



# Agenda

BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE  
Tuesday, February 23, 1993 - 9:30 a.m.  
Long Beach Room, 11th Floor  
818 West Seventh Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90017

		<u>DISPOSITION</u>
1. Call to Order		Mark Malone Chair
2. Approval of Minutes for Meeting of February, 11, 1993	(Item #1)	Action Mark Malone
3. Call for Projects Funding Marks Development	(To be Distributed at the Meeting)	Information Nancy Whelan
4. Local Share Policy	(Oral Report)	Information Nancy Whelan
5. Review of Article 8 Unmet Needs Hearing	(Oral Report)	Information Mike Tanner
6. Section 9 Delay Update	(Oral Report)	Information Rex Gephart
7. Prop C Priority List	(To be Distributed at the Meeting)	Informaiton Rex Gephart
8. LACTC Bus Rail Coordination Policy	(Oral Report)	Information Alan Patashnick
9. Legislative Update	(Oral Report)	Information Claudette Moody
10. Fare Debit Card Update	(Oral Report)	Information Jim Lair
11. New Business		
12. Adjournment		

bos:bos22393.agn



Los Angeles County  
Transportation  
Commission

818 West Seventh Street  
Suite 1100  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
Tel 213 623-1194

Leading the Way to Greater Mobility



# Minutes

## BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE February 11, 1993

### MEMBERS PRESENT

#### Name

Mark Malone (Chair)  
Jim Mills (Secretary)  
Stephanie Griffin  
Deidre Mumford  
Roger Mommaerts  
Al Reyes  
David Feinberg  
Deborah Fancett  
Birgit Brazil  
Bob Hildebrand (Vice Chair)  
George Vara  
Susan Rizenman  
Michael Uyeno

#### Agency

Long Beach  
Gardena  
Santa Monica  
Montebello  
Norwalk  
SCRTD  
Arcadia  
La Marida  
Foothill Transit  
Torrance  
Commerce  
Culver City  
LADOT

### OTHERS PRESENT

Norm Stabeck  
Steven Brown

SCRTD  
SCRTD

### LACTC STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Linda Bohlinger  
Nancy Whelan  
Mark Bozigion  
Alan Patashnick  
Julie Austin

Nalini Ahuja  
Larry Torres  
Samantha Mock  
Lorenzo Tyner  
Terry Matsumoto

BOS:\busoper4.min



**Los Angeles County  
Transportation  
Commission**

818 West Seventh Street  
Suite 1100  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
Tel 213 623-1194

*Leading the Way to Greater Mobility*



# Minutes

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 9:40 a.m.

## 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the January 7th and December 30th meetings were approved with the following amendments:

BOS requested that the January 7th minutes reflect that at the meeting there was a lengthy discussion on incentive funded projects. In addition, LACTC staff agreed to provide a list of Prop C Capital Projects in order of priority. Staff informed the BOS that a letter listing the capital projects in 1st, 2nd & 3rd priority will be going out within a week.

Referring to the minutes of the December 30 meeting, BOS requested that the final language proposed by Paros and included in the Call for Projects application package be shown. The final language is shown as Attachment A.

## 3. FUNDING MARKS:

At the request of BOS, LACTC staff highlighted the assumptions on which the funding marks were based.

- a.) UCLA forecasts used to estimate future years projections.
- b.) Forecasts reduced by 3.4% which was the amount collected through the Snack Tax which is now abolished.
- c.) Although TDA is 1/4 cent sales tax compared to Prop A which is 1/2 cent, TDA has been 52% of Prop A.
- d.) The aerospace impact to Prop A sales tax receipts is \$38 million. \$33 million was reserved from FY 1992 and FY 1993 receipts and 5 million is reserved from FY 1994 Prop A receipts.
- e.) The Federal Section 9 is based on this year's revised Section 9 estimate.
- f.) The funding marks based on the base scenario.

Staff explained the reason for the difference between Prop A and Prop C revenues:

- a.) Installment sales.
- b.) Delay by the retailers in collecting Prop C tax
- c.) The difference reduces over time.



4. POLICY ON TDA INTEREST

LACTC Staff informed the BOS that there was a sizable balance of TDA interest. This interest will be allocated whenever there is shortfall a in revenues.

BOS was concerned that while before, TDA interest was added to the funding marks, now it would be allocated only in case of revenue shortfalls. The policy has been revised without BOS review and input. BOS was especially concerned about the discretionary use of interest earnings with the formation of MTA.

5. CALL FOR PROJECTS FUND SOURCES APPENDIX

LACTC Staff invited input from BOS on each funding policy listed in the fund sources Appendix. A subgroup to work on these policies was appointed:

Stephanie Griffin  
Birgit Brazil  
Didi Mumford  
Susan Rizenmena  
Micheal Uyeno

6. CALL FOR PROJECTS UPDATE

Staff gave an update on the Call for Projects process, and handed out a schedule of upcoming training sessions. Staff informed the BOS that a short list of recommended projects will be available on April 30th, and a final list would be available on May 10th, 1993. BOS requested information on LACTC policy on matching Capital Funds with Local Funds.

7. 30-YEAR PLAN UPDATE

Staff described the 30-Year Plan update process. A task force has been set up which meets every thursday at 3:00 p.m. and staff requested that a member of BOS work in the task force. BOS would like to discuss the opportunities for expanded BOS Operations. Staff also informed the BOS that over the next year BOS would be given a chance to give input in the 30-Year Plan development. Staff informed the BOS that CMAQ funds can be used for two years for operating new services. Staff has requested FTA's advice on whether CMAQ funds can be used for Rail operations. Staff will also explore the possibilities of using them for operating expanded bus services.

8. AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS COORDINATION BETWEEN 30-YEAR PLAN AND SRTPS

Staff presented the audit recommendation stating that the aim was to request BOS to give input into the 30-Year Plan through the short range Transit Plan. Staff handed out the motion made by the chair of the Audit Ad Hoc Committee.

9. SRTP

Staff informed the BOS that the guidelines contained only the forms required for allocation of funds. Guidelines included a form requesting information on operators' operating and capital plans if there were no funding shortfalls. This would help staff assess the operators' unmet transit needs. BOS should complete their SRTP's assuming all capital projects will be funded. If some projects are not funded, operators will have to revise their L-10 tables. BOS requested that Prop A discretionary carryover be listed as a potential capital funding source on table L-10.

BOS requested that the SRTP due date be moved from March 31 to a later date. Staff was not able to move the SRTP due date but agreed that if operators submit their Capital Project list by March 15, staff could get back with preliminary recommendations on funding by March 22nd. Staff informed the BOS that priority 1 projects would be automatically funded. The operators would not have to apply for these projects but would still be required to discuss them in their SRTP's. For 2nd, 3rd and 4th priority projects, operators would have to apply.

Items 9, 10 & 11 were deferred to the next meeting set for February 23rd, 1993.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

**BUS OPERATING FUNDING PRIORITIES**

Since the only source of operating funds for new or expanded service is Proposition C, the greatest scrutiny will be used in evaluating proposed and demonstration service applications. Applicants are encouraged to review the Proposition C 40% Discretionary Policy Guidelines, adopted May 27, 1992, and the Bus System Capacity Expansion Component of the Guidelines, adopted April 24, 1991, for policy guidance.

The highest priority for funding will be given to service previously approved by the LACTC in the FY 91 and/or FY 92 SRTP annual elements. Henceforth, these will be considered Proposition C "Base" service and will be renewed automatically.

The next priority for funding will be temporary and demonstration services, such as the Transit Service Expansion Program. Recommendations will be made regarding the permanency of funding for these services. Since this will set the precedent for future projects, evaluations will carefully examine whether Commission goals and objectives are being achieved, as described in the Bus Transit Operating Subsidy Evaluation Criteria.

Per the previous cited guidelines, consideration will next be given to marginal operating cost increases associated with the mandated programs of AQMP and ADA.

Finally, applications will be considered for demonstration funding for fixed-route operators as well as the marginal operating and capital cost of expansion, coordination, and enhancement of paratransit systems which operate more cost-effectively than fixed-route service, again using the Bus Transit Operating Subsidy Evaluation Criteria, in accordance with the Proposition C Guidelines. Section 15 reports are required for all paratransit services that are approved for funding in this category.