

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA  
RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

PUBLIC HEARING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT  
OF  
MEETING

Los Angeles, California

May 7, 1973

REPORTED BY:

L. KATHERINE YEATS, C.S.R.

SCHECHTER DEPOSITION SERVICE

CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTERS

3030 WEST TEMPLE STREET

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90026

(213) 381-3935

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

APPEARANCES:

BOARD OF DIRECTORS:  
(Present)

JAY B. PRICE, Chairman  
of Meeting

DON C. McMILLAN

(Not Present)

NORMAN TOPPING, President

THOMAS G. NEUSOM, Vice-President

ARTHUR BALDONADO

BYRON E. COOK

A.J. EYRAUD, JR.

ADELINE GREGORY

HERBERT H. KRAUCH

DOUGLAS A. NEWCOMB

Also Present:

RICHARD GALLAGHER, Chief  
Engineer

JOHN CURTIS, Manager of Rapid  
Transit and Surface Planning

JACK R. GILSTRAP, General  
Manager

RICHARD K. KISSICK, District  
Secretary

GEORGE W. HEINLE, Manager of  
Operations

JACK T. STUBBS, Assistant General  
Manager for Administration

PATRICIA GRIESSEL, Board  
Committee Secretary

1  
2 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA  
3 RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT  
4

5 PUBLIC HEARING  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 1060 South Broadway  
11 District Board Room  
12 Los Angeles, California 90015

13 Met, pursuant to Notice of Intent to Hold Public  
14 Hearing on Urban Mass Transportation Administration  
15 Capital Grant Project of the Southern California  
16 Rapid Transit District at 9:30 a.m.

17 BEFORE:

18 JAY B. PRICE, Chairman of the Meeting  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 THE CHAIRMAN, JAY B. PRICE: We will call the meeting  
2 to order. I will ask for the roll call please.

3 MR. KISSICK: Norman Topping.  
4 (Not present.)

5 MR. KISSICK: Thomas G. Neusom.  
6 (Not present.)

7 MR. KISSICK: Arthur Baldonado.  
8 (Not present.)

9 MR. KISSICK: Byron E. Cook.  
10 (Not present.)

11 MR. KISSICK: A.J. Eyraud, Jr.  
12 (Not present.)

13 MR. KISSICK: Adeline Gregory.  
14 (Not present.)

15 MR. KISSICK: Herbert H. Krauch.  
16 (Not present.)

17 MR. KISSICK: Don C. McMillan.  
18 (Not present at this time but came in later.)

19 MR. KISSICK: Douglas A. Newcomb.  
20 (Not present.)

21 MR. KISSICK: Jay B. Price.  
22 (Present.)

23 THE CHAIRMAN, JAY B. PRICE: This public meeting has been  
24 called in connection with a portion of Phase II of the  
25 District Urban Mass Transportation Administration Capital  
26 Grant Project, CA-03-0049 adopted by the district on October 13,  
27 1971 and revised May 22, 1972, comprised of improvements to  
28 operating Division No. 3 and the establishment of brake service

1 equipment at nine operating divisions.

2 The first item on the agenda is the report of the  
3 general manager, Mr. Gilstrap.

4 Will you present your report, Mr. Gilstrap?

5 MR. GILSTRAP: Thank you, Mr. President.

6 The Board of Directors on October 13, 1971 adopted  
7 a Five-Year Capital Improvement Program to maintain and  
8 improve bus operations and authorized the General Manager to  
9 file a Capital Grant Application with the Urban Mass  
10 Transportation Administration to obtain assistance for this  
11 project.

12 The program was modified on May 22, 1972 and on  
13 October 30, 1972 the Urban Mass Transportation Administration  
14 approved the District's Capital Grant Application for Phase I  
15 comprised of buses and various equipment.

16 The District is now prepared to file a Capital  
17 Grant Application for a portion of Phase II of the Capital  
18 Improvement Program. Approval of this application will allow  
19 the District to make needed facility improvements at operating  
20 Division No. 3 and establish brake service equipment at  
21 nine operating divisions to improve the efficiency of our  
22 maintenance operations.

23 This public hearing is in accordance with rules which  
24 have been promulgated by the Urban Mass Transportation  
25 Administration so that parties having a significant economic,  
26 social or environmental interest may be afforded the opportunity  
27 to appear and be heard.

28 On May 15, 1973, the Board of Directors will file in

1 the project record and with the District Secretary a finding  
2 that the projects described above are categorically exempt  
3 from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality  
4 Act of 1970.

5 The addition of the modern equipment and improvements  
6 included in this portion of Phase II of the District's Five-  
7 Year Capital Improvement Program will benefit the transit  
8 users, District employees and the general public throughout the  
9 District's service area.

10 That concludes my report, Mr. President.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gallagher, I understand that you also  
12 wish to represent a report.

13 MR. GALLAGHER: Yes, Mr. President.

14 This portion of Phase II of the Capital Improvement  
15 Program CA-03-0049 covers improvements of SCRTD's operating  
16 Division 3 and the establishment of brake service equipment  
17 at nine operating divisions.

18 Construction of the proposed new facilities at  
19 operating Division 3 will greatly improve the maintenance and  
20 servicing efficiency at that division.

21 The present maintenance facility was constructed in  
22 1912 and designed for streetcars. The facility was constructed  
23 with unreinforced brick and is unsafe in that it is not  
24 earthquake resistant. It is also inefficient for maintenance  
25 of buses.

26 A completely new maintenance building will be  
27 constructed, and it will specifically be designed for bus  
28 maintenance. The service station facilities will be

1 reconstructed in a new location so as to provide for a more  
2 efficient operation of buses. The present yard also has a  
3 severe drainage problem that will be corrected by regrading and  
4 repaving.

5 The construction projects at Division 3 will speed  
6 up maintenance turnaround time, and will result in less buses  
7 down for servicing at any one time.

8 At the present time all brake servicing is done at  
9 the main shop facility at South Park yard. The present  
10 practice is to transfer buses to the main shop where brake work  
11 can be performed. It is estimated that this practice requires  
12 an extra 15 buses.

13 The District plans to install brake servicing  
14 equipment at the nine operating divisions. This will eliminate  
15 the necessity of transferring buses to the one shop, and the  
16 resulting delay. This will allow the District to place 15  
17 more buses on the streets, without having to increase the size  
18 of the fleet.

19 The two maintenance service improvements covered in  
20 this project will greatly improve the District's overall  
21 maintenance program. It will allow the District to keep a  
22 greater percentage of its fleet on the street. This will  
23 contribute to greater service to the riding public.

24 Now as to protection of the environment: Phase II  
25 of the Capital Improvement Program CA-03-0049 involves the  
26 construction of new maintenance facilities at operating Division  
27 3. These facilities are to replace old and out-moded facilities  
28 which will be torn down. Phase II of the Capital Improvement

1 Program CA-03-0049 also includes the installation of brake  
2 servicing equipment inside the shop facilities at the nine  
3 operating divisions.

4 The improvements planned at Division 3 will improve  
5 the local environment. The new maintenance building will  
6 improve the old facility in three ways: First, the building  
7 will be designed in accordance with aesthetic as well as  
8 functional requirements. Second, it will be constructed so as  
9 to minimize noise emitting from the facility. Third, it will  
10 be constructed in conformance with current earthquake codes,  
11 thus, significantly reducing potential hazard to life and limb  
12 in the event of an earthquake. The new location for the  
13 service facility will allow adequate bus storage while awaiting  
14 service, rather than encroaching on adjacent streets. The  
15 brake servicing equipment planned for the nine operating  
16 divisions will be located inside existing buildings and will  
17 have no effect on the environment whatsoever.

18 No adverse environmental effects of this project  
19 are anticipated.

20 In the short term the new shop and maintenance  
21 facilities at Division 3 will improve the aesthetics of the  
22 area of Highland Park, where it is situated. Also, it will be  
23 a safer place to work for the District employees. The old  
24 facilities were constructed in 1912 with unreinforced brick  
25 and are earthquake prone. The new facility will be constructed  
26 with textured concrete block and steel framing or materials of  
27 equal aesthetic value.

28 The long term effects of this project will also be



1 beneficial to the environment. The new facilities (both  
2 Division 3 maintenance facilities and the brake servicing  
3 facilities) will allow the District to be able to keep a  
4 greater percentage of its fleet on the streets at any one time.  
5 This is particularly significant in light of the impending  
6 energy crises and the Environmental Protection Agency's  
7 proposed gas rationing plans for the Los Angeles area. By  
8 having more buses on the streets, fewer automobiles will be  
9 required to meet the transportation requirements of the people  
10 living in the Los Angeles area. This will produce a net decrease  
11 in the quantity of pollutants dumped into the air. Also, in  
12 relation to conservation of energy, it is estimated that  
13 buses require about 25 percent of the energy that a private  
14 automobile does, per passenger mile. Therefore, it is  
15 anticipated that project CA-03-0049 will have long-term  
16 environmental consequences of reducing the number of air  
17 pollutants in the region, and of reducing the quantity of  
18 energy required to meet transportation demands of the community.

19 No adverse environmental impacts are likely to be  
20 caused by future developments generated by this proposed  
21 project.

22 That concludes my report, Mr. President.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: For the record, I would like the record  
24 to show that Mr. McMillan has arrived.

25 (Mr. McMillan arrived at 9:45 a.m.)

26 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Curtis, do you have a report to make?

27 MR. CURTIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

28 My name is John Curtis. I am the manager of Rapid

1 Transit and Surface Planning Department.

2           The Southern California Rapid Transit District and  
3 its predecessor, Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority,  
4 have been active participants in the regional comprehensive  
5 and transportation planning effort since the inception of  
6 regional planning in the Los Angeles area in 1960. From 1960  
7 to 1965 this participation was through coordination with the  
8 Los Angeles Regional Transportation Study. In 1965 the transit  
9 agency became a contract member of the Transportation Associa-  
10 tion of Southern California, which was organized in that year  
11 as a joint powers transportation planning agency of the  
12 Counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Ventura, Riverside and  
13 San Bernardino, the municipalities therein, the California  
14 State Transportation Agency and the District. Imperial County  
15 was subsequently added to the membership. In 1971 the function  
16 of the Transportation Association of Southern California was  
17 assumed by the Southern California Association of Governments'  
18 Comprehensive Transportation Planning Committee, of which  
19 Southern California Rapid Transit District is an active member.

20           Southern California Rapid Transit District will  
21 complete an updated rapid transit development plan in the  
22 summer of 1973, with the objective of financing implementation  
23 by 1974.

24           Orange County Transit District is engaged in a  
25 rapid transit planning study, and Riverside and San Bernardino  
26 Counties are preparing rapid transit development programs.  
27 All of these programs are being conducted as integrated  
28 elements of the unified work program of the Southern California

1 Association of Governments, the agency responsible for  
2 comprehensive planning in the Los Angeles region.

3 The coordination of operations and development of any  
4 existing transit systems in the region is planned through the  
5 Transit Advisory Committee of SCAG. Through this organizational  
6 structure matters of service coverage, physical arrangements  
7 for interchange of traffic among the systems and a  
8 continuing program for improvement of the equipment and  
9 operating facilities of all systems are coordinated. A draft  
10 five-year transit development program has been prepared and  
11 approved by the Committee and is currently being updated and  
12 completed. The schedule of improvements to transit facilities  
13 included in the draft development program makes provision for  
14 the improvements which are the subject of this hearing.

15 Thank you, Mr. President.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Curtis.

17 Mr. Kissick, as the secretary, do you have the  
18 proper affidavits of publication and notice of intent to  
19 hold hearing? Will you so report?

20 MR. KISSICK: Mr. Chairman, I have in my possession  
21 affidavits of publication from La Opinion, Los Angeles Daily  
22 Journal and the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner showing publica-  
23 tion of notice of intent to hold hearing with all three  
24 newspapers. A publishing of the notice of intent to hold  
25 meeting was on April 5th and 6th, 1973. I have caused a copy  
26 of notice of intent to hold hearing to be mailed to a list  
27 of 83 federal, state and local agencies with jurisdiction by  
28 law or special expertise, and authorized to develop and

1 enforce environmental standards, which could be interested in  
2 the project as follows: Seven federal agencies, five State  
3 of California agencies, five Los Angeles County agencies, and  
4 66 elected federal and state representatives.

5 That concludes my report, Mr. Chairman.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Kissick.

7 It is my understanding that we have in the audience  
8 Mr. Jerome C. Long representing Amalgamated Transit Union  
9 Division 1277 that would wish to speak regarding during public  
10 hearing. Mr. Long.

11 MR. LONG: Gentlemen, my name is Jerome C. Long. I am  
12 president of the Amalgamated Transit Union Division 1277 and  
13 I am speaking on behalf of more than 675 members, who are  
14 employees of the Southern California Rapid Transit District.

15 Dear Employees:

16 Our union wishes to go on record opposing the  
17 changes contemplated by this Board relative to the manner in  
18 which the brake shops will be operating.

19 We have two main objections. One, safety and welfare  
20 of the public, and secondly, but certainly not unimportantly,  
21 cost to the public.

22 In reference to my first point, it is only common  
23 sense to realize that brakes and steering are the two most  
24 important single items in vehicular safety. Malfunction of  
25 engine, while serious of course, can generally be solved by  
26 pulling over to the curb. But if you cannot steer or stop,  
27 extremely serious consequences may result.

28 The present method of brake maintenance is one of

1 the finest in use in the entire United States and has been  
2 established and proven as being safe, efficient and economical.

3 The system now being proposed was in use at one time  
4 prior to the establishment of the Metropolitan Transit  
5 Authorities, and it brought with it nothing but problems to the  
6 working personnel and the management alike. Since this new  
7 system has been established and working, things have improved  
8 greatly, and no major accidents or injuries have been caused  
9 by brake failures, to my knowledge.

10 Two or three years ago a major problem arose regarding  
11 brake linings and mileage. Noise pollution was a byword with  
12 the RTD being a major target of attack it seems.

13 A picture comes to mind that was published in the  
14 Los Angeles Times. It showed a pedestrian holding his ears  
15 while an RTD bus screeched to a stop beside him. We do not  
16 know who screeches the loudest: The people, the papers or the  
17 Board of Directors trying to work on the tenth floor with  
18 buses stopped at 11th and Broadway every few minutes. The  
19 noise problem was not as a result of any maintenance problem,  
20 but by reason of a change in the contingency of the brake  
21 linings themselves, which had been purchased direct from the  
22 manufacturers. Changes such as the one proposed would not  
23 eliminate a problem of this sort, as its cause was not distinctly  
24 related. At that time mileage had dropped to six and 8,000  
25 between lining changes. Through a cooperative effort between  
26 management and experienced skilled workmen of the brake  
27 department, problems were ironed out and mileage was increased  
28 nearly five times that amount, a fantastic 35,000 miles

1 between changes. This kind of report can be achieved only  
2 through having a specialized group of people handling a  
3 specialized type of problem.

4 In reference to point two, cost to the people. The  
5 amount of the price tag on this project is, in our opinion,  
6 totally unnecessary. The cost is to duplicate machinery, stock  
7 and equipment already available at the major location now  
8 being used. The cost has changed its system from one that is  
9 close to being the very best in the country to one that has  
10 been previously tried and found to be wanting. All the  
11 necessary tools, lathes, stock equipment are located in one  
12 spot. Key men are located in this one spot along with the  
13 tools they need. These key men are well-trained specialists,  
14 mostly trained only in this one field and mostly with long  
15 seniority privileges. They are valuable employees. If this  
16 new plan were implemented, it would not only have to buy all  
17 this new equipment but many long-time employees would have to  
18 be moved totally to new locations, which would not only work  
19 a hardship on these people involved, but would no doubt  
20 involve further, as yet, unknown cause to the provisions  
21 protecting the labor force and the federal laws guarding  
22 against such occurrences as this.

23 Who pays this cost? Who pays the cost to the  
24 individual and his family for the trauma of being uprooted  
25 after years of service as a trusted and a valuable employee?  
26 As you no doubt know, these people could not be forced to make  
27 such a move. If they should decline to move voluntarily,  
28 other employees will have to be drafted from the bottom of

1 the seniority list.

2           Who is to train these people? Who then pays this  
3 cost? Implementation of this proposed new plan would cause  
4 further personnel problems. Even if there were enough  
5 presently employed skilled people who could and would be  
6 transferred along with this work -- as I said before they  
7 could refuse, they would be spread so thin that there would  
8 be no one to cover when illness, vacation or any other  
9 contingency might occur. This could require the training of  
10 additional personnel to be available when necessary. Who then  
11 will pay this cost?

12           What are the additional costs involved when a bus  
13 is down for a protracted period due to unforeseen problems or  
14 unusual parts not being available at the outlying areas?  
15 Would there be a special employee who is available to doing  
16 nothing but taxi parts from one location to another? Who pays  
17 this cost?

18           The job of stocking our parts, equipment, et cetera,  
19 which could be conceivably needed for any brake jobs, are  
20 monumental in itself.

21           With the present system, the manpower for maintenance  
22 of brakes has kept up with the demand of the increase load  
23 which has been placed upon it by the expansion of the District  
24 over the past few years.

25           Added mileage in the future, of course, could  
26 require the addition of manpower in this department, but it has  
27 not done so as yet. In such an event, wouldn't it be far  
28 more feasible to add a second or possibly even a third shift to

1 the South Park Yard Department presently so adequately equipped  
2 to handle any contingency, rather than invest so much capital  
3 and needless duplication of equipment?

4           The Amalgamated Transit Union Division 1277  
5 respectfully requests that the Board of Directors of the  
6 Southern California Rapid Transit District reject the proposal  
7 for the addition of brake shops at the nine locations  
8 mentioned in the agenda and continue to rely upon the method  
9 that has been, through trial, proven effective.

10           Thank you for letting me speak at this time.

11           THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Long.

12           If there is no objection, I will receive Mr. Long's  
13 report and Union objections to be filed for the consideration  
14 of the Staff and the Board.

15           Is there anyone else in the audience that would care  
16 to speak.

17           State your name and address and relate directly to  
18 the business at hand.

19           THE SPEAKER: My name is Howard Watts, 1021 North  
20 Mariposa Avenue, Los Angeles, Apartment 3-1/2.

21           First of all, I would like to state that as the  
22 secretary said, there was an ad in the Herald-Examiner -- I  
23 have got it in front of me. It tells me more about the  
24 project than your agenda does. Also, there is no materials  
25 for the general public to know exactly what is happening for  
26 this public hearing in front of us right now.

27           The ad talks about a two-thirds federal grant in  
28 the amount of \$2,178,000 under Section 3 of the Urban Mass



1 Transportation Act of '64 as amended, and the remaining one-  
2 third or \$1,089,000 by the District from funds made available  
3 by the Transportation Development Act of 1971. State of  
4 California stats 1971, Chapter 1400.

5 Division No. 3 seems to be, from what I have just  
6 heard, adequate to take care of what has to be done in this  
7 District. If every public agency because of earthquake  
8 safety reasons would go to the federal government and ask for  
9 all of their buildings to be earthquake safety proof and to be  
10 paid for by the federal government, we wouldn't need any  
11 local government.

12 The local government, which is this RTD District  
13 should be able to supply the money needed to updo and take  
14 care of their building program, their maintenance and whatever  
15 there is to be done without outside help. It seems to me,  
16 after what I heard from Mr. Curtis-- also that it is obvious  
17 that we don't have a local governmental agency here -- we have  
18 a form of regional government, of which I object very strongly  
19 to. Regional government says, under this joint portion  
20 agreement, which I didn't know about until just now that you  
21 have entered into it some time ago, that the general public,  
22 the electorate, has nothing to say about what is going to  
23 happen if we disagree in a public hearing. We have nothing to  
24 say to object to it. There is no way we can go to every one  
25 of these agencies and say: "Here. We object to a part, either  
26 the environmental section of it or any of it."

27 If we had a Board here, we then could object very  
28 strongly to them, because they would possibly be elected by us,

1 but in this case we are not. We are not able to elect them.  
2 They are appointed by another regional body, and I object very  
3 strongly to what is happening today.

4 Thank you, Mr. President.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, very much.

6 Receive his comments for file of the record.  
7 Regarding No. 2 of your complaint, regarding the availability  
8 of information at a hearing, that will be considered by the  
9 Staff for future hearings.

10 Is there anyone else in the audience that wishes to  
11 speak regarding this public hearing?

12 The last time: Is there anyone in the audience that  
13 wishes to speak?

14 I will entertain a motion to close this hearing.

15 MR. McMILLAN: I will second.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: So moved. The public hearing is closed.

17 (Whereupon at the hour of 10:05 a.m. the public  
18 hearing of the Southern California Rapid Transit  
19 District adjourned.)

20 ---oOo---

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

