

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

Minutes of Regular Meeting of
the Board of Directors of the District

August 18, 1965

Upon notice duly given, the Directors of the Southern California Rapid Transit District met at a regular meeting in the District Board Room, 1060 South Broadway, Los Angeles, California, at 9:30 a.m. on August 18, 1965, at which time President Harry A. Faull called the meeting to order.

Directors Kermit M. Bill, Mark Boyar, Robert F. Brandon, Harry A. Faull, Gordon R. Hahn, Leonard Horwin, Don C. McMillan and Douglas A. Newcomb were present. Directors Howard P. Allen, Martin Pollard and Norman Topping were absent.

Also present were Acting General Manager Cone T. Bass; General Counsel Milton McKay; Treasurer and Auditor H. L. Black; Fiscal Consultant Walter J. Braunschweiger; Chief Engineer Ernest R. Gerlach; Assistant to General Manager Jack R. Gilstrap; Secretary Virginia L. Rees; and the public.

Approval of Minutes

The Minutes of the Regular Meeting held August 4, 1965 were approved.

Certificate of Merit

Director Bill presented the District's Certificate of Merit to Homer Blair, Operator-of-the-Month for August, 1965, in recognition of the outstanding courtesy displayed by Mr. Blair toward his passengers and the public.

Temporary Route Diversions

After discussion, upon motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, it was

RESOLVED, that the temporary route diversions affecting Lines 27, 66 and 118, as described in report dated August 10, 1965 filed with the Secretary, be and the same are hereby ratified and approved.

Changes of Bus Stop Zones

After discussion, upon motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, it was

RESOLVED, that the report dated August 10, 1965 relating to bus stop changes, filed with the Secretary, be and the same is hereby ratified and approved.

Report of Purchasing Committee

After discussion, upon motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, it was

RESOLVED, that the Report of the Purchasing Committee for the period of August 4, 1965 through August 17, 1965, as discussed at this meeting and attached to these minutes as Exhibit 1, be and the same is hereby ratified and approved, and the appropriate payments are hereby authorized.

Approval of Authorization For Expenditure No. 224

After discussion, upon motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, it was

RESOLVED, that Authorization For Expenditure No. 224, covering the purchase and installation at South Park Shops of one Rotex Model 18 BCHD 24" stroke sheet metal machine, complete with duplicator, at a cost not to exceed \$3,500.00, be and the same is hereby approved.

Operating Report

Mr. Black presented the Operating Report for July, 1965, a copy of which is on file with the Secretary.

Non-Contract Employee - Management Group Level

After discussion, upon motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, it was

RESOLVED, that Mr. J. L. Smith be and hereby is appointed to the position of Director of Purchasing and Stores at an annual salary of \$10,800.00, effective as of August 9, 1965.

Resolution Re Initiation of Organization of Transit Planning Committee

Upon approval of the seven Directors present, there was added to the agenda the consideration of resolution directing the District staff to initiate the organization of a transit planning committee, including representation thereon by public and privately owned public transportation agencies in the Los Angeles area, for the purpose of coordinating transit planning and preparation of a transit development program to meet the

requirements of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964.

After a report by Director McMillan and a full discussion, upon motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 provides for federal capital grants and loans for urban mass transit development; and

WHEREAS, participation in these programs requires the development of a coordinated regional mass transit plan which is consistent with the over-all regional transportation planning effort of the Los Angeles Regional Transportation Study; and

WHEREAS, the Southern California Rapid Transit District and other transit operating agencies in the Los Angeles area have current need for capital equipment and facilities which could be aided by these grant and loan programs;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the District staff be directed to initiate the organization of a transit planning committee including representation by the publicly and privately owned mass transportation agencies, airports, harbors and railroads, in the region, and to proceed through such committee with coordinated transit planning and the preparation of a transit development program which will meet the transit planning requirements of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. This should be done in order that eligibility of transit agencies in the Los Angeles area for participation in the federal grant and loan programs may be established at the earliest possible date.

Director Horwin thereupon entered the meeting.

Report of Relationship Between Freeway Program and Planned Rapid Transit System

In response to the request of Director Allen at the August 4, 1965 Regular Meeting, Chief Engineer Gerlach presented to the

meeting and discussed the report prepared by his office, entitled "Southern California Rapid Transit District - Relationship between Freeway Program and Planned Rapid Transit System," dated August 17, 1965, a copy of which report is attached to these minutes as Exhibit 2.

In connection with the discussion of Mr. Gerlach's report (Exhibit 2), upon motion of Director Hahn, seconded and unanimously carried, the Staff was directed to prepare a resolution for consideration by this Board at the next regular meeting urging that in the federal and state programs for new freeways sufficient rights-of-way be acquired to provide for mass rapid transit.

Report of Mr. Bass re Disturbance in Watts area

Mr. Bass commented briefly on the District's operations during the disturbance in the Watts area and commended the members of the Staff for their outstanding performance in keeping up with the situation as it developed with respect to the withdrawal of service in certain areas when it became necessary and also in keeping up with the situation minute-by-minute in order to resume service at the earliest possible time.

Next Regular Meeting

After discussion, upon motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, it was

RESOLVED, that the next regular meeting of the District be held at the District's Board Room in the Transit District Building, 1060 South Broadway, Los Angeles, California, at 9:30 a.m. on September 1, 1965.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned.

Virginia K. Rees
Secretary

REPORT OF PURCHASING COMMITTEE
 FOR PERIOD OF
 AUGUST 4, 1965 THROUGH AUGUST 17, 1965
 TO DIRECTORS OF
 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

APPROVED THE FOLLOWING:

A. REQUISITIONS OVER \$100, BUT LESS THAN \$1,000:

NO.	VENDOR	COVERING	AMOUNT	A.F.E. NO.
OB-6589	GENERAL APPRAISAL COMPANY	APPRAISAL OF REAL PROPERTY CONSISTING OF APPROX. 44,250 SQ. FT. LOCATED BETWEEN 2ND & 3RD STS. 317 FT. ELY OF FRENCH ST., SANTA ANA	\$ 500.00	
OB-6590	GENERAL APPRAISAL COMPANY	APPRAISAL OF REAL PROPERTY CONSISTING OF 12,257 SQ. FT., KNOWN AND DESIGNATED AS 4300 WHITTIER BLVD., LOS ANGELES	300.00	
PM-755	GENERAL ELECTRIC SUPPLY CO.	1 - G.E. WATER COOLER, 10-GAL. CAPACITY, RSA 12	150.75	223A
PM-778	GENERAL ELECTRIC SUPPLY CO.	1 - G.E. WATER COOLER, 10-GAL. CAPACITY, RSA 12	150.75	223B
PM-790	LUMAR INDUSTRIES, INC.	300 - ALUMINUM BUS STOP SIGNS FOR USE IN CONJUNCTION WITH SANTA MONICA MUNICIPAL BUS LINES, AT A TOTAL COST OF \$1,638 ONE-HALF OF WHICH IS TO BE PAID BY MUNICIPAL LINES, OR NET COST TO DISTRICT OF	819.00	
SA-52	CREST OFFICE FURNITURE	2 - STEEL TYPEWRITER DESKS (60"x30")	386.36	223c
TD-114	CREST OFFICE FURNITURE	1 - GRAY METAL TABLE (70"x30") WITH PLASTIC TOP	125.38	223d
TD-131	COFFEE TIME	COFFEE & DOUGHNUTS SERVED AT VARIOUS DIVISIONS IN CONNECTION WITH SAFETY AWARD PIN PRESENTATIONS	225.00	

B. VARIOUS REQUISITIONS FOR EQUIPMENT, MATERIALS, SERVICES, ETC., THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR WHICH HAVE PREVIOUSLY BEEN APPROVED BY THE DIRECTORS AND/OR MTA MEMBERS.

Southern California Rapid Transit District

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FREEWAY PROGRAM AND
PLANNED RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM

Office of the Chief Engineer
August 17, 1965

SECRET

Relationship Between Freeway Program and
Planned Rapid Transit System

In response to a request from the Board of the Southern California Rapid Transit District we have prepared a report which includes a resume of past relationships between the California Highway Department and the public transportation agencies, the major considerations in analyzing the possible joint use of freeway rights-of way and the recent changes in Bureau of Public Roads procedures which require co-ordinated planning of freeways and public transportation.

Summary:-

1. Concept of joint use of rights of way for freeways and rapid transit is not new. First introduced into studies in Los Angeles in 1911.
2. Efforts were made to include rapid transit in freeway program in 1948. These failed for lack of support for necessary legislative changes while freeway program was adopted and adequately funded.
3. The only way to effect significant savings in cost of rapid transit facilities is to incorporate them in the freeway design at the outset. This has not been done in Los Angeles.
4. Within the boundaries of the Rapid Transit District, approximately half of the freeway mileage on the 1980 Master Plan has been completed or is under construction including eight of the nine freeways radiating from downtown Los Angeles.
5. Freeway locations do not always meet the requirements for a rapid transit route, particularly in concentrated commercial areas where freeways skirt these areas while rapid transit must penetrate the area.
6. Adding rapid transit routes to existing freeways does not represent any saving in construction costs and may result in increased costs under many typical freeway conditions. Location and construction of stations is more difficult and expensive where busy freeway interchanges serve the same important cross streets or boulevards.
7. Recent experience in San Francisco with the BARTD system indicates that under present laws and regulations the Rapid Transit District must pay for its share of the right of way including not only the track area but also a portion of the side slope costs and costs of frontage roads.

-
8. Recognizing the problems of location and cost previously cited there may still be many places in our community where joint construction is in the over-all best interest of the community. These are given every consideration in the rapid transit planning.
 9. Relationships with the staff of the Highway Department have been very good to date. New Federal Law requires ~~these~~ relationships to be formalized and will place the District in an even better position as a participant in future freeway planning.
 10. Nothing can be done to really take advantage of this new relationship until the Rapid Transit District has an assured source of funds to pay its share of costs.

Past Relationships Between Freeway and
Transportation Planning

The concept of joint use of rights of way for rail and highway transportation is not new. Highways have been built paralleling railroads and railroads have been built along highways for over 150 years. The idea of grade separating these facilities on a common right of way dates back at least to the early 1900's. One early transportation report prepared by Bion J. Arnold in 1911 for the City of Los Angeles recommended such a facility for a rapid transit and highway connection between Los Angeles and the harbor.

This same idea was advanced in other cities from time to time. The most notable example is probably the transportation portion of the Chicago Master Plan prepared in the mid-thirties which included a coordinated plan of rapid transit and expressways. The Congress Expressway which now has the rapid transit in the median strip was a major part of this plan.

In the period immediately following World War II a number of studies were made which outlined our present freeway system. A serious effort was made to include rail rapid transit in these plans. Unfortunately the enthusiasm for the freeway program did not carry over into the rapid transit program. State and Federal legislation was enacted which accelerated the freeway program without any provision for rail rapid transit.

The significant feature of all of these plans was the inclusion of rail rapid transit facilities at the same grade or level as the freeway roadways by providing wide medians and also providing the extra bridge length at over crossings or under crossings. Various assumptions were made as to allocating the costs between rapid transit and freeways but it was generally thought that the transit system would pay for its right of way strip and perhaps a portion of the bridge costs. There is no doubt that this would have provided a rail rapid transit system at the lowest cost.

Since there was neither an effective public transportation agency or a plan for providing the funds for the rapid transit right of way, freeway plans were developed without any such provision.

Some concession was given to public transportation with the inclusion of bus stops on the freeways. The first stops including those on the Hollywood Freeway at Alvarado, Vermont and Western were paid for by the City of Los Angeles. Federal regulations and State law were later changed to permit these costs to be included in the freeway costs since bus operators pay user taxes of various kinds which presumably were available to defray the cost of the stops.

Consideration of Use of Freeway Rights of Way
in Recent Rapid Studies

Joint use of freeway rights of way has been one of the major possibilities considered in developing a rapid transit plan for the Los Angeles Area.

Two major points had to be considered.

- (1) Does the freeway location meet the travel needs of those persons most likely to use rapid transit now and in the future?
- (2) Does the freeway right of way offer any significant cost savings or other benefits to the community as a whole?

There are no pat answers to these questions. Each line in each corridor and in fact each major portion of line has to be studied and analyzed separately.

Location criteria for freeways and rapid transit can be vastly different, particularly in commercial areas. Freeway planners attempt to locate their facilities close to the commercial centers but seldom penetrate these centers. There are good economic reasons for this as well as traffic considerations. The cost of right of way for the freeway and the necessary on and off ramps would be prohibitive. Furthermore there must be some opportunity for the heavy freeway traffic volumes to spread over the city streets which have limited capacity. Since the motor vehicles can move from one system to the other with a minimum time penalty, the system works reasonably well. Rapid transit planners on the other hand recognize the need for delivering the passenger as close to his destination as possible. Once the passenger leaves the station he is usually on foot and the range is limited to a few blocks. For this reason rapid transit plans for major cities usually include at least a section of subway in the major commercial centers.

In outlying areas, particularly suburban residential areas, the criteria for freeway and rapid transit may be very similar. The principal problem is the competition between freeway interchange activity and the rapid transit station activities including pedestrian access, bus transfer facilities and parking lots.

Assuming the freeway alignment is a satisfactory route, the next factor to consider is the cost as compared to other reasonable alternates. The attached excerpt (Exhibit A) from the DMJM Progress Report of February 2, 1960 outlines some of the construction problems which can effect costs. On existing freeways where no provision has been made for rapid transit rights of way overhead structures would be required with supporting columns in the median or on one of the shoulders. Construc-

tion costs can vary from the same to up to 50% more than a similar overhead facility located on a major boulevard.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit District has planned to use the freeway right of way for several parts of its system. In a recent conversation with Stanley Forsythe, Director of Development and Operations, he expressed the opinion that they found little, if any, cost saving by using the freeway routes for two significant reasons:-

1. The right of way was not free. BARTD has to pay for its share of the right of way where tracks are to be located and, in addition, must pay for its pro-rate share of shoulder costs and frontage roads.
2. Station costs are increased.

In one case the Bay Area District is really buying a right of way paralleling a freeway since by so doing they minimize the effect on the surrounding community as compared to developing two separate rights of way.

BARTD has experienced the same difficulties previously mentioned in trying to take advantage of freeway rights of way as to proper location of stations to best serve the passengers and to solve the conflict between station activity and interchange activity.

Working Relationship Between Rapid Transit District
and Highway Department

On the staff level a very good working relationship has been established with the Division VII Office of the Highway Department. In addition to the screening of each new Freeway for bus stop locations, we have been brought into the preliminary route location studies for freeways where there is some possibility of joint use.

One notable example was the Beverly Hills Freeway. Some of the early study routes closely paralleled Wilshire Boulevard. These were analyzed as to possible joint use. In this instance it was found that there would be serious conflicts between rapid transit and freeway facilities at stations. Right of way costs to accommodate both facilities would have been extremely high since many substantial commercial and apartment properties would have to be purchased.

Most recently we have met with their staff regarding the Industrial Freeway to the Harbor Area to determine whether one of their study routes might also serve our needs. This work is still in progress.

The Industrial Freeway is the last freeway still in the planning stage radiating from downtown Los Angeles on the 1980 Master Plan. All others are now complete or under construction.

Approximately half of the freeway mileage within the Rapid Transit District is completed or under construction.

Changes in Highway Planning Procedure Under
Revised Federal Highway Program

Effective July 1, 1965 the Federal Highway program has been revised to require much more consideration of local planning problems and rapid transit plans before Federal Funds will be released for construction. This gives the District a more important position in freeway planning. However, no funds were provided to pay for rapid transit facilities should they be deemed necessary.

We have received a letter from District VII requesting our comments and approval on a number of freeway projects which are ready to go ahead. After reviewing these in detail we will have a report and recommendation as to appropriate District action. The attached map (Exhibit B) shows the sections to be reviewed. Design is complete on some of these and construction is scheduled for an early date. Others are still in design.

1. Freeway Right-of-Way-Median

The majority of Los Angeles freeways now in operation have been constructed with minimum width medians.

The addition of a supporting column for an elevated transit system in such narrow medians may reduce the clearance to traffic lanes to the danger point. The accompanying Figures IV-1 through IV-4 graphically illustrate this condition.

A second consideration is that of crossing bridges which require an increase in the vertical clearance of the transit system. The normal clearance of 15 feet above the traveled way must be raised to 14 feet above the crossing bridge. An extreme example of this condition occurs at Mulholland Bridge in Cahuenga Pass where required height above ground is increased to approximately 45 feet, due to the bridge level. An average condition might be 35 feet.

Another consideration is that of interruption of traffic flow on the the freeway during construction of way structures and line maintenance after completion of the system. Foundations for an elevated system are massive and would extend under adjacent traffic lanes. The time required for construction of any one foundation is not great, but multiplied by the number of supports required for the system, the time becomes quite extended. Maintenance access in existing freeways would have to be gained through traffic lanes and in many cases actually performed from this location causing hazardous conditions to freeway traffic. If it is determined desirable to locate rapid transit within the median of future freeways, it is probable that a 10 foot access road should be included as part of the transit system right-of-way to remove this problem of obstruction.

Appendix "A" Continued


Additional right-of-way width required for this alignment is also shown in the accompanying figures.

A significant factor in the consideration of elevated transit alignment adjacent to a freeway is that of diversion of driver's attention. The high speed and relatively frequent stops of a transit vehicle above traffic on the freeway may divert the automobile driver's attention, and thereby generate congestion or accidents. This problem might be overcome by the addition of a screen to obscure the transit vehicle from adjacent traffic. However, a device of this nature presents a maintenance problem in addition to cost and aesthetic considerations.


2. Freeway Right-of-Way-Shoulder

Conditions for shoulder alignment are very similar to those for median. Many areas of freeway utilize retained side slopes with minimum clearance to structures on adjacent property. Way structure heights could be reduced slightly in some conditions but in general, alignment along this line for any distance may prove difficult, if not impossible, because of side clearances.

Examples of restricted side clearances are Santa Ana-San Bernardino Freeway from Broadway to approximately State Street and the general area of South San Gabriel and Alhambra.




**TYPICAL MEDIAN STRUCTURE
AT STREET CROSSING**




TYPICAL SHOULDER STRUCTURE

EXISTING FREEWAY RIGHT-OF-WAY

FREEWAY RIGHT-OF-WAY ALIGNM




RIGHT-OF-WAY IN MEDIAN OF PUBLIC STREET



**SUPPORTED
RIGHT**

DANIEL, MANN, JOHNSON, & MENDENHA
ARCHITECTS & ENGINEERS

3325 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD - LOS ANGELES 5, CALIFORNIA - TELEPHONE DUNK 11



Man
Be

V
Est