

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE I-710 OVERSIGHT POLICY COMMITTEE**

**A Meeting Held at Progress Park
15500 Downey Avenue
Paramount, CA**

May 28, 2003

I. Call to Order

Co-Chair Samuel Pena called the meeting to order at 6:45 p.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Co-Chair Frank Colonna, Long Beach; Co-Chair Samuel Peña, Maywood; Daniel Crespo, Bell Gardens; Hugo Argumedo, Commerce; Melanie Andrews, Compton; Keith McCarthy, Downey; Juan Noguez, Huntington Park; Hector De La Torre, South Gate; Sharas Bangalore, Caltrans; Jim Dear, Carson; Ray Maekawa, MTA; Gus Hein, Port of Long Beach; Thomas Warren, Port of Los Angeles; Robert Burlingham, SCAG.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: George Cole, Bell; Frank Gurule, Cudahy; Fernando Pedroza, Lynwood; Gene Daniels, Paramount; William Davis, Vernon; Supervisor Gloria Molina, County of Los Angeles.

ALSO PRESENT: Bridget Sramek, Office of Assemblymember Alan Lowenthal; Commerce Councilmember Nancy Ramos; Commerce Councilmember Rosalina Lopez; Gerald Miller, Long Beach City Manager and Gateway Cities City Managers' Representative to the OPC; William Pagett, Chair, I-710 Technical Advisory Committee; Maged El-Rabaa, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works; Ray Ramirez, City of Commerce Director of Economic Development; Mohammad Mostahkami, City of South Gate Engineering Manager; Augustus Ajawara, City of Compton Transportation Program Manager; Carol Gomez, South Coast Air Quality Management District; Ernest Morales, MTA I-710 Project Manager; Deborah Chankin, City of Long Beach; Richard Powers, GCCOG Executive Director; Jack Joseph, GCCOG Deputy Executive Director; Robert Messenger, GCCOG General Counsel; David Levinsohn, Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas; Steven Yoshizumi, Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas.

II. Roll Call

Roll call of the OPC members was taken by self introductions.

III. Pledge of Allegiance

Richard Powers, Gateway Cities Council of Governments Executive Director, led the pledge of allegiance.

IV. Amendments to the Agenda

There were no amendments to the agenda.

V. Public Comments

Anna Estrada, resident of West Long Beach, asked for more information about the project and the public outreach effort. Co-Chair Pena responded that Gateway Cities COG staff would get back to her to answer her questions.

Julie Masters, National Resources Defense Council (NRDC) referred the OPC to extensive written comments she had previously submitted. She commented that she felt that public outreach had been inadequate, though better more recently. She said that the impacts of the alternatives need to be studied in an EIR/EIS, that the preliminary environmental assessment is totally inadequate. She said it is imperative to study air pollution and health effects of the alternatives. She said that the alternatives being studied are wrong, because the study assumption of future cargo volumes from the ports is not a given. She said that feels that new alternatives should be developed and studied that are health protective.

Co-Chair Pena responded that he felt she had made good comments; that every option has yet to be studied, and that we are at the beginning of a long process. He commented that the OPC was not creating truck traffic growth, but the likely growth needed to be accommodated.

Marta Segura, Communities for a Better Environment (CBE), said that she supports everything said by the previous speaker. She said that the community feels the need for a community driven study, that they want to study newer technologies, and that the OPC has access to funds to study newer technologies. She also said that she believes it is not inevitable that the ports will expand. She requested an air quality analysis that is comprehensive, which studies all pollution sources, both mobile and stationary, and

Minutes I-710 Oversight Policy Committee

May 28, 2003

Page 3 of 12

that starts by developing a comprehensive baseline of current pollution levels in the study area.

Malcolm Carson, Legal Aid Foundation, said that he also endorsed the comments of the NRDC representative. He said he believes it is not a valid assumption that truck traffic will increase 3-4 times in the future. For example, he said, the Alameda Corridor is under utilized and truck trips can be reduced by moving more containers on trains. In addition, more public transit improvements could reduce auto traffic by attracting drivers to public transit. He said that, with respect to air quality, we can't just allow more trucks to use I-710 without having trucks become less polluting. He said he favored not just advocating reducing emissions, but mandating emissions reductions.

Dave San Jose, Coolidge Triangle Association, Long Beach said that everything has been said already, and that new capacity on I-710 will fill up. He said the presentation by the Port of Long Beach the other night at a Long Beach community meeting was amazing in that the Port claims pollution will go down in the future. He said he didn't believe the claim. He said he opposed right-of-way takes, particularly losing homes. He said the Long Beach Freeway should not be used by the Ports, and that finding another way to move the cargo is the Port's problem.

Robert Cabrales, Communities for a Better Environment and resident of Bell, said that he is concerned by the process and the way it is going. He said the fact that the Los Angeles Times reported that the study was over was why there was not more public turnout at this meeting. He said he feels that the outreach has been inadequate, but also feels that the elected officials have not done a good job of disseminating information about the study to their constituents. He said the study is flawed because it caters to 20th Century technologies, not newer, cleaner technologies. He said that public health needs to be considered in all decisions regarding improvements in the I-710 corridor.

Julie Jones, Coolidge Triangle, Long Beach, said her house is impacted by two of the proposed alternatives. She questioned why the Long Beach Press-Telegram reported that Caltrans will ultimately make the decision about the preferred alternative, because she thought that the OPC is the decision-making body.

Richard Powers replied that the four funding partners, including Caltrans, had signed a Memorandum of Understanding in which it was agreed that in this phase of the project the OPC was given the authority to decide the locally preferred strategy.

Alan Hose, President of the Windward Mobile Home Park Homeowners Association, Long Beach, said he regularly drove Alameda Street and that there was no traffic, while I-710 was backed up with traffic. He said that we are studying the wrong corridor and need to utilize the Alameda Corridor for both truck and rail cargo. He said that they are trying to turn the mobile home park into an owner park, the proposed alternatives that

Minutes I-710 Oversight Policy Committee

May 28, 2003

Page 4 of 12

would widen I-710 or extend the Terminal Island Freeway past their community should not be considered further.

Member De La Torre said that his interpretation of the Press-Telegram article is that if nothing comes out of this study, Caltrans will decide what to do.

Member Andrews said that Compton has three freeways cutting through it, and although she believes in regional transportation, she also believes that the City of Compton has paid its dues to the region. She asked how we blend the need to deal with commerce from the ports with the quality of life in our communities.

Member Argumedo said that he has raised concerns about the alternatives. He reported that the Commerce City Council has opted to prefer Alternative A, the No Build Alternative. He said Commerce is being victimized twice, by the I-710 and the I-5, as well as the rail yards. The I-710 alternatives propose residential and business relocations in Commerce; therefore the council has no choice but to support Alternative A. He said they have collected over 1,000 signatures in support of Alternative A. He said he wants direction from the OPC to look at non-standard designs for improvement elements.

VI. Consent Calendar

- A. Minutes of the Meetings of February 28, 2002; April 10, 2002; June 27, 2002; and January 23, 2003
- B. A RESOLUTION OF THE I-710 OVERSIGHT POLICY COMMITTEE DESIGNATING LOCATIONS FOR POSTING OF AGENDAS AND RESOLUTIONS REQUIRED BY LAW TO BE PUBLISHED OR POSTED

It was moved by Member McCarthy, seconded by Member Andrews, to approve the consent calendar. The motion was approved unanimously, with the following abstentions with regard to the minutes: Member Dear and Member Noguez abstained on all minutes; Member De La Torre abstained on the minutes of June 27, 2002, and January 23, 2003; Member Warren abstained on the minutes of February 28, 2002, April 10, 2002, and June 27, 2002.

VII. Reports

- A. Summary of Public Comments on the Five Alternative Conceptual Strategies

Julie Gertler, President of Consensus Planning Group (CPG) presented the outreach findings to the OPC. She said the OPC had heard previously about the earlier stages of the outreach process-- the Purpose and Need phase and the initial twelve alternatives

Minutes I-710 Oversight Policy Committee

May 28, 2003

Page 5 of 12

phase. Tonight she said would present the outreach since the final set of five alternatives was developed and the impacts understood. Once the five alternatives were determined and lines were drawn on the map, the Study Team immediately began sharing the maps with the elected officials and to the public through media briefings. She said that the maps were first presented to the Technical Advisory Committee on March 26, becoming public on that date. This was followed by meetings in impacted communities.

Ms. Gertler reported that since March 26th, more than 157,000 invitations have been sent to homes and businesses along the corridor. Additionally, the following communication strategies were employed:

- Notices were sent to residents in the water and power bills of the cities with the capacity to do so.
- Notices were placed on buses running in the corridor
- Letters were sent to every school in the corridor asking for two things—presentation; send notices home with the students. Follow up calls made to every school
- Letters were sent to every church in the corridor asking for two things—presentation; send notices home with parishioners. Follow up calls made to every church
- A notice was posted on the electronic signboard near the 710/405 interchange
- If a city had a Public Information Officer, he or she was contacted to determine that city's communications preferences and which audiences were important to it.
- Contact was made with every city's cable TV channel.
- Letters were sent to council members of every city requesting a briefing and an opportunity to obtain the lists of important community groups and stakeholders. Follow up calls were made to those who did not respond, as we consider the information provided at these briefings to be crucial in ensuring validity of the process.

She said that they have met with over 2,200 people and this is what was heard:

- Concern and anxiety about property takes
- Concern about equitable financial compensation
- Desire to stay in the community they love
- Concerns about possible park takings
- Concern that their homes were being taken immediately
- Health concerns related to truck traffic
- Frustration with existing rail yards
- Frustration regarding notification of project impacts
- Frustration with increased port/truck traffic
- Put trucks on Alameda Street; on Alameda Corridor
- Do something!

Minutes I-710 Oversight Policy Committee

May 28, 2003

Page 6 of 12

- Improvements are needed but the property takes under consideration are just too big!
- Ports cause the problems/ports should be responsible for the solution
- I-710 is dangerous
- It's dangerous sharing the freeway with large trucks
- Trucks and drivers are the problem, not the freeway
- Separate cars from trucks

Ms. Gertler said that this is a tough time for everybody involved in the process; there is a lot of frustration. She summarized public outreach findings as:

- In order to achieve the significant safety and time-saving improvements called for by the study, it became apparent that the consequences **would** be enormous
- The information provided to the public about right-of-way acquisition is vague and ambiguous, fueling legitimate fears about loss of property values and a long period of limbo
- As a result of historic land uses, industrial uses and the ports, the corridor suffers an environmental burden, stimulating frustration among interest groups trying to reduce pollution
- Several cities sit at the crossroads of lots of transportation infrastructure
- The agencies that are charged with planning for transportation needs are in a challenging situation. The impacts of what it takes to achieve the mobility improvements are not popular with those directly affected and so politically difficult for elected officials.

She said that all of this leads to the difficult decisions that face the elected officials on the OPC.

Member McCarthy, Downey, asked if the OPC would get summaries of the comments. Ms. Gertler replied that those would be made available.

It was the consensus of the I-710 Oversight Policy Committee to receive and file the report.

B. Report from the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee

William Pagett, Chair of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, reported that the TAC has been listening to detailed reports from the study team about the evaluation of the alternatives at meetings on March 26, April 2, April 9, April 15 and May 1. These reports have included information about:

- Congestion benefits of alternatives
- Impacts on surface street traffic
- Potential for tolling truckway

Minutes I-710 Oversight Policy Committee

May 28, 2003

Page 7 of 12

- Safety benefits of alternatives
- Noise impacts of alternatives
- Air Quality impacts of alternatives
- Health impacts of diesel emissions
- ROW impacts by acres, land use, population and structures
- Parks, open space and biological resources
- Hydrology and floodplain

Mr. Pagett said that the TAC has been listening to specific concerns and information requests from individual members, studying the right-of-way impacts of each alternative, and evaluating the individual elements. He said that this process would continue at the next scheduled TAC meeting on June 11th.

He said that the TAC has been listening to the public who have commented and asked questions at each of the TAC meetings as well as those whose comments that have been gathered through the outreach process.

Mr. Pagett said that many of the TAC members have also attended public meetings to listen directly to the public. He reported that the TAC introduced and agendized for formal action on June 11 four guiding principles, which the OPC will be discussing in more detail this evening:

1. Minimize right-of-way acquisitions
2. Reduce air pollution
3. Improve safety
4. Relieve congestion

Mr. Pagett said that the study team was also directed to meet with the AQMD to discuss the methodology used to estimated diesel particulate matter concentrations. The AQMD is now a member of the TAC.

Mr. Pagett suggested that, by immersing itself in the details of the alternatives and the alternative evaluation material, the TAC is well positioned to undertake the task of selecting from among the elements of the alternatives.

Mr. Pagett said that the TAC members and the agencies represented are committed to spending as long as it takes to discharge their responsibilities in a professional and responsible manner. He said that he thinks the TAC can meet the objectives of the guiding principles that are proposed for OPC adoption.

It was the consensus of the Oversight Policy Committee to receive and file the report.

C. Consideration of the Adoption of the “Guiding Principles”

Richard Powers, Executive Director of the Gateway Cities COG, introduced four Guiding Principles to govern the remainder of the I-710 Major Corridor Study:

1. Minimize Right-of-Way Acquisitions with the objective being to preserve existing houses, businesses and open space.
2. Reduce Air Pollution with aggressive advocacy and implementation of diesel emissions reduction programs and use of alternative fuels.
3. Improve Safety by considering enhanced truck safety inspection facilities and reduced truck/car conflicts and improved roadway design.
4. Relieve Congestion and reduce intrusion of traffic into communities and neighborhoods by adding needed capacity, deploying Transportation Systems Management and Transportation Demand Management technologies and strategies (TSM/TDM), and maximizing use of the Alameda Corridor.

It was moved by Member McCarthy, seconded by Member De La Torre, to adopt all four principles.

Co-Chair Colonna said that the City of Long Beach requested added an additional guiding principle and modified wording for the other principles. Co-Chair Colonna introduced the following changes to the principles:

2. Identify and minimize both immediate and cumulative exposure to Air toxics and Pollution with aggressive advocacy and implementation of diesel emissions reduction programs and use of alternative fuels as well as in project planning and design.
4. Relieve Congestion and reduce intrusion of traffic into communities and neighborhoods by employing a comprehensive regional systems approach that includes adding needed capacity as well as, deploying Transportation Systems Management and Transportation Demand Management technologies and strategies (TSM/TDM), to make full and~~maximizing~~ use of freeway, roadway, rail and transit systems. ~~the Alameda Corridor.~~
5. Improve public participation in the development and consideration of alternatives and provide technical assistance to facilitate effective public participation.

Minutes I-710 Oversight Policy Committee

May 28, 2003

Page 9 of 12

Member Andrews suggested adding language to Guiding Principal #1 that special consideration be given for economic compensation in the event of residential takes. Member McCarthy suggested that the issue be held until more specific right-of-way impacts are known.

After discussion among the OPC members, Members McCarthy and De La Torre accepted Co-Chair Colonna's amendments to their motion.

ROLL CALL

AYES: Member Crespo, Member Ramos, Member Andrews, Member McCarthy, Member Noguez, Member De La Torre, Member Bangalore, Member Dear, Member Maekawa, Member Hein, Member Warren, Member Burlingham, Co-Chair Colonna, Co-Chair Pena.

NOES: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

ABSENT: Member Cole, Member Gurule, Member Pedroza, Member Daniels, Member Davis, Member Molina.

D. Consideration of a Motion Directing the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to start with Alternative B and create a "hybrid" alternative that combines appropriate elements from all 5 alternatives. These elements must be acceptable to each affected city with the purpose of minimizing right-of-way acquisitions and the objective of preserving existing housing stock, yet work together as an integrated strategy consistent with adopted guiding principles.

Richard Powers introduced this item, saying that it had been drafted by Gateway Cities COG staff in an attempt to merge the MTA Board action with the desires of the corridor cities. He said that the intent of the proposed action is to provide specific direction to the TAC as it continues its deliberations on the five alternatives.

It was moved by Co-Chair Colonna, seconded by Member De La Torre, to approve the recommended direction to the TAC.

Fahardi Bahrani, Communities for a Better Environment, said that he felt it was premature to adopt the motion because the five alternatives under consideration are prejudiced because a flawed process produced these five alternatives. He said that the OPC should go back to the initial set of twelve alternatives.

Minutes I-710 Oversight Policy Committee

May 28, 2003

Page 10 of 12

Augustus Ajawara, City of Compton, said that the OPC should not segment the TAC process because decisions made by one city affect the others. He said that the TAC should continue to deliberate as a whole.

Marta Segura, Communities for a Better Environment, and Julie Masters, NRDC, said that a decision should be deferred.

ROLL CALL

AYES: Member McCarthy, Member De La Torre, Member Bangalore, Member Maekawa, Member Hein, Member Warren, Co-Chair Colonna, Co-Chair Pena.

NOES: Member Crespo, Member Ramos, Member Andrews, Member Dear.

ABSTAIN: Member Noguez, Member Burlingham.

ABSENT: Member Cole, Member Gurule, Member Pedroza, Member Davis, Member Molina.

Member Argumedo returned to the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

E. Consideration of the Creation of I-710 Citizens Advisory Committees

Richard Powers introduced the item. He said that there has been discussion of ways to improve public input to the study process and that an idea was to create citizens advisory committees, perhaps two committees, one for the area north of I-105 and one for the area south of I-105. He asked for Committee discussion.

Co-Chair Colonna suggested the Committee take the proposal under advisement, and consider establishing a committee for future study phases.

Member McCarthy said he was concerned about the costs of establishing and staffing the committee and who would fund the cost of the committee.

There was discussion among the OPC members as to how representation of the citizens committee would be determined.

It was moved by Co-Chair Colonna, seconded by Member Dear, to create a citizens advisory committee and to come back at the next meeting with comments from the cities

Minutes I-710 Oversight Policy Committee

May 28, 2003

Page 11 of 12

as to how to structure the committee. Member McCarthy recommended that recommendations should also be solicited from the TAC. Co-Chair Colonna and Member Dear accepted Member McCarthy's amendment to their motion.

Malcolm Carson, Legal Aid Society, said that tactics should not be used to reduce public involvement, such as arguing that the study must be hurried or the chance to obtain federal funds will be lost. He said he rejects that argument categorically; let's do it right no matter how long it takes. Furthermore, he said that the statement that Caltrans will act if the OPC doesn't act is not correct. He said Caltrans can't do whatever they want with I-710; they are subject to MTA and SCAG planning and programming processes.

Fahardi Bahrn, Communities for a Better Environment, asked if the original twelve alternatives were included in the previous motion. Co-Chair Pena responded that no, the motion was not amended to include all twelve initial alternatives, and that it directs the TAC to develop a hybrid alternative from the final five alternatives.

Co-Chair Pena asked for two separate votes on the pending motion. The first was on the motion to create a citizen advisory committee.

ROLL CALL

AYES: Member Crespo, Member Argumedo, Member Andrews, Member McCarthy, Member Noguez, Member De La Torre, Member Bangalore, Member Dear, Member Maekawa, Member Hein, Member Warren, Member Burlingham, Co-Chair Colonna, Co-Chair Pena.

NOES: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

ABSENT: Member Cole, Member Gurule, Member Pedroza, Member Davis, Member Molina.

Co-Chair Pena then asked for a vote on the motion to seek recommendations from the cities and the TAC on the structure of the committee.

ROLL CALL

AYES: Member Crespo, Member Argumedo, Member Andrews, Member McCarthy, Member Noguez, Member De La Torre, Member Bangalore, Member Dear, Member Maekawa, Member Hein, Member Warren, Member Burlingham, Co-Chair Colonna, Co-Chair Pena.

Minutes I-710 Oversight Policy Committee

May 28, 2003

Page 12 of 12

NOES: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

ABSENT: Member Cole, Member Gurule, Member Pedroza, Member Davis, Member Molina.

F. Adoption of Meeting Schedule for the Oversight Policy Committee

1. Consideration of a Workshop focusing on the Environment and Public Health
2. Consideration of a Workshop Focusing on Congestion, Mobility and the Economy

Richard Powers introduced a tentative schedule which proposed to hold the first OPC workshop on June 25 at Progress Park in Paramount, and the second workshop on July 9, also at Progress Park. It was noted that since these would be workshops not requiring action items by the OPC, a quorum would not be necessary to be present in order for the workshops to proceed.

It was the consensus of the Committee to adopt the proposed meeting schedule.

VIII. Adjournment

It was the consensus of the Committee to adjourn. Co-Chair Pena adjourned the meeting at 8:45 p.m.