

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

Minutes of Special Committee of the Whole Meeting
Industry Hills & Sheraton Resort
One Industry Hills Parkway
City of Industry

January 15-17, 1982

Directors Present:

Jan Hall
Marvin L. Holen (absent 1/15)
Mike Lewis
Carl Meseck
Thomas G. Neusom

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

Staff Present:

John A. Dyer
Richard T. Powers
Joe B. Scatchard
George L. McDonald
Sam M. Black
John S. Wilkens
Richard Gallagher

Barry Engelberg
Phil Meyers
Robert Williams
Dave Dominguez
Roger Slagle
Helen M. Bolen
Ira Trachter

Also present were members of the public.

On Friday, January 15, 1982, the meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by President Neusom.

Overview

General Manager Dyer gave a historical overview of the District and its impact on the community as a whole. His presentation also concerned the role of the District in the next ten years and the need for sound policy decisions now to effectively place the District in a proper position to meet the demands of the community.

Meeting recessed at 9:35 p.m. until 8:30 a.m. on Saturday, January 16, 1982.

On Saturday, January 16, 1982, the meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m., by President Neusom.

Policy and Administration

Mr. Powers, General Counsel, presented graphs and a short summary of the administrative and management recommendations proposed by the Arthur Andersen Study which was done in 1977. His presentation graphically indicated those recommendations which have been implemented, partially implemented or if not implemented, gave the reasons why.

Mr. McDonald, Manager of Planning & Marketing, led a discussion on the District's service deployment policy.

Mr. Powers then made a presentation on the Board of Directors role as policy maker in achieving the District's objectives. This presentation and the ensuing discussion dealt with the definition of Board and staff functions.

Financial Policies/Planning

J. B. Scatchard and George McDonald spoke concerning the financial and planning efforts of the District given different climates: Without Proposition A, with Proposition A, and a Long Range Policy and Planning scenario.

Transit Program Development Policies

Sam Black discussed equipment expansion policies and the impact on transit if there is no fixed guideway in Los Angeles by 1990.

Phil Meyers presented a summary of the bus facilities program, which was accompanied by several graphs and charts.

Operations, Policies and Programs

George McDonald spoke concerning the short term planning, both with and without Proposition A.

Bob Williams spoke briefly concerning the status of the Computerized Customer Information System and future plans for the System.

John Wilkens appeared and made a brief presentation on the District's personnel practices and policies.

Barry Engelberg spoke concerning the role of staff and Board in the legislative process. He presented several charts.

Meeting recessed at 5:30 p.m. until 8:30 a.m. on Sunday, January 17, 1982.

Meeting called to order at 8:30 a.m. Sunday, January 17, 1982, by President Neusom.

Substantive Policy Issues of the 80's

General Manager Dyer gave a very detailed synopsis of the District's relationship with the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission, the cities in our service area, the County, State and the federal government. He also spoke concerning the interaction the District has with transit organizations such as CAPOTS and APTA.

Richard Gallagher spoke concerning the District's rapid transit effort, summarizing the steps the District has taken to date and those milestone decisions that must be made during the remainder of the preliminary engineering phase.

Wrap-Up

During the wrap-up portion of the meeting, General Manager Dyer presented a recap of the issues raised by members of the Board during the discussion of each agenda item. A copy of the recap is attached to these Minutes as Exhibit I. Copies of each graph and chart presented during the three-day meeting are filed with the Secretary. He asked for comments from the Board members within the next few days so that staff can proceed to develop a set of policy definitions.

Several Directors expressed satisfaction at the accomplishments of this meeting, indicating a desire to have this type of meeting again in six months. There was discussion concerning the topics appropriate for this type of meeting and discussion concerning a possible change in the format of agendas for regular meetings as well as a change in the scope and nature of items to be considered by the Board. The concensus was that the Board should deal more exclusively with policy issues.

The meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m.


District Secretary

January 15, 1982

8pm Friday

OVERVIEW

ISSUES OUTLINED IN PRESENTATIONS

1. Where are we as an agency?
2. What is the agency's current direction?
3. Is the agency going where we want it to?
4. Are goals developed?
5. Does the capacity exist to achieve these goals?

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS FROM BOARD

HALL

1. Downtown L.A. developers are reducing cost by eliminating parking spaces without contributing to the cost of public transit.

PRICE

2. Will ridership climb if Proposition A passes?
3. Has the RTD really benefitted from S.B. 325?
4. What impact would a favorable Proposition A decision have upon the upcoming labor negotiations?

MESECK

5. Will the Houston letter-of-no-prejudice put L.A. at a disadvantage regarding rail funding?

NEUSIM

6. Los Angeles needs to retain the population density factor in the UMTA funding formula.

SWANSON

7. The RTD should seek local funding sources to achieve more financial stability.

Jan 16 1982
8:30 - 10:15 AM Sat

POLICY & ADMINISTRATION

ISSUES OUTLINED IN PRESENTATIONS

1. Status report on Arthur Andersen Report
2. The full use of workload indicators is not justified in all departments

COMMENTS / QUESTIONS FROM BOARD

- PATSAOURAS 1. Does the RTD promote from within?
2. Does the RTD adequately train employees for promotional opportunities.
- RICHTER 3. Are mechanics trained to become supervisors and division managers.
- AALL 4. Do employees remain with the RTD following training?
- LEWIS 5. How do the District project personnel needs, especially without using workload indicators?
- PATSAOURAS 6. What is the feasibility of an incentive program for department heads?
- NEUSOM 7. Incentives should also be available for other employees and should include non-monetary items
- MESECK 8. Should incentives be given in the form of salary increases or bonuses
- HALL 9. Deferred compensation bonuses should be considered

SERVICE DEPLOYMENT

ISSUES OUTLINED IN PRESENTATIONS

1. The District has not adopted the core concept nor limited itself to once-a-year service changes.
2. The RTD does use a 55% ridership - 45% population service allocation policy and a 140% load standard.

COMMENTS / QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

HALL
PATSAOURAS

1. What are the characteristics of low productivity lines?
2. The RTD should consider service reductions before fare increases.

Lewis

3. Bus capacity should be increased, perhaps by removing seats to permit more standees.
4. The 140% load standard should be increased.
5. What would be the impact of the potential LACTC M.O.V. on Proposition A on the RTD's service deployment policy?

HOLEN

6. Alternative service allocation formula should be tested (i.e. 50-50, 100-0, 0-100, etc)
7. Are new maintenance facilities adequate for more double-deck and articulated buses?
8. Does the District need more high capacity buses?
9. Can the benefit of the Arthur Andersen Report be dollarized?

Jan 16, 110
1030-12AM Sat

BOARD AS POLICY MAKER

ISSUES OUTLINED IN PRESENTATIONS

1. What is the function of the Board? the staff?
2. Would increased formal Board policy-making be desirable?

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

- LEWIS 1. Can more complete information be provided to the Board?
- TAKEI 2. Is there a need for an additional mechanism for bringing sensitive matters to the Board?
- HALL 3. Need a "time-line" for reporting back to the Board.
- MESECK 4. Director report requests should require a majority vote
5. The Board should go through the General Manager for all requests.
- SWANSON 6. Board is the RTD's linkage with the community.
7. Current practices prevent the Board from focusing on policy issues: items brought to the Board are all "small"
- RICHTER 8. Some problems are more easily handled with direct requests.
- NEUSOM 9. Policy vacuums should be identified.
- MESECK 10. The Board should more closely link goals with programs.
- HOLEN 11. RTD lacks structured response to policy questions.

HALL

12. Resource implications of decisions should be clearer.

MESECK

13. RTD needs more input into inter-agency planning so that resource availability can be factored into projections.

LEWIS

14. Board should seek to exercise more influence with SCAG and LACTC.

SWANSON

15. Staff personnel should be more involved in reviewing SCAG documents.

Jan 16, 1982
100-2:30pm Sat

FINANCIAL POLICIES / PLANNING

ISSUES OUTLINED IN PRESENTATIONS

1. An unfavorable Proposition A decision will necessitate a service reduction and fare increase.
2. A favorable Proposition A decision will necessitate a rapid service expansion and will defer fare increases and service reductions for three years.
3. The RTD faces significant long-term financial problems.

COMMENTS / QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

- MESECK 1. What is the cause of the patronage decline?
- PATSAOURAS 2. What is the trade-off between a fare increase and a ridership decline?
- MESECK 3. What would be the impact of no wage increases on 1983 deficits?
4. Costs should be decreased by work-rule changes before implementing service cuts.
- HALL 5. Fringe benefits should be reduced.
- SWANSON 6. What is the RTD's view of a proliferation of transit operators as a consequence of Proposition A?
- MESECK 7. The RTD should offer to assist the cities in their transit planning.

Jan 16, 1972
2:45-4 pm Sat.

TRANSIT PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT POLICIES

ISSUES OUTLINED IN PRESENTATION

1. The RTD has significant equipment needs over the next ten years.
2. Several major facilities projects are necessary.
3. VMS and CCIS offer potential for operational improvements and operational efficiencies.

COMMENTS / QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

- HOLEN 1. Is there some way of reducing deadhead time?
- PATSAOURAS 2. Can a private developer be utilized as a means of obtaining additional operating divisions?
3. Would the operational savings from reduced deadhead be adequate to offset the lease-back cost?
- HOLEN 4. What is the trade-off between adding more divisions and reducing deadhead?
- MESECK 5. Does high deadhead mileage imply the need for a private carrier?
6. Is long-haul service better provided by a private carrier?
- NEUSOM 7. What is the status of a domestic double-decker?
- MESECK 8. Can CCIS be implemented more rapidly?
9. Should the municipal bus systems be included in CCIS?
- PRICE 10. Can dollar-bill unfolding be subcontracted to a handicap agency or can a lower wage rate be negotiated?
- NEUSOM 11. What is status of cameras on buses?
- HALL 12. Has cost-benefit analysis of the rehabilitation or job sharing program been done?
- STORING 13. What is feasibility of a secretarial pool?

Jan 17 1984

8:30 AM Sunday

SUBSTANTIVE POLICY ISSUES

ISSUES OUTLINED IN PRESENTATION

1. There is need for a stable and predictable local funding source.
2. There is a danger for state "re-regulation" of transit.
3. The institutional arrangements for transit decision-making should be rationalized.
4. Transit policies are often contradictory (ie: need for high capacity vehicles, Buy America, and UMTA 504, etc)
5. Effective transit value capture will require state legislative action.

COMMENTS / QUESTIONS FROM BOARD

PATSAOURAS 1. Does the LA-long Beach light rail route preclude other routes?

2. What happens to light rail in L.A. if Proposition A fails?

HOLEN 3. What is likelihood of UMTA issuing a letter of no prejudice regarding the LA-long Beach light rail project?