

Wednesday, January 5, 2011

6:30-7:30 PM

Minutes

San Fernando Valley
Service Council

Regular Meeting

Marvin Braude Constituent Service Center
6262 Van Nuys Blvd.
Van Nuys, CA 91401

Call to Order

Council Members:

Gary Bric
Michael Cano
Jesus R. Ochoa
Kymberleigh Richards, Acting Chair
Donald Weissman

Officers:

Jon Hillmer, Director
Wilbur Babb, Communications Manager
Suzanne Handler, Council Secretary



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Please turn off cell phones or put them on vibrate

Representative Kymberleigh Richards presiding until Chair Arvizu arrives

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. APPROVE Minutes for December 1, 2010 meeting - approved and seconded
3. Chairs Remarks – no chair remarks
4. Public Comment
 - Vince Garofla, quoted a poem he wrote. January 1, 2011 on Van Nuys Blvd., heading Northbound, the driver pointed across the street, (did not elaborate on why the driver pointed).
 - Faramarz Nabavi, I'll mention two things today; encourage staff to present to the governance council at the February hearing, perhaps some of the concepts and terms of the levels of service that they are going to provide for each of the changes they are anticipating. There is relevance here, when the December service changes were implemented staff had suggested to the council that the cuts in weekend service on the Ventura Rapid would be used in part to augment the local service. What I found after calculating the number of trips is that actually there was a net cut of service on Sundays and a very small increase on Saturdays. I don't think that the governance council was aware that staff was anticipating doing this. Perhaps, staff was not aware of this either, it may have happened afterward. Also the number of weekday trips that were cut on the eastbound segment was 55 trips from the Rapid compared to 63 weekend trips by eliminating the whole service. So again, the amount of service that was cut on weekdays was almost the same as the weekend service. The governance council was not told that was being considered. Although in terms of public notice requirements that may be less percentage-wise than is required. I think it would benefit the governance council to be able to consider what staff is thinking when it is trying to provide guidance to staff in terms of cuts. So I would like to encourage staff to provide that information at the February hearing.

Representative Richards, let me ask a pertinent question based on that public comment. I've always operated under the presumption that staff determines service levels based upon the data we have on what the actual ridership is. In the case of the 750 we knew that the 750 was carrying a far lower passenger



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

load than it should have. I would like to get this bone of contention out of the way, could we have staff provide as a board box item a review of how the service was reallocated as a result of the 750 rapid cut? I am presuming if we are running less service on Sunday we did not have enough passengers overall on Sunday to support service levels, but without getting a report from staff I cannot say that for sure.

Jon Hillmer, the service levels are based upon the ridership levels, the more riders we have the more service you would be provided, in case of Ventura Blvd., they reallocated some of that resource to additional running time and then scheduled according to actual demand. When the weekend rapid was canceled they assumed all of those riders who were on the remaining rapid would be put on to the local. So they combined those two together to determine the level of local service that would be provided on the 150.

Representative Richards, presumably we were running a level of service on Line 150 prior to the December shakeup that was adequate without creating too long of a gap between service. Once we took the Rapid off there and combined the ridership it turned out we could alter the headway.

5. RECEIVE Director's Report, Jon Hillmer

- Performance Report for November 2010
 - On-Time Performance: Metro Target 80.0%, San Fernando Valley 76.6% achieved in San Fernando Valley
 - Complaints per 100,000 passengers: Metro Target 2.52; San Fernando Valley Target 2.94; November San Fernando Valley 2.86
 - Miles Between Mechanical Road Calls: Metro Target 3,664; San Fernando Valley Target 3,635; San Fernando Valley November 4,707
 - Accidents per 100,000 Miles; Metro Target 3.14; San Fernando Valley Target 2.32; San Fernando Valley November 3.20
 - Ridership in San Fernando Valley: Target is 4,890,000; San Fernando Valley November 4,870,000
- System-wide Road Calls by type
 - Council requested breakdown on Engine road calls
 - 338, stalls; 130 slow bus; 120 check engine light; 54 throttle; 50 no start; 29 ECM fault light; 28 no start - crank; 22 engine hot; 12 no start, no crank; 11 misses; 10 smoke/fire; 3 fan belt; 3 on rear run; 1 fire alarm activated
- Ridership Trends for Orange Line
 - 2 year trend January 2009, 20,000 riders during the week; November 2010, 21,500: Weekends are showing steady, with a dip in ridership in November 2010.



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

- Revenue Hour Trends for Bus and Rail
 - FY2010 estimated \$337,642,350, actual \$307,906,996: FY2011 estimated 335,351,412, actual as of November 2010 \$342,000,000
- Metro Board Actions in December
 - Artesia Transit Center Improvement Project
 - Life or project budget
 - Consult with South Bay Cities COG
 - Wilshire BRT Project
 - Approve without Condo Canyon segment
 - Reanalyze project
 - FEIR/EA to be considered again in Spring
 - Regional Fare System Plan
 - Return in February 2011 with results of meeting with LACMOA
 - Return with implementation Plan
- Line Rides on Proposed Service Changes
 - Jon Hillmer will set up line rides for 183, 634 and on a weekend Line 794, will be sending out an itinerary and all are welcome

Representative Cano, targets, what is the recourse if the different regions do not reach their targets? Will there be penalties?

Jon Hillmer, typically we have targets, 320,000 hours of service reductions a good piece of that is coming from service level reductions, the remainder of that will be coming from service route modifications.

Representative Cano, let me clarify, performance targets, what happens, how does that work, how binding are they?

Jon Hillmer, well the targets are binding in terms they will stay that way for the year, now what happens when we don't reach it or we have certain areas that don't reach their targets, I don't really know. They have created an on-time-performance task force, for example, "what is the cause for the failure." That turns out to be a combination of issues, schedules may not be adequate, supervisors/operators who may not be able to manage the service well, management at divisions who are not counseling the operators aggressively enough, all those are going to play into it, since we do have the ATMS system are we using that aggressively enough to monitor the operators. I cannot tell you if there will be personnel actions. Some bus routes have very poor on-time performance and this is due to construction, we have pulled out a couple of bus routes in this report due to construction on Santa Monica Blvd. We are monitoring everything else, downturn in on-time performance we had approached 75% system-wide then we dropped. That seemed to have occurred right around September when students come back, nonetheless,



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

schedules are created to be robust enough that they can take care of most of the anomalies that take place within a margin.

6. REVIEW Bylaws for Service Councils, Jon Hillmer, Director of Service Councils
Jon Hillmer, we have had a very good exchange of information, e-mailed to all of the council members. I've listed out the suggested changes, highlighting those where they substituted words or phrases. The vast majority is acceptable and I propose to implement them into the by-laws. There have been suggestions that we build up the councils' responsibilities. More overview of rail service, facilities more in tune with what needs to be done to make it work better, as well as better cooperation and coordination with municipal operators. I will be inviting munis and local return operators to come to our council meetings on a quarterly basis. Did receive a few phone calls from muni GM's concerned with the councils taking a management role in the munis function. I had to reassure them that this was not the intent it would be an information exchange on opportunities for better communication and cooperation. Better service at a lower operating cost.

My plan is to take this to the Board in February for approval. This is the final round of information and comments. Potential modification to the name, we spoke of Governing Councils, it has been suggested that maybe a better term would be something that conveys a local or purposeful name. Three suggestions have come up, local service councils, community service councils or Metro service councils. Any other suggestions?

Representative Richards, if I may respond to that, I've been fluctuating in what I have been calling us has been either a "regional service council" or "local service council" simply for that reason. If we are not to be called governance councils anymore, and the sectors have been turned into regions, they "regional" seems to make sense. I oppose to being called "representatives" that is still a point of contention. When I was a service representative with Pac Bell, I represented the service in that area; however, I do not feel this is a position where I am representing. This is a council and we are members, I feel we are council members. The Metro Citizens Advisory Council or CAC they are called council members. If the CAC which has no decision making authority, can be called council members, then we who do have some authority to make some decisions should also be called council members.

Representative Cano, I agree with you.

Representative Richards, I like being called a local service council or regional service council, it does define what we do.



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Representative Ochoa, the last one you mentioned, really appeals to me “metro service council” because we are Metro and when you mention it, people will know exactly what you are talking about. But I do agree with your point, as a representative, I think that gives the wrong impression. Whereas when you are a council member, you are representing the public and we are here to contribute as such. When you use the label “representative” that gives a whole different meaning.

Representative Richards, I don’t see any problem with us being “Metro San Fernando Valley Local Service Council” or “Metro San Fernando Valley Regional Service Council” once it gets into print the word “Metro” should become part of the first line. I can see where we could incorporate “Metro”.

Representative Ochoa, when you use “San Fernando Valley” it’s not necessary to use “local” or “regional” it is implied.

Representative Cano, Metro San Fernando Valley Service Council.

Jon Hillmer since San Fernando Valley is first up I will make sure I convey to all the other councils the idea that “representative vs. member” is an issue. And relative to the name there is still a variety.

Representative Bric, under Article I and Article II is speaks of the regular transit consumer residing in the region, that we use the public transit, 50% of the council use it regularly, I don’t know if I qualify for that.

Jon Hillmer, what we have is the 50% as regular transit users is actually a carryover from the existing by-laws. We expect council members to use public transit and that half of them would be regular transit users. Regular transit user is someone who uses public transit multiple times in a month. We will not be keeping track of who is riding and who is not riding, it’s the expectation the council members will use public transit.

Representative Weissman, on the draft of the by-laws regional service councils has already been inserted, wondering if the choice of that phrase is now “fait accompli”.

Jon Hillmer, regional service councils is a term we thought conveyed enough meaning of what the council’s main purpose was.

Representative Cano, is this a phrase that describes all the councils?

Jon Hillmer, that also created a problem in perception that you were responsible for the entire region, does that include all of LA County? Include



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Orange County? That is when it became clear we needed to revisit the branding. Including Metro into the name would be helpful.

Representative Richards, keeping our original name of “Metro San Fernando Valley, etc.” should go a long way towards clearing up some of those misconceptions of what does regional mean.

Jon Hillmer, one thing of note in the by-laws is to normalize council terms so they all begin on July 1st and go for three years. That will mean we will need to adjust some of the terms relying on the council to make those decisions. However, I will come back with a method, but it will be up to the council to decide. This will be done after the board approves the revised by-laws.

Representative Ochoa, to add another vice chair as a consideration. Today, that would have come in handy.

Council members, no additional responsibilities.

Jon Hillmer, we could do this on an optional basis allowing each council to decide if that would be necessary.

7. RECEIVE Customer Satisfaction Survey Input, Jeff Boberg, Transportation Planning Manager IV

We have two main surveys that we do once every two years, telephone survey of the general public and riders, this is done every year. This year we did both of them at the same time, as well as a focus group on riders and potential riders. The focus of the group is why people choose metro and why they don't. Transit attitudes, on-board customer satisfaction survey, we get between 15,000 – 17,000 completed surveys per annum. We do 98% of our ridership. We do a general public tracking survey, every two years on awareness and perception of the program for generally non-metro riders.

For those who have a choice, bus vs. automobile and why they made the switch to Metro, convenience, money, parking, etc. For the people who do not take Metro they talk about how long it takes. 80% of the people, who took the telephone survey, said they were within a mile of a bus stop. Access is not necessarily a problem, it is convenient access. Others felt it was a complicated trip or it took a long time and they could get to their destination faster by driving. Plus of course there is the stigma, but when they travel they use transit in other cities.



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Asked the non-riders to rate our system vs. the riders of our system. The riders of our system rated us above the non-riders under rapid, safe, efficient, competent, trustworthy and friendly. Customer satisfaction was 85%, bus on time 75%; schedule meets needs 89%; courteous 83%; metro has improved service 78%, seat available 83%, bus broken down 78%; and, easy to buy passes 78%. There are fewer people taking Metro due to the recession and less commuters during an 8 year survey, Spring of 2002 was at 26%; Spring of 2006 was 34%; and, Spring of 2010 was 25%. Nearly half of our riders have a smart phone, and 70% have a cell phone. The awareness level of Metro is at 98% and only 2% are unaware of Metro's services.

The public perspective (non-riders) of the service is: Satisfied with service 50%; Stops and stations are safe 57%; Buses and trains are safe 75%; cleanliness 58%; considerate of residents 57%; Cares about service 58%; and uses tax dollars wisely 33%.

77% of the residents use internet for transit information. On the heavily used corridors it was fairly even on car vs. transit during the competitive analysis only one corridor North Hollywood to Downtown showed more car usage than transit rider. This was Google transit where the information was used to make the comparisons of riding transit vs. driving a car.

8. Chair and Council Member Comments no chair comment

Representative Bric, thank you for coming I am sure we will have a full room for our public hearing in February. See you then.

Representative Weissman, wishing everyone a happy and healthy new year.

Representative Richards, I did the last half of the 168 trip on December 10, and the entire westbound trip. I had a chance to explain to a couple of disgruntled riders why their bus was going away after today, most of them understood it, one person thought we should run the bus even if he was the only one on it. The very last part of the westbound trip we had all of 4 revenue paying passengers, end to end.

Jon Hillmer, I would like to do a recap of all action items.

- Ventura Blvd. analysis,
- add to by-laws for 2nd vice chair,
- mention to all of the other councils members vs. representatives,

Representative Richards, we will adjourn with a reminder to the public there will not be a council meeting in February there will be a public hearing on the



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

service changes for June 2011, it will be February 2, 2011 at 6:30pm. The afternoon before there will be an all regions Public Hearing which will be in the Metro Board room at 5pm on Tuesday, February 1. Each of the regions will have a representative attending.

Adjourned: 7:50pm



Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Metro