



ATTACHMENT #1

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

MINUTES

April 8, 1981

The regular Commission meeting was called to order by Chairman Rubly at 3:20 p.m.

Members in attendance were:

Chairman Russ Rubley
Councilwoman Pat Russell
Councilman John Zimmerman
Mayor Ed Russ
Wendell Cox
Robert Geoghegan, alternate to Supervisor Edelman
Ted Pierce, alternate to Supervisor Antonovich
Robert Reeves, alternate to Supervisor Hahn
Barna Szabo, alternate to Supervisor Dana
Peter Tweedt, alternate to Supervisor Schabarum
Ray Remy, alternate to Mayor Bradley
Councilman John Van Doren, alternate to Councilman Zimmerman
Heinz Heckeroth, ex-officio, for the 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. Reeves, seconded by Mr. Cox, to approve the minutes of the April 8, 1981 meeting. Mr. Heckeroth requested that the minutes on page 2, in the first full paragraph, should read that the bid opening on May 21 is for the first stage of the Redondo Beach Boulevard ramp project. The minutes were approved, as amended.

CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS

Mr. Rubley mentioned that there were several new attendees at the meeting and that the outreach program was apparently beginning to work.

COMMITTEE REPORTSFinance Review Committee:

The next meeting of the FRC is scheduled for April 20, 1981 at 12 noon in the Room 508 of the Commission offices.

Intergovernmental Relations Committee:

Mr. Szabo explained that he chaired the last IRC meeting while the Chairman, Ray Remy, was in Washington. Mr. Remy gave a brief summary of his trip. He indicated that it appeared that the Administration is very supportive of the Wilshire project, but that their proposed budget policies make funding for continued preliminary engineering activities questionable from their perspective. Mr. Richmond added that the list of transit projects that will go forward has been submitted to the House, but has not been made public.

Mr. Szabo said that two federal bills, HR 1588 and SB 239, involve ridesharing. These bills would provide tax incentives to employers to encourage ridesharing. The legislation is similar to bills that were supported by the Commission last year. It was recommended by the Committee that the Commission continue to work with the authors to get the measures scheduled for hearings and further assist in co-sponsoring by soliciting a greater number of supporters.

At the State level, legislation involving ridesharing includes AB 549 and AB 550. The Committee recommended continued support of these bills.

The Committee recommended opposition of AB 640. This bill would require the California Transportation Commission to conduct a study with a 16-member advisory committee on State transportation requirements which categorizes State highway and transit needs over the next 20 years, and is to be updated every 5 years. It was opposed by the Committee on the grounds that transit and highway needs planning should be done on a local level, not on a State level. Mr. Szabo explained that the following amendment was recommended for the bill: tie the State and local transportation processes together and delete the provision that requires the State Commission to be involved in the transit planning process. The Committee's recommendation was to have staff suggest the recommended amendments to the author.

If passed, AB 965 would decree that, if the Federal Fuel Tax is reduced below 4¢ per gallon, the State would increase the tax rate by the amount the Federal Fuel Tax is reduced,

so the combined State and Federal Tax rate equals 11¢ per gallon. The recommendation was to support the bill, provided that a reallocation formula, along the lines of that being sought in SB 215, is in the legislation.

Additional legislation that the Committee considered included AB 1176, which would require SCAG to convene at least four meetings annually of the four county transportation commissions to review transportation improvement programs and other matters. The Committee recommended support of the legislation as it stands.

AB 1009 would entitle the county transportation commissioners to be compensated at the rate of \$75 per day, but not to exceed \$300 per month. The Committee recommends support of the bill.

Mr. Szabo further explained the newly-adopted Joint Rule. The rule prohibits fiscal committees from hearing any bill in excess of \$25,000 or more prior to the passage of the State budget. Staff brought the rule to the attention of the Committee because it could have a delay impact on the bills which have budget impacts before the Senate Finance Committee and the Assembly Ways and Means Committee.

Staff had reviewed the draft version of the California Transportation Commission draft Biennial Report II to the Legislature on State transportation issues. The Committee has worked on a number of approved comments, which have been forwarded to the CTC.

Mr. Remy made the following motions, seconded by Mr. Russ: to approve the recommendations on AB 640 with amendment, and not to express specific opposition or support; to support AB 965, provided the bill is amended to have a 70% return to source; to support AB 1009 and AB 1146.

Mr. Remy added the following amendment to the motions on AB 1176: to make the meetings permissive rather than mandatory. No opposition was heard.

Mr. Szabo then introduced AB 1623 (Martinez). The bill would exempt Caltrans from freeway agreement requirements under certain conditions. Those certain conditions currently exist in only one case--the Long Beach Freeway gap closure. AB 1623 would authorize Caltrans to construct Route 7 without a freeway agreement if all of the following conditions are met:

- This Commission has adopted a specific route after holding public hearings;
- The freeway is included in the California freeway and expressway system;

- Construction has started along the adopted route, but has not been completed; therefore, a gap exists between the constructed portions of the freeway;
- In addition to the adopted route, there exists at least one other alternative route as determined by Caltrans;
- A draft EIR has been prepared; and
- In the opinion of the Commission, an impasse exists in the execution of the required freeway agreement.

It was then explained that the bill addresses one of the reasons frequently cited for the lack of progress on the Long Beach Freeway, the lack of an agreement among all parties to construct the freeway along a particular route

All of the cities involved, except South Pasadena, have signed a freeway agreement with Caltrans. The City of Los Angeles rescinded their agreement in 1975.

It was stressed that, even if there were to be an agreement on the particular route and the bill was passed and signed into law, additional problems existed involving funding and staging/segmentation of the construction.

Mr. Szabo further explained that in light of previous work done by the Commission on this issue, the recommendation was to support AB 1623 with modifications, but if the bill is amended to limit safeguards which it now contains, the Commission would have to reconsider its position.

Mr. Szabo made a motion to support the Committee's recommendation.

Public Comments on AB 1623:

The first speaker was Mr. J. Albert Curran, Vice Chairman of the Long Beach Freeway Association. Mr. Curran felt that it was important to fill in the gap of the Long Beach Freeway. He then gave a brief review of the events leading up to the City of South Pasadena's resolution to stop the freeway closure. Mr. Curran read excerpts from a letter from then Governor Reagan to the South Pasadena Mayor Sullivan. Governor Reagan expressed concern for the growing controversy over the route. The California Highway Commission concluded that the Westerly Route could not be considered a reasonable location.

Mr. Curran explained that the Long Beach Freeway Association is a group of citizens interested in getting the gap closed. The association had collected 25,000 signatures on a petition and presented it to Governor Brown and Ms. Gianturco.

A letter from Congressman Rousselot stated that Federal regulations do not require the location Federally-funded freeways be unanimously agreed upon by all communities involved along the route. Federal regulations do require that appropriate Federal and State agencies are notified.

The Long Beach Freeway Association made the recommendation for this bill to Assemblyman Martinez. The Freeway Association is convinced that the only way the freeway gap will be closed is by legislation. The Association felt that it was necessary to have the Commission act as arbitrators through the bill to solve the problem. The Commission was also informed that the City Council of Los Angeles endorsed AB 1623 by a vote of 13 to 0.

Mr. John Crowley, Board of Directors, City of Pasadena, was the next speaker. He stated that the Board of Directors of the City of Pasadena is anxious to seek, find, and take the action necessary to complete a resolution of approval for a route and begin construction. Mr. Crowley felt that legislation was the only way, but that the Board of Directors was willing to hear of any other options.

The next speaker was Mayor Peter J. Letournean of the City of Alhambra who stated that AB 1623 is supported and encouraged by the City of Alhambra because it would alleviate some of the highway traffic congestion that is found on some of the streets in Alhambra.

Mayor Samuel Knowles from the City of South Pasadena spoke in opposition of the bill. The City of South Pasadena recognizes the need for the completion and is willing to sign an agreement with Caltrans, but the City is against the Meridian Route because of the way it would divide the City into quarters. It was the opinion of the City of South Pasadena that local ways and means had not been exhausted. It was also felt that AB 1623 was directly aimed at the City of South Pasadena and will adversely affected other cities in the future.

Ms. Alvalee Arnold, Councilwoman from the City of South Pasadena, was the next speaker. Ms. Arnold reviewed the chronological events regarding the Long Beach Freeway gap closure leading up to today. Ms. Arnold stated that she has been unable to find any documentation of the City of South Pasadena approving the Meridian Route. In 1968, the City of South Pasadena expressed its willingness to sign a freeway agreement

)

with Caltrans on the Westerly Corridor of Route 7 through the city. In 1969, the City of South Pasadena presented a proposal for the Westerly Route to Caltrans. She said they would not accept a freeway through their city. In 1971, South Pasadena and Caltrans entered into an agreement whereby Caltrans would conduct a study of South Pasadena's Westerly Route to determine feasibility. In 1972, Caltrans' study was completed with the conclusion that the Westerly Route was feasible from an engineering standpoint, but was too costly. In 1974, South Pasadena submitted a Plan B, which kept the westerly edge completely within the limits of South Pasadena. Assemblyman Alatorre objected to the use of park land in the Arroyo being used for a freeway. In 1976, another plan was submitted bringing the Westerly Route farther east. In 1977, the State Transportation Commission stated that the costs of both routes were relatively the same and should not be a determining factor. In 1977, another resolution to sign an agreement was offered by South Pasadena involving the Westerly Route. The same was offered in 1979 and 1980.

Mr. Don Howery, representating the City of Los Angeles, stated that the City recognized there is an impasse and would support AB 1623 or any other similar legislation that would allow the Commission to settle the impasse once it has been certified. The Los Angeles City Council requested that the Commission support the legislation.

Mr. Bryan Allen, a private citizen, expressed his opinion that the key was not the closure of the gap, but the transportation issue. Part of the solution was not the freeway itself but a package of three alternatives. The first would be to close the legitimate gap between the Pasadena Freeway and the Foothill Freeway. Mr. Allen also expressed that another important issue was that of rapid transit in the Pasadena area, South Pasadena, and Highland Park corridors and grade separation of existing roadways. Mr. Allen felt that the local governments should have a clearer role in citing how people will be affected by the government.

Mr. Szabo expressed appreciation for the comments from the public on AB 1623, but stressed that this was not a public hearing.

A motion was made by Mr. Cox, seconded by Mrs. Russell, to approve the staff recommendation to support AB 1623.

Each Commissioner expressed his own views and opinions.

Mr. Rubley explained that "buck passing" has got to stop at some time. It is the intent of the Commission to see Route 7 completed.

)

Mr. Zimmerman took a position in opposition because, as a representative of the League of California Cities, he was concerned for the smaller cities.

Mr. Cox felt that the bill was the next logical step after having adopted the "Meridian Route," and further urged support of the bill.

Mrs. Russell explained that the City of Los Angeles, in reviewing the engineering studies and the transportation studies, felt that it was important to review all alternatives. Mrs. Russell also felt that part of the Commission's duties were to work out disagreements between cities. She felt that this was an appropriate role for the Commission.

Mr. Pierce expressed reluctance to support the bill as it might set a precedent for future freeway construction. Mr. Pierce suggested that the Commission discuss realistic modes of transportation to be used in the freeway with all cities involved in the project.

Mr. Szabo suggested, so as not to make this bill a precedent setting bill, to have it clearer as to the actual project involved. He suggested that wording be added to state that this bill is an attempt to resolve the issue of Route 7.

Mr. Russ felt that with all the hours spent on the issue in the last year, that the Commission should go ahead with a precedent-setting issue.

Mr. Rubley assured all those concerned that the Commission did not make any snap decisions on the issue. Mr. Rubley also explained that this is not an issue of big versus small and felt that there was no way to get unity on this issue.

Mr. Geoghegan agreed that the issue of Route 7 has reached a stage where a decision must be made. He also expressed concern for the environmental survey that must be conducted regardless of the route that was decided on. In the environmental process, he stated that alternatives be included.

Mr. Heckerth explained that the present environmental document is not concerned with a full freeway development project because it only goes from Valley Boulevard to the freeway. Mr. Heckerth explained that the project must be developed on the basis of what is least impacted.

Mr. Zimmerman felt that the issue of Route 7 was simply a matter of politics between Caltrans, Pasadena, and South Pasadena.

Mr. Van Doren agreed the cities involved must reach a compromise and, therefore, supported AB 1623.

A roll call vote was then taken:

Ayes: Mr. Rubley, Mr. Geoghegan, Mr. Reeves,
Mr. Szabo, Mr. Tweedt, Mrs. Russell,
Mr. Russ, and Mr. Cox

Noes: Mr. Pierce and Mr. Zimmerman

Abstain: Mr. Remy

Motion was carried: 8-2-1.

Service Coordination Committee:

Mr. Cox informed the Commissioners that, although the SCC had met, there were no action items to be presented at this meeting.

CENTURY FREEWAY PROJECT

Mr. Heckeroth made a presentation to the Commissioners on the status of the Century Freeway. Mr. Heckeroth discussed the source of funding for an Interstate, such as the Century Freeway. Mr. Heckeroth further informed the Commissioners of the current costs of putting in one segment of the freeway. The first segment to be completed would be from LAX to about Crenshaw Boulevard.

A short question and answer period followed Mr. Heckeroth's presentation.

Mrs. Russell recommended that, at the next meeting, a presentation of the actions and strategies being taken by the Los Angeles City Council on this issue be given.

Mr. Tweedt made a motion that Mr. Rubley write to the Governor, telling him of the Commission's concerns about Caltrans' resolve to build the freeway. Included in the letter would be a request to urge the Director of Caltrans to get on with the completion before the cost increases even more. Mrs. Russell seconded Mr. Tweedt's motion.

After a short discussion, Mr. Remy made a motion that the Commission develop a position and a recommendation for the Governor's office, Congressman Anderson and Mr. Barnhart of the Federal Highway Administration, and have staff return at a future meeting with the framework for a position. Mr. Tweedt seconded Mr. Remy's motion.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Richmond's report included notification of the APTA Rapid Transit Conference in June, to be held in Philadelphia.

As a follow-up to the position taken by the Commission at the last meeting, Mr. Richmond distributed a copy of a letter that was sent to the California Congressional Delegation concerning the Federal budget and an analysis of the impacts of the proposed budget policies in the UMTA Section 3 Grant Program. The Commissioners were also informed of a similar analysis being done on the Interstate program, the FAU program and Section 5 transit operating assistance. The UMTA Budget Hearings for 1982 will begin at the end of April. Staff would like to forward the impact assessments to our delegation before then. Mr. Remy indicated that the information being developed was useful and that the Commission should be circulating it to all interested parties.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Cox requested that a 1977 policy dealing with service reduction for the operators be reexamined. It was requested by Mr. Cox that staff review the policy and refer it to the Finance Review Committee for investigation and possible reconsideration during possible transit funding budget cuts.

Other new business included Mr. Bryan Allen, a private citizen, who mentioned that April 8 was the 20th anniversary of the final day of service of the Los Angeles-to-Long Beach Red Car run.

NOTICE OF MEETINGS

The notice of meetings was received and filed. The next meeting scheduled for April 22 will be held at the Department of Water and Power, 111 North Hope Street, Los Angeles.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK RICHMOND
Executive Director