

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
I-710 OVERSIGHT POLICY COMMITTEE**

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

July 9, 2003

I. Call to Order

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

II. Roll Call

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Co-Chair Frank Colonna, Long Beach; Co-Chair Sam Peña, Maywood; Daniel Crespo, Bell Gardens; Jim Dear, Carson; Hugo Argumedo, Commerce; Frank Gurule, Cudahy; Keith McCarthy, Downey; Juan Noguez, Huntington Park; Gene Daniels, Paramount; Hector De La Torre, South Gate; Louis Byrd, Lynwood; John Calhoun, Port of Long Beach; Naresh Amatya, Caltrans; Ray Maekawa, MTA.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: George Cole, Bell; Eric Perrodin, Compton; Fernando Pedroza, Lynwood; William Davis, Vernon; Gloria Molina, County of Los Angeles; Thomas Warren, Port of Los Angeles; Zahi Faranesh, SCAG.

ALSO PRESENT: Richard Powers, GCCOG; Don Camph, GCCOG; Robert Messinger, GCCOG; Deborah Chankin, GCCOG.

III. Pledge of Allegiance

The pledge of allegiance was led by Member Gurule.

IV. Amendments to the Agenda

There were no amendments to the agenda.

V. Public Comments

Co-Chair Pena asked if any members of the public wished to comment. He requested that speakers fill out a 3" x 5" card and to restrict their comments to three minutes in the interest of time. Several members of the public then spoke.

Mr. Flores, Commerce, said that present solutions are not the right formula for easing congestion for autos and trucks. We need to look at near-dock rail yards, and shipping

containers out to Ontario on rail. We need to present alternatives to single occupant autos; need rapid passenger rail along the freeway going to Los Angeles. Expanding the freeway is not the solution. US101 expansion has been killed; they have the political clout. The I-710 gap in South Pasadena should have been addressed first; he wants to see a level playing field. He said if we expand I-710, then also expand US101 and do the gap closure. We need to look at other alternatives; perhaps set up a non-profit organization to keep an eye on the agencies and elected officials; don't accommodate cargo at the expense of residents

Mr. Allen Hose, President of Windward Village Mobile Home Park Homeowners Association, Long Beach asked a point of information directed to MTA -- an MTA Board member allegedly told a friend of his that MTA has unofficially selected Alternative C, which includes the SR-103 extension past their Mobile Home Park. He referred to an April 29, 2003, Long Beach Press-Telegram article where two lines mentioned the SR-103 extension, using I-710 as a diversion for the extension of SR-103. He said he still believes that to be true; they are tired of electing officials that don't represent their constituents.

Mr. Gilbert Estrada, Physicians for Social Responsibility, said that we cannot solve the problem by more freeway congestion; more lanes on freeways create more traffic. He said both a UC Berkeley study and the SCAG regional growth management plan say that adding or expanding freeways does not reduce congestion. The "Big Dig" in Boston has saved only 3 minutes of travel time per trip; I-110 double decking has not reduced congestion. He urged the OPC to not break any laws during the study such as the Children's Health Protection Act. He said the I-710 study must do health risk assessment for children. The EPA standards for cancer risk are one per million for PM10 and PM2.5. The OPC should study Clean Water Act impacts and the environmental justice executive order prohibiting disproportionate impacts to minorities.

Mr. Bob Eula, Commerce resident, asked the OPC what their priorities are. Just expand the freeway? He said that a speaker at the last OPC meeting gave them information about diesel toxins and he hopes the railroads and trucking companies are considering that.

Ms. Coto, Commerce said she has a child with learning disabilities and knows of other children with speech problems and learning disabilities due to pollution impacts. She said she understands the need for jobs and the need to transport goods from the ports to the rest of the country, but we need a combination of railroads and trucks. Most trucks use I-710. She said we need to get trucks to use other freeways as well; we have rights to clean air and not suffer asthma; the pollution is killing us in our communities.

Mr. Robert Cabrales, Communities for a Better Environment, said that his organization wants the title to be "community advisory committee", not "citizens' advisory committee"; and that they want to have real community representation. They want the CAC to have veto power over the TAC and OPC.

Ms. Tanya Bernard, Bus Riders' Union, said she wants more CNG buses, which move people at less cost than autos. She expressed concern about the funnel effect of 8 lanes reducing to 2 lanes; it creates a backup that is unbelievable. Are you intending to widen all freeways and arterials? She said she is tired of not being represented; corporate interests

will have their way over the people, but bus riders oppose expansion of the I-710 freeway.

Mr. Linder, Long Beach, said the freeway is too narrow a viewpoint; 25 years too short a time horizon. We should be thinking in terms of a transportation corridor, an additional Alameda Corridor for redundancy, additional truck and auto corridors, and economic compensation to affected residents. It's a NIMBY attitude to move ports somewhere else; however unrealistic, cargo could come to ports in Mexico and then move to the U.S. in less safe and more polluting trucks.

Mr. Osornio, San Pedro, said that they are going to do to you same thing as they did to Chavez Ravine. His idea of I-710 traffic is different; most trucks use I-110 or I-710 and come close to rail yards in East Los Angeles. He said he proposes that all trucks would have to pick up boxes at East Los Angeles yards, not at the ports. This would take 80 percent of trucks off the freeway. If cargo is destined within 15 miles of the ports, it can be picked up at the ports; if further away, then it must go by rail.

Ms. Acqui, Physicians for Social Responsibility, asked that Report item B, on the CAC, be discussed first, as many members of the public are more interested in that item.

Co-Chairs Pena and Colonna agreed to change the order of the agenda.

VI. Consent Calendar

A. Minutes of the Meeting of June 25, 2003.

Approval of the minutes was deferred to the next meeting as they had not been provided to the OPC members.

VII. Reports

A. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding I-710 Citizens Advisory Committee

Nancy Ramos of Commerce replaced Member Argumedo at this point in the meeting.

Richard Powers presented the item to the OPC. He said that at its May 25th meeting the I-710 OPC adopted a set of "Guiding Principles", including:

"5. Improve public participation in the development and consideration of alternatives and provide technical assistance to facilitate effective public participation."

At its meeting of June 25th, the OPC directed staff to incorporate comments from that meeting and suggestions from a meeting of the co-chairs, the study funding partners and the SCAQMD into a proposal for consideration at its July 9th meeting. Mr. Powers reported that staff had met as directed and has the following proposal to offer for OPC consideration.

Purpose of I-710 Citizens Advisory Committees (CACs)

A. Solicit community (residents, businesses, institutions, labor, environmental and health interests, etc.) input and engagement on issues of local and regional

importance relating to the present and future of the I-710 Corridor from the Port of Long Beach to SR-60.

- B. Encourage a representative and broad base of citizen participation both within and beyond the CACs
- C. Provide a vehicle to incorporate and respond to public input in planning for the I-710 Corridor.
- D. Assist the OPC and the TAC in educating and communicating information about the I-710 Program.
- E. Promote constructive dialogue in an environment of trust, credibility and mutual respect in the community outreach process and in the transportation planning process.
- F. Strive to understand and reconcile diverse interests and objectives.
- G. Develop consensus on a set of corridor solutions, including the hybrid alternative, consistent with the goal of reinvigorating corridor economies and sustaining safe, healthy and vibrant communities.
- H. Provide a long-term structure for community engagement with any environmental process that ultimately evolves from the Major Corridor Study to ensure that implementation is faithful to the community vision and the community outreach process.

Recommended Initial Two-Tiered CAC Structure

Tier One – Community Level

Tier One will consist of community level Community Advisory Committees. The communities are the 14 corridor cities and two unincorporated areas, with the understanding that the City of Long Beach may identify no more than four impacted communities based on the length (8 miles) of the freeway frontage within that City.

Each corridor community may, through its city council (or for unincorporated areas through its County supervisor), establish a citizens committee whose focus is strictly on issues related to the I-710 Corridor and its current and future impacts on their communities.

Many of the corridor city councils, as well as the unincorporated area in East Los Angeles, have already developed such committees or are in the process of doing so. For directly impacted communities (those where potential right-of-way needs have been identified), the professional outreach facilitators will assist in forming a Tier One committee if the City Council or County Supervisor has not done so. For indirectly impacted communities (those where no potential right-of-way needs have been identified), the formation of a Tier One committee will be optional.

Members of Tier One committees will be drawn from impacted neighborhoods and are

encouraged to incorporate representation from existing neighborhood-based associations. Each Tier One committee will elect a chairperson to guide the meetings and reconcile issues.

Tier Two –Corridor Level

The Corridor Level Advisory Committee is a broad based corridor-wide body. The initial membership will consist of:

- The Chair of each Tier One committee
- For each community that does not have a Tier One committee, a member appointed by the city council or County supervisor.
- No more than 15 members appointed by the OPC to provide representation from the environmental community, business, labor, institutions, and academia.

The Chair of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee
The Chair of the I-710 Enhancement Committee

In order to empower the CAC to engage additional perspectives or interests that it deems important, the OPC will delegate to the CAC the authority to appoint, by unanimous vote, up to 10 additional members.

With the professional facilitator as a resource, this Advisory Committee will structure itself and its work based on key issue areas that are identified by the Tier One grass roots committees. These issue areas might include:

Health/Environment/Quality of Life
Mobility (Congestion/Safety/Access)
Economic Development
Land Use/Urban Design

The structure should include procedures and mechanisms to encourage consensus building in the development of the hybrid alternative. This consensus building process must be most sensitive to the input of the directly impacted communities. The procedures and mechanisms to ensure accurate communications with the OPC will need to be codified and presented to the OPC for ratification.

Mr. Powers then requested discussion among the OPC members on the proposal.

Member McCarthy asked for a clarification of how many members would sit on the Tier II CAC.

Member De La Torre noted that up to 46 members could be seated on the Tier II CAC.

Co-Chair Pena asked for the sense of the Committee as to how much time should be given for each city to form their Tier I committees. The consensus response was that one month should be enough time.

Member McCarthy requested that staff look at creating an online “whiteboard” on the

internet so that community dialogue can be increased on the issues and is available at all times, not just during scheduled meetings. He also recommended that the Tier II CAC not exceed 47 members.

Member Ramos asked whether the advisory committee has voting powers. Staff answered yes, but the CAC advises the Oversight Policy Committee.

Co-Chair Pena then asked if there was any public comment on the subject of the Community Advisory Committees.

Malcolm Carson, Legal Aid Foundation: He has submitted written comments to Mr. Powers. CAC should be given veto power over the OPC. CAC should have access to same consultant technical resources as the TAC. The CAC should have same structure as the formal Project Area Committees used for redevelopment projects. With respect to the proposed CAC structure, the structure itself doesn't conflict with effective community input, but it is still not clear how the Tier I group establishes legitimacy. Waste of everyone's time if CAC not given formal role and veto power over the OPC decisions.

Robert Cabrales, CBE: He has several concerns about the CAC proposal. 1) Not enough time was given in advance to review this proposal; 2) 15 members to be appointed by the OPC is problematic, there will be a bias towards freeway expansion; 3) use of a professional facilitator worries him given the performance of the other outreach consultants used in the study.

Regina Taylor, Sierra Club and Citizens for a Better Environment: She wishes they had access to the proposal prior to the meeting. She has a concern about the hybrid alternative; what if the community comes back with a preference for the No Build alternative, will this be acceptable? The I-710 project is a port expansion issue as port trucks are the cause of the problem.

Barbara Mead, West Long Beach Homeowners Association: Wish they had a chance to review the CAC proposal prior to the OPC meeting.

Co-Chair Colonna said that he wanted to respond to comments being made. The Long Beach City Council I-710 Advisory Committee will have public hearings before establishing a city position on I-710 improvements. He said that there are 5-10 years of continued planning before a final plan is adopted; we're just at the beginning of the process, but we need to move forward to fix a bad freeway.

A member of the public stated that they don't want expansion, just resurfacing of the I-710 freeway. We were told no houses will be taken, yet the OPC is still saying that potential right of way will be taken. What is your position?

Co-Chair Colonna said there could be right of way taken, but not residences.

Member De La Torre responded that the hybrid concept is a direction to mix and match features of the alternatives, not a specific plan.

Member Ramos said that we are not really at the beginning of the process. If we really are

Minutes - July 9, 2003

at the beginning, why not start over again? We should take all current options off the table. Three council members from Commerce are conflicted due to property locations near one or more of the final alternatives. She proposed that they go back to No Build and start over.

Co-Chair Pena responded that the community advisory committees will go back to the original alternatives.

Member Dear said that after looking over the CAC proposal of the staff, he requested elected representation of CAC members; Carson has one affected residential community.

Co-Chair Colonna said that he agrees with Member Dear. He responded to Mr. Carson's comments regarding the analogy to PACs: we do want to have meaningful community representation. Community groups will have a democratic process to elect their representatives. The OPC must do something as we will be held under the mantle of a defective freeway and air quality impacts; we need to fix the freeway and address air quality impacts.

It was moved by Co-Chair Colonna, seconded by Member De La Torre, to approve the staff recommendation.

Member Daniels said he encourages citizen participation, but we need solutions. There is a problem that needs to be addressed. We need a win-win outcome.

Member De La Torre requested a point of information. Will the cities have 30 days to appoint CAC members?

Member McCarthy suggested that cities have 30 days to appoint members and that no more than 47 members in total be appointed.

Commerce Councilmember Argumedo said he was concerned about proportional representation relative to impacts; he said he wants in writing that any city can veto the overall plan if against their interests.

Richard Powers said that there is a need to develop consensus because each city has an effective veto power through the required freeway agreement with Caltrans.

Member McCarthy asked that the recommendation be amended to read "two-thirds of the members may vote to add up to 10 additional members" rather than a majority.

Co-Chair Colonna said he would agree to amend his motion to require a 2/3 vote of the CAC members to add up to 10 additional members. The amendment was accepted by Member De La Torre.

Member Dear said he would rather make it a three quarters vote rather than a two-thirds vote, but that he would vote in favor of the motion.

The motion was approved unanimously.

A. Workshop on Congestion, Mobility and the Economy

Ms. Marianne Venieris, Director, Center of International Trade and Transportation (CITT) at California State University, Long Beach

Ms. Venieris said that she has assembled a panel of experts from academia and the shipping and logistics industry to present to the OPC perspectives on trade, traffic congestion mobility and the local and national economy. She first introduced Dr. Joseph Magaddino.

Dr. Joseph Magaddino, Chairman and Professor of Economics, California State University, Long Beach.

Dr. Maggadino said that he would confine his comments to international trade. Trade has increased 10% per year, three times faster than US economic growth. In 1950, trade was confined to east coast ports. He presented a slide of the rate of growth of container traffic for the twin ports of LA and Long Beach for 1990-2002. There have been many double digit growth years and the overall growth rate in container traffic has been greater than U.S. total container growth rate. There are 220,000 jobs in the region in logistics industries; 440,000 jobs, or 7% of total employment, in international trade. The Global Insight economic forecast predicts U.S. GDP growth of 3.1% per year, which means the economy will double by the year 2027. Exports are forecast to grow at an annual average rate of 6.3% per year, imports forecast to grow by 5.5% per year. Even if the twin ports hold their current market share of U.S. trade, by 2025 there will be 3-4 times growth in current cargo volumes through the ports.

Dr. Charles Woo, CEO of Megatoys, representing a southern California shipper, said that cargo mobility is important to his business and employees. He provided a brief background of his business, a toy importer, and similar businesses. His business has seen a change in the 24 years since it was started. It used to take 21 days to get products from Asia; it now takes 12 days. Manufacturing has expanded in Asia. Many customers

want just-in-time delivery. Many importers are small business owners and don't want their capital tied up in inventory. He said he was not talking about congestion that costs minutes or hours, but days delayed because of delayed turn times. They need cargo to arrive on time at the warehouse and the infrastructure to make it happen. What about the argument of sharing cargo flow with ports in other cities? In southern California, we have a critical mass of businesses and consumers; his firms does 1,000 forty foot containers per year. Many of the local businesses hire staff to support their trade based businesses. Trade creates jobs; many of his type of businesses require truck deliveries.

Mr. Tom Teofilo, Vice President of the Pacific Merchant Shipping Association, said that the PMSA was founded in 1919 and represents 85% of the California maritime industry. Considering container cargo growth, they were projecting 36 million TEUs by 2020 compared to 9.5 million today. The supply chain is Port authorities, ocean carriers, terminal operators, stevedores, the trucking community, warehouse and distribution centers, custom brokers and freight forwarders, railroads, plus many other ancillary industries and government agencies. They are committed to the efficient movement of international freight. As in any industry, the customer is the "reason for being." In international commerce, the importer or exporter of record, often called the cargo owner, is the entity

those in the supply chain aim to please. In turn, if you're a *Target* or *Wal-Mart*, your customer is the American public. It's important to remember, the ultimate customer for the volume of consumer goods imports is you and me!

Mr. Teofilo stated that, while the solution is complex, supply chain stakeholders are committed to resolving the immediate roadway congestion issue. Through cooperation between cargo owners and those in the supply chain, it is hoped that a plan can be worked out that would create a wider time window for container delivery and pickup at marine terminals, thereby reducing congestion on all arteries near the ports. 24/7 is a concept for the future. It's pretty much agreed that port operations will be conducted 24 hours a day when the cargo volume warrants and it is economically feasible to do so. Right now there is insufficient cargo to warrant around-the-clock operations. Cooperation in planning for extended gate operations now, will prepare stakeholders for the eventual 24/7 operations of the future.

Mr. Teofilo commented that the maritime industry has been proactive in addressing environmental issues. Voluntary Vessel Speed Reduction to 12 knots outside our harbor is responsible for a reduction of about 1.5 tons of nitrogen oxide per day. Terminal operators and shipping lines have become partners in exchanging yard equipment for alternate fuel vehicles, using emulsified diesel fuel, creating a 20% NOX decrease and a 50% reduction in particulate matter. Ports are investing in Diesel Catalytic Converter installations at terminals.

Mr. Teofilo said the maritime industry is committed to being a part of the solution to the growth-related problems associated with the movement of international commerce. Terminal operators, ocean carriers and shippers are currently in dialogue regarding expanded hours of operation within the ports of LA/LB. A conference is being organized to foster even greater communication among stakeholders. Cargo owners and supply chain executives will exchange viewpoints and evaluate the merits and prospects of extended

gate hours at San Pedro Bay container terminals. The conference is scheduled for August 14th, beginning at 8:00 a.m., at the Hyatt Regency - Long Beach. He said to watch for more details.

Co-Chair Colonna said that he was pleased to see the PMSA and stakeholders moving towards extended gate hours. He said we need to move to 24/7 operations now, not later. We can't build infrastructure that will accommodate traffic without 24/7 operations.

Mr. Teofilo responded that several terminals are operating over 70 hours per week; if all terminals would agree to operate second shift 1-2 days per week that would help.

Ms. Patti Senecal, California Trucking Association, reported that CTA has 2,500 members. She said the average member operates 10 trucks; many are family owned businesses living in the communities they serve, including ship-to-rail intermodal container traffic. CTA has advocated national diesel emissions standards, EPA has adopted new standards that take effect in 2007, and diesel engines under the new standard will be as clean as CNG engines.

Ms. Senecal presented an overview on the trucking industry. There are many sectors of trucks, one of which is intermodal port haulers. Forty percent of total port containers in

2002 were by truck between ship to rail; 14.8% of containers were delivered in the ports area, 12.5% were delivered to the ICTF and 12.7% were delivered to the rail yards in Commerce and Vernon. The operating cost is \$80/hr. for a company owned truck and \$55/hr. for an owner/operator. Many operators are "red lined" by insurance companies, as southern California is the cargo theft capital of the world. This has contributed to a 300 percent increase in operating costs over the past four years. Warehouses have moved further from the ports in order to access cheap land, therefore the yield per truck is greatly reduced; most can only do one turn per day. Congestion has had a big impact on truck productivity. The solution to congestion needs to be looked at on a network-wide basis, including not just I-710, but I-5, SR-60, I-10 and others. A great model for this analytical approach is the seven-state I-10 freight corridor study.

With respect to 24/7 operations, Ms. Senecal said that if the port gates are open trucks are willing to come, but asked will the warehouses be open? Plus there is a concern about cargo theft from any truck holding yards. She said to look to the 1984 Olympics plan as a model. MTA should look at a freeway service patrol specifically for big rigs for incident management, which would reduce the duration of truck-involved sig-alerts; the CHP says that the majority of I-710 sig-alerts involve big rigs.

Member Daniels asked if the high operating costs cause skimping on maintenance.

Ms. Senecal responded yes, among a small number of companies. Smart customers demand proof of safe vehicles by truckers. CTA also supports the Gateway COG truck scrapping program.

Mr. George Fetty, Railroad Consultant said that forty percent of containers from the San Pedro Bay ports are moving by rail. 14.8% (817,000) containers are loaded on trains on dock. 12.5% (690,000) containers are loaded at the ICTF on Willow St. 12.7% (700,000) containers are transported to the yards in East Los Angeles. A new BNSF yard near the ports would eliminate an average of 1,900 truck trips per day on I-710. Shuttle trains to the Inland Empire could reduce 1,100-1,500 truck trips per day. We could get up to 50% of the containers on the Alameda Corridor. Railroad user fees are an invisible tax on U.S. consumers living east of the Rockies. However, 50% of imports are going to southern California and can't travel by train.

Mr. Daniel Meylon, Branch Manager, Carmichael International Service, Custom Brokers/Freight Forwarders told the OPC that it is important to note that we have an infrastructure problem. Fifty percent of imports stay in Southern California. The majority of the imports/exports go to small and medium size businesses, which are an important component of the local economy. The brokers pledge to work with the PMSA and CTA on implementing 24/7 freight operations at the ports.

Dr. Domenick Moretti, ILWU Senior Liaison for POLA and POLB said that there is a need to expand port related infrastructure, but it is becoming difficult because of community impact issues. Two polarized views have developed: stop port growth versus unrestricted growth. He supports no restrictions on growth as cargo volumes are consumer driven. However, there are things that can be done to mitigate the impacts of growth. For example, he would favor reducing truck queuing times by expanding an appointment system, and a move to 24/7 operations.

Dr. Moretti said that increasing cargo volumes are putting a strain on regional infrastructure. Increasing trade will produce pressure to free up state and federal funds to improve infrastructure.

Following the presentations, there were several questions by OPC members and members of the public to clarify the information presented. The various presenters answered to clarify their information.

VIII. Adjournment

Co-Chair Pena adjourned the meeting at 10:30 p.m.