



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.

- **Provider Contracts**

The RTB holds contracts with over 30 transit providers. Management plan proposals from these providers were due to the RTB on July 15 for contracts to be in place on January 1, 1995. Review of the proposals and negotiation of management plans/contracts is underway. Because funding is tight this year, negotiations are challenging. Contracts may not be ready for approval until October or November. The RTB staff is proceeding with negotiations but is also preparing a set of recommended guidelines for board adoption that can be passed on to the Metropolitan Council for their use in approving the management plans in October and November, 1994.

- **Regional Fleet**

The RTB's Provider Advisory Committee is currently examining issues surrounding the creation of a regional fleet of buses. This fleet, which would include existing MTC buses, would be allocated among all providers.

- **High-Subsidy Routes**

There a number of routes which are not meeting performance standards for regular route service. Public hearings need to be held to solicit feedback. The board recently adopted a new process for the review of high-subsidy routes and included in their policy some of the social considerations that should be made when deciding the future of these services. It is unclear whether the RTB will have an adequate amount of time to conduct these public hearings and make a decision regarding these routes.

- **1995 Regional Transit Board Budget (including MTC budget)**

RTB has begun to prepare its 1995 budget. General direction to providers is generally that funding is tight and that only same level service will be funded. Public hearing must be held by August 15 and the budget must be approved by December 15.

MTC is expected to submit its budget to the RTB in late summer. RTB staff will evaluate the budget in terms of its consistency with the Five-Year Transit Plan and available funding. Approval of the MTC budget is scheduled for September.

- **Signage**

The RTB has directed the use of the international bus symbol to be used on all metropolitan area bus stop signage. The board should approve the final design.

- **Advisory Committees**

Currently the RTB has three active advisory committees:

- Transportation Accessibility Advisory Committee (TAAC)
- Rideshare Advisory Committee (RAC)
- Providers' Advisory Committee (PAC)

Members have been appointed by RTB members and are anxious to know if they will continue in these positions. Both TAAC and RAC are legislatively mandated committees; the PAC was originally established in response to federal guidelines.

- **School Education**

In December, 1992, the RTB and nine other transit-related organizations (including the Metropolitan Council) combined to create the Metropolitan Transit Education Committee. A strategic communications and education plan was developed. The group's goals are to increase understanding of the need for transit improvements and to generate support for those improvements among transit users and non-transit users.

One tactic planned to accomplish these goals is the development of transit curricula for the schools. Thomas Learning Consultants was hired this past March to create a plan for developing school education. The plan will be completed June 15, 1994. This plan will outline how the Committee should proceed with the development of school curricula. The Committee applied for ISTEA funding to support this project. The results of the ISTEA selection process will be available on June 15 as well. So far, the committee is optimistic about receiving funding for the project.

If full funding is available, the Committee would like to release an RFP this summer, get a school curricula developer to prepare curricula this fall, field test the curricula in the spring and have a completed curricula available for a summer workshop sponsored by Hamline University as well as the 1994-1995 school year.

- **Technical Assistance**

The Regional Transit Board staff is frequently asked for its assistance in conducting special planning and/or implementation studies for transit services. Currently, the RTB staff is working on a project in Washington County. Requests have been received for additional assistance including Anoka County. With its reduced staff size, RTB staff is making an effort to be responsive to these requests. However, consulting assistance may be necessary if additional staff resources are not able to be hired and/or assigned.

II. Twelve-Month Priorities

- **Accessibility Issues**

Efforts in this region toward making transit services accessible to persons with disabilities have focused primarily on Metro Mobility and accessible regular route transit service, as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The RTB staff is currently taking an inventory all of the other providers, under contract, to determine how accessible those services are. With that information and additional information regarding ADA requirements, RTB staff is planning to develop a regional transit accessibility plan which will outline policies and funding needs for making the transit system accessible. Furthermore, the MTC, in conjunction with the RTB, is revising its accessible regular route transit plan which addresses where and how accessible buses should be deployed as they are purchased.

There has been considerable discussion about the financial impacts of ADA and how the region will comply with ADA mandates to provide both accessible regular route transit service and complementary paratransit service. Council members may wish to have a briefing and extended discussion on this topic.

- **Service Contracting**

Two significant services are due to be re-bid within the next year--University of Minnesota Route 52 and the Roseville Area Circulator. As indicated below, the Route 52 service, in particular, raises some wide-reaching policy issues and there may be an effort to simply extend the existing contract at this time. The RFP for the Roseville Circulator, on the other hand, needs to be released soon. Some opt-out contracts are also scheduled to be bid out in 1995.

Currently, the RTB is revising its competitive transit guidelines which set forth the specific requirements for competitively contracting service. In progress, as well, is some preliminary work on a more general contracting policy that would address the circumstances under which it makes the most sense to contract or sub-contract service. A background paper on this topic is being prepared and should be ready for review early fall.

- **Travel Demand Management**

The RTB staff has identified the need to develop a new regional strategy for ridesharing, particularly given that the rate of carpooling and vanpooling in the region has declined in recent years. Currently, Minnesota Rideshare services are provided by the MTC under contract to the RTB. There is a need to establish regional TDM goals and then determine how to best structure and organize TDM services. This is particularly important given Downtown Minneapolis TMO, 35W and 494 efforts.

- **Funding Existing Services**

RTB did not receive all of the funding it requested from the legislature for transit services. The impact of this shortfall can be specifically identified once the providers submit their management plan proposals. A decision will then need to be made whether or not to request additional funding for existing transit services.

Additionally, given changes in the transit system over the past several years, RTB staff has identified the need for a revision in the transit funding formulas now established in state law. A background paper with options is currently being prepared on this topic and should be ready by late summer for incorporation into the legislative program discussion.

- **Funding Vision for Transit**

There exists strong support and endorsement of the RTB's Vision for Transit. This scheme for designing transit services has been adopted by the Metropolitan Council as part of its Transit Facilities Plan. Although some efforts have been made to implement certain components of this plan, additional funding is needed in order to significantly carry out the plan and program. Legislative support has been strong for the concept, but, to date, no funding has been provided.

- **Fares**

No fare increase is currently under consideration. However, over the longer-term, discussion should take place regarding the appropriate level of fares, given "prices" of other transportation services (i.e., parking). RTB also suggests continued discussion of youth fares and what the social implications are for either increasing and/or decreasing these fares.

- **Marketing**

Identity

There are a variety of issues related to establishing a regional identity for transit services versus retaining individual service identities, i.e., how will the Metro Council be identified with services?

Marketing All Transit Services

Transit marketing has occurred on a number of levels in the region for the various transit services. The new merger creates the opportunity to look at marketing transit as a regional service making better use of resources, and communicating more clearly to the public.

- **Route 52**

The University of Minnesota has completed a transportation study which recommends that Route 52--the commuter bus network serving the university--be merged into the regional regular route system. Doing so has financial implications for the RTB since currently the cost of providing this service is shared between the University and the RTB.

- **Administration**

The RTB needs to close out provider audits, negotiate contracts and conduct other administrative functions.

- **Legislative Program**

A unified, single legislative program is desirable. A variety of legislative remedies may be pursued included:

- additional funding for existing services, including Metro Mobility shortfall
- additional funding for Vision for Transit
- change in funding formulas

- **Metro Mobility**

The Metro Council has determined that it will conduct an evaluation of the Metro Mobility program in July, 1995.

- **Special Events**

Refinements to the special events policy need to be implemented as to procedures for responding to special events' transportation needs. Parties needing to be involved include the Convention Bureau, charter bus operators, MCTO and the cities.

III. Relationship/Organization Issues

Additionally, there are a variety of relationship and organizational issues that need to be addressed as the Metropolitan Transit Commission, the Regional Transit Board and the Metropolitan Council are merged.

It is generally the view of RTB staff and board members that there are some key organizational elements that have been developed over the past decade that should be preserved as part of the general approach and organizational structure related to public transit services. These elements include:

- The region needs to continue to support a "family of transit services" approach--i.e., a variety of transit services and transit providers should be offered in an effort to match the diverse needs of the community. Needs and expenditures also need to be established from a regional point of view to ensure that services are well matched to needs and available resources.
- Services should be provided in a cost-effective manner.
- It is challenging to provide necessary transit services within available resources. Consideration needs to be made to a variety of factors.
- There are many advantages to maintaining some separation of policy development and planning from operations yet closely linking them in the collection and sharing of information. Operations can tend to dominate agendas and interests.
- There are also advantages to maintaining organizational separation between the actual provision of service from contracting and regulating services. There is an inherent conflict of interest in being able to provide the service and to regulate others who provide this service. This was substantiated by the courts in the late 1970s when it was concluded that the MTC could not constitutionally own the dominant bus system and, at the same time, regulate competitors. The regulatory authority was taken back by the state, through the Transportation Regulatory Board.
- A commitment to innovation and service demonstration should be continued in an effort to continually seek new and better ways to provide service and to more effectively reach and serve potential transit markets. Also, a culture that encourages and facilitates alternative policy options is very desirable.
- The RTB has an excellent staff with a great deal of expertise in transit. This expertise should be maintained not only in planning and programs, but also in public information.
- Transit advocacy is important. Not only should the Metropolitan Council strongly advocate for public transit interests but also work toward cultivating transit constituencies.
- Distinctions between various transit planning functions needs to be acknowledged and organizationally addressed. Different levels exist including service planning for MTC services, service planning for non-MTC services, development of community plans, overall regional planning, etc.
- Recognizing the close relationship of transit and land use is important and deserving of ongoing and increased attention.

- The use and development of measures of performance for transit services is important, especially when developing policies to direct and assess the activities of transit management.
- Maintaining a choice of providers creates a healthy, competitive environment.

IV. RTB Personnel Issues

Finally, there are a number of issues related to RTB personnel which deserve attention during next few months. These include:

- RTB staff is committed toward making the consolidation smooth and productive. They are anxious to share their ideas, participate on committee, provide feedback, etc. in order to optimize the new organization's success.
- RTB staff would like to see committees established that deal with transportation/transit issues and how through the organizational structure these issues can be dealt with most effectively.
- RTB staff members are concerned about their job security, but would request if staffing cuts/changes need to be made that they are treated humanely and offered outplacement services, severance pay and benefits, etc. Particular, since RTB staff members don't join the new organization until October, there is some concern that our interests and positions will be considered the lowest priority.
- RTB staff members encourage the transition to be considered a merger, not an absorption whereby RTB employees have the opportunity to be considered for key positions within the new organization.
- RTB staff members would like to communicated with on a regular basis about transition issues.

RTB Agency Priorities, Activities and Issues Schedule

- Metro Mobility
 - Budget Options
 - Eligibility Criteria
- Preparation of FYTP
- Provider Contracts/Management Plans
- Regional Fleet
- High-Subsidy Routes
- 1995 RTB Budget Including Review of MTC Budget
- Signage
- Advisory Committees
- School Education
- Technical Assistance

Timetable

Week of 8/1

- Prepare first MTC budget memorandum
- Begin review of management plans/prepare update for 8/8 A & F Committee
- Work toward completion of draft FYTP
- Set forth strategy and timetable for adoption of Metro Mobility eligibility criteria
- Work toward completion of modifications to Metro Mobility eligibility criteria

8/1 RTB Meeting

Week of 8/8

- Complete draft FYTP; give copy to board @ retreat on 8/11
- Complete modifications to eligibility criteria; prepare memo for mailing on 8/9
- Begin to develop guidelines for approving management plans
- Work on Metro Mobility budget options

8/8 A & F Committee

8/10 Transportation Committee

8/11 Board Retreat

--Five-Year Transit Plan
--Priorities, Activities, Issues--Modifications & Timetable

Week of 8/15

- Prepare memorandum regarding Metro Mobility budget options (Part I)

8/15 RTB

Week of 8/22

- Continue working on Metro Mobility budget options

8/22 Policy Committee
--Adopt Five-Year Transit Plan
--Adopt Metro Mobility Eligibility Criteria
--Metro Mobility Budget Options--Continued Discussion
--High Subsidy Routes
--U of M Route 52 Overview

8/24 Transportation Committee

Week of 8/29

Week of 9/5

9/6 RTB Meeting
--Adopt Five-Year Transit Plan
--Adopt Metro Mobility Eligibility Criteria

Week of 9/12

9/12 Committee of the Whole
--MTC Budget Approval
--Management Plan Guidelines
--Roseville Circulaator Request for Proposal (RFP)
--RTB Budget Approval

- Three-Year Capital Plan (?)
- Jobseekers Budget

- 9/14 Transportation Committee
- Five-Year Transit Plan Presentation
 - Metro Mobility Eligibility

Week of 9/19

- 9/19 Committee of the Whole
- School Education
 - Metro Mobility Budget Options--Final Recommendations
 - High Subsidy Routes

Week of 9/26

- 9/26 RTB
- MTC Budget Review
 - Management Plan Guidelines
- 9/28 Transportation Committee
- MTC Budget Review
 - Management Plan Guidelines

October 1, 1994--Forward

October, 1994

- Provider contract approvals
- Legislative program

November, 1994

- Provider contract approvals

December, 1994

- RTB/MTC budget approval (by December 15)

January, 1995

February, 1995

March, 1995

April, 1995

May, 1995

June, 1995

- Metro Council twelve-month evaluation of Metro Mobility restructuring

July, 1995

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD
ROLL CALL AND ATTENDANCE SHEET

DATE: _____

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

ISSUE

Michael Beard - A									
Sharon Feess - A									
Ruth Franklin, Chair - A									
Morgan Grant - P									
Val M. Higgins, Chair - P									
James Hovland - P									
Gary Humphrey - P									
Ruby Hunt - P									
Harry Mares A									
District D - A									
Sally Evert									

Visitors

Staff

mff

CHART OF MOTIONS

(In Order of Precedence Through #13; No Order of Precedence Among Remaining 10 Motions)

	Type of Motion	Interrupt Speaker	Require Second	Amendable	Debatable	Required Vote	Purpose
1. Fix the Time to Which To Adjourn	Privileged	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Majority	to set time for continuation of meeting
2. Adjourn	Privileged	No	Yes	No	No	Majority	to close the meeting
3. Take a Recess	Privileged	No	Yes	Yes	No	Majority	to interrupt the meeting
4. Raise a Question of Privilege	Privileged	Yes	No	No	No	---	to request a personal privilege
5. Call for the Orders of the Day	Privileged	Yes	No	No	No	---	to require adherence to agenda
6. Lay on the Table	Subsidiary	No	Yes	No	No	Majority	to interrupt business for some urgent reason
7. Previous Question (Close Debate)	Subsidiary	No	Yes	No	No	2/3	to close debate on pending motion
8. Limit or Extend Limits of Debate	Subsidiary	No	Yes	Yes	No	2/3	to limit or extend debate
9. Postpone to a Certain Time (Postpone Definitely)	Subsidiary	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Majority	to postpone to another, specified time
10. Refer to Committee	Subsidiary	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Majority	to send to a committee for further study
11. Amend	Subsidiary	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Majority	to alter or modify the wording of a motion
12. Postpone Indefinitely	Subsidiary	No	Yes	No	Yes	Majority	to avoid a direct vote on a motion
13. Original Main Motion	Main	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Majority	to introduce new business
14. Point of Order	Incidental	Yes	No	No	No	---	to enforce rules and orders
15. Appeal	Incidental	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Majority	try to reverse ruling
16. Questions or Points of Information	Incidental	Yes	No	No	No	---	obtain answers to questions and seek information
17. Suspend the Rules	Incidental	No	Yes	No	No	2/3	set aside rules that interfere with action desired
18. Object to Consideration	Incidental	Yes	No	No	No	2/3	to avoid unprofitable questions
19. Division of a Question	Incidental	No	Yes	Yes	No	Majority	to divide a question
20. Consideration by Paragraph -- Seriatum	Incidental	No	Yes	Yes	No	Majority	to consider by sections
21. Division of the Assembly	Incidental	Yes	No	No	No	---	to provide for a more accurate count of the vote
22. Rescind	Bring back before assembly	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	2/3	to nullify a motion previously adopted
23. Reconsider	Bring back before assembly	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Majority	to bring back for review



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

Meeting Notice

The Regional Transit Board will meet at the time and place shown below for the purpose of discussing its Five-Year Plan and long-term priorities and issues that should be communicated to the members of the Metropolitan Council for their consideration in the transition process. No action will be taken.

Mosquito Control Commission Offices
2099 University Avenue West
St. Paul, Minnesota
Thursday, August 11, 1994
1:00 to 4:30 p.m.

No action will be taken.

Sally Evert
Chair

mff
August 2, 1994

Five-Year Plan Overview

- 1. Policies/Issues:**
 - **Key Issues**
 - **Priorities**
- 2. Service Plan**
- 3. Capital Plan**
- 4. Financial Plan**