

MINUTES OF THE ELEVENTH MEETING OF THE
METROPOLITAN ATLANTA RAPID TRANSIT AUTHORITY

JANUARY 3, 1967

The Board of Directors of the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority held its regular meeting on January 3, 1967, at 3:30 P.M. in the Conference Room of the Glenn Building, Atlanta. Mr. Richard H. Rich, Chairman, presided.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sanford Atwood (DeKalb County)
Roy A. Blount (DeKalb County)
Rawson Haverty (City of Atlanta)
K. A. McMillon (Gwinnett County)
W. A. Pulver (Fulton County)
Richard H. Rich (City of Atlanta)

MEMBERS ABSENT:

M. C. Bishop (Fulton County)
Edgar Blalock (Clayton County)
Mills B. Lane, Jr. (City of Atlanta)
L. D. Milton (City of Atlanta)

OTHERS PRESENT:

Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority:

H. L. Stuart, General Manager
Glenn E. Bennett, Secretary
King Elliott, Public Information Director
H. N. Johnson, Secretary to General Manager

Consultants:

J. A. Coil, Resident Manager, Parsons, Brinckerhoff-Tudor,
Bechtel, Atlanta
Raoul Garcia, Hammer, Greene, Siler Associates, Atlanta
W. Stell Huie and Tom Watson Brown, Huie and Harland,
Legal Counsel for the Authority

Others:

J. D. Wingfield, Jr., Planning Director, Atlanta Region
Metropolitan Planning Commission

Others (Cont'd.):

Mrs. Rachel Champagne, Assistant to the Executive Director,
Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission
Jerry Coursey, Transportation Planner, Atlanta Region
Metropolitan Planning Commission
W. Roy Newsome, Regional Planner, Atlanta Region Metro-
politan Planning Commission

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman.

Minutes:

Minutes of the December 5, 1966, meeting, which had been mailed, were unanimously approved, upon a motion by Dr. Atwood, seconded by Mr. Pulver. The Secretary called the attention of the Board members to a letter of explanation from the economic consultant, regarding one item in the minutes of the December 5, 1966, meeting. This related to a statement that financial officers of the governments had tentatively approved the bases for a formula for cost-sharing of rapid transit capital expenditures among the governments. The Secretary suggested that this letter be made a part of the minutes as a matter of explanation. ✓

In an effort to keep the participating governments fully informed of the progress being made by the Authority, the Secretary was directed to make certain that all participating governments receive a complete set of all minutes.

Financial Report:

The financial report for December, 1966, and the balance sheet as of December 31, 1966, together with a financial statement showing total itemized expenditures under the open-ended retainer agreement with Parsons, Brinckerhoff-Tudor, Bechtel, were unanimously accepted upon motion by Dr. Atwood, seconded by Mr. Blount.

Mr. Bennett presented an accounting of Committee of 100 funds for which he had been custodian. An advance of \$10,000.00 had been made by Forward Atlanta to assist in public information work relative to Amendment No. 14 which was approved in the November, 1966, general election. Funds expended totaled \$3,489.43, and the balance of \$6,510.57 was to be returned to Forward Atlanta. This was accepted by the Board, and Mr. Rich requested the General Manager to write a letter of appreciation to Forward Atlanta on behalf of the Board.

All financial reports are attached hereto and made a part of these minutes.

Progress Reports:

1. General Manager. The General Manager reported on his appearance before the Committee on the Study of State and Local Governments of the Georgia House of Representatives. The Committee recommended that the State provide 10% of the total cost of the rapid transit system. He referred to negotiations which he had carried on with representatives of developers in the gulch area and the L. & N. Railroad, relative to rapid transit plans in the gulch. It appeared that all plans for development of the gulch had taken into account the needs of the rapid transit system.

After some discussion on the subject of handling the Authority's public information, particularly that part of it relating to financial considerations affecting local governments, it was agreed that all press releases prepared by the Authority's staff would be cleared with at least one member of the Board, preferably the Chairman or the Vice Chairman.

2. Parsons, Brinckerhoff-Tudor, Bechtel. Mr. Coil reported on work which Parsons, Brinckerhoff-Tudor, Bechtel had been carrying out during the past month. He said that the study of the north, northeast and east lines had been almost completed. Right-of-way maps had been prepared for the estimator, who was working in San Francisco on preliminary cost estimates. The firm was negotiating with several companies for aerial photography of the system, and expected to acquire this photography at an early date.

In the discussion which followed Mr. Coil's report, it was agreed that at the earliest possible time, members of the Board should inspect routes, alignments and station locations recommended by the engineers, and that the highest governing authorities of the City of Atlanta - that is, the Mayor and the Board of Aldermen - should be apprised of the recommendations of the engineers and the decisions on specific route locations by the Authority. In order to acquire the necessary property within the city limits, it was essential that the Board of Aldermen and the Authority be in agreement prior to public hearings which are required by law.

3. Hammer, Greene, Siler Associates. Mr. Garcia reported that his firm had assembled data for Cobb County comparable to that which had been secured earlier for the other governments. Meetings had been held with finance officers of DeKalb County, and similar meetings were planned with Fulton

County and the City of Atlanta, to discuss recommendations in the reports which had been submitted to the Authority. The firm was assembling material explaining their research, and drafting the final report.

Reappointment of Committees:

The Board had established two committees in 1966. One was the Finance Committee, composed of Mr. Lane, Mr. Blount and Mr. Rich. A second was called the Financial Advisory Committee. This was the professional finance officers of the local governments.

The reappointment of these committees was postponed. A vacancy appeared to exist on the Board since the Chairman had received a letter from Mr. Lane in which he stated that he was being forced to resign because of pressure of other work.

Reappointment of Auditor:

In accordance with provisions of the Rapid Transit Authority Act it was necessary to appoint an auditor annually. The Arthur Andersen Company was unanimously reappointed for 1967, at a fee of \$300.

Authorization to Execute Contracts:

The General Manager requested authorization to execute a contract between the Authority and the Department of Housing and Urban Development to provide for the use of a grant of \$396,333.00 under Section 9 of the Mass Transit Act of 1966. The grant had been approved but the contract documents had not been received.

He further requested authorization to execute a contract between the Authority and Parsons, Brinckerhoff-Tudor, Bechtel for engineering work to be performed in accordance with the grant. Copies of this agreement had been circulated to members of the Board.

Upon a motion by Mr. Haverty, seconded by Dr. Atwood, Mr. Stuart was authorized to execute both contracts at the appropriate times.

The General Manager asked for authority to authorize, if necessary, the expenditure of \$1,250.00 by Parsons, Brinckerhoff-Tudor, Bechtel for a right-of-way expert, Mr. Charles H. Shaw of San Francisco, to assist him in matters relating to right-of-way acquisition procedures.

The General Manager also asked authorization to expend under the open-ended retainer agreement, an amount up to \$2,000.00 for

surveying work, if required, to stake out certain alignments in the vicinity of the Union Station and Terminal Station area, to coordinate rapid transit plans with air right development plans.

Authority's Funds:

At Mr. Haverty's suggestion it was decided that the question of distribution of the Authority's funds among local banks be left as a matter for the Finance Committee to work out with the General Manager.

Amendment to the Retainer Agreement:

In view of the fact that a new contract was being made with Parsons, Brinckerhoff-Tudor, Bechtel, it was considered to be in the best interest of the Authority that an amendment be made to the retainer agreement, consistent with its treatment of the other two contracts in effect with Parsons, Brinckerhoff-Tudor, Bechtel, that is, the 701 and 702 contracts. It was unanimously agreed that the following resolution be adopted:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Section 6 of the Retainer Agreement of June 28, 1966, between the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority and Parsons, Brinckerhoff-Tudor, Bechtel provides that the existence of other contracts between the Authority and Parsons, Brinckerhoff-Tudor, Bechtel and between the Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission and Parsons, Brinckerhoff-Tudor, Bechtel will not cause the total compensation to Parsons, Brinckerhoff-Tudor, Bechtel under the three contracts to be more than the cost that would prevail if all the work was performed under the terms of the said Retainer Agreement; and

WHEREAS, a new contract will be executed between this Authority and Parsons, Brinckerhoff-Tudor, Bechtel covering essentially the same work program but in a different geographical area than the other contracts;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that Section 6 of said Retainer Agreement be amended to place this new contract in the same perspective as the aforementioned contracts.

Proposed Amendments to Rapid Transit Act:

Mr. Huie stated that in an effort to further perfect the Act under which the Authority was constituted, certain amendments had been suggested for presentation to the forthcoming Legislature. These related to:

1. Giving to the Authority the power of eminent domain.
2. Broadening the definition of "professional services."
3. Clarifying the question of spending funds of the Authority for public information and public education.
4. Giving the Authority the right to invest surplus funds.
5. Changing the requirements for expenditures which require competitive bidding.

During the discussion of methods of communication between the Board of Directors and the delegations to the General Assembly, it was suggested by Mr. Rich that the Board, if possible, meet with the local delegations. Mr. Huie would make an effort to arrange appropriate meetings.

February Meeting Date:

It was agreed that because some members would be absent from the city on February 7, 1967, the next scheduled meeting date, the February meeting would be held on February 14, 1967, at 3:30 P.M. and appropriate notices would be sent.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 P.M.