

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

MINUTES/PROCEEDINGS

Special Meeting
Board of Directors
Thursday, July 14, 1983
District Board Room
425 South Main Street
Los Angeles

RECEIVED

AUG 22 1983

LIBRARY

Called to order at 10:04 a.m.

Directors Present:

Michael W. Lewis, President
Ruth E. Richter, Vice-President
John F. Day
Jan Hall
Marvin L. Holen

Nick Patsaouras
Jay B. Price
Charles H. Storing
Gordana Swanson
George Takei

Agenda Item No. 1 - Introduction to discussion

General Manager Dyer presented an overview of the District's status on the Metro Rail Project.

He indicated there are more new starts now in this nation than there have been in the last 100 years. The timing between preliminary engineering and actual construction is the most delicate time for a new start. He also stated that the closer to construction the more vocal the opponents will become; normally, once construction begins, local opposition turns around and becomes supportive. He spoke to the reaction of various segments of the community and the postures they may adopt at various stages of the project. He also indicated that perhaps the most important issue to be resolved early on will be the role of the Board and staff. He suggested a workshop be set to discuss what the Board will do, and what the Board will expect the staff to do, what the role of the General Manager will be, what the consultants should do, and what the role of other agencies will be. We have to continue to mobilize local community support. It is important to arrive at a consensus. He cautioned the Board members not to get into a major split on the Board over any Metro Rail issues. Mr. Dyer concluded his comments by stating that he is cautiously optimistic that we have a system.

Agenda Item No. 2A - Presentation on architectural features of Metro Rail System

Mr. Hannan Kivett gave a presentation on the architectural features of the Metro Rail System. He spoke concerning the elements of continuity and the elements of variability. After discussion, he stated that the Board has adopted the concept of a single column station. The Board members talked about the decision making process to the present time, with Director Patsaouras stating that he would like to have the consultants make periodic presentations to the Board during the design process.

Agenda Item No. 6 - Considered results of Public Hearing held June 30, 1983 regarding cancellation of Bus Express Employee Program (BEEP).

General Manager Dyer gave a brief overview. Director Swanson reported that she had met with representatives of El Segundo Employers Association (ESEA) and they have made a proposal to retain the three 530 lines with a subsidy from their group. Director Swanson made a motion to this effect with the caveat that the guarantee from ESEA be forthcoming, which motion was seconded.

Mr. Don Troulemke of ESEA appeared before the Board stating that their objective is the ridership, not just the money.

On a call for the question, the motion carried unanimously.

The Board recessed for lunch at 12:07 p.m. reconvening at 12-52 p.m. with all Directors present.

Agenda Item No. 2B - Status of preliminary engineering elements

Mr. Robert Murray gave a report on the status of preliminary engineering elements. A statement was made that future funding sources and commitment for FY '84 is \$242.5 million.

The Board Meeting recessed at 1:15 p.m. to conduct the Public Hearing, with the meeting reconvening at 1:21 p.m. with all Directors present.

Mr. Nadeem Tahir made a presentation of the EIS/EIR. Director Hall spoke to the traffic problem, discussing the possibility of adopting a Certificate of Overriding Mitigation.

Agenda Item No. 2C - Presentation and discussion of Hollywood Bowl Station Analysis

Mr. Robert Murray made a detailed report on the analysis of the Hollywood Bowl Station, speaking to the various processes that could be used to provide for a station to be built at a later time. He indicated that the only activity recommended at this time is to raise the profile of the line, and flatten it out in the area where the station would be built.

Director Patsouras questioned the status of the Hollywood Bowl Station, stating that he thought that the Board had already voted to add the Station. General Manager Dyer responded that in the Milestone 9 decision, the station was added for the purpose of the planning modeling effort; however, in the Milestone 10 process, the staff recommendation was to delete the Station. The Board deferred that decision at that stage, and in fact instructed staff to come back with a recommendation on what interim steps or measures could be taken that would not preclude a station at a later date.

There was discussion on this issue, with a number of the Board members stating they felt that the decision had been made to include the Hollywood Bowl Station. Director Hall stated that staff presented a specific recommendation to the Board to delete the Hollywood Bowl Station, but the Board voted to request the General Manager to come back with other alternatives that could be considered short of deleting the station entirely.

Agenda Item No. 2D - Discussion of Milestone 11 - Cost Estimate

Mr. Jim Crawley made a presentation on Milestone 11 - Cost Estimate. Director Day indicated he was concerned about the list of cost reductions and he suggested that some of these items could be called out for mischief purposes in the future. Mr. Dyer responded that these reductions are over the basic system which was established in Milestone No. 1.

Agenda Item No. 3 - Adoption of Milestone 12 - System Plan

Mr. Bill Rhine presented the report recommending adoption of Milestone No. 12 - System Plan, with a recommendation that the Board make a decision regarding the Hollywood Bowl Station.

Director Richter moved adoption of Milestone No. 12, which motion was seconded by Director Patsouras.

Agenda Item No. 3 - Adoption of Milestone 12 - System Plan
(cont'd)

Director Takei then asked General Manager Dyer to speak concerning his recommendation to modify the art policy. Mr. Dyer spoke to this modification of Milestone 10, which is a change in the process to be utilized for the selection of artists to work with the station architects.

Director Richter spoke, indicating her opposition to the art policy. After discussion, it was decided to vote on the art policy as a separate issue.

In restating the motion on Milestone 12, Director Richter indicated that her motion was to include the Hollywood Bowl Station. There was discussion that the Board had already made the decision to include the Hollywood Bowl Station. General Manager Dyer indicated that he did not interpret it that way. In the Milestone 10 process, the Board deferred the decision on the Hollywood Bowl Station. It was deferred until the Milestone 12 decision. The Milestone 11 - Cost Estimate does not contain the Hollywood Bowl Station. The Milestone 12, as it is put together, does not include the Hollywood Bowl Station. If it is the Board's desire to add the Hollywood Bowl Station -- fine, if the Board wants to reinterpret it, adopt Milestone 12 and put the Hollywood Bowl Station in -- fine, but he indicated that his interpretation of the Board's actions on deferral of Milestone 10 was that the Board would take the issue up and vote on it in Milestone 12.

Director Patsaouras stated that the Board voted for the Station sometime ago. The question now is do we add the cost of the Hollywood Bowl Station to the basic figure of \$3 billion. Do we include it now in order to adopt it. General Manager Dyer responded that yes, in order to approve the inclusion of the Hollywood Bowl Station, it would have to be adopted now.

Director Takei stated that it would be a cleaner issue if Milestone 12 vote was taken without the Hollywood Bowl Station because the staff report does not contain the cost factor for the Hollywood Bowl Station. Also, staff was asked to furnish some alternatives which have not been discussed yet. Director Takei then made a substitute motion to approve Milestone 12 as recommended by the General Manager without the Hollywood Bowl Station.

Agenda Item No. 3 - Adoption of Milestone 12 - System Plan
(cont'd)

Director Holen stated that today is the first time that the Board has been given a cost factor with respect to the Hollywood Bowl Station. When the Board adopted Milestone 11, no cost estimate was given for this station, so Milestone 11, as adopted, was ambiguous in that it did not include an additional specified cost for this potential station. At that time, the Board agreed to consider a possible preparation of the site for a future station. From a procedural point of view, the Hollywood Bowl Station is a part of the Metro Rail System. Milestone 12 should be adopted, reflecting that fact, as well as the cost factors provided today as they relate to the Hollywood Bowl Station. After discussion, Director Holen stated that Milestone 12 does include the Hollywood Bowl Station and it will include an estimated cost of the total project of \$3.262 billion.

Director Swanson spoke to a point of procedure. There is a motion on the floor to adopt Milestone 12, including the Hollywood Bowl Station, which motion was seconded. Director Takei offered a substitute motion, which died for lack of a second. She summarized that there is a motion on the floor which should be voted on.

Director Hall spoke, indicating that in the beginning, she had reservations because of the high cost of the station, but after hearing the discussion today, she would support a motion to include the Hollywood Bowl Station.

Director Takei, stated that the cost factor may not turn out to be as high as initially projected, but it has to be considered in the context of the ridership. While it may cost about the same as other stations, those other stations have projected ridership well over 20,000 per day. Patronage at the Bowl Station is expected to be about 10% of some of the other stations. Beyond that, there is another factor to consider; it will have a significant impact on the area around the Bowl. Director Takei spoke concerning value capture and the pressure on the District to develop the area around the Bowl densely; there is a great deal of historically important architecture in the Bowl area. It will be impacted by the construction of this station. The desires of the community people is strongly against the inclusion of a station at this location.

Agenda Item No. 3 - Adoption of Milestone 12 - System Plan
(cont'd)

Before calling for the question, President Lewis stated that he felt that voting for the Hollywood Bowl Station was a mistake, one that would haunt the District throughout the Project. On a Roll Call vote, the motion carried as noted below:

Ayes: Hall, Holen, Patsaouras, Price,
Richter, Swanson
Noes: Day, Lewis, Storing, Takei
Abstain: None
Absent: None

Director Takei then made a motion to approve the staff recommendation concerning the modification of the art policy, which motion was seconded and carried on a Roll Call vote as noted below:

Ayes: Day, Hall, Holen, Patsaouras,
Price, Swanson, Takei
Noes: Richter, Storing, Lewis
Abstain: None
Absent: None

Director Holen spoke, stating that he very much appreciated Mr. Dyer's very high level of professional competence. Perhaps the decision on this station is, in truth, very much a policy issue and not a technical issue in any sense.

Agenda Item No. 4 - Board involvement during Continuing
Preliminary Engineering

This item was deferred until a future meeting.

(Director Hall left the meeting.)

Agenda Item No. 5 - Consideration of the District's 1984 Olympic Budget

General Manager Dyer and staff presented the proposed budget for the 1984 Olympic Games. It is projected that there will be a 20-25% increase in the person trips that are carried on the roadways in the County, with about 700,000 attending the games. The District could carry as many as 200 million riders per day during the games. Proposed revenue/fares are: \$2 for shuttle service, \$4 for special line service, and \$6 for Park/Ride service.

After discussion, Director Storing inquired what would happen if no funding commitments are made. Mr. Dyer responded that if no commitments are made by September 1st, he would recommend that the District withdraw from the provision of any service for the Olympic Games.

General Manager Dyer did recommend that the Board authorize the expenditure of \$300,000 to complete the initial planning efforts required, and to identify funding to overcome the projected shortfall.

Director Swanson commented that she would recommend that this proposed budget be sent to the Advance Planning Committee for study, with a recommendation to be brought to the full Board. She also recommended a meeting with representatives of the Olympic Organizing Committee. She concluded her comments by stating that the District's responsibility is to provide service to the public for which we are the most accountable agency in the area. It is also the District's responsibility to convince the LAOOC that we would not have this problem if we did not have the Olympics in Los Angeles.

Director Swanson then moved approval of the staff recommendation for the expenditure of \$300,000 which motion was seconded. It was also stated that the Advance Planning Committee would return to the full Board with a recommendation at the first meeting in August.

President Lewis stated that he feels that it is not sound policy to drop \$11 million worth of service because of the shortfall of \$1.6. Is the District in a position to risk public dollars to provide a service that is being provided only as a consequence of the Olympics. He stated he does not believe there is any reason to talk to the Olympic Organizing Committee; he suggested that the District proceed, with the thought that the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission is a better place to secure the \$1.6 million shortfall.

Agenda Item No. 5 - Consideration of the District's 1984 Olympic Budget (cont'd)

After further discussion, Director Patsouras made a substitute motion to authorize the expenditure of the \$300,000 as requested by the General Manager, adopt the \$11.726 budget with a deficit of \$1.6 million and identify the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission, the City of Los Angeles, and private sector sponsors as possible sources for funding the shortfall. This substitute motion was seconded by Director Richter.

Director Takei stated that he felt it was imprudent at this point to preclude asking the Olympic Organizing Committee for any money.

On a Roll Call vote, the substitute motion failed as noted below:

Ayes: Patsouras, Price, Richter,
Lewis
Noes: Day, Holen, Storing, Swanson,
Takei
Abstain: None
Absent: Hall

On a call for the question on Director Swanson's original motion, the motion passed with Director Patsouras voting "no".

The meeting adjourned at 4:22 p.m.


District Secretary