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How wage-price freeze affects workers

How does President Richard Nixon’s freeze on wages and prices affect employees of AC Transit?

Answers may change with time or interpretations, but this is the situation to the best of current knowledge:

Q. What about the one-year contract agreement reached between Division 192, Amalgamated Transit Union, and AC Transit in June?

A. Wage increases, granted to union and non-union employees, retroactive to July 1, remain as they are now.

Q. What about the cost-of-living increase, which would become effective with the first pay period after Jan 1?

A. This could not be paid, under present interpretation of the President’s plan.

Q. Are modifications of the pension plan affected?

A. New pension modifications could be discussed, subject to further clarification, but additional benefits could not be paid under terms of the freeze.

Q. Would negotiated benefits be retroactive?

A. Any increases scheduled to be made under existing contracts or negotiations apparently would not be retroactive. However, the District is seeking further clarification on the two pension items.

Q. What about additional medical benefits, scheduled for March 1, 1972?

A. It is AC Transit’s understanding the increase in medical benefits would not be paid if the wage-price freeze still is in effect.

Q. What about the new dental plan to go into effect January 1, 1972?

A. This also would be considered a violation of price control, under present interpretation.

Q. Would a new suggestion award program be put into effect?

A. Because it involves payment for awards, the program will be held in abeyance until controls are removed.

Q. Can a worker receive wage increases from step A to B, or B to C?

A. Step increases are frozen, but clarification is being sought.

Q. After qualifying, will bus drivers receive progressing step wage increases to top rate?

A. The District has received conflicting opinions and is seeking definite guidelines.

Q. Can promotions be made?

A. The District can make promotions or fill bona fide vacancies at salary levels not exceeding rates paid to the employee who previously held the job.

John Larson returns

John F. Larson, AC Transit’s first Treasurer-Controller, was back on the job this month in an interim capacity until the position is filled.

Larson resumed his former position as a replacement for Robert D. Tough, who resigned to go to the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District as Deputy Auditor. Tough became Treasurer-Controller when Larson retired Dec. 31, 1968.

Larson joined AC Transit in 1959 after serving as chief financial officer for the world-wide Winslow Engineering and Manufacturing Co. He formerly was Treasurer-Controller of a major Los Angeles power transmission and bearing distribution firm.

Deficit met from various sources

A projected budget deficit of $1,778,459 for the 1971-72 fiscal year will be met through a combination of a small tax increase, anticipated federal grants and use of reserve funds, AC Transit directors have decided.

The board last month adopted an operating budget of $26,348,532 for the current fiscal year, an increase of $2,786,693 or 11.8 percent above the previous year’s expenses of $23,561,839.

The increase in the operating estimate was attributed to higher wages, higher material costs and the additional mileage the District expects to operate.

A tax increase of two cents per $100 assessed valuation makes the District’s new, consolidated tax rate 31.1 cents.

Because of differences in assessment ratios, the tax is 30.8 cents in Alameda County and 32.4 cents in Contra Costa County.

The new tax is expected to generate about $502,500. The balance of the projected deficit is expected to be met through federal grants already authorized and by transferring contingency reserve funds.

Transit agencies meet on coordination

Representatives of the new Metropolitan Transportation Commission joined with AC Transit and BART Board of Directors this month in discussing transfer and joint fare procedures.

The three agencies are working together to evaluate the years of planning which have gone into coordinated services and to thoroughly test results after BART trains begin to roll.

Work already undertaken by the two Boards of Directors in previous meetings will be continued, with MTC helping to set a pattern for effective interfacing of the transit agencies.

General agreement was reached at the first joint project meeting that the purpose of the AC Transit-BART-MTC coordination program is to provide the proper level of service, no matter which agency is providing the service.

Under the joint powers agreement executed by AC Transit, BART and MTC, three members were appointed by each agency to serve on a Board of Control.

Representing AC Transit are directors Robert M. Copeland, E. Guy Warren and Claude Daughtry.

BART is represented by directors Arnold Anderson, Richard O. Clark and Nello Bianco.

Representing MTC are Joseph P. Bort, Alameda County supervisor; James P. Kenny, Contra Costa County supervisor; and John C. Beckett, industrial representative from Santa Clara County.
The recommended plan for Central Contra Costa County is a mix of BART, AC Transit and an innovative system using 30,000 small, publicly-owned electric cars.

Although all final decisions will be made by local governmental bodies, the AC Transit Board of Directors has pledged its "full cooperation" toward implementation of plans for public transportation systems in Central Contra Costa County and Southern and Eastern Alameda County.

The pledge came in the form of letters from Board President Ray Rinehart to city councils and boards of supervisors in both counties.

The District, he said, is prepared to assist in every way in developing the type and quality of transit services desired by residents in the affected areas.

New public transit systems for the three areas were recommended by engineering teams from De Leuw, Cather and Co., a San Francisco transit consulting firm, following nearly year-long studies.

Each of the three teams spent months in the field, conducting surveys, interviews and research. Once their raw data was gathered, the teams used computers to analyze riding habits of the hundreds of thousands of people involved and to make projections regarding use of public transit.

With the needed information in hand, the engineers drew numerous routes and schedules. They experimented, via computer, with different combinations of public transit to see which best served the needs of people involved.

Tri-City Area

For the Southern Alameda County cities of Fremont, Newark and Union City, engineers proposed a three-part system consisting of fixed routes, commute-hour charters and a dial-a-bus operation.

The fixed routes would connect residential areas with downtown sections of the three cities and the Fremont and Union City BART stations.

Subscription charter buses would carry commuters between the Fremont BART station and the General Motors assembly plant.

Residents living too far from any of the fixed routes would be served by a dial-a-bus operation. By phoning a central dispatch number, a patron could have a small bus pick him up at his door for a slightly extra fee.

Livermore-Amador Valley

A similar plan was proposed for Eastern Alameda County communities.

Fixed-route buses would circulate within and between cities. Subscription buses would carry workers to Sandia and Lawrence Radiation Laboratory. A dial-a-bus operation would serve neighborhoods off the fixed routes.

In addition, morning and afternoon express buses would take commuters to the Hayward BART station.

Contra Costa County

In central Contra Costa County, engineers felt the BART line would function as the major transportation corridor, with buses extending service to cities not served by BART.

A dial-a-bus operation throughout much of the central county would be a feeder system to BART stations, particularly for "low mobility" people.

The engineers also proposed a fleet of 30,000 publicly-owned, small electric automobiles. These cars would be parked at some 4,000 locations scattered throughout the county, giving easy access to most central county residents.

Under the engineers' plan, residents would use the small cars to get to BART stations or other central locations. Individual cars would be left for use by other riders. Users' costs would be tabulated by a computer.

As part of the same plan, Pinole in West Contra Costa County could be served by an extension of AC Transit lines now operating in that part of the county.
3 year passenger revenue comparison

Patronage and revenue figures, in all categories except East Bay passengers, dipped during July compared to the previous year's experience.

AC Transit buses carried 3,796,981 passengers during July, down 55,877 or 1.45 percent below the 3,852,858 carried during the month of July, 1970. East Bay buses carried 2,722,424, up 21,281 or .79 percent above the 2,701,143 who rode during the same month a year earlier. On transbay lines, patronage for the month totaled 1,074,557, down 77,158 or 6.70 percent below the July, 1970 figure of 1,151,715.

Total passenger revenue for the month was $1,165,908, down $21,322 or 1.80 percent below the $1,187,230 collected during July, 1970. East Bay revenue was $613,021, down $2,740 from the $615,761 dropped into fare boxes a year ago—a decrease of .44 percent. Transbay revenue for July was $552,887, down $18,582 or 3.25 percent below revenue of $571,469 collected during July, 1970.

Commute book sales totaled $252,492, down $3,790 or 1.48 percent from sales of $256,282 during the same month one year ago.

Operating costs during July were $1,931,284, up $169,771 or 9.64 percent above year-ago expenses of $1,761,513. The system operated 2,076,598 miles of service, a decrease 21,378 or 1.02 percent below the July, 1970, mileage of 2,097,976.

Total income of $2,021,490 left a deficit of $112,120 in meeting full bond debt requirements and operating costs.

The transit industry nationally indicated a riding decrease of 6.06 percent for July, compared to July, 1970.
At an adjourned regular meeting Aug. 15, the Board of Directors:

- Authorized General Manager to prepare specifications and seek bids for re-roofing of buildings at Richmond and Seminary divisions, on motion of Director Copeland.
- Directed that lines 32-Oakland-Fairway Park and RF-San Francisco-Fairway Park be retained on Mission Blvd. rather than be rerouted via Vanderbilt St. as previously authorized, on motion of Vice President Warren.
- Authorized two new routes: Line 37-Warren Blvd., to serve Merritt College, and Line 95-Kelly St.-"D" St., to serve the Kelly Hill area of Hayward, on motion of Director Bettencourt.
- Authorized a minor rerouting of Line 43 from Virginia St. to Cedar St. in Berkeley and a curtailment of some runs on Line 50C-55th Ave.-56th Ave., on motion of Director Bettencourt.
- Authorized President to send letters to appropriate governmental bodies expressing District’s intent to cooperate in any programs extending bus service to new areas, on motion of Director Bettencourt. (See story, Pg. 4)
- Authorized General Manager to negotiate contracts for school service, on motion of Director Bettencourt.
- Approved curtailment of bicycle bus operation, on motion of Director Bettencourt.
- Adopted a revised 1971-72 operating estimate, on motion of Vice President Warren.

At a regular meeting Sept. 8, the Board of Directors:

- Authorized board and management attendance at American Transit Association Annual Meeting, on motion of Director Bettencourt.
- Authorized board vice-president to sign checks in the absence of the board president or other authorized personnel, on motion of Director Bettencourt.