help build transit ridership in the corridor. A larger park and ride lot is needed to increase the number of buses in the I-35W corridor and to contribute to the success of the third lane (HOV) on I-35W. The lot will initially accommodate 550 vehicles with a growth potential for 250 more spaces. Construction will begin in the Spring of 94 with completion to coincide with the opening of the third lane on I-35W.





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

## REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

At its special meeting of February 14, 1994, the committee approved the following recommendation:

### **MINNESOTA VALLEY TRANSIT AUTHORITY CAPITAL FUNDING REQUEST FOR CONSTRUCTION OF BURNSVILLE TRANSIT HUB**

That the Regional Transit authorize the executive director to execute a funding agreement with the Minnesota Valley Transit Authority to provide RTB capital funds in an amount not to exceed \$2,850,000 for construction of the Burnsville Transit Hub.

### **CHAIR'S BENEFITS**

That the Regional Transit establish the chair's benefits as follows:

- Medical and Dental Insurance: the Regional Transit Board will contribute to the cost of this coverage at the level of a full-time employee.
- Vacation and Sick Leave will be accrued at the same rate as other part-time employees.
- Expense allowance not to exceed \$750 per year.

π

### **METRO MOBILITY REAR HEATER VEHICLE INSTALLATION**

That the Regional Transit:

1. Instruct ATE Management Company, Inc. to competitively procure installation of 149 rear heaters for the Metro Mobility programs demand vehicles with completion of installation no later than September 1, 1994; and
2. Allocate an amount not to exceed \$67,050 from the provider portion of the Metro Mobility budget to complete the installation of the rear heaters for the 149 Metro Mobility demand vehicles.

**Ruth Franklin**  
Chair

## REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

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

DATE: February 1, 1994  
TO: Chair and Members of the Regional Transit Board  
FROM: Gregory L. Andrews, Executive Director  
SUBJECT: Amendment to Chair's Benefits

### ACTION REQUESTED

The Board is requested to amend the fringe benefits for the Chair pursuant to Article VII A of the Regional Transit Board Bylaws.

### BACKGROUND

Article VII A of the Regional Transit Board's Bylaws gives the board the responsibility to establish the expense allowance and benefits of the Chair provided that they not exceed the expense allowance or benefits received by the Chair of the Metropolitan Council. Sally Evert was appointed as part-time Chair by the Governor on December 21 and it is necessary to amend the Chair's benefits, particularly the board's level of contribution to medical and dental coverage, the vacation and sick leave accrual rate, and the expense allowance.

Part-time employees at the Regional Transit Board receive pro-rated sick and vacation leave, and the agency contributes 75% of the normal employer contribution towards health and dental coverage. It is proposed that the board amend this policy and set the Chair's benefits for sick and vacation leave and medical and dental coverage at the same level as that of a full-time employee. In addition, it is recommended that the Chair's annual expense allowance be set at \$750 per year.

### RECOMMENDATION

That the Regional Transit Board establish the Chair's benefits as:

- Vacation and Sick Leave Accrual Rate - set at the same level as that of a full-time employee.
- Medical and Dental Insurance - the board will contribute to the cost of this coverage at the level of a full-time employee.
- Expense allowance not to exceed \$750.00 per year.

All other benefit levels will be consistent with those as stated in the current board-approved RTB Personnel Code.

## REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

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

**DATE:** February 10, 1994  
**TO:** Greg Andrews  
**FROM:** Bob Dietrick *hobD*  
**SUBJECT:** Chair's Benefits

Other metropolitan agency policies concerning benefits for part-time Chair:

- Met Council : full-time
- MWCC: full-time, however when this position was part-time, the Chair was given full-time insurance benefits, along with paid parking. Chair did not accrue vacation or sick leave and did not account for time off.
- MSFC: part-time Chair - receives no benefits. Benefits are reserved for "permanent, full-time employees." Sports does, however, allow Chair to be part of deferred comp program and covers the Chair in the retirement program.
- MTC: part-time Chair - no benefits at all.
- MAC: part-time Chair, per-diem only. Receives travel expenses and is allowed to buy health/dental insurance at COBRA rates.

*Hawkins*  
*2/22/94*

**REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD**

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

**DATE:** February 22, 1994  
**TO:** Regional Transit Board  
**FROM:** Bob LaShomb *RL*  
**SUBJECT:** Draft Bill on Metropolitan Governance

The Revisor of Statutes has prepared legislation to implement the recommendations of the Legislative Commission on Metropolitan Governance. Attached is the draft bill which will be reviewed by the Commission on Wednesday at 3 PM and probably introduced in a few days.

1 A bill for an act

2 relating to metropolitan government; establishing an  
3 elected metropolitan council; making conforming  
4 changes; amending Minnesota Statutes 1992, section  
5 473.123, subdivisions 1, 2a, 4, 5, 6, and by adding  
6 subdivisions; Minnesota Statutes 1993 Supplement,  
7 section 473.123, subdivision 3a; repealing Minnesota  
8 Statutes 1992, section 473.123, subdivision 3.

9 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA:

10 ARTICLE 1

11 ELECTED METROPOLITAN COUNCIL

12 Section 1. Minnesota Statutes 1992, section 473.123,  
13 subdivision 1, is amended to read:

14 Subdivision 1. [CREATION.] A metropolitan council with  
15 jurisdiction in the metropolitan area is created. It shall be  
16 under the supervision and control of ~~±7~~ 16 members, all of whom  
17 shall be residents of the metropolitan area.

18 Sec. 2. Minnesota Statutes 1992, section 473.123,  
19 subdivision 2a, is amended to read:

20 Subd. 2a. [TERMS.] Following each apportionment of council  
21 districts, as provided under subdivision 3a, council members  
22 must be ~~appointed~~ elected on a nonpartisan basis from newly  
23 drawn districts as provided in subdivision 3a. The terms of  
24 members are as follows: members representing even-numbered  
25 districts for terms ending the first Monday in January of the  
26 year ending in the numeral "7"; members representing  
27 odd-numbered districts for terms ending the first Monday in

1 January of the year ending in the numeral "5." Thereafter the  
 2 term of each member is four years, with terms ending the first  
 3 Monday in January, except that all terms expire on the effective  
 4 date of the next apportionment. A member shall continue to  
 5 serve the member's district until a successor is appointed  
 6 elected and qualified, ~~except that, following each~~  
 7 ~~apportionment, the member shall continue to serve at large until~~  
 8 ~~the governor appoints 16 council members, one from each of the~~  
 9 ~~newly drawn council districts as provided under subdivision 3a,~~  
 10 ~~to serve terms as provided under this section.~~ ~~The appointment~~  
 11 ~~to the council must be made by the first Monday in March of the~~  
 12 ~~year in which the term ends.~~ Each council member must reside in  
 13 the council district represented. Each council district must be  
 14 represented by one member of the council.

15 Sec. 3. Minnesota Statutes 1992, section 473.123, is  
 16 amended by adding a subdivision to read:

17 Subd. 2b. [VACANCIES.] A majority of the full membership  
 18 of the council may make an appointment to fill a vacancy in the  
 19 council. The appointee shall serve until the first Monday in  
 20 January of the next year ending in an odd number after a special  
 21 or regular election is held for the vacant seat. The council  
 22 may establish its own procedure to fill the vacancy. If, in a  
 23 seat for which no election is scheduled at the next general  
 24 election, a vacancy occurs at least ten days before regular  
 25 filing opens for metropolitan council seats, a special election  
 26 for the unexpired term must be held concurrently with the  
 27 regular primary, if need be, and general election for  
 28 metropolitan council seats.

29 Sec. 4. Minnesota Statutes 1993 Supplement, section  
 30 473.123, subdivision 3a, is amended to read:

31 Subd. 3a. [REDISTRICTING.] The legislature metropolitan  
 32 council shall redraw the boundaries of the council districts  
 33 after each decennial federal census so that each district has  
 34 substantially equal population. ~~Redistricting is effective in~~  
 35 ~~the year ending in the numeral "3."~~ ~~Within 60 days after a~~  
 36 ~~redistricting plan takes effect, the governor shall appoint~~

1 members and shall adopt the redistricting plan no later than 25  
2 weeks before the state primary election in the year ending in  
3 the numeral "2." Council members elected from the newly drawn  
4 districts to serve terms as provided under subdivision 2a.

5 Sec. 5. Minnesota Statutes 1992, section 473.123, is  
6 amended by adding a subdivision to read:

7 Subd. 3e. [ELECTIONS; PROCEDURES.] (a) Except as provided  
8 in this section, Minnesota election law including but not  
9 limited to chapters 211A and 211B applies to council elections,  
10 as far as practicable.

11 (b) Affidavits of candidacy must be filed with the  
12 secretary of state as provided under section 204B.06.

13 (c) The filing fee shall be the same as for county office  
14 as provided in section 204B.11, subdivision 1, paragraph (d).

15 (d) At the time of filing an affidavit of candidacy, a  
16 candidate may present a petition in place of the filing fee with  
17 the same number of signatures required for a candidate for  
18 county office in section 204B.11, subdivision 2.

19 (e) Council members must be elected at the state and county  
20 general election held in the year before the terms of office  
21 that they seek expire.

22 Sec. 6. Minnesota Statutes 1992, section 473.123,  
23 subdivision 4, is amended to read:

24 Subd. 4. [CHAIR; APPOINTMENT; SELECTION; DUTIES.] (a) The  
25 chair of the metropolitan council shall be appointed-by-the  
26 governor-as-the-17th-voting-member-thereof-by-and-with-the  
27 advice-and-consent-of-the-senate-to-serve-at-the-pleasure-of-the  
28 governor.---Senate-confirmation-shall-be-as-provided-by-section  
29 15.066.---The-chair-shall-be-a-person-experienced-in-the-field-of  
30 municipal-and-urban-affairs-with-administrative-training-and  
31 executive-ability elected by and from among the members of the  
32 council at the first meeting of the council after the first  
33 Monday of January each year and serves for a term of one year.

34 (b) The chair of the metropolitan council shall preside at  
35 the meetings of the metropolitan council and-shall-act-as  
36 principal-executive-officer, if present, and shall perform all

1 ~~other duties assigned by the council or by law. The chair shall~~  
2 ~~organize the work of the metropolitan council, appoint all~~  
3 ~~officers and employees thereof, subject to the approval of the~~  
4 ~~metropolitan council, and be responsible for carrying out all~~  
5 ~~policy decisions of the metropolitan council. The chair's~~  
6 ~~salary shall be as provided in section 15A.081. The chair shall~~  
7 ~~be eligible for expenses in the same manner and amount as state~~  
8 ~~employees.~~

9       Sec. 7. Minnesota Statutes 1992, section 473.123,  
10 subdivision 5, is amended to read:

11       Subd. 5. [METROPOLITAN COUNCIL; DUTIES AND COMPENSATION.]

12 The metropolitan council shall elect such officers in addition  
13 to the chair as it deems necessary for the conduct of its  
14 affairs ~~other than the chair.~~ The additional officers are  
15 elected for the same one-year term as the chair. A secretary  
16 and treasurer need not be members of the metropolitan council.  
17 Meeting times and places shall be fixed by the metropolitan  
18 council and special meetings may be called by a majority of the  
19 members of the metropolitan council or by the chair thereof.  
20 Each metropolitan council member ~~other than the chair~~ shall be  
21 paid \$50 ~~for each day when the member attends one or more~~  
22 ~~meetings or provides other services,~~ as authorized by the  
23 metropolitan council, and shall be reimbursed for  
24 reasonable actual and necessary expenses. The annual budget of  
25 the council shall provide as a separate account anticipated  
26 expenditures for per diem compensation, travel, and associated  
27 expenses for ~~the chair and~~ members, and compensation or  
28 reimbursement shall be made to the ~~chair and~~ members only when  
29 budgeted.

30       In the performance of its duties the metropolitan council  
31 may ~~promulgate rules~~ adopt policies and procedures governing its  
32 operation, establish committees, ~~divisions, departments and~~  
33 ~~bureaus~~ and staff the same as necessary to carry out its duties  
34 and when specifically authorized by law make appointments to  
35 other governmental agencies and districts. ~~All officers and~~  
36 ~~employees of the metropolitan council shall serve at the~~

1 ~~pleasure-of-the-appointing-authority-in-the-unclassified-service~~  
 2 ~~of-the-state-civil-service---Rules-promulgated-by-the~~  
 3 ~~metropolitan-council-shall-be-in-accordance-with-the~~  
 4 ~~administrative-procedure-provisions-contained-in-chapter-14-~~

5 Sec. 8. Minnesota Statutes 1992, section 473.123,  
 6 subdivision 6, is amended to read:

7 Subd. 6. [~~EXECUTIVE-DIRECTOR~~ REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR.] Upon  
 8 ~~the-recommendation-of-the-chair~~ The metropolitan council may  
 9 shall appoint ~~an-executive-director~~ a regional administrator to  
 10 serve at the ~~chair's~~ council's pleasure as the principal  
 11 ~~operating-administrator~~ executive officer for the metropolitan  
 12 council. Except as otherwise expressly provided in this  
 13 chapter, the regional administrator shall organize the work of  
 14 the council staff, appoint all employees, and discipline and  
 15 discharge them in accordance with the council's personnel policy.  
 16 The regional administrator must see that all policy decisions of  
 17 the council are carried out. The ~~director~~ regional  
 18 administrator may be chosen from among the citizens of the  
 19 nation at large, and shall be selected on the basis of training  
 20 and experience in ~~the-field-of-municipal-and-urban~~  
 21 affairs public administration.

22 Sec. 9. [TRANSITIONAL ORGANIZATION.]

23 Subdivision 1. [PERIOD OF EFFECT.] Except as otherwise  
 24 expressly provided in this section, this section is effective  
 25 June 1, 1994, and expires the first Monday in January 1996.

26 Subd. 2. [DIVISIONS.] The metropolitan council has four  
 27 divisions:

- 28 (1) transportation;  
 29 (2) environmental;  
 30 (3) community development; and  
 31 (4) administration.

32 Subd. 3. [REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR AND MANAGEMENT TEAM.] (a)  
 33 The regional administrator must recommend for council approval  
 34 persons to serve in the positions enumerated in this paragraph:

- 35 (1) the director of the transportation division;  
 36 (2) the director of the environmental division;

1 (3) the director of the community development division;

2 (4) the director of the administration division;

3 (5) the manager of transit operations; and

4 (6) the manager of wastewater services.

5 (b) Persons appointed to the positions enumerated in  
6 paragraph (b)<sup>a</sup> serve at the pleasure of the council.

7 (c) The regional administrator is the head of the  
8 metropolitan council's senior management team made up of the  
9 regional administrator and at least the persons serving in the  
10 positions enumerated in paragraph (b)<sup>a</sup>.

11 (d) The management team shall advise the regional  
12 administrator on the overall operation of the metropolitan  
13 council.

14 (e) This subdivision is effective the first Monday in  
15 January 1995.

16 Subd. 4. [COUNCIL COMMITTEES.] The council must have a  
17 transportation division committee, an environmental division  
18 committee, a community development committee, and other  
19 committees it considers appropriate. Each division committee  
20 must meet regularly to oversee the operations of its respective  
21 division and recommend policy to the full council with respect  
22 to its division.

23 Subd. 5. [INTERAGENCY MONEY TRANSFERS.] Except as provided  
24 in Minnesota Statutes ~~section~~, section 473.164, no money may be  
25 transferred from a fund or account of a metropolitan agency  
26 abolished by section 11 or its successor fund or account, to a  
27 fund or account of another agency abolished by section 11, or  
28 its successor fund or account, or to a fund or account of the  
29 metropolitan council during the period this section is effective  
30 without ten days' written notice of the proposed action to each  
31 council member and approval of three-fourths of the full  
32 membership of the council.

33 Subd. 6. [TRANSITIONAL SALARIES OF MEMBERS.] The members  
34 of the metropolitan council elected to serve terms beginning the  
35 first Monday in January 1995 shall receive salaries of \$35,000  
36 per year.

## 1       Sec. 10. [CONTINUATION OF TERMS.]

2       The appointed chair and appointed council members  
3 representing council districts 1 through 16 described in  
4 Minnesota Statutes 1993 Supplement, section 473.123, subdivision  
5 3c, and holding office on the effective date of this section,  
6 and any successor appointed to fill a vacancy, shall continue in  
7 office until the first Monday in January 1995.

## 8       Sec. 11. [ABOLISHED AGENCIES, SUCCESSORS, STATUS QUO.]

9       (a) The regional transit board is abolished. Its duties  
10 and responsibilities are transferred to the metropolitan  
11 council. Its activities are assumed by the transportation  
12 division of the metropolitan council. Policy with respect to  
13 those activities must be recommended by the transportation  
14 division committee of the metropolitan council to the full  
15 council. The metropolitan council is the successor entity to  
16 the regional transit board with respect to all of the board's  
17 property, interests, and obligations. No termination of  
18 personnel may be made except for cause. This paragraph expires  
19 the first Monday in January 1995.

20       (b) The metropolitan transit commission is abolished. Its  
21 duties and responsibilities are transferred to the metropolitan  
22 council. Its activities are assumed by the transportation  
23 division of the metropolitan council. Policy with respect to  
24 those activities must be recommended by the transportation  
25 division committee of the metropolitan council to the full  
26 council. The metropolitan council is the successor entity to  
27 the metropolitan transit commission with respect to all of the  
28 commission's property, interests, and obligations. All of the  
29 operations managed by the commission are transferred as is to  
30 the office of transit operations of the transportation division  
31 of the metropolitan council. No termination of personnel may be  
32 made except for cause. This paragraph expires the first Monday  
33 in January 1996.

34       (c) The metropolitan waste control commission is  
35 abolished. Its duties and responsibilities are transferred to  
36 the metropolitan council. Its activities are assumed by the

1 environmental division of the metropolitan council. Policy with  
2 respect to those activities must be recommended by the  
3 environmental division committee of the metropolitan council to  
4 the full council. The metropolitan council is the successor  
5 entity to the metropolitan waste control commission with respect  
6 to all the commission's property, interests, and obligations.  
7 All of the operations managed by the commission are transferred  
8 as is to the office of wastewater services of the environmental  
9 division of the metropolitan council. No termination of  
10 personnel may be made except for cause. This paragraph expires  
11 the first Monday in January 1996.

12 (d) This act does not abrogate or change any rights enjoyed  
13 by employees of agencies abolished by this section under the  
14 terms of a contract that is required by Minnesota Statutes,  
15 section 179A.20 and that is in effect on March 1, 1994.

16 Sec. 12. [REPEALER.]

17 Minnesota Statutes 1992, section 473.123, subdivision 3, is  
18 repealed.

19 Sec. 13. [APPLICATION.]

20 This article applies in the counties of Anoka, Carver,  
21 Dakota, Hennepin, Ramsey, Scott, and Washington.

22 Sec. 14. [EFFECTIVE DATES.]

23 Sections 1, 3, 4, 6 to 8, and 12 are effective the first  
24 Monday in January 1995. The remainder of this article is  
25 effective June 1, 1994, except as otherwise provided in this  
26 article.

## 1       Sec. 10. [CONTINUATION OF TERMS.]

2       The appointed chair and appointed council members  
3 representing council districts 1 through 16 described in  
4 Minnesota Statutes 1993 Supplement, section 473.123, subdivision  
5 3c, and holding office on the effective date of this section,  
6 and any successor appointed to fill a vacancy, shall continue in  
7 office until the first Monday in January 1995.

## 8       Sec. 11. [ABOLISHED AGENCIES, SUCCESSORS, STATUS QUO.]

9       (a) The regional transit board is abolished. Its duties  
10 and responsibilities are transferred to the metropolitan  
11 council. Its activities are assumed by the transportation  
12 division of the metropolitan council. Policy with respect to  
13 those activities must be recommended by the transportation  
14 division committee of the metropolitan council to the full  
15 council. The metropolitan council is the successor entity to  
16 the regional transit board with respect to all of the board's  
17 property, interests, and obligations. No termination of  
18 personnel may be made except for cause. This paragraph expires  
19 the first Monday in January 1995.

20       (b) The metropolitan transit commission is abolished. Its  
21 duties and responsibilities are transferred to the metropolitan  
22 council. Its activities are assumed by the transportation  
23 division of the metropolitan council. Policy with respect to  
24 those activities must be recommended by the transportation  
25 division committee of the metropolitan council to the full  
26 council. The metropolitan council is the successor entity to  
27 the metropolitan transit commission with respect to all of the  
28 commission's property, interests, and obligations. All of the  
29 operations managed by the commission are transferred as is to  
30 the office of transit operations of the transportation division  
31 of the metropolitan council. No termination of personnel may be  
32 made except for cause. This paragraph expires the first Monday  
33 in January 1996.

34       (c) The metropolitan waste control commission is  
35 abolished. Its duties and responsibilities are transferred to  
36 the metropolitan council. Its activities are assumed by the

1 environmental division of the metropolitan council. Policy with  
2 respect to those activities must be recommended by the  
3 environmental division committee of the metropolitan council to  
4 the full council. The metropolitan council is the successor  
5 entity to the metropolitan waste control commission with respect  
6 to all the commission's property, interests, and obligations.  
7 All of the operations managed by the commission are transferred  
8 as is to the office of wastewater services of the environmental  
9 division of the metropolitan council. No termination of  
10 personnel may be made except for cause. This paragraph expires  
11 the first Monday in January 1996.

12 (d) This act does not abrogate or change any rights enjoyed  
13 by employees of agencies abolished by this section under the  
14 terms of a contract that is required by Minnesota Statutes,  
15 section 179A.20 and that is in effect on March 1, 1994.

16 Sec. 12. [REPEALER.]

17 Minnesota Statutes 1992, section 473.123, subdivision 3, is  
18 repealed.

19 Sec. 13. [APPLICATION.]

20 This article applies in the counties of Anoka, Carver,  
21 Dakota, Hennepin, Ramsey, Scott, and Washington.

22 Sec. 14. [EFFECTIVE DATES.]

23 Sections 1, 3, 4, 6 to 8, and 12 are effective the first  
24 Monday in January 1995. The remainder of this article is  
25 effective June 1, 1994, except as otherwise provided in this  
26 article.

Handout A+F 2/1

## REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

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

**DATE:** February 14, 1994  
**TO:** Chair and Members of the Administration and Finance Committee  
**FROM:** Dave Jacobson, Senior Project Administrator *DJ*  
**SUBJECT:** Metro Mobility Rear Heater Vehicle Installation

### SUMMARY

Despite action taken to increase the heat output of the vehicles, customer complaints continue about the lack of heat on the Metro Mobility vehicles. This memorandum requests the Regional Transit Board (RTB) allocate \$67,050 of the provider operating line item for rear heaters to be installed on the Metro Mobility vehicles.

### DISCUSSION

#### Background

As part of the Metro Mobility Service Center (MMSC) Request for Proposal (RFP) response, ATE Management Company, Inc. purchased 150 lift equipped vehicles. These vehicles are in full compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). This is the first fleet in the nation that is fully compliant with ADA. However, there have been complaints about the lack of adequate heat on the vehicles, especially during the recent 10 year low cold spell during the week of January 17, 1994.

There are three vehicle sizes currently in service consisting of 20, 22, and 24 foot lengths, all on Ford chassis. The vehicles are diesel powered which typically have a slightly lower heat output than gas engines. The 20 foot vehicles have a combination air conditioning and heating system of 30,000 BTU output. The 22 and 24 foot vehicles have a 40,000 BTU combination air conditioning and heating system. All of these vehicles have the heat vent located in the front of the vehicle behind the driver compartment close to the ceiling.

The original vehicle heating configuration had an average output temperature of 100 degrees Fahrenheit when the outside temperature was 15 degrees. As the temperature dropped outside, the vehicles heat output also dropped slightly. A second test was done at zero degrees outside. The findings were that the heat output of the vehicles dropped to a temperature in the mid 90's. In order to help the vehicles remain warm, providers are reminded constantly by ATE and the RTB to keep all doors shut with the exception of the lift door.

**Rear Heater Vehicle Installation**  
**February 14, 1994**  
**Page 2**

In an initial attempt to improve internal vehicle heat productivity, two mechanical enhancements were done. The first was to place wind covers on the outside grill of the vehicles. This helps a diesel engine by keeping the heat the engine produces close to the engine thus increasing output. The wind covers increased the internal heat output by an average of 2-4 degrees.

Secondly, on Saturday January 15 and Sunday January 16 Metrotrans flew a crew of mechanics to the Twin Cities to reconfigure the heating system of all vehicles. Metrotrans re-routed the heater hose accessing the rear of the engine where the water for heating is warmer. The reconfiguration increased heat output by an average of 34 degrees. The wind screen and heating reconfiguration costs were not paid for with the Metro Mobility budget.

**Proposed Rear Vehicle Heaters**

Despite adding the wind covers and reconfiguring the heat output, a lack of adequate vehicle heat still remains an issue. Prior to reconfiguring the heat output, ATE also installed a rear under seat auxiliary heater in one of the 24 foot vehicles. The result was that the rear heater had an output of 121 degrees. Adding the rear auxiliary heater did not affect the main heater output temperature. If a rear heater is installed; it is anticipated that maintenance and the potential vehicle down time due to the added equipment will increase.

**Cost**

The estimated cost for the parts of installing the medium range rear heater is \$350. Labor is anticipated to be \$100 per vehicle. Assuming this cost, it is projected that the retrofitting of the remaining 149 vehicles would cost approximately \$67,050 and take approximately 447 total labor hours to complete the installation.

Due to the time necessary to complete installation of the project staff recommends that ATE Management put this project out competitively. It is anticipated that the procurement process would take approximately 90 days from board approval. Installation shall be complete by no later than September 1, 1994.

There are no additional funding sources to draw upon for this procurement. As a result, it is proposed the source of funding be the providers portion of the operating budget of the Metro Mobility program.

**Recommendation**

That the Regional Transit Board:

- 1) Instruct ATE Management Company, Inc. to competitively procure installation of 149 rear heaters for the Metro Mobility programs demand vehicles with completion of installation no later than September 1, 1994; and
- 2) Allocate an amount not to exceed \$67,050 from the provider portion of the Metro Mobility budget to complete the installation of the rear heaters for the 149 Metro Mobility demand vehicles.