

MINUTES



LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION 403 West 8th St., Suite 500, Los Angeles, CA 90014 (213) 626-0370

LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

MARCH 22, 1989

The regular Commission meeting was called to order by Chair Reed at 1:45 p.m. in the Board of Supervisors' Hearing Room at the Hall of Administration.

Mr. Peterson indicated that he is in receipt of a letter from Supervisor Edelman designating Richard Callahan as his alternate for today's meeting.

Members in attendance were:

Council Member Christine E. Reed
Councilwoman Jacki Bacharach
Councilman Ray Grabinski
Marcia Mednick
Mike Lewis, alternate to Supervisor Schabarum
Walter King, alternate to Supervisor Hahn
Richard Callahan, alternate to Supervisor Edelman
Barna Szabo, alternate to Supervisor Dana
John La Follette, alternate to Supervisor Antonovich
Ray Remy, alternate to Mayor Bradley
Jerry Baxter, Ex-Officio for State of California

Staff members present:

Neil Peterson, Executive Director
David Kelsey, County Counsel
Kathy Torigoe, Executive Secretary
Barbara Norris, Senior Administrative Secretary

PUBLIC HEARING re. Necessity for the Acquisition of the Permanent Fee, Parcel No. R01-R21-AS352 - Gabriele, Owners

Mr. Peterson indicated that in order to authorize the acquisition of the subject property interest, the Commission must find and determine that:

1. The public interest and necessity require the proposed Project;
2. The proposed Project is planned and located in the manner that will be the most compatible with the greatest public good and the least private injury;
3. The property interest sought to be acquired is necessary for the proposed Project; and
4. The offer to the property owners required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code has been made.

Mr. Peterson stated that the statutory offer was made on January 23, 1989 to the owners, Guy Gabriele and Nancy Margaret Gabriele. Several attempts were made to negotiate the acquisition of the subject property but these were unsuccessful. Reference was made to Findings A and B in the staff report. With respect to Finding C, this is a LB-4 alignment (Long Beach Loop), a single northbound track that runs in the middle of Pacific Avenue and then turns easterly to run in the middle of 8th Street. The trackway necessarily reduces the width of the streets that remain for automobile and truck traffic. At the intersection of Pacific Avenue and 8th Street, the trackway will fall against the existing curb line of the southeast corner and would thereby cause traffic moving along north Pacific Avenue and making a right hand turn onto 8th Street to block the trackway, which would greatly impede train movements.

Mr. Kelsey swore in Mr. Peterson and Mr. James Wiley who would be testifying at the hearing and also asked the Chair to accept the staff report in its entirety into evidence as a basis for their findings under the resolution of necessity. Chair Reed accepted the staff report as evidence.

Mr. Grabinski indicated that this is the same piece of property that was tremendously impacted by the fact that 8th Street was going to be closed. He had spoken to the owner, Mr. Gabriele, and Mr. Gabriele's concern is that impacts on 8th Street will cause havoc to his restaurant business. He is concerned about rounding off the corner of the curb and how much impact it will have. He asked that, if it is not critical, a decision could be delayed for at least a week or two until after a meeting is held with staff and others.

Mr. Wiley explained that Mr. Gabriele's concern is about the construction that will be taking place and staff is working closely with him and a meeting is scheduled to go over the construction schedule.

Mr. Grabinski requested that he be informed of the progress of the Long Beach Loop.

Chair Reed asked Mr. Wiley if there is procedure whereby a business receives compensation from the Commission if it is forced to be closed by the activities of construction, even if it is only for one or two days.

Mr. Wiley responded that there is a provision whereby a business can be paid but the Commission has not actually had a case where a business was physically closed by the Commission's construction procedure.

Mrs. Bacharach moved that the Commission adopt the Resolution of Necessity authorizing the commencement of an eminent domain action to acquire the subject property, seconded by Mr. King.

Mr. Grabinski indicated that he would support the motion with the stipulation that the Commission will work closely with all of the people who are impacted by this project.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion to adopt the Resolution of Necessity:

Yes: Lewis, King, Callahan, Szabo, La Follette, Remy,
Grabinski, Bacharach, Mednick, Reed

No: (none)

Motion was carried.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Chair Reed indicated that Item No. 6 has been removed from the Calendar by staff and will be on the agenda at the next meeting.

Mr. Peterson read into the records: Parties of interest who have made a contribution of \$250 or more in the past twelve months to any member of the Commission are asked to come forward and state for the record the Commissioner to whom such contribution was made and to identify the item involved. (None)

Mrs. Bacharach moved, seconded by Mrs. Reed, to approve the consent calendar Items 1 - 16 with the exception of Items 4 and 8. Mr. Lewis and Mr. La Follette asked to be recorded as a "no" vote on Item #3. Hearing no other objection, the consent calendar was approved.

1. Approval of Minutes of March 8, 1989

Correction on page 4, Mr. Holden offered a procedural motion that the Commission attempt to limit the time of the speakers to one hour in favor and one hour opposed. The motion was seconded by Mr. King. The County Counsel stated that the motion would be proper. Discussion followed. Mr. Holden withdrew his motion.

On page 22, Mr. Remy suggested clarification on the discussion relative to additional work that will be done on the competing lines. He is not entirely comfortable with the language in the minutes which merely says that such work will not imply a selection. He would prefer language that states any decision relative to additional work would not prejudice a selection decision for any route prior to the March 1990 date.

Mrs. Bacharach asked that the sentence before that..."This decision is expected to be made no later than March 1990." be corrected. Her amendment to the motion was that the decision would be made no later than March 1990.

The minutes of March 8, 1989 were approved as corrected.

2. Government Relations & Finance Committee recommended the Commission retain Morgan Stanley & Co. as Lessee's Financial Advisor to structure and negotiate a Cross-Border Leveraged Lease Financing of 54 Light Rail Vehicles with a minimum net benefit to the Commission of 5.0% of equipment cost.

Should the transaction take place, it is recommended that the Commission retain the same team of advisors who assisted Morgan Stanley with their successful \$216 million Cross-Border lease transaction for the MTA including:

a) Special Counsel: Lord, Day & Lord - for preparation of Japanese leveraged lease documentation. (Fee est. \$150,000).

b) Japanese Legal Counsel: Hashidate Law Office - To advise on Japanese law implications of the transaction, (Fee est. \$35,000).

c) Japanese Accounting and Tax Counsel: Chuo Coopers & Lybrand - to advise on tax-related matters and serve as chief liaison to the Commission and the Japanese Tax Authority (NTA). (Fee est. \$25,000).

d) Defeasance Bank: Algemene Bank Nederlands (or a more competitive bank) - to defease the rent payments into a one-time, up-front payment thereby eliminating currency exchange risk on this international multi-currency transaction. (Fee est. 0.35% - 0.65% of equipment cost).

Staff requests authorization to issue Requests for Proposal for Lessee's Counsel to advise on aspects of California law and disclosure requirements pertaining to the transaction, should it occur. Fee est. \$25,000).

3. Government Relations & Finance Committee recommended the Commission authorize the Executive Director to award a contract, not to exceed \$35,000, for an opinion survey on an additional 1/2-cent sales tax in Los Angeles County for highways purposes.

Mr. Szabo recommended that after the selection of a consultant is made, that staff solicit some of the public comments received at the GRFC meeting and include those comments in the opinion survey material.

5. Government Relations & Finance Committee recommended the Commission direct staff to share concerns with the department and the California Transportation Commission (CTC) regarding the California Corridor Concept Plan.
7. Government Relations & Finance Committee recommended the Commission support H.R. 41 (Anderson) and oppose H.R. 1023 (Beilenson)
9. The Commission awarded Contract No. R01-T01-C455 (Compton Creek Bridge) to PKB Construction, Inc. on December 23, 1986, for the Long Beach-Los Angeles rail transit project. The Rail Construction Committee recommended the Commission:

- a) Approve the acceptance of the subject contract substantially complete as of November 13, 1987, and authorize the recording of the Notice of Completion.
 - b) Authorize the release of retention in the amount of \$95,366.95, with \$65,366.95 to be released thirty calendar days after the filing of the Notice of Completion, and remaining \$30,000 to be released in ten years after expiration of escrow agreement.
 - c) Approve the transfer of funds in the amount of \$255,338.09 to the Program Reserve. This amount represents a surplus over the total obligated funds for Contract No. R01-T01-C455.
10. Rail Construction Committee recommended approval of Change Order No. 018 in the amount of \$455,000 for Contract No. R01-T01-C140 (LA CBD Approach), Contractor: Homer J. Olsen) for the Long Beach-Los Angeles rail transit project. Sufficient contingency remains in this contract to cover the cost of this additional work.
 11. Rail Construction Committee recommended the Commission authorize an extension for Mr. Trnka's services to Kaiser Engineers of California in the amount of \$56,177 covering the period from April 1, 1989 to July 28, 1989, at which time a permanent rail vehicle engineer will be on staff for the Metro Blue Line rail project.
 12. Rail Construction Committee recommended the Commission approve staff's recommendation to approve Change Order No. 002 (Contract No. R01-T01-C325, Willow Station) in the amount of \$565,151, with the proviso that the Commission's philosophy be discussed with the City of Long Beach and indicate to them that their share of the responsibility of the \$565,151 should be \$100,000. Also that the Commission indicate to the City that in the future LACTC staff will have to get Board authorization for any City-initiated changes that involve additional costs. Sufficient contingency remains in Contract C325 to cover the cost of this additional work.
 14. Streets and Highways Committee recommended the Commission adopt the LACTC's AB 84 project list for 1989. This project list is based on the 1988 list, the LACTC highway plan "On the Road to the Year 2000", and additional recommendations from Caltrans. The recommendation has been revised to delete projects with project study reports currently underway and to add projects recommended for study reports by Caltrans.

15. Transit Committee recommended approval of the FY 1989 Transit TIP Amendments as described below:
 - a) Commit \$592,000 to the SCRTPD to acquire approximately 2.1 acres of land to eliminate two-way traffic through the Division 10 which currently presents a safety hazard. The acquisition will further allow additional employee parking. The project would be funded from SCRTPD's allocation of FY 1990 TDA Carryover funds.
 - b) Commit \$291,500 for bus-rail interface projects on the Long Beach-Los Angeles light rail transit project. The needed improvements will promote coordination between Long Beach Public Transportation (LBPT) and the SCRTPD, the operator of the light rail line, and provide easier access for riders to bus and rail service. Improvements include relocation of bus stops, bus shelter and kiosk foundations, and restroom facilities for bus operators at the Wardlow and Del Amo light rail stations. The project would be funded with uncommitted STA interest.
16. Transit Committee recommended the Commission authorize the Executive Director to execute Amendment No. 5 for Deloitte/Kellogg Joint Venture (DKJV) to conduct an audit of Metro Rail MOS-1 forecast cost under Contract R80-S12-MQ01 for a not-to-exceed amount of \$49,500, subject to satisfactory consummation of contract negotiations. This will increase the total contract price from \$5,562,368 to \$5,611,868. In addition, it is requested that the Commission authorize \$30,000 as a contingency amount in the event the Commission elects to exercise the option for audit of Metro Rail contracts currently unawarded.

DISCUSSION ON CONSENT ITEMS

4. Mr. Szabo reported that the Government Relations & Finance Committee recommended the Commission support, in concept, AB 471 (Katz), SB 300 (Kopp), and SB 339 (Robbins) and direct staff to share concerns about various elements of the bills with the authors. This recommendation is based on Commission policy in support of a state gas tax increase. It further recommended that the Commission monitor AB 14 (Kelley) and SCA 7 (Campbell).

Mr. Remy expressed his concern about the recommendations. He offered a substitute motion that the Commission support additional funding for transportation and within that framework, the Commission will monitor the effects of AB 471, SB 300 and SB 339 and express the Commission's concerns to the authors. Motion was seconded by Mr. King.

Mr. Lewis also expressed concerns about the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Callahan indicated that the Commission should consider the concept of changes in the Gann limit not only for transportation but across the board and asked staff to work along those lines as well.

Chair Reed indicated that the GRFC will be reviewing the comprehensive Gann limit amendment legislation that is being worked on now.

Hearing no objection to Mr. Remy's motion, the motion was carried.

Mr. Szabo moved that the Commission monitor AB 14 (Kelly) and SCA 7 (Campbell), which was seconded by Mrs. Reed. Hearing no objection, motion was carried.

8. Mrs. Bacharach reported that item has to do with the landscaping contract for the Long Beach-Los Angeles rail transit project. This is a comprehensive landscaping contract dealing with the 14 stations, park-and-ride lots and central control facilities and the traction-powered substations. There were three bidders for the contract and Artistic Landscaping and Eng., Inc., was the lowest bidder. Rail Construction Committee recommended the Commission authorize the Executive Director to award Contract No. R01-T01-C275 to Artistic Landscaping and Eng., Inc., the lowest responsive and responsible bidder for the Long Beach-Los Angeles rail transit project. The contract award will be for a total contract price of \$1,209,081. A 10% contract reserve fund of \$120,919 is also recommended to cover the cost of changes and extra work, but will not be included in the contract award amount. This contract is 73% of the engineer's estimate and had no established DBE/WBE goals. At the Committee which staff explained that this was a contract that did not have identifiable subcontracting opportunities. Therefore, staff decided that the invitation to bid would not include DBE/WBE goals. Award will be contingent upon resolution of any bid protest filed in a timely manner with the Commission.

Mrs. Bacharach moved approval of the RCC's recommendation which was seconded.

Mr. Timothy Watkins appeared before the Commission and asked how he could get involved in getting work from LACTC after certifying, meeting insurance requirements, keeping in touch and otherwise, preparing to respond to, what will probably be a few bids in the realm that he specializes in. He had learned that what was originally prepared is three separate contract packages which obviously presents several opportunities for contractors. Those packages were grouped into one packages which automatically excluded his bid and any other contractor that would be unable to deal with the size and magnitude of this installation. He has been operating out of Watts for 16 years and has been waiting for over a year for this first landscape package to come out and is learning now that he is out of the running. He opposed the award of this contract to Artistic. He indicated that the bid was originally presented as smaller packages.

Mrs. Bacharach indicated that Mr. Watkins did not come before the Committee and encouraged he and other contractors to appear before the Committee so that these issues can be heard before recommendations are made to the Commission.

Mrs. Reed indicated that by reading the list of items involved in the subject contract that it could be broken down into smaller units. She asked if there was any staff thought given to breaking this contract up into smaller working units instead of one giant package.

Mr. Scala of staff indicated that previously the contract was broken down to Long Beach, Mid-Corridor, and the Los Angeles landscaping. Then it was broken down to two: one was the Long Beach which staff will issue sometime in the next couple of months; and the Mid-Corridor and Los Angeles landscaping contracts were combined. The reason it was done that way is that the landscaping contractor must interface with an irrigation contractor under the C-265 job for the north of the L.A. River and C-335 contract south of the L.A. River. It was felt that this interface was somewhat important so staff decided that it would be necessary to put the contract into two packages. After the contract was put together, the affirmative action staff interviewed by phone 15 DBE/WBE firms and they conveyed a willingness on their part to bid, in fact, the second low bidder was a disadvantaged business enterprise. The bid was advertised in November with a 60-day period for response. Unfortunately, staff does not believe that Mr. Watkins is certified with the Commission. If he was in fact certified, he would have received an advance notice.

Mrs. Mednick directed staff to look at these contracts and how they are put together with an eye towards opening them up for small businesses that would not have the resources or the bonding capacity to bid on very large jobs so that it is one of the goals and objectives to be looked at in concert with the others.

Mr. Callahan asked for the timeframe of this contract.

Mr. Scala responded that this is not a critical path contract. Advance notice was mailed to the bidders that staff had on its DBE listing as well as RTD's listing. Staff also attempted to send out advertising notices to bidders throughout the western United States. Unfortunately, staff received only three responses for this contract.

Mr. Callahan indicated that Mr. Watkins had stated that he only had 20 days to respond to this contract which would put a small business at a disadvantage. He asked for an explanation of the process of how it would work or what steps could be taken in the future to insure that small businesses have adequate time to respond to contracts.

Mr. Scala indicated that again it is the period of time that staff has on the contract with 60 days from the advertisement to the bid opening. Staff tried to find firms that would be willing to solicit on this job. Quite a few advance notices were sent to bidders who staff knew of, including everyone listed on its listings. This is typical of what is done with the contract process. He did not know what else staff could have done except split the contract up and try the bid process all over again.

Chair Reed asked if any Commissioner wants to make a substitute motion to award this contract or reject this contract and direct staff to rebid it in some other fashion in the manner in which it has been bid.

Mrs. Reed indicated that the motion was enhanced by directing the staff to take the Long Beach portion of the work (remaining portion) and break it into smaller units in the hopes that the Commission would have more competitive bids.

Mr. Grabinski offered a substitute motion to not award the contract and direct the staff to rebid the contract in smaller increments of work, which was seconded by Mr. King.

Mr. Lewis suggested that rather than have staff spend their time parceling up this particular contract, the Commission should develop a small business program that forces staff to deal with that on a contract-by-contract basis with the same degree of effort that staff does for minority and women-owned businesses.

Mr. Remy asked County Counsel if the Commission is exposed to any liability problem to the apparent low bidder in rejecting the bid.

Mr. Kelsey explained that the Commission has the right to reject a low bid for good cause and rebid the project.

A roll call vote was taken on the substitute motion by Mr. Grabinski.

Yes: King, Callahan, Szabo, Remy, Grabinski, Bacharach, Mednick, Reed

No: Lewis, La Follette

Motion was carried.

13. Mrs. Bacharach reported that Rail Construction Committee recommended the Commission authorize changing the location of the Compton Station to the southern site and that design and construction begin for the Norwalk/El Segundo rail transit project. The Committee recommended that a "Notice of Exclusion" be filed. This does not result in a significant increase in the budget.

Mrs. Bacharach moved approval, seconded by Mr. King.

Mr. Bryan Allen appeared before the Commission and expressed his opposition to the Committee's recommendation. He submitted a plan that will be placed into the record.

Mr. Peterson indicated that this project is at the conceptual design stage with two options being looked at in the preliminary design, one is not over the street and the other is over the street. The final station site will be coming back through the Committee to the Commission at a later time. Hearing no objection to the Committee's recommendation, the motion was carried.

STAFF OR COMMITTEE REPORTS

17. Mrs. Mednick reported that Streets & Highways Committee recommended the Commission approve the following:

- a) Approve the Los Angeles County portion of the FY 1990-94 State Highway Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). This action will reconfirm a commitment to currently programmed projects such as the Glenn Anderson (Route Century) Freeway and the Harbor Freeway/Transitway, and add over \$300 million of new projects.
- b) Find the recommended State Highway TIP to be in conformance with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) based on the following three findings:
 - o All of the projects in the out-years (years 3 through 5) of the Los Angeles County Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) are consistent with the Regional Mobility Plan and, therefore, conform to the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) and the State Implementation Plan (SIP).
 - o All of the eligible projects in the annual/biennial element of the Los Angeles County TIP have received the required environmental review.
 - o Priority has been given to transportation control measures to maximize long-term air quality benefits and, therefore, the Los Angeles County TIP conforms to the AQMP and the SIP.

Mrs. Mednick moved approval of the Committee's recommendation, seconded by Mrs. Bacharach.

Mayor Donna Smith, City of Pomona, appeared before the Commission regarding the Route 60-71 Interchange under new capital project and asked the Commission to approve the Los Angeles County Transportation Improvement Program.

Hearing no objection, the motion was recommended.

18. Mrs. Mednick reported that the Streets & Highways Committee recommended the Commission approve the following:

- a) Approve the Los Angeles County portion of the FY 1990-94 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Federal-aid Urban funded projects. The program is summarized.

b) Find the recommended TIP to be in conformance with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) based on three findings:

1) All of the project in the out-years (years 3 through 5 of the Los Angeles County Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) are consistent with the Regional Mobility Plan and, therefore, conform to the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) and the State Implementation Plan (SIP).

2) All of the eligible projects in the annual/biennial element of the Los Angeles County TIP have received the required environmental review.

3) Priority has been given to transportation control measures to maximize long-term air quality benefits and, therefore, the Los Angeles County TIP conforms to the AQMP and SIP.

Mrs. Mednick moved for approval, seconded by Mrs. Reed, to adopt the FY 1990-94 Los Angeles County Highway Federal-Aid Urban funds.

Mr. Remy asked County Counsel under the present law, you have to have the conformity with the Air Quality Plan, what happens if the air quality plan prioritizes the projects, would we then have to use the same priority list for conformity purposes? Mr. Kelsey did not have a comment and thinks it is an issue to look into under the new AQMD plan. Staff was directed in look this matter and report back to the Commission.

Hearing no objection, the motion was carried.

INFORMATION ITEMS

19. Metropolitan Transportation Commission/LACTC Proposal on the Transportation Planning and Development Account
20. Update on SB 1 (Robbins) - Legislation to reorganize transportation entities in Los Angeles County
21. Policies for 1991 reauthorization of the Federal Surface Transportation Assistance Act

22. Preparation of Rail Start-Up
23. Names for Stations and Trains
24. Graffiti Removal Program

REPORT OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

25. Authorization for Executive Director to execute Section 13(c) Side Letter on the South Bay Commuter Transportation Implementation Plan (CTIP) (CA-03-0338)

In September 1988, the Commission authorized staff to apply for an UMTA Section 3 grant to fund the capital for CTIP. The CTIP is a nine-city demonstration project aimed at providing commuter bus service on three routes to the El Segundo Employment Center. Staff believes that the negotiations over the past several months have produced a 13(c) side letter agreement that protects employees who might have concerns with potential impacts of the project, yet excludes a number of items originally proposed by the unions which were of concern to the Commission. Therefore, staff recommended that the Executive Director be authorized to execute the proposed Section 13(c) side letter on behalf of the Commission.

Mrs. Bacharach moved approval, seconded by Mrs. Reed. Hearing no objection, the motion was carried.

26. Commission Travel Requests

Commissioners Bacharach and Lewis have expressed an interest in attending the APTA Commuter Rail Conference in Chicago, Illinois on April 2-5. Since then, Mr. Lewis had to cancel his plans. Also, Mr. King had expressed an interest in attending the APTA Western Conference in Reno on April 9-13. Commission approval was requested for the above travel requests. Motion was made by Mrs. Reed, seconded by Mrs. Mednick. Hearing no objection, travel requests were approved.

27. Notice of Meetings

Suggestion was made to cancel the April 12 LACTC issues meeting and have a 15-20 minute discussion at the regular meeting scheduled for April 26 on the overall rail development plan for Los Angeles County.

Mrs. Bacharach asked if the negotiations with the County of Los Angeles have been completed on the SAFE. Mr. Jim Sims indicated there is no further action to be taken. The SAFE was approved by the Board of Supervisors 5-0 yesterday.

Streets & Highways meeting date may be changed.

REPORT FROM CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

Chair Reed reported that she had attended the APTA Legislative Conference along with several other Commissioners, members of the RTD Board, members of the business community and the City of Los Angeles. Some of them attended meetings at the National League of Cities Conference and also met with members of Congress and Senators with regard to funding for Metro Rail and other funding issues from the federal government.

The Governor's Summit will be meeting in about two weeks and Mr. Remy has been asked by the Chair to attend the meeting in her absence.

Mr. Szabo gave an update report on SB 1. He testified before the Senate Transportation Committee in Sacramento and will testify again on April 4. He also reported on the Joint LACTC/RTD meeting on reorganization and those proposals introduced by the RTD will be considered at the joint meeting on Monday and brought before the Committee and Commission. The Commissioners were also made aware of two bills by Senator Robbins; one having to do with a trust fund for the Valley and the other, having to do with the specific construction parameters for rail line in the Valley.

Mr. King reported on the Institute of Transportation Engineering Conference which he had attended. He mentioned a publication, "Tool Box" which will be made available to all elected officials.

NEW BUSINESS

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Lee Greenwood appeared before the Commission and commented on the equal rights amendment for public transportation, particularly as it pertains to LAX.

CLOSED SESSION: At 3:35 p.m., the Commission recessed into closed session pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.8/54956.9 to authorize an offer of just compensation for five properties:

R01-R21-AS097 - William and Thelma Rogers
(located at the northeast corner of Rosecrans Avenue and
Rose Avenue, City of Compton)

R01-R21-AS100 - Jose & Herminia Silva
(located at the southeast corner of Rosecrans Avenue and
Rose Avenue, City of Compton)

R01-R21-AS089 - Sergio A. Banuelos
(located at the northwest corner of Rosecrans Avenue and
Mulberry Street, City of Compton)

R01-R21-AS354 - Manfredo C. & Dora C. Pentzke
(located at the southeast corner of Graham Avenue and
Florence Avenue, City of Los Angeles)

R01-R21-AS340 - Robert Lee
(located near the intersection of Willow Street and
Orange Avenue, City of Signal Hill)

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.



NEIL PETERSON
Executive Director

NP:kyt