

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

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

September 3, 1975

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 1:00 p.m. on September 3, 1975, at which time President Byron E. Cook called the meeting to order.

Directors George W. Brewster, Victor M. Carter, Byron E. Cook, A. J. Eyraud, Jr., Adelina Gregory, Thomas G. Neusom, Jay B. Price and George Takei responded to Roll Call, with Directors Pete Schabarum and Donald H. Gibbs arriving at 1:12 p.m. and 1:30 p.m., respectively. Director Baxter Ward was 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 Employee Relations John S. Wilkens; Controller-Treasurer-Auditor Joe B. Scatchard; Senior Transportation Engineer Brian Pearson; Secretary Richard K. Kissick, and the public.

Consideration of Item Nos. 1 through 4 on the Consent Calendar

On motion of Director Eyraud, seconded and unanimously carried, the following resolutions were adopted and/or actions taken:

The Minutes of the Special Meeting held August 19, 1975 and the Regular Meeting held August 20, 1975 were approved, after amending the August 20 Minutes by the insertion of the following paragraph immediately following Resolution No. R-75-335 on page 11 of those Minutes:

"Director Carter requested that the staff submit a report concerning the reinstatement of service on the South Central Grid Lines 358 and 362 which had been discontinued on July 13, 1975, since he felt the lines should have been checked again before discontinuance, that they are in high transit dependent areas and patronage on the lines had been steadily rising and would have eventually met the criteria necessary for retention of the services."

RESOLUTION NO. R-75-348

RESOLVED, that the temporary route diversions caused by construction work affecting Line Nos. 10, 22, 24, 60, 64, 68, 103, 104, 133, 401 and 402, as described in the report dated August 25, 1975 filed with the Secretary, be and the same is hereby ratified and approved.

RESOLUTION NO. R-75-349

RESOLVED, that the changes in bus stops as described in the report dated August 11, 1975 filed with the Secretary, be and the same is hereby ratified and approved.

The Purchasing Agent's Statement of Purchases Over \$1,000 for the month of July, 1975, a copy of which is filed with the Secretary, was ordered "Received and filed."

Report of Surface Operations Committee and Adoption of Resolutions and/or actions Regarding Agenda Item Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10

After discussion, on motion of Director Eyraud, chairman of the Surface Operations Committee, seconded and unaimously carried, the following resolutions were adopted and/or actions taken regarding Agenda Item Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10:

Agenda Item no. 5, reading as follows, was carried over to the next meeting:

"Consider award of Contracts to Super Delivery Service, 2142 N. Cahuenga Blvd., Hollywood, and to 1-2-3 Messenger Service, 668 South Bonnie Brae, Los Angeles, covering the District's messenger service requirements for the remainder of Fiscal Year 1976 at an estimated cost of \$10,000; form of contracts subject to approval of the General Counsel."

RESOLUTION NO. R-75-350

RESOLVED, that award of contract to Reeves Company, 225 O'Neil Blvd., Attleboro, Massachusetts, the only bidder responding to Bid no. 8-7517, covering the purchase of 6,000 metal name badges at a total cost of \$12,529.20, including sales tax, as described in the report dated August 26, 1975, a copy of which is filed with the Secretary, be and the same is withheld until the badge design has been reviewed by the Staff Design Review Committee and a report submitted for consideration at the next meeting of the Board.

RESOLUTION NO. R-75-351

RESOLVED, that the report dated August 25, 1975, a copy of which is filed with the Secretary, be and the same is hereby approved, and the General Manager be and he hereby is authorized to execute on behalf of the District a contract with Fuel Data Systems, 13701 South Velma Street, Gardena, California, the lowest responsive bidder under Bid No. 8-7514 as described in the Abstract of Proposals attached to these Minutes as EXHIBIT 1, covering the purchase and installation of one semi-automated fueling and data collection system at an estimated cost of \$39,968, including sales tax, which purchase is funded in part under UMTA Capital Grant Project No. CA-03-0034; form of contract subject to approval of the General Counsel.

RESOLUTION NO. R-75-352

RESOLVED, that the report dated August 25, 1975, a copy of which is filed with the Secretary, be and the same is hereby approved, and the General Manager be and he hereby is authorized to execute a contract on behalf of the District with Carlisle Corporation, P.O. Box P, Ridgeway, Pa., the lowest responsible bidder under Bid No. 8-7513 as described in the Abstract of Proposals attached to these Minutes as EXHIBIT 2, covering the purchase of the District's brake block requirements for a one-year period from date of contract, with option for one additional year at the election of the District,

at an estimated cost of \$91,000 per year, including sales tax; form of contract subject to approval of the General Counsel.

RESOLUTION NO. R-75-353

RESOLVED, That the report dated August 29, 1975, a copy of which is filed with the Secretary, be and the same is hereby approved, and the General Manager be and he hereby is authorized to execute on behalf of the District a contract with Equipment Distributing, dba Huntington Desk Company, 1015 South Baldwin Avenue, Arcadia, California, the lowest responsible bidder under Bid No. 8-7528 as described in the Abstract of Proposal attached to these Minutes as EXHIBIT 3, covering the District's modular furniture requirements at the new Headquarters Building, 425 South Main Street, Los Angeles, at a total cost of \$245,734.24, including sales tax, which purchase is funded in part under UMTA Capital Grant Project No. CA-03-00-0; form of contract subject to approval of the General Counsel.

Award of Contract to Arthur Andersen & Co. Covering a Study of Maintenance Systems and Procedures

Director Eyraud reported that the Joint Committee at its morning meeting had recommended award of contract to Arthur Andersen & Co. covering a study of maintenance systems and procedures at an estimated cost of \$135,000, together with certain amendments made by the Committee. Mr. Eyraud further stated that he personally was against the contract award, since he felt that the staff could operate the system and felt the District did not need a consultant to tell us how to make repairs, etc.

Director Carter moved approval of the recommendation, which motion was seconded.

Director Neusom stated that as outlined in his report dated September 2, 1975, a copy of which is filed with the Secretary, the contract award was the recommendation of the four Directors

who had heard all three presentations of the finalist firms proposing to make the study and that the study had been approved by the Board.

The question was called for and the motion carried, with Director Eyraud voting "No", and the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLUTION NO. R-75-354

RESOLVED, that the General Manager be and he hereby is authorized to negotiate and execute on behalf of the District a contract with the firm of Arthur Andersen & Co. covering a study of maintenance systems and procedures at an estimated cost of \$135,000, subject to a schedule of fees satisfactory to the staff and the availability of a member of the consultant team having experience in public transit; with form of contract subject to approval of the General Counsel.

Director Schabarum entered the meeting at 1:12 p.m.

Approval of Extension of Cancellation Date of Greyhound Lease at Former Gas Company Property in El Monte

With the approval of all Directors present, consideration of extension of the cancellation date of the Greyhound Lease at the former Gas Company property in El Monte was added to the Agenda.

Director Eyraud, Chairman of the Surface Operations Committee, reported that the Joint Committee at its morning meeting had recommended extension of the cancellation date of the above lease, and moved its approval, which motion was seconded, unanimously carried and the following resolution adopted:

RESOLUTION NO. R-75-355

RESOLVED, that the General Manager be and he hereby is authorized to execute on behalf of the District an amendment to the lease agreement with Western Greyhound at the former Gas Company property in El Monte providing

for extension of the notice of termination date from thirty to ninety days; form of amended agreement subject to approval of the General Counsel.

Approval of Route Modification and Extension of Line No. 7

After discussion, on motion of Director Brewster, Chairman of the Advance Planning & Marketing Committee, seconded and unanimously carried, the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLUTION NO. R-75-356

RESOLVED, that the report dated August 28, 1975, a copy of which is filed with the Secretary, be and the same is hereby adopted, and the General Manager be and he hereby is authorized to include in the Official Route Descriptions adopted November 4, 1964, as amended, Eighth Revised Page 7, providing for modification and extension of Eagle Rock-South Broadway Line No. 7, as described in the aforementioned report, effective December 21, 1975; subject to favorable comment from the County of Los Angeles and approval of the Consulting Engineer.

Approval of Continuation of Line No. 175 on an Experimental Basis

After discussion, on motion of Director Brewster, seconded and unanimously carried, the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLUTION NO. R-75-357

RESOLVED, that the report dated August 29, 1975, a copy of which is filed with the Secretary, be and the same is hereby adopted, and continuation of service on the Santa Monica-Malibu-Trancas Line No. 175 is hereby approved, except that said continuation of service is to be considered on an experimental basis; subject to favorable comment from the County of Los Angeles and approval of the Consulting Engineer.

The staff was directed to investigate and furnish a report on suggestions submitted by the Malibu Community Bus Organization as contained in a report distributed to Directors and staff, a copy of which is filed with the Secretary.

Approval of Santa Monica Freeway Preferential Lane Project Lines 708 and 774 and Cancellation of Lines 704 and 783

After discussion, on motion of Director Brewster, seconded and unanimously carried, the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLUTION NO. R-75-358

RESOLVED, that the reports dated August 28, 1975 and September 2, 1975, copies of which are filed with the Secretary, recommending cancellation of Lines 704 and 783 and approval of Lines 708 and 774 in connection with the Santa Monica Freeway Preferential Lane project, be and the same are hereby adopted, and the General Manager be and he hereby is authorized to:

- a. Include in the Official Route Descriptions adopted November 4, 1964, as amended, Original Page 708 - East Santa Monica-Los Angeles Park/Ride Line no. 708, and Original Page 774 - Van Nuys-Century City-Los Angeles Flyer Line No. 774, effective September 29, 1975; and
- b. Delete from the Official Route Descriptions adopted November 4, 1964, as amended, Original Pages 704 and 783;

subject to favorable comments from the County of Los Angeles and approval of the Consulting Engineer.

At the request of Director Takei, the staff was directed to review and report back on the feasibility of providing continuance of service on the Line 708 loop in the vicinity of Third and Alameda Streets, which continuation would provide service to the Little Tokyo area and to a senior citizen complex soon to be opened.

At the request of Director Carter, the staff was directed to review and report back on the feasibility of originating the Line 774 service in the vicinity of Sepulveda and Oxnard, instead of Sepulveda and Roscoe, and to also report on the feasibility of providing service on Line 774 during the daytime non-peak hours between the San Fernando Valley and Century City, and from Century City to Downtown Los Angeles via the Santa Monica Freeway preferential lane.

②
CART

Approval of Discontinuance of Line No. 38 and a Portion of Line No. 55 and Carrying Over of Certain Service Modifications Proposed in the San Fernando Valley

Director Brewster, Chairman of the Advance Planning & Marketing Committee, reported that the Joint Committee had reviewed the report dated August 28, 1975 concerning proposed service modifications, and that the Committee had recommended withholding approval of Item (a) of the report pending receipt of a staff report on suggestions submitted by Director Carter, but the Committee had recommended adoption of Items (b) and (c) of the recommendations.

After discussion, on motion of Director Brewster, seconded and unanimously carried, the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLUTION NO. R-75-359

WHEREAS, this Board of Directors has reviewed the report dated August 28, 1975, a copy of which is filed with the Secretary, proposing certain service modifications, line discontinuances and related actions, and has recommended withholding approval of Item (a) in said report, which item proposes the extension of Lines 155 and 157 along the Sylmar leg and Olive View leg, respectively, of Line 167 to absorb the services of Line 167, pending submission of a staff report with respect to the suggestions of Director Carter proposing alternate modifications, as follows:

Merge Line 157 with the Sylmar leg of Line 167;
Improve operational difficulties of Line 24 by merging Line 24-L with the Olive View leg of Line 167, eliminating Line 24-L shuttle service between Burbank and San Fernando, adjust service schedules due to excess seating capacities, eliminating Line 24-G and extend Line 39 segment between Burbank and San Fernando, and adjust service frequencies of Line 39 between Glendale and San Fernando; and
Merge Lines 155 and 160 to save one bus;

and;

WHEREAS, approval of Items (b) and (c) of the
aforementioned August 28, 1975 report is recommended;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that approval of
Item (a) of the August 28, 1975 report is withheld
pending receipt of the above-mentioned report from the
staff;

RESOLVED FURTHER, that Items (b) and (c) of the
aforementioned August 28, 1975 report be and the same are
hereby approved, and the General Manager be and he hereby
is authorized to:

- a. Discontinue service on Long Beach-Whittier-
El Monte Line No. 38 effective October 12,
1975 and delete from the Official Route
Descriptions adopted November 4, 1964, as
amended, Fourth Revised Page 38; subject to
favorable comments from the County of Los Angeles
and approval of the Consulting Engineer; and
- b. Discontinue service of that segment of Los
Angeles-Newport Beach-Balboa Line No. 55
south of Seal Beach effective with the implemen-
tation of the Mid-Cities Improvement Plan in
January, 1976, and to include in the Official
Route Descriptions adopted November 4, 1964,
as amended, Tenth Revised Page 55; subject to
approval of the Consulting Engineer.

Report of Finance Committee

On motion of Director Carter, Chairman of The Finance Committee, seconded and unanimously carried, the Operating Report for the month of July, 1975 was received and filed.

Director Carter then reported that the Finance Committee had recommended that consideration of the findings of the public hearing in connection with the purchase of 30 articulated buses be discussed by the full Board.

Adoption of Resolution Certifying Findings of Public Hearing Regarding Amended Capital Grant Application to Aid in the Financing of 30 Articulated Buses - Discussion Regarding Future Bus Purchases

General Manager Gilstrap reviewed the report dated August 28, 1975, a copy of which is filed with the Secretary, reporting that on June 18, 1975 the Board had approved revision of the specifications to delete the special provisions for the elderly and the handicapped for the purchase of 30 articulated buses, since such equipped buses would not be available in the near future, and that a public hearing had been held on August 6, 1975. Even though the specification changes had been opposed by the handicapped at the public hearing, the staff feels that these experimental vehicles should be obtained off-the-shelf due to the pressing needs for new buses.

Director Carter expressed opposition to obtaining buses not equipped to handle the elderly and the handicapped, and felt that we should not experiment with them and to let other properties experiment with them but not the District.

Director Eyraud asked what the Board was approving and Mr. Heinle reported the specifications as approved by the Board on June 18.

Director Takei said the RTD E & H specification is preempted by UMTA, and Mr. Heinle reported the specifications were written by CalTrans and that the Board had approved the specifications as written by CalTrans.

Mr. Takei stated if the Board changes the specifications we won't get the buses and we will be out, and Mr. Carter repeated his previous statement of letting someone else get the buses not equipped for the elderly and the handicapped.

Director Neusom stated that we have a problem--that we can't determine if they will operate here without operating them, and that by operating them in Phoenix doesn't tell us if we can operate them here. He felt we should acquire them as formerly approved by the Board and find out how they function, and that still doesn't affect our policy since they are experimental.

Mr. Carter felt we shouldn't spend money for buses not equipped for the elderly and the handicapped; that we have to tell the manufacturers they have to give us buses equipped for the elderly and the handicapped and they will manufacture them.

Mr. Neusom stated that we have the UMTA problem, and until UMTA says everyone has to get buses for the E & H RTD can't change that policy of UMTA; that he was in accord with the RTD policy but we should get these experimental buses because none of the manufacturers are willing to manufacture them and UMTA won't take a positive position.

Mr. Carter said he had talked to the Rohr people and that they could provide the buses equipped for the E & H and felt

) all manufacturers would follow suit, and that he was not in favor of experimental buses for this purpose and against spending the money.

Director Schabarum inquired if the buses complied with state and local law, and Mr. Heinle stated that they did--60-foot maximum for articulated buses and not over 102, probably 100, inches in width.

Upon inquiry, Director Schabarum was advised that the estimated cost was \$3.6-million, funded 80-20 by UMTA (about \$700,000 local matching funds), that funds were not in this year's budget since they wouldn't be delivered during this fiscal year, and should be delivered about one year from date of placing the order.

Mr. Schabarum stated he was somewhat confused on the recent action of the Board on the 200 bus order, and asked if the staff had presented the picture as it relates to the current bus fleet of 2,000 as to their age and maintenance costs associated with an aging fleet.

President Cook asked for further explanation and Mr. Schabarum said the aging equipment should be a part of the consideration and, since "X" dollars are being spent for maintenance and the staff has indicated we have a bus fleet averaging 15 years, we are looking at this point in time at a bus fleet which will be two or two and a half years older before receiving any replacements, which translates into some compounding maintenance costs as the fleet gets older. He further stated that Mr. Carter's remarks had a point, but if we follow Mr. Carter's theory of insisting on

100% of the fleet being equipped for the E & H, we will in reality end up with either a horrendous maintenance cost or a dramatically smaller total operable fleet by the time we get around to any noticeable bus replacements for the sake of providing service for the E & H, and asked if we bring a major portion of the fleet to a standstill. He then stated that beyond the experimental features, two of the articulated buses represents three standard buses which can serve as replacement for some of our older buses. He felt these points were also relevant in connection with the 200 bus purchase.

Director Gibbs entered the meeting at 1:30 p.m.

President Cook agreed, and stated the Board has to face the question of whether the bus fleet is slowly but surely aging itself out of existence and whether we can permit it to disintegrate, reduce it substantially because of age or replace them in the interim.

Mr. Schabarum asked if the staff had furnished the figures at the last meeting, and Mr. Carter said they had discussed age but not figures.

Mr. Gilstrap stated the staff would be glad to prepare a detailed report, and Mr. Cook felt the staff should provide the Board with that information.

Mr. Price said he agreed in principle with what Mr. Schabarum had stated, and asked regarding the articulated buses wouldn't they almost double the capacity of ridership with less bus drivers, and wouldn't that result in less operational and labor costs.

Mr. Heinle replied there was no question about that, and the intended use of the buses would be on high frequency routes where there would not be a degradation of service and, as Mr. Schabarum had indicated, substitute two for three and save the operators' salary.

Dennis Cannon, the District's handicapped consultant, agreed that the 30 articulated buses would free 45 standard buses for service improvements or replace older buses. He also stated that Trans Coach has a device which might be possible to install to retrofit the articulated buses when they are delivered, and the Board could do that without retracting its October, 1974 resolution.

Mr. Neusom moved approval of the public hearing certification resolution, which motion was seconded.

Mr. Carter said he didn't know if an amendment to the motion was necessary but he wanted it recorded that he was opposed to revising the specifications, and wanted to be on record on that.

Mr. Eyraud said the Board revised the specifications on June 18, and Mr. Carter said that this was September 3 and he wanted it recorded that he was opposed to deletion of the E & H specifications from the buses.

Mr. Cook inquired if he was offering an amendment to the motion, and Mr. Carter said either included in the motion or offered as an amendment, to which Mr. Eyraud replied that all that was being done today was certifying that we had the public hearing and what the result was, and Mr. Cook said that Mr. Carter's option was to record his opposition to the motion, to which Mr. Carter replied that his opposition was to the deletion of the specification.

Mr. Cook asked all in favor of the motion to state "Aye" and before the vote Mr. Carter asked if his opposition was in the motion, to which Mr. Cook replied it was not, that an amendment was not necessary to record his objection, that Mr. Carter could vote against it and it is noted in the record that he opposed it.

Mr. Brewster stated that if a Director wanted something recorded in the minutes on a certain subject with respect to his position that it could be recorded in the minutes but that it doesn't take a motion.

Mr. Carter said that is what he wanted and Mr. Cook said the Secretary would be instructed to note Mr. Carter's objection in the minutes.

Secretary Kissick stated that Mr. Carter's objections would be recorded in the minutes but not in the certification.

The question was called for, carried and the following certifying resolution adopted, with Director Carter's opposition herein recorded:

RESOLUTION NO. R-75-360

CERTIFICATION

Findings of Public Hearing held August 6, 1975 at 1:00 P.M. in connection with the Southern California Rapid Transit District's application to the Urban Mass Transportation Administration including the purchase of 30 articulated buses.

Byron E. Cook, President of the
Southern California Rapid Transit District

HEREBY CERTIFIES THAT, in the development of the District's Capital Grant application (CA-03-0106) to the Urban Mass Transportation Administration which includes the purchase of 30 articulated buses, it:

1. Has afforded adequate opportunity for public hearings pursuant to adequate prior notice, and has held such hearings, in accordance with the requirements set forth by the Urban Mass Transportation Administration.
2. Has considered the economic and social effects of this proposed project and its impact on the environment, including requirements under the Clean Air Act, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and other applicable Federal environmental statutes, and its consistency with goals and objectives of such urban planning as has been promulgated by the community.
3. Has found that this proposed project is consistent with official plans for the comprehensive development of the urban area.
4. Has found that the project is made in the best overall public interest taking into consideration the need for fast, safe and efficient transportation, public services, and conservation of environment and natural resources and the cost of eliminating or minimizing any adverse effects.

Following adoption of the above resolution, Mr. Schabarum said he would like to expand on the maintenance question, that the highway patrol and others junk cars after 60,000 or 70,000 miles and asked what the District's policy was on buses.

Mr. Gilstrap replied that some time ago the District had adopted a 12-year depreciation or replacement policy, but due to the expansion programs and not being able to obtain equipment we had to ignore that policy and, in fact, we have many buses over 20 years of age.

Mr. Schabarum then inquired if there had been any discussion about applying for another 300 or 500 buses to replace the present old buses which it was costing so much to maintain.

Mr. Neusom replied that we have a schedule for acquisition over the next three years, and the effect of not being able to get the 200 may mean trying to get 400 next year and even 600 the year after that, depending on what we buy, and the backlog may some day be enough to cause the manufacturers to build them.

Mr. Schabarum felt if the maintenance cost for the old buses were matched against those current costs as opposed to acquiring new buses, it might indicate we need to find some local matching funds that would be the basis for initiating now an application for a goodly order of replacement buses, and suggested that issue be brought up in the near future.

Mr. Gilstrap stated that the best prospects under the current policy for obtaining new buses was anywhere from 2-1/2 to 3 years, and by that time roughly 1228 out of a fleet of 2250 will be over 15 years' old, and that is a simple fact whether we like it or not. Also, we are implementing new services of which at least 75% of our customers are not elderly and handicapped, and we are receiving complaints about implementing new services with old buses; that new service is a very important element in the whole planning process, so whatever we do within the next 2-1/2 to 3 years is going to have to be done with our current fleet.

Mr. Carter inquired why we didn't increase our orders now; that Rohr had told him privately that if they received an order for 500 instead of 200 they would advance the delivery date and perhaps reduce the price. Mr. Gilstrap stated we have a money problem on that proposal, and Mr. Carter inquired what he meant by a money problem--that we are talking now

about buying more buses, and if we stick to the 200, which is a small amount, and not let them think they will get more business they are not going to be anxious to build the 200; however, if we give them an additional order now for 300 more, delivery dates will be advanced especially if they get the feeling we are really going to buy handicapped buses.

Mr. Cook felt we have to accept the limitations of our capital grants for the acquisition of buses.

Mr. Heinle stated that this discussion came up at the meeting last Wednesday (August 27), at which time he had made the comment that his understanding and discussion with the manufacturers that the lead time entailed the tooling up, and the production design and tooling for a new model, and the quantity ordered would have no effect on the delivery of the first bus; also, that at last Wednesday's meeting Rohr representatives were offered an opportunity to comment but they would not. However, their private comments to him have been that it wouldn't make any difference if they received an order for one thousand buses, that first bus to get the tooling and the production design ready will still take two years.

Mr. Schabarum stated we now have a depreciation schedule of 12 years which presumably indicates over that life span, an average maintenance cost per bus, and asked what is it going to cost in "X" dollars for that older bus, to which Mr. Gilstrap replied that we haven't that refined information bus-by-bus as yet, but wished we did, but that is what we're going to have in a very short while on our computer program.

) Mr. Eyraud said older buses cost more to maintain, that last year it cost us 22¢ per mile and we used to do it for 17¢.

Mr. Schabarum said he gathered the conclusion was that we are going to go ahead with the handicapped specs on the 200 buses, notwithstanding the added maintenance costs and the 2-1/2 year delivery date, and that still doesn't deal with the subject of a thousand buses in the present fleet that are going to be 15 years old two years from now, and suggested that a reasonable analysis be made, including maintenance cost, analysis of cost today versus ordering a year from now and the escalation and inflationary costs that are going to come to pass, which may well dictate our seeking an application for 300 or more buses now and scrounge around for our local match now rather than wait another year--that what he wanted to do today was raise the issue.

Mr. Gilstrap stated that in our initial proposal to the County we asked for 520 buses, or some figure near that, to purchase this year, and that was pared back because of the County's fiscal constraints and the fact they wouldn't be delivered this year, so there was no commitment for it.

Mr. Schabarum felt that if the RTD were using the County as a crutch, the Board was not doing their job.

Mr. Gilstrap stated that we have a capital grant now in preparation which includes an order for 320 more buses, that hearings have already been held and they include the E & H specifications, but we don't have the local 20% matching money this fiscal year.

Mr. Carter said they are not going to be delivered this year so we can place an order.

Mr. Price stated that two or three months ago he had brought up the same compromise that Mr. Schabarum had mentioned to go ahead and buy some buses, to go ahead and get the 200 buses for the handicapped but to also place an order for 300 standard buses and the Board did not go along with that compromise at that time.

Mr. Carter felt that we should still place the order for the 320 buses equipped for the handicapped which would make a larger order for the manufacturer to tool up for, to which Mr. Price replied that the delivery date was the problem. Mr. Carter continued with the fact that we don't have the money to buy buses anyway, whether standard or for the handicapped, and if we place the order now we will have the additional 300 for delivery in 21 months and UMTA will approve that, and perhaps the manufacturer might even give us a lower price on a larger order.

Mr. Neusom inquired if he understood the statement correctly, it meant that we republish indicating that we want to buy 200 immediately, with an option to buy 300 more at a certain time, or did Mr. Carter mean to buy 500 now, to which Mr. Carter replied he meant that we have bought 200 already. Mr. Neusom replied that we hadn't bought already, and that was the problem. Mr. Carter said we have the UMTA application for 320 buses with the same specifications and we should try to get the manufacturer to take an order for 520. Mr. Neusom replied that we still have to go through the procedure of offering

