

7. A. 4

7. A. 4

LA COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COUNCIL

MEETING MINUTES - APRIL 24, 1996

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Larry McFarland, Chairman
Neil Bjornsen
Pam Corradi - Secretary
Russ Davies
Mike Dickerson
Stanley Hart
David Louie - Vice Chairman
Esperanza Rivera
Seymour Rosen
Howard Sachar
Peter Schick
James Seal
Charles Stapleton

SPEAKERS

Honorable Raul Perez - Director, MTA Board of Directors
Gary Clark - Assistant Director, Government Relations
Len Struthers - Deputy Project Manager, Engineering, Pasadena Blue Line

STAFF PRESENT

Ray Harris, MTA Government Relations
Audrey Noda, MTA Government Relations
Fe Alcid-Little, MTA Government Relations

I. Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 6:25 p.m. by CAC Chairman Larry McFarland

II. Chairman's Report

L. McFarland reported on MTA's Board Report Item #29, the MTA staff recommendation to study Wilton Place/Arlington and CAC's Board Report Item #30 in support of the motion to study Wilshire Boulevard. The items were discussed at both the Planning and Programming (P & P) and Executive Management Committees (EMC).

Planning and Programming: The Members of the P & P Committee (Directors Burke, Chair, Fasana, Cragin, Dana, Schatz and Dunphy, Ex-Officio) listened intently to the CAC's position which was very convincing. P & P Chair Burke moved to approve her motion in support of Item #29, the staff recommendation but it failed. She introduced her motion which called "for further consideration of a Wilshire alignment for Segment 3 be deferred until the prohibition against tunneling through the methane 'risk zone' can be lifted". The motion died because she couldn't get a second. There was dead silence. Both Items #29 & #30 were sent to the full Board without recommendation.

Executive Management Committee: The EMC is chaired by Mayor Riordan and consists of Directors Antonovich, Zarian, Alatorre, Burke, Fasana and Dunphy, Ex-Officio. Director Alatorre reported that he spoke with Congressman Dixon who reiterated his support of the subway to Pico-San Vicente. MTA CEO Joe Drew reported on his trip to Washington about political capital. L. McFarland believes that translates to what Congressman Dixon wants. The EMC voted not surprisingly against the CAC motion and sent it to the full Board in support of studying the Wilton Place/Arlington alternative.

MTA Board Meeting: Director Yaroslavsky was great. He actually said the Wilton Place/Arlington alternative was dumb. He said if you are going to build a subway, Wilton Place/Arlington really jumps off the map at you as a major subway route. Director Burke introduced her motion for "further consideration of a Wilshire alignment for Segment 3 be deferred until the prohibition against tunneling through the methane 'risk zone' can be lifted." The motion was seconded by Director Fasana. Director Patsouras made a substitute motion, seconded by Director Cragin to study the Wilshire alignment as well as the Wilton Place/Arlington alignment. Director Patsouras' motion failed. (Ayes: Patsouras, Arthur, Perez, Yaroslavsky-Noes: Alatorre, Burke, Cragin, Fasana, Riordan, Schatz, Wilson, Zarian-Abstain: Molina).

The motion by Director Burke was approved (Ayes: Alatorre, Burke, Cragin, Fasana, Molina, Perez-Noes: Patsouras, Arthur, Yaroslavsky)

M. Dickerson asked about the Mayor's position.

L. McFarland said the Mayor is the reason we lost. The Mayor did not support us. The MTA will spend another \$700,000 studying the route to make Congressman Dixon happy with no intention of ever going to it. We should be honest and say stop, take the money and spend it somewhere where we need it, buy some buses, build the Pasadena Line or go to East L.A. but the Board just punts. The Board says one more year to study, we'll try to figure out what we are going to do and come back in a year. L. McFarland referred to the L.A. Times Metro article which was one of the best articles the CAC received. The CAC is very prominently displayed in it. It really puts the CAC on the map. He reported that he developed good relations with the L.A. Times reporter Rich Simon. He spoke with him twenty times for the article and wants very much to have regular communications with the CAC. He wants to know what the CAC is doing and issues that are important to the CAC. If appropriate he will write an article in the L.A. Times about issues of concern to the CAC.

M. Dickerson asked about follow-up on this issue.

L. McFarland said he thought a follow-up article will be in tomorrow's issue. R. Simon said after it hit the press, the Editor decided he made a mistake by not making it the headline in the front page.

H. Sachar congratulated L. McFarland on doing an outstanding job.

L. McFarland commented that H. Sachar did a great job. L. McFarland emphasized to the Board that it is the CAC's position. The CAC needs to bring different faces and people to the Board Meetings.

H. Sachar explained that two years ago we started from zero. He suggested to change the name of the Red Line to the Dixon-Waxman Line.

P. Schick said to call it the Dixon Dangle and the Waxman Wiggle.

L. McFarland said Director Yaroslavsky was right when he said everyone knows that Wilshire is the right thing to do. Everyone on Staff and on the Board knows if you are going to build a subway you go on Wilshire. Here we are again making the wrong decision. Someone should stand up to Congressman Dixon. The CAC needs to invite each of the Board Members to our meetings so we can develop a relationship with them. H. Sachar mentioned this issue will not go away. A year from now, they are going to come back with another study on Wilton Place/Arlington. We need to make sure we keep this on the front burner. We have their attention. People do respect what we are doing.

M. Dickerson thinks the CAC has the opportunity to do something with the amount of money projected for the Pico-San Vicente study. He had a meeting with Chairman Zarian. Chairman

Zarian wants to quickly start talking about a meeting with the Mayor and suggests that the Mid-Cities money is used instead for Warner Center.

H. Sachar The new route is much longer than the original Pico-San Vicente route. It goes to Arlington all the way to Venice and then back over and it must be another quarter of a mile.

M. Dickerson said at the next MTA Board meeting the Board is going to present the alternate rail technology (A-R-T) report. He recommended the possibility of a CAC report that suggests the transfer of money with the Mayor's cooperation. He believes that the Mayor can be convinced. He thinks that the Mayor will be open to these suggestions. Chairman Zarian can set it up.

L. McFarland believes that it is the CAC's duty to show alternatives and create a checklist for options for the money.

M. Dickerson thinks the CAC could get Directors Antonovich, Zarian and the Mayor to support this issue. It takes all the politics out of the situation.

J. Seal asked if this action would take the project out of Congressman Dixon's district.

L. McFarland said Congressman Dixon will not support this. According to the Board, Congressman Dixon has said that studying Wilshire will cut-off all funds for MetroRail.

L. McFarland said we should discuss this under New Business. He doesn't lose the money, he puts the money somewhere where it is needed.

III. Committee Reports: Ad-Hoc Structure Committee

G. Clark, Assistant Director, Government Relations provided a brief update on two legislative measures making its way through the Assembly regarding the reorganization of the MTA Board Directors. AB 2995 (Kuykendall) requires a ten member Board of Directors: three appointed by the Mayor of Los Angeles, three appointed by the Board of Supervisors, three appointed by the League California cities and one ex-officio member appointed by the Governor. AB 2495 (Margett) calls for a 17 member MTA Board: 8 appointed by the League of the California Cities, 5 appointed by the Board of Supervisors, 4 appointed by City of Los Angeles. The Margett bill is sponsored and backed by Director Antonovich, the Kuykendall is sponsored by Mayor Riordan. The Assembly Transportation Committee will be holding a special Assembly Transportation Committee hearing in Los Angeles on Friday May 10th at 9:00 a.m. at the LAX Airport Boardroom. He invited the CAC Members to attend.

J. Seal asked what the staff recommendation is.

G. Clark said the staff has no recommendation. The Board however has taken an opposed position on AB 2995 and has no position on AB 2495.

M. Dickerson mentioned that both Directors Antonovich and Chairman Zarian have different points of view on this issue. Chairman Zarian feels the important thing to do is to cut down the size. Director Antonovich feels approximately the same way but believes we must increase the size of the Board to balance the City of L.A.'s current position.

R. Davies reported that L.A. County has a population of 9.2 million and the City of L.A. has a population of 2.9 million, so the county is three times as big.

L. McFarland asked if there is any discussion going on making the board an elected board.

G. Clark reported there was a bill last year by Senator Polanco that failed in the Assembly.

Public Comment: H. Watt said the CAC is not supporting the bus riders. The MTA Board doesn't have time to listen to the public's comment. He supports an elected Board.

R. Seymour said the problem on Line 424, which was brought up at the last meeting was resolved. He said there is a great difference on the service of that line. He said that MTA did a good job and gave its best effort.

L. McFarland asked A. Noda to draft a letter of thanks for the effort that was done on behalf of the CAC.

J. Seal said the City of San Francisco does not have an elected Board, it has an appointed Board. The East Bay not only has BART but also has AC Transit which is an elected Board. He mentioned the deficit of \$12M and said that they might be ending the all-night service. This is only the beginning and more drastic actions may be taken in the future. The point is we can look at all forms of Boards but MTA has institutional constraints that need to be resolved.

H. Sachar said there is no evidence that there is a difference between an elected board vs. an appointed board.

IV. Pasadena Blue Line Turn Key Issue

L. Struthers, Deputy Project Manager of Engineering, Pasadena Blue Line addressed the turn key issue on the Pasadena Blue Line. The Board's cost containment efforts also included a recommendation on whether we should proceed with turn key for the full project. Staff recommendation was not to proceed with turn key for the Pasadena Blue Line. Turn key should be based upon the status of the design. Turn key in his opinion looks good if you are starting out new with the project and you can tailor the project work to a turn key design bid situation. The Pasadena Blue Line is basically about 80% designed and other contracts about 30% designed. The MTA was able to equal the turn key savings and the number of areas by virtue of the cost reduction. We reduced the budget by \$193M and cut the schedule by one year. The cost associated with escalation was slightly greater for turn key. A request was made by one of the Board Members to come back and tell them the possibility of using turn key in smaller portions. There are three stations in a fairly low design status: Union Station, Del Mar station and Sierra Madre Villa station. All three are at 30% design or less so turn key is more applicable. There is a question from the Board regarding our ability to use turn key for the design build of the yard and shop contract which is currently at about 70% design. We have to add some more things to it in order to encompass the full service shop that is being requested. It is our intent to use turn key with train control contract on a performance basis to open up to various types of technology.

R. Davies said both Denver and St. Louis cost \$20M per mile without cost reductions.

L. Struthers said Denver/St. Louis used more of the available right of way than we will be able to reuse the track that was there.

D. Louie asked if they are single track.

L. Struthers said it is double track. We are going into the cost reduction mode and discussions with the communities regarding the changes we are proposing. We are meeting significant amounts of resistance from the community. The stations we have are fairly expensive stations. We do use a fairly high degree of technology here. We are cutting back in technology significantly compared to what was on the Green Line. L. Struthers came to the project from the Green Line.

D. Louie asked if he saw a problem on the development of cost cutting if the public involved in studying the problems of the project.

L. Struthers said staff work was done without using consultants. We are holding a series of public meetings with various members of the community. The Board passed the recommendation in October '95. We were unable to come up with cost reductions that would get us down to \$700M. Staff went back in February and told them what our suggested reductions were.

There was Board action to go back and find ways to reduce the cost. We are holding workshops in the community on Saturdays and committee meetings during the week. The announcements are being handled by the coordinator of the committee.

M. Dickerson asked in the train control system that the areas of performance would be fiber optic.

L. Struthers said the method selected was to choose train control that was performance based and fiber optics would not be needed for the areas of performance type contracts.

M. Dickerson asked why is it that the design cost is more per mile than any area.

L. Struthers said he agreed that it cost too much to design. His job as the Director of Engineering was to get a handle on that cost and reduce the cost. Staff is working hard with EMC to do so. There are a lot of things that were added to the project after the project got started that required to be redesigned. If we were designing the system as we originally thought, our cost was a \$72.9M for the design.

V. Honorable Raul Perez, Chair, MTA Construction Committee

The last time he attended a CAC meeting the group was talking about buying natural gas buses. We still are trying to find out what is going to be happen to these buses, the methanol buses which we cannot get rid of them because they are so new and by the Federal standards we have to keep them for another 8 or 9 years running. In the meantime, turning them into ethanol may not really be feasible. We have people that are getting high just standing close to the bus. We get reports that people are really getting sick and suing us because they are getting headaches....etc. We are still trying to get a price on the new CNG buses and of course, as you know we are going to get the first prototype of the ATTB bus which is going to start running as an experimental bus. We are going to build two more within 6 or 7 months. We have to look at this as future investment because of it weighs 15,000 pounds less and the brakes are going to last 90% longer. He invited the CAC to take a look at it.

He said that when he went to Washington, D.C. last March, the MTA got \$5M from the DOT to continue the ATTB project.

Mid-Cities issue: He agreed with the CAC. He voted to study Wilshire and Wilton Place/Arlington at the same time. He feels that maybe 5, 6, 7, 8 years from now we will still end up down Wilshire Boulevard. He read the CAC letter in support of studying Wilshire Boulevard. He is contemplating maybe bringing back the motion, since we are looking into Robbins Bill that prohibits above ground transportation in the Valley. It will all come down to an economic situation whether or not we have the money.

We are still fighting the fare increase. We are going to court next month. We could lose the case because in front of a real judge who takes the view of the riders, he may decide to rule in their favor.

P. Corradi asked what is the future of MTA do you see more privatization or locally governed area or do you see it continuing as it is now.

R. Perez said after talking with some people he feels the MTA should actually divest some of the MTA bus operations. There was a plan to build the transit system in the southeast area where he lives. They included the 24 cities of the southeast to build the transit zone. Santa Monica, Long Beach, Foothill etc. all claim they can do it for less money. He wants to give them the opportunity to prove it. The March meeting, we were going to be awarding money for operations. We compete for the money with Long Beach, Foothill, Santa Monica, Culver City etc. MTA and Norwalk buses go down the same street every day. There's no need for that. If there was no money saved, we will be able to become a lot more efficient and will probably increase the amount of service. If MTA Operations was able to somehow put in a different zone, with the

amount of buses we got we may be able to increase the level of service even though there may not be any money savings, but the riding public will be a lot better off.

We can't delay any longer. The path of least resistance is doing more studies. He doesn't particularly think more studies is the right way to go. Regarding the Eastern Extension, he was ready to vote for the staff recommendation to get project going. The longer we wait the more real estate prices are going to go up again. This is happening with the Blue Line in Pasadena. If we wait too long, we probably will end up with another \$900M line again. Stan Phernambucq came with a slogan "804" no more and we hold him for that. By the June Board Meeting, we will not accept anymore changes on the Blue Line in Pasadena.

The MTA is only three years old. The merger is really a shotgun wedding between the two organizations. He asked for F. White's resignation, because he really did not see him melting the two agencies. With J. Drew, we are beginning to see a lot of changes. We have been playing a reacting game. We need to realize the gas tax money is dwindling. We used to get 6 - 7 miles a gallon. We bought the same amount of gas, drove the same type of cars that get 30 miles/gallon and do the same damage to the road now, yet we pay a lot less money in gasoline taxes. We are have to balance that out. Maybe the DMV will end up setting a fee for yearly mileage to pay for the HOV lane. We pay several hundred millions of dollars on the tow trucks that pick people up on the freeways. When AB152 passed we were charged with a lot of responsibilities, responsibilities a lot of people don't know how to get done.

The Board is working better and more as a team. The Board has gone through it's changes: first it was Bradley then Riordan came in, and then we split the chairmanship to Antonovich and Edelman. It was confusing. The Board was fighting with one another whether to build this building or not. People never realized we were paying almost \$13M a year rent from six different locations. This didn't take into account all the people traveling to the various locations. This building cost \$145M and it will be paid for in 15 years. F. White's problem was when he came from New York, he only had to keep the Governor happy, if the Governor was happy you had no more problems. He thought the Mayor of Los Angeles was going to be like the Governor but was surprised to find out that there are the Supervisors and members of the cities. He is from one of the smaller cities and has no stake in the big politics of Los Angeles. He has the luxury of agreeing and disagreeing with people.

He has had several conversations with the bus rider's union because they want an elected board. He told them we have an elected board. Because if got a representative from the 23 cities of the southeast and elected one person from there, it would take probably 4,000 - 6,000 votes to get somebody out. If you don't like him all you have to do is go to Huntington Park and get 4,000 - 6,000 votes and he is out.

S. Hart said the decision making process of the board is really political. He asked at the J. Drew why we spend 25% of the Prop. C money for the HOV lane. HOV lanes are simply an enlargement of our freeway system.. Has the Board faced that problem?

R. Perez said when Caltrans decided they cannot spend the money on HOV lanes anymore and instead they give it to us. He thought it is a carryover from the LACTC. A lot of projects are carryovers, pre -MTA. The Red Line through Hollywood was planned 10 years ago long before the MTA was formed. MTA staff is going to become a lot stronger as time is goes by. He has a lot of faith that J. Drew is going to do a good job because he is more assertive. He supports staff because he doesn't want to second-guess. If he second guesses, he may as well be staff himself.

S. Hart said he didn't think staff understood that the Board really looks to them and as a result sees the Board as a rudderless ship without any direction without any real reasons for what they are doing. The Board is supposed to provide the wisdom, despite the political pressures.

R. Perez said the Board is trying to dig themselves out of a hole. He feels that 5-6 months from now you are going to see a different picture. We have a lot of new personnel, like Stan Phernambucq who was only here for a few months, a lot of new people on board.

VI. Old Business

Amendment to the CAC By-Laws: N. Bjornsen stated that the amendment to the CAC By-Laws was not included in the minutes of the previous meeting: "Article III, Section A, Subsection 1: Duties of the Chairperson - the following sentence was added and seconded by all present: "The immediate past Chairperson shall serve as a member of the Executive Committee".

M. Dickerson said he wants to create a Sub-Committee to discuss A-R-T's and to present the findings to the Executive Committee. He wanted to include a motion on the agenda for the May Board Meeting . He also wants a separate meeting to discuss the issue of A-R-T's.

R. Seymour a motion to have the item ready for the CAC at our next meeting.

L. McFarland said it is not a motion but just a presentation.

A. Noda noted that the motion cannot be placed on the agenda unless it received in proper format. Chairman Zarian reviews it and decides whether or not it goes on the Board agenda.

M. Dickerson said that he will fax the information the following day.

R. Seymour raised the question about CAC business cards. He said that he hasn't received a response.

L. McFarland asked if L. Bohlinger would attend the next meeting.

A. Noda responded that she has invited L. Bohlinger to two meetings now but she has not been available.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF COST REDUCTION RECOMMENDATIONS
(in \$ millions)

Item	Baseline \$997.7 Forecast (As of 03/95)	Staff Recommended \$ 803.9 Project	Reductions
Guideway and Trackwork	200.5	175.7	53.6
Stations	49.9	43.8	6.1
Maintenance Facility	23.4	24.8	(1.4)
Specialty	8.0	8.3	(0.3)
Utility Relocation/Agency Force Accounts	36.2	23.6	12.6
Passenger Vehicle	0.0	0.0	0.0
Electrification	51.2	26.9	24.3
Systemwide Equipment	65.0	27.5	37.5
Testing and Pre-Revenue Operations	14.4	7.6	6.8
Owner's Insurance	36.3	27.5	8.8
Professional Services	215.2	232.0	(16.8)
Real Estate	77.7	69.3	8.4
Miscellaneous	2.2	2.2	(0.0)
Contingency (Board Approval Required)	24.0	17.8	6.2
Contingency	50.6	37.3	13.3
*Design Allowance (Board Approval Required)	31.0	22.4	10.0
Escalation	112.1	57.2	54.9
GRAND TOTAL	997.7	803.9	193.8

NOTES: Variance reflects delta between \$997.7M Baseline Forecast and VE Option #1 (Full-funding).

Revenue Operations Date - April 2001.

*The revised Design Allowance is based on a ratio of cost reductions and will be verified as redesign for cost reductions progresses.

MICHAEL E. DICKERSON
FAX

2262 E. Chevy Chase Dr.
Glendale, CA 91206-1807

FAX 1-818-246-6824

To: Paul Monaci

Date: 05/07/96 1:55 PM

Attention:

Pages: 1+3

Reference: CAC

To follow is the Motion and final draft of Board Resolution we discussed.

f.c. Larry Mc Farland
Audery Nota MTA

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY MTA
CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COUNCIL (CAC)**

MOTION

WHEREAS, the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority ("LACMTA") has authorized study of two of the three likely transportation corridors through the San Fernando Valley to the Warner Center; and

WHEREAS, the cost of the preferred alignment (Chandler) as proposed may be prohibitive; and

WHEREAS, the alternates proposals in the corridors have significant opposition; and

WHEREAS, the use of Alternate Rail Technologies has the potential to provide service at the lowest possible build cost, with an accelerated implementation.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Citizens' Advisory Council requests that the LACMTA Board of Directors authorize necessary studies for the third potential alignment to Warner Center via Chatsworth, Van Nuys, Burbank and Glendale. Further Citizens' Advisory Council requests that Requests for Proposals (RFP's) be sought, as soon as possible, on the segment LA to Chatsworth previously studied by The Regional Rail Authority (Metrolink), so as to quantify the true potential savings.

DATE PREPARED 29 April, 1996
DATE REVISED

TO : BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: CITIZENS ADVISORY COUNCIL
SUBJECT: ALTERNATE RAIL TECHNOLOGY

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board authorize:

1. Evaluation of potential utilization of alternate rail technology to Warner Center via and Chatsworth, Van Nuys, Burbank and Glendale
2. Evaluation of potential utilization of alternate rail technology from Burbank to San Fernando.

ORGANIZATIONAL IMPACT

The utilization of a Van Nuys - Chatsworth - Warner Center corridor as an alternate to the Chandler corridor is consistent with MTA Long Range Plan. The extension to San Fernando would be an addition to the MTA Long Range Plans.

BUDGET IMPACT

The cost of Alternate Rail Technology is the least expensive way to provide frequent, high speed and high capacity rail service to Warner Center. The track and signaling, except from Chatsworth to Warner Center, would also be utilized by Amtrak - Metrolink - Freight which may allow additional funding sources not available for the two alternate corridors previously studied.

The San Fernando corridor is not in the long range plan. The inclusion is suggested for reasons of operating efficiency.

ALTERNATES CONSIDERED

The Board has previously authorized analysis of 101 Freeway and Chandler alignments.

DISCUSSION

In line with the board's direction to find lower cost alternates to capital programs, the utilization of Alternate Rail Technology should produce a very significant savings.

A direct connection to the Warner Center would be provided, at Chatsworth, for Metrolink users from the Simi Valley and Ventura County.

The alignment is longer than either the Chandler or 101 Alignments but the potential speed is higher so the travel time may in fact be shorter.

The alignment has very little adjacent housing thus reducing the potential for negative homeowner comments. The alignment allows for direct service to a number of locations with high ridership potential, in addition to the Warner Center.

- The redevelopment site of the General Motors Assembly Plant
- Two airports
- Two transportation centers in addition to Union Station.

Initial service could be provided in less than two years.

The equipment likely to be used is not currently operating in the United States. Design / build and design / build / operate contracting, with appropriate guarantees, is recommended as a bid procedure.

The use of this corridor does not preclude the future extension of the Red Line in the Valley.