Attendance of the March 19, 2003 GMAC Meeting
(based on sign-in sheet)

Name	Agency
Brown, Hon. Arthur C.	City of Buena Park
Caldwell, Don	Union Pacific Railroad
Calix, Robert	LACMTA
Carpenter, Jeff	City of Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency
Cartwright, Kerry	Port of Long Beach
Catz, Sarah	Golden State Gateway Coalition
Cheng, Luke	LACMTA
Daniels, Hon. Gene	City of Paramount
DiCamillo, LaDonna	BNSF
Dorland, Kanya	Port of Los Angeles
Escoula, Liberty	Caltrans District 7
Fetty, George	George Fetty and Associates
Gillings, Bruce	NAIOP – Southern California
Guss, Ron	Intermodal West/California Trucking Association
Hayes, Jolene	Port of Long Beach
Hicks, Gill	Gill V. Hicks and Associates
Kodama, Michael	Michael Kodama Associates
Kumar, Vin	Caltrans District 7
Lau, Charles	Caltrans District 8
Lee, Francis	Caltrans Corridor Studies
Lopez, Ernest	SCAQMD
Morales, Ernest	LACMTA
Neal, Jim	Wilbur Smith Associates
Neely, Sharon	ACE Construction Authority
Padival, Navnit	LA County Sanitation District
Proo, Hon. Beatrice	City of Pico Rivera
Randolph, Stan	Caltrans
Rodriguez, Dilara	Caltrans
Smith, Steve	SANBAG
Wiggins, Stephanie	RCTC
Zeigler, John	Auto Club of Southern California

SCAG Staff

Griffin, Mark
Havens, Alan
Keynejad, Charles
Nam, Annie
Wong, Philbert

GOODS MOVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 19, 2003

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Councilmember Art Brown, City of Buena Park, called the meeting to order. A list of those in attendance is included in the minutes.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

There were no public comments.

3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

3.1 Approval Items

3.1.1 Approval of the February 19, 2002 Minutes

ACTION: Motion to approve the minutes was accepted and seconded with no objections.

4.0 INFORMATION ITEMS

4.1 Draft 2004 RTP Financial Forecast

Ms. Annie Nam, SCAG staff, presented this item. Since the adoption of the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan, significant updates have been made to the financial plan. Some of these updates include: time horizon, which now begins at 2002 and ends at 2030; revenues and costs are now expressed in 2002 dollars; local sales tax revenues have been updated; and Proposition 42 revenues are included beginning in FY 2009. Based upon these assumptions, a draft revenue forecast has been developed which includes high, medium, and low scenarios.

Baseline costs include short-term capital costs, operation and maintenance, and debt service, which as a region total $115 billion. Given baseline costs and utilizing the medium revenue scenario, funding is sufficient only to maintain the existing transportation system but is inadequate to fund new RTP projects. Therefore, alternative funding scenarios will need to be explored. The financial forecast is currently in draft form, and is subject to revision.

4.2 The Impact of Dedicated Truck Lanes on Air Quality Conformity

Mr. Charles Keynejad, SCAG staff, presented this item. Because almost the entire SCAG region (the exception being eastern Riverside County, in the area between the Coachella Valley and the California-Arizona border) is in one or more federal Non-Attainment Areas, our regional transportation plan and program are subject to transportation conformity regulations. As a result, this region's transportation plan is required to: 1) prove that our plan and the plan in the program are financially constrained; 2) prove that regional emissions caused by transportation activity including the Truck Lanes, do not exceed emission budgets. If there is no emission budget then we have to prove that not implementing this plan will not increase emissions more than a no-build scenario.

The SR-60 Truck Lanes are located in the South Coast Air Basin, which covers the urbanized area of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties. Currently, the applicable Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the South Coast Air Basin is the 1997 AQMP. This does not have truck lanes as a Transportation Control Measure (TCM). However, it does include other goods movement projects such as the Alameda Corridor. Truck lanes can have a significant impact on air quality in congested corridors because additional capacity can increase vehicle speed in those areas.

The SR-60 Truck Lane project was planned in the 2001 RTP to be implemented by 2010. The draft 2003 AQMP/SIP (State Implementation Plan) currently under development includes this project as a TCM. If truck lanes are included as a TCM in the final AQMP/SIP, this region will be obligated to construct the project by a specified date. However, there is uncertainty as to whether or not the SR-60 truck lane project can be implemented by 2010. SCAG is responsible for developing the Transportation Control Measures for the South Coast Air Basin for the AQMP, and is discussing this issue with the county transportation commissions, Caltrans, Air agencies, and Federal agencies.

A question was asked whether or not MAGLEV is shown as a TCM. In response, Mr. Keynejad answered that MAGLEV is not currently a TCM.

5.0 <u>ACTION ITEMS</u>

5.1 List of Goods Movement Projects

Mr. Mark Griffin, SCAG staff, presented this item. The list of goods movement project is intended to be the essential foundational piece for the

development of the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan. Mr. Griffin noted that the list is not static, but is instead dynamic. Over the next several months, SCAG staff will develop and bring to the GMAC strategies and policies for inclusion in the goods movement element of the 2004 RTP.

Mr. Griffin noted that the goods movement list will need to be cross-referenced with the overall RTP project. A pivot table will be created which will link the list the goods movement list to the RTP list so that we can track project by project what is going on in the RTP tables. The overall RTP project list and the goods movement list will need to be reconciled to determine if projects appear in one list and not the other.

Mr. Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach, believes that these projects included in the TEA-21 reauthorization list should be prioritized above candidate projects and perhaps be included in the tier 2 list. Mr. Carwright wants to provide some guidance from GMAC to the RTP TAC, TCC, and RC so that certain projects can be included in the final list of the RTP projects.

Mr. Naresh Amatya, SCAG staff, stated that the essential tasks for developing the draft RTP are to develop the alternatives and merge the alternative process with the EIR process. The idea of the PILUT (Planning for Integrated Land Use and Transportation) program is to merge different processes within SCAG including the RTP, EIR, PILUT, and the Compass Envisioning Process into one process. As a result, there will be a focus on developing growth scenarios, growth projections for the region, how we hope the region to evolve in terms of urban form etc. The next step would be to develop the Transportation Development Investment Alternatives that match with the alternatives, which is scheduled to be completed by the end of April. In the meantime the Compass group is working on developing the Compass alternative visions between now and May. By the end of June alternatives will be further refined and evaluated for RTP purposes. The recommendations coming from the GMAC will be part of the mix. Between June and the end of September is the intensive analytical process in developing the RTP. The draft Alternative Plan with the preferred Alternative selected, is scheduled to go to the Regional Council for their endorsement to release the draft by the end of October.

Mr. Robert Calix, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, stated that in light of the budget shortfall at the state level as well as national uncertainty the MTA can only support those projects that are in the MTA's long range transportation plan that have a funding commitment, are in the TEA-21 reauthorization priority list of projects, and have received board action. Since MTA does not know how SCAG intends to fund other projects the MTA cannot support another project list that does not have funding commitments. MTA is concerned that

supporting a list of projects without funding will risk the regional air quality conformity status of the RTP.

In response, Mr. John Zeigler, Auto Club of Southern California, felt that maybe there is a need to clearly state what is a reasonably unfunded project and a possibly funded project in order to make a distinction when the committee looks at the projects. Mr. Griffin noted that the RTP includes projects classified as baseline (funded), constrained (possibly funded), and unconstrained (no funding). Councilmember Brown requested that there be a review of some of the funding options that might be considered for truck lanes and other projects that might not be currently funded.

Ms. Dilara Rodriguez, Caltrans, stated that the four southern California Caltrans districts (7,8,11, and 12) have created a working group for freight. The four districts meet periodically and look at issues that are related to freight. At last month's meeting district 11 submitted a list of projects for Imperial County and district 12 also had a list of additional projects. She requested that these be incorporated and shared with the committee.

Mr. Amatya clarified some issues. The RTP list is the global list of all the potential candidate projects that will be considered for the update process. This list will be the basis for developing the alternative growth projection vision. Most of the projects that are on the GMAC list are in the RTP list. However, some projects are not included because they are not modeled, such as ITS improvements. It is important to remember that there are projects that are not modeled yet are part of the baseline. SCAG will attempt to distribute a complete list that includes not just the projects that will be modeled, but also projects that are committed in this region from the funding standpoint to clarify what is the global list of committed projects in this region. Mr. Amatya also provided clarification as to the definition of baseline and Tier 2 projects. When the last RTP was developed there were three sets of baselines. Furthermore, the Conformity Analysis and EIR each had its own baseline. To eliminate confusion, the RTP needed a single definition of baseline, which is as follows: a project in the baseline is any 2002 RTIP projects that have environmental clearance by December 2002. A 2002 RTIP project that does not have environmental clearance by this date is placed onto the Tier 2 list. Baseline and Tier 2 are going to be a part of all the alternatives that will be looked at. Based on the known revenue sources there is barely enough money to accommodate the Baseline and Tier 2 projects. Therefore, there is a great need to come up with innovative financing strategies. Much of the strategy beyond the Tier 2 will have to rely on alternative financing sources.

ACTION: The recommended action to confirm the goods movement project list was approved. The Chairman requested that staff examine Mr. Cartwright's suggestion to also look at the TEA-21 reauthorization list as well as and Ms. Rodriguez's request to incorporate the additional Caltrans projects into the goods movement project list.

6.0 COMMENT PERIOD

There were no public comments.

7.0 NEXT MEETING

The next regular GMAC meeting will be:
Wednesday, April 16, 2003
9:30am-11:00am
SCAG Offices, San Bernardino Conference Rooms A&B

8.0 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30am.