1. **CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**
   Renee Berlin (Chair) called the meeting to order at 9:45 a.m. Randy Lamm (MTA) took roll and declared a quorum was present. Ms. Berlin reminded everyone of the new attendance policy and asked everyone to sign the attendance sheet.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   The minutes from the October 10th meeting were approved. The minutes from the October 3rd meeting were approved with one correction. Sylvia Patsaouras (SCAG) asked that the second bullet on page 4, dealing with the Arbor Vitae Project update, be changed to read that SCAG requested the RTAC be informed that the Arbor Vitae project had been deleted from the Regional Transportation Plan.

3. **REPORTS BY STANDING COMMITTEES**
   **BOS (Brynn Kernaghan)**
   - Claudette Moody (MTA) made a presentation on TEA-21 Reauthorization
   - Had a discussion about the Federal Economic Stimulus Package and the Federal Emergency Safety and Security Funding Program
   - Discussed the countywide short-range transit plan (SRTP) and worked on goals and priorities for next year

   **LOCAL TRANSIT SYSTEMS (Mark Maloney)**
   - Met on October 25th
   - Reviewed the new Prop A Incentive application and approved the letter and form for transmittal
   - Had an overview of the 5310 applications that are now available
   - Had a presentation on the 3rd Tier Transit system and appointed members to the 3rd Tier Working Group
   - Had an update on the Universal Fare System
   - Next meeting is November 29th and the December meeting was cancelled
STREETS AND FREEWAYS (Bill Winter)

- Met October 18th
- Discussed recent developments with the Arbor Vitae project
- Had a debriefing on the MTA’s workshop regarding FTIP and STIP forms
- An overview was given on the Bus Signal Priority Pilot Project
- TEA-21 Reauthorization was discussed
- For the Economic Stimulus Package, LA County City Services reps have contacted the cities and have compiled a rough needs assessment – roughly $500 million of projects for road rehabilitation could be funded
- Received a report on Goods Movement -- MTA is working with SCAG on the heavy duty truck model and looking at the impact delivery trucks have on the system
- Next meeting is scheduled for November 15th

TDM/AIR QUALITY (Mark Yamarone)

- Did not meet in October; next meeting is November 13th

4. CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

- Roger Snoble will be attending the December 5th TAC meeting
- The Board approved the TAC reorganization and revisions to the administrative guidelines, with two changes to both the Staff and TAC’s recommendations. The Board retained the ADA seat as a voting member. MTA staff is working with the MTA’s Access Advisory Committee to identify a member and alternate and SCARRA was approved as an ex-officio member. An e-mail has been sent to the League of Cities and the 7 sub-regions, with a copy to the current League of Cities Representatives informing them of the TAC organizational changes and asking the subregions to nominate their members for confirmation at the League’s January meeting. A formal letter was also sent to all members impacted by the reorganization. The new membership is expected to be in place for the February TAC meeting.
- The Board is scheduled to have a closed session November 8th to provide the CEO with direction regarding the Consent Decree
- A 5-year contract was approved for DuPont Safety Resources to address the MTA’s Workman’s Compensation issue
- Roger Snoble held his first all staff meeting and indicated that customer service and quality of service were his main themes
- The TAC Subcommittee Chairs met on October 29th. At the meeting, each subcommittees’ role in TEA-21 Reauthorization was discussed. Additionally, each chair was asked to review their subcommittee’s by-laws to determine whether any changes are needed to be consistent with the TAC reorganization. Subcommittee Chairs asked to be made aware of items coming forward to the Board. The MTA may be able to provide TAC
members with a rolling agenda in the next couple of weeks. They also talked about how to facilitate inter-Subcommittee communication. The next meeting will be in January or February.

- System Preservation - MTA staff is proceeding with the System Preservation Needs Assessment Study. Each of the subregions as well as the City and County of Los Angeles needs to identify a representative to the Study’s steering committee. So far, meetings have been held with the County of Los Angeles, and the San Gabriel Valley COG’s Transportation Committee. Today there is a meeting with the Gateway Cities COG Transportation Committee and later this month, or in December, meetings will be held with the remainder of the COGs and subregions.

Ms. Berlin recapped the actions at the October MTA Board meeting:

- The MTA Board renamed the MTA Transportation Library, the Dorothy Peyton Gray Transportation Library, in memory of Dorothy Gray, who was the long-time MTA librarian.
- The Board carried over to the next meeting, Supervisor Antonovich’s motion to rename the Pasadena Blue Line to the Gold Line.
- Approved Chairman Fasana’s motion to change the name of the Executive Management Committee to the Executive Management and Audit Committee. Staff is to review the last three years of Prop A and C administrative specific use and distribution so the Board may determine if expenditures are appropriate and report back to the committee by November 2001.
- Approved Board member Bernson’s motion, as amended by Board members Knabe and Proo, to develop a proposal in conjunction with consulting with the cities of Norwalk and Santa Fe Springs to close the gap between the Metro Green Line and the Norwalk/ Santa Fe Springs Metrolink Station and report back in 60 days.
- Approved Board member Bernson’s motion to remove Consolidated Freightways and Conway Transportation Services properties from any future considerations as a site for a bus storage facility and maintenance facility for the Wilshire Bus Rapid Transit (BRT).
- Approved Board member Bernson’s motion that staff prepare a plan for opening the Canoga Avenue right-of-way as a dedicated transit route and report back on funding options and implementation issues.
- Mayor Hahn’s motion was approved to have the MTA as lead agency, with LAPD, Sheriff’s department, Amtrak, SCRRRA, MWD and Catellus Development Corporation to conduct a security assessment for the Union Station Complex and Gateway Building and report back in 30 days and that MTA staff in coordination with LAPD and the Sheriff’s department conduct a security assessment of the bus and rail system and also report back in 30 days.
• Approved Chairman Fasana’s revised motion addressing the language in HR 2299 regarding the I-710 extension (Schiff amendment) that MTA join SCAG and an I-710 legislative action group in urging the Congressional Conference Committee for federal 2002 Transportation Appropriations to delete an amendment in HR 2299, Section 340, as enacted by the House that states that “none of the funds in this Act may be used for planning, design, development or construction of the I-710 Freeway extension project”

• Approved a motion by Supervisors Antonovich and Molina that the MTA Board support the Pasadena Blue Line Construction Authority’s construction application for grade crossings at the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) meeting

MTA Board Approved the following items on Consent:
• That MTA act as a pass-through grant sponsor for specified FTA grants at the request of cities and local agencies in Los Angeles County
• Approved a 13 month firm fixed price contract for $452,787 with KAKU Associates for the Alameda Street Corridor Feasibility Study
• A fare agreement with Montebello Bus Lines
• Approved a 12 month, noncompetitive contract in the amount of $725,000 to Tetra Tech to restart and complete a Project Report for the HOV lane project on the I-10 from Citrus to Route 57
• Approved a 12 month, noncompetitive contract in the amount of $459,899 to Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade And Douglas (PB) to restart a complete Project Report for the HOV lane project on the Route 10 from Puente to Citrus Avenue

Mark Yamarone (TDM/AQ) asked what MTA’s role was with the grade crossings on the Pasadena Blue Line, since it is under the jurisdiction of the JPA. Concern was expressed that if all the grade crossings become grade separations, it will be a huge project to fund. Ms. Berlin responded that MTA is involved because it will be the operator.

5. TEA-21 REAUTHORIZATION
Claudette Moody (MTA) discussed the status of TEA-21 Reauthorization. The government is still discussing the Aviation Security Bill and the amount of funding proposed for the Economic Stimulus Bill (if there is one) will be dependent upon the amount of funding for the Aviation Security Bill. There is no Appropriation Bill yet. TEA-21 Reauthorization is pending resolution of these two items.

Ms. Moody distributed a draft package of materials for reauthorization, which was collated by MTA staff for discussion and distribution countywide:
• A Fact Sheet that summarizes the draft principles broken into 3 broad areas and identifies programs for which MTA would like to see continued federal funding in the next reauthorization. Other programs suggested by TAC or other agencies could be added.

• Principles for Reauthorization - Ms. Moody would like each of the TAC Subcommittees to review and discuss the principles and then have TAC make a consensus opinion on any language that may need to be changed, as well as any items of agreement. The first part is general principles and then it is split into Transit Programs, Highway Programs, and other Regional Programs that MTA would like to support such as, Airport Security, Goods Movement, Commuter Rail, and Pedestrian activity, etc. The package also includes a sample letter to send to Congressional and/ or Senate representatives, a sample resolution, and a list of committees and subcommittees (Senate Environment & Public Works Committee - Highways, Senate Subcommittee on Transportation, Infrastructure and Nuclear Safety - environment, Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee - Transit, Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Transportation-Banking, House Subcommittee on Highway and Transit, House Transportation Infrastructure Committee) and their members. California is underrepresented on these committees.

• Ms. Moody said she would like to finalize the package and reach countywide consensus in the next two months.

Brynn Kernaghan (BOS) asked what the deadline was for final comments. Ms. Moody responded that comments should be returned to her in January. Ms. Berlin suggested that the Subcommittee chairs could report to Ms. Moody at the next Quarterly Subcommittee Chairs meeting to be held in January. Mark Bozigian (League of Cities) asked if the cover letter would be going to the cities and if there was an attempt to include the cities’ and county’s specific project requests in this package. If so, then consideration needs to be made on how to handle all the submissions and requests. Ms. Moody responded that at the moment it was just going to TAC. Mr. Bozigian suggested the letter go to all cities. Ms. Moody agreed to send the package to all cities and Subregions and also to the League of Cities and its Transportation Committee.

Mr. Bozigian suggested that part of the process could use the subregions to filter some of the comments. Ms. Berlin then asked the Subcommittees to agendize the draft package for discussion and comments at their next meeting so that the Subcommittee chairs could discuss it with Ms. Moody at the 3rd Quarter Subcommittee Chairs meeting in January. Ms. Moody indicated that she would like this package in final form by March.
6. **LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

Michael Turner (MTA) provided an update on recent legislative activity and upcoming Committee hearings:

- **AB 1171** (Dutra) Bay Bridges Retrofit bill was signed by the Governor and it commits $642 million in HBRR funds and any remaining costs will be funded by tolls. A clause leaves the State responsible for any project cost overruns. To be resolved next year, is how the state will refund savings, if less money is spent than what was originally estimated to be needed.

- **AB 1419** (Aroner) Trans Bay Terminal Building bill was vetoed by the Governor because of the potential for conflict with the work on the Bay Bridge and the circumvention of Caltrans' normal process for transferring property. Governor Davis may approve transfer of a portion of the property to the City of San Francisco.

- **AB 631** (Oropeza) Needs Assessment, was vetoed by the Governor. It would have required the preparation of a needs and deficiencies study every 5 years. The Governor requested that Caltrans work with local agencies to do something similar to AB 631, but with less intensive analysis.

- **ACA 4** (Dutra and Longville with Principal coauthors: Senators Murray and Karnette) was approved by the Governor. The measure proposes making the sales tax on gasoline permanent. It is now Prop 42 and will appear on the March ballot. A campaign consultant has been hired. The MTA will be listed as an agency that supports the measure, but the MTA can’t go out and actively campaign for it. Felicia Brannon (BOS) asked if the MTA would make educational materials available to the public. Mr. Turner indicated thus far the material is being developed by the campaign consultants for statewide distribution. The consultants would be doing some outreach to local agencies. Mr. Finnegan (Auto Club) added that the Auto Club will run a parallel promotion to augment the campaign.

- Committee hearings: There was an Anti-Terrorist Committee hearing in Los Angeles a few weeks ago. The Assembly Budget Committee will be holding a hearing in Los Angeles on November 19th. Some suggestions regarding an economic stimulus package could come out of these meetings. The Assembly Transportation Committee will be holding a hearing on November 20th in Oakland to address Transportation security. On November 28th, two select committees created on the MTA will be holding a hearing in Sacramento to discuss Transportation security in Los Angeles.

7. **MTA TRIENNIAL PERFORMANCE AUDIT**

Karen Heit (MTA) discussed the MTA's Triennial Audit report, and distributed an Executive Summary to everyone in attendance. She explained that every three years under TDA law, the MTA undergoes a Triennial Audit by the State. This year's audit covers the period from 1998-2000 and reports on the status of
the recommendations from 1995-1997 audit. The MTA didn’t make as much progress as it should have on some of the prior recommendations because the last audit was 6-12 months late due to procurement problems. The MTA was in compliance with most sections of the Public Utilities Code (PUC) except for one, where it has not been monitoring TDA performance improvements for transit operators. MTA is collectively working on this with the municipal transit operators through the preparation of the Countywide Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP).

The 25 recommendations from the previous Management Audit have been resolved or are in the process of being resolved - particularly the dedication of resources to the management of funds, the Countywide SRTP, making payments and receiving reimbursements from Caltrans on time. There are 12 new recommendations in this Audit. A lot of them pertain to actions already being worked on, such as better monitoring of countywide bus service, devising a plan for franchising rapid bus, developing a better plan for meeting the Consent Decree obligations and some internal management items. The report was sent to the Board in July and then to the State. The other half of the audit, the Transit Operators Audit, went to the Board in August.

8. 2001 CALL FOR PROJECTS FOLLOW UP:
   Lessons Learned Survey
Heather Hills (MTA) asked if anyone had not received the Lesson Learned Survey and reminded everyone that the deadline for returning completed surveys to Ms. Hills is Friday, November 9th. Ms. Berlin added that the Bikeway mode had distributed a mode specific survey and there is also one in the works for the Regional Surface Transportation Improvements (RSTI) mode. Ms. Hills noted that the MTA will start gearing up for the 2003 Call for Projects in August of 2002, with applications most likely due in February 2003. The MTA will be holding subregional workshops to start the project development process. Over the next few months, staff will be reviewing the 2001 application to identify potential revisions. Ms. Hills will be presenting the results of the survey at the December TAC meeting.

Advancement Requests
Wanda Knight (MTA Capital Planning) distributed a sample advancement request letter. MTA will consider advancement requests from sponsors for projects funded with TEA, RIP, or CMAQ funds. Projects receiving Proposition C funds will not be considered for advancement. For those requesting an advancement, revised Fact and Fund sheets need to be submitted along with the project sponsor’s signature/concurrence on the form letter sent by the MTA. Ms. Knight commented that only sponsors that made an advancement request would...
receive a letter with an attachment listing the required documentation that needs to be sent to the MTA and Caltrans. Advancements are not guaranteed as the CTC has the final approval.

Implementation Schedule
Ms. Knight distributed a Master Schedule, listing the important dates for the RTIP, MOU/LOA, STIP and the De-obligation/Re-Certification Process. The important dates include:
- RTIP/FTIP - December 3rd is the deadline for the sponsor to submit the RTIP and FTIP Sheets to the MTA. The Federal FTIP will be adopted in October 2002.
- MOU/LOA - December 31st is the deadline for the FY 2001-02 MOU/LOA execution. Ms. Berlin indicated that a letter would be going to project sponsors to remind them of the deadline.
- STIP - Ms. Knight said that MTA Capital Planning would be making amendments into the FTIP for those projects approved in the STIP. An important date for the STIP process is December 15th - the date for the MTA’s final STIP submittal to the CTC. Another important date is March 12, 2002, which is the last day for the MTA to submit STIP amendments to move FY 03 projects out to FY 04 or beyond. Sponsors need to allow a couple of weeks for MTA’s concurrence. April 16th is the date for final submittal of ’02 allocation or extension requests. Ms. Berlin suggested that if you know you’re going to need an extension or an allocation vote, you should not wait until the last minute.
- Deobligation/Re-certification - On April 3rd, TAC will have the opportunity to review the recommendations for deobligations and hear appeals. Staff plans to take its recommendations to the May 30th Board meeting.

9. PROGRAMMING OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS FROM THE 2002 STIP FUND ESTIMATE
Jim de la Loza (MTA) and Hal Suetsugu (MTA) provided a summary of the MTA staff recommendation for programming additional STIP. A summary of the staff recommendations was distributed. Since the October 10th TAC meeting, additional funds have become available to the MTA for reprogramming for a total of about $97.4 million.

The following are the MTA staff recommendations:

Light Rail Vehicle Enhancement -- $31.6M - This funding is for 24 Light Rail vehicles that would operate on the Pasadena Blue Line and implementation of the 3-car trains on the Long Beach Blue Line. Mr. de la Loza indicated that in 1995 the order for Light Rail cars was cut by 22 vehicles because of the Board
approved postponement of the Pasadena Blue Line project. With the overcrowding needs of the Long Beach and Green Lines and the legislation to create the Pasadena Blue Line Construction Authority, the additional 24 cars are needed to address growth and expansion demands. Mr. Bozigian then asked if this additional money had not become available, what would the MTA have done? Mr. Suetsugu responded that the headways could be increased or bonds would fund the shortfall.

Universal Fare System $12.3M - TAC had recommended $15 million and staff is recommending $12.25 million. Ms. Kernaghan stated a major concern was that the use of the funds should be for LTSS and BOS operators and not for the MTA’s bid. Ms. Kernaghan stated that it seems to be unclear as to who will obtain the benefit of these funds. Mr. De La Loza suggested that the MTA get back in writing to the LTSS and BOS in writing as to how these funds will be used. The MTA has a commitment to the entire county for the UFS. He also indicated he would clarify whether these funds were earmarked to fulfill the regional municipal operators’ and the LTSS needs in relationship to the UFS.

Kara Bouton (LTSS) suggested that the LTSS was never considered in previous years and have not received any funding. Ms. Kernaghan added that 3 or 4 years ago there was $17.5 million allocated to the municipal operators and part of that was to go to ASI and Metrolink. BOS said they needed $10 million and LTSS said they needed $8 million to start. It was understood that those funds would be reserved for those uses and not for a general bid. Mr. Winter asked if the UFS was going to get into the STIP in time for a bid? Mr. Suetsugu said deadlines are tight and that the UFS may have to delay the award of the contract until the funding is available.

ITIP Matches $14.5M - The recommendation assumed that Caltrans and MTA would be working together to provide the 50/50 match to fully fund these projects. The projects are: SR-134 Improvements, I-405 Gap Closure, and the Route 138 Phase I Enhancement. Route 138 Phase I was added because it allows MTA to access rural ITIP funds for which MTA rarely qualifies. The funding recommended will fully fund these projects. Ms. Berlin also added that these projects were applied for in the Call.

I-5 HOV (SR 170 - SR 134) - $11.063M - The MTA Board approved accelerating this project from the next STIP cycle and CTC staff suggested lowering the request amount closer to $200 million from the original $214 million. Steve Lantz (SCRRA) asked if it would free up $200 million in the STIP, if the CTC declines. Ms. Berlin indicated that it would free up money in the next STIP cycle (FY08).
Soundwalls -- $9.5M - Mr. Bozigian asked how many miles of soundwalls the $9.5M would buy. Mr. de la Loza answered that it would allow MTA to accelerate design and speed project delivery.

System Preservation - Mr. Suetsugu commented, that while the TAC recommended $15 million, it is premature at this time to allocate funding before the final analysis and results of the Needs Assessment study, previously directed by the Board, are known. Should the study show a potential need, then staff would come back to TAC and the Board and offer recommendations for funding System Preservation types of projects. Mr. de la Loza said that the MTA needs to reserve a pot of money for capacity enhancement projects, and if resurfacing and capacity enhancement projects can be integrated that may be the best way.

Mr. Bozigian commented that the Board’s intent was to fund System Preservation and that it was a priority. He suggested the money provided an opportunity for the MTA, with $15 million, to buy 400-500 lane miles of overlay throughout the County. Ms. Berlin responded to Mr. Bozigian’s concern by saying that the City of Lancaster spends its money, but there are other cities that cannot spend their money for various reasons. There are issues out there and before MTA programs additional funds it needs to know what are the issues.

Mr. Winter (LA Co. DPW) added the reason a lot of cities have problems spending the money is because the process is cumbersome. If these funds were made available through the STPL method, which is an equitable distribution of the funds, more projects would be completed. Mr. Bozigian agreed that it is a good long-term goal, but there is an opportunity to take care of a short-term issue and an immediate need, and suggested he would take $15 million out of the rail cars. Staff could fund $15 million for the rail cars and $15 million for System Preservation. Mr. Finnegan (Auto Club) added that one way to look at this is when you replace a bus you don’t get anymore capacity, but it needs to be replaced and the roads need to be looked at in the same way. Mr. Bozigian asked if there was an opportunity to change the staff recommendation? Mr. de la Loza said that he was not offering to change it, but that he was there to listen and to reflect TAC’s comments.

Mr. Burtt (League of Cities) then commented that as a representative of one of the subregions, they were told the $15 million would be distributed among the COGs. Ms. Berlin responded that at the last meeting, it was never suggested by staff or TAC that the $15 million would be going to the COGs. Mr. Burtt responded that they have already done an inventory to determine the need and the South Bay COG can spend the money now. Mr. Uyeno (City of Los Angeles) asked Magan Champaneria (City of LA, Bureau of Street Services) what the
capability of the Bureau of Street Services was to spend the additional money. Mr. Champaneria replied that they could spend the money on slurry seal or re-sealing local streets because that is where the money is required. Mr. Winter responded that slurry seal would be in the category of maintenance and not eligible for this funding and outside the arena of System Preservation. Mr. Uyeno stated that the longer rehabilitation needs are delayed, the more it’s going to cost; it goes beyond cost of living increases.

Mr. de la Loza interjected that there are two issues - one is to make it clear in the Board report that the TAC recommendation is not for maintenance, but for System Preservation (rehabilitation, reconstruction, resurfacing to a greater than 5 year life). Mr. Winter added that with this new money, we should be showing a good faith effort by addressing some of the needs now. Mr. Uyeno added that the issue of System Preservation has been discussed for at least 5-6 years. There seems to be reluctance on MTA’s part to acknowledge their role as the regional agency to assist with System Preservation needs. Mr. de la Loza responded that it is a policy issue and that the Board could override the staff recommendations. The MTA Board needs to decide if this is an important enough issue to make a change in policy and practice.

Mr. Uyeno mentioned that money that is eligible for rehabilitation is also money that the MTA requires cities to use as a local match. Ms. Berlin added that if there are things that you think need to be addressed in the Call let us know now. Mr. Uyeno then asked if MTA might make System Preservation part of the Call and ask for applications? Mr. de la Loza suggested that MTA will be looking at the local match issue and that may free up sources for the cities. This is still in the discussion phase, and MTA has not decided to change its policy on local match for the next Call. Mr. Winter suggested that the MTA consider emulating the SHOPP, where Caltrans takes State funding for the SHOPP “off the top” prior to developing the STIP fund estimate.

The following three projects became known after the October 10th TAC meeting:

**Interstate 5/ Route 14 HOV Connector $12.937M** - Recently, Caltrans notified MTA that the cost increased by $12.9 million due to more stringent Seismic standards. These funds would come from TCRP dollars freed up due to the Governor’s allocation. This would fully fund the project.

**Metro Rapid Bus Stations Phase II $5M** - Mr. de la Loza indicated that $5M would be used for stations similar to Light Rail Stations and this money will be put to work right away in the unveiling of the next 2-3 Metro Rapid Bus lines next year. Mr. Uyeno asked if this project was part of the Regionally Significant Project list that MTA submitted earlier. Mr. de la Loza commented that what
was funded was the signal element. The signal improvements were about $7.5 million. Mr. Uyeno asked why the stations were so important now when they weren’t part of the original request. Mr. de la Loza responded that the signal system was fast tracked and now they are ready to move forward with the stations.

**Countywide Bus Stop Safety $500k** - On a competitive basis, about $500,000 will be distributed to the munis and cities. MTA would ask for projects to be submitted and determine and prioritize a needs list and distribute the funding throughout the region. Ms. Kernaghan said that in the past the money was limited per applicant and asked if this would be the case again. Mr. Suetsugu did not think there would be a dollar limit for each applicant or project. Mr. de la Loza thought it might make sense to work through the subregions as these programs are already developed.

Ms. Berlin indicated this item was on the agenda to provide TAC with an opportunity to take an action. Ms. Berlin announced that the TAC no longer had a quorum and therefore, could not make a motion. Ms. Kernaghan suggested that the summary of TAC’s recommendation should indicate that System Preservation should still be in the staff recommendation. Ms. Berlin responded that the Board report would indicate TAC’s original recommendation and that the TAC still feels very strongly that System Preservation at the $15 million or higher mark is a priority and should be included. She also suggested that the Board report could include TAC’s desire that the additional funds be on a pro rata share even though it’s not a motion. Mr. Finnegan suggested that in the future any action items should be placed earlier on the TAC agenda. Mr. Winter also mentioned that TAC is interested in working with the MTA on the System Preservation study. TAC agreed that Pat DeChellis (LA Co. DPW) should still be the TAC representative for this item at the Planning and Programming Committee and MTA Board Meetings. Mr. Suetsugu said the formalized recommendation would be e-mailed to TAC members when it became available.

10. **NEW BUSINESS**
Eyvonne Sells (SCAQMD) announced that delivery of a final approved 2001 AQMP has been delayed indefinitely, but that a working draft should be available in early 2002.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**
The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m. The next TAC Meeting will be held on December 5, 2001, in the Union Station Room at 9:30 am.