



LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION • 311 SOUTH SPRING STREET—SUITE 1206, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90013 • (213) 626-0370

MINUTES

March 11, 1981

The regular Commission meeting was called to order by Chairman Rubley at 3:15 p.m.

Members in attendance were:

Chairman Russ Rubley
Mayor Ed Russ
Councilman John Zimmerman
Councilwoman Pat Russell
Wendell Cox
Ted Pierce, alternate to Supervisor Antonovich
Barna Szabo, alternate to Supervisor Dana
Robert Reeves, alternate to Supervisor Hahn
Ray Remy, alternate to Mayor Bradley
Heinz Heckeroth, Ex-Officio, representing State of California

Staff members in attendance were:

Rick Richmond, Executive Director
Ron Schneider, Principal Deputy County Counsel
Kathy Torigoe, Executive Secretary
Phyllis Eder, Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A motion was made by Mr. Cox, seconded by Mr. Szabo, to approve the minutes of the February 25, 1981, meeting. No objection was heard to the motion.

CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS:

Mr. Rubley's remarks included welcoming Mr. Ted Pierce to his first Commission meeting as an alternate to Supervisor Mike Antonovich. Mr. Rubley also mentioned that the meeting held in Gardena was a continuation of the outreach program.

Mr. Rubley made a motion, seconded by Mr. Zimmerman, to adjourn into an Executive Session at 3:20 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 4:00 p.m.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Finance Review Committee:

Mayor Ed Russ presented the following items for the Commissioners' approval:

- o Approval of SCRTD's request for \$2.25 million State Prop. 5 and \$750,000 SB 620 funds for preliminary engineering of the Wilshire Starter line.
- o Approval of the proposed policies for Article 4.5 program with a provision that a) procedural measures will be developed to allow and "included operators" to submit applications for 4.5 funds next year, and b) continuing programs which will have met service objectives will receive priority consideration for refunding. Priority consideration should not be construed as an automatic approval.
- o Receipt and transmittal of CAC report on commuter rail stations locations to Caltrans.
- o Agreement to co-sponsor a ridesharing workshop for elected officials with SCAG and the LA County Division of the League of Cities.

Mayor Russ moved for approval of the preceeding items and was seconded by Mr. Cox. Mr. Zimmerman inquired on the status of the preliminary engineering program. Mr. Russ explained that the local funding was for the second year effort for which \$12 million in Federal funding is being sought. No objection was heard to the motion.

The items for information and follow up were:

- o FY 82-86 LA County TIP was held over for adoption until the March 23 meeting. The TIP includes \$920 million worth of highway and transit projects. Of that, \$460 million of State Highway projects are included in Tier 1, which conforms to California Transportation Commission fund estimates. The fund estimate reflects a \$915 million deficit for the five year state highway program and funds only one full year of continued projects plus rehabilitation, safety and Prop. 5 fixed guideway projects for the remaining four years. Tier 2 includes the projects outside of the CTC fund estimate which represents \$459 million of construction operational improvements in the last 4 years of the TIP, which are unfunded under the CTC fund estimate scenario.

Further consideration will be given to the following issues:

) A discussion of CTC fund estimates regarding the unfunded Tier 2 projects.

A discussion of the TAC-adopted criteria for prioritizing interstate and non-interstate projects for inclusion in L.A. County TIP.

- o On soundwall prioritization, the Executive Director will transmit a request to Caltrans for comprehensive list for Category 2 and Category 3 for soundwall projects in Los Angeles. Caltrans has indicated that the list will be made available within six months.
- o Request from Caltrans to rescind its allocation of \$300,000 to Commuter Computer from STAF SB 620 funds was received and filed pending a meeting with the Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing.
- o Received and filed a report on the Wilmington/Willowbrook right-of-way.
- o Programming of highway safety funds was carried over to the next meeting.

A short discussion followed Mr. Russ' presentation.

In response to a question, Mr. Heckeroth explained the time involved for the completion of the projects in the State TIP and how projects are defined into the certain categories. The discussion included the issues of prioritization and funding with budget cuts for the projects on the STIP.

Mr. Heckeroth also indicated that Caltrans could provide a list of projects.

Intergovernmental Relations Committee:

Mr. Remy presented the issue of the Commission seeking standby legislation for a 1/2% transit sales tax in L.A. County. It was understood that the SCRTD had also started to seek legislation, but that the provisions are likely to be different from what appeared on the ballot.

) Mr. Richmond stated that it was staff's understanding that SCRTD's proposal was available in Sacramento in bill form; however, staff has been unable to get a written version of the language from SCRTD. Based on discussions with various officials, it seems that the legislation would authorize the Commission to impose a 1/2¢ sales tax which could be acted upon by the Commissioners, but not their alternates, and that the revenue would be divided 20% to cities for transportation purposes, 30% to the Commission for mass transit construction, and 50% to the Commission for operating assistance to the SCRTD and municipal bus operators. Mr. Richmond understood that a fare freeze was mentioned, but no reduction was contemplated.

Mr. Richmond also identified the importance of meeting legislative deadlines as they arise and the necessity to be specific as to what would be included in Commission legislation. Discussions in Sacramento indicated that any type of legislation for increased taxes will be difficult under any circumstances; however, the best case could be made to implement what was voted on. Specifically, this would be legislation which would implement the Prop. A Ordinance. It was staff's recommendation that the Commission support what was voted on rather than make any changes, since this course of action appeared to have the best possible chance of approval.

Mr. Cox made a motion to follow the staff recommendation which would be to put the bill in, indicating that the Commission only want to implement Prop. A as passed by the voters and to get it in by the next deadline. Mr. Cox's motion was seconded by Mr. Russ.

Mr. Szabo felt that, because of the national situation, transit is going to have problems getting operating subsidies. This would mean that fares nationally, as well as locally, will have to rise. Mr. Szabo felt that if the legislation freezes fares, that it would create a problem for the entire allocation of the monies, because more monies would have to be shifted over to maintain the lower fare. Mr. Szabo felt that it was important to adjust the legislation.

Mr. Cox raised the possibility of drafting the legislation as staff has recommended and later introduce amendments that might change it to possibly resolve the problem Mr. Szabo brought up. Mr. Cox further emphasized how crucial unity within the County agencies, including the SCRTD, would be for getting a successful piece of legislation. Mr. Cox made a motion that staff look at a means of coordinating the legislative effort of the County with respect to transportation in order to maximize the return for the people.

There was no further discussion or opposition to the first motion.

Mr. Russ seconded Mr. Cox's second motion and added that staff and legal counsel should investigate legal implications of coordinated lobbying efforts.

Mr. Cox suggested that the staff investigation include an analysis of the roles of the respective agencies in the County and if, in the staff's view, it required legislative action, then it should be included in staff recommendation. Furthermore, he felt that staff's report should include coordination of lobbying activities.

No further discussion or opposition was heard to the motion.

Mr. Szabo reported on the recent trip made by the three members of the Commission to an APTA meeting held in Washington, D.C. Mr. Szabo described the atmosphere for transit funding as being under siege. Mr. Szabo requested that staff make an impact analysis as to what the budget cuts mean to California and the County specifically; also, possibly suggest a program that could deal with the cuts. Possibilities include expanding programs like vanpooling to alleviate some of the pressure on public transit.

Mr. Cox suggested that the definition for primary highway funding be reviewed by staff. It appeared that a redefinition of highways eligible for primary designation might increase Los Angeles' portion of a declining fund.

Mr. Cox described his second reason for going back to the Conference which was to be involved in the formation of APTA's standing committee on governing boards. The purpose of the committee is to get Governing Board Members much more involved in the policy matters of APTA to try and improve the representation of the taxpayer and the transit users in the APTA organization and hopefully through that be a more positive influence in terms of the legislation before Congress. Because of suggestions by the newly-formed Committee, APTA has now gone on record as supporting vanpooling, ridesharing and other private sector operations.

Mr. Cox also explained that he had met with Mr. Bill Lucius of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission of San Francisco, and Mr. Lucius requested that the LACTC and MTC get together on legislative issues. Mr. Cox suggested that staff be requested to look at the possibility of talking to MTC on finding common position on common issues.

Mr. Cox requested that staff move on the primary issue of highway funding and getting a liaison going with the MTC.

Mr. Remy made a motion that staff make an assessment of the impact of the Federal policies on transportation as it affects this county and transportation program and to identify these national policies which are consistent with what the Commission has adopted so that we could work with the administration on these issues. National policies which are clearly discriminatory against Los Angeles in terms of the capital program or the operating assistance program also needed to be identified. Mr. Cox seconded Mr. Remy's motion.

A short discussion followed the motion.

No objection was heard to the motion.

Mr. Szabo then made a motion that staff prepare preliminary recommendations as to the options that may be available to offset the dislocation of funds that the national policies may create. Options should cover finding new revenue sources or in terms of using private bus companies to fill in the void, carpools, vanpools and other possible suggested options. Mr. Szabo's motion was seconded by Mr. Cox.

Mr. Szabo's motion was incorporated into Mr. Remy's previous motion.

Mr. Cox reiterated his suggestion to have Chairman Rubley send a letter to Mr. Lucius of MTC.

Mr. Richmond also mentioned that there should not be much difficulty in reporting back about possible private and public options. Mr. Richmond assured the Commissioners that staff would report back to the FRC but was not sure as to the level of specificity.

A discussion followed the presentation.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Meeting reconvened at 7:00 p.m.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

Mr. Richmond reported that the California Transportation Commission will be meeting in Long Beach on May 26, 27, and 28. The Commission will be requesting that the Long Beach Port's Transportation Task Force set up a tour for the CTC members. The tour will include the port's facilities and Route 47. The principal reasons for the meeting will be to discuss the results of the Route 47 study.

At the suggestion of the Executive Director, Mr. Zimmerman made a motion to invite the CTC members to dinner, which was seconded by Mr. Reeves. No objection was heard to the motion.

Mr. Richmond also introduced Pat Van Matre who has joined the staff as Chief Transit Fiscal Analyst.

COMMISSION PRIORITIES:

Mr. Rubley opened up the discussion by stating that whatever items were not discussed at the meeting could be carried over until the next one. He felt that someone might want to discuss a few other items.

Before getting into the discussion of priorities, Mr. Zimmerman inquired as to whether staff had received any replies from legislators or anyone else regarding the letter sent about the EPA sanctions against the 91/I-110 Freeway. Mr. Richmond replied that copies of letters have been received and further that the request has been sent from FHWA to EPA and is awaiting a decision.

Mr. Richmond briefly summarized his paper on Commission priorities and pointed out that while in the past, much of the Commission activities focused on policy and programming issues, the trend now was on specific projects. He further briefly described what the Commission's statutory responsibilities were, and what was not within the Commission's authority. For example, although responsibilities have been given to the Commission there has not been a corresponding removal or limitation placed on other transportation agencies formerly assuming these responsibilities. In the highway area, the Commission has no clear ability to initiate projects; however, there is a clear project veto power. If the Commission does initiate a project, it is subject to a higher review. Similarly, the Commission has no implementing ability.

Mr. Richmond also reviewed issues that are anticipated for the coming year but have not, at this point, been identified clearly as Commission priorities. The issues include soundwall criteria, airport access, issues relating to taxi cab regulation, among others. These issues could be worked on, but not to any great length or degree relative to other Commission priorities.

In reviewing general programs, Mr. Richmond described specific activities, required tasks, anticipated products or results, and the approximate allocation of staff time necessary to complete the project.

Issues that surfaced to the staff in preparing the document include does the Commission concur in the listing of activities, what staff is trying to accomplish, and the relative amount of emphasis on each? Of the other activities identified, should some or all be moved into a more prioritized status? Should staff continue to devote a significant amount of time to specific projects in view of the fact that the Commission cannot sponsor projects?

Mr. Rubley asked the staff to make a bigger effort to make the Commission known throughout the County, and to realize that Prop. A is the big issue right now and whatever else is done, should be secondary.

Mr. Cox questioned whether some of the heavy involvement is necessary in some major projects. Mr. Cox believes that if the fractionalized approach continues, things will be lost. Mr. Cox feels that the Commission should possibly take the lead in other areas. Mr. Cox suggested that possibly the Commission adopt guidelines with respect to lobbying and legislative efforts for agencies that are within the County and funded by the Commission. It is possible under the Commission to prescribe conditions under which transit agencies and other agencies file federal and state grants.

Mr. Remy felt that the Chairman was right in stating that Prop. A is really the biggest issue going, and in terms of support for public transportation and mobility, it is the only issue. Mr. Remy also felt that possibly the lateness of starting meetings at 3:00 p.m. could have an effect on media exposure.

Mr. Russ also felt that Prop. A was the number one item for the year. He also felt that there should be a plan as to how Prop. A money will be spent. Mr. Russ also felt that legislation should be enacted to give the Commission more power.

Mr. Zimmerman felt if the funds from Washington are going to be tight, he felt it more important to readdress the types of transportation that will be provided. Mr. Zimmerman also felt that with most of the monies already spoken for in Prop. A, he felt that the Commission should reconsider as to what will be the major transportation system for L.A. County.

Mr. Szaabo felt that there were some major tasks ahead including fulfilling the statutory obligations and providing leadership on a local level. He felt that in taking leadership roles, the Commission ought to identify issues, identify problems and take the lead in offering solutions. Mr. Szabo agreed that the two major issues are Prop. A and the budget cuts.

Mr. Cox felt that it was important for the Commission to be seeking innovative ways to help the mobility of the citizens.

Mr. Szabo also suggested that the Commission think about sponsoring a "forum" for private citizens and organizations for more public involvement. Mr. Szabo suggested that one issue being focussed for one day was better than scattering the shots in a long agenda.

Mr. Pierce felt that one of the top priorities should be to get other agencies involved in coming to the Commission. He also suggested getting the Advisory Committees of the Commission more involved in getting the word out about the Commission meetings. He also suggested developing a short-term project to bring the people from the outlying areas into downtown.

Mr. Zimmerman expressed concern about the 1984 Olympics. Mr. Remy assures Mr. Zimmerman that the local planning agencies do not want to get too deeply involved this far before the games. Mr. Remy further stated that to the best of his knowledge, there has not been any other meeting other than the one sponsored by the Commission. Mr. Heckeroth also agreed that the main issues is where the events are going to occur and the timing of events. Mr. Heckeroth stated that once the actual sites are picked, the planning stages will be easier to work on. Mr. Richmond explained that the Commission is responsible for convening another meeting once all the sites are picked and choosing those that might be a potential problem.

Mr. Rubley suggested that the discussion continue at the next meeting, but requested that staff continue to address itself to the issue of Prop. A.

NEW BUSINESS:

Mr. Russ thanked everyone for coming to Gardena and expressed pleasure at having the Commission meeting held in the Council Chambers. Mr. Russ also mentioned that Caltrans has been planning a park-and-ride lot at Artesia and Normandie without an EIS. Mr. Russ requested that the Commission staff and Caltrans look into it and come back at a future meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,


RICK RICHMOND
Executive Director

RR:pae