



LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION • 354 SOUTH SPRING STREET—SUITE 500, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90013 • (213) 626-0370

MINUTES

August 25, 1982

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

Members in attendance were:

Councilwoman Pat Russell
 Councilwoman Jacki Bacharach
 Councilman Ernie Kell
 Wendell Cox
 Blake Sanborn, alternate to Supervisor Schabarum
 Burke Roche, alternate to Supervisor Hahn
 Ted Pierce, alternate to Supervisor Antonovich
 Robert Geoghegan, alternate to Supervisor Edelman
 Mayor Robert White, alternate to Christine Reed
 Ray Remy, alternate to Mayor Bradley
 Heinz Heckerth, Ex-Officio for State of California

Staff members in attendance were:

Rick Richmond, Executive Director
 Ronald Schneider, Principal Deputy County Counsel
 Kathy Torigoe, Executive Secretary
 Annette Honda, Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On page 3 of the August 11, 1982 minutes, under Options for Allowing Substitution of Proposition A for other transit funds, there was a roll call vote to adopt the amendment. The minutes should reflect that all options were included, not only Mr. Remy's modification to Item "b."

On page 3, under the Printing Contract for Progress Report, Mrs. Bacharach mentioned that the minutes should reflect that the motion was carried for approval of contract.

Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved, as amended.

CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS

Mrs. Russell introduced Robert White, Mayor of Norwalk, who is the alternate member to Councilwoman Christine Reed.

COMMITTEE REPORTSFINANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr. Sanborn reported on the FRC meeting of August 23, 1982. The committee's recommendations are as follows:

1. Report on LACTC's Public Affairs Program

Authorize staff to seek outside assistance to evaluate both the Commission's public affairs needs and to accomplish the following specific tasks:

- a. Conduct an audit of our existing program, and recommend a variety of incremental expansion options with analysis of benefits and costs;
- b. Produce an updated LACTC slide show;
- c. Develop one-time publications, such as brochures on rail transit and transportation financing; and
- d. Evaluate means to increase the coordination between the LACTC public affairs program and those of other transportation agencies, such as the RTD.

Staff will prepare a Request for Proposal to be brought back to the FRC on September 8, 1982.

Mr. Sanborn moved for approval; seconded by Mr. Cox. Hearing no objection, motion was carried.

2. Revised Proposition A Local Return Proposal from the City of Inglewood

Review of the revised Proposition A Local Return Program from the City of Inglewood was held over until the FRC's September 8, 1982 meeting, due to lack of consensus on this issue. However, the FRC did recommend that the Commission:

- Request a formal finding from the SCRTD Board that the proposed transit security program in the City of Inglewood is provided under an arrangement with the SCRTD and does not duplicate or compete with existing transit security service.

Mr. Sanborn moved for approval; seconded by Mr. Roche.

Mr. Cox indicated that the recommendation involving SCRTD's review of the Inglewood security program is stated a little more finely than the regulations indicate. LACTC's regulations indicate that transit security is a reasonable use of the money under an arrangement with the particular transit operator. He also indicated that the language should be a bit more general, and that the Commission is not just limited to the issues of duplication or competition because there is also the issue of whether or not it is an appropriate use to begin with, as the program is structured.

Mr. Cox requested the SCRTD Board to comment and take a position on the Inglewood proposal. He made this as an amendment to the recommendation. Chairwoman Russell accepted this as an amendment.

Mr. Remy questioned whether the intent is to ask SCRTD to comment on the basic policy or whether the Commission should authorize Proposition A funds for security.

Mr. Cox indicated that the real question is whether the program, that is being looked at, is a valid transit security program.

Mr. Roche mentioned that he strongly favors the use of Proposition A funds as appropriate for security on the bus system.

Hearing no objection, motion was carried as amended.

3. Private Bus Operator and Proposition A Local Return Projects

Request staff to report back to the Commission the role of the private sector in Proposition A Local Return projects in September concurrent with review of legal issues relating to recreational transit.

Mr. Sanborn moved for approval; seconded by Mr. Cox. Hearing no objection, motion was carried.

4. Memorandum of Understanding for Fare Reduction by Gardena Bus Lines

- Approve the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for fare reduction under Proposition A Reduced Fare Program by Gardena Municipal Bus Lines as shown in the FRC agenda;

- Request staff to address the issue of maintenance of effort to retain existing funding sources under the Fare Reduction Program of Proposition A.

Mr. Sanborn moved for approval; seconded by Mr. White.
Hearing no objection, motion was carried.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. Remy mentioned that no IRC meeting was held the past two weeks. The next meeting is scheduled for September 8.

There was a matrix in the agenda that showed the status of several bills; however, there were no questions by members of the Commission on these bills.

SERVICE COORDINATION COMMITTEE

Mr. Cox reported on the SCC meeting of August 20, 1982. The committee had the following recommendations:

1. Additional Members for EHTAC

Approve expansion of the Elderly and Handicapped Transportation Advisory Council (EHTAC) to include representatives from the following organizations:

- a. American Association of Retired Persons (AARP)
- b. National Council of Senior Citizens
- c. Grey Panthers

2. Culver City/Santa Monica Service Dispute

Mr. Cox briefed the Commission on the status of the service dispute between Culver City and Santa Monica. Under the Administrative Code of the Commission, staff sought to arbitrate the dispute but was not successful in producing an agreement between the parties. The next step was for the Commission to assume jurisdiction in the dispute followed by a hearing by the SCC. The hearing was held on August 13, 1982. On August 20, the SCC met to consider the evidence that had been presented at the hearing as well as other submittals.

The committee is recommending that Culver City be granted the authorization to extend their line to the UCLA campus. This finding is based upon the fact that the proposed service meets the criteria for new service expansion which was adopted by this Commission.

Summarization by Mr. Cox:

"First, the operator involved, Culver City, is not in violation of the standards of the Transit Performance Measurement (TPM) Program nor will be thrown into violation by the adding of this new service. Second, that the

combined operation of the two operators will show a net improvement in performance data. Third, that there is no significant effect on the operators of the county of transportation in the county in general; and fourth, that there is no significant effect on Santa Monica that is the intruded upon operator or any of its individual services. Under the authority which this Commission was granted under AB 103 in 1979, we have very broad authority to resolve jurisdictional disputes. In fact, we can largely override many sections of the law; however, there are three sections of law that require an eight-vote majority for us to override them. One of those sections of the law, Public Utilities Code Section 99280, is involved herein. This is the section of the law that says that the municipal operator has to assent to the intrusion into its reserved service area. It is our view as a committee that this action, which we are proposing for the recommendation, be made final by the Commission. Eight affirmative votes will be needed under AB 103.

"Our recommendation again summarized is first, that we authorize Culver City to extend their service to the UCLA campus and that authorization be effective upon the adoption of the Proposed Decision and Order; and second, that both operators be asked to report on the effect of this new service addition approximately nine months after the service has been established."

Mr. Cox moved for approval; seconded by Mrs. Bacharach.

There was a roll call vote:

ayes - Mr. Sanborn, Mr. Roche, Mr. Pierce, Mr. Remy,
Mr. White, Mrs. Bacharach, Mr. Kell, Mr. Cox,
Mr. Geoghegan, Chairwoman Russell

nays - none

Motion was carried unanimously.

Culver City Councilman Ron Perkins requested to speak before the Commission. He thanked the Commission for the decision to extend bus service to the UCLA campus.

Mr. Roche indicated that Mr. Cox and the Service Coordination Committee should be commended for conducting the hearing in an objective manner. Both parties received a complete hearing with regard to the issues in dispute.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

1. Travel Request - Commissioner Remy has expressed an interest in meeting with UMTA Regional Administrator and key staff in San Francisco on a number of pending issues of Commission interest, including a "letter of no prejudice" request on light rail engineering, on August 30, 1982.

Chairman Edelman had asked that Commissioners' travel requests be forward to the Commission for approval. Mr. Cox moved for approval; seconded by Mr. Pierce. Motion was carried.

2. New Employee - Ben Darche was introduced to the Commissioners. He is the Commission's Transit Development Officer.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Crenshaw Station

Mr. Roche distributed a letter dated August 16, 1982, which advocates that the Crenshaw Station be included as one of the stations on the Metro Rail Line. The letter was signed by State Senators David Roberti and Diane Watson, Assemblywoman Gwen Moore, Congressman Julian Dixon, Supervisor Kenneth Hahn, and Councilwoman Pat Russell. The letter asks the SCRTD to consider Crenshaw Station as a location.

2. Proposition A Local Return Policies

Rita Barschak, Transit Consultant for the League of Women Voters of Los Angeles County, addressed the Commission on the issue of Proposition A Local Return Policies. She distributed copies of her testimony.

Mr. Richmond indicated that Mrs. Barschak's testimony pertains to the recent decision made on the Local Return guidelines. Two weeks ago, after reconsideration through the Finance Review Committee, the Commission went back to the original provision adopted in the guidelines which states that substitution can now be allowed where it is not replacing property tax revenue.

Considerable discussion followed.

Mrs. Russell indicated that the Rapid Transit Committee has been reviewing pending SCRTD decision on the Metro Rail Line. There was a public discussion where John Dyer, SCRTD General Manager, made a presentation. There will be further consideration with a recommendation to be brought back to the Commission.

NOTICE OF MEETINGS

The next Finance Review Committee meeting is scheduled for September 8, 1982 at 11:30 a.m.

Notice was received and filed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 2:20 p.m., there was an Executive Session to discuss personnel matters.

Meeting reconvened at 2:37 p.m.

Mrs. Russell reported that the Commissioners voted to accept the findings of the Hearing Officer who recommended the following:

"It is respectfully recommended that the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission be sustained in its discharge of Willette Jones from the position of Secretary effective August 6, 1980."

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK RICHMOND
Executive Director

RR:ahh:kyt