

7E 7E

MOTION BY MAYOR RICHARD J. RIORDAN AND SUPERVISOR ZEV YAROSLAVSKY

May 28, 1997

Immediate Bus Purchase and Bus System Improvement Plan

In September, 1995 the Board adopted bus system improvement as its highest policy, however substantive progress in this area has been extremely slow and unsatisfactory. Specifically, MTA staff has failed to produce a detailed plan for how bus service should look in Los Angeles County. Full funding of the bus system is also a baseline assumption in the proposed rail recovery plan.

Despite constant Board direction, implementation of bus system improvement, including new buses to replacing aging and high polluting rolling stock and relieve overcrowding, has been far too slow and long overdue. While the Board expects MTA staff to return to the Board with a fully developed bus plan in the near future, enough information has been presented to conclude that immediate bus purchases are in order.

I THEREFORE MOVE THAT the Board direct the CEO to:

1. Immediately order 200 new CNG buses by exercising the current procurement option available to the MTA; and
2. Report back to the Board within 30 days with a report detailing the cost and sources of funds used to pay for the buses starting FY 98-99.

I FURTHER MOVE THAT the Board again direct the CEO to present to the Board within 30 days a detailed plan for bus system improvement, including but not limited to full implementation of consent decree requirements. This plan must:

1. Describe a vision and detailed plan for what the bus system *should* look like and how it should perform from the customers' as well as an operational and financial perspective, including a long-term bus replacement plan. This analysis must not be financially constrained. Instead, the plan must be goal and objective oriented and contain measurable milestones. The report must include bus *performance indicators* for the 1995 Long Range Plan, the current state of the bus system, and the detailed plan recommended by staff, including but not limited to indicators identified in the attachment to this motion.
2. Determine the cost of full implementation of the detailed bus plan, both aggregated and on an annual basis. The report must contain all capital, operating, maintenance, and any other related costs.
3. Determine the difference between the current, *Board-approved* funding level for the bus system and the cost of full implementation of the bus plan. If the set aside is sufficient, then the report should recommend that the Board immediately adopt the full plan, commit necessary funds, and direct MTA staff to implement. If the set aside is insufficient, then the report must present the Board with at least two policy options, including: 1) identification of what resources must be committed and what lower priority programs and projects will be impacted; and 2) the level of service that can be achieved given the current bus funding set aside.

Attachment - Performance Indicators

If planning data assumed modal shifts to rail, also include same data for rail system. All data should be reported by year, i.e. data for 1995, data for 1996, etc. Answers may require attachments to answer fully. Additional data and performance indicators should be added; the table below should be considered a minimum and MTA staff should add additional performance indicators based on their own technical expertise. Information must be quantified, and qualitative factors should also be included as applicable.

Bus System	Long Range Plan (March, 1995)	Current Bus System	Proposed Bus Plan
Demand			
Market segmentation by demographic group, including identification of population in groups with historically high transit utilization			
Projected ridership			
Bus Fleet			
Peak fleet			
Spare fleet			
Total fleet			
Spare ratio			
Number of buses exceeding 12 years			
Average bus age			
Number of buses considered mechanically unreliable (from an Operations perspective)			
Capital replacement plan (buses per year)			

Attachment - Performance Indicators

Bus System	Long Range Plan (March, 1995)	Current Bus System	Proposed Bus Plan
Service			
Average peak headway			
Average non-peak headway			
On-time performance			
Load factor			
Revenue hours			
Revenue miles			
Line-by-line breakdown of service			
Funding			
Annual O&M budget			
Annual capital budget			
Total O&M budget (over same period)			
Total capital budget (over same period)			
Fares			
Pass			
Base			
Transfer			
Media (including but limited to uniform, countrywide media plus debit and smart card technology)			

Attachment - Performance Indicators

Bus System	Long Range Plan (March, 1995)	Bus System Improvement Plan (December, 1995)	Updated financial plan (January 10, 1997)
Operations			
Reliability			
Seat replacement			
Window replacement			
Bus security			
Cost per revenue hour			
Cost per revenue mile			
Farebox recovery ratio			
Average emissions profile per bus (criteria pollutants)			
Other			
Priority lane miles			