

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT
MINUTES/PROCEEDINGS

Special Joint Board Meeting of the
Southern California Rapid Transit District
in conjunction with the
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission

January 13, 1988 - 1:30 p.m.
Department of Water and Power
111 N. Hope Street, Room 1555-H
Los Angeles

The meeting was called to order by Tom Bradley, Chairman of the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission.

Directors Present:

Jan Hall
John F. Day
Joseph S. Dunning
Marvin L. Holen

Erwin N. Jones
Jay B. Price
Gordana Swanson
Kenneth R. Thomas

Directors Absent:

Carmen A. Estrada
Nick Patsaouras

Charles H. Storing

1. Chairman Bradley spoke briefly about the series of informal meetings held by the RTD/LACTC Liaison Committee in an effort to seek some way to deal with the problems in public transportation that have been revealed during the past year.

A joint report issued by the District and the Commission contains four alternative approaches to transportation agency restructuring. Chairman Bradley concluded his remarks by asking RTD General Manager John Dyer to explain the first two alternatives and LACTC Executive Director Rick Richmond to explain alternatives 3 and 4.

Following the comments by Dyer and Richmond, President Jan Hall summarized the process of the RTD/LACTC Liaison Committee, indicating that the goal to be accomplished was always foremost in the criteria used by the Committee, i.e., the ability to have better accountability and the best possible expenditure of transportation dollars. She concluded by stating that the Liaison Committee is recommending Alternative No. 3. Ray Remy, representing the Commission, spoke to the potential for legislative actions if the local agencies do not take steps to resolve the problems. He mentioned that the direction from the Board of Directors and the

1. Cont'd.

Commission was to look at a Joint Powers Agreement. The Liaison Committee concluded there was a real problem in having three agencies instead of the two current agencies. Under Alternative No. 3, the District would have a clearer role in construction.

Mr. Remy concluded by stating it was his recommendation that the staff be given direction to determine what implementation actions would be necessary to proceed with Alternative No. 3.

Commissioner Bacharach spoke, expressing her concern with the recommended alternative. Director Jones also spoke, indicating the proposal is very appropriate; it is simple and easy to place responsibility.

Commissioner Grabinski expressed his concern that the recommendation is different than the direction given to the Liaison Committee by the Commission and the Board of Directors at the last joint meeting.

Director Dunning commented on the proposed alternative and suggested there be communication between the agencies close to the hand-over point delineated in the proposed alternative. He also commended the Liaison Committee for the objectivity expressed in the proposal.

Director Dunning then made a motion to adopt Alternative No. 3, which motion was seconded. Discussion continued.

Commissioner Reed stated her concern about the mechanics of the hand-over of the projects and the dissolution of overlapping areas of responsibility. Chairman Bradley responded that if the alternative is adopted, the Liaison Committee will have to discuss those issues.

Commissioner Remy mentioned that a follow-up report would have to outline what steps, administratively and legislatively, would have to be undertaken and precisely what the problems are.

Commissioner King expressed his support of the recommended alternative and asked if the Committee assumed that bus operations would not be involved. President Hall replied that the staff of both agencies would have to study that aspect.

Commissioner Bacharach expressed her concern with the motion on the floor, and requested that it be amended to ask staff to study Alternatives 2 and 3. Chairman Bradley indicated the Chair would rule the amendment out of order. He said that when this subject comes back to the respective policy

bodies, that would be the time to reject what is unacceptable. He also said the intent today is to help staff focus on what alternatives to study.

Following additional discussion, General Manager Dyer suggested that staff could prepare a Program Implementation Plan which would define the mechanics, develop the steps, analyze the issues and present a series of actions required to accomplish the task.

Prior to the vote on the motion on the floor, President Hall stated that the success of the efforts being undertaken by the District and the Commission rests with the willingness of the elected officials to sit on the Commission or the Board of Directors to make accountability-type decisions. She concluded by stating that the Joint Powers Agreement approach seems to add a layer of government to the process.

Members of the public addressed the joint Boards. Peter Baxter spoke on the subject of the District's General Manager. Bryan Allen registered his opposition to the motion on the floor.

A Roll Call vote was taken of the District Board with the following results:

Ayes: Day, Dunning, Holen, Jones, Price, Swanson,
Thomas, Hall

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Estrada, Patsaouras, Storing

Commissioner King then made a similar motion on behalf of the Commission, which motion was seconded and carried on a 6-3 vote.

2. President Hall then requested an opportunity to present the District's request regarding the swap of farebox revenues for Local Proposition A funds. General Manager Dyer presented the District's arguments on this subject. He indicated that the federal appropriations is about 1 to 2 million dollars less than what has been budgeted. He also spoke to the revenue shortfall, the elimination of \$3.7 million in State Transportation Assistance funds, and the reduction in ridership, with the cumulative effective being approximately \$10 million. General Manager Dyer concluded by indicating the District's operating budget is \$510 million; District is experiencing about a 2% shortfall. He also spoke to the fact that the District is not allowed to maintain a contingency fund.

2. Cont'd.

Director Holen concluded the presentation by stating the specific amount the District requires is \$12 million. He suggested a contingency factor be built into the budget process so that this will not happen in the future.

The meeting concluded at 2:50 p.m.


Helen M. Holen
District Secretary