

MINUTES



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

October 22, 1986

The regular Commission meeting was called to order by Chairman Dana at 1:45 p.m. in the Board of Supervisors' Hearing Room at the Hall of Administration.

Members in attendance were:

Supervisor Deane Dana
Mayor Christine E. Reed
Councilwoman Jacki Bacharach
Councilman Edd Tuttle
Marcia Mednick
Blake Sanborn, alternate to Supervisor Schabarum
Walter King, alternate to Supervisor Hahn
Robert Geoghegan, alternate to Supervisor Edelman
Ray Remy, alternate to Mayor Bradley
Don Watson, Ex-Officio for State of California

Staff members present:

Rick Richmond, Executive Director
David Kelsey, Acting Assistant County Counsel
Kathy Torigoe, Executive Director
Deana Burton, Acting Senior Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of October 8, 1986 were moved and seconded for approval. Hearing no objection, minutes were approved as submitted.

CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS

Mr. Dana designated the Finance Review Committee as the hearing board for the Commission's required hearing on the UMTA Capital Grant Project. This hearing is scheduled for November 10.

PUBLIC HEARINGS RE: CONDEMNATION OF THE FOLLOWING PARCELS

Mr. Dana indicated that the public hearings will be held on the condemnation of the three properties: 2652 Long Beach Avenue, 1920 South Acacia Avenue, and 2034 Santa Fe Avenue. These parcels are needed for the Long-Beach-Los Angeles light rail project.

Mr. Dana turned the meeting over to Mr. Richmond.

Mr. Richmond, and others indicating a desire to testify at the public hearings were sworn in by Mr. Kelsey.

Mr. Richmond stated that the testimony in the public hearings would be limited to owners' representatives or representatives of local jurisdictions in which the property is located, and that the scope of the hearings is to cover the findings the Commission needs to make in order to adopt a resolution of necessity and not other subjects such as compensation that are not addressed directly in these findings.

Hearing re: Smart & Final Iris Company property located at 2652 Long Beach Avenue, Los Angeles.

Mr. Richmond presented the staff report to the Commission which addresses the four findings which the Commission must make under the Eminent Domain Law in order to adopt a resolution of necessity to condemn the property. The staff report was entered into the record of the hearing as evidence. A copy of the staff report is incorporated with these minutes and made a part hereof by this reference.

Mr. Dana opened the public hearing for testimony from the public relative to the property located at 2652 Long Beach Avenue.

There being no one wishing to testify, Mr. Richmond recommended that the hearing be closed.

It was moved and seconded to close the hearing. The hearing was closed without objection.

A motion was made by Mr. Sanborn, seconded by Mrs. Bacharach, to adopt the Resolution of Necessity for the acquisition of this parcel.

A roll call vote was taken:

Yes: Sanborn, King, Geoghegan, Remy, Bacharach, Reed,
Tuttle, Mednick, Dana

No: None

Motion passed.

Hearing re: 3M Business Products Sales, Inc., property located at 1920 South Acacia Avenue, Compton.

Mr. Richmond presented the staff report to the Commission which addresses the four findings which the Commission must make under the Eminent Domain Law in order to adopt a resolution of necessity to condemn the property. The staff report was entered into the record of the hearing as evidence. A copy of the staff report is incorporated with these minutes and made a part hereof by this reference.

Mr. Richmond suggested that the hearing for the property located at 1920 S. Acacia Avenue be opened.

Mr. Dana indicated that public hearing was open for anyone from the public who wished to testify relative to the property located at 1920 South Acacia Avenue.

Since there was no testimony from the public, the hearing was closed without objection.

Mrs. Bacharach moved to approve the Resolution of Necessity, seconded by Mrs. Reed.

A roll call vote was taken:

Yes: Sanborn, King, Geoghegan, Remy, Bacharach, Reed, Tuttle, Mednick, Dana

No: None

Motion passed.

Rollins Leasing Corporation property located at 2034 Santa Fe Avenue, Carson

Mr. Richmond presented the staff report to the Commission which addresses the four findings which the Commission must make under the Eminent Domain Law in order to adopt a resolution of necessity to condemn the property. The staff report was entered into the record of the hearing as evidence. A copy of the staff report is incorporated with these minutes and made a part hereof by this reference.

Mr. Dana indicated that the public hearing was open for anyone from the public who wished to testify relative to the property located at 2034 Santa Fe Avenue.

Mr. Rick Scott, District Manager, of Rollins Leasing Corporation, and Mr. Steven English, Attorney for Rollings Leasing, testified before the Commission.

Mr. Scott testified that the environmental impact report stated that no business would be dislocated by the mid-corridor of the light rail line, but that Rollins Truck Leasing is a business that will be dislocated. Mr. Scott described the company's clientele and services and stated that Rollins Leasing was unable to locate a suitable existing and available facility, and, therefore, it has started looking for available land. Mr. Scott testified as to the characteristics of the alternate property which would be needed by Rolling Leasing and that the business needs additional time to locate a permanent and suitable site and build a facility.

Mr. Scott indicated that a Summary of Facts has been prepared and asked that copies be distributed to the Commissioners. A copy of the Summary of Facts relating to Resolution of Necessity, Rollins Leasing Corporation, is incorporated into these minutes and made a part hereof by this reference.

On behalf of Rollins Leasing Corporation, Mr. Scott requested that the Commission (1) Defer adopting the Resolution of Necessity at this time; (2) Instruct staff to try to find an alternate site for the temporary storage yard; and (3) Advise Rollins as soon as possible as to the date on which it will have to vacate the property so that it may be prepared as a park-and-ride lot in time for the start of revenue service on the rail line.

Questions were asked the Commissioners.

Mr. Steve English, counsel for Rollins, suggested that the Commission make a temporary acquisition of a portion or the entire vacant 7-acre parcel that is adjacent to Rollins' property for a storage yard during the two-year construction process. Thereafter the Commission could acquire the Rollins property for the park and ride facility. English stated that the cost to the Commission of this alternative would be nominal because Rollins would continue to pay rent to the Commission for that land during that two-year period of time and that

could be offset against the cost of the temporary acquisition. This alternative provides Rollins with additional time to relocate.

Mrs. Reed asked if this item can be held over so that staff can be authorized to enter into the negotiations as English has suggested since a third party is involved.

Discussion followed.

Mr. Richmond stated that this property is owned by the Commission now. This property was acquired as part of the railroad acquisition. Rollins Leasing has previously leased it from the Southern Pacific, and the Commission is now trying to terminate the lease.

Mr. Richmond also suggested that staff comment on the alternative proposal.

Further questions were asked of Mr. English by the Commissioners.

Mr. James Wiley, Real Estate and Development Administrator for LACTC, was sworn in by Mr. Kelsey. He stated that the property, is owned by the Commission. The Commission obtained it from the Southern Pacific Transportation Company, and upon obtaining it, the tenants were put on notice that the Commission would be taking the property in the near future in order to give them as much notice as we could. Mr. Wiley stated staff has met with Rollins a number of times and has entertained the offer of using another site. The alternate could work if Rollins provides it to the Commission on a timely basis. For the Commission to acquire, it would take far too much time for our needs as a temporary storage site which is critical to the project. Mr. Wiley stated staff has looked at the site that Rollins has nominated, but has not conducted a far-reaching search.

Questions were asked of Mr. Wiley by the Commissioners.

Wiley stated that staff's first contact with Rollins was about May of 1985. He stated that the alternate property was suitable but that to obtain a property from an unwilling seller would take approximately 12 to 14 months, and the Commission requires this property in about February, 1987 to begin work to prepare the site to hold the materials that are needed for the rail project.

Mr. Wiley stated the property will be a major storage site.

Reed asked whether staff considered leasing the property, and if it takes just as long to rent it for awhile?

Wiley stated that staff would rent the property, but from an unwilling renter, it would take months. If it was a willing renter, then it could be done, but if it was a willing renter, they would have rented to the other party.

Richmond asked whether the alternate site is on the market for rent or for sale.

Wiley stated it is for sale and that he has not talked to the owner in terms for rent. It is on the market. Wiley's understanding is that Rollins has even been discussing the purchase of it for their permanent site but he doesn't know what has happened.

Dana asked if it would be even feasible for the Commission to rent it and Rollins to take the cost?

Wiley responded that it would be very costly for the Commission. He stated that both sites require site preparation, a certain amount of construction work in order to make the soil strong enough to support the materials to be stored on. So not only would the site have to be rented, it would have to be improved for this period. The improvement work that would be done to the site the Commission owns would benefit the Commission when the park-and-ride is constructed. It's work that would have to be done then so it's not a duplication of work. With the other site, the Commission would lose that money put into improving the site and would be paying rent for property when it has a substitute that it owns.

Dana asked whether Rollins would be willing to pick up all of those costs?

Wiley responded that is the assumption and that was the basis for his discussion with them. He said that if they provide staff an alternative site that worked that didn't cost the Commission any money that could be used, staff would be in favor of that, but that is not what they are proposing now.

Dana said Rollins would have to pick up the costs because the Commission couldn't expend public funds in any way; it would have to be a break even situation.

Wiley stated that staff's reason for coming before the Commission now is the need for the property. Staff told Rollins that we would continue to negotiate with them even after the Commission made the finding of necessity and authorized filing for the condemnation if the Commission approved it. Staff told Rollins that, such action does not preclude continuing negotiations with them up until the time Commission actually taken possession of the property.

Wiley strongly recommended that the Commission act today.

Mr. English stated that he believes there is enough time to consider the alternate site and defer a decision until the next meeting to explore his proposal.

Sanborn asked whether English was suggesting that the Commission would then be acting as a broker?

English responded: Not really. He stated that first of all, he thinks there is a specific provision in eminent domain law for property to be cross acquired for this kind of arrangement. But, he stated, actually what he was suggesting right now is let Rollins have an opportunity to sit down with staff and try to work this thing out so we can come back to you and all of the alternatives have been explored. He said he thinks there is enough time to do that today without prejudicing the Commission's ability to acquire the property if it doesn't work out and have it in time for the March construction preparations that you need.

Tuttle stated that the concern he has is if the Commission were to acquire the property using any other methods of negotiations it would seem to him perhaps to be using the potential of eminent domain to benefit Rollins at the expense of the other party. He stated he certainly wouldn't want to see the Commission put into that kind of position. He had no problem if, and I would look to our Director for his input, if this could be explored and brought back in 30 days or the next meeting, but he wouldn't want it see the Commission talking to somebody else about eminent domain with their offer to pick up the cost. He said he thinks that would set a bad precedent.

Dana asked Mr. Wiley if the Commission could go forward with a condemnation today and still negotiate.

Wiley responded that if the Commission approves the finding of necessity and the filing, staff could still negotiate. He reiterated that staff has waited until the last moment to come to the Commission because they were negotiating

with Rollins. Staff now has enough time to place the contract for the site preparation out to bid and for the work to begin. If this were delayed, then that contract will necessarily be delayed.

King stated he agreed that the possibility of the threat of condemnation being used on a third party bothers him greatly. He was concerned that Rollins might not want to buy the property and then the Commission would have to sell to the highest bidder of the public so Rollins gains nothing.

English stated that he is only suggesting that the Commission make a temporary acquisition of this vacant land and use the vacant land as the storage yard while Rollins continues for the two-year period that the storage yard is needed to operate an ongoing business on the property. Then at the end of two years, the Commission could take the Rollins property as the park-and-ride facility. That has given Rollins an additional period of time to make the transition that it needs to make. English is not suggesting that spread of eminent domain be used against the third party, he suggests that when the Commission has a choice between taking property on which an ongoing business is sitting and property which is vacant, and it has a need of that property for a two-year period, that the vacant property is the better choice for that two-year period for a construction yard; that could be done in a manner which as was suggested here would not cost anything additional to the Commission because Rollins would be remaining on that property where it is now and continue to pay rent for the two years.

_____ stated that if the Commission is unable to negotiate a successful lease with the other property owner, how could it do that without the use of eminent domain, and why would a person with 7 acres for sale be interested in leasing an acre and a half and potentially tying up the entire parcel for two years.

English stated that no matter what happens, the Commission is going to have to take land from a private individual. It is either going to have to take land from Rollins or take it from the other party. The Rollins land has got an ongoing business on it. There are people employed there. There are businesses who are relying on that facility. The alternative acquisition is vacant. He stated that he thinks it is more sensible to acquire, if the Commission is going to use the power anyway to acquire private property under eminent domain, it makes more sense to acquire the

vacant land under that power for a temporary period of time then to put someone out of business with that power. Rollins did attempt to acquire that other property so that it could try to work something out one way or another. That wasn't successful. He suggested the Commission could acquire the adjacent property and that would be a more sensible use of the eminent domain power rather than acquiring the property and putting somebody out of business instead to acquire some vacant land and allow somebody to remain in business.

Dana said the problem is that the Commission needs the particular land that Rollins is on.

King stated he thinks that he summarized by saying just what he thought. It still puts the Commission in a position of the third party helping Rollins get the land by threat of condemnation. But Rollins is making the Commission look like the bad guys. Rollins has had more than a year and a half notice and all of a sudden it is making the Commission look like the bad guys. Since the Commission owns the property, Rollins could sit there maybe and make it wait until 1995 but that's the only recourse that Rollins has got. King stated Rollins is getting a big price just to accommodate it to move on and help it find its site, and it is looking to the government for help in condemnation. King thinks that's wrong, and he resents what Rollins suggested.

English appologized and said he didn't mean to create a misimpression. By taking Rollins' lease, it's the same as taking the property. Rollins has a right to be on that property under the lease until 1995 and all it is asking is to be allowed to continue to operate the business and make that transition for two years. It is just trying to work around to find a formula. English stated he just suggested something that he thinks would work that would optimize the situation for everyone and he didn't mean to put the Commission in the position of being the bad guys. He was just trying to ask you for help to keep the business operating for as long as possible.

Remy asked what's the length of time that the Commission would have if it took the action today in which negotiations could still be carried out before the final action would be taken.

Wiley responded: Approximately 100 days.

Remy asked if Wiley said that the Commission would delay a contract for the construction work if it delayed action on the property. He said he was assuming that if it was delayed for two weeks, it would delay that contract for two weeks, and asked if it would have a broader implication.

Wiley said he was not sure it's day-for-day but the delay of two weeks would be a delay of the contract.

Remy said so there is no other major things that would occur. It just would move it off to two weeks. If something was worked out, he understands they have a five-year lease, is that right?

Wiley said the Commission is in the lease and there is a cancellation clause in there. The compensation being offered to them is for improvements that Rollins made to the property, not for the termination of the lease. The term of the lease was described but it has a cancellation clause.

Remy asked whether the lease could be cancelled without any particular penalty adverse effect.

Wiley said staff would maintain that.

Tuttle asked whether Rollins and the Transportation Commission's staff are in agreement as to the amount of money that was offered for the acquisition of the lease?

Wiley said staff has made an offer and has had no response to the offer.

Tuttle directed the question to the attorney representing Rollins.

English responded Rollins hasn't really addressed the dollar figure because the timing is the more important consideration. So his answer is no, Rollins is not in agreement, since it hasn't taken it up yet.

Since no one else wished to testify, Mr. Dana closed the public hearing without objection.

Mr. Tuttle moved that the Commission adopt the Resolution of Necessity and direct staff to explore any possibilities for helping resolve the problems that Rollins has. Motion was seconded by Mrs. Reed.

A roll call vote was taken:

Yes: Sanborn, Geoghegan, Remy, Bacharach, Reed,
Tuttle, Mednick, Dana

No: King

Motion passed.

A roll call vote was taken:

Yes: Sanborn, Geoghegan, Remy, Bacharach, Reed,
Tuttle, Mednick, Dana

No: King

Motion passed.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

FINANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr. Sanborn reported on the FRC meeting of October 20, 1986. The committee's recommendations were as follows:

New UMTA 504 Regulations -- Required Operator Plan and Clarification of Policies

- o Approve the staff recommendations as amended by the Bus Operations Subcommittee (attached). Also, change the phrase "in conjunction with" to "in consultation with" in the BOS recommendation #3.

Mr. Sanborn moved for approval, seconded by Mrs. Bacharach. Hearing no objection, motion was carried.

Transit Operator Performance Audit -- Phase II Results

Mr. Fred Psyck, Senior Partner of Price Waterhouse, provided background on why the focus on the SCRTD in particular, the areas that were reviewed and the resulting recommendations. He indicated that Price Waterhouse received extensive and positive support from SCRTD throughout the audit process.

Questions were asked of Mr. Psyck by the Commissioners.

As a result of the report of Price Waterhouse and a number of other meetings that the FRC had with regard to Phase I and II, the following recommendations were made to the Commission:

- o Approve the recommendation contained in the staff report with the following additions:
 1. That the LACTC would make the consultant available to the SCRTD Board and the ATU, UTU, and BRAC to present the findings of the performance audit and answer questions.
 2. That the staff would report back to the Commission by the end of November on the recommended absenteeism reduction targets and special emphasis on the 20% chronic absentee category.
 3. That the staff would provide advance notice (in April or May, 1987) to the Commission, and to the SCRTD Board, if it appears that the SCRTD would fail to meet the target reductions in absenteeism.

Mr. Sanborn moved for approval, seconded by Mrs. Bacharach. Mr. Geoghegan indicated his concern about the amount of money that the RTD would receive in future years if they failed to meet the goals in terms of absenteeism. He asked that alternatives ways be looked at to convince RTD to implement the absenteeism recommendations as a possible substitute to withholding funds.

Mrs. Bacharach and Mr. Remy supported the committee's recommendations. Mrs. Reed indicated that the maintenance workers with 100% attendance should be recognized.

A roll call vote was taken:

Yes: Sanborn, King, Remy, Bacharach, Reed, Tuttle, Mednick, Dana

No: Geoghegan

Motion passed.

Mr. Sanborn commended Price Waterhouse for presenting the Commission with a meaningful document.

Transit Operator Productivity Improvement Fund (TOPIF) Closeout Report

This item was held over to the next meeting.

Proposition A Discretionary Grant -- FY 1986-87 MOU with Torrance Transit System

- o Authorize the Executive Director to execute FY 1987 MOU with Torrance Transit System.

Mr. Sanborn moved for approval, seconded by Mrs. Bacharach. Hearing no objection, motion was carried.

Performance Audit -- CPI Task

- o Approve staff report with direction to include on next LACTC/SCRTD Liaison Committee agenda.

Mr. Sanborn moved for approval, seconded by Mrs. Bacharach. Hearing no objection, motion was carried.

Appeal by the City of Culver City to Allow Multiple Exchanges of Proposition A Local Return Funds

- o Approve policy to allow multiple trades as requested by Culver City, with the conditions recommended in the staff report. Also, add the following conditions:
 1. That traded Proposition A Local Return funds retain their original date of allocation for purposes of compliance with LACTC guidelines on timely expenditures.
 2. That cities be put on notice that if a high volume of trades result in increased administrative and/or audit costs, these increased costs will be billed to jurisdictions participating in trades.
 3. That staff draft a letter formally advising the League of Cities of the above LACTC actions.

Mr. Sanborn moved for approval, seconded by Mrs. Reed. Mrs. Bacharach indicated that it was her understanding at the FRC meeting that item #3 should also include having workshops with cities to explain the multiple exchange.

Mr. Sanborn moved to amend the item #3 to read that workshops will be held in this manner, seconded by Mrs. Reed. Hearing no objection, motion was carried as amended.

Expansion of Eligible Recreational Transit Service Area

- o Approve recommendation to expand the eligible recreational transit service area from its present boundaries to include all of Orange and Ventura counties and portions of Riverside and San Bernardino counties (Option #3).
- o Approve recommendation that the proportional share provision continue to be applied to destinations which are outside of the eligible area but are within Southern California.

Mr. Sanborn moved for approval, seconded by Mrs. Bacharach. Hearing objection, motion was carried.

Appointment of New Technical Advisory Committee Members

- o Approve appointment of the cities of Lancaster and West Covina, as recommended by the League of California Cities.

Mr. Sanborn moved for approval, seconded by Mrs. Bacharach. Hearing no objection, motion was carried.

Approval of Antelope Valley Study Consultant

- o Approve selection of the firm of Ekistic to perform the Antelope Valley Transit Study at a price not to exceed \$41,000.

Mr. Sanborn moved for approval, seconded by Mrs. Mednick. Hearing no objection, motion was carried.

Southern California Association of Governments' Proposed Federal-Aid Urban (FAU) Trade Approval Procedures

- o Approve recommendations contained in the staff report with the following changes:
 1. Give SCAG 45 days, rather than 30 days, to approve out-of-region trades.
 2. Approve the TAC recommendation that, once a trade has been approved by SCAG, SCAG would execute and transmit documents implementing the trades within 15 working days.

Mr. Sanborn moved for approval, seconded by Mrs. Reed. Mrs. Bacharach questioned the recommendation for Item #1. She indicated that SCAG had requested for 60 days instead of 30 days. Mrs. Reed indicated that #1 should read: "Request that SCAG approve out-of-region trades within 45 days, rather than 60 days."

Hearing no further objection, motion was carried as amended.

Appointment of FRC as the Public Hearing Board for the Bus Service Continuation Project

Chairman Dana appointed the Finance Review Committee as the hearing board under Chairman's Remarks.

Mr. Sanborn reported the FRC received information reports on the following items:

1. Publication of staff paper on transit operator cost comparison;
2. Status of local transportation sales tax measures;
3. Status of San Gabriel Valley Transportation Zone application process;
4. The FRC appointed the Almanson Education Center and the Frank D. Lanterman Regional Center to the Paratransit Operations Subcommittee.

STREETS AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE

Mrs. Mednick reported on the S&HC meeting of October 22, 1986 as follows:

Partial Draft Action Plan for "On the Road to the Year 2000"

The committee directed staff to direct its efforts in developing the Financial Chapter and Action Plan to:

1. Focus on a county sales tax;
2. Encourage the state to pursue an increased gas tax;
3. Pursue legislation to exclude the gas tax from the Gann expenditure limit;
4. Provide information to cities on potential revenue sources identified in matrix.

Staff will use this as a basis for additional work that they will be doing and will return at the next meeting.

For information only, staff was asked to collect additional information on hotel taxes.

While reviewing the Action Plan, the committee recommended that the Commission direct staff to hire a consultant to conduct a survey of commuters. This survey would evaluate the public's willingness to leave the freeway for a well-defined alternative route.

At this time, the Action Plan recommends the Commission work to accomplish the following goals:

1. Increase ridesharing;
2. Encourage Transportation Demand Management strategies;
3. Improve emergency response time;
4. Improve emergency-communication programs;
5. Create a demonstration project of computer-linked ("Smart") arterials and freeways;
6. Reduce traffic congestion caused by "rubber-necking";

7. Establish peak-hour parking restrictions on designated major arterials; and
8. Reroute or prohibit truck traffic on selected freeways during peak hours.

The completed Action Plan will also include recommended capital improvements and funding strategies. A draft of the complete Action Plan Chapter will be presented at Commission's November 26 meeting.

Route 101 HOV Lane Status Report

The S&HC also received an update on the status of the Route 101 High-Occupancy Vehicle Lane Advisory Committee.

Mrs. Reed commented that if the 10-Year Plan is going to focus on attempting to get an additional half-cent sale tax for road purposes, the committee should drop any attempt to look at the hotel taxes as an additional revenue source, because that will be perceived as very threatening to the cities that currently rely upon bed taxes as part of their revenue base.

Mrs. Mednick indicated that the alternative revenue sources listed in the Financial Chapter were for information purposes only, and have not been endorsed by the S&HC. The S&HC has supported the sales tax approach.

Mrs. Bacharach suggested that before a consultant is hired to survey commuters, the staff should coordinate with the IRC opinion poll.

Some discussion followed.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mrs. Reed reported on the IRC meeting of October 22, as follows:

Public Affairs Outreach

The IRC directed staff to arrange for a Public Affairs Outreach Workshop for the Commission and other interested parties for the first week in December. An agenda and further information on the workshop will be distributed in the near future.

Process for Developing and Approving 1987 LACTC Legislative Agenda

The schedule for the preparation of the 1987 LACTC Legislative Agenda was noted as an information item. The first draft of the agenda will be provided to the IRC members by November 12.

Federal Legislation

An update on federal legislation was presented as an information item. It was noted that H.J. Res. 738, the omnibus FY 1987 appropriations bill which includes funding for federal transportation programs, was approved by Congress on October 17, and signed into law by the President the following day. H.R. 3129, the bill to reauthorize federal highway and transit programs, was not passed by the Congress before that body adjourned. A similar measure will likely be introduced early next year. The FY 1987 budget reconciliation bill, H.R. 5300, was signed into law by the President on October 21.

Presentation by LACTC Washington, D.C. Consultant

Irving Smith, the LACTC Washington, D.C. consultant, presented a review of recent congressional action and a synopsis of transportation issues and legislation which will be of concern to the Commission in the next Congress.

Legislative Update

The September issue of the Legislative Update was presented as an information item.

Legislative Matrix

The final legislative matrix for action in 1986 was presented as an information item.

RAIL CONSTRUCTION COMMITTEE

Mrs. Bacharach reported on the RCC meeting of October 17. The committee's recommendations were as follows:

Award Contracts P820-Concrete Ties and C315-L.A. River to Willow Street

The committee recommended the Commission authorize the Executive Director to award, as described in the staff report, the following contracts for the Long Beach-Los Angeles and Century Rail Transit Projects:

1. P820--Concrete Ties: Genstar Costain Tie Co., Inc., in the amount of \$9,770,148.
2. C315--L.A. River to Willow Street: Kiewit-Pacific, Inc., in the amount of \$2,515,956.

Mrs. Bacharach moved for approval, seconded by Mr. Tuttle. Hearing no objection, motion was carried.

Quarterly Report on Budget and Schedule

The RCC received a quarterly report on budget and schedule and recommended no changes in the budget or schedule for either the Long Beach-Los Angeles or Century projects. The cost estimate requested for Washington Boulevard is \$3,300,000 for mitigation measures.

Mr. King expressed his opposition to the project alignment on Washington Boulevard.

Cooperative Agreements

The committee recommended the Commission authorize the Executive Director to execute cooperative agreements with City of Carson; Heritage Cable TV; Metropolitan Water District of Southern California; Santa Fe Railway Company; and Union Pacific Railroad Company and begin to issue work orders for necessary activities including design work, which should be done by LACTC-controlled forces to the maximum extent possible.

Mrs. Bacharach moved for approval, seconded by Mr. Tuttle. Hearing no objection, motion was carried.

Contractors' Conference

Mrs. Bacharach reminded the Commissioners that the Contractors' Conference is being held tomorrow and Friday at the Queen Mary Hotel in Long Beach.

RAPID TRANSIT COMMITTEE

Mrs. Bacharach reported on the RTC meeting of October 17. The committee's recommendations were as follows:

Santa Barbara-Los Angeles Amtrak Service

The RTC recommended that the Commission take the following position with regard to the extension of Amtrak San Diegan service from Los Angeles to Santa Barbara.

1. Support and encourage the establishment of two additional intercity rail stations in the San Fernando Valley--at the former Caltrain facilities in Van Nuys/Panorama City and Chatsworth.
2. Review the deficiencies of the former Caltrain Burbank Airport facility with the City of Burbank and the airport authority with the objective of developing a cost-effective, well-located long-term station facility.

3. Notify Caltrans of the Commission's preferences on station sites and urge Caltrans to press for the earliest possible start-up date for the service.
4. Adopt the position that the new San Fernando Valley intercity stations should be included in Caltrans' own cost base for the Santa Barbara "403-b program" service in a way similar to treatment of payments for similar facilities in the San Joaquin Valley.
5. Initiate efforts to seek the early extension of one or more additional trains to the San Fernando Valley.
6. Contact the affected cities and Ventura County about sharing any future costs nor borne by the State and Amtrak.
7. Initiate discussions with the City of Los Angeles and Caltrans toward a multi-modal transportation center for the mid-San Fernando Valley.

Mrs. Bacharach moved for approval, seconded by Mrs. Reed. Hearing no objection, motion was carried.

Evaluation of Metro Rail CORE Study Alternatives

The Committee has reviewed staff's report which evaluates the Metro Rail CORE study alternatives against the Commission's adopted guidelines, and recommended the Commission transmit the report to SCRTD for consideration in preparation of the draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The RTC has made three changes to the draft EIR:

1. Requested for a visual explanation of modified C-1 alternative;
2. Change "eliminating" to "deferring" the Hollywood Bowl Station;
3. Want "impacts" added for the Western leg terminus.

Mrs. Bacharach moved that staff submit these changes to the SCRTD, seconded by Mrs. Reed.

Mr. Bryan Allen appeared before the Commission and commented on the Metro CORE Study Alternatives.

Mrs. Reed moved for the submission of the comments to the EIR as they have been proposed and amended by the Committee, seconded by Mrs. Bacharach. Hearing no objection, motion was carried.

Mrs. Bacharach also reported as an information item on the Lincoln Heights-El Sereno Route Refinement Study:

Staff has completed technical evaluation of the Lincoln Heights-El Sereno Route Refinement Study and discussed its findings and community input received to-date with the Committee. At the November 7 meeting, the RTC will consider appropriate next steps.

STATUS REPORT ON LACTC GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Item was postponed to the next meeting.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

a. Citizens Advisory Committee Appointments

This item was postponed to the next meeting

NEW BUSINESS

None

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Commission adjourned into a closed session in accordance with Government Code Section 54956.9(b) - Exposure to Litigation.

Meeting was reconvened at 3:55 p.m.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the staff recommendation that the Executive Director be authorized to execute the proposed settlement agreement and related documents in substantially the form presented to the Commission. Hearing no objection, motion was carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Bryan Allen spoke in support of implementing tolls during peak-hours of traffic congestion.

NOTICE OF MEETINGS

Notice was received and filed.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Rick Richmond".

RICK RICHMOND
Executive Director

RR:kyt

Attachment