



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

MINUTES

OCTOBER 29, 1980

The regular Commission meeting was called to order by Chairman Schabarum at 3:12 p.m.

Members in attendance were:

Supervisor Peter F. Schabarum  
Councilman Russell Rubley  
Councilman John Zimmerman  
Mayor Edmond J. Russ  
Mr. Wendell Cox  
Ms. Eleanor Killeen, alternate to Supervisor Ward  
Mr. Robert Reeves, alternate to Supervisor Hahn  
Mr. Robert Geoghegan, alternate to Supervisor Edelman  
Mr. Heinz Heckeroth, ex-officio representing State of California

Staff members in attendance were:

Rick Richmond, Executive Director  
Ronald 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. Geoghegan, to approve the minutes of the October 15, 1980, meeting.

II. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS:

Mr. Schabarum thanked Commissioners Cox, Zimmerman, and Geoghegan for their willingness to make suggestions to the Commission on citizens who might be interested in being members of the Productivity Committee.

III. BRIEFING BY PORT OF LOS ANGELES STAFF:

Mr. Art Goodwin, from the Department of Advance Engineering Planning for the Port of Los Angeles made a presentation to the Commission on a project which is being undertaken jointly by the Port of Los Angeles and the Port of Long Beach. It is referred to as the ICTF (Intermodal Container Transfer Facility).

It was explained that the container movement of cargo is the most rapidly expanding mode of ocean traffic today. Consequently, the ports are trying to bridge the gap in modes whereby cargo comes to the ports by ship, then to truck then to transcontinental rail to the east coast, and finally back on a ship to Europe.

The basic problem that the ports are facing today is that the Port of Los Angeles is in San Pedro Bay while the major rail yards of the three railroads serving the Southern California area are all located in the downtown area of Los Angeles, anywhere from 19 to 25 miles distance from the San Pedro Bay, Port of Los Angeles, and Port of Long Beach.

The proposed ICTF site is between located between the San Diego Freeway, the Pacific Coast Highway on the eastside of Alameda St. It is presently owned by the Port of Los Angeles is called the Classification Yard. The City of Long Beach is to the immediate east of the property and the City of Carson is on the immediate west of the property with the San Diego Freeway on the North. Sepulveda Blvd. crosses through the property and Pacific Coast Highway is to the south.

Mr. Goodwin showed the Commissioners an artist's rendering that depicted all the various activities that could be included in the ICTF. The main rail yard would be located on port owned property through the center of the facility. The containers would be sorted and stacked on property to the west, which would be acquired. The property to the east would be used to store cases.

Trucks would be able to bring the containers from the two ports by existing freeway systems and surface streets to the facility. Once the containers were sorted, they would be loaded on to the appropriate train to their destination. The train would leave the facility as dedicated service, meaning that after it left the facility, it would go as a unit train to its destination and would not go through the downtown railyards and would not be reclassified to the appropriate destination in the San Bernardino area. Trains coming in would be unloaded and "trucked" the 4 to 5 miles to the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach.

The extension of Rte. 47 to the San Diego Freeway, to Alameda St., or to Willow Rd. could have serious ramifications for the facility. Rte. 47 would have to cross the facility to join with Alameda St. If it went to the San Diego Freeway, it would still interfere with the facility.

A feasibility study for the railyard is being conducted by the Port's consultants to determine what would be a good preliminary plan. They are also reviewing any extension of Rte. 47 across the property and determining what the cost would be to the Port's project.

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

Mr. Cox asked whether it would require truck interface between the port and the railyard with no direct port/rail connection.

Mr. Goodwin explained that currently containers are transported by truck 19 to 25 miles from the container terminal in San Pedro Bay to a downtown railyard. The port would transport 4 to 5 miles to this facility and would reduce fuel consumption and subsequent air pollution.

Mr. Cox asked whether the ports are working with the railroads concerning the declassification yards. He also asked if there would be incoming unit trains from other parts of the country.

Mr. Goodwin explained that the Port is working with the Southern Pacific Railroad at this time. The Southern Pacific Railroad had shown the greatest amount of interest of all railroads so far.

Mr. Zimmerman asked whether the Southern Pacific would have to reroute the rails to reach the yard.

Mr. Goodwin explained that the Southern Pacific Dolores Railyard is located immediately to the west of Alameda St. The site is considered a good location for the Union Pacific because their main line adjoins the Edison property that is located in the City of Long Beach.

Mr. Geoghegan asked whether the proposals that the Port is considering would conflict with the proposed extension of Rte. 47.

Mr. Goodwin explained that a possibility of conflict existed. A resolution has been adopted by the Board of Harbor Commissioners to the effect that the Port would be willing to design the intermodal rail facility to permit an extension of Rte. 47 provided that the planning effort on the part of Caltrans is done concurrently.

An official offer has not been received by Caltrans, but there have been several unofficial inquiries. The consultant will start on the feasibility study in about two weeks.

Mr. Geoghegan asked what the port proposed to do if the development of the facility proceeded as planned and the Commission decided to proceed with the extension of Rte. 47.

Mr. Goodwin explained that the adopted route is a highway corridor and that the corridor extends westward and eventually follows up to the terminus of the San Diego Freeway. The alternative route under consideration would be a route that would cross and come into Alameda St. A second option is to reroute the Union Pacific Main Line Track to the west and come straight up the UP main line, crossing over and going to Willow Rd., using the SCE right of way. The second option is only a suggestion and has not been studied.

Mr. Heckerath commented that Caltrans is obviously concerned about this and that there are reservations not only about the extension of Rte. 47, but also about considering this intermodal interface separately from area wide transportation considerations. The reports have indicated that they want other improvements in the area tied into the ICTF as well as Rte. 47 .

First, Caltrans does want to work with the Port. Caltrans shares the Port's concerns about the traffic interface in the area. A particular benefit of the intermodal facility is that there is currently traffic from the Ports area going to the downtown area on both the Long Beach Freeway as well as the Santa Ana Freeway, through the East Los Angeles interchange. This also affects some city streets in the vicinity of the General Hospital and the east side of the Los Angeles River. Not only is there an interest in Rte. 47, but also in the benefits that would stem from the diversion of trucks from the existing freeway system to the ICTF.

Caltrans does have a basic problem in extending Rte. 47 to a tie with the San Diego Freeway in this vicinity. This is caused by the fact that the San Diego Freeway is currently operating at capacity. The extension could introduce more traffic to an already congested freeway, complicated by the proximity of the freeway interchange between the San Diego and the Long Beach Freeway. It makes the extension a very expensive proposition in order to make it operate effectively.

Caltrans is very interested in looking at a tie-in to Alameda St., and any other options short of extending the freeway up to an already congested freeway. With the truck emphasis on the Terminal Island Freeway from the Long Beach and the LA Port areas, it is possible that Rte. 47, should ultimately serve as a principle truck facility extending to Alameda St. and ending at the Terminal. It is a complex transportation issue with area-wide implications, including the downtown areas.

Mr. Schabarum questioned whether Mr. Heckeroth had just made the appropriate offer to cooperate on development of solutions in the Rte. 47 ICTF area.

Mr. Heckeroth explained that he feels that Caltrans cannot operate independently of other concerned agencies and that, yes, he made the offer.

At that time, Mr. Goodwin took the opportunity to introduce Dr. Roy Perry, Executive Director of the Port of Los Angeles.

Mr. Cox expressed some concerns about the Commission's commitment to Rte. 47. If the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles are going to grow as expected, there is need for the inter-modal facility. The Commission has the authority and the responsibility to adopt routes and Rte. 47 has not yet been definitively adopted. The Ports are having some difficulty in planning the facility without such specific adoption. Mr. Cox wondered whether the Commission should take the task of trying to identify the specific route and the scope of the project. Mr. Cox felt that it certainly ought to go as far as the San Diego Freeway.

Mr. Cox made a motion that the Commission study the Rte. 47 project and adopt a specific route and scope of project so that the Port of Los Angeles and others concerned with transportation planning in the area will be able to move forward with some assurance of what the eventual scope of that project is going to be.

Mr. Rubley seconded Mr. Cox's motion.

Mr. Zimmerman asked what stage Caltrans' plans were in regarding the direction of Rte. 47.

Mr. Heckeroth explained that there is currently no study being done. The segment remaining is in the highway system and it is an adopted freeway corridor. The problem is that it is not funded as part of the improvement program process. Caltrans feels that engineering should not be started without a prospect of funding. Caltrans offered to look at the area itself and its effect on the facility to insure that we are not precluding options that would be available to Caltrans in the future, should the project be funded.

Mr. Heckeroth further explained that there are several problems with the route. First, it is an old freeway that was constructed during war time with defense funds as an access facility to the Long Beach Naval Facility. Second,

it is a remnant of a route that was to extend from the port area all the way into downtown. As an entire facility going into the Santa Monica Freeway in the south part of the downtown area, it made sense to have a freeway extending across all the way up. Now it is a limited facility in terms of origin and destinations points. There is a port at the south end, and the San Diego Freeway and its adopted terminus at the north end. It is a very limited-use facility. Some of the reasons for adoption, including the remnant transportation reasons, are lost.

Mr. Zimmerman suggested that, in conjunction with the motion that had been made, a motion should be made to encourage the Army Corps of Engineers, to move forward with the EIS even if Caltrans cooperation could not be obtained. Mr. Zimmerman explained that he was supporting the motion.

Mr. Rubley asked what would happen if the Terminal Island Freeway were not completed.

Mr. Heckerth explained that the freeway system in the port areas is comprised of the Harbor Freeway down to the San Pedro area and the Long Beach Freeway down to the port area neighboring the Queen Mary.

It was further explained that the freeway system breaks down north of the San Diego Freeway. Mr. Heckerth felt that the Terminal Island Freeway should not end at Willow. He felt it should end at some north/south arterial, probably Alameda St., with the use of the existing ramps to and from the San Diego Freeway at Alameda, with a direct connection to the Intermodal Terminal. This would eliminate trucks on City streets.

Mr. Rubley stated that the City of Long Beach had supplied the State Commission with information for a master blue print for the proposed area. He thought that the Commission should have received a report back from the State some time ago.

Mr. Zimmerman asked whether the TAC had been involved with the Rete. proposed projects.

Mr. Schabarum explained that the essence of Mr. Cox's motion would immediately involve the TAC.

No further discussion followed the motion and no objections were heard.

Mr. Bryan Allen, a private citizen, made a few brief comments.

A short discussion followed to clarify the amount of time needed to prepare the necessary documents.

It was agreed that the Commission should encourage the Corps of Engineers to proceed expeditiously with their study of the transportation needs of the area, to monitor that effort, and on its conclusion adopt appropriate specific projects.

IV. STATUS REPORT ON COMMUTER COMPUTER:

Mr. Steve Giovanisci, Chairman of the Board of Commuter Transportation Services Inc., thanked the Commissioners for their recent support in helping Commuter Computer solve its cash flow problem.

Mr. Tad Widby, the president of Commuter Computer was introduced by Mr. Giovanisci.

Mr. Schabarum also mentioned that Mr. Giovanisci is a volunteer at Commuter Computer and has been since its inception.

Mr. Widby explained that one of Commuter Computer's first priorities is to improve their financial management system. Changes already made in the accounting system are helping them to respond more effectively to Caltrans and others. The cash flow problem has been partially eliminated by a loan.

A second priority is to improve productivity in order to provide more match lists so that more people can be carpooling and vanpooling. An effort to decrease turn-around time is being made so match lists are received by commuters more quickly.

A third priority is to establish an organizational in order to alleviate staffing problems and create new opportunities for staffing.

Another priority is to improve communications. It is important to keep outside organizations, particularly the private sector, informed regarding Commuter Computer's activities and the reason behind certain decisions. This creates an understanding of Commuter Computer's goals and objectives.

Mr. Widby outlined Commuter Computer's achievements to date: the system has helped to form over 20,000 carpools and has put over 60,000 people into carpools and vanpools over the past few years. In doing, LA County has saved over 2½ million gallons of gasoline and has kept about 26 million pounds of air pollution out of the air. Carpooling has saved commuters \$56 million over the past 4 or 5 years.

Total registrations have increased from about 250,000 people to just under 500,000. That represents an increase of about 87%. The majority of the registrations come from businesses. Approximately 15% of the registrations come from individuals.

One of the goals that Commuter Computer is expected to meet is the production of 30,000 match lists per month. Last year, the level being produced was approximately at that level.

Turn around-time has improved. Of larger companies, (those with over 1,000 employees) 90% should receive match lists within 15 days. This standard is currently being maintained. Of medium-sized employers (those with under 1,000 employees) 90% should be receiving match lists in 10 days. That standard is not currently being met.

The turn-around time for individuals should be five days. That standard has been met for the last few months.

The Commission and other sources programmed funds for the purchase of an in-house computer for Commuter Computer. The feasibility study of that purchase has been completed and is currently being reviewed by Caltrans.

Performance objectives include: increasing the number of match lists, adding new clients, shortening turn-around time, and providing more responsive service to clients.

Relations with District 7 of Caltrans are excellent. The most recent evaluation of Commuter Computer by Caltrans reflect positive organizational improvements, a satisfactory work program, and progress towards meeting objectives.

The two areas of criticism by Caltrans are the accounting system and the billing system from Commuter Computer to the Vanpool operation. Both items are being corrected and should be improved within the next month.

Copies of the quarterly reports will be distributed to the Commissioners as soon as they are completed.

Mr. Schabarum asked Mr. Heckeroth whether he concurred with the results that Mr. Widby reported. Mr. Heckeroth concurred.

Mr. Cox expressed pleasure in the progress that has been made by Commuter Computer in the area of ridesharing.

Mr. Richmond asked whether the demand for services had increased or decreased.

Mr. Widby explained that requests from employers were down from what they were. The demand from individuals has remained constant.

Mr. Zimmerman was impressed with both Commuter Computers' progress and the large corporations that are taking some of the responsibility.

Mr. Widby explained that Commuter Computer is starting to divest itself of its vanpool fleet and estimates that this will be accomplished by January 31, 1981.

V. REQUEST FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF PARATRANSIT SUBCOMMITTEE:

Mr. Richmond brought to the attention of the Commissioners that staff is currently working on the suggestion of Rene Wilson, of the SCAG paratransit task force, that a paratransit subcommittee to the TAC be established within the Commission's structure.

Staff is developing a recommendation which will be presented at the next meeting. The recommendation will include how to organize committee efforts to meet the legitimate interests that may exist in the County.

VI. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

Mr. Richmond presented to the Commission what will be on the agendas of the next meeting and possible scheduling. The meetings in November will be the second and fourth Wednesdays (12th and 26th). The Commission will tentatively meet in December on the 2nd and 3rd Wednesdays due to the Christmas holiday.

At the meeting of November 26th, Mr. Richmond hoped that the Commission would be able to discuss the priorities on the Commission for the next year or two, focusing on the results of the performance audit of the Commission.

Twice in December there will be a discussion of the AB 103 Transit Study and hopefully adoption at December's last meeting.

VII. NEW BUSINESS:

There was no new business.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT:

Meeting adjourned at 4:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK RICHMOND  
Executive Director