



NEW MTA FARES

NOTE: These fares are effective Feb 1 and are the result of a temporary settlement between the MTA and the NAACP/LCSC. The actual trial will be held in June.

REGULAR CASH FARES

Discount Token* (valid for payment of base cash fare)	90¢
Base Fare	\$1.35
Metro Red Line Fare	25¢
Transfers (each use)	25¢
Express Zone Fare	50¢ per zone
(maximum 5 additional zones on express bus lines)	

SENIOR/DISABLED/SIGHT-IMPAIRED FARES

Senior/Disabled/Sight-Impaired	45¢
Metro Red Line	10¢
Transfers (each use)	10¢

MONTHLY PASSES

Regular Monthly Pass	\$49
Semi-monthly Pass	\$26.50
Express Stamps	\$15
Senior, Disabled, Sight-Impaired	\$12
Students (Kindergarten-Grade 12)	\$20
College/Vocational	\$30

**For additional fare, pass or token sales location information,
call 1-800-870-0MTA,**

**or write MTA Customer Relations,
P.O. Box 194, Los Angeles, CA 90053**

*Save 45¢ on every ride! MTA Discount Tokens are available in bags of 10 for \$9 and are good for the base fare. Tokens are available at hundreds of locations all over Los Angeles County. **BUSINESSES** – if you want to become a token sales outlet, call (213) 972-7000.

Help keep all of your fellow SO.CA.TA members informed!!! If you notice any new, modified, or cancelled transit services, please call us at 213-254-9041!



FROM THE EDITOR

Announcements and
comments about SO.CA.TA

Membership: We've fallen to about 24 paid members currently. Perhaps, several members have forgotten to pay dues for 1995. It's never too late!

Meeting Place: The Echo Park Methodist Church has asked that SO.CA.TA, as regular users of their facilities, provide some financial support (i.e. a donation) for upkeep of the building, etc. \$10 per meeting has been suggested by several members.

Rapid Transit/Light Rail/Proposition A: At our Rapid Transit Committee Meeting (on Jan 28), we decided that we should at least develop a working definition of "Rapid Transit" for our purposes. This debate will continue for some time; hopefully, a solution that the majority of SO.CA.TA members can commit to, will be obtained soon.

Newsletter: As always, *The Transit Advocate* needs articles, letters, photographs and research (newspaper clippings, etc.) from all members and interested non-members. If you see an interesting, transit-related article in the newspaper, consider sending a copy (preferably two copies) of the article to Box 41198, Los Angeles 90041. Material for publication should be received two weeks before the scheduled SO.CA.TA meeting date.

-Charles P. Hobbs, President/Newsletter Editor



TRANSIT USE CLIMBS AGAIN

WASHINGTON, Jan. 9— Use of the nation's public transportation systems increased last summer for the fifth straight quarter, Passenger Transport, the weekly newspaper of the transit industry, reported today.

Boardings on buses, trains and vans increased by 20.3 million between July and September, contrasted to the same period in 1993. During the first nine months of 1994, ridership grew by more than 105 million boardings, about 1.7 percent of the national total, PT reported.

"Transit's vital sign continues to be strong and increasingly regular," said APTA

Executive Vice President Jack Gilstrap. "Demand for transit service is widespread; that's an important message to Washington decision-makers at a time when all federal aid programs are under scrutiny." Most of the Federal Transit Administration's \$4.6 billion budget for 1995 is used by states and localities to buy new buses and rail cars or fix up worn out facilities.

Transit's ridership growth continues to be paced by the rail mode. Patronage on commuter rail systems climbed 5.3 percent in the quarter; heavy rail (subway) usage grew by 3.8 percent and light rail (trolley) boardings increased 3.0 percent.

(continued on page 5)



Editor's Note: This is Part Two of a two part article. Part One was presented in January's issue of The Transit Advocate.

This article is the opinion of its author(s) only, and does not necessarily represent the position of the Southern California Transit Advocates.

The Los Angeles Chapter of the Sierra Club can be contacted at (213) 387-4287. The Chairman of the Transportation Committee of the Sierra Club in Los Angeles is Stanley Hart (who is also a SO.CA.TA) member; he may be contacted either via the Sierra Club or via SO.CA.TA.

Planning Obstacles:

Many MPOs and DOTs use models to "prove" that they need to build more highways. The model may be a simple extrapolation of present trends or it may model the location of growth, commute trips and road congestion. By using assumptions which cause sprawl, they can argue that new highways are required to reduce congestion and air pollution, even though those highways increase traffic. The region can't reach attainment for ozone, they assert, but the air is cleaner than it would be without the new roads.

In polluted "non-attainment" areas, ISTEA prohibits using its funds "for any highway project that will result in a significant increase in carrying capacity for single occupant vehicles (SOV) unless

the project is part of an approved congestion management system." Be aware that constructing a high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane (rather than converting a present SOV lane into HOV) increases SOV highway capacity by removing buses and carpools from "mixed flow" lanes for the few hours a day it operates as HOV, and even more the rest of the day when it's not HOV. DOTs have even converted HOV lanes into mixed-flow lanes after construction.

Opportunities:

Challenge the adequacy of modeling which does not show how pedestrian and transit oriented infill can reduce driving. Challenge assumptions and results. Ask the following:

Would compact development in central areas, nearer destinations, shorten trips and relieve congestion?

Are the projections from the traffic models fed back to modify land use projections, and do these new land uses then modify the traffic projections, and so on to equilibrium?

- Is at least one pedestrian and transit oriented compact growth alternative modeled regionally?

• How well does the traffic model predict increased walking and transit use, and shorter trips, in denser compact areas?

Resources:

John Holtzclaw, "So You Aren't Convinced a New Highway's the ONLY Solution: An Activists Guide To Land Use - Transportation Modeling", Sierra Club, 24 April 1992, 4 p.

1000 Friends of Oregon, Making the Land Use, Transportation, Air Quality Connection: Modeling Practices, Vol 1, 10/91 (\$12, 534 SW 3rd #300, Portland OR 97204).

Michael Replogle, Managing Transportation For Air Quality and Efficient Growth, Environmental Defense Fund, 1993 (\$10; 1616 P St NW, Washington DC 20036; 202-387-3500).

M Replogle, Transportation Management Strategy for the Washington, DC Region, EDF, Aug 93 (address above).

Nancy Hanson, Energy Aware Planning Guide, California Energy Commission, 1993 (\$19, Publications MS-13, POBox 944295, Sacramento CA 94244-2950).

Wolfgang Zuckermann, End of the Road, Chelsea Green, 1991 (\$16.95).

.....
(APTA, from Page 3)

Overall use of transit buses was down slightly, except in areas of fewer than 100,000 population where increases averaged from 1.7 percent to 3.6 percent. "There was wide fluctuation in bus patronage," Gilstrap said, speculating that it was prompted by fare increases and service reductions that took effect in some areas in July, the start of the fiscal year for many public authorities. "Our member systems also felt the effect of the baseball strike, especially in cities which have direct service to ballparks," he added.

APTA is the international association of operating transit authorities, their suppliers and other advocates of improved public transportation.

.....
Selected increases in the third quarter of 1994 included

- Akron, Ohio, 6.8 %;**
- Cobb County, Ga., 5.3 %;**
- Chicago, 2.0 %;**
- Cincinnati, 6.6 %;**
- Detroit, 7.9 %;**
- Fort Lauderdale, 8.0 %;**
- Long Beach, Calif., 6.0 %.**
- New York, 4.0 %;**
- New Jersey Transit, 3.4 %;**
- Orlando, 10.7 %;**
- Philadelphia, 6.1 %;**
- Phoenix, 3.7 %;**
- Portland, 5.1 %;**
- St. Louis, 20.6 %**