

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

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

March 4, 1976

Upon notice duly given, the Board of 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 1:50 p.m. on March 4, 1976, at which time President Byron E. Cook called the meeting to order.

Directors present:

George W. Brewster
(Entered at 2:15 p.m.)
Byron E. Cook
Adelina Gregory
Marvin L. Holen

Thomas G. Neusom
Jay B. Price
George Takei
Baxter Ward
(Entered at 2:17 p.m.)

Directors absent:

Donald Gibbs
Ruth E. Richter
Pete Schabarum

Staff present:

Jack R. Gilstrap, General Manager
Richard T. Powers, General Counsel
Joe Scatchard, Controller-Treasurer-Auditor
George L. McDonald, Manager of Planning & Marketing
R. K. Kissick, Secretary
Richard Gallagher, Manager of Rapid Transit
Ralph de la Cruz, Principal Analyst

Also present were members of the public, the news media and the following members of the Los Angeles City Council Ad Hoc Committee on Rapid Transit:

John Ferraro, Chairman
Ernani Bernardi
Louis R. Nowell
Robert M. Wilkinson
Zev Yaroslavsky

President Cook announced that the purpose of the special meeting was to receive a progress report from the District's consultants regarding Supervisor Ward's Sunset Coast Line proposal in order for the Board to have as much time as possible to consider the consultants' input and information to be conveyed to the Legislature in connection with pending legislation necessary for a June election on the rapid transit proposal. He also stated that the consultants' final written report would be received next week, at which time it was expected the Board would make a decision one way or the other on whether to place the measure before the voters.

General Manager Gilstrap briefly reviewed the consultants' scope of work and called on Principal Analyst Ralph de la Cruz to present the consultants.

At this point, Director Price interceded and requested a ruling from General Counsel Powers if it would be in order to propose amendments to Assembly Bill 1246. Mr. Powers replied that since portions of AB 1246 related to rapid transit consideration of amendments would be in order.

Mr. Price moved that AB 1246 be amended to include that no appointing or electing authority would have its numerical representation on the present RTD Board reduced on the new transit commission, and that the two cities that receive statutory authority to make appointments to the new transit commission by the mayor, or by the mayor with the corresponding city council approval, should not be voting members on the City Selection Committee of the League of California Cities, as is the present case with Los Angeles where the Mayor appoints its present two members with council approval and do not vote on the City Selection Committee's four corridor representatives and which should be maintained in the new commission and not reduced from four corridor directors to two directors; which proposed amendments would in effect raise the membership of the new commission from eleven to thirteen, which motion was seconded.

After discussion on the merits of whether amendments should be proposed at this time, and in view of the fact that amendments were to be discussed with the author (Assemblyman Ingalls) at a meeting to be scheduled in the next few days, Mr. Price moved to table his motion until the special meeting of the Board which was scheduled on Tuesday, March 9, 1976, which motion was seconded and unanimously carried.

(Director Brewster entered the meeting at 2:15 p.m.
and Director Ward at 2:17 p.m.)

Mr. de la Cruz then introduced the consultants who made presentations as follows:

Ki Suh Park, Gruen Associates, Inc.

Socioeconomic environmental and planning impact factors

Donald Green, Stanford Research Institute

Financing issues

Emanuel Diamant, De Leuw, Cather & Co.

Capital and operating costs and engineering factors

(Directors Neusom and Holen and General Manager Gilstrap left the meeting at 2:45 p.m.)

George Adams, Mobility Systems & Equipment Co.

Issues of right-of-way adaptability guide-way construction, hardware availability, energy requirements and maintenance facilities

Also present and responding to questions was Donald Hodgman, representing O'Melveny & Meyers, the District's Bond Counsel.

(Directors Price and Ward left the meeting at 3:15 p.m. Director Price re-entered the meeting and Director Brewster left the meeting at 3:37 p.m.)

A question and answer period followed the presentations by the consultants.

(Director Price left the meeting at 3:55 p.m.)

A reporter's transcript of the meeting is attached to these Minutes as EXHIBIT 1.

President Cook stated the Board would be receiving the consultants' final reports next week, and in the absence of a quorum the meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.



Secretary

29816

Telephone 625-7615

POLK COURT REPORTERS *Certified Deposition Notaries*

606 S. Olive Street, Suite 307-309, Los Angeles, Calif. 90014

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

1060 South Broadway

Los Angeles, California

March 4, 1976

1:45 p.m.

JUANITA GONZALEZ, Reporter



9316

Telephone 625-7615

POLK COURT REPORTERS *Certified Deposition Notaries*

606 S. Olive Street, Suite 307-309, Los Angeles, Calif. 90014

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

PRESENT:

BYRON E. COOK, President

THOMAS G. NEUSOM, Vice President

GEORGE W. BREWSTER (arrived 2:15pm)

ADELINA GREGORY

MARVIN L. HOLEN

JAY B. PRICE

PETE SCHABARUM

GEORGE TAKEI

MR. KISSICK, Secretary

BAXTER WARD (arrived 2:18pm)



P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2
3 MR. COOK: The special meeting of the Board
4 of Directors will come to order.

5 Mr. Secretary, please call the roll.

6 MR. KISSICK: Byron Cook.

7 MR. COOK: Present.

8 MR. KISSICK: Thomas Neusom.

9 MR. NEUSOM: Present.

10 MR. KISSICK: George Brewster.

11 [No response.]

12 MR. KISSICK: Donald Gibbs.

13 [No response.]

14 MR. KISSICK: Adelina Gregory.

15 MS. GREGORY: Present.

16 MR. KISSICK: Marvin Holen.

17 MR. HOLEN: Present.

18 MR. KISSICK: Jay Price.

19 MR. PRICE: Present.

20 MR. KISSICK: Ruth E. Richter.

21 [No response.]

22 MR. KISSICK: Pete Schabarum.

23 [No response.]

24 MR. KISSICK: George Takei.

25 MR. TAKEI: Here.



1 MR. KISSICK: Baxter Ward.

2 [No response.]

3 [Whereupon, Mr. George W. Brewster entered.]

4 MR. COOK: The special meeting of the R.T.D.
5 Board has been called today to receive a progress report
6 from the team of expert consultants which was hired to
7 evaluate and report their findings and recommendations
8 on Supervisor Baxter Ward's Sunset Coastline Rapid Transit
9 Proposal which he has requested the R.T.D. Board to place
10 before the voters in June of this year.

11 The R.T.D. Board will not be making a decision
12 today. We are receiving this progress report today so
13 that the Board can have as much time as possible to consider
14 the consultants' input and, further, so that this information
15 today can be conveyed to the Legislature in a timely manner,
16 inasmuch as they have before them the enabling legislation
17 necessary for a June election on the Rapid Transit Proposal.
18 We will receive the consultant's final written report next
19 week and, following that, will expect to make a decision
20 one way or the other on whether to place the measure before
21 the voters.

22 The consultants we will be hearing from
23 today were asked to review all aspects of Supervisor Ward's
24 proposal, including the socio-economic, environmental, and
25 community impacts and benefits, capital and operating costs,



1 construction feasibilities, construction timespan and,
2 ultimately, the financing feasibility of the program. Last
3 Saturday, the Board and its consultants received the input
4 from a number of agencies and individuals at our all-day
5 study session held at the County Hall of Administration.
6 This proposed program will have a profound impact on our
7 community and it behooves all of us to give it maximum
8 consideration at this time.

9 I would like to call upon General Manager
10 Jack Gilstrap to begin the report.

11 MR. GILSTRAP: Thank you, Mr. President.

12 We're pleased to have the considerable
13 attention that we see being given this report in the
14 audience, and we're particularly pleased to have with us
15 today the Rapid Transit ad hoc committee chaired by
16 Councilman John Ferraro, City of Los Angeles.

17 As you know, we have had this work underway now
18 for a number of days and we've had a team of consultants
19 that we're very pleased with, and have a great deal of
20 confidence in, working under the general coordination of
21 Ralph de la Cruz in our office.

22 I would like to call upon Ralph to introduce
23 the consultants and call upon them to present their report.

24 MR. COOK: Excuse me, Mr. de la Cruz. Before
25 we get into the reports by the consultants, I believe



1 Director Price has a question.

2 MR. PRICE: Thank you, Mr. President.

3 I would ask for the indulgence of the Board
4 for just a few brief moments. I have been in contact this
5 morning with the Chairman of the Transportation Committee
6 of the League of California Cities and he wished for me to
7 express our concern on this AB-1246. I would ask counsel
8 right now before I proceed any further -- and I want to make
9 it as quickly as possible -- is it possible for me -- Do
10 I have the prerogative of addressing a short statement,
11 and hopefully a motion, on an item relating to legislation?

12 MR. POWERS: Yes, Mr. Price. The meeting is,
13 among other things, to consider legislation relating to
14 Rapid Transit; and AB-1246 relates to Rapid Transit; so
15 your discussion would be perfectly all right.

16 MR. PRICE: Under the new legislation of
17 AB-1246 it has been retributive that this new label of
18 government, the one that will be handling all funds
19 relating to transportation and most of the long-range
20 planning; and which our Board has taken an action as of
21 yesterday not to be in opposition but to work with the
22 authors to bring about a satisfactory legislation that
23 will be satisfactory to all. The concern that has been
24 expressed to me today, and I hope the Board would give me
25 the indulgence to allow me to make an amendment to the
motion I made yesterday because under the legislation as



1 it is in our hands now, it winds up with an 11-member Board,
2 the same as we have now -- five by the Board of Supervisors
3 and three by the City of Los Angeles and one by the City of
4 Long Beach. Both Los Angeles and Long Beach are statutory,
5 appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Council. Then
6 the other 75 cities of the county have reduced from four
7 to two members. Now, bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that
8 the L.A. members and the Long Beach members roughly
9 represent about three million people. This is in round
10 figures and the four city, selection city members represent
11 roughly five million people. And so this would be a diminu-
12 tion of one-half of the voting strength of five million
13 people in 75 cities throughout the county.

14 I would humbly request that in our action of
15 yesterday indicating that we are rescinding our opposition
16 as such to 1246 and wish to work with the authors in,
17 shall I say, compromise legislation that will be acceptable
18 to all. Based on the present representations that have
19 been made to me today indicating that five million people
20 of our county representing 75 cities under the new plan
21 are truly going to lose two representatives because Los
22 Angeles and Long Beach -- their members will be statutory
23 confirmed by the Council, and will not be elected by the
24 city selective committee and not representatives of the
25 other 75 cities.



1 I would humbly request that I be able to
2 make a motion that would indicate that our previous action
3 would stand, but that in our reconsideration with the
4 author of the bill that it be indicated that no appointing
5 authority would have its numerical representation on the
6 present R.T.D. Board to be reduced on the new transit
7 commission and that the two cities that receive statutory
8 authority to make appointments to the new transit commission
9 with their council approval not be voting members of the
10 city selection committee of the League of California
11 Cities as is the present case with Los Angeles that appoints
12 its present two members with Council approval and do not
13 vote on the other cities for representatives. In other
14 words, the plea that I'm trying to make is not that I'm
15 against 1246 or our action rescinding our previous
16 disapproval of 1246, but in behalf of five million people
17 and 75 cities where this body is going to be the body that
18 will be the determining body for the handing out or the
19 distribution of federal money, state money, potentially
20 county money, SB-325 money and five money, and they are
21 the ones that are going to be planning the long-range
22 planning.

23 I agree that in all respects 1246 will
24 probably become law, but I certainly do not agree that
25 five million people should lose two of their representatives



Telephone 625-7615

POLK COURT REPORTERS Certified Deposition Notaries

606 S. Olive Street, Suite 307-309, Los Angeles, Calif. 90014

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

in order to set up this new commission. I believe the commission should be set up exactly as it has been proposed to us with the supervisors having five here and five there. Los Angeles would move from two here to three there, statutorily. Long Beach gets one statutorily, not through the city selection committee. We've been reduced to two. We should remain with our same four statutory members and I would like to amend the previous action to that degree, because I think, in all fairness, as honestly and humbly as I can, it's not right for us to take five million people of this county that now have four representatives that represent them at the grass-roots level and say to them, "We're taking two of your representatives away" -- and I didn't say "take them away and give them to somebody else," because I approve of Los Angeles having greater representation and I believe it's right that Long Beach have representation, statutorily; but I do not believe it's right to take five million people and compare them to three million people and reduce their representation from four to two. This is wrong, and I humbly request your indulgence that our staff, in your action of taking away our opposition of 1246 yesterday, would include in that action that we would desire that the Board be -- the new Board -- would be so constituted as to continue to reflect the existing representation as given by the city selection



1 committee of four members.

2 This would, in effect, increase the proposed
3 legislation from 11 members to 13 members; and I would
4 humbly request the Board to accept my amendment to yesterday's
5 motion and I will have to say in all candor, based upon
6 my talks today with the League committee and so forth,
7 that shall I fail, I will fight for this at every meeting
8 from here on out to protect the grass-roots representation
9 of 75 cities of this county until, hopefully, we can win
10 the battle.

11 Mr. President, I so move.

12 MS. GREGORY: Somewhere along the line there
13 was a short motion. If you could, for the benefit of
14 our secretary --

15 MR. COOK: We have the reporter. She got it
16 down.

17 MS. GREGORY: For the short motion Mr. Price
18 just made, I would second it.

19 MR. COOK: All right. We have the motion,
20 seconded.

21 MR. PRICE: This is only to go before the
22 legislature to tell them this is our desire; that's all.
23 I'm not asking for the impossible. I am not asking for
24 the moon. I'm just saying, "Let's don't disenfranchise
25 75 cities and five million people."



29816

Telephone 625-7615

POLK COURT REPORTERS Certified Deposition Notaries

606 S. Olive Street, Suite 307-309, Los Angeles, Calif. 90014

1 MR. COOK: Any discussion on the motion?

2 MR. TAKEI: I think the issue Mr. Price
3 articulates is a very important one and certainly should
4 be considered, but I don't know whether it's appropriate
5 at this point in the discussion for our Board to lock
6 ourselves in on just that. I think the parameters of
7 discussion should be as open and as wide as possible; so
8 I think my feeling at this point is that we should not
9 take a Board action locking ourselves in to just this
10 specific area.

11 MR. COOK: We have on the agenda recommendations,
12 plural, with respect to pending legislation; and while the
13 motion is out of order on the agenda, I think it's a
14 matter for consideration at this time and the fact the
15 Board may or may not approve Mr. Price's motion does not
16 in any way detract from the possibility that other members
17 may bring up any recommendations with respect to 1246.
18 This is a special item.

19 MR. PRICE: All I'm saying is, let us give
20 the staff this flexibility with, you know, my prior motion --
21 you know, so they can lay this before us about if we go
22 through -- and I don't care how thin you want to cut this
23 meeting. If our previous action stands without an action
24 by this Board then it's a tacit approval that our Board
25 recommends or is recommending that five million people and



1 75 cities are going to have their representation reduced.
2 Now don't tell me if we don't say something somebody in
3 Sacramento is going to get a different idea and say,
4 "Let's worry about those five million people and the 75
5 cities." They are not. If we do not make a firm statement
6 that we wish to protect the 75 cities and five million people
7 then I'm sure in Sacramento they're not going to be concerned
8 with this issue. I don't mean to be the dog in the manger,
9 but I feel so strongly over this disenfranchisement of
10 75 cities and five million people that I'm going to fight
11 this battle if it takes an hour at every meeting from here
12 on until the end of this Board; because I don't think it's
13 right and I think our Board should have the flexibility
14 to at least be able to discuss this with the authors of
15 the bill to see that this representation is not diminished
16 because -- follow me -- it's not being diminished for the
17 supervisors and it's not being diminished for Los Angeles.

18 MR. COOK: I think you stated your motion very
19 well.

20 Any further discussion?

21 MR. HOLEN: I would not like the City Council
22 members of the City of Los Angeles to get the idea it does
23 expand the Council's authority over the city's appointees
24 to the new commission. It, in fact, reduces the Los
25 Angeles City Council's authority with respect to approval
of the city's appointees to the new commission -- at least



1 AB-1246 does as it reads today.

2 MR. COOK: Any further discussion?

3 MR. NEUSOM: I would like to say this because
4 I believe that Mr. Price understands my sentiments. What
5 we're talking about is not flexibility, but rigidity
6 because if we start -- we initially said we would talk
7 with the author with the full range of possibilities. Jack
8 had mentioned in his report the addition of two people to
9 represent this Board. All of those are things prospective
10 and to attempt to single one out today and say, "It's
11 something that must be in any negotiated agreement" -- I think
12 -- "or any proposal for acceptable legislation" -- would not
13 be proper, and I think would tie our hands.

14 I have talked with the author and I think we
15 are going to invite him to meet with this Board, and I
16 think what Mr. Price has indicated is something that
17 should be taken up with him when he meets with the Board
18 before the legislation proceeds further.

19 I would simply say that I think to take this
20 action today would be -- would create an additional problem
21 and since we have the other people to make reports, I would
22 -- I'll just confine my comments to that.

23 MR. COOK: I would have to disagree, because
24 I think the sooner the author of this bill is aware of the
25 tenor of the community involved -- I happen to agree with



1 Mr. Price -- we're talking about a diminution only in
2 one area of the Board representation and not of the full
3 Board. Everybody else is being expanded at the cost of
4 the cities and I think that is unfortunate. I think it's
5 unfair and I think the sooner we convey our displeasure
6 to the author of this bill, I think the more likely
7 we will be to have some amendatory legislation.

8 MR. PRICE: Could Mr. Brewster be apprised of
9 what has happened? Because I do not feel we have the
10 six votes. Without the full Board here we may only have
11 about -- Mr. President, we're going to meet again in formal
12 session when?

13 MR. COOK: Tuesday, 11:00 a.m.

14 MR. PRICE: I can see from the tenor that we
15 have at least two no votes and possibly three, which means
16 we only have seven people here. That would only give us
17 a maximum of five votes which is not sufficient to pass
18 this; and I'm not sure we get five votes. We might only
19 get four, which is the city selection committee members
20 themselves because all four of us are here and, this again,
21 might point out very ironically that if the four city
22 selection committee members which are here -- and we would
23 vote to protect ourselves -- we would be voting in the
24 minority -- and would lose the motion. I would ask that
25 in view of the fact I probably would not get six votes,



Telephone 625-7615

POLK COUNTY REPORTERS Certified Deposition Notaries

606 S. Olive Street, Suite 307-309, Los Angeles, Calif. 90014

1 that this be made an item of the agenda for our next formal
2 Board meeting.

3 MR. COOK: You want to move to table it until
4 Tuesday?

5 MR. PRICE: Next formal Board meeting.

6 MR. COOK: All right.
7 We have a motion to table. All in favor
8 indicate by saying "aye."

9 MR. GILSTRAP: The 9th of May, 11:00 a.m.?

10 MR. PRICE: May?

11 MR. GILSTRAP: I'm sorry, March.

12 MR. PRICE: Those of you that spoke against
13 it, -- March the 9th happens to be my birthday -- how about
14 you guys coming through on March 9th on my birthday with
15 a little bit better comment than I heard so far today.

16 MR. COOK: We have a motion to table the
17 matter until next Tuesday's meeting. All in favor indicate
18 by saying "aye."

19 [Chorus of ayes.]

20 MR. COOK: Opposed.

21 [No response.]

22 MR. COOK: The ayes have it.

23 So ordered.

24 The matter has been tabled and we will continue.

25 MR. WILKINSON: Is there a chance we can hear



1 the presentation today?

2 MR. COOK: That was the next item on the
3 agenda.

4 MR. GILSTRAP: Mr. President, I would like
5 now to call upon Ralph de la Cruz to introduce the
6 consultants' team and ask them to proceed with their
7 presentation.

8 MR. de la CRUZ: Thank you. In view of the
9 time, we will move on rapidly.

10 I want to state your Board has hired a team
11 of very expert consultants and they are as follows:

12 DeLeuw, Cather & Company; Gruen Associates;
13 Mobility Systems & Equipment Company; and Stanford Research
14 Institute.

15 The basic charge has been to review and evaluate
16 and make some recommendations on the Sunset Coast Line
17 Proposal proposed by Supervisor Baxter Ward.

18 The firm of DeLeuw, Cather & Company represented
19 by its principal, Mr. Emmanuel Diamond, senior vice-president
20 in the company, will discuss with you, as per their basic
21 charge, the construction feasibility, capital costs,
22 operating costs, and the feeder systems as described in
23 the proposal.

24 Gruen Associates represented by Mr. Ki Suk Park,
25 senior vice-president within Gruen, will give an overview of



1 the environmental, socio-economic, land-use planning,
2 and community benefits and impacts as described in the
3 proposal.

4 Mr. Don Green, associate executive director of
5 the Stanford Research Institute will discuss with you the
6 escalation factors applicable within the proposal, the
7 bonding requirements and, in a sense, the financial
8 feasibility of the proposal.

9 Mr. George Adams, president of Mobility
10 Systems & Equipment Company, will discuss with you the
11 adaptability of the freeways for the proposal, equipment
12 availability and energy requirements.

13 Again, let me review -- I would like for Mr.
14 Ki Suk Park to give a very brief overview and then to
15 be followed by Mr. Manny Diamond and then Mr. Donald Green
16 of Stanford Research and George Adams of Mobility Systems.

17 MR. PARK: Thank you, Ralph.

18 Mr. President and Members of the Board.

19 We have evaluated the Sunset Coast Line
20 report and as documented in the report itself, no
21 attempt has been made to compare this plan with other
22 alternatives. Basically, the plan proposed an extensive
23 countywide transit coverage, rail transit coverage in
24 most of the cities in the Los Angeles County area. The
25 system covers over 200 miles and it provides an alternative



29816
Telephone 625-7615

1 means for travel to automobiles commensurate with the size
2 and scale of the Los Angeles County population and the
3 geographic area.

4 The proposal makes a commitment that the
5 system will be built in accordance with the land, substantially
6 in accordance with the land, and in a relatively short time
7 period. It specifies the names of the cities to be served
8 directly or indirectly and also gives the cities the right
9 of approval of station locations and this concept of
10 guaranty of equity in service is a key feature of the
11 plan.

12 Now, because of this extensive transit coverage
13 I believe certain lines will carry a high level of
14 transit service patronage, and certain lines undoubtedly
15 carry low level transit service. On the other hand, if
16 those lines now carrying high level transit patronage
17 are eliminated, then the transit network will be much
18 smaller, possibly concentrating in central cities and
19 thus defeating the key feature or weakening the key feature
20 of the plan, namely, equitable coverage throughout the
21 county.

22 In terms of environmental impact, because of
23 the extensive use of freeway rights-of-way and railroads
24 and flood control channels, it's basically a low impact
25 alternative. In terms of displacement, relocation and
speeding construction and minimizing potential litigation



1 and delays.

2 However, in terms of the arterial, the situation
3 will be slightly different. Special consideration should
4 be given to those lines which are utilized in arterials.
5 In this proposal it's approximately 19 miles where impact
6 could be very significant depending on the alinement, station
7 location and also vertical configuration.

8 Just to give you some idea what kind of impact
9 the freeway related configuration looked like -- I'd like
10 to ask Jim to show some slides on the screen.

11 This slide shows you the guideway in the
12 median of the freeway. Basically, the purpose of this
13 drawing is to indicate to you that in order to clear the
14 overcrossings or undercrossings in the freeway itself,
15 the guideway has to be substantially higher. Sometimes
16 it would have to be 45 to 50 feet high to clear the
17 overcrossing.

18 Next slide, please.

19 If you are using on the side banks of the
20 freeway, it also has the same kind of situation. To
21 clear the crossing traffic, the guideway has to be
22 substantially higher; so either you have a road across
23 the track or the guideway has to be at a substantially
24 higher level throughout the entire system.

25 The next slide.

