

AGENDA



LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION 403 West 8th St., Suite 500, Los Angeles, CA 90014 (213) 626-0370

BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Thursday, August 4, 1988 - 9:00 a.m.
LACTC Main Conference Room, 6th Floor
403 West Eighth Street
Los Angeles, CA 90014

		SUGGESTED DISPOSITION
1.	Call to Order	Action
2.	Approval of Minutes for Meeting (Item #2) of July 7, 1988	Action
3.	Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) on Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Handicap (Item #3)	Action
4.	Revised Proposition A Discretionary Guidelines - Follow-Up (Item #4)	Action
5.	Bus Transit Capital Plan (Material to be Distributed Under Separate Cover)	Review/Comment
6.	Community Bus Service Map (Material to be Distributed at Meeting)	Information
7.	Legislative Update (Oral Report)	Information
8.	New Business	

NOTE: Due to the number of items, the meeting has been moved to 9:00 a.m.

MINUTES



LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION 403 West 8th St., Suite 500, Los Angeles, CA 90014 (213) 626-0370

BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

July 7, 1988

MEMBERS PRESENT

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>
Earl Docimo	Montebello
David Feinberg	Arcadia
Tom Bachman	Commerce
Susan Cauldwell	Culver City
Jim Parker	Gardena
Daniel Shoeman	L.A. County Dept. of Public Works
Dan Benson	La Mirada
Karen King	Long Beach Transit
Catherine Cole	Norwalk
Cara Rice	Redondo Beach
Stephanie Griffin	Santa Monica
Leila Procopio	SCRTD
Bob Hildebrand	Torrance

OTHERS PRESENT

Alex McIntyre	Arcadia
Danny Gomez	Commerce
Larry Torres	Montebello
Evelyn Freeman	SCAG
Norm Lester	SCAG
Rex Gephart	SCRTD

LACTC STAFF PRESENT

Sharon Neely	Nalini Ahuja
Mariko Yamagami	Mary Sue O'Melia
Alan Patashnick	

BOS - 7/7 Meeting
Page 2

CALL TO ORDER

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR MEETING OF JUNE 9, 1988

Minutes approved with the following changes:

- Attach BOS Comments matrix to minutes.
- Add to discussion on items to be reviewed by BOS that staff should provide materials before each meeting, to streamline process and avoid extra meetings.

REVISED PROPOSITION A DISCRETIONARY GUIDELINES - FOLLOW-UP

Following presentation by staff, BOS discussed and make comments on the staff report.

The motions made by the BOS at the July 7, 1988 meeting were as follows:

1. Because the interpretation in Attachment B is a different one, the BOS recommends applying the original interpretation of single-year instead of cumulative years for "current year un-committed fund balances." Approve 9, Oppose 1.
2. The BOS recommends conveying to the LACTC that the current language, coupled with other expenditure requirements (5% or 25% maintenance of effort, lapsing funds after 3 years) are sufficient to ensure timely expenditure of Local Return funds. Approve 9, Abstain 1.
3. The BOS recommends that the policy adopted under Section 8.4 should apply to all other subsidy programs, e.g., Incentive Program. Approve 5, Oppose 4, Abstain 1.

BUS TRANSIT CAPITAL PLAN

Materials distributed and presented by staff. A workshop meeting was scheduled to discuss the plan on July 21, 1988.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Brief status report was given by staff. Staff report was distributed on UMTA Charter Regulations.

ITEM #3



Los Angeles County
Transportation
Commission
403 West Eighth Street
Suite 500
Los Angeles
California 90014-3096
(213) 626-0370

July 28, 1988

MEMO TO: E & D TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL - 8/3 MEETING
BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE - 8/4 MEETING

FROM: MANAGER, TRANSIT PROGRAMS

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING (NPRM) ON NONDISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF HANDICAP

ISSUE

UMTA is requesting comments on the UMTA 504 Regulation on a proposal to eliminate the provision which permits credit for off-peak, reduced fares for handicapped passengers to be counted in the calculation of the three percent limit on required expenditures.

RECOMMENDATION

Forward the following comments to UMTA concerning changing the eligible expenditures allowed under the 504 Accessible Service Regulation.

BACKGROUND

UMTA seeks comments, by August 23, 1988, concerning a change to the 504 Regulation which provides that "incremental costs of compliance with 49 CFR 609.23" may count among required expenditures. UMTA requires that recipients, during non-peak hours, must charge elderly and handicapped riders no more than half the normal peak hour fares applicable to other persons. Under the 504 Plan, UMTA had allowed credit towards the 3% expenditure limitation for the costs associated with the handicapped reduced fare. UMTA is seeking a change as a result of litigation brought to the federal court by disability groups. While UMTA is appealing the court's ruling that the 3% expenditure limitation is invalid, UMTA is not appealing the decision that the reduced fare program credit is invalid. A summary of the notice by UMTA and their concerns is provided on Attachment A.

MEMO TO: BOS - 8/4 Meeting
July 28, 1988
Page 2

Analysis

Staff has summarized on Attachment B, the impact of the proposed change to compliance with the 504 Regulation. No operator would be impacted by the proposed change since all the municipal operators significantly exceed the 3% expenditure requirement. SCRTD does not meet the 3% requirement, but meets all the required service criteria and therefore would not be required to exceed its current annual expenditure of \$6.9 million.

One issue that is not addressed in the UMTA notice is how the operators would be required to amend their adopted and UMTA-approved 504 plans to reflect the proposed change. LACTC should strongly urge UMTA to allow the operators to amend their 504 plans administratively without being required to go back through the laborious and costly 90-day public participation process required in the 504 Regulation. Should an operator be found to be below the 3% expenditure limitation, and not meeting the service criteria, then UMTA could require documentation from the operator of consultation with disabled groups about the increased expenditures and alternatives considered. Staff recommends this concern be forwarded to UMTA.

Sharon Neely
SHARON A. NEELY
Manager
Transit Programs

Attachments

SAN:MY:db
NPRM.BOS
L&M-M.1

SUMMARY OF UMTA 504 REGULATION NOTICE AND CONCERNS

- UMTA's notice would prevent incremental expenditures incurred by operators in providing the half-fare program for disabled persons to be counted in the calculation of the three percent limit on required expenditures for accessible transit service.
- One concern that has been raised about the provision is that the incremental costs of providing the half-fare program are imposed not under the 504 regulation, but under 49 CFR 609.23. Therefore, it is inconsistent to count these costs toward the limit on required expenditures under the 504 regulation.
- Another concern about this provision is that by including the incremental costs of the half-fare program, the operator is not required to meet all service criteria without exceeding the limit on required expenditures.
- A third concern is that it may be very difficult to calculate the incremental cost of the half-fare attributable to its use by handicapped, as distinct from non-disabled elderly persons.

UMTA 504 REGULATION

<u>OPERATOR</u>	<u>DOES OPERATOR MEET ALL SERVICE CRITERIA?</u>	<u>DOES OPERATOR CURRENTLY EXCEED 3% LIMITATION?</u>	<u>IF HALF FARE PROGRAM ELIMINATED, WILL OPERATOR BE BELOW 3% EXPEND LIMITATION?</u>	<u>OPERATORS WHO WOULD HAVE TO REVISE THEIR PROGRAM</u>
Arcadia	Yes	Yes	No	No
Claremont ^a	---	---	---	---
Commerce	Yes	Yes	No	No
Culver City	Yes	Yes	No	No
Gardena	Yes	Yes	No	No
La Mirada	Yes	Yes	No	No
Long Beach	Yes	Yes	No	No
Montebello	Yes	Yes	No	No
Norwalk	Yes	Yes	No	No
Redondo Beach	Yes	Yes	No	No
Santa Monica	Yes	Yes	No	No
Torrance	Yes	Yes	No	No
SCRTD	Yes	No	Yes	No
North County	Yes	Yes	No	No

^aNot a federal grant recipient.



Los Angeles County
Transportation
Commission
403 West Eighth Street
Suite 500
Los Angeles
California 90014-3096
(213) 626-0370

July 29, 1988

MEMO TO: BUS OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE - 8/4 MEETING
FROM: MANAGER, TRANSIT PROGRAMS
SUBJECT: REVISED PROPOSITION A DISCRETIONARY GUIDELINES -
FOLLOW-UP

ISSUE

Clarification on the implementation of Section 8.4 regarding uncommitted Proposition A Local Return balances.

RECOMMENDATION

Approve one of the alternatives for implementation of Section 8.4, as listed on Attachment 11.

BACKGROUND

At the last BOS meeting on July 7, 1988, a motion was taken recommending application of the interpretation of annual instead of cumulative years for "current year uncommitted fund balances" under Section 8.4 of the revised Proposition A Discretionary Guidelines.

Attachment I summarizes the financial impacts of the change in Section 8.4, using both annual and cumulative Proposition A Local Return balances.

Attachment II summarizes the current alternatives for implementation that are still being discussed by the BOS and staff.

Sharon Neely

SHARON A. NEELY
Manager
Transit Programs

Attachments

SAN:MY:db
REVPROPA.BOS
L&M M.1

FINANCIAL IMPACTS OF THE CHANGE TO PROPOSITION A DISCRETIONARY GUIDELINES SECTION 8.4

OPERATOR	FY 1988 PROP A	FY 1982-88 CUMULATIVE		FY 1988 PROP A UNCOMMITTED		FY 1988
	LOCAL RETURN	LOCAL RETURN BALANCE AS	NON-COMPLIANCE	LOCAL RETURN BALANCE AS OF	NONCOMPLIANCE	DISCRETIONARY GRANT
ALLOCATION X 50%	OF FY 1988 YEAR-END	OF FY 1988 YEAR-END	COL 2 - COL 1	FY 1988 YEAR-END (EST)	COL 4 - COL 1	
	(EST)	(EST)				
Arcadia	\$ 253,700	\$ 686,068	\$ 432,368	\$393,809	\$140,109	\$ 153,595
Claremont	185,395	590,221	404,826	(248,817)	---	36,492
Commerce	64,242	835,351	771,109	7,483	---	303,020
Culver City	209,808	1,031,694	821,886	92,115	---	908,809
Gardena	258,679	(39,717)	---	(191,441)	---	1,081,185
La Mirada	219,288	519,757	300,469	19,144	---	84,359
Long Beach	2,092,365	729,065	---	36,980	---	5,838,667
Montebello	304,648	10,011	---	26,892	---	1,349,787
Norwalk	461,560	783,577	322,017	188,770	---	535,150
Redondo Beach	331,528	1,609,340	1,277,812	177,705	---	22,865
Santa Monica	494,848	1,711,427	1,216,579	281,601	---	5,263,588
Torrance	722,273	1,272,121	549,848	(883,696)	---	1,551,488
TOTAL	\$5,598,334	\$9,738,915	\$6,096,914	\$(99,455)	\$140,109	\$17,129,085

Note: Negative balances are a result of fund exchanges.

THREE ALTERNATIVES FOR IMPLEMENTING THE CHANGE TO
PROPOSITION A DISCRETIONARY GUIDELINES SECTION 8.4

ALTERNATIVE I
(Annual Allocation)

Any municipal operator whose sponsoring city has a prior year-end allocation of uncommitted Prop A Local Return funds (as of June 30) greater than 50%, will have their Prop A Discretionary fund grant reduced by the amount of the uncommitted balance which exceeds 50% of the prior year's allocation.

ALTERNATIVE II
(Cumulative Balance)

Any municipal operator whose sponsoring city has a cumulative uncommitted Prop A Local Return cumulative balance (as of June 30) greater than 50% of the prior year's allocation, will have their Prop A Discretionary fund grant reduced by the amount of the uncommitted balance which exceeds 50% of the prior year's allocation.

ALTERNATIVE III
(Phase In Between
Alternative I and Alternative II)

For FY 1989, any municipal operator whose sponsoring city has a year-end uncommitted Prop A Local Return balance (as of June 30, 1988) greater than 50% of the FY 1988 allocation, will have their FY 1989 Prop A Discretionary fund grant reduced by the amount of the uncommitted balance which exceeds 50% of the FY 1988 allocation.

From FY 1990 and on, any municipal operator whose sponsoring city has an uncommitted Prop A Local Return cumulative balance (as of June 30) greater than 50% of the prior year's allocation, will have their Prop A Discretionary fund grant reduced by the amount of the uncommitted balance which exceeds 50% of the prior year's allocation.