

Wednesday, December 1, 2010

6:45-10:00 PM

Minutes

San Fernando Valley
Governance Council

Regular Meeting

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

Call to Order

Council Members:

Richard Arvizu, Chair
Brad Rosenheim, Vice Chair
Gary Bric
Michael Cano
Jesus R. Ochoa
Kymberleigh Richards
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

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. APPROVE Minutes for November 3, 2010 meeting – approved and seconded
3. Chairs Remarks

Dr. Arvizu, Chair remarks

We had a good meeting this afternoon with CEO Art Leahy at the Meet and Confer with all the councils. It was encouraging to hear where we are and where we are going even though the economy is bad. Some of things Metro has been doing is reducing personnel, being more efficient and more effective with the potential changes to some of the routes we have among the 5 various councils. It looks like Metro will be in fairly good shape might be in the black again. Hopefully, one of these years the economy will turn around and we again will have increased ridership.

I'll open it up to the council members.

4. Public Comment

Vince Garozalo, good evening, I am going to share some personal matters that might entertain everybody. In the spirit of Christmas. On December 25 2008, I was on Van Nuys Blvd. and Blythe, anyone who knows that area knows it is very busy, on this particular evening it was dead as a door nail which gave new meaning to the following. (Vince sang Silent Night)

5. RECEIVE Director's Report, Jon Hillmer

- Performance Report for October
 - On Time Performance, we are continuing to take a descent system-wide for October it was 72% for OTP, Valley was 75.3% the system has come down the last two months. We've placed more street supervision and more active bus operations control monitoring of our service via the ATMS. This system is being upgraded, it polls every 5 minutes, but with the upgrade it will poll every 3 minutes, and will provide better information on real-time. This information is provided to the street supervisors in their vehicles. As we reduce our service, we are not reducing field supervisors or instructors.
 - Complaints per 100,000 riders, our target is 2.5 system-wide again we had a challenge with 3.65. The SFV has a higher target of 2.94 but showed at 3.83 with a year to date of 3.47.
 - **Representative Cano**, do we have ability on the web-site to do a line-by-line complaint system.



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

- Jon Hillmer it is not on the web-page, but I receive a line level complaint but I can generate a chart showing 180 bus lines. You will find that our heaviest lines have the most complaints.
- **Representative Cano**, if I am a consumer and upset about a certain line, I cannot just click on the line and write my complaint, it is not available.
- Jon Hillmer generally speaking it usually is about the bus operator it is important for the customer to get the bus number, date and time of day and we can identify the line and bus operator.
- Miles between Mechanical Road Calls, Metro Target is 3,664, system-wide it was 3,292. SFV's target is 3,635 but increased to 4,555 which is above both targets.
- Accidents per 100,000 Miles, target system-wide is 3.14 October was 3.20. SFV's target is 2.32 we are below the system, but increased in October to 3.09, year to date for SFV is 2.78. System-wide the accidents are usually not the operators fault. The highest accident numbers come from buses standing at a stop and getting hit from behind by another vehicle.
- Monthly ridership is up both System-wide at 30,390,000 and SFV 5,200,000 targets are 29,400,000 and 4,890,000 respectively.
- Metro Orange Line Ridership is steady at 24,000 average weekday highest ridership number we have had in the past 18 months.
- Overview of Road Calls
Mechanical Road Calls by Type range from Engine at 34% this is consistent throughout the system, Doors 14%, Electrical System 8%, Transmission 7%, and it goes down from there, except for one type "others" which is at 19%. Bring more detail on type of Engine problems at next months meeting.
 - **Representative Rosenheim**, we noticed when we had an older fleet, the breakdowns were more frequent, but since adding newer buses, our road calls have decreased.
 - Jon Hillmer, typically a new type of bus comes in we have slightly higher road calls for 6 months when we are breaking in the new engine, then for the next 5 years or so it is a very good bus. During that 5 years although we have put on 250,000 miles. The diesel engines would last for 500-600,000 CNG are lasting longer than that. But after 5 years, some of the components start to wear out. If it does not go through a mid-life rehab, it becomes problematic.
- Revenue Hour Trends
Metro Bus and Rail Revenue budgeted hours from fiscal year 2004 to 2011; Bus Hours in 2004, 7,326,700 and 2011, 7,212,100 decrease of -



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

2%; Rail in 2004, 676,300 and 2011, 715,500 increase of 6% these are car hours not train hours.

6. REVIEW Bylaws for Service Councils, Jon Hillmer, Director of Service Councils
This is an important document report, when the service sectors were created in 2002, they had general managers and each of the sectors had responsibility for the bus lines that ran out of those divisions. The General Managers had responsibility for those divisions so they had line responsibilities for the managers, mechanics, supervisors team of planners schedule makers, community relations, even labor relations. Since we recentralized and no longer have general managers, it is incumbent upon us to review the bylaws. At a minimum we need to refocus the bylaws to recognize the fact of the changes made by the recentralization. Also, following in the direction of Mr. Leahy, we want to take the opportunity to strengthen the roles of the governing councils. The primary change being proposed is that the governance councils would be fully responsible for all the bus lines, including contract bus lines that operate within their area. Presently the Board has to approve all tier 1 route changes; those are rapid lines or bus lines that have more than 10,000 boardings per week day. If adopted by the Board, councils would have full responsibility to make those changes for all the lines. Conan Cheung would report to the Board of Directors as an information only item on approved changes. The Board of course has the authority to overrule any decision made by the councils, which they have done already to tier 2 and 3 lines. So they would retain that ability.

Among the other important changes is the fact it recognizes the position of a Regional Director who reports directly to Paul Taylor, Deputy CEO. He will be required to contact the councils to get feedback on the performance of the Regional Director.

Other important issues are riding the bus service, it is the expectation that council members would ride transit; we would like to see the council members ride transit. It does not have to be Metro. Generate a standard report that you could fill out your bus ride and any issues that were apparent. Return the form to me for any immediate resolution.

Terms, we have terms that begin and end at various times of the year, we need to realign so they all begin July 1, 3 of them each year for renewal, so they are staggered over a 3 year period. This would entail some council members extending their term to meet the new criteria. It will be up to the councils to recommend how they wish to handle the new term extensions.



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Once we review the councils input will we determine which Board meeting to present our final bylaws, either January or February. Any questions or comments.

Chair Arvizu, has everyone had a chance to review the proposed changes to the bylaws?

Jon Hillmer, I am not asking for your final comments today. You are the first council to see this, San Gabriel Valley will be the last and their meeting is on the 13th. So I am looking to get comments in by the 15th of December if at all possible.

Representative Ochoa, just for clarification, is it a one year term?

Staff, no it is still for three years staggered.

Representative Rosenheim, I guess I want to take a step back and remind everyone why this body was formed. This came out of an effort to create a zone in the San Fernando Valley and as a means of placating the San Fernando Valley residents, the Board created the Sectors.

The intent was to provide local governance over local operation, and much more direct control for the ridership and operations. That was the intent and it evolved out of conflict. What we have seen since Mr. Leahy came in from outside of the area, is a unilateral effort, to reverse that local orientation. As I understand it he brought a report to one of the Committees as a Receive and File in essence to transition these sectors to the control of downtown and eliminate the local control by eliminating the general managers, staff, planners, schedule-makers and direct oversight of the areas.

The new bylaws officially creates that transition, as I see it. I for one fundamentally object to how this has been done. I do not think given my understanding of the initial action of the Board several years ago when these things were formed it was an action of the Board that created the sectors. It seems to me that without the Board's action on the original proposal by Mr. Leahy, other than a Receive and File to a committee, that this means nothing from a technical perspective. If I were a Board member, I would be very upset that a new CEO outside of the system came in and usurped a previous Board action without going back to the Board getting their concurrence, number 1; and, number 2, evaluating the potential that this may bring for a future activity to creating zones again this council and sector was created to quell.



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

I for one am not comfortable with this, or maybe they don't care because the Valley is quiet. I don't know if that will remain consistent if local involvement and greater control is eliminated.

Representative Cano, Mr. Leahy was involved with operations prior to the Service Sectors being created. It is more like a circle.

Representative Rosenheim, he brought it back to where he was familiar with originally, things evolve.

Representative Cano, is this driven more by the budget? What is the rationale?

Jon Hillmer, I don't believe it was a financial move, I think what Mr. Leahy was looking at was the poor performance and poor quality of service. The variety of decision-making processes particularly with operations, not necessarily for the schedules or bus routes, but it had to do with how each operating division was managed. There seemed to be a difference of management approaches and structure. This led to disparate treatment among labor.

Representative Rosenheim, I could argue that was the whole idea to bring it local so each sector could function a little independently to craft themselves toward the community and their needs. I think after reflecting back on the report that was brought to the committee, there was an inference there was a cost element. I think the predominate was the centralization and consistency of service, but there was some reference to financial aspect because my question at that point was where is the financial analysis that demonstrates that it is actually going to save money, because there was none.

Representative Cano, I recall there was something about the overhead consolidation, removing 5 general managers.

Jon Hillmer, that got mixed in with the overall reduction of staff due to budget issues. So it may not be possible to come up with a specific number that was associated with the savings of recentralization.

Representative Richards, I am inclined to agree philosophically with Mr. Rosenheim, because he is correct. The service sectors were created by a decision of the Board of Directors. From a legal standpoint that decision has never been reversed by the Board. So it comes down to a question does the CEO have the authority to override the previous Board's decision? I would have to say that it probably doesn't, because then CEO Roger Snoble, would have created the sectors without their approval.



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

As far as the reasoning of why Mr. Leahy wanted to recentralize I had several conversations around this time with our former service development manager, Michael Brewer. Mr. Brewer indicated to me that one problem we had with the sector model, was in our scheduling department. Each sector had its own schedule makers operating independently of the system as a whole and there were places where connections were missed and anything of connectivity was thrown apart because this line was run by this sector and the other line was run by the other sector and schedule makers were not talking to each other. From that standpoint, I can see wisdom in consolidating scheduling. Once you do that you have to consolidate service planning as well.

When you change a line it is going to impact another sector potentially if that line you are changing crosses the boundary. I will say that in the perspective of service councils and we started out as governance councils and I am one of the original appointees to this council, for me it has always been about the service and the decisions about the service and less about how a division manager chooses to manage their division. The most important part of this has always been the visibility of Metro and the availability for local passengers to come to a local governing body with their concerns and for the service change process, specifically the public hearing to take place in a local venue. Prior to the sectors every service change program was accompanied by an hour's long area-wide public hearing held on a Saturday morning at the headquarters building. This part of the process is the most important thing we have done.

Philosophically, I agree with you Mr. Rosenheim it does not sound kosher.

Representative Bric, the Board is inviting our comments on these proposed changes, is this council going to be voting yea or nay on these proposed changes? And if we say No, are they going to be implemented anyway? What if three of the five councils say they do not agree with these changes?

Jon Hillmer, that would be extremely serious to the implementation of these changes. If the councils decide there are significant changes that need to be made within the text of this document, that is a different issue. We are not asking for a vote up or down, we are asking for comments and if the council wishes to have unanimous or majority vote that says they do not like this at all, that is up the council's prerogative.

Representative Cano, but it is not up to us to vote to approve or reject these changes?



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Representative Weissman, as decision makers of this council we propose to cut lines and add will the Board adhere to our recommendations.

Jon Hillmer, your approval of the service changes would go to the Board as an information item, right now if it is a tier 1 route it has to go to the Board for approval. The Board has in the past taken a look at tier 1 and 2 changes and made adjustments to the council findings. In this case you would have authority over all the routes including contract routes for service changes.

Representative Rosenheim, but at the end of the day, as I understood it, the Board could reverse any decision made.

Representative Richards, they have always had that authority they simply delegated it to us, legally they have the final responsibility.

Jon Hillmer, if they want to make a change they have to bring it back next month as a Board of Director item.

Chair Arvizu, as it stands right now, you need our comments back by the 15th of December.

Jon Hillmer if there is significant concerns the council can submit a majority report or it can be individual items brought up by the councils.

Representative Rosenheim, ok how many of us would actually take the time after this meeting to write specifically about comments about this, I have strong feelings and I won't do it, because I think it would be meaningless. If this council felt like we want to send a message to the Board that we do not agree with this direction because we were not given an opportunity when the staff report was brought to the Board committee, we were made aware but not given an opportunity to comment, this would be our opportunity to make a comment that we are not necessarily satisfied with the changing role that the director has brought forth for the sectors.

Representative Rosenheim, I guess my point is, this officially enacts what was done months ago, and I did not necessarily agree with that at the time and was not given a chance to have any input. This is our chance to say we don't agree with the fact the general manager was removed, we don't agree with the fact the scheduling was centralized, operations was centralized, and that you have essentially taken the compromised position that was made to the zone effort and eliminated it, or reduced its function and influence. That is the point. So if we said we do not support these by-law changes that is a message. If we comment that we don't like the wording that will be fairly meaningless.



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Chair Arvizu, anyone else have strong comments, or minor changes to the proposed bylaws.

Jon Hillmer, just for clarification Representative Rosenheim, is the issue that the system has been recentralized or it was centralized without consultation and Board Action? Or both?

Representative Rosenheim, it's really both. The bottom line is I believe taking away more and more from the governance will lead towards the same thing that happened years ago, trying to split apart the Metro. Strategically, I don't know if anyone has given any thought to this, but I would not be surprised that could happen and we would go through the same thing.

Representative Cano, these are long standing issues that most of the Board may not be aware of, it has turned over quite a bit since the sectors and councils were established. My concern is that this only went to EMAC and not the full the Board, it is not just an administrative document this is the arm of Metro into the region where people can interface with the communities they are serving. We need to have an understanding of what these things are and sector councils need more time to digest and not get rushed because it is on a bureaucratic trail, we have to live with it for a while. Do you think more time is needed in this case to understand it better?

Representative Rosenheim, I have a personal philosophical position, so it would not necessarily change my mind dramatically, but others may feel more comfortable if they had a chance to study it more carefully.

Representative Richards, I am going to make a slight suggestion, I wonder even with the system recentralized, the language needs to clarify that because the council has responsibility for the service change programs, that we also have the ability to set policy for the planning, scheduling and operation of those lines within our region. That we would gain the benefits of the reconsolidation of those functions, but retain the council's role in setting the policies under which we plan, schedule and operate services. Maybe there needs to be language that strengthens those responsibilities. Would that fend off the potential chance of zones again, if we retained some of our authority over those functions?

Jon Hillmer, I was involved in the zone applications for the San Fernando Valley, involved in the internal group of Metro employees created the sector concept and worked in San Gabriel Valley. As I recall the creation of the zones was to give local jurisdiction more control over the service. We did do a



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

study on the zones and it became a little costly because of the labor contracts, it was doable but ended up having to cost more money. I will check and see what the status is, but I do believe this document will do what you say and codify the centralization. This document does provide more local control over the issues for each of the regions, more overview of all the bus service without having the Board looking over the “shoulder” for all major services, provides a work plan that we would be developing for each of the regions each year. Defining what we intend to do and what we are looking for and provides input of each individual council member or council group into service quality issues. Move in the direction of strengthening that role, again I will check to see about the issue with our legal department on the centralization vs. a Board action in 2002.

Representative Cano, I love to hear about oversight but I want to know the budget implications for this to provide more budget available to the councils for communication and outreach efforts. We had major issues with Metro where we could not do bus drops within a two week period because we had to get the branding right on it through the downtown office. Budget control what the sector has what the protocol is what we control. I don’t want to be in the situation where the councils are making great suggestions then having no authority to implement due to budget constraints.

Jon Hillmer that was one of the issues raised early on, was very limited if any budget control from the sectors to the General Manager. The budgets were created the GM’s had input to the budget, but the councils themselves were not a part of that process. Rather when the budgets were finalized it was presented to the councils as “fait accompli” track the compliance with the budget. That issue of the communications grant there was money that was pulled out of communications thanks to the effort of Board members.

Representative Rosenheim, reflecting back to we as a council had instructed one being express service on the Orange Line, that was going to be doing a pilot program to see how some additional peak hour express might work. The other Orange Line was reaching capacity and that there was an opportunity to obtain larger buses with higher capacity but there needed to be some state legislation to modify some of the vehicle code section to allow those buses to run on public streets to get to and from the maintenance yards. I don’t think that has ever happened. So what you are telling me if we ask for changes that affects the San Fernando Valley it will get implemented and or consideration will be given and we’ll get reports back on those requests and that this will lean towards that? That would be wonderful, that would be good and helpful, I don’t see that happening, and I see the opposite. If this added responsibility and consultation with the sectors for local planning issues of a broader scope,



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

for instance, the 405 freeway and how to accommodate service across the hill during construction may be taken advantage of that opportunity to enhance service so people would have an alternative, that would be wonderful.

Jon Hillmer, I would say the intent is just the exact opposite, the intent is to give the councils more input to service planning, scheduling and more input into service quality issues as well. Again, my job is dependent upon providing good service to each and every one of the councils. I am motivated to make sure that the input that you want is done. Cannot guarantee that everything you want gets implemented but a minimum is to bring back to you the issues and bring back staff to explain those issues. Very similar to what we are going to do today on the Canoga Park Station, which is another design issue that could have been addressed if the council had been involved early enough? Very similar with what we did on little Tokyo station off the Gold Line where there is virtually no bus facility for people to transfer from the Gold Line to a bus to get into downtown Los Angeles. The council has more leverage than a staff member does.

Chair Arvizu, I have a recommendation, it sounds to me like we need more time to digest it, and really think through the whole concept of changing what the councils were initially. Is it possible to bring this issue up again in January?

Jon Hillmer, I would love to have comment so we can fine tune this, if the council would like to have a minority report or a sub-text which indicates dissatisfaction with the centralization process without a consultation, it can also be done.

Representative Richards, in light of Mr. Rosenheim's comments and the question you just asked, and Mr. Hilmar's answer, I am going to move that this council have the opportunity to review the document again after all the input has been received and specifically not go to the Board of Directors until after we have reviewed it again. – Motion passes

Representative Cano, who is running this show? EMAC? Who is synthesizing all these changes?

Jon Hillmer, Paul Taylor, Lynda Bybee, Art Leahy, Conan Cheung, and myself.

Representative Cano, this needs to go to the finance and budget committees.

Public Comment



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Faramaz Nabari, I would like to echo some of the issues raised by Representatives Rosenheim and Richards. I think that it is important that regional service councils be able to provide meaningful insight into the service planning process and that is one of the key benefits that stakeholders have of this body of the time that you are dedicating to these meetings.

Under Article VII: Authority, there is a change to “councils would call public hearings pertaining to “all bus route changes within the sectors including rapid bus,” now it says “call public hearings pertaining to significant bus route changes with the Councils jurisdiction”. What this means is a reversal of direction towards more centralized decision making. It actually specifically states in another section of the bylaws minor route changes could be done preemptively and then reported to the service councils within 6 months. I am not saying this is a bad thing, it may be good to give staff that flexibility, but I think it is important to make sure that stakeholders have the opportunity to and present their concerns. One example a couple of years ago, Metro staff proposed to change the 90/91 in Montrose, where right now there are two generations of essentially one line, has a very steep grade, two different areas and two different elevations. And that was proposed during the Metro Connections program to simplify the service and have one route. Stakeholders from the City of Glendale came and said this will not work well for us, because due to the topography of that area this would harm our service. Thanks to the service council, Metro kept the service the way it was. I would encourage the council to give their feedback to the Board to have all service changes still come to the council.

Representative Richards, Jon would I be correct in my presumption that the change of language he referred to has more to do with the existing policy of staff to make minor changes without council approval, such as a minor detour routing or some such.

Jon Hillmer, public hearings are called for major route changes, this has been the case even before the sectors. Minor changes can be brought to the public hearing as an informational item, the council can take action if they care to but it is mainly for your review.

Representative Richards, in regards to the 90/91, it was not voted down by the council, it was withdrawn by staff after the public hearing. SOCATA did an



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

independent review of the line, and found the public comments were without merit.

Representative Cano, I am not comfortable with the concept of work programs. Usually they are requests or money is given from an umbrella agency to regional agencies to carry out actual program, but the money is given to them as a planning grant. It is a decentralizing concept because it gives money and some ability to the sub-regions to be able to say here is \$250,000 grant let's see about express service, etc. which are unique to this region. I want to know if this work program is a responsibility we are gaining and I do not see any dollars attached to it.

Jon Hillmer, it is a responsibility if you are inheriting from the existing bylaws that a General Manager is to come up with a work plan that is to be reviewed by each of the councils, so this is more of a service workplan what I need to bring to the councils, it could be similar that you had on the Orange Line.

Representative Cano, I would like to see a budget attached to this. We could make a motion at the finance and budget committee, I don't understand work programs that do not provide funding from the "mothership" to be able to implement the activities here. Are we going to have to take money out of service. I want to understand the budget mechanisms a grant of some sort provided to each sector so they can implement their work program for the region they represent to enhance service. I don't understand the work program it is very sparse the way it is written.

Jon Hillmer, that would be a different approach than what we had with the general managers, were to come up with their work plan for which was within the budget that was developed for each of the sectors general managers. Again the intent here is not budget driven or project driven but is really a scope of the amount of effort we need to focus on different areas.

Representative Cano, that sounds like goal setting, work plans to me carries a lot more weight. If Metro is serious about more responsibility, then a work plan should have funding attached to it and since the council is the eyes and ears of the community we could implement things that we think would work. These are the type of discussions we need to start having.

Jon Hillmer, having funds assigned, would take Board action, direction there is no excess funds.

Representative Rosenheim, if we wanted to cut a line put those hours towards another line that we wanted to change, do we have the authority to do that?



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Jon Hillmer, you have the authority but it still would need to go through the process.

Chair Arvizu, let's try and get out inputs to Mr. Hillmer by the 15th of December and we'll bring up this topic again in January.

Jon Hillmer, I will in fact e-mail back to each of the members by the 15th what input we have received from the councils. I will put together a table of all the recommended modifications.

7. RECEIVE preliminary recommendations on Service Changes for June 2011; authorize publication of hearing notice; and approve public hearing date, time and location, Conan Cheung, Deputy Executive Officer

This is really following up from last month. Start moving towards the regional transit division, we had our Blue Ribbon Committee come up with, as you recall we had a representative from each of the governance councils as well as transit users, non-users, transit providers, business districts and education.

Metro services as well as municipal operators and local return operators, better bus/rail integration, with the rail and BRT being the back bone of the network we need to set up a hierarchy of the system so we are not duplicating each other or ourselves. Simplifying the network, by consolidating services along a common corridor. Complexity in a system is not really good, it is difficult for people to use the system if it is not intuitive it makes it harder to manage we want to make it more simple, tighten up the system and provide better quality service. Right-size metro rapid lines, which we started doing in December after the last public hearing in August and we will continue to do so.

Proposed changes being considered: 96, terminate at Burbank Transit Center it starts in Los Angeles and continues to Sherman Oaks, this line is too long and has on-time performance problems due to its length; 155, modify route to operate over Line 96 route from Media Center along Riverside Drive; 183, simplify route in Burbank and Glendale to better serve transit centers route modification that we worked with staff in Burbank and Glendale; 634, cancel line which is a shuttle bus that goes from Sylmar Metrolink Station to Mission College, extend line 230 to Mission College; and, 794, discontinue weekend service.



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Where we are running rapid service we have a distinct longer distance travel market and we can achieve significant speed advantage. If we cannot do that, then we might as well provide local service at all the stops as well. In terms of the rapid program for the San Fernando Valley area, we are really only looking at the 794 during the weekends. The weekdays it meets all the warrants but on the weekends the productivity and running time do not warrant the rapid service. Since we want to keep the one-seat ride to the Metrolink Station we will extend the 94 on the weekends to get to the Sylmar Station.

Other corridors discussed were Van Nuys Blvd. and 902 all the way to Westwood. We have done a lot of work on that, and will be prepared to show analysis we have relative to the 761, 233 the ridership loads, our constraints, demands and origins. At this point there are too many questions, how to best serve that corridor. We will come back next month or the following month with our analysis where we are to date and our action steps. Knowing that the 902 was only postponed for cancellation for 6 months for us to come up with this proposal we are willing to discontinue the 902 and reallocate the services back to the 233.

The next steps for the council today is to approve the public hearing notice and approve the public hearing date of February 2, 2011 at 6:30pm.

Representative Richards, on the weekend extension of the 94, knowing our passengers, if we extend the 94 only on weekends and the rest of the week it only goes to Sun Valley, we are going to have passengers during the week wondering why the 94 is not extended. They do not read the service disqualification. I am hoping staff took to heart the comment I gave you a couple of weeks ago in that in stead of just extending the 94 just simply operate 224 trips just for consistency of signage. You can still have the bus come out of downtown as 94 Sylmar station, but it would just change its line number to be consistent with our usage of line 224.

Conan Cheung, we are still looking at the comment, but there are operational issues in terms of operators changing their headsigns, data collection and how that simulates between the 224 and 94 and 794.

Representative Richards, with that in mind I am going to pass these out while I am talking. As Mr. Cheung just mentioned the Line 183 proposal is responsive to the requests of the cities of Burbank and Glendale to interconnect to their business districts and North Hollywood Station. However I have had concerns and did express some of these last month with Mr. Page. The real line 183 service would remain duplicative of our line 94 on San Fernando Road. I also note it may be duplicative of Glendale Bee line



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

down Central avenue. While it still runs down San Fernando Road, it runs foul of our new service guidelines of duplicative service. At the same time we already operate line 92 which connects both of those downtowns via Glenoaks Blvd. I would suggest that we look at an alternative an extension of line 92 between downtown Burbank and North Hollywood station replacing line 183. In addition of avoiding duplication of service this proposal would serve the entire downtown Glendale business district due to the fact of running it on Brand Blvd. More frequent service is possible. Line 183 runs hourly service Line 92 base service is 30 minutes, we would create a direct connection that does not exist directly from the Glenoaks Blvd. corridor which I think is important to both cities, directly into North Hollywood station, that connects them to the Red Line and the Orange Line. And we would have a resource savings because we would be able to cancel duplicative line 183 service on San Fernando Road. I believe this proposal would be more in line of what the cities are requesting, and we could achieve it with fewer resources than the staff proposal. To be fair, I move that both the staff proposal and my alternate proposal be included in the public hearing and staff can then make a recommendation to the council based on public comment received on both.

Representative Bric seconded for discussion

Representative Cano, what we always look at is downtown Glendale/Burbank, Red Line terminus and the airport. Is there any value you see?

Representative Richards, neither proposal would connect the airport.

Representative Cano, would there be any value in the extension of Line 92? At least come close to the Metrolink Station, airport, via victory Blvd. would there be a link?

Representative Bric, is it going to loop around Verdugo Road down there by the train station.

Representative Richards, there is certainly nothing to prevent the 92 going to the Burbank station.

Representative Bric, our city planner David Kriske would like to say a few words regarding the 183. In fact we were discussing eliminating the 183 in the hillside looping around there because the ridership is so low, average about 1 per trip. As I was coming down here tonight after the tree lighting ceremony, the 183 was stopped at Magnolia and only one person got off at 5:30pm. I stopped the gentleman and asked where he was coming from and where he was going and explained the possible cuts to service. What is your



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

average? And he answered he takes it 5 nights a week, there are probably 6 or 7 people on the bus. He could probably walk down the hill, but going back to his home might get a little difficult.

- David Kriske, Principle Planner at the City of Burbank, we are in support of Metro's recommendations for further discussion as part of the hearing, with regard to the 183 line we do see the advantage in streamlining the connection between Glendale and Burbank. There will be tradeoffs with some of our hillside residents, however, we also believe there is potentially a larger developing market between North Hollywood, Burbank, Glendale and eventually Pasadena. There is a demand for service in that corridor East/West is underserved and we think that this service change opportunity presents us with an opportunity to put local service in that corridor and see if there is a demand and the current configuration of the 183 does not lend itself to travel through the area. Ms. Richards had the courtesy of extending to us her proposal prior to this discussion this evening it does achieve some of the same aims that the 183 proposal does, we do have a few concerns primarily with regard to the line lengths that would be created with her proposal and the high amounts of transfers that would have to occur in North Hollywood, certainly from North Hollywood, Burbank and Glendale it would not be affected but if we were to grab any west Valley Village area, they would have to transfer to North Hollywood. The city locally has a concern currently the 92 terminates at a downtown station, and meets up with the 292 which extends further north up Glenoaks Blvd. into the east San Fernando Valley, when that line was spilt a few years ago we had concerns.

Representative Richards, I would like to answer the questions Mr. Kriske put forward, I did consider some of the things he said in crafting this proposal. On the question of passengers west of North Hollywood station, that segment of Magnolia is very lightly used, a lot of its ridership compiles of a few schools, and the amount of through ridership to North Hollywood station is not as large as the number of passengers who actually board North Hollywood station to come in to Burbank. As far as the 92/292 connection in operational fact the 292 doesn't actually stop/start at downtown Burbank, the 292 service continues as line 155. I am not certain from my knowledge from what staff has told me that there is any more or less of possibility of 92/292 connection being any better or worse than it is now.

Conan Cheung, what I put up on the screen is the load factor on Magnolia Blvd. I highlighted the North Hollywood station so the bars represent how many people are on Board the bus as it continues to move eastbound. You



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

can see there is a significant amount of people still on the bus as it continues east of North Hollywood station. There are decent boardings at North Hollywood station but there are still people on the bus going eastbound.

Chair Arvizu, we have two things to approve, one is the proposed hearing dates for the publication and the public hearing date. I would like to have a vote on the proposed hearing notice.

Representative Rosenheim, on line 634 that would be eliminated due to the extension of the 230, what is the frequency of the 634 vs. the 230?

Conan Cheung, the 634 is every ½ hour we would maintain the same, we will be putting larger buses on this route and the service would be equal.

Chair Arvizu, the line 230 would only run during the weekdays?

Conan Cheung, it would replace every trip the 634 now runs.

Chair Arvizu, there will be a demand for Saturday classes at Mission College and I would hate to see the reduction of bus travel to Mission College on Saturday.

Chair Arvizu, Mr. Nabavi has another comment on item 7.

- Faramarz Nabavi, I would like to speak on Ms. Richards motion, I actually have taken line 183 quite a bit, and think the proposal may have merit. My own personal observation is there is a lot of boarding and deboarding at North Hollywood station, there are some what distinct travel markets between west of North Hollywood and east of North Hollywood. One modification you might want to consider is potentially doing it as a circulator between Magnolia and Riverside. What Metro is proposing right now is to eliminate all service on Riverside Drive between Van Nuys Blvd. and Cahuenga Blvd. Line 155 will replace all the segment between Burbank and Universal City station.

Representative Richards, let me interrupt, that is not what I see.

- Faramarz Nabavi, Conan is that correct? My understanding from the previous month Metro was considering Riverside Drive to be duplicative with Magnolia?

Conan Cheung, we are intending to run to the Red Line.



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

- Farmarz Nabavi, I will withdraw that remark. Thank you very much for the clarification. The other comment I wanted to make was with respect to the 794. During the previous service change we considered elimination of the 750 weekend service, and what we were told was there was an increase in service on the 150 local so that not all the savings would just disappear in the system, we would have better service for the 150. I would like to ask, with the runs that were bid out to the drivers, was there an increase in the service and how much was there.

Conan Cheung, I don't have the specifics with me, but our goal was to ensure that our productivity would remain the same.

- Faramarz Nabavi, I think the answer from what I understand, is that there may in fact not be any significant increase in the number of headways. Therefore, stakeholders supporting Metro's proposal were under the impression there would be better service, more frequent service on the local. Now we are just going to have less service options. I think it is important for the council members to make sure that they provide input whether that is something you want or not. Finally, with respect to the Orange Line, I spoke last month about weekday mid-day service was misaligned, the Orange Line has 10 minute headways the Red Line has 12 minute headways, Metro could actually save money and provide better service to the riders at the same time if it went to 12 minute headways during those off peak hours. It causes service imbalance and unnecessary delays. Suggest to staff that this is a consideration.

Conan Cheung, in terms of the comment about reallocating service into the corridor, that is not entirely correct. We did add service back onto the 150, I just don't have the information with me on how much.

Representative Richards, just a remark answering that, staff will schedule the appropriate level of service for the corridors demand. Now I do not know what that service level is, because I am not involved in that detail, but quite honestly I don't think it is fair to ask a question about a line we were not considering and then chastise you for not having an answer. I am sure schedulers have done what they were told to do, which was get rid of the rapid and recut the local service based on the corridor demand. Now if the schedulers were wrong, we will certainly find out soon enough.

Chair Arvizu, on Representative Richards motion it was seconded for discussion do we want a second to actually propose this on the agenda to be looked at by the general public?



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Representative Cano, do we have the City of Glendale's input on the proposal? In agreement with service proposals by Representative Richards would rather have more on the table to discuss.

Representative Richards, that was my intention to have both proposals come through the public hearing process so that both options are given consideration when we make our final decision. If my motion passes, staff will probably have a conversation with the City of Glendale.

Representative Rosenheim, instruct staff to meet with Burbank and Glendale and tweak Ms. Richards proposal accordingly, and would like to see a Burbank and Glendale representative or indication of their concurrence with one or the other, so that we know what the jurisdiction's feelings are about the change. The concept of bringing this to the airport?

Representative Cano, I just wanted to see how that would be integrated maybe this can be moved up. I would like to see that at least discussed.

Representative Richards, if both of you are willing to make those friendly amendments, I would accept same in giving staff direction on how to bring this forward at the public hearing.

Representative Rosenheim, consider it a friendly amendment.

Jon Hillmer, to small caveats, Conan and staff have to fill in the cost estimates for the route extensions, balance that off with need. Conan has a timeline that he has to meet to get the document prepared and published. So there is not a lot of time to meet the deadlines.

Chair Arvizu, so it is feasible for you to get all the budgetary information?

Conan Cheung, yes.

Representative Bric, whatever we can bring back for discussion would be good.

Chair Arvizu, do we need to include this in the publication?

Representative Bric, I would like the additional numbers on what the cost is to run the 183 up the hill for the residents, cost savings that would actually be done.



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Jon Hillmer, can that be done at staff level when Conan meets with Glendale and Burbank?

Chair Arvizu, Conan can you have those numbers by January?

Conan Cheung, yes

Chair Arvizu, we need to have a formal concurrence on the motion that Representative Richards proposed to us, seconded by Representative Cano, with amendments – passes

Representative Richards, I move to approve the publication of the notice and setting of the hearing date for February 2, 2011. seconded by representatives, passes unanimously

Representative Cano, do we canvas with Metrolink and other agencies in terms of their service concepts for this region in terms of connectivity? We are working with Metrolink on different concepts on the Valley line and one of the big ones is potentially providing them with a platform on the Antelope Valley line closer to the Burbank Airport so that the Sun Valley station is served and bring the platform down to Hollywood Way so that there would be connectivity with Burbank Airport that would obviously necessitate routing issues. That would be the key location for some to enter into the San Fernando Valley. Preparing for the next round, do we have a formal process to reach out to the other munis, Metrolink and other service providers to discuss changes we have to take into account.

Jon Hillmer, Conan and his staff have set up quarterly meetings with transit providers, we do coordinate with Metrolink when they are proposing changes to stations or new stations.

Representative Cano, we are discussing skip stop service express service which would create greater demands at the stations. Mr. Fenton is bringing creativity to the service and I want to make sure there is not miscommunication between the systems.

8. RECEIVE report on Contract Lines, Shannon Anderson, Transportation Services Manager

Currently we run 22 bus lines 3 will be canceled in December. Annual revenue service hours for FY11 is 549,254 which is approximately 7% of the Metro Service. We have three vendors; MV Transportation operates in the South, Southland Transit operates in the East, and Veolia Transportation



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

operates in the North. They operate under the same conditions as Metro Operations but at a lower hourly cost compared with Metro Operators. The buses must maintain the same cleanliness restrictions, training, uniforms, maintenance and respond to customer complaints with the 5 calendar days requirement. We perform “mystery rider programs” using a 3rd party consultant. We have corporate bus rides by both staff from Metro and contractor.

Representative Cano, what was the reason for the 3 lines that were canceled? Is it because of performance or union contract?

Shannon Anderson, they were identified as poor performing lines.

Representative Cano, do we have the same measurement for contract lines as we do for Metro lines?

Shannon Anderson, yes

Representative Cano, in terms of issues of divisions and mean miles between road calls, are they apples to apples comparison to what we are doing in the Metro system?

Shannon Anderson, there are some important differences with the statistics and that is driven by the reporting requirements written in the contracts, there are financial incentives for mechanical breakdowns that occur while they are in revenue service. Metro uses a different calculation, these are not apples to apples.

Representative Cano, I believe in contract service and using them more, but unfortunately not all agree with me. How contract service is performed, because when we have this type of discussion, give them more flexibility your cost per revenue service hour is what?

Shannon Anderson, in our fiscal year 2011 budget it is in the neighborhood of \$86 per revenue service hour.

Representative Cano, and metro’s is \$134. I want to make sure I understand better statistically, so we can see if there is merit to provide more flexibility to contract services to be allowed within different regions.

Jon Hillmer we are advocates, Shannon and I, that contract service is operated by someone else, but needs to be incorporated into metro’s system, including the ATMS. Contract lines tend to lines that are lower passenger demand,



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

were allocated to contract service lines, given this result contract lines run with wider headways.

Representative Richards, several years ago I saw an old operations report that used to break out the complaints by division, and you would see all the divisions then you would see contract services which showed the most complaints. It is not fair to compare contract services to everything else metro does, but I would like at some point to see how the complaint per 100,000 boardings compares with in-house operated service of similar service characteristics. I think that would be a fairer way to look. This is just information for me, when does the Veolia contract come up for rebidding?

Shannon Anderson, August 2013.

Chair Arvizu, is there a certain percentage within the metro that allocates contract service.

Jon Hillmer, the labor contract was negotiated back in 1980's which allowed metro to contract out 13 bus lines, in addition metro can contract out what is defined as new service. That is the reason why we have several of the 600 lines that are contracted out because they are defined as new routes.

Chair Arvizu, these contracted lines unionized or non-union?

Shannon Anderson, two of our 3 current contracts have represented bus operators.

Representative Bric, metro provides the buses and the contractors provide the maintenance, how do you determine what condition the buses are in?

Shannon Anderson, basically the CHP has a regulatory requirement to do inspections of bus facilities on an annual basis, and an annual safety inspection. We do a mock CHP inspection on a quarterly basis. We are looking for compliance of all the Title 13 requirements for vehicle maintenance, the same basic criteria the CHP is using. Vehicle safety requirements do not change or the age of the equipment.

Representative Bric, aren't you going to put more maintenance into an older bus?

Shannon Anderson, in terms of cost, yes. We've tried different strategies on how to have contractors price their services according to the age of the fleet.



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Representative Rosenheim, with our proposed authority, would we be able to authorize new contracts for new lines or lines?

Jon Hillmer, creating new lines that would be contracted out? Yes, you do have the ability. If there are options to create new lines that meet the labor contract requirements, then yes, we would take a look at several of the new contracted lines have come about during a similar process, particularly in the South Bay.

Representative Cano, can we get a copy of the labor contract of just that part, for discussion sake, that's a pretty big caveat in terms of what is in there.

Jon Hillmer, I must say that when it says new service, is defined by the contract that service does not replace, duplicate, or parallel an existing metro bus line in whole or in part. If you take this literally, there is not a new route in the world that would parallel some portion of an existing metro route. But we have been able to implement many new routes.

Representative Ochoa, how much of the valley is contract?
Staff, 2 routes

Representative Cano, I understand there is a clause if there are going to be cuts lines that contract lines are the first ones to be considered.

Jon Hillmer, I do not believe so, we do evaluate lines based on performance and those include cost per hour.

9. UPDATE on Canoga Park Station Orange Line, Hitesh Patel, Deputy Executive Officer, Project Manager

Scott McConnell presenting with Mr. Patel. I've been involved in this project since the inception, but during the planning and environmental phase Walt Davis was the project manager. I can talk about the history and some of the plans that were discussed. There were three items from the last meeting that came out that needed discussion. I will be speaking about two of the items one I will not be speaking of is discussion of a new station at the south end of Warner Center, that will not be discussed this evening. 1) configuration of the Canoga Station Platforms and other future entrance adjacent to the development. During the draft environmental phase, number of alternatives were looked at for configuring the platforms at Canoga. Currently we have two existing platforms one of the alternatives was to abandon these platforms and put in one giant loop. That was discarded due to the impact of the potential future joint development.



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

The outcome of the third alternative that was added into the environmental document was configuration of keeping the two existing platforms and adding two new platforms along the extension of the busway to Chatsworth. This alternative allowed for new consolidated entrance providing access from the parking lot. This parking lot is significantly reduced by creating this extension and what this allows is to have one consolidated fare collection to the new platforms. The old access from Canoga Avenue will remain. The platform access between the platforms is controlled by a new signalized light in this location. We maintain the existing busway intersection and keeping the route going to Warner Center along its current route and also keeping the existing platform intact. We maximized the number of parking spaces by the alternative we optimized our future joint development area by keeping the new platforms along the perimeter and keeping the existing on the south end. This alternative was looked at by all major functions at Metro, operations, safety, ADA systems and engineering were part of the discussion. It does comply with Metro design criteria including safety, ADA, way finding systems and fare enforcement. Walkway from the joint development, we have provided provisions for a future access from this site.

How the movement of the platforms and signage will work. We are currently in the development phase of this signage concept and will be using electronic message signs (way findings) and also a public address system. The address system will alert patrons of the next bus and location, the signage concept will show destination, platform location, and next bus arrival time. We have 3 entrances: 1) the new entrance we will have a display where the platforms are located and also which platform to go for the next bus. The biggest confusion is there are two platforms going to North Hollywood. 2) Concept entrance would have the same display telling you of the destination next bus, time and which platform to board.

The alternative that was discussed and which I think you had mentioned last time was why we are not doing this alternative. This alternative would result in existing platform to be eliminated and put a new platform at another location. The positive side, we have three separate platforms there is no confusion about where to go. Some of the problems we have is an additional right-of-way will be required for the design standards. There is an existing 17' bike path which goes along the westerly boundary and south end of the Canoga Station site and the busway adjacent to it, in order to create room for it, you would have to shift the busway to the east and reduce the bike path to 12'. Even in doing that, we are looking at some right of way acquisition to make this alignment work just purely from the horizontal curves we need. There would be a significant realignment of the existing bus way towards the



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

east because you are shifting the entire busway to the east. And make all these curves to fit to the existing curves on the west end. The existing bike path would have to be reduced to a multi-use path because patrons would have to use the path to access platform 3. If you enter along the existing platform we would not have room for additional sidewalks into for an entrance two. You go across the busway and again along the multi-use path. The platform three would result in a significant walk for our patrons, currently patrons in the parking lot would enter platform three which will not be visible from platform two or Canoga Avenue so it is very confusing for someone entering from Canoga. Again the platforms are spread over 3 locations which creates more confusion. There will be impacts to grading and drainage as well as utilities, as we do have fiber optic lines in this area will be mitigated.

Those are some of the major flaws of this alternative that were looked at and it was discarded.

Representative Richards, I believe you are wrong and hope I do not have to come back and say I told you so after this opens. There will be a longer walk. The Sepulveda station is a nice long walk. We will have these message boards, and hope they work better than ones we have now.

Hatish Patel, we do have concerns on the signage too and its reliability. Our next slide talks to that issue. The electronic VMS signs display the next bus arrival based on two different data sources. One is the LADOT transit priority system and the second is the GPS which is the same installed on the buses. The GPS data that we send to the BOC via radio sometimes has unexpected delays which result in an unacceptable reliability level. LADOT uses fiber optic lines and does provide an acceptable reliability level of 95%. What we are doing is going to integrate as part of this project, both data.

10. Chair and Council Member Comments

No comments meeting adjourned at 10pm

ADJOURNMENT



Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority