

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

Minutes of Special Meeting of
the Board of Directors of the District

June 26, 1975

Upon notice duly given, the Directors of the Southern California Rapid Transit District met at a special meeting in the District Board Room, 1060 South Broadway, Los Angeles, California, at 4:10 p. m. on June 26, 1975, at which time President Byron E. Cook called the meeting to order.

Directors George W. Brewster, Byron E. Cook, A. J. Eyraud, Jr. Adelina Gregory, Thomas G. Neusom, Jay B. Price, Pete Schabarum, George Takei and Baxter Ward responded to Roll Call. Directors Victor M. Carter and Donald H. Gibbs were absent from the meeting.

Also present were General Manager Jack R. Gilstrap; Manager of Operations George W. Heinle; Assistant General Manager for Administration Jack Stubbs; General Counsel Richard T. Powers; Manager of Planning & Marketing George L. McDonald; Manager of Rapid Transit Richard Gallagher; Manager of Employee Relations John S. Wilkens; Manager of Customer Relations Robert G. Williams; Deputy Administrator, Equal Employment Opportunities, Michael Olivas; Secretary Richard K. Kissick, and the public.

Consideration of Amendment of the District's Tariffs - Carried
Over to the Next Meeting

President Cook announced the Board would consider Item No. 1 on the agenda, proposed amendments to the District's tariffs.

Director Eyraud stated that the Board is considering fare changes and line modifications which are a part of federally funded operations and felt that the matter should be viewed in light of the federal 13 (c) labor protective agreements presently being negotiated. He inquired of Mr. Powers if the Board could recess in Executive Session to receive a report on the status of the 13 (c) negotiations.

General Counsel Powers concurred that the Board could recess for that purpose.

On motion of Director Eyraud, seconded and unanimously carried, the Board of Directors recessed in Executive Session at 4:14 p. m.

The Board of Directors reconvened at 4:32 p. m. with the nine Directors present who had responded at the original Roll Call.

Director Ward moved that the Board not act on Agenda Item No. 1 today since the decision could be influenced by the Board of Supervisors of the County; that there is a wariness and uneasiness on the Board of Supervisors' requests; that the 25¢ fare issue has been discussed briefly and will again be discussed by the Board of Supervisors and

he would request reconsideration of the subsidy at next Tuesday's meeting, and that the problem is severe and is one that could yield to a three or four day delay. Director Ward's motion was seconded by Director Takei.

By a Roll Call vote of 5-4 the motion failed, with Directors Cook, Eyraud, Price, Takei and Ward voting "Yes", and Directors Brewster, Gregory, Neusom and Schabarum voting "No."

Director Neusom moved that the public be allowed to speak before further discussion to table, which motion was seconded by Director Schabarum.

Director Schabarum asked General Manager Gilstrap to briefly review what is before the Board regarding Item No. 1.

General Manager Gilstrap briefly reviewed the report dated June 25, 1975, a copy of which is filed with the Secretary, and indicated that the basic question is whether or not the Board wanted to depend on the County subsidy this fiscal year to support the District's services and fares, which branches into two alternatives:

1. Accept the offer and the conditions before the Board on the agenda and in the report; and
2. If no County assistance is accepted, there were several alternative plans without that assistance; one being a 35¢ fare with two 20¢ zones and taking out of service about 150 buses--the Santa Monica Preferential Freeway Lane project plus 100 more of the fleet, with the 100 new buses due to be delivered in October to be used as replacements.

He further reported the Board could also possibly negotiate a new contract with the County on other than the conditions before the Board today.

Mr. Gilstrap then explained the 25/25¢ zone fare proposed by the County, which proposal provided for an East Los Angeles grid system and the Santa Monica Freeway project; also elimination of service of thirty buses in the present grid systems which have been recommended by the County and RTD staffs. The County has raised the proposed subsidy from the previous \$12.1 million to \$12.9 million, an increase of about \$800,000.

Director Schabarum pointed out the fact that the proposed East Los Angeles grid system would require 46 buses.

Mr. Gilstrap also reported that in balancing the budget for the coming fiscal year, the County has taken credit for elimination of the night services listed on the agenda and including the 25¢ zone increase as of July 1, 1975, and that every day of delay in implementation of these elements of the program compounds the fiscal problems of the District during the next fiscal year.

Director Brewster requested a summary of the County plan as to how it causes service shifts within the County.

Mr. Gilstrap referred to Item No. 4 on the agenda regarding discontinuance of service on four lines effective July 13; that buses saved from that elimination amount to 14. Additional buses would

come from other similar service reductions in accordance with the evaluation program adopted by the Board.

Director Neusom inquired if the Board could act on the elimination of services today effective on July 13 without any determinations with respect to the contract.

Mr. Powers stated the Board could act on each separately numbered item on the agenda, with action on one item not contingent on others.

Director Eyraud felt that several items on the agenda warranted discussion, and Mr. Neusom felt the Board should hear from the public.

Director Gregory stated that since the Board of Supervisors had taken its action she had been deluged with calls and letters, and people in the San Gabriel Valley were upset and confused and the Board should listen to a few of them.

President Cook announced that the Board would hear from members of the public, but limited to five minutes each, later changed by motion to three minutes each.

Appearances by the Public

Councilman Doug Miller, City of Glendora - spoke to the need for comprehensive services in the area and said people in the San Gabriel Valley have been upset and concerned regarding equity of services provided, with proposed services totally inadequate. Other areas get the dollars while the Valley gets nothing and urged more fair treatment to the San Gabriel Valley. Valley representatives have met with Directory Gregory and they represent 1.3 million people, and it is time for service inequities in the Valley to be met. He felt a 35¢ fare would be more appropriate and provide funds to

improve services in the Valley and now is the time to take the action. He threatened to go outside the RTD and go to the Legislature.

President Cook asked Mr. Miller if the rate increase provided additional San Gabriel Valley service, would that be okey with them, and Mr. Miller replied that it would.

Lyman H. Cozad, City of Arcadia, representing the San Gabriel Valley Transit Improvement Plan - the San Gabriel Valley improvement program proposed by the RTD is a good one and has almost unanimous support of the cities in the Valley. The cities have been working with the District and Arcadia is working on a dial-a-ride which could feed the RTD lines. Need a north-south line in the Arcadia area to Temple City. The decision of the County Board of Supervisors places all those improvements down the drain. The proposed San Gabriel Valley fare is inequitable in that their fare would be 50¢ (60¢ with transfer), while within the San Fernando Valley the fare would only be 25¢.

Richard C. Wilkinson, Administrative Assistant, City of Monterey Park - Concurred in the statements of Mr. Cozad and urged the RTD Board to reconsider the implementation of the San Gabriel Valley proposals.

President Cook asked Mr. Wilkinson if the primary issue is not so much the fare structure but the level of service, to which Mr. Wilkinson replied "yes" if the fare in the San Gabriel Valley is equitable.

Lynn K. Durham, representing the City of Rosemead - Concurred in the previous statements.

Edward Tewes, representing the City of Pasadena - Concurred in the previous statements and stated the Pasadena Board of Directors also concurred. In addition, he stated that the RTD's planning process would be the victim if the San Gabriel Valley improvements do not go forth and be implemented.

Director Schabarum pointed out that service rate changes are contemplated for the park-ride lots, and Mr. Tewes replied that he was

not aware of what the proposal was with respect to the fare zones, park and ride lots, etc.

By request, Mr. Beardsley explained the proposed zone system on a large map and pointed out the fact that a rider could go through any two zones for a 25¢ fare and would only be required to pay the additional 25¢ upon entering a third zone.

Pat Moser, 1914 Norwalk Ave., Los Angeles, representing the Highland Park Democratic Club - stated that the green and white zones (on the zone map) take in 70 percent of the RTD patrons many of whom were low income who could ride those two zones for 25¢ and recommended approval of the fare zones as outlined on the map.

Eugene B. Pester, City of Pomona, Director of Community Development - stated he was speaking on behalf of the City of Pomona, that the City had requested a fare zone study be made and was told that none had been made. He said that the distance traveled is not necessarily the criteria, especially when fare box revenues only fund about 30 percent of the revenue of the system, and recommended that a study be made in the City of Pomona.

Director Ward asked Mr. Pester how the City of Pomona would be affected by the proposals made last week by Supervisor Schabarum, and Mr. Schabarum replied that a 35¢ fare and two 20-cent zones be called for in order that people riding the farthest would be paying their share. Mr. Pester replied that he was not aware of that, but a system funded 70 percent by subsidy should be on an equitable basis and not be required to pay more even though distance traveled is more. If the system were operating out of the fare box, then zones would be applicable.

Mr. Cook asked if distance traveled didn't make a difference, and Mr. Pester replied that the buses have to run anyway and the miles involved do not add to the costs that much.

Mr. Price asked if the fares should be based on the fact that the non-riding public is paying two-thirds and the riding public only one-third, should the riding public pay a higher percentage. Mr. Pester replied that the subsidies should be used to solve the transportation problems and use a flat fare and not use zone fares.

Mr. Schabarum stated that the entire attention the last several months has been focused on the 25¢ fare--that a little over a year ago the same passenger was charged \$1.25 and he believed that looking at it that way people in the Pomona portion of the San Gabriel Valley, and others, would be willing to pay a fare commensurate to that distance in exchange for a better level of service. The 25¢ fare has resulted in a 40 percent increase in miles and patronage has gone up, particularly in the grid system areas, because of increased service, but not the rates of fare.

Mr. Ward asked Mr. Gilstrap to report on the grid system headways, to which Mr. Gilstrap replied they were on 20-minute headways. Mr. Ward pointed out that everyone appearing was from the San Gabriel Valley, and stated he hoped we could keep the grid systems in and that he was upset by getting away from the 25¢ flat fare. There are many problems to be solved and the Board of Supervisors is being criticized

for not coming up with an equitable subsidy and also the increase in the tax rates. He hoped next Tuesday to get the Supervisors to come up with additional funds to provide better services, that the Board of Supervisors needs a second chance and sought the support of Mr. Schabarum in his statement.

Mr. Neusom stated that he recognized the assistance which has been rendered by the County and felt essentially the question is a level of service that would provide the implementation of the San Gabriel Valley and the Mid-Cities programs, and adoption of a program to provide these additional services and removal of the several proposed to be removed without interfering with the fare structure would be reasonable. He said Mr. Gilstrap could report on that proposal or the Board could wait to see what the Board of Supervisors did next Tuesday.

Mr. Price concurred in Mr. Neusom's statement and said that if a delay would help to make some improvements, not necessarily all of them, the Board should wait until the Board of Supervisors acts and a few days would not hurt.

Mr. Ward said that a communication from the RTD as to a balanced program for the entire County would be helpful in the Board of Supervisors' discussion.

Mr. Neusom again asked Mr. Gilstrap to report on a plan which he had requested.

Mr. Gilstrap reported that the staff would urge adoption of the evaluation program on the agenda (Item No. 4 a) giving specific criteria of better utilization of District resources--that additional equipment can be found which can be better used in experimental services in the San Gabriel Valley, Mid-Cities, et cetera, and an understanding that we would have to move some buses from the low-use lines. Secondly, maybe the Board should have the flexibility to use that equipment in an equitable manner and the contract between the District and the County should state improved services in the San Gabriel Valley, Mid-Cities, East Los Angeles, and the South Bay area should also be included in the contract.

Mr. Neusom asked how this could be accomplished and Mr. Gilstrap replied that the report today would give fourteen more buses and the staff will continue evaluating the lines to obtain additional equipment to place in service where better utilization could be made, and possibly the equivalent of 75 buses could be obtained in this manner. Further, we need an expression from the two Boards to work together to expand the program on receipt of the 100 new buses to be received next October, together with additional funds, instead of using them as replacements.

Mr. Cook stated there was one line in Burbank that has four passengers per hour and it costs \$15 per hour to operate, so he would recommend discontinuance of that line, even though in his home city, and those buses could be better utilized.

Mr. Neusom stated that the Board should endorse that concept and request the Board of Supervisors to include those provisions in the contract, to which Mr. Eyraud agreed.

Mr. Schabarum said the County had made "ball park" estimates as to how many buses would be used for the various programs, and we now have firm figures on the San Gabriel Valley and Mid-Cities, none on the South Bay area, etc., and 46 buses in East Los Angeles. He stated he had tried to get exact numbers of buses required for all the programs, that the 25/25¢ plan does not state how the services will be operated and inquired where are the additional buses (approximately 88) coming from. He felt the existing buses should be better utilized. He further stated that the Board and staff have in good faith attempted to negotiate with the San Gabriel Valley cities and the Mid-Cities areas over the last year.

Mr. Brewster supported the statement about the number of units distributed by the various programs and felt that information was needed under the various options so the Board would know where the buses will be applied and where they will be removed.

Mr. Eyraud suggested going on with the rest of the agenda and then come back to Item No. 1.

Mr. Takei mentioned Mayor Bradley's letter of June 26, copies of which had been distributed to all Directors, and suggested extending the item to next week until after the Board of Supervisors had met.

Mr. Cook said that the interests of the people in the San Gabriel Valley had already been well stated and, in the interest of time, would those who did not have something new or different to speak on defer their statements.

Howard Watts, 1021 No. Mariposa Ave., Los Angeles - stated he attended the Board of Supervisors' meeting when the 35¢ fare was voted and was unaware of the later vote on the 25¢. He said the Board of Supervisors did not say how much they gave the RTD and he was very upset with them and felt they should give the RTD more money. He objected to members of the Board of Supervisors serving on the RTD Board and the RTD Board should be elected. He recommended funding from the County and said there should be no strings on it.

Hazel Scotto, Councilwoman, City of Downey - Urged adoption of the Mid-Cities report program since the cities in those areas were also paying the SB-325 money.

Ruth Driemler (Arcadia), representing Coalition of Improved Transit (CIT) - Pleased with the Wilbur Smith report. Transit in San Gabriel Valley is inadequate and they are also taxpayers--willing to pay increased fare if the service is improved, and very dissatisfied with the services presently provided in the San Gabriel Valley.

Charles Thomas, 7355 No. Figueroa St., Eagle Rock - Suggested a 35¢ basic fare and two 20¢ zones.

Steven G. Hayes, representing City of El Monte - Stated that the City of El Monte supports the views of Director Schabarum.

Director Gregory thanked the people from San Gabriel Valley for appearing in her support and Supervisor Schabarum. President Cook also thanked everyone for taking the time to appear before the Board.

Director Price moved that Item No. 1 on the agenda be deferred until after the next meeting of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors (July 1) and be carried over to the next Regular Meeting of the RTD Board on July 2, with the expression to the Board of Supervisors that the RTD Board hopes the Board of Supervisors can ameliorate their last action and give a greater equity to transportation facilities to the areas covered, which motion was seconded.

Director Eyraud offered an amended motion to include a report by the staff to the Board of Supervisors outlining the problem of the Mid-Cities San Gabriel Valley services so that the Board of Supervisors can definitely commit the RTD Board to augmented services in those areas, which motion was seconded by Director Takei.

Director Neusom stated the position is clear and that if the RTD Board believes the two additional programs are clearly needed that the contract should include funding for a minimum of 50 and not to exceed 88 buses to include those programs in the contract, and, if necessary, the County can suggest different fares, but, at least this action would send it to the Board of Supervisors with a request to fund the operation of the additional 100 buses to be received next fall, and moved his statement as a substitute motion, which motion

was accepted by Director Price, with the understanding that this plan is approved by the RTD Board of Directors based on the addition of 50 to 88 buses no later than next November.

Mr. Gilstrap inquired if this proposal would eliminate the East Los Angeles plan and the Santa Monica Freeway Preferential Lane plan and was assured it would not.

Director Brewster inquired concerning a commitment to the South Bay Area plan, and Mr. McDonald reported that it would take about 38 additional buses.

Director Ward inquired as to how some areas got the grid services and other areas did not, to which Director Neusom replied that the general level of services was not good in most areas, especially in the San Fernando Valley. Director Price stated that the San Gabriel Valley and other plans had not yet been completed at the time the two grids were placed in operation. Director Gregory pointed out that Pasadena and Altadena were in Director Ward's area, and the San Gabriel Valley improvements would help those areas.

Director Schabarum requested that the request be in a form of a letter and not as a proposed contract with the County.

Director Brewster concurred providing the communication requested the County to provide the subsidy necessary.

Director Neusom restated his substitute motion to include that a communication be transmitted to the Board of Supervisors expressing the desire of the RTD Board that they reconsider their previous action for a more equitable distribution of services in the entire Los Angeles County area within the available funds, including operating funds for an additional 50 to 88 buses necessary to implement programs now being finalized.

The questions were called for and both Director Neusom's substitute motion and Director Price's original motion as amended were unanimously carried and the following resolution adopted:

RESOLUTION NO. R-75-247

WHEREAS, this Board of Directors has reviewed the June 20, 1975 actions of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors proposing a subsidy to the District in the amount of \$12,924,000 during the 1976 Fiscal Year, which actions, among other things, recommended a flat fare of 25¢, plus a zone charge of 25¢ for longer rides within the County, increases in fares for park-ride services, reductions in some services, and also recommended implementation of improved services in the East Los Angeles area and the inauguration of the Santa Monica Freeway Preferential Lane project; and

WHEREAS, this Board of Directors by unanimous vote has recommended that the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors reconsider the aforementioned actions to include funding for additional improved services plans, studies for which are now in process of finalization, including the Mid-Cities plan, the San Gabriel Valley plan and the South Bay plan, which request should include funding for the operation of up to one hundred (100) additional buses beginning in the fall of 1975;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the General Manager is hereby directed to forward a communication to the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles requesting that Board's reconsideration of its June 20, 1975 actions that in order to provide a more equitable distribution of services throughout the Los Angeles County area that funding be provided for the operation of up to one hundred (100) additional buses by the District during the 1976 Fiscal Year with the understanding that the one-hundred new buses to be received by the District next fall will be used for improved services and not as replacements.

Items 2 and 3 on Agenda - Carried Over to Next Meeting

After discussion, on motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, Agenda Item Nos. 2 and 3, reading as follows, were carried over to the next meeting of the Board:

- "2. Consider authorization to enter into a contract with the County of Los Angeles providing County subsidy to the District for Fiscal Year 1976, as described in report filed with the Secretary; form of contract subject to approval of the General Counsel. "
- "3. Consider approval of the budget for Fiscal Year 1976 modified as required to reflect tariff revisions. "

Proposed Service Evaluation Program - Carried Over to Next Meeting

Director Eyraud objected to the proposed service evaluation program as outlined in the report dated June 16, 1975, a copy of which is filed with the Secretary. He objected to placing the Board in such a rigid position that we do not have the option of discontinuing the service within all of the time period proposed; that when a line only has two or

three passengers per hour there was no need for a 180-day trial period and wanted a managerial prerogative to remove a line when warranted without time constraints.

Director Eyraud moved to refer the report back to the staff for further report regarding his objections, which motion was seconded by Director Gregory.

Mr. Gilstrap reported that the time frame was in the recommendation so that the Board could have a consistent policy and the Board and the community would have a standard for running the services. He pointed out that after a 90-day period the staff evaluates the line and the line could be dropped after 180 days.

Mr. Eyraud felt the lines should be evaluated and checked every 60 days.

President Cook asked Mr. Eyraud what he wanted the staff to bring back, and Mr. Eyraud replied that he didn't want it as part of his motion but that 90 days, plus a 30-day notice period for discontinuance, was sufficient, with each line to be evaluated independently. He again objected to locking the Board into running a line for 180 days.

Mr. Gilstrap pointed out that we are talking about putting in the San Gabriel Valley and Mid-Cities improvements and 90 days might not be sufficient time to evaluate them.

The question was called for on Director Eyraud's motion and unanimously carried. Therefore, Agenda Item No. 4 (a) entitled "Adoption of Service Evaluation Program as described in report filed with the Secretary" was carried over to the next meeting of the Board with the staff requested to furnish a further report.

Approval of Discontinuance of Line Nos. 161, 358, 360 and 362

Mr. Wendell Cox, 11564 Viking Avenue, Northridge, representing the Mayor's San Fernando Valley Advisory Committee on Transportation, appeared before the Board to object to the proposed discontinuance of Buena Vista Line No. 161 in the San Fernando Valley, and felt that the line should not be discontinued at this time, and that all grid lines in the Valley not be altered until September 30. A copy of Mr. Cox's statement dated June 26, 1975 is filed with the Secretary.

President Cook stated that continuing these lines would indicate a fiscal incompatibility on the part of the District, and that he has had complaints of the empty buses running around and that we need a more equitable distribution of service.

Director Eyraud moved approval of the discontinuance of the four lines effective July 13, 1975, which motion was seconded by Director Price. After a short discussion the question was called for and carried by a vote of 8-0, with Director Neusom abstaining, and the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLUTION NO. R-75-248

RESOLVED, that the General Manager be and he hereby is authorized to revise the Official Route Descriptions adopted November 4, 1964, as amended, to delete the following pages effective July 13, 1975, subject to approval of the Consulting Engineer:

First Revised Page 161 - Buena Vista
First Revised Page 358 - 120th St.
Original Page 360 - 92nd Street - Arbor Vitae
First Revised Page 362 - 108th St.

Director Brewster departed the meeting at 6:40 p.m.

Consideration of Agenda Item No. 4 (c) - Proposed Discontinuance
of Night Service on Certain Grid Lines

President Cook stated that the Board would next consider Agenda Item No. 4 (c), the proposed discontinuance of night service on four South Central grid lines effective August 3, and sixteen San Fernando Valley grid lines effective August 10.

Mr. Wendell Cox again appeared before the Board stating that his previous statement concerning discontinuance of the Buena Vista line also applied to the discontinuance of the night services on the grid lines in the San Fernando Valley, and said the services had not been in a long enough period of time to get the ridership nor had they been sufficiently marketed.

Mr. Walter Baumgartner, 6201 Winnetka Avenue, Woodland Hills, representing Pierce College, appeared before the Board and requested continuation of the Victory Blvd. Line No. 164 night service for the

students at Pierce College so that students registering for the summer courses could have the buses available through September. He agreed the District could not run empty buses, but the students should be given the opportunity for their use during the summer session. Upon inquiry, he stated there would be about 13,000 summer students and the total enrollment next year would be about 25,000.

Director Ward inquired if there were any provisions for public hearings in service matters of this kind. Director Takei stated the District should have a public hearing to give an opportunity for the public to appear, and Director Ward felt a public hearing would help public awareness.

Upon inquiry, Mr. Beardsley reported that the Victory line had nine total buses during the base period (5:30 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.) and three buses at night (7:00 to 10:00 p.m.).

Director Ward moved for reconsideration of the Service Evaluation program (Agenda Item No. 4(a), since he felt lines needed more time in operation before evaluation of whether they should be continued, which motion was seconded. By a Roll Call vote, the motion failed by a vote of 4-4, with Directors Neusom, Price, Takei and Ward voting "Aye" and Directors Cook, Eyraud, Gregory and Schabarum voting "No".

President Cook felt the Board should be in a position to cull out the unproductive lines, and suggested that Board members evaluate the lines they felt should be further studied.

Mr. Gilstrap stated that the District has not been formally asked by the County to eliminate these night services, but the County staff has recommended it to the Board of Supervisors and, further, that the County has included these actions in the proposed contract and the savings therefrom.

Director Neusom suggested that Lines 363 and 364 be retained for further evaluation and eliminate the night services on the others in the South Central area.

President Cook suggested that Pierce College should take an affirmative action to advise students of the possibility of elimination of night service on the 164 line. Director Takei stated that many of the lines did not previously have night service and they should be in for six months.

Director Ward moved to defer action on Agenda Item No. 4 (c) until the lines have been in service for six months, which motion was seconded by Director Takei.

Mr. Gilstrap pointed out that the proposed line service evaluation report provided for a procedure of evaluation after 90 days.

Director Schabarum observed that the cost of night service reductions would defer \$850,000 which would be available from the Board of Supervisors for operation of the buses.

Director Eyraud entered a substitute motion moving approval of the removal of the night services as outlined in the report dated June 25, 1975,

a copy of which is filed with the Secretary, which motion was seconded. The question was called for and on a Roll Call vote the motion failed by a vote of 3-5, with Directors Price, Eyarud and Schabarum voting "Yes" and Directors Gregory, Neusom, Price, Takei and Ward voting "No."

Director Neusom thereupon moved adoption of Director Ward's previous motion, and to include a procedure for the conducting of public hearings in the form of community meetings prior to removal of services, which motion was seconded by Director Price.

The question was called for, unanimously carried, and the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLUTION NO. R-75-249

RESOLVED, that night services not be removed on lines listed in the report dated June 25, 1975, a copy of which is filed with the Secretary, until said lines have been in operation for a period of six months, and the staff is directed to conduct a series of public meetings prior to removal of said services in order that the public is made aware of the possibility of removal of said services.

Directors Neusom, Takei and Ward departed the meeting at 7:10 p. m.

Discussion of Fullerton Park-Ride Report

Director Schabarum stated that he was concerned with the losses being incurred by the operation of the Fullerton Park-Ride Line No. 757,

as outlined in the report dated June 16, 1975, a copy of which is filed with the Secretary, and listed on the agenda as Item No. 5.

Manager of Operations Heinle reported that although the report does show a significant deficit, the deficit is being reimbursed to the District by SB-325 funds received from Orange County.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p. m.



Secretary