

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
A Meeting Held at Progress Park
15500 Downey Avenue
Paramount, CA
May 1, 2003**

I. Call to Order

Chairman Pagett called the meeting to order at 1:45 p.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair William Pagett, Bell Gardens, Maywood, Paramount; Anthony La, Downey; Luis Ramirez, Bell, Cudahy; Robert Zarrilli, Commerce; Joseph Lim, Compton; Patrick Fu, Huntington Park; Lon Maddox, Long Beach; Yadi Farhadi, Lynwood; Joe Comstock, South Gate; Kevin Wilson, Vernon; Victor Rollinger, Carson; Maged El-Rabaa, County of Los Angeles; Sharas Bangalore, Caltrans; Lt. William Murphy, CHP; Sandra Balmir, FHWA/FTA; Ernest Morales, MTA; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach; Kanya Dorland, Port of Los Angeles; Al Bowser, SCAG; Carol Gomez, SCAQMD.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: None.

OTHERS PRESENT: Samara Ashley, Senator Betty Karnette's office; Jeannine Critie, Vice Mayor Frank Colonna's office, Long Beach; Leana Marshall, Councilmember Val Lerch's office, Long Beach; Sara Skinner, Councilmember Tonia Reyes-Uranga's office, Long Beach; Patrick Burkhardt, Councilmember Bonnie Lowenthal's office, Long Beach; Raymond Maekawa, MTA; Anthony R. Ybarra, City of Bell Gardens; Sumire Gant, City of Long Beach; Deborah Chankin, City of Long Beach; Mohammad Mostahkami, City of South Gate; Jolene Hayes, Port of Long Beach; Sue Lai, Port of Los Angeles; Pat Smith, Los Angeles County DPW; Cathie Chavez, San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy; Richard Powers, Gateway Cities COG; Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities COG; Julie Masters, NRDC; Malcolm Carson, Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles; Roger Holman, Coolidge Triangle Homeowners Association, Long Beach; David San Jose, Coolidge Triangle Homeowners Association and Future Generations Youth Center, Long Beach; Noel Park, San Pedro and Peninsula Homeowners Coalition; Art Krugler, resident of Whittier; David Levinsohn, PBQD; Steven Yoshizumi, PBQD; Doris Chan, PBQD; Julie Rush, PBQD; Josh Gertler, Consensus Planning Group; Julia Brown, CPG; Jacki Bacarach, Jacki Bacarach and Associates; Lee Ward, Meyer, Mohaddes Associates.

II. Roll Call

Roll was taken through self-introductions and a sign-in sheet was circulated.

III. Pledge of Allegiance

Bill Pagett, TAC Chair, led the pledge of allegiance.

IV. Amendments to the Agenda

There were no amendments to the agenda.

V. Public Comments

Comments were made by the following individuals/agencies:

Noel Park, President of the San Pedro and Peninsula Homeowners Coalition, spoke as a nearby resident and daily commuter on I-710 (he has a business in Bellflower). He has attended a number of I-710 public meetings, and has spoken out about air quality issues. His organization had supported a maximum build out alternative on I-710. However, they now see this study as facilitating port expansion. Because of the presumed air quality impacts that his neighborhood would experience from expansion of port activity, they now support Alternative A, the No Build alternative. His organization would rather deal with the traffic impacts related to the No Build alternative than the air quality impacts related to port expansion facilitated by the build alternatives. Mr. Park quoted a report provided to the Port Community Advisory Committee that forecast that the volume of cargo coming into the Port of Los Angeles would grow from 10 million twenty-foot equivalent units (TEUs) in 2000 to 47 million TEUs by 2020. He said that he and the San Pedro and Peninsula Homeowners Coalition are willing to work with the stakeholders in this corridor to find a safe and environmentally just solution to the problems on I-710. Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach, responded that the 20-year forecasts prepared by the Port five years ago indicate projections of 24 to 36 million TEUs. But Mr. Park stated that as a member of the Traffic Subcommittee of the Port of Los Angeles Community Advisory Committee, he had been provided a report developed by Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc. that indicated that the 2020 projections were for 47 million TEUs.

Julie Masters, Natural Resources Defense Council, submitted extensive written comments and stated that over 15 community groups agree that the public outreach on this study has been inadequate, that the wording of the outreach materials has been misleading, and that not enough of the outreach materials were translated into Spanish. She said that she also feels that the Preliminary Environmental Assessment Report is insufficient under CEQA and NEPA and that it ratifies the alternatives that have already been selected. Additionally, she said that she feels that the air quality and diesel particulate analysis is insufficient and that it does not address asthma, and that the process is fatally flawed because it assumes that I-710 must be widened. She urged the TAC to suspend the process until:

- A full environmental review of the project's impacts is prepared;
- Alternatives that are health protective are developed and studied;
- Input from affected communities is solicited and considered

David San Jose, Coolidge Triangle Homeowners Association in Long Beach, stated that he felt that the proposals would not enrich the lives of the city's youth. He also questioned how much good would be accomplished by constructing two additional lanes in each direction when truck traffic is expected to triple and car traffic could double. He also stated that the Port is like a cancer and that Long Beach has sacrificed the City for the Port.

Art Krugler, resident of Whittier and licensed mechanical engineer, said that he has been in Southern California since 1956 and has been using the freeways since 1966. He has recently become aware of the study and thinks that it is doing some good work. He said that when he looks at this corridor and all of the issues surrounding it, he sees four pictures:

- Adding four lanes (two in each direction) will be insufficient, that it won't keep pace with the growth.
- The Los Angeles County Flood Control District is trying to reduce water pollution in the Los Angeles River and is considering means to reduce the outflow, but is looking for funding.
- He knows that the Los Angeles River Conservancy is also looking for funding to convert sections of the river into parks and education centers.
- The County needs money.

To set the context of his comments, Mr. Krugler explained that he is a licensed mechanical, chemical, environmental and construction engineer, and that he designed the Long Beach Power Plant that increased output with no additional pollution. He realizes that you cannot put a freeway in the river, but that the Los Angeles River is really just the 28-foot wide, one-foot deep channel in the middle of a very wide concrete flood plain. He stated that you could build ten lanes on the concrete within the flood plain adjacent to the channel.

Malcolm Carson, Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles, stated that he had received calls from people in East Los Angeles and Pico Rivera about the study. He echoed the comments from the NRDC, and stressed the need for more analysis, to open up the process and have meaningful public input. He agreed with NRDC that Port growth should not be assumed, and that the job market has moved from manufacturing to service (that manufacturing jobs are being exported overseas) which has an impact on low income populations. He summarized by saying that the study should be slowed, that there needs to be more study of the impacts, and that the process needs to be opened up.

VI. Consent Calendar

It was moved by Member El-Rabaa, seconded by Member Bowser, to approve the minutes of the meetings of April 2, April 9, and April 15, 2003. The motion was approved unanimously.

VII. Reports

A. Preliminary Report on Recent Outreach Activities

Josh Gertler, Consensus Planning Group (CPG), introduced himself and explained that he was standing in for Sylvia Novoa, who was out on medical leave.

He reminded the TAC of the public outreach topics that had been discussed at the previous TAC meeting:

- The goal of the community outreach program
- Who had been contacted about the I-710 study
- The various outreach methods that had been used to make the community feel comfortable with the process
- Language and cultural sensitivity
- The triggers for community meetings
- The Purpose and Need Statement
- That the Initial Set of 12 alternatives had been discussed with the public
- That there was now a Final Set of 5 alternatives that had been discussed with the public
- Impacts of the five alternatives
- Next phase of outreach meetings
- Impacted Community meetings
- Open Houses

Mr. Gertler summarized what was heard from stakeholders (the public) who attended the Impacted Community Meetings held thus far, and the Open Houses.

To date, there have been three Impacted Community Meetings in Commerce:

- April 22 – Rosewood Park
- April 23 – Bandini Park
- April 24 – Bristow Park

Invitations for all three meetings were sent in English and Spanish to a total of 12,896 people:

- 4,800 addresses received from City of Commerce (every single resident and business)
- 3,000 addresses from Supervisor Gloria Molina's office
- 5,096 address list purchased from mail house targeting East Los Angeles

Minutes

I-710 Technical Advisory Committee

May 1, 2003

Page 5 of 14

A total of 352 residents signed-in at the Commerce Impacted Community meetings.

- Rosewood Park – 86 people (speaker/comment cards – 34)
- Bandini Park – 145 people (speaker/comment cards – 54)
- Bristow Park – 121 people (speaker/comment cards – 62)

A total of 20 Comment Sheets were received from all three meetings.

The following were topics that were raised by the public attendees at these meetings:

- Concern and anxiety about property takes
- Equitable financial compensation
- Desire to stay in the community they love
- Concerns regarding possible park takings
- Confusion with project timeline and process; many people thought their homes would be taken immediately
- Health concerns related to increased truck traffic (including increased cancer risks)
- Frustration regarding notification of project impacts (and the outreach efforts in their community)
- Frustration with existing rail yards
- Frustration with increased port/truck traffic
- Commerce feels that they would bear the majority of the impacts from this project with regards to land takings
- Commerce would lose land to both the I-710 and the I-5 freeway projects; it's already a small community; it's a "model city" and everyone wants to live here
- Anecdote: One woman approached Sylvia and she was angry and relieved – she was angry, scared and fearful because the notice that was sent to her led her to believe that her home would be taken; she was relieved to find that she wouldn't be impacted at all.

In summary, the attendees of the Commerce Impact Community Meetings felt that the I-710 improvements would not be worth the impacts, and that they would either oppose the project altogether or support Alternative A, the No Build alternative.

Other Impacted Community Meetings are (or will be) scheduled in Long Beach, Bell Gardens and East Los Angeles.

The schedule of meetings in Long Beach includes:

- Wednesday, May 7, 2003 – Houghton Park Activity Room
- Monday, May 12, 2003 – Silverado Park Social Hall
- Wednesday, May 21, 2003 – Drake Park Social Hall

Each meeting begins at 7 p.m.

Invitations for all three meetings were sent in English and Spanish to a total of 44,791 people:

- 14,340 addresses received from City of Long Beach (an area bounded by the city boundary on the south and west; Del Amo Boulevard on the north; and Long Beach Boulevard, Wardlow Road, and Magnolia Avenue on the east)
- 30,000 address list purchased from mail house targeting the North Long Beach zip code 90805 (roughly corresponding to Council District 9)
- 451 addresses in the study database created and maintained by CPG, including elected officials, businesses, community and environmental groups and anyone who has ever attending a meeting, submitted a comment or contacted the team for any reason

The meeting in Bell Gardens has not been scheduled yet. The Study Team is working with City staff to coordinate a date and venue. City staff is also helping the Study Team compile the mailing list for the appropriate impacted communities.

The East Los Angeles Impacted Community meeting is also still being coordinated. It is tentatively scheduled for May 15th; and the venue is still pending. Approximately 32,000 invitations will be sent, comprised of the complete list from Supervisor Gloria Molina (25,470 addresses), and the East Los Angeles portion of the list purchased from a mail house targeting those living within ¼ mile of I-710 (approximately 8,000).

During the week of April 28th, there were three Open House Meetings throughout the corridor:

- April 28 – Long Beach
- April 29 – Bell Gardens
- April 30 – East Los Angeles

Invitations for all three meetings were sent in English and Spanish (and Khmer in Long Beach) to a total of 61,020 people:

- 4,800 addresses received from City of Commerce
- 25,470 addresses from Supervisor Gloria Molina's office
- 21,012 addresses purchased from a mail house targeting those living within ¼ mile of I-710, on both sides, in East Los Angeles, Bell Gardens, Long Beach and the Terminal Island Freeway
- 836 addresses purchased from a mail house targeting those living within ¼ mile of the 710 freeway, on both sides, in Carson
- 7,398 addresses purchased from a mail house targeting those living within ¼ mile of the 710 freeway, on both sides, in Compton, South Gate and Lynwood
- 1,504 addresses in the study database created and maintained by CPG, including elected officials, businesses, community and environmental groups and anyone who has ever attending a meeting, submitted a comment or contacted the team for any reason

The three meetings were well attended.

- Long Beach – 406 attended; 85 comments received
- Bell Gardens – 262 attended; 59 comments received
- East Los Angeles – 117 attended; 17 comments received

Similar to the Commerce Impacted Communities Meetings, there were certain themes to the input that came from the public:

- Residents support Alternatives A and B because there are no (or minor) right-of-way takes.
- There are too many trucks on the road.
- Trucks and drivers are the problem, not the freeway.
- People do not support the build alternatives because of the impacts to the area.
- Lots of community members expressed support for separating cars and trucks.

After distilling all of the input received over the last few weeks, and in summary, Mr. Gertler said that the following are the main ideas expressed by the public:

- There continues to be confusion regarding the project timeline.
- There continues to be confusion as to the fact that we are at a conceptual stage that is planning a long-range vision.
- The community is not clear about the respective roles played by the OPC and the TAC and the decision-making process.
- There is a great deal of distrust about exactly when the impacts became known.
- Media reports regarding this project have caused a premature panic regarding the five alternatives.
- Confusion exists regarding goal of this project – improving mobility and safety, not facilitating port growth.

Maged El-Rabaa, County of Los Angeles DPW, requested that the format and mailing list for the East Los Angeles Impacted Community Meeting be approved by Supervisor Molina's office. He also asked if the TAC members had been advised of all of the Impacted Community Meetings. Bill Pagett, TAC Chair, said they had not, but that TAC members could be e-mailed a notice of future meetings.

Ernest Morales, MTA, suggested that the public input could be summarized in four guiding principles:

- Minimize right-of-way impacts
- Minimize pollution and environmental impacts
- Improve safety
- Relieve congestion

Al Bowser, SCAG, commented that the TAC should review these principles with their staff and discuss them with their OPC members, and return at the next TAC meeting

ready to take a position on how to proceed relative to these principles. It was moved by Member Farhadi, seconded by Member Wilson, to agendaize the guiding principles suggested by Member Morales for the next meeting of the TAC. The motion was approved unanimously.

B. Consultant Team Responses to Previous TAC Questions

Steven Yoshizumi, PBQD, provided responses to three technical questions raised by the TAC at previous meetings:

- Demand for SR-91/I-710 Truck Ramps
- Impact on I-110 Truck Traffic
- Right-of-Way Impact Estimates for Modified Truckway Alignment

Mr. Yoshizumi reported that truck volumes are highest on the northbound I-710 to eastbound SR-91 (and reverse) movements, and second highest on the eastbound SR-91 to northbound I-710 (and reverse) movements. The other connectors were forecasted to serve a demand of between 130 and 250 trucks (converted from PCEs) in the peak periods. Kerry Cartwright, POLB, asked that the study team provide a recommendation to the TAC on which ramps should be implemented based on the data presented. Deborah Chankin, City of Long Beach, asked if FHWA has any rules regarding providing fully directional truck ramp connections that would require implementing all of the truck ramps regardless of the demand. Mr. Yoshizumi replied that the preliminary discussions that the study team has had with FHWA geometric reviewers (and the reviewers' subsequent research with staff in California and Washington, D.C.) indicate that there would be no problem with implementing only some of the truck ramps.

Next, Mr. Yoshizumi reported the truck demand (in PCEs) on I-110 between Sepulveda Boulevard and Pacific Coast Highway for Alternatives A, C, D, and E. In Alternative A, daily truck volumes are forecast to be approximately 73,000 PCEs in 2025. Alternative C daily truck volumes are forecast to be approximately 60,000 PCEs in 2025. Alternative D daily truck volumes are forecast to be approximately 62,000 PCEs in 2025. And Alternative E daily truck volumes are forecast to be approximately 65,000 PCEs in 2025. Alternative C seemed to have the greatest impact on truck demand on I-110, probably due to the extension of the Terminal Island Freeway.

Bill Pagett, TAC Chair, asked what truck demand on I-110 would be like if Alternative C did not include the Terminal Island Freeway extension. Mr. Yoshizumi responded that, based on the data (since all three of the build alternatives have some truck facility drawing trucks off of I-710 and I-110), in a scenario similar to Alternative C without the Terminal Island Freeway extension, truck demand on I-110 would likely be similar to Alternative A, No Build. Victor Rollinger, City of Carson, asked what the alternatives do to truck demand on Alameda Street. Mr. Yoshizumi responded that, based on the data provided at the April 15, 2003 TAC meeting, only Alternative D (which includes the

Alameda Truckway Connector) is forecast to result in a significant change in truck demand on Alameda Street, jumping from 33,000 PCEs per day under Alternative A to 71,000 in Alternative D. Mr. Rollinger said that those numbers don't consider the indirect impacts caused by increased truck traffic on Alameda Street, e.g., air quality, and noise.

Mr. Yoshizumi then reported that the study team had been asked to assess the right-of-way impacts in Bell Gardens and a few other adjacent cities if the exclusive Truckway in Alternative E was aligned in the median of I-710 instead of on the east side of I-710. He reported that there would be a very significant change in Bell Gardens (dropping from 35.1 acres to 4.0 acres), a measurable change in Commerce and South Gate (dropping from 32.9 acres to 19.2 acres and 30.6 acres to 12.2 acres, respectively), and a negligible change in Bell (changing from 26.5 acres to 24.0 acres). This data was based on a cursory analysis extending from Rio Hondo to north of Slauson Avenue.

Chairman Pagett asked if the analysis assumed vertical walls instead of slopes. Mr. Yoshizumi said it did. Mr. Pagett then asked if the analysis assumed realigning the centerline of the freeway toward the DWP property. Mr. Yoshizumi said that all analyses assumed concentric widening. Maged El-Rabaa, County of Los Angeles, asked if this analysis presumed modifications to any other components. Mr. Yoshizumi replied that it did not, that it was only an analysis of the exclusive Truckway alignment in a segment of the corridor. Kevin Wilson, City of Vernon, asked if this analysis accounted for full acquisition or partial acquisition of properties. Mr. Yoshizumi clarified that all right-of-way acreage impact analyses have accounted for only the land that would be necessary for the ultimate improvements and that land in excess of the ultimate state right-of-way that would have to be acquired is assumed to be repackaged and sold. The acreages and the cost estimates assume only the impact to and cost of the ultimate state right-of-way. The parcel counts and structure counts provided in the discussion for the environmental checklist were "actual" and accounted for all directly impacted parcels and structures.

Kerry Cartwright, POLB, asked that the study team provide data for the intersection of Ocean Boulevard and the Terminal Island Freeway to see the impacts of the various alternatives. Mr. Yoshizumi indicated that the requested data would be provided at a future TAC meeting.

Member Comstock, South Gate, left the meeting at 2:50 p.m.

C. Continued Discussion on Alternatives

Ray Maekawa, MTA, asked that each jurisdiction identify which components they are in favor of and which they find unacceptable. Chairman Pagett suggested starting at the south end and focusing all comments on the mainline alternatives.

Lon Maddox, City of Long Beach, said that the City generally supports the project, but that property and environmental impacts should be minimized. He then read a letter from Mayor Beverly O'Neill and Acting City Manager Gerald Miller to Acting Director of Public Works Christine Shippey outlining the City's general position.

Joe Lim, City of Compton, said that until his City Council or City Manager provided direction, the City of Compton would have no comment.

Victor Rollinger, City of Carson, indicated that Carson was not ready to take position on the mainline concepts because they had joined the TAC and OPC only recently. Generally speaking, the City would favor alignments that moved widening or elevated structures to the east, away from private property to avoid reducing the privacy of residents of the Dominguez tract. Mr. Rollinger indicated that the City's OPC member would elaborate on the City's position more at a later date.

Yadi Farhadi, City of Lynwood, asked what the Alameda Corridor has done to offset the growth in truck demand on I-710. He thought it was supposed to remove trucks from I-710. Kerry Cartwright, POLB, said that there is a misperception that the Alameda Corridor was going to remove trucks from I-710. The Alameda Corridor will really only offset some of the expected growth in truck demand on I-710. Mr. Farhadi said that Lynwood is opposed to Alternative E and that they would like to see additional study of Alternatives C and D.

The City of South Gate had no representative at the meeting at the time of this discussion.

Bill Pagett, City of Paramount, said that there are no proposed right-of-way impacts in Paramount. From a visual impact perspective Paramount may have concerns with the elevated alternatives.

Anthony La, City of Downey, stated that there are no right-of-way acquisitions within the City, and that the City generally favored the operational concepts in Alternatives C and E because they took traffic off local streets and put it on the freeways. However, the City does have concerns about privacy issues related to elevated lanes.

Luis Ramirez, Cities of Bell and Cudahy, said that his cities had no specific concerns about right-of-way impacts at this time. The City of Bell supports the Slauson Avenue interchange, but has no preference with regard to the mainline concept.

Patrick Fu, City of Huntington Park, said that since the City is the farthest away from I-710, it has no specific concerns about right-of-way impacts at this time. Huntington Park also supports the Slauson Avenue interchange, but has no preference with regard to the mainline concept.

Bill Pagett, City of Bell Gardens, said that Bell Gardens experiences significant right-of-way impacts from all three mainline concepts. Alternative E with the revisions discussed earlier in this TAC meeting reduces the impacts, but there would still be residential acquisitions. The elevated alternatives tend to reduce right-of-way acquisitions, but could result in noise, air quality, visual, and privacy impacts. Mr. Pagett asked that vertical walls be used wherever possible to reduce right-of-way impacts. He said that the City supports the Slauson Avenue interchange, and supports a diamond configuration at Florence Avenue.

Bob Zarrilli, City of Commerce, stated that the City Council had not taken any formal action as of this meeting, but that the issue was on the May 6, 2003 agenda and that the Council might voice opposition to components that require residential, commercial/industrial, and/or park acquisitions. It is possible that the Council would favor Alternative A, although there may be some elements of the other alternatives that could be included if they did not require right-of-way acquisition.

Kevin Wilson, City of Vernon, said that they City is sympathetic to the right-of-way impacts of the neighboring cities. He indicated that the City prefers the collector-distributor road system between Atlantic Boulevard and I-5 over the truck bypass lanes. The City also favors direct truck ramp connections into the two rail yards, and the Slauson Avenue interchange (diamond configuration). Mr. Wilson said that the City of Vernon would like to see a revised I-5/I-710 interchange with direct connectors for the missing moves (as in Alternative D), but is aware of the impacts on Commerce. He also said that the City is in favor of an additional general purpose lane and one additional HOV lane in each direction along with some of the truck-specific components of Alternative C.

Bob Zarrilli, City of Commerce, added that the city staff is generally in favor of the Slauson Avenue interchange and direct truck ramps into the two rail yards, but he again clarified that the City Council had not taken any action on any of the components as of this TAC meeting.

Maged El-Rabaa, County of Los Angeles, said that the County is opposed to right-of-way impacts and generally favors Alternative A. He said that the County is unsure if Alternative B provides enough benefit to justify the cost. Mr. El-Rabaa also said that the concepts for the I-5/I-710 interchange should be reviewed because they result in significant impacts in Los Angeles County without providing any obvious benefits.

Bill Pagett, City of Maywood, said that the City had no specific concerns about right-of-way impacts at this time. The City supports the Slauson Avenue interchange, but has no preference with regard to the mainline concept.

Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach, expressed that the Port felt that the impacts south of Anaheim were unnecessary. He also said that he felt that the alternatives needed to be revisited with respect to the original objectives.

Kanya Dorland, Port of Los Angeles, said that senior management at the Port had not reviewed the project in detail yet and did not have a specific position. She said that the Port is generally supportive of the alternative that improves congestion the most and supports an extension of the Terminal Island Freeway, but has not decided which of the two concepts (in Alternatives C and D) they support most.

Sharas Bangalore, Caltrans, said that the State has no position at this time. He asked what the traffic and right-of-way impacts would be of eliminating some of the truck ramps at the SR-91/I-710 interchange. Would such a move overburden either the city streets or the general-purpose connectors, and would the right-of-way savings make it worth doing?

Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach, asked the same question of the HOV connector. Consultant staff indicated that data could be provided to help clarify the traffic and right-of-way impacts of eliminating these connectors.

Carol Gomez, Southern California Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), said that her agency had no position at this time and that SCAQMD would be meeting with the study team the following week to review the air quality/diesel particulate analysis. She said that SCAQMD might have concerns over using vertical walls to reduce right of way acquisitions, because that might place the closest home within a shorter distance from the freeway, thus having a greater environmental impact.

Sandra Balmir, FHWA/FTA said that her agency has no position on the alternatives, and that they are involved to advise on the process. She suggested that the TAC focus on options that meet state and federal standards first and that the study must show reasons why standards cannot be met prior to evaluating non-standard features.

Al Bowser, SCAG, indicated that his agency had no position on the alternatives, and suggested that there is no need to rush the process. He said that the Adopted 2001 RTP recognizes the need to improve goods movement to/from the ports and that SCAG is looking at the I-10 and SR-60 corridor, as well as the I-15 corridor and the I-5 corridor. Mr. Bowser continued by saying that SCAG is committed to the corridor study process, and that the TAC is the forum for developing a recommendation. He said that it may take a while to develop a solution that can be embraced as a consensus. Mr. Bowser said that SCAG is happy to be a funding partner of this study and that his agency is looking for a real solution to the problems in this corridor.

Richard Powers, Gateway Cities COG Executive Director, said that he agrees that no one should rush to judge the alternatives. He sees that there is a consensus to avoid

residential right-of-way acquisitions if possible and minimize all right-of-way acquisitions. He recognizes that there are severe public health risks already in place in this corridor and that there is the opportunity for this project to help mitigate that. Mr. Powers said that the schedule needs to be relaxed. From his viewpoint there are three issues that need to be addressed:

- congestion, mobility, goods movement
- environmental issues including acquisitions and air quality
- safety/security
-

Mr. Powers said that the schedule needs to be relaxed until everyone is heard and all city interests have been brought to the table.

Ray Maekawa, MTA, said that this discussion has been valuable because it allows all of the cities to hear what their neighbors are thinking about the various options. He said that the Oversight Policy Committee meeting on May 8, 2003, would be an opportunity to get guidance from the elected officials on what direction in which to head, and that it is the responsibility of the TAC members to brief their OPC members.

Mr. Maekawa said that three OPC meetings are currently scheduled (May 8, May 28, and June 25, 2003) and that they would be informational workshops for the OPC. Information will be presented by stakeholders. The 3 meeting topics include:

- goods movement
- public health (air quality)
- safety

Carol Gomez, SCAQMD, said that May 28th may be too soon to have a discussion of air quality issues and would like to have more time to review the air quality/diesel particulates analysis before the OPC workshop on the subject.

Kanya Dorland, Port of Los Angeles, asked if the OPC meetings could be delayed. Mr. Powers said that they are only information meetings, not decision making meetings. Attendance would not be mandatory. Maged El-Rabaa, County of Los Angeles, said that Supervisor Molina would not be available for the May 8, 2003 OPC meeting and suggested that she wanted to assess the input received at the May 15, 2003 East Los Angeles impacted Community meeting prior to the next OPC meeting. Mr. Powers said that he would check with the OPC co-chairs to see if they would reschedule.

Victor Rollinger, City of Carson, said that so far the TAC had only discussed the mainline components and that Carson is particularly concerned about a non-mainline component, the Alameda Truckway Connector. The TAC Chair said that he was hoping to develop some direction for the mainline and that the non-mainline components would be discussed at the next TAC meeting. Mr. Rollinger said that his city views the impacts of the Alameda Truckway Connector as very significant and that it needs to be

discussed in the context of the mainline improvements. Lon Maddox, City of Long Beach, agreed.

The TAC Chair said that at the next meeting, the TAC would review all of the components and asked that the study team create a listing of all the components that are included in all of the alternatives (with reference to which alternative each is currently attached to). He also directed the study team to meet with all of the cities to discuss and understand the individual concerns of the cities and report back at the next TAC meeting.

Deborah Chankin, City of Long Beach, asked if the study team could report on their meetings with SCAQMD and the railroads. Dave Levinsohn said they would. Kevin Wilson and Bill Pagett asked to be included in the meeting with the railroads.

D. Discussion of Future TAC Meetings and Agendas

The next TAC meeting was tentatively set for Wednesday, June 11, 2003 at 1:30 PM, location to be determined.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 4:00 p.m.