



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

MINUTES

August 27, 1980

The regular Commission meeting was called to order by Vice-Chairman Rubley at 3:05 p.m.

Members in attendance were:

Councilman Russell Rubley
Councilman John Zimmerman
Mayor Edmond Russ
Councilwoman Pat Russell, alternate to Councilman Ferraro
Peter Tweedt, alternate to Supervisor Peter Schabarum
Robert Reeves, alternate to Supervisor Kenneth Hahn
Ray Remy, alternate to Mayor Bradley
Eleanor Killeen, alternate to Supervisor Baxter Ward
Wendell Cox
Heinz Heckeroth, Ex-Officio representing the State of California

Staff members present:

Rick Richmond, Acting Executive Director
Ronald Schneider, Principal Deputy County Counsel
Kathy Torigoe, Secretary to Executive Director
Phyllis Eder, Secretary

I. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the August 20, 1980, meeting will be provided at the next meeting.

II. Chairman's Remarks

There were none at this time.

III. Briefing by Caltrans Staff on the Status of Busway Plans

Mr. Heckeroth introduced Mr. Jerry Baxter, Chief of Caltrans' Transit Branch for District 7.

Mr. Baxter then began his briefing by discussing the El Monte Busway Extension. The project will extend the current busway from Mission Street to Alameda Street. Caltrans is currently preparing an Environmental Impact Report to be completed about October 1982, with the extension to be in operation in time for the Olympics.

The other projects are the Harbor Freeway Corridor and the Santa Ana Freeway Corridor guideway studies. The Harbor Freeway corridor under study runs from the downtown Civic Center area to San Pedro. The Santa Ana Freeway Corridor under study runs from downtown into Orange County.

Under the Harbor Freeway project, Caltrans is studying three different modal alternatives in the corridor--busway, heavy and light rail.

When the study is finished, there will be enough information to evaluate the alternatives in that corridor. The Environmental Study should be done about June or July of 1981 with decisions to be made during the following 12 to 18 months.

Caltrans is working with both FHWA and UMTA to satisfy both of their requirements depending on which alternative is chosen.

The Harbor Freeway study is also associated with the Route I-105 project. Although the Route I-105 is being designed for initial busway convertible to rail, other decisions and alternatives may impact the transit facility being provided on the Century Freeway.

The other corridor being studied is the Santa Ana, running from downtown into Orange County. In this corridor, Caltrans is looking at the same modal alternatives both on and off the freeway right-of-way.

The Santa Ana corridor study in Los Angeles County is being coordinated with one that is being done in Orange County under the direction of the Orange County Transportation Commission. It is a unique corridor because it has been split in half by the County-line.

The schedule for this project is about six months behind the Harbor Freeway Project. The draft project and engineering report will probably be out in December of 1981. Construction of both these corridors is probable by 1985.

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

IV. Committee Reports:

A. Finance Review Committee:

Mr. Tweedt gave several items to the Commission for their consideration:

1. Concerning the RTD request for \$1.5 million: The Committee recommends deferring action of that request until the Board of Supervisors takes action on a \$2.1 million subsidy consideration, until final action by RTD with respect to proposed service adjustments, and until we get into the budget year a little further.

2. Concerning the El Monte Mid-Valley Paratransit Request: The Committee recommends releasing the \$37,026 that had been held pending compliance with LACTC conditions concerning restricting ridership to elderly and handicapped persons.

3. Concerning the Commuter Bicycle RFP: Committee recommends deferring approval of issuing the RFP pending a poll by the League of Cities to determine the level of interest in the study and the current status of commuter bikeway paths.

4. Concerning STIP Appeals: The committee recommends that the Commission direct staff to appeal to CTC, the proposed deletion of \$400,000 in right-of-way funds for Route 2 and any other proposed deletions of right-of-way cuts in L.A. County. Also, we request that the State Commission respect locally set priorities when cuts are made because of insufficient funds.

A motion was made by Mr. Tweedt, seconded by Mr. Cox, to approve the first four recommendations from the Finance Review Committee. There was no objection.

5. FAU Program: The subject was LACTC Staff Report on the FAU Program in Los Angeles County. Attachment 1 of the memo is the revised FAU recommendations that have been modified by the League of California Cities. It is the Finance Review Committee recommendation that the Commission accept the recommendations as revised by the League with one exception.

The Finance Committee recommends that the recommendation concerning the institutional relationship between LACTC and the FAU Policy Committee be change to read:

"The LACTC will consider recommendations from the FAU Policy Committee in making its policy and program decision regarding the FAU Program in L.A. County."

It should be noted that the League amended the original recommendation #7, changing the word "altering" to "supplementing."

The FRC further recommends that funds which lapse under these policies be used to fund local projects of Countywide significance, thus preserving the 80/20 fund split.

Mr. Tweedt moved that this item be approved; seconded by Mr. Remy. Mr. Remy also passed out recommended amendments to Recommendations 1 and 3 (to be added as opposed to omission), and moved that they be approved; seconded by Ms. Russell.

A discussion followed regarding the wording of the text. It was agreed that the amended motion shall read as follows:

#1 (1 + 3 Obligation Test)

Funds which "lapse" under the 1 + 3 obligation test will remain obligated for projects nominated by the jurisdiction if implementation is to be performed by another agency (as permitted under existing Caltrans Policy and Procedure).

#3 (Commencing Construction within One Year of Obligation)

It is recognized that any "lapsed funds" would remain earmarked for the project originally nominated by the defaulting jurisdiction, but that actual construction shall be awarded to another agency. Further, it recognized that no jurisdiction will be penalized for delays resulting from occurrences beyond the jurisdictions control, such as legal actions, labor actions, or unavailability of materials.

Mr. Tweedt suggested that action on the motion be temporarily delayed until additional language could be developed which would deal with the League's concerns about how jurisdictions which lose funds might be able to have those funds restored when and if supplemental funds or changed circumstances made project supplementation possible; this was agreed to.

6. Soundwalls: The Finance Review Committee recommends approval of the TAC recommendations that request Caltrans to develop individual projects with 70 decibel or above levels in categories C2 and C3 by January 1, 1981, for information purposes and for possible programming in the 1982-86 L.A. County TIP. The LACTC uses the new Caltrans soundwall prioritization formula on new soundwall projects to be considered for 1982 through 86 in our TIP. The FRC further recommends that the Commission maintain the old priority ranking for soundwall projects currently in the 1980 TIP.

7. 1981 Highway Needs Study: The Finance Review Committee approves the recommendation to request Caltrans, District 7 to include the following projects in its inventory for the 1981 Needs Study:

Route 30-Foothill Freeway
Route 47-Terminal Island Freeway
The full cost of Route 2, Santa Monica Boulevard
Route 90-Westerly extension of the Marina Freeway

Additionally the Committee requests that Caltrans consider inclusion of widening Route 5 to the Orange County Line to a substandard 8 lane freeway in the inventory needs.

Mr. Tweedt moved, seconded by Ms. Russell, to approve these two items. There was no opposition.

A short discussion followed concerning the clarification of soundwall needs of certain areas.

FAU Program (con't): It was also suggested by Mr. Tweedt to include the following wording in the FAU recommendations:

"If the jurisdiction loses funds under the criteria of the recommendations 1 or 3, projects which would have otherwise been implemented using these funds shall be added to a shelf-list of projects for implementation when additional funds or changed circumstances make implementation possible."

Mr. Zimmerman made the suggestion that wording should read, "...shall be made available for programming when funds...." They are automatically shelved because they become a part of the program.

Mr. Tweedt then read the changed amendment to read as follows:

"If a jurisdiction loses funds under recommendations 1 or 3, projects which would have otherwise been implemented using these funds, shall be implemented when funds or changed circumstances make implementation possible."

Mr. Tweedt made a motion that the amended version of the FAU recommendations be approved; seconded by Ms. Russell. There was no opposition.

B. Intergovernmental Relations Committee:

State Legislation:

Mr. Remy led the discussion on the following bills and their status:

SB 512: The attempt on the part of Orange County to obtain additional funding guarantees has become a major legislative fight involving a lot of interests. The latest information was that the second Conference Committee Report turned down by the Senate by a vote of 15 ayes and 19 noes. There is some desire on the part of the author of the bill, Senator Briggs, to have a third Conference Committee appointed to meet on Friday and try and bring that conference committee report in to see if he can get concurrence on that. The Legislature will supposedly adjourn on Friday, though the estimates are that they will go perhaps until Saturday or Sunday. The pronounced statements by the proponents of the bill, are that the monies to go to Orange County would come solely and exclusively from the Los Angeles and Ventura Counties, primarily from Los Angeles. Staff estimates are that there would be transference of about \$50 million dollars over a four year period to Orange County. It is a measure that cannot be in our interest and we should continue to fight it.

ACA 74: It has been amended now to apply only to the ballot in 1982. The Commission has supported this bill; however, it appears doubtful that it will pass.

AB 3417: This is a clean up measure that has been introduced at the request of this Commission. It is in the Governor's Office waiting for signature. We have sent a letter in support of the bill to the Governor.

Also in the case of SB 512, we should draft a letter just in case it does get out of the Senate urging the Governor to veto the measure.

Federal Legislation:

Mr. Remy then introduced Mr. Irv Smith, for his presentation on pending Federal Legislation.

Mr. Smith summarized the main points discussed at the IRC Meeting. They center around two bills that are currently before Congress.

The two bills that are currently before Congress are the authorization bill and FY 81 appropriations bill. The authorization bill has already passed the senate on June 25, by a 79 to 15 vote. The House must take up the bill next and is not planning on doing that until after the election.

Mr. Smith did not go into the many provisions, but highlighted those that would be of interest to the Commission.

One is the formula by which Section 5, or Operating Assistance is to be allocated across the nation. Under current law, Section 5 money is allocated based on population and population density. Under the proposed law, which has passed the full Senate, the allocation will be made based on transit service levels as measured by revenue vehicle miles. It is not possible to give the exact impact of this on Los Angeles County, but a ball park figure is that Los Angeles would lose \$8-10 million in the first year.

The proposed change in formula has come with tremendous national support. The idea behind the formula change is that those who provide the service should be rewarded.

Mr. Smith indicated that he would like to try and see if it is possible to mitigate the results of the new formula on the area. There is very little doubt that a new formula will pass in some form or another.

An amendment offered by Senator Schweicker to allow Medicare Cards to serve as proof of eligibility for reduced fare programs has been included. Staff and RTD is probably looking into the impact of such an amendment on the local area here.

The last amendment that may be of interest to the Commission is the amendment that would allow loans and grants to urbanized areas to purchase right-of-way for transportation corridor development. The idea of this is to allow the purchase before the real estate values and costs go up.

Mr. Smith distributed the legislative up-date that is provided on a monthly basis.

C. Service Coordination Committee:

Mrs. Killeen gave the Service Coordination Report. There is one action pursuant to AB 816 - Rules and Regulations on the Inter-agency Transfers. The Service Coordination Committee unanimously recommends that the following paragraph be approved:

"Every effort shall be made to keep transfer charges at a reasonable rate. Furthermore, these charges shall be reviewed annually by the Bus Operators Subcommittee. They shall also be subject to annual review by the Commission."

Mrs. Killeen made a motion to approve this paragraph; Ms. Russell seconded. There was no opposition.

V. Status Report on Route 7:

This item will be heard at the next regular meeting, as the material has not arrived.

VI. Acting Executive Director's Report:

The annual APTA Conference is scheduled to take place in San Diego between the 5th and 9th of October.

A number of documents relating to the Commission's transit ballot issue were distributed including the summary of the action, the ballot language itself, and the ordinance as adopted. The County Counsel analysis will be forwarded.

VII. New Business:

Mrs. Killeen, representing Supervisor Baxter Ward, informed the Commission that the Supervisor had been contacted by a citizens group, calling themselves Citizens Advisory Committee for Abatement of Noise and Vibrations and Hazard, San Bernardino Freeway. This is a group of people who have been battling the Southern Pacific Railroad because of noise they say is beyond the legal limit. The Southern Pacific is arguing with them. Their vibrations have caused material damage in the homes of the area and they now have concerns about hazardous waste being carried through that area. They have come up with a solution to their problems, and that is that the Southern Pacific use an alternative track into Los Angeles. Mrs. Killeen requested that staff

study this, and return it with their comments for Supervisor Ward.

Mr. Schneider informed Mrs. Killeen that he had spoken to a representative and had advised her that the County has no jurisdiction in this matter at all. Other suggestions were made to Ms. Killeen as to who would probably handle the issues. It was agreed that the Commission probably was not an appropriate agency to respond to this issue.

Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Rick Richmond".

Rick Richmond
Acting Executive Director

RR:pae



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

MINUTES

April 23, 1980

Meeting was called to order by Chairman Schabarum at 3:14 p.m.

Members in attendance were:

Supervisor Peter Schabarum
Councilman Russell Rubley
Councilman John Zimmerman
Wendell Cox
Eleanor Killeen, alternate to Supervisor Ward
Robert Reeves, alternate to Supervisor Hahn
Robert Geoghegan, alternate to Supervisor Edelman
Barna Szabo, alternate to Supervisor Burke
Ray Remy, alternate to Mayor Bradley
Councilwoman Pat Russell, alternate to Councilman Ferraro
Councilwoman Chris Reed, alternate to Mayor Russ
Heinz Heckerath, Interim Commissioner, representing State
of California

Staff members present:

Jerome C. Premo, Executive Director
Ronald Schneider, Principal Deputy County Counsel
Kathy Torigoe, Secretary to Executive Director

Approval of Minutes

Commissioner Reed indicated that the minutes of April 9 on page 4, under Intergovernmental Relations Committee's 1/2¢ sales tax discussion, refer to the Burke/Szabo proposal. Mrs. Reed suggested that the proposal be added to the minutes as a supplement. The minutes, as amended, were unanimously approved.