AUG 2 9 1074

Trip Report, Los Angeles, California, August 22, 1979

Steven A. Barsony (2) signed Director, Office of AGT Applications, CTD-60

Acting Deputy Administrator, UOL-2

Thru: Associate Administrator for Technologys/ G. J. Pastor Development and Deployment, UTD-1

> Gaurge Fastor and Stave Barsony of UTD-1 and UTD-60 respectively attended the California State Transportation Commission August 23 and 24th meeting in Los Angeles, California. Also present were from the Feds Norm Emerson, Region IX Representative of the Secretary, John Taylor, Associate Administrator for Transit Assistance, Dee Jacobs, UNTA Regional Director, Robert Young, Deputy Director, FEWA, Region IX, and Al Galardo, FEWA, District Engineer.

> The Commission decided to take up the LA DPM as their first item of business and to proceed with the hearings on the other agenda items later.

Only seven members of the mine member Commission were present for the August 23 hearings. Mr. Norton Simon, an eighth member, attended only the August 24 meeting. One member (Mr. Gravel) was on vacation. The subcommittee meeting wasters SYMBOL chaired by the Vice-Chairman of the Commission, Commissioner Dean Meyer. INITIALS/SIG.

Other Commissioners present were Judith Soley, permanent Chairman of the Commission, Dr. Ivan Hinderaker, Mr. Charles Reid, Mrs. Francis/Walan/Mossman, Mr. Claude Fernandez and MTG. SYMBOL Ms. Carole Onorato. Also present were Mr. Michael Evanhoe, Executive Secretary of the Commission and four or five staff members.

Commissioner Meyer opened the hearings and asked the Executive Secretary to read an August 22, 1979 letter to the SYMBOL Commission Chairman Judith Soley signed by State Senator John F. Foran, Chairman, Senate Transportation Committee and Walter M. Ingalls, Chairman, Assembly Transportation

CONCURRENCES

RTG SYMBOL INITIALS SIG

RTG SYMBOL INITIALS/SIG

INITIALS/SIG

DATE

RTG SYMBOL

RTG SYMBOL

NITIALS/SIG. DATE

INITIALS/SIG.

DATE

Committee ungling the Counission to consider the need of In County to devilog a regional rail regist transit system. The letter stressed that the Commission smould address some serious questions before making a final decision on the DPM.

The chairman than called on Jerry Frenc, Executive Director, LA County Transportation Consignion to give an overview of the LA County transportation situation. Jerry showed a color coded map, de icting Lajor corridor movements and discussed the Federal Assistance of close to a 1/1 of billion dollar for the LA County bus procurement - the largest ever issued in this country. He enformed the DPM project as as a interer part of the LA Country.

sorn haerson followed Jerry with a general statement expressing Secretary Goldschmidt's support for the DPM program and specifically for the LA DEM project. He introduced all the Feds present and asked John Taylor to come forward and discuss the Federal Assistance to the LA Drift project. John assured the Commissioners that UNTA is firely benind the project and will provide 80% of all allowable costs and expenditures even if it was above the original \$100 million committed. Upon questioning shout the \$118 million UMLA share and the \$25 million Fiwh share, John reiterated that the Department was behind the project and that if other agencies, or Federal sources were not available UNTA would cover the Federal share although UNTA would prefer participation by others as well. Commissioner Hinderaker questioned John whether the DPM funds could be diverted to other projects, i.e., Wilshire corridor rail starter line. Mr. Taylor answered that the money earmarked for DPM, namely the \$220 million can not be used for any other project, but for the people mover.

Taylor was followed by Mayor Bradley who expressed his strong support for the DMA project and his displeasure in the number of conditions that the Commission intends to levy on the LM officials before approving the project (based on the staff report which he said he received that morning). He considered these conditions as an indication of lack of good faith. He said that many of the conditions were unnecessiry, too confining and too restrictive. Mayor Bradley also expressed his unconditional support for the Wilshire corridor project and said that "nobody is more firmly committed to these projects than I am." He has offered to

cooperate with the Cormission and asked in return that the Cormission work in good faith with his office.

The Mayor was then followed by a number of people speaking out against the project. Where were three University instances, became britisle, first far-forst Decop bott from Forman of Desirate From LA. There was and gattleman who read someone class statement as well as his own on behalf of the Fierra Club opposing the LDH project. Hrs. Durke's argument was that in her opinion, there was no valle coar benefit ratio to justify the people hower project. One said that she spoke to some assemblyman in himmesota who told her that that was also the reason for the first was no sach argument in the himmesota for the first was no sach argument in the himmesota to be seen argument in the himmesota to cliffet we dear to guide in the Parkinson of Course, there was no sach argument in the himmesota localitative debate. During intermission she was so advised.)

We were somewhat surprised that the opposition did not Easter nore muscle against the program. There were no 'big gene' against the project. The strongest argument was coming from Commissioner Carole Omerate and Cathy Buthe.

After all this opposition, it was a pleasant change to hear flor; Inster press, who very 'saccinetly' was unle to summarize the background of the DFM project OFM report; industry experience; cost benefit analysis of 10 AGT systems in comparison with conventional transit systems. He sade a very good parellel by showing the influence of our DFM project on the rest of the industrialized world. He pointed out that the Osaka and Kone City systems under construction in Japan, the VLL system in France and the DEMACMED system in harburg are the direct results of our inflictive with the DFM program, and that they all will be operational prior to IN's.

The morning paper, LA Times August 24 (next day), front page HUTLO Section, carried an article entitled, "State Indicates It May not OK Funds for Ropple Hower' subtitled, "Angry Rayor brailey Claims transjoration Commission's Conditions back of Good Faith'." The mood was dir. The meeting which was supposed to have started at 9.00 AM was postponed to 1:30 FM. All indications were that the vote would be close. At the start, two or three commissioners askel for the Feds to stay aroun' just in case there was a need for clerification. Deputy Mayor Ray Rami was, however, the only one who was asked to clarify a point. The rest of the discussion was aroung the commissioners themselves - like a stream of conscience, each appeared to be saying that they were for it but

Then the vote came. The first vote was taken by the Commission as the responsible agancy under the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act by resolution 1-79-12 adopting the findings with supporting Statement of Parts. 7 to 1 in fever of the resolution. Only to. Corese voted against it. Forton Simon, who during the previous day was policyed to be an opponent, was propent and led the miscussions in favor of the project. The second vote was taken on 1-73-13 which adopted the Statement of Cvarriling Considerations and approved the project for future to mission action subject to specified conditions. The vote was 7 to 1; again Hs. Onorato voting against it. The final vot. was on BOTH72-8, Band ICT of the Ludgue Fot of 1970 for the per has or county longer to more a row and contains and a state of the country to concect final design, right-of-way acquisition and construction of the LA bin project. Again the vote was 7 to 1, 30. Chorato voting against. A copy of the final resolution is attached as voted on with corrections.

Attachient

cc: UTD-60/LA File UTD-60/Barsony UTD-5/Serial UTD-1 UTD-60:SBarsony:GJPastor:hbj:8/29/79

P.S. Robert Young, FHWA Deputy Director Region IX, confirmed that as of now only \$4.9 million of the planned FAI funds of \$25 million satisifed FHWA requirements. Congressional action would be needed for additional FAI funds.

STATE HIGHWAY ACCOUNT FOR LOC. ASSISTANCE MASS TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (1979-80) FISCAL YEAR

No. FMT-79-8

MB-22 Program Article XIX Guideway Funding South WHEREAS, Section 1(b), Article XIX of the California Constitution permits the use of motor vehicle tax revenues for the design and construction of public mass transit, guideways; and

WHEREAS, the Budget Act of 1979, Item 167, appropriates funds for Local Assistance, Mass Transportation Programs; and

WHERE: the City of Los Angeles has made application for \$15,900,000 of Article XIX funds in the State Highway Account for the purpose of final design, right-of-way acquisition and construction for the Downtown People Mover project; and

With the County Transportation Commission has approved the City of Los Angeles application of \$2,900,000 by resolution; and

**MEREAS, the California Transportation Commission, as a responsible agency under the provisions of CEQA, by resolution E-79-13, has adopted the attached Statement of Overriding Considerations and approved the project for future Commission action subject to specified conditions;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that \$2,900,000.00 be allocated from Item 167 of the Budget Act of 1979, for the purpose of matching available Federal funding to conduct a portion of the final design, right-of-way acquisition and construction of the Downtown People Hover project by the City of Los Angeles; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that such allocation be subject to the following conditions:

 that Urban Mass Transportation Administration agree to commit to an 80% match to the total project cost;

that the Federal Highway Administration agree to perficient committed parking and related facilities at Union Station;

- that the City of Los Angeles agree to pay its proportionate share of any cost overruns with <u>cash</u> (<u>not</u> increased valuation of land);
- 4. that these funds may be used to reimburse any eligible capital project expenditure up to a maximum of 10 percent of total expenditures but not to exceed a total of \$15,900,000;
- that the City of Los Angeles, through resolution, agree to assume all future risk for providing operational funding from fares, lease revenues, value capture funds, and other City funds;
- 6. that the City of Los Angeles and the Southern California Rapid Transit District sign an agreement, prior to any subsequent allocations by the California Transportation Commission, for Southern California Rapid Transit District to participate in final system planning, design, equipment procurement, and service integration;
- 7. that the City of Los Angeles create, prior to any subsequent allocations by the California Transportation Commission, a "value capture" assessment district consistent with the Los Angeles Community Development Agency's current financial plan;
- 8. that the City of Los Angeles present to the California Transportation Commission evidence that it has examined the feasibility and jurisdictional responsibility for providing on-site security personnel at Downtown People Mover stations and/or vehicles;
- 9. to ensure that maximum benefits are derived from the use of State funds to construct the DPM as a linkage between other planned transportation improvements in the Los Angeles area and to ensure that the various planned improvements will operate as a single, integrated system, California Transportation Commission and Department of Transportation retain the right to ensure system compatibility at the points of interface between the DPM and complementary Los Angeles area transportation projects in which the State has a financial or operating interest.
- that the City of Los Angeles receive the requisite approvals of Caltrans pursuant to Section 14085 of the Government Code;
- 11. that Caltrans and the Urban Mass Transportation Administration approve scope of work;
- that there be execution of a fund transfer agreement between the City of Los Angeles and Department of Transportation with review by the California Transportation Cummission.

