

RECEIVED

APR 12 1985

J. W. R.

S.C.R.T.D. LIBRARY

A LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP-“**CAN WE GET OUR
TRANSPORTATION
ACT TOGETHER ?**”

**ORGANIZING SOUTHERN
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION
INSTITUTIONS FOR THE
21st CENTURY**



**SPONSORED BY THE PUBLIC/
PRIVATE CONSORTIUM ON
URBAN PROBLEMS**

PROCEEDINGS

A LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP --

"CAN WE GET OUR TRANSPORTATION ACT TOGETHER?"

ORGANIZING SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
TRANSPORTATION INSTITUTIONS
FOR THE 21st CENTURY

SPONSORED BY THE PUBLIC/PRIVATE CONSORTIUM
ON URBAN PROBLEMS

PARTICIPATING AGENCIES:

Edmund G. "Pat" Brown Institute of Government Affairs;
the Center for Public Resources, California State
University, Los Angeles; the Los Angeles Area Chamber
of Commerce; and the Southern California Association
of Governments

May 4, 1984

Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce Building

07121

HE
310
.L7
C35
1984

Workshop Leadership

Workshop Introduction:

The Honorable Jacki Bacharach, Major, City of Rancho Palos Verdes

Workshop Keynote Speaker:

Dr. Peter L. Shaw, Director, Institute for Transportation Policy and
Planning,
Center for Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Long Beach

Workshop Panel Chairs:

David Grayson, Southern California Automobile Club

David Mars, University of Southern California

John Kirshner, California State University, Los Angeles

Workshop Planning Committee:

Mark Hamud, Southern California Association of Governments

Thomas Snelson, Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce

Nathan Wang, Edmund G. "Pat" Brown Institute of Government Affairs

Murray Brown, Center for Public Resources, California State University,
Los Angeles

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
Preface	1
Conference Agenda	2
Introduction -- Mayor Bacharach	4
Keynote Presentation -- Dr. Peter L. Shaw	
-Executive Summary	8
-Remarks	10
Discussion Questions	14
Summary of Discussions	15
Conclusion	21
List of Participants	23
 Appendix A	
 Appendix B	

P R E F A C E

This Workshop is the third in a series co-sponsored by the Southern California Association of Governments; the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce; the Center for Public Resources, California State University, Los Angeles, and; the Edmund G. "Pat" Brown Institute of Government Affairs. The first symposium was held at California State University at Los Angeles, and was entitled, "A Working Conference: State Block Grants and the Local Response." The symposium examined State Block Grant Administration in FY 1982/83 and beyond, the areas of housing and community development, health services, energy and emergency assistance, social services, education, and highways and mass transit. The second was a symposium held in the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce on July 29, 1983, on the subject of "Future Government Alignment: Determining Who Will Do What?" Participants from local governments, citizen groups and business gathered to hear speakers representing federal, state, and local agencies on the topics of "Adapting to the Shift of Responsibilities Between the Federal Government and the State" and "Realigning State/Local Government Responsibilities." As an outgrowth and extension from the interest and concern on the part of the participants to examine more specific issues concerning government alignment, the workshop on May 4, 1984 focused on the area of transportation. "Can We Get Our Transportation Act Together" will be one in a series of symposium designed to explore a number of pressing policy issues, and to create a forum for representatives from the public and private sectors to come together and discuss the problems which confront all of us.

Conference Agenda

The meeting was designed to maximize free and open informal discussion among the participants. To encourage such exchange, introductory remarks were provided by the

Honorable Jacki Bacharach
Mayor, City of Rancho Palos Verdes
Chairwoman, Southern California Association of Governments
Transportation and Communications Committee
Member, Los Angeles County Transportation Commission

Then a keynote presentation was provided by

Dr. Peter L. Shaw, Director
Institute for Transportation Policy and Planning
Center for Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Long Beach

based upon a background paper he prepared for the meeting and distributed with the advance registration packets. The full agenda was:

"CAN WE GET OUR TRANSPORTATION ACT TOGETHER?"

May 4, 1984

AGENDA

8:30 A.M. REGISTRATION
(Continental Breakfast)

9:15 A.M. OPENING SESSION

Welcome:

Honorable Jacki Bacharach
Mayor, City of Palos Verdes
Chairwoman, SCAG Transportation and Communications
Committee
Member, Los Angeles County Transportation
Commission

Presentation of Workshop Report:

Dr. Peter L. Shaw
Director, Institute of Transportation
Policy and Planning
California State University, Long Beach

9:45 A.M. BREAK

10:00 A.M. ROUNDTABLE WORKSHOPS

12:00 NOON LUNCHEON

1:00 P.M. MODERATOR SUMMARIES

1:45 P.M. RECAP AND DISCUSSION

Dr. Peter L. Shaw

2:15 P.M. ADJOURNMENT

Sponsored by: Edmund G. "Pat" Brown Institute of Government Affairs
Center for Public Resources
California State University, Los Angeles
Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
Southern California Association of Governments

INTRODUCTION
Mayor Jacki Bacharach

Welcome . . . Today's workshop begins with a very provocative title and focuses on some challenging questions. The bulk of this day is devoted to discussion. Therefore, I think it would be fair to say that the quality of the day will really depend upon your participation.

It is always important to assess the way in which we organize ourselves to make decisions. Some of you may find yourselves in the same position that I am in. It was only in the last 5 years that I entered public office, and the transportation institutions of today were all here before me. This gives me ability to step back--not as a charter member or an author of any agency; I don't need to pledge allegiance to the existing organizational structure. So--I read Dr. Shaw's paper as a "user" of the structure, and from my perspective, as an elected official--and asked how our institutional arrangements help or hinder us in transportation decision-making in Southern California.

PRESENTATION

The problems we face in transportation are clear and well-outlined in Dr. Shaw's paper. Our region is growing and it is the role and responsibility of the regional, state, and countywide agencies to accommodate for that growth on a metropolitan scale. Unfortunately, there is little that can solve these problems in the short term. Solutions will take 5 years or more and to most elected officials that's too far off. By the necessity of the political process, elected officials in the main are project oriented--

trying to accomplish what they can today. Future planning doesn't attract a lot of citizen attention or votes. A ribbon cutting does.

So, attracting attention to organize or prepare for the 21st Century is a problem. Also, I believe transportation planning is its own special problem. We've always just expected mobility in Southern California. It's comparable to walking into a room and noting the sofa and carpet--never the floorboard. The transportation network, I would suggest, is analogous to the floorboard.

Dr. Shaw states in his paper that in the early post-Proposition 13 period, transportation was at the bottom of importance in public opinion poll responses. This is very understandable to me--based on the floorboard analogy. It is becoming a public interest issue today because of air quality concerns, access to jobs and the marketplace and congestion frustration. These concerns allow us to now be able to politically focus on future transportation planning. The Governor's Infrastructure Task Force is a good example of this.

So, how have our institutions met the challenge, and can they in the future? That's today's discussion assignment. I look at our institutional structure today and see progress, but I also see that all of the players involved share feelings of frustration. Maybe that is inevitable.

It is suggested that 2 courses are open to us. Structural change or improving the Status Quo through better coordination.

A recent example of coordination exists in the recent effort to define the institutional roles of agencies in Los Angeles County on just the subject of rail transit development. A policy plan was prepared by the general managers of LACTC, SCRTD, SCAG, and Caltrans. This plan is to be the statement of each agency's role--to be agreed to by each agency's policy board. I believe this is a step in the right direction. These kinds of efforts--if meaningfully accepted by the policy boards, allow coordination to take place without creating new institutions. New institutions become attractive when the present ones cannot get their job done properly. Supervisor Hahn's recent resolution to study agency duplication shows this concern. But we recognize that clearer coordination is essential.

As a policy board member, another issue raised in Dr. Shaw's paper, which I wanted to comment on, is the makeup of governing boards. Previously, in the 1960s for example, our transit agencies were appointed by the State. In order to achieve local control, policy boards were established with representatives of city and county governments. It is not a perfect system by any means, but does provide a voice for smaller governments in the region, that even a directly elected official to that board would not.

The dual role of being a local representative and regional board member is important. Those of us who serve on regional bodies do "run for office" among the cities and feel an obligation to represent them. We are accountable to them. Those of us who serve, in most cases, show by our desire to serve that we have a regional perspective. By our experience and constituency, we bring a local perspective. This balance serves to make our agencies more aware and better able to work with the myriad of juris-

dictions with which they have to interface. Directly elected representatives, I believe, would not have as clear or well identified constituency. Indeed, there is no real metropolitan constituency. When speaking of the myriad of jurisdictions--I suggest we not forget to focus on the cities' new role in the transportation organizational structure.

CONCLUDING NOTES

The passage of Prop. A has led to new transportation institutional arrangements.

Cities are new power brokers and emerging interested actors.

We cannot discuss the future without discussing where the dollars rest; and because of the Proposition A local return programs, the dollars are now with the cities as never before. Therefore, they are part of future actions and will individually, if not collectively, be part of our transportation structure of the future.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, organizing for the 21st Century is our task. The need for project planning, programming, and implementation is clear. The current players are identified. As you discuss our transportation institutional arrangements, consider not only structural changes, but also the operational interrelationships in today's structure.

Keynote Presentation

Dr. Peter L. Shaw

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES

The Keynote presentation addressed several themes about the development of Southern California transportation institutions for the challenges presented to us by the 21st century. His written comments are summarized in the following Executive Summary:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

More than ever, the region has an opportunity to confront the future and decide what to do about it. Key, regionwide public policy decisions are being made by many public and private entities, and the transportation consumer. It is a large, complex, and often fragmented policy system that depends upon independent organizations for implementation. In some regards, it is becoming less centralized as the federal government slowly leaves more authority and fiscal responsibility to local governments.

Some urban areas have made fundamental decisions to change institutional relationships at key points in their development, and then successfully installed large scale multimodal transportation systems. Still others have followed an incremental approach while guided by overall policy goals. Most areas are now facing maintenance and rehabilitation of their operations. Southern California is, in contrast, attempting to complete its basic multimodal transportation system, and to maintain and rehabilitate older components. In a sense, our task is three times as difficult. We must do three things at once: finish existing system components; maintain and rehabilitate older sections; and, install completely new elements to meet estimated travel demand resulting from a one-third population increase by the year 2000.

Our current institutional relationships for transportation policy encompass six major modes (highway, transit, aviation, ports, rail, pipelines) with at least eleven administrative functions (planning, programming priorities, coordinating, evaluating, designing, engineering, financing, site/equipment acquisition, building, operating and maintaining, enforcement). Decision-making for these modes and functions addresses several levels. The Macro-Policy/Program level includes the first four (planning to evaluating). An intermediate level--Macro/Micro-Program/Project-- provides a transition for relating broader level concerns to specific transportation activities (designing to financing). The third level--Micro/Implementation--

traditionally performs technical and operational work (acquisition to enforcement). In general terms, the macro level is more centralized for policy and program decisions, while micro activities actually implement. The more centralized modes are highways and transit.

When considering the year 2000, several choices are available to us: (1) status quo (leave things as they are, make incremental or marginal changes); (2) disinvolvement (lessen governmental activity, as now in process at the federal level); (3) grand strategy design (develop blueprint for entire transportation function in Southern California.) In many ways the easiest choice is status quo. Then, as some new goal or crisis develops, a new institution will be created on top of the existing system, if it is perceived that existing arrangements cannot respond to the situation (as it often is). But is this really the best way to go?

One way to proceed is to consider needs and actions for the immediate, near-term and year 2000 futures. What organizational structure, and interrelationships are desirable for each time-oriented function? At what point should elected officials provide, basic policy arena game rules for the management of the process? When should public votes be utilized for guidance? What organization(s) is best suited to accomplish immediate, near- and long-term goals?

REMARKS

DR. PETER L. SHAW

Additional comments provided by Dr. Shaw suggested that the questions that should be addressed for the Southern California area were prompted by the earlier workshop and the quickly growing pace of development and population. Some of the themes that became apparent were related to:

What will our future look like?
How will we get to the future?
Who or what will get us there?
What alternative ways might there be to reach the future?
How would they be managed?
Could they be managed?
And with what impacts?

As a child in a candy shop, it became quickly evident that there are many choices. Other urban areas in the nation have opted for different ways of addressing things and quite often made some choices to get themselves adequately to the present day.

Influencing the Southern California perspectives are some points-of-view that are no longer obvious or valid; such as Los Angeles being mainly a suburban area with no central city; or, Los Angeles represents the future and it does not work; or, Los Angeles is lurching from one crisis to another as Johnny Carson would joke--the smog was so bad that . . .

It is very obvious to the speaker that Southern California does work and it has one of the most impressive transportation systems for moving freight and people in the nation. Our freeway system is second to none. The bus transit system is one of the largest in the country. The area served by the total system is giant in both scale and population basis. Befitting

the region's position on the Pacific Rim, it is willingly assuming a leadership position for international trade and relationships with the entire Pacific basin.

The trick for all of us here today is to make that system even better. There are challenges though, and they are serious. The first is new population growth, up to three million people according to some estimates. When that number of people is added to an urban area, there has to be commensurate impacts on all the life-support systems, starting with water, land use; employment, housing, environment, in addition to transportation. If we looked only at transportation, our task becomes three-fold: 1. to complete existing major plans; 2. to maintain and rehabilitate existing transportation systems; 3. to meet current unmet needs and future needs for the entire system.

Making our challenge even more complicated is a set of external forces operating in many diverse ways. They range from the more obvious aspects such as the instability in the world economy, the American economy's federal and trade deficits, federal transportation financial support, disinvolvement of the federal government in many program areas, a greater thrust toward a decentralization of government, citizen dissatisfaction and loss of confidence about government, and the combined impacts of a change in the area population base. On this point it would appear that the area's population would increase demand for governmental services while unable to contribute through income taxation. This would generally be the elderly,

the young, and the lower income segments. All this adds up to the possibility that the area will be severely challenged as it develops world class region status.

We as citizens can be concerned about public affairs, particularly in the transportation arena, and are recognizing that these cross currents and contradictions are very much a part of the job for us. It makes our response and organizing ourselves and transportation institutions all the more difficult. To some degree, other urban areas have faced similar challenges but I believe none ever to the point that we have now before us. Whenever these areas faced their challenges, the change has been prompted by a crisis or possibly a long perceived need that became more feasible as political and economic opportunities arose. Nevertheless, we are not alone in the nation and other areas are now facing a mixture of challenges as intense for themselves though not the same. No area is self-satisfied and contented with current or future transportation systems.

Given these forces and general background developments for the public policy arena, transportation will have to compete with other basic life-support activities for the region. Keeping that very much in mind, the paper and ensuing discussion addressed the challenges and opportunities, the current institutional arrangements, the process-oriented alternatives for reaching the future, and examples of arrangements in different modal forms and locations.

Much of the Southern California reputation, of which multi-modal transportation has to a large part made possible, is a cultural value of rich

diversity. The cultures themselves, languages, ethnicity, racial, life-style, economic, climate and geographic diversities add up to a wonderful chemistry that gives us a positive reputation in the world. People still move here willingly and seek it as an area to live. Let us help keep our transportation system in strong form as now and make it even better to protect and enhance the diversity of our environment and lifestyle.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. What regional transportation needs do you foresee?
 - immediate
 - near-term (five years)
 - long-term (year 2000)
2. What organizational structures and interrelationships would be necessary for such needs?
 - status quo (including incremental, marginal adjustments)
 - disinvolvement
 - grand design
 - combination
3. When and how should elected officials provide strategy leadership for meeting transportation needs and managing transportation organizations?
4. When and how should public votes be sought for guidance?

In terms of:

 1. identifying needs
 2. meeting the needs
 3. organizational structure and management of the process
 4. supporting solutions
5. How should organizational arrangements be established?
 1. local evolution (agreements, contracts, memoranda of understanding)
 2. state legislature creating new agency(ies), policies, programs
 3. federal law creating new agency(ies), policies, programs
 4. public vote(s)

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS

Mr. David Grayson
Auto Club of Southern California
Panel #1

- o The multitude of Southern California governments has not taken a leadership role in local decision making and transportation planning. This has shifted to Washington and Sacramento. Locals need to be pulled together to support decision making instead of transportation commissions and the SCRTD. Perhaps SCAG or the Chamber should take a role of pulling it together.
- o Great strides are taking place in diverse groups coming together--the transportation future is much brighter now than in the last 35 years.
- o Transportation commissions have a pivotal role in bringing officials together and focusing on transportation issues.
- o A jointly managed, five county transportation authority has been proposed--and received a good reception from all counties but Los Angeles.
- o Orange County Proposition A is not completely in sync with regional transportation plans. (Editor's note: the measure failed)

- o Recently, private providers have been invited into the discussion of regional transportation services.
- o A major problem encountered is turn over of elected officials.
- o Privately owned vehicles and private sector providers (plus tax payers) actually furnish 95% of all transportation.
- o Need to focus on meeting demand of public for transportation services and how might the demand-side change.
- o Cornerstone of the basin is the automobiles. We cannot surplant the auto but should create mix of transportation modes.
- o Anticipate stable change process.
- o Los Angeles is a world-class city and the L. A. of the future will be several urban centers. The district features of the separate but related communities will be clearly evident.
- o Decisions concerning future land use are being decided today-outside of current urban boundaries. They will impact the quality of life and certainly future transportation needs.
- o Greater interest in transportation planning due to increase density of area.

- o Distribution of working hours has varied throughout the area.
- o Future lies in two-tiered transportation system (traditional transit services and ride sharing).
- o Demand for transportation may be shaped by increased use of balanced communities.
- o Support voiced for the large grand designed approach included some change in roles for elected officials, more education for them, the possibility of SCAG and the Chamber working together, the need to plan around the automobile, and the belief that consensus is synonymous where money and power reside and that is where we need to focus on regional government.
- o No present funding mechanism is in place for regional government.
- o We can use existing structures for creating cohesion and regional planning.
- o Time is of the essence.
- o The mayor of Los Angeles is giving leadership to the region but has no real power.
- o We need to agree to agree.

Dr. David Mars
University of Southern California
Panel #2

- o Is there a problem? Yes there seems to be a problem in the transportation arena.
- o What is the problem? On that there was more diverse thought and difficulty in reaching definition and agreement.
- o What is the future problem or, is there one? Yes, there are future problems and they relate to the increased population growth.
- o What to do about the future problems? There was even more uncertainty and division of opinion on how to respond to those future challenges.
- o Some thought that technology and telecommunication can play increasingly important role in changing the transportation situation.
- o Others believe that management of transportation demand offers greater promise and that we are beginning to make strides in that.
- o Questions were raised about, should we change the way people think or build systems serving what people want?
- o Other discussion related to how priorities are shaped, by whom, by accident, or by intent?

- o Most discussion related to the people aspect of mass transportation.

- o Many believe that elected officials would have to give up political power to make progress possible.

- o Los Angeles is not unique among urban sunbelt cities, despite our tendency to think we are different.
- o Los Angeles already has better bus utilization, ride sharing, and van pooling accomplishments than most other sunbelt cities.
- o A balanced approach is necessary to link together land use and transportation planning--the two are inseparable.
- o How is consensus defined and achieved is a major concern.
- o The possible separation of transportation planning from transportation operations was considered; e.g., overlapping jurisdictions--RTD to run buses (or rapid rail), CTC (or SCAG) as the implementing body.
- o Metropolitan planning as a necessary, but almost utopian, goal.
- o Public perception of transportation in L.A. is distorted. How to increase both awareness of needs and acceptance for change?
- o There are indications that vehicle miles traveled (VTM) are less in the Southern California area than many other cities, shorter trips and perhaps fewer trips in given circumstances.
- o Other urban areas have caught up with us in terms of metropolitan-wide travel.

CONCLUSION

Recognizing the diversity of the participants and comments made here today, it would seem that we have made an excellent start on addressing the organizational relationships for our transportation institutions to help us reach the twenty-first century. The financial problems will be of strong consideration, along with infrastructure demands for the general urban area and specifically transportation. More and more of our system is due to reach its design lifetime and will require large sums of additional capital to maintain and rehabilitate. These tasks are basic ones that must be completed and continued without even considering the possibility of building new systems. More and more, the area is realizing its interdependence with freight components, although the passenger side of the transportation system in Southern California is the more visible and glamorous one. It captures far more of the headlines. In the port complexes, the pipeline modes, intercity freight by truck and rail and aviation, there are enormous transportation activities with large significant impacts for the area and the nation.

Consensus of the day was that there will be serious transportation problems, but their impact may be unevenly felt, both geographically and by the type of trip. Opinions seemed to favor the incremental approach which would allow the introduction of innovation, such as telecommunications. While there was agreement that transportation facilities needed improving, there was strong feelings that individual autonomy and mobility must be

Whether attempting to respond to our citizens' transportation needs at the current level of population (or the future level expanding by three million people), or with the national interest very much in mind as the leading American city on the Pacific Rim, our challenges are clear and formidable. We have an excellent base started already that must be kept going. Upon it we can build much if consensus is achieved among institutions, leadership, and the people. However these features may be reached, certain key guidelines should be considered, and include: 1. economic factors; 2. efficiency; 3. effectiveness; 4. productivity; 5. social equity. These factors can well be incorporated in our transportation work. Additional items that will make a significant difference for our efforts are prompted by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Not only do they stress economic efficiency and equity, but they raise the up-front need for political accountability and administrative effectiveness. Lastly, there is something to be said for getting started whatever we choose to do; to end discussion and to do something, presuming it is the right thing that gets started and there is agreement to support it. Robert Moses, reportedly during earlier days in New York when building up the NY/NJ Port Authority, used to say when asked about his gigantic public works projects: "Once the stakes are planted, the appropriations battle is over." And so it may be with Los Angeles. Once the public sees something has begun, support can galvanize for a coordinated, well-balanced and designed blue print for the future.

APPENDIX A

ORGANIZING SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
TRANSPORTATION INSTITUTIONS
FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Introduction

Every now and then citizens face a situation perceived as an opportunity. Sometimes, such moments may be called challenges or crises. Other times, they may be missed entirely as clear cut, visible opportunities. They may sneak up on us. They may be incremental, slow moving changes that in any given moment or month may not be too evident as a concern. However when we take a look, dropping back and saying what has changed in the last couple years or what may in the future, some significant observations might bubble up to the surface. Often, they can be very startling. The Southern California crystal ball currently employed by most observers conjures up some intriguing possibilities.

Other Urban Areas

When presented with similar challenges, how have other urban areas in the nation responded? Some, with strong institutional relationships and traditions, have met their challenges, as we are beginning to meet or at least foresee, with very far reaching commitments and action. As a result they assembled the most impressive systems. Although these areas may sometimes be considered as decaying now, unable to resurrect or renew themselves, their basic infrastructure still makes a significant difference. But for many, the amount of new capital and political organization commitment is just too large. Northeastern and Midwestern cities and their public works infrastructure, particularly in transportation, illustrate the political and organizational leadership that made those structures possible in earlier days. New York, Boston and Chicago had tremendous past investments, which are still vital to their life support. However, their own representatives have indicated large, grand measures must be taken to rehabilitate and improve their systems. In the sunbelt areas of the country such as the South and Southwest (to some extent the Northwest) where the political relationships and population needs are all newer, more freshly created, the question only recently has been--how do we rehabilitate and improve? It was instead, how do we even meet the basic needs for the projected growth?

The purpose in raising comparative situations is just to say that these areas made some large scale public decisions, often that were intensely fought and developed over time. It was not as if there was always a single moment when the key, major decision was made. Yet in a few cases such as in the New York and Seattle area, clear-cut decisions were made about what type of organizations and political leadership was necessary, and how to finance it. They are still moving forward today on these basic decisions that have set up the parameters of the political, transportation decision making game. Even with all the problems of federal and state funding and infrastructure deterioration, their game rules still apply.

Reality Check

The concept implicit for us here is that we have now the chance to start fundamental discussions, which may lead to similar important decisions. It might be said that things are fine the way they are. That really may just be the case. But are we sure? Do we want to pass by the opportunity to take that review?

With that in mind it would be useful to review some of the current and future challenges before us.

Year 2000 Challenges for Southern California

Data generated by SCAG and other public and private organizations indicate that the Southern California area may grow to as much as fifteen million population by the year 2000. In an area that is already stressed, or at capacity, for many of the basic, life-support infrastructure requirements, such numbers appear disturbing and even mindboggling. Even if the population increase does not generate as highly or at all, current needs are large enough in many locations that basic decisions must be made, one would think, and not overlooked or consciously avoided. The challenges that are evident range from water, housing, and food supply, to quality of life factors involving education, health, mobility, air, among many factors.

Impacts

Befitting our status as the fourteenth largest gross national product¹ in the world, future transportation needs, according to earlier SCAG data are the following:²

TABLE I
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS -- YEAR 2000

	BASE CONDITION 1979 OR 1980	YEAR 2000 IMPACTS
Added person trips/day (percent)	36,751,000	+37%
Added transit trips/day (percent)	1,144,000	+51%
Added vehicle miles of travel/day (percent)	193,789,000	+36%
Percent of transportation system with congestion during peak periods	27%	50%
Average speed on highway network (p.m. peak period; miles/hour)	23 m/h (estimated)	14.5 m/h

There is no need to belabor the impact of such numbers. What must be kept in mind financially and politically is that response to such travel needs does not take place in a vacuum. Transportation must compete with other public policy problems of equal or greater magnitude. Housing, water, power, health and education and law enforcement are right up there too. In the early post-Proposition 13 period we quickly experienced and learned how transportation fit into state and local priorities. In various public opinion polls, transportation concerns (as most public works activities) were far down at the bottom. At the top were basic political elements for the immediate well being of the community-public safety, education, health. The lesson should not be forgotten.

The consequences of these predictions begin to influence how we organize and lead ourselves. If transportation can be extricated from the larger public

policy environment of these other urban services, and given long-term stability so that it may provide a basic framework for the urban area's survival and growth, then a tremendous breakthrough will have occurred. Heretofore, our freeway system in the post-World War II era represented that transportation institutional framework. It seems likely that with more limited future resources, competing demands and more population, this framework will not work as well.

Transportation Institutional Arrangements -- 1984

The existing transportation institutional framework is a rich fabric of heritage, experience and independence. It has worked very well so far in many regards and been up to the needs of our population. In other ways, it has not worked so well and segments of the population are making their opinions known. It has been fragmented and influenced greatly by several large scale influential actors. In the process of performing their legal responsibility, they have helped determine Southern California geographic form and infrastructure. Such institutions have been evident in aviation, highway, rail, and port activities.

Technology and Institutions

As each transportation technology became available in Southern California, new institutions were laid over the existing framework of facilities and operations. The 1984 mosaic was developed by a familiar sequence. Generally, one major transportation system started the framework. In our case it was rail, which became a network of interurban electric rail transportation designed in large part to help facilitate urban residential development. Soon overlapping the twelve hundred mile Pacific Electric network was the new automobile/highway technology. The extensive system today determines the character of bus transit operations. While this was occurring, aviation was planted in rural locations, along with the pipeline (water, waste, petroleum) system and the power grid system. Developing in parallel but still primarily as a function of the rail system were the ports of Southern California. The entire mosaic became more tightly woven together, as population grew. Its components are now coexisting in reasonable tolerance of each other, both passenger and freight movement. The future though may not remain so sanguine.

Considering just the institutional relationships, Southern California is complex,³ but not as much as other areas.⁴ New York has fourteen hundred separate units of local government, Chicago has four hundred. In California there are at least forty-seven hundred special districts, excluding school districts. Our area has over 180 cities. Still, the number of transportation agencies must number over several hundred if social service/health providers are counted as well.⁵

Modal and Administrative Complexity

It is thus useful to try to segment the large jigsaw puzzle into several pieces. For our purpose there are six major modes in operation:

1. Highways
2. Transit
3. Aviation
4. Ports (maritime)
5. Rail
6. Pipelines

For these modes certain administrative functions must occur. Each is a large function by itself. A broad brush review divides these functions into at least eleven categories:

1. Planning
2. Programming Priorities
3. Coordinating
4. Evaluating
5. Designing
6. Engineering
7. Financing
8. Site/Equipment Acquisition
9. Building
10. Operating and Maintaining
11. Enforcement

Table II identifies current organizations involved in each of these activities. They range from the regional level such as SCAG, to the county and municipal level including state agencies as appropriate. Also, private operators are involved: railroad and pipeline corporations. There are quasi-public authorities or special districts, such as transit operators, airport authorities or districts. Please note that not all types are listed, intentionally (e.g., taxi, intercity bus).

In this scheme one sees a blending generally from the macro, that is a broad regional scale to the micro, the narrow geographic, specific activity. In fact, the various functions identified in the table show three broad bands:

Macro-Policy/Program

1. Planning
2. Programming
3. Coordinating
4. Evaluating

Macro/micro-Program/Project

5. Designing
6. Engineering
7. Financing

Micro/Implementation

8. Site/equipment acquisition
9. Building

10. Operating/Maintaining
11. Enforcement

The three bands, in this sense from large scale to small scale, highlight broad responsibilities and relationships as shift to implementation stages. There are exceptions to this across the board, but in general relationships hold. For example, Caltrans does broad scale macro level activities in the freeway system but also very micro level, project implementation.

Two other vantage points highlight the degree of decentralization and centralization of our current institutions. Table III shows how transportation management functions tend from decentralized to centralized as the activity moves from the implementation project level to the macro policy level. However when considering model operations in Table IV, the relationship becomes more decentralized in most modes.

Organizing Guidelines

As difficult as it may be to make some observations about this system, there are ways to at least organize initial thinking about what might be useful for the year 2000. Over the years several criteria have been generally identified as useful analytic departure points.

They can be reduced to three major aspects:

1. Technical
2. Administrative/Political
3. Private/Public Providers

By technical, it is meant, does the function do what it is supposed to do? How well does it do it? Is it meeting the legal and common public expectations for that service? Is it constantly renewing its basic operation, and improving it for the future? Is it prepared to install and phase in new technology and procedures?

The administrative and political aspects are meant to indicate a variety of things that add up to what we consider organizational competence and capability. They include geographic scale and population of the service area, the number of functions allocated to that organization, the structure of the organization, its leadership, including elected, appointed, civil service, or private management, the cost of its activities, how the transportation function is financed, and the complexity of its operation.

With the variety of possible guidelines to help us already, a third possibility is the provider. A simplistic maxim seems to be that the private sector prefers profits. If transport services are profitable, they may be provided. At some point though, when it is no longer a money making venture but necessary as a public function for the commonweal, the public often moves in. In rare cases, the flow of relationship goes in the other direction. A public agency starts an operation and becomes a private operation. Several examples will illustrate both directions. In many metropolitan areas a transit system, initially private sector ventures, became public as

TABLE II
TRANSPORTATION INSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND STRUCTURE
IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA 1984

<u>MODE:</u>	<u>HIGHWAY</u>	<u>TRANSIT</u>	<u>AVIATION</u>	<u>PORTS</u>	<u>RAIL</u>	<u>PIPELINES</u>
<u>LEVEL/AUTHORITY:</u>						
I. <u>Macro (Policy/Program)</u>						
1. Planning						
2. Programming Priorities	SCAG Caltrans	SCAG Caltrans	SCAG Operators	SCAG Ports	SCAG R.R.	SCAG Operator
3. Coordinating	CTC's	CTC's				
4. Evaluating						
II. <u>Macro/Micro (Program/Project)</u>						
5. Designing	Caltrans County	Operators	Operators	Ports	R.R.	Operators
6. Engineering	City					
7. Financing	+CTC's	+CTC's				
III. <u>Micro (Implementation)</u>						
8. Site/Equipment Acquisition	Caltrans County	Operators	Operators	Ports	R.r.	Operators
9. Building	City					
10. Operating/ Maintaining						
11. Enforcement	CHP PUC Police	PUC Police	Operators FAA CAB PUC	Operators PUC Cst. Grd. Corps Eng.	R.R. PUC Police	PUC Police

TABLE III

DECENTRALIZATION-CENTRALIZATION SCALE OF TRANSPORTATION INSTITUTIONS

IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA 1984

(All modes combined)*

<u>RANGE:</u>	<u>DECENTRALIZATION</u>	<u>MODERATE</u>	<u>CENTRALIZATION</u>
<u>FUNCTIONS:</u>			
<u>Macro (Policy/Program)</u>			
1. Planning			X
2. Programming			X
3. Coordinating			X
4. Evaluating			X
<u>Macro/Mirco (Program/Project)</u>			
5. Designing		X	
6. Engineering		X	
7. Financing		X	
<u>Micro (Implementation)</u>			
8. Site/Equipment Acquisition	X		
9. Building	X		
10. Operating/Maintaining	X		
11. Enforcement	X		

* Scale based on number of agencies involved, unity of authority and implementation.

TABLE IV

DECENTRALIZATION-CENTRALIZATION SCALE OF TRANSPORTATION MODES
IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA 1984

(All functions combined)*

<u>RANGE:</u>	<u>DECENTRALIZATION</u>	<u>MODERATE</u>	<u>CENTRALIZATION</u>
<u>MODE:</u>			
1. Highways			X
2. Transit		X	
3. Aviation	X		
4. Ports	X		
5. Rail	X		
6. Pipelines	X		

* If reviewing each function within a mode, a different placement would result.

a basic lifesupport public service. Commuter rail followed the same path. The provision of water in many areas went the same way. Yet, in some transportation functions the initial capital required was so large for even private leadership, public involvement was necessary and ultimately became more dominate. These include aviation and ports. In those cases special districts or public authorities were created and given freedom (and independence) to operate as if a private corporation. This power includes making a profit and keeping it, labelling it as a surplus or capital reserve. A notable exception to the pattern has been highways in the state of California. From the very beginning the freeway system has been a public function and this may well be a result of the extreme size, complexity and magnitude of the public works project.

Reversing the direction, public operation is so successful it is sold (or attempted to) back to the private sector. The New York/New Jersey Port Authority considered selling its World Trade Center when New York City was bankrupt and there was pressure to raise revenue from all sources. Conrail might be sold.

For the most part, it would seem that both public and private remain separate and the blending is very infrequent. However, it appears that as these future needs earlier identified become more evident, the level of cooperation and combined activity from public and private sectors may be encouraged or forced to be much larger than we experienced so far in the Southern California frame of reference.

As a rule it would appear that experience in the nation has been built incrementally and on a fragmented basis. There has been no great leap forward except for some extreme situations such as the formation of the New York Port Authority, that has brought planning for transport across the board to a large scale region. And now with the federal incentive for such macro level activities slowly disinvolving, there is more stress upon the local areas to organize themselves in the best way, free of federal and sometimes state influence.

Implications of Institutional Arrangements

Keeping the blending of the bands in mind from macro to mirco, we can see that there are certain types of activities that may naturally cry out for some organizational form and particular functions. For example, building or operating or enforcement are fairly specialized. They could be lumped together into one organization by each mode or for all modes. These are fairly technical matters. They possess considerable amount of organizational size and prestige because of the resources necessary. In many ways they may be considered prime prize or rewards for managing the system. But such an idea is jumping ahead somewhat. Let us go back to reality for a moment.

Current we have an amalgum of organizations with different powers and degrees of centralization.

Status Quo

The first possibility is to leave things as they are, status quo. If this were done, then all the existing relationships remain in place. They might be slightly worked with on the margin through interagency agreements and memoranda. This has worked. It may continue to work and could be just as effective. However, common sense and some sort of "experimental horse sense" has been telling us; maybe, this has not worked as well in the past as it could have and we are concerned. Some of the limitations in the past may well have been leadership, technological complexity, limitations on funds (local, state, federal) lengthiness of the organizational negotiation process, among many other possible factors. Such status quo choice does not preclude the possibility of a stronger staff and bureaucratic role in the decision making system, and for them to take a much stronger leadership role.

Disinvolvement

A second broad strategy choice is for the public role, whatever it may be, to disinvolve. It is not inconceivable, as we have seen at the federal level since 1980, to back out; to take the philosophical point that if a service is necessary, it will be provided by a private sector. People will organize the operations themselves. If that is the case, then those activities which promise potential profits will be the ones to flourish and others will naturally be left out. It is also possible that the private sector in combination with the nonprofit or voluntary sector may provide some forms of public charity to make possible serving those unable to pay. This choice heretofore has not been made in Southern California. It does not seem to be a feasible view for the future. Nevertheless, it must be recognized as a distinct possibility because the model for the nation has been set at the federal level, even though the federal government's attempt to do this has not been completely successful.

Grand Strategy Designs

A third broad choice is to state some kind of grand strategy design. Here, a theoretical structure would be developed to handle the entire transport function in Southern California. It could be in any number of combinations and varieties, from one unified form to a variety of subagencies and level of relationships. A key difference from status quo would be this: a blueprint would be established to clearly lay out who does what, how, when and other prime relationships such as funding and authority. In this scheme it could be accomplished by a ground swell of public opinion or civic groups to initiate the process, by governmental staff leadership, by appointed political or elected political leadership, or by crisis creating an opportunity. To design, sell and implement such a plan, an unusual circumstance would be necessary. In other urban areas it generally has been a financial crisis, a traffic crisis such as grid lock, power failures, or private sector bankruptcy. In a few limited cases the private sector leadership for the metropolitan area has seen what is happening, organizes into task forces and

commissions (with high level public sector participation) to identify goals for the area and sell to the public how those goals can best be met technically and organizationally. Seattle and Portland have employed this approach and on occasion New York, Atlanta, Dallas and Indianapolis.

Future Realism

Knowing the political and cultural heritage of Southern California, it is difficult for us to imagine how a large scale, monolithic agency would work here. But it is possible. With proper public support our political leadership may accomplish it. But it may not be desirable, just as we already know that the existing framework may not be desirable in some regards. So, what does that leave us with; some very serious fundamental questions. So long as the political representation system is aggregated for each body or function in the transport sector, a commission or governing body reflects the same composition. In each case the representative will have split responsibilities--to represent his or her jurisdiction directly, issue by issue, or on a larger more civic macro scale represent the general citizenry. Both roles do conflict. With that in mind, appointing such representatives directly to a new commission or board may only bring their prior experiences forward into a new setting. We have seen some indication of that in existing organizations.

Occasionally, one solution is to elect an independent group of people with their own electoral base to direct the newly created organization. By creating yet another organization with an independent power base, it is possible to break loose of existing relationships and representation patterns. And rather than hire completely new staff and start from scratch, some organizations may take over the existing structures and reorganize incrementally. If this path were taken, there is indication from other experiences as well that the staffs do not easily blend and the period of transition is long and tumultuous.

If new organizations are created, they also might be based upon the functional and modal combinations presented in the earlier tables. It might be decided that one agency in the entire metropolitan area, from the macro to the micro level, would perform a single modal function. For example, in aviation a single organization could handle all functions. Some areas in the nation have chosen to do this for transit: Metropolitan Atlanta Regional Transit Authority (MARTA) and Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) with the cooperation of their regional A-95 type agencies. There are other illustrations in the country where several modes have been combined and handle all the functions including maritime, freight, and passenger functions. Seattle and New York have moved in this direction. Another possibility is take all similar activity--financing--and assign it to a new organization. There really is no model of this in the nation and it may not be a very good approach.

Conclusion

At this point discussion can not usefully proceed further. Alternatives and their implications have been raised with selected discussion of previous

experiences elsewhere in the country. In our democratic system such free wheeling discussion and choice in wonderful and provides a valuable exchange of ideas. Given the way the region is growing (population and life support needs), it is crucial that we institutionally reorganize by the year 2000 towards a more coordinated system. It must be done to provide the best possible combined activities and services for the public.

We should consider the future in terms of actions desirable

1. immediately;
2. near term (up to 5 years);
3. long term (to the year 2000).

Segmenting time in this manner makes it easier to discuss what types of crises and issues might occur and appropriate responses.

For more shorter term, immediate situations, existing status quo operations and relationships can be enhanced by planning on the margin at the status quo. Such incremental adjustments may be quite satisfactory given their current conditions. But for those large scale, mega, new activities necessary whether they be a bullet train, airport development, harbor development, transit development, whatever, new organizations might be considered and phased in as part of this process.

Hotter, more political issues may be very difficult. New responses could be set up in such a way to become effective beyond the life-span, politically, of current agencies, organizations and leadership. For example, if it were decided that some large scale, multimodal functional agency were necessary, then its effective implementation period could be targeted for 1995. The transition period thus is well known and discussed in advance. If elections were necessary for new leadership, or new taxes, this could be worked out in the same way.

Experience nationally is so diverse, given various geographic, demographic and economic bases, that no single form or situation appears better than another. There is one, rare example which seems to be continually moving forward and meeting new challenges. The New York/New Jersey Port Authority is perhaps the closest American combined, multimodal, planning, engineering building and operating agency with strong powers in many categories. Often a subject of complaint and alienation in its own metropolitan area, it nevertheless is the dominating transportation force.

Lastly, for better or for worse, the New York experience (also Seattle, Portland, Chicago, Atlanta, Washington, San Francisco) indicates a trend towards greater centralization and coordinated activity. Perhaps, that is a function of operating scale and complexity in their urban areas. What it does seem to suggest is that as things become more difficult, more complex and a greater magnitude of operation, a different organizational structure and relationship is necessary intergovernmentally. We have yet to make those decisions and yield completely to that tendency, though there have been some hints (County Transportation Commission). Our counties are large. They are greater than many of the metropolitan jurisdictions in the country. That reality has somewhat lessened our past need for centralization.

Another three million people may well put our assumptions at risk. Initial thinking in the transportation community shows we are concerned and want to gaze into the Southern California crystal ball to the year 2000. Whatever is made visible to us, we should be ready institutionally to respond and serve the Southern California community in the best possible way.



Notes

1. Security Pacific Bank, The Sixty Mile Circle (Los Angeles: Security Pacific, 1982), p. 3.
2. Southern California Association of Governments, Environmental Impact Report on SCAG-82 Growth Forecast Policy (Draft), Summary (Los Angeles: SCAG, 1982), p. 14.
3. Southern California Association of Governments, Regional Transportation Plan Amendment (Los Angeles: SCAG, Draft, November, 1978), p. 97.
4. See Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Condition of Contemporary Federalism (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing office, August, 1981) and ACIR, Toward More Balanced Transportation (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975) for excellent general background discussion.
5. See Peter L. Shaw and Renee Simon, Los Angeles County Transportation Public Policy Impact Study, 1977-1980 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation/Urban Mass Transportation Administration, Governments Printing Office, 1981), pp. 47-53, p. 74.

APPENDIX B
PARTICIPANTS

Rita Barschak
League of Women Voters
3660 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 116
Los Angeles, Ca. 90010

Adrienne Brooks
ESGV Consortium
1325 West Garvey Ave.
West Covina, Ca. 91790

Richard J. Begley
Ralph M. Parsons Company
100 West Walnut
Pasadena, Ca. 91124

Murray Brown
Executive Director
Center for Public Resources
JFK Library
California State University
Los Angeles
5151 State University Drive
Los Angeles, Ca. 90032

David Butler
Caltrans, District 7
P.O. Box 2304
Terminal Annex
Los Angeles, Ca. 90051

Patti Chaplin
Commuter Computer
3325 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, Ca. 90010

Geoffrey Commons
California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street, Room 312
Sacramento, Ca. 95814

Nancy Coss-Fitzwater
Orange County Transportation
Commission

Gary N. Cottrell
County of Riverside Administration
Office
4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor
Riverside, Ca.

Alan T. Cunningham
Transamerica Occidental
1150 South Olive St., T-2500
Los Angeles, Ca. 90015

L.R. Davis
Southern California Rapid Transit
District
7878 Telegraph Rd.
Downey, Ca. 90240

Ron Davis
Pacific Bussing
1901 Blake Ave.
Los Angeles, Ca. 90039

John F. Day
Director
SCRTD
425 South Main Street
Los Angeles, Ca. 90013

John P. Drohan, Jr.
Director of Business Planning
Jones, Cooper, & Associates, Inc.
528 State St.
Glendale, Ca. 91203

George M. Duarte
Parsons, Brinckerhoff, Quade,
& Douglas, Inc.
2323 North Broadway, Ste. 200
Santa Ana, Ca. 92708

John A. Dyer
Southern California RTD
425 South Main St.
Los Angeles, Ca. 90013

John R. Edney
The Durham Companies
P.O. Box 948
Rosemead, Ca. 91770

Gary Edson
OCTD
11222 Alicia Parkway
Gardena Grove, Ca. 92642

Gunter Ernst
Dueway Corporation
165 Carver Ave.
Westwood, N.J. 07675

Charles H. Fitts
The Budd Company, Transit Division
One Red Lion Road
Philadelphia, Pa. 19115

Cliff Ford
City of Delano
P.O. Box 939
Delano, Ca. 93216

Bea Foster
Director
California Peace Academy
(Orange Community Housing Corp.)
12593 Vista Panorama
Santa Ana, Ca. 92705

Dan J. Gladden
Southern California Gas Company
810 South Flower St.
Los Angeles, Ca. 90051

Patricia Guin
County of Los Angeles
Transportation Dept.
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, Ca. 90012

Lois Hill Hale
Senator Diane Watson's Office
4401 Crenshaw Blvd., Ste. 300
Los Angeles, Ca. 90043

Mark Hamud
Government Relations
SCAG
600 South Commonwealth Ave., Ste. 1000
Los Angeles, Ca. 90005

Lynn Harris Government Relations
SCAG
600 South Commonwealth Ave., Ste. 1000
Los Angeles, Ca. 90005

Tricia Harrigan
League of Women Voters of
Orange County
One Hampshire Court
Newport Beach, Ca. 92660

Robert Kabel
Caltrans
P.O. Box 2304, T.A.
Los Angeles, Ca. 90051

Olivia Joseph
Los Angeles City Transportation Dept.
City Hall, Room 1200
Los Angeles, Ca. 90012

James S. Kenan
Orange County Transportation Commissioner
1055 North Main St., Ste. 516
Santa Ana, Ca. 92701

Tim Kerr
City of Rosemead
8838 Valley Blvd.
Rosemead, Ca. 91770

Charles L. Laird
Assistant Director
San Bernardino County Transportation/
Flood Control
825 East Third St., Room 100
San Bernardino, Ca. 92415-0835

Joe Leach
Los Angeles County
Transportation Commission
354 South Spring St., Suite 500
Los Angeles, Ca. 90013

Eugene R. Leyval
Taxicab Paratransit Association
of California
1005 Eighth St., Suite 205
Sacramento, Ca. 95814

Pamela A. Lucado
City of Anaheim Planning Dept., Rm. 162
P.O. Box 3222
Anaheim, Ca. 92803

Neal K. Liddicoat
Barton-Aschman Associates, Inc.
180 South Lake Ave., Ste. 260
Pasadena, Ca. 91101

Wesley C. McDaniel
Executive Director
San Bernardino Associated
Governments
334 West Third St., Ste. 401
San Bernardino, Ca. 92401

Jene McKnight
Los Angeles County Department
of Regional Planning
1390 Hall of Records
320 West Temple St.
Los Angeles, Ca. 90012

Andre Migneault, Eng.
Economic Counsellor
Quebec Government Office
700 Flower Street, Ste. 1520
Los Angeles, Ca. 90017

David R. Miller
Printing Industries of California
1434 West 12th Street
Los Angeles, Ca. 90015

Brian Navis
Pacific Busing
1901 Blake Ave.
Los Angeles, Ca. 90039

John W. Nugent
N/S Corporation
235 West Florence Ave.
Inglewood, Ca. 90301

James D. Ortner
Automobile Club of Southern California
2601 South Figueroa St.
Los Angeles, Ca. 90007

Anne Palatino
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond St.
Redondo Beach, Ca. 90277

Vahak Petrossian
California Public Utilities Commission
350 McAllister St.
San Francisco, Ca. 94102

R.G. (Bob) Pote
Caltrans, District 8
P.O. Box 231
San Bernardino, Ca. 92402

Anne W. Purse
League of Women Voters,
Pasadena Area
1393 East Washington Blvd.
Pasadena, Ca. 91104

Marie Ransom
Transportation Director
Foothill Area Community Services
101 South Arroyo Parkway
Pasadena, Ca. 91105

John W. Richeson
Southern California
Rapid Transit District
425 South Main St.
Los Angeles, Ca. 90013

Nan Reinan
Northrop Aircraft Corp.
1201-31 Northrop Aircraft Division
One Northrop Ave.
Hawthorne, Ca. 90250

Irwin Rosenberg
Medi-Ride, Inc.
6117 Lankershim Blvd.
North Hollywood, Ca. 91606

Mitchell S. Rouse
Private Sector Systems, Inc.
117 West "B" Street
Wilmington, Ca. 90744

Stephens Schutte
Citizens of the 13th District

Joy Saltzberg
Los Angeles County Department of
Regional Planning
320 West Temple St.
Los Angeles, Ca. 90012

Jerry A. Saunders
Continental Development Corp.
2041 Rosecrans Ave., #265
El Segundo, Ca. 90245

John Simmons
Golden Transportation
1901 Blake Ave.
Los Angeles, Ca. 90039

Myles A. Simpson
Bolt Berane and Newman, Inc.
21120 Vanowen St.
Canoga Park, Ca. 91303

Renee Simon
SCAG
600 South Commonwealth Ave., Ste. 1000
Los Angeles, Ca. 90005

Jim Sims
Los Angeles County
Transportation Commission
354 South Spring St., Ste. 500
Los Angeles, Ca. 90013

Tom Snelson
Executive Director
Government Council
Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
404 South Bixel St.
Los Angeles, Ca. 90017

Jonathan Stevens
City of Santa Ana
20 Civic Center Plaza
Santa Ana, Ca. 92701

Brice Allen Stephenson
City of San Marino
2200 Huntington Drive
San Marino, Ca. 91108

Carl A. Stutsman
Hill, Farrer, & Burrill
1422 North Central, #1
Glendale, Ca. 91202

Murray A. Sulkin
Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Mendonhall
3250 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, Ca. 90010

Daniel K. Tabor
Councilman
City of Inglewood
P.O. Box 6500
Inglewood, Ca. 90301

Lee Travers
City of Upland
P.O. Box 460
Upland, Ca. 91786

Nathan Wang
Director of Research
Edmund G. "Pat" Brown
Institute of Government Affairs
450 North Roxbury Dr., Ste. 305
Beverly Hills, Ca. 90210

Monte R. Ward
Orange County
Transportation Commission
1055 North Main St., Ste. 516
Santa Ana, Ca. 92701

Chuck White
Sumitomo Corporation of America
444 South Flower St., Ste. 1600
Los Angeles, Ca. 90071

Brad Williams
SCAG
600 South Commonwealth Ave., Ste. 1000
Los Angeles, Ca. 90005

Rene Wilson
1215 Kewen Drive
Pasadena, Ca. 91108

Mark Zierten
Culver City Municipal Bus Lines
9815 Jefferson Blvd.
Culver City, Ca. 90232

