

8.A.2

8.A.2

LA COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

CITIZENS' ADVISORY COUNCIL

MEETING MINUTES - JUNE 26, 1996

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Larry McFarland, Chairman  
Neil Bjornsen  
Nathan Chroman  
Russ Davies  
Mike Dickerson  
Stan Hart  
William Lyte  
Mary Ann Plumley  
Seymour Rosen  
Howard Sachar  
Peter Schick  
Jim Seal

**SPEAKER**

Rich DeRock, Administrator, Access Services, Inc.

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Ray Harris, MTA Government Relations  
Audrey Noda, MTA Government Relations

I. **Call to Order and Introductions**

The meeting was called to order at 6:20 p.m. by CAC Chairman L. McFarland

II. **Chairman's Report**

L. McFarland asked M. Dickerson to report on CAC/MTA Board Item # 20 regarding Alternate Rail Technology (ART). M. Dickerson reported that the CAC Board Item #20 was pulled from the MTA Board Agenda. A. Noda reported it was on the MTA Board Agenda as a "receive and file" item.

M. Dickerson complemented R. Davies on the slide presentation made to the Planning and Programming Committee.

R. Davis said the CAC tried to make two points: 1) there is a better way to do things than what is in the current twenty year plan. 2) ART is the alternative. (example: to run a line to Warner Center, it would cost \$400 million.)

M. Dickerson said MTA staff doesn't understand the program. MTA Board Member Fasana said that ART has all the characteristics of light rail. MTA Board Member Burke asked staff to include the CAC in the discussions on technical and finance issues. M. Dickerson said it is frustrating when you are in the minority. The CAC motion makes too much sense and would mean stopping the twenty year plan.

R. Davis reported that his presentation covered two points: 1) run light rail through subway tunnels; 2) ART. He complemented MTA and Metrolink and reported that the combined boardings of the 4 rail systems has been averaging over 100,000 riders per day. Six years ago today, the number was 0. In February there were 102,500 and March, 104,000.

L. McFarland introduced MTA Board Alternate, Joe Dawidziak.

J. Dawidziak commented that ART would be perfect for the Exposition Right-of-Way and Crenshaw Corridor. He is looking at a link-up to the Harbor area. Santa Fe Railroad is blocking that.

M. Dickerson said this technology is brand new, different. Siemens and ABB are dying to build turnkey design.

J. Dawidziak commented the CAC proposal would usurp the projects in the 20 year plan. The 20 year plan will be revisited in March. MTA Board Member Burke was concerned about leap-frogging. The discussion of ISTEA funds may or may not be an issue. The issue will be how much money is available. We will be looking at a natural reduction in funding. The reality is providing transit or planning for it.

III. **R. DeRock, Administrator, Access Services, Inc.**

R. DeRock gave a brief overview of the Access Services, Inc. (ASI) group. ASI implements the countywide coordinated plan to meet the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). The ADA requires each fixed route operator to provide complementary paratransit for individuals whose disabilities prevent them from using an accessible bus or rail system.

There are 41 fixed route operators in Los Angeles County. The first demonstration program was created by the former LACTC and began in the San Gabriel Valley with Prop. C 40% discretionary funds.

There are three different ADA categories:

1. Because of a disability, individuals are unable to board, ride or disembark from a fixed route bus;
2. Individuals who can't use the fixed route bus because it lacks accessible equipment;
3. Individuals who have a disability in conjunction with the environment.

Under a strict definition, 95,000 - 115,000 people are eligible in Los Angeles County vs. 1.5 million of the elderly and disabled that are eligible.

Categories of Eligibility:

**Unconditional** eligibility = individuals who are never able to ride an accessible fixed route bus or train. This level allows individuals to use ASI for any trip in access services' service area.

**Trip by trip** = individuals who can use the accessible fixed route bus/train for some trips but not all. Eligibility is determined on a trip by trip basis.

**Conditional** = individuals who are prevented from using the fixed routes only at times when certain disabling conditions exist. ASI is available when mobility impairment fluctuates in a manner that prevents them from riding the fixed routes.

**Temporary** = individuals whose conditions will resolve themselves over time.

There is a 21 day application process for ASI.

ASI transports 4000 people daily. The system is growing very rapidly.

The ASI 1996 budget is \$26 million. Next year, ASI is budgeted for \$33 million and will provide 1.5 million trips.

40% of the eligible people are in wheel chairs. 60% are ambulatory.

Average age is 78 years old. Average use = 24 trips per month.  
Average cost is \$24 a trip which translates into \$75 million a year (or two rail lines). The cost has been brought down to \$15 a trip. Average speed is 28 miles per hour vs. average bus speed = 10 mph.

The Federal government says the fares cannot exceed twice the lowest fare amount. In L.A. County there are 55 different fare structures due to the 41 providers.

ASI petitioned the Federal government to get the average fare down to \$1.50. There will be a public hearing to increase the fare to \$1.70. (Twice the MTA fare would be \$2.70). A transfer system will be instituted.

Bus routes in L.A. County are extremely long due to the grid system.

MTA has 300 wheelchair boardings a day. ASI celebrated its 1 millionth rider last month. Weekend ridership is growing faster than weekday.

ASI contracts have performance standard penalties included in them. Penalties start from \$2000 +. Contractors must show a pattern in practice. Currently ASI is renegotiating contracts and will increase penalties. Contracts in three areas will be rebid in two months to improve efficiencies and lower costs.

Legally ASI is a private/non-profit.

S. Rosen stated in today's L.A. Times Editorial Section Mayor Riordan expressed how important buses are to transportation in this city. He recommended a citizens advisory panel for buses. S. Rosen commented that the CAC needs to let him know that the CAC covers bus issues.

H. Sachar said the Mayor doesn't understand what we're doing and recommended that Mayor Riordan's appointees on the CAC communicate to him directly.

S. Rosen introduced a motion to send a letter to the Mayor regarding the CAC's opposition to creating a bus citizens committee and let the Mayor know that the CAC covers a plateful of issues such as bus, rail and paratransit. J. Seal seconded the motion. Motion was carried unanimously.

#### IV. Ad Hoc HOV Committee Report

S. Hart asked the CAC to approve the Motion and letter he submitted to B. McAllester regarding HOV's. He reported on the following points: 1) requirements of construction projects must be justified; 2) 25% of Prop C funds are for HOV lanes; 3) the elevated HOV program on the Harbor Freeway = \$750 million; 4) construction contracts alone = \$500 million; 5) divert funds away from HOV programs because it diverts money away from rail; 6) pricing issue.

In L.A. County, there are 9 million people who make an average of 4-5 trips a day = 47 million trips per day. We have no data on trips per cost.

**Public Comment:** D. Gabbard submitted his letter regarding the CAC's public comment policy and said that it violated the Brown Act.

L. McFarland restated the CAC public comment policy (which was introduced at the prior meeting) is that the public comment period will be held after every agenda item.

V. **New Business**

**Nominations Committee Report:** H. Sachar presented the Nominations Committee recommendations for the 1996-1997 slate of officers. He also announced that nominations for CAC officers may be made from the floor.

Slate of Officers:       L. McFarland, Chair;  
                              P. Corradi, Vice-Chair;  
                              M. Dickerson, Secretary

N. Bjornsen nominated R. Davies for Secretary. R. Davies declined the nomination.

Motion to close the nominations. M/S/C

Vote for L. McFarland, Chair, P. Corradi, Vice-Chair and M. Dickerson, Secretary was unanimous.

L. McFarland introduced the newest CAC Member, William Lyte. W. Lyte was appointed by MTA Board Member Fasana. W. Lyte is involved in Pasadena's development of a 120 acre bio-tech medical zone along the Pasadena Blue Line/Fillmore Station. He is interested in economic development around the transit stations and the Alameda Corridor. He is a member of the Pasadena Chamber of Commerce.

R. Davies pointed out MTA Board Report, Item #9 CRA/MTA Hollywood/Highland Station which was approved by the Board today.

VI. **Old Business**

**Ad Hoc Structure Committee:** J. Seal reported that he wants to invite the experts in cutting edge management systems to perhaps one of the CAC General Membership Meetings. These experts have lowered overall costs and completed projects on time. They have completed projects in Denver and Orange County. The toll road project in Orange County was completed on time, under budget and was a design/build project.

H. Sachar stated BART is going to design/build.

VII. **Minutes**

The May 22, 1996 CAC General Membership Meeting Minutes were approved unanimously.

VIII. **Adjournment**

L. McFarland adjourned the meeting at 8:40 p.m.