

include it in the environmental work currently underway. This would be done if the LTWG would support moving forward with analysis of this new alternative.

Alan Nishio made the following motion, which was seconded by Chris Aihara and approved by the LTWG as follows: *“The LTWG recommends to the LTCC Board to endorse the concept and preliminary design as presented today for the third build alternative.”* The motion was approved with a vote of 23 ayes, and zero “no” votes.

LTWG will continue working to identify potential mitigations for each build alternative. In the meantime, the LTWG asked the Metro technical team to present information about this 3rd Build alternative at the next LTCC meeting. There was a question about the possibility of removing the underground-emphasis alternatives from further environmental review. However, Dolores and Ray explained that removing the alternative at this juncture could threaten future federal funding for the Regional Connector.

The DEIS/R will be released for public review during the summer of 2010 prior to its presentation to the Metro Board of Directors, with staff providing their recommendation for the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). Once the LPA has been chosen, additional technical work will be completed. The Regional Connector does not become a “project” until the Metro Board of Directors approves the Final EIS/R. Dolores emphasized that Metro will continue to work with the LTWG to address issues related to the Regional Connector, including developing potential mitigation measures so the document should not contain any surprises.

In response to the LTWG's request at its previous meeting for examples of mitigation plans, Metro distributed a CD containing examples from Seattle and the Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension mitigation programs. The documents will be discussed at a future meeting.

There was a short discussion regarding whom Metro sees as the official representative of Little Tokyo. Metro noted that it continues to meet with stakeholders individually, often at their request, as well as with larger groups. The LTCC represents a number of stakeholders that Metro has met with during the project.

Ann mentioned that she is aware that some Little Tokyo stakeholders who would like to participate in the LTWG, are currently unable to attend meetings because of scheduling conflicts on Thursday evenings. Ann wondered whether the LTWG could occasionally meet on Tuesday or Wednesday evenings to accommodate those unable to meet Thursdays.

Items to discuss at future meetings:

- Updates regarding the technical consultant to support the LTWG
- Continued discussion about the 100% grade separated Alternative
- Discussion of examples of mitigation plans
- Discuss traffic control during construction (e.g. on Temple/Alameda, 1st/Alameda, 2nd/Alameda, and routing at 2nd/San Pedro at Kyoto Grand Hotel)

- Overall traffic impact of the project and during construction
- Construction timing and process, with particular attention to the underground-emphasis alternative's Alameda underpass
- Current and future project need, including justification of ridership and station capacity, and 2035 transportation needs

Upcoming Schedule

- Next meeting is Thursday, December 17, 2009 at 6 p.m.

DRAFT – PROPOSAL (11/19/09)

Little Tokyo Working Group Consultant

for the

Regional Connector Transit Corridor Draft EIS/R

OVERVIEW

The Little Tokyo Working Group (Working Group), a committee of the Little Tokyo Community Council (Council) seeks to engage the services of a consultant who can assist the Working Group in the development of proposed mitigations for the Regional Connector Transit Corridor Project Draft EIS/R. The Project will connect the Metro Gold Line Pasadena and Eastside segments to the Blue Line and Expo Line. This will place Little Tokyo at the center of a regional rail system, making it one of the most accessible communities in the County. The consultant will work with the Working Group to help them understand the Draft EIR/S process and identify potential impacts and mitigations associated with the development of a new transit link within downtown Los Angeles. The consultant will provide the following functions: (1) provide a technical resource to Little Tokyo community during the development of draft environmental documents for the Regional Connector Transit Corridor Project; (2) help the Working Group identify impacts and potential mitigations for each build alternative that will protect the historical and cultural integrity of Little Tokyo; and (3) extract the concerns of residents, businesses and stakeholders in Little Tokyo and recommend potential mitigations for inclusion in the Draft Environment Impact Statement/Environment Impact Report (Draft EIS/R).

CONTEXT OF REQUESTED WORK: HISTORY OF THE LITTLE TOKYO COMMUNITY

Land use has long been a contentious issue in Little Tokyo. As one of only three remaining official Japantowns in the United States, Little Tokyo has felt continually threatened with development that could eradicate it. At its peak, Little Tokyo had approximately 30,000 Japanese Americans living in an area that covered over one square mile, but the internment of Japanese Americans during WWII emptied Little Tokyo. After the war, Japanese Americans returning from the internment camps moved into other areas surrounding downtown. What is left of the original Little Tokyo can be found in roughly four city blocks today. This sense of an ever-shrinking Little Tokyo and resistance to development in the area is supported by the development of Parker Center at the former site of the Nishi Hongwanji Buddhist Temple and the First Street business strip, as well as Weller Court which was developed on property that was formerly a strip of family-owned small businesses. The Regional Connector Transit

Corridor Project is seen by some in the Little Tokyo Community as one more attempt to encroach into Little Tokyo and further reduce its size and viability. However, the investment of transit dollars and siting of the Regional Connector in Little Tokyo may be a rare opportunity to ensure that the historic and cultural identity of Little Tokyo is protected for years to come by the inclusion of specific mitigations in the Draft EIS/R for the Regional Connector Transit Corridor Project. Such mitigations can help take advantage of and leverage the enhanced accessibility to Little Tokyo from all parts of the region and Southern California that would accompany implementation of the Regional Connector project

PROCESS:

Metro is in the process of developing a mechanism to provide funding not to exceed \$30,000 for purposes described above. This mechanism will be described in detail in future drafts. Funding must be used exclusively to pay for said consultant. The consultant will be secured through an independent search process subject to Metro’s approval that the consultant is qualified in the areas stated below. It is expected that the term of engagement will be no longer than six months or through the release of the Draft EIS/R by Metro. The consultant must commit to a reasonable deadline and to work within a proscribed budget. No changes in the project timeline or schedule will be permitted.

QUALIFICATIONS:

It is expected that the consultant has expertise in the following areas:

- Light Rail operations both street running and underground.
- Right-of-way requirements
- Construction impacts
- Transportation Planning including traffic, parking and pedestrian issues
- Economic Development
- Community Development
- Draft EIS/R Process
- Urban Design and Station Area Planning
- Others as appropriate

CONSULTANT TASKS

- 1) Communicate with the Little Tokyo community and provide technical assistance to small businesses and residents on how the Project may affect them.
- 2) Assist the Little Tokyo community in understanding:
 - How the Draft EIS/R works
 - How the environmental process works
- 3) Assist Little Tokyo in identifying potential impacts and mitigation measures for each build alternative for incorporation into the Draft EIS/R for the Regional Connector Transit Corridor Project.

MEETING REPORT

- Project Name: Metro Regional Connector Transit Corridor Study
- Organization: Little Tokyo Working Group
- Date/Time: December 17, 2009; 6 p.m.
- Meeting Location: Japanese American Community and Cultural Center
- Project Team: Dolores Roybal Saltarelli, Laura Cornejo, Gerry Alvarez, Ann Kerman, Eric Carlson, Ray Sosa, Kansai Uchida, Ginny Brideau
- Attendees: Roy Nakahara, Goro Endo, Robert Volk, Kristin Fukushima, Sean Miura, Wilbur Takashima, Jerard Wright, Yukio Kawaratani, Bill Watanabe, Ron Fong, Chris Komai, Evelyn Yoshimura, Kim Tachiki-Chin, Eric Kurimura, Alan Nishio, Kei Nagao, Chris Aihara, James Okazaki, Jeff Carpenter, Jeff Liu, Satori Uyeda, Mary Graybill, Susie Tae
- Action Items:
- Provide Working Group with updated consultant terms
 - Ann Kerman to provide a list of firms from Metro's "Bench"

Summary:

This was the fifth meeting of the Little Tokyo Working Group (LTWG), a subcommittee of the Little Tokyo Community Council's Planning and Cultural Preservation Committee (PCPC). The LTWG was convened to discuss issues pertinent to the Little Tokyo community as it relates to Metro's Regional Connector Transit Corridor project.

Wilbur Takashima and Chris Aihara chaired the meeting and led introductions. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the draft consultant agreement and updates to the potential build alternative.

Ann Kerman presented a draft scope of work identifying the process for securing a consultant that would assist the LTWG during the development of the project mitigation measures, and would review the Draft EIS/R on LTCC's behalf. A copy of the draft scope is attached to this document.

Ann further explained that while the consultant would be the choice of the LTCC, Metro is requesting that the LTCC identify a person or firm who has understanding of and expertise in light rail operations, right-of-way requirements, construction impacts, transportation planning, economic and community development, the EIS/R process, urban design, and station area planning. The consultant would work with the LTWG and LTCC until the release of the Draft EIS/R.

The consultant would submit invoices to the LTCC, which the LTCC would approve and send to Metro for payment. Metro would be responsible for timely payment based on the invoice submitted.

LTCC will decide internally how the consultant will be managed, and who will manage this person/firm. Chris Aihara and Don Watanabe asked if Metro could provide any direction or suggestions on how to best reach out to the professional community. Ann offered to provide a copy of firms listed on Metro's "bench" to Don. Chris wanted to set up a small committee to identify a potential consultant. The committee will meet on the 28th and 29th of December. The committee includes Chris, Alan Nishio, Ron Fong, and Yukio Kawaratani.

The Working Group is concerned they won't have enough time to get the consultant up to speed on the project, and won't be prepared to review the Draft EIS/R. They understand the work of the consultant would conclude by the time the Draft EIS/R is released to the community. Dolores tried to impress upon the Working Group that they would have ample opportunity to provide feedback and fine-tune mitigations, including the review of the station and urban designs.

The LTWG also wanted to be sure that once the consultant's funds are expended that the LTCC would not incur any additional debt. Ann reassured the LTWG they would continue to have the entire Metro consultant team to provide support. The consultant is not intended to replace Metro's consultant team.

Don expressed his appreciation to Metro for working with the LTCC and trusting the council to go through this process.

Dolores provided an update on the third build alternative and provided an overview of the initial operating plan. Metro is continuing to develop the initial concept for this third alternative with the support of its construction and operations departments. Dolores will update the Metro Board of Directors at its February meeting about the new alternative, so that the Board will authorize Metro staff to move forward with adding this

alternative to the full study. Dolores recently provided a briefing to Supervisor Molina's office as well as the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation.

A short discussion followed regarding the topics for the next meeting. Because of the holidays, the need for Metro to continue developing the conceptual designs for the third build alternative, and time needed for the LTCC to hire the consultant, the next Working Group meeting is anticipated to take place on Thursday, January 21, 2010.

The meeting ended shortly before 7:30.

MEETING REPORT

Project Name: Regional Connector

Organization: Little Tokyo Working Group

Date/Time: February 18, 2010; 6 to 8 p.m.

Meeting Location: Japanese American Cultural and Community Center

Project Team: Dolores Roybal Saltarelli, Ann Kerman, Ray Sosa, Virginia Jackson, Kanshi Uchida, Helene Kornblatt, Ginny Brideau

Attendees:

Action Items:

- Metro encourages participation at the upcoming Metro Board of Directors meeting on February 25th
- Metro to provide an update on the study timeline

Summary:

Chris Aihara began by noting this would be the 6th meeting of the LTWG. Once the group introduced themselves, Chris reviewed the previous meeting summary and current meeting agenda.

Chris Aihara presented an update on the hire of Douglas Kim and Associates (DKA). A pre-meeting was held on February 17th to discuss the approach and management of the contract. The working group has identified a task force to manage the contract. Chris feels DKA will effectively represent the Little Tokyo Community during the EIR process.

Jason Yamaguchi asked about the hiring process, the total number of applicants, and who on the LTCC decided to hire DKA. He was supportive of the hiring process, just wanted to be clear on the process itself. Alan responded by noting all of the applicants were very strong, however there were certain characteristics of the firm provided the committee with assurances DKA would be a better fit for the LTCC. Wilbur introduced Jared Jerome of DKA. The firm's website is dougaskimandassociates.com

Dolores began by thanking the LTWG members who had attended the Planning and Programming meeting earlier in the day. The community's turnout was seen as support for the adding the new alternative to the study. The motion unanimously passed both the Measure R and Planning/Programming Committee meetings. She outlined the next steps, and what to expect at the Metro Board of Directors meeting, and what would happen if the new alternative were added to the study.

Dolores provided an update regarding the recent meeting with the Nishi Temple. Metro presented two variations to the Nishi Temple, with the Nishi Temple finding only the first variation (or single tunnel option) to be the only acceptable variation. The Nishi Temple

liked the treatment with vegetation and the trains as they move by, but did not like the second variation as the portal ended right at the “front door” to the Nishi Temple. The Working Group agreed to support the only variation supported by the Nishi Temple.

Ted Tanaka presented the two variations, highlighting different urban design treatments, and concepts used in the Phoenix Light Rail system.

Chris Aihara noted that no action is needed at this time.

Darryl Garibay asked about the location of the station in the fully grade separated alternative. Dolores explained the only possible location for the station with this alternative is at the Office Depot site. It is not possible to provide access to Union Station and to East Los Angeles, and place the station anywhere else. The station cannot be located at the Nikkei Center development, however it is possible to place a passenger portal directly connecting the station to the Center.

Evelyn Yoshimura asked what would happen if the fully grade separated alternative is not added to the project? She wanted to know if both stations along 2nd Street would continue to be studied, and who would make the final recommendation regarding the location of the station. Dolores explained that with the predominately below-grade alternative would continue to be studied as part of the DEIS/R process. If the predominately below-grade alternative is selected as the LPA, the Metro Board of Directors would make the final recommendation regarding the station location, and there would not be a station at the Office Depot property.

Satoru Uyeda asked if Metro could provide information that would identify businesses that would be impacted by construction. Ray Sosa explained that in the Draft EIR the community would see a large area of identified properties that could be impacted by construction, however it is possible that not all of the properties would be impacted. Metro will know more as Advanced Conceptual Design is completed and enters into Preliminary Engineering.

Ann Kerman discussed the LTWG’s next steps. At the March 18th meeting, Doug Kim will be in attendance to begin the mitigations discussion. The LTWG asked Metro to provide an updated timeline for the Draft EIR review and the study’s next steps.

The meeting concluded at 7:30 p.m.

MEETING REPORT

- Project Name: Regional Connector Transit Corridor Project
- Organization: Little Tokyo Working Group (LTWG)
- Date/Time: Thursday, March 4, 2010; 6 to 8 p.m.
- Meeting Location: Japanese American Cultural and Community Center
- Project Team: Dolores Roybal Saltarelli, Eric Carlson, Ann Kerman, Ray Sosa, Kansai Uchida, Ginny Brideau
- Attendees: Chris Aihara, Edwin Barker, June Berk, Ron Fong, Kristin Fukushima, Bobby Garza, Mary Graybill, Yukio Kawaratani, Chris Komai, Alan Kumamoto, Joanne Kumamoto, Kei Nagao, Alan Nishio, Sawako Nita, Mike Okamoto, Susie Tae, Wilbur Takashima, Satoro Uyeda, Robert Volk, Bill Watanabe, Jason Yamaguchi, Vanessa Yee, Evelyn Yoshimura
- Action Items:
- The LTWG requested the mitigation measure examples be resent to the group (completed)
 - Doug Kim to present Mitigations Measures Action Plan at next LTWG meeting

Summary:

Wilbur Takashima called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m., and led introductions of those in attendance. Wilbur reviewed the agenda with LTWG members; items for discussion included an overview of mitigation measure examples from other rail transit projects in the country.

Dolores Roybal Saltarelli provided the LTWG with background about typical mitigation measures. She explained that mitigation measures for this project are intended to reduce or avoid impacts from construction and operation of the Regional Connector.

Dolores noted that the Draft Environmental Impact Study and Report (DEIS/R) would be available for public review in Summer 2010. Metro is requesting feedback from the Little Tokyo Community Council (LTCC) by April 15, 2010 regarding requested mitigation measures for inclusion in the DEIS/R. Dolores emphasized, however, that April 15th, 2010 is not the final deadline for submission of requested mitigations and that the Final EIS/R (FEIS/R) will be the last opportunity during the project to make changes to the mitigation measures suggested for the Regional Connector. The FEIS/R will become available for public review in Fall 2011. The FEIS/R will include a menu of mitigation measures, which will then become part of the Record of Decision (ROD) and ultimately the contract between the community and Metro.

The mitigation measures section of the DEIS/R will likely be listed in both paragraph and table form, calling out impacts connected to specific candidate mitigation measures. These measures will be developed by Metro in coordination with the LTWG, which will work with its consultant to recommend additional measures if needed. There will also be other opportunities to add or refine mitigation measures during Preliminary Engineering (PE), the next phase of the project.

Dolores asked the LTWG to refer to the mitigation plans from Sound Transit (located in Seattle, Washington) and the Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension (located in Los Angeles, California), which were distributed at the LTWG meeting on November 19, 2009. The LTWG requested that Metro resend the mitigation measure materials previously distributed.

Dolores then explained the steps needed to draft the environmental document. She clarified that numerous technical reports are still in the process of being drafted and will be submitted to Metro by the consultant. Once Metro completes the review, the draft document will be turned over to the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA). Once the FTA reviews the DEIS/R, the document will be released to the public for comment.

Doug Kim was introduced to the LTWG as the consultant hired by LTCC to support its role working with Metro on issues specific to Little Tokyo-during the DEIS/R phase of the Regional Connector project. Chris Aihara asked that Doug, as part of his scope, specifically address the selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA), identification of candidate mitigation measures, and his vision for the community process. Doug then discussed the purpose of the Mitigation Monitoring Plan (MMP), which will outline impacts and specific mitigation activities that can be implemented. The MMP identifies Metro's responsibilities and community expectations. Doug added that he would review the technical studies Metro has available prior to the next LTWG meeting. He would also like to lead a roundtable discussion with the LTCC, or community-at-large, by the end of April.

Bill Watanabe asked whether each alternative would have specific sets of mitigation plans. Dolores noted that Metro would identify a full list of mitigation measures for each alternative. Doug added that FTA would require Metro to study each of the build alternatives equally, identify potential impacts, and the associated mitigation measures. To allow the community and Metro greater flexibility once construction begins, Ray asked the LTWG to consider identifying an array of potential mitigations, rather than just one major activity to address individual impacts. .

Dolores pointed out that, in other jurisdictions, LPAs have been identified prior to the completion of the environmental process. Since the Little Tokyo community has identified a preferred alternative, the LTWG could consider focusing its time on identifying mitigation measures specific to the fully-grade separated alternative. The LTWG agreed to focus on the fully-grade separated alternative, but would still continue to evaluate the remaining alternatives.

Wilbur asked about the status of the Advanced Conceptual Engineering (ACE) and Preliminary Engineering (PE). Dolores responded that the ACE is taking place at present, but once the ACE is completed, Metro will ask FTA for permission to enter into PE. The request to enter into PE will be submitted to FTA this summer, once the DEIS/R document has been circulated to the public.

Ron Fong asked about cultural impacts to Little Tokyo, specifically impacts to Nisei week activities, and to minority and low income residents. Ray Sosa clarified that Metro has already identified the impacts to minority and low-income communities, and that mitigation measures will be identified to address project impacts.

Robert Volk asked about the entry point for the Tunnel Boring Machine (TBM). Dolores explained two potential locations (2nd Street and Central Avenue or 2nd and Hope Streets) would be reviewed as part of the study, and that both would be “environmentally cleared” for construction. Metro’s Board of Directors would make a recommendation based both on the outcome of the technical reports and staff’s recommendation regarding the final location of the entry point of the TBM. Robert stated his concerns about the cut/cover construction activity’s impacts to 1st and Alameda Streets, and about the impacts of the TBM. Ray explained that typically turns using a TBM have been gentle, and that the turn needed at 1st and Alameda Streets is too sharp and shallow to safely use a TBM at this location.

Doug asked the LTWG to consider what Little Tokyo would look like once the project is in operation, including prospects for the future of the Office Depot site. He also wanted to know whether Metro has engaged any developers, or has any expectations for the property once construction is completed. Dolores explained that, during the DEIS/R, Metro is focused on the project alternatives and will not entertain any discussions about future development at the site. Ron then enquired about the status of the Office Depot site once construction is completed. Ray explained that any development at 1st and Alameda Streets would be a community-led decision.

Yukio Kawaratani emphasized that the future use of the Office Depot site should fit into the fabric of the neighborhood and specifically requested that the LTCC should have a plan in place once construction is completed. He would prefer to see buildings that meet the needs of the community, and doesn’t want “Highest and Best Use” of the property.

A short discussion began regarding timing station construction with construction of any development that would be located at 1st and Alameda Streets. There would be a benefit to the community if the construction of the Regional Connector and any potential development at the current Office Depot site could take place during the same timeframe, rather than have ongoing construction for more than 5 years.

Satoro Uyeda owns a business on 1st Street and is concerned about the long-term construction impacts to Little Tokyo. He pointed out that it isn’t just the actual construction, but rather perceptions about construction that impacts the community.

The Little Tokyo Public Safety Association has worked to change the public's perception of the neighborhood by addressing the perceived safety concerns. He observed that if an activity is scheduled to take place at or around City Hall, business that day tends to drop off noticeably. If people routinely hear that construction is taking place in Little Tokyo, or that construction on the Regional Connector has started, he is worried that they will avoid Little Tokyo entirely. He continued by pointing out that, while there may have been no loss of business on the Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension, many businesses are noticing they have new business owners next door.

Jason Yamaguchi wanted to know if more community meetings are scheduled. He's concerned that businesses along 2nd Street are unaware of the project, even though Metro contacted the owners. Chris Aihara reiterated she would like to see more concerted outreach to businesses along 2nd Street and that a community meeting would need to be scheduled for April. This meeting would take place before Metro's currently scheduled Community Update Meeting on April 14th, 2010.

Doug then provided an overview of next steps, including hosting focused stakeholder roundtable discussions, and a schedule of activities. He anticipates holding three roundtable meetings for Businesses, Residents, and Cultural/Religious stakeholder groups. Robert Volk suggested that Doug Kim meet with stakeholders before he reviews Metro's materials in order to make best use of his time. Kei Nagao suggested using the matrix as a starting point. Alan Kumamoto would like the group to complete a survey to understand the "hot topics" of most urgent concern to the LTWG. Doug offered to bring an action plan to the next LTWG meeting, and discuss the best approach to identify mitigation measures. The schedule depends on the availability of Metro's technical reports; there are 23 technical reports, some of which are only available in mid- April. Metro offered to assist Doug in any way with the community outreach effort. Dolores undertook to provide Doug with a copy of the Methodology Approach report, which will help the LTWG identify Metro's assumptions about the project.

The LTWG exchanged ideas about how Doug could best identify community concerns, identify potential mitigation activities, and how to convey information back to Metro. The group wants to be sure that that the schedule, is adequate to cover issues to be discussed so that a clear message can be developed.

Ann Kerman thanked the LTWG and LTCC for the letter sent to the Metro Board of Directors and CEO Art Leahy. The letter recognized Metro staff for their prompt attention and willingness to address Little Tokyo's concerns by adding a new fully-grade separated build alternative through the Little Tokyo community.

The meeting concluded at 8:00 p.m.

The next meeting will take place on March 18, 2010.

MEETING REPORT

- Project Name: Regional Connector Transit Corridor Project
- Organization: Little Tokyo Working Group (LTWG)
- Date/Time: Thursday, March 18, 2010; 6 to 8 p.m.
- Meeting Location: Japanese American Cultural and Community Center
222 S San Pedro St, Los Angeles
- Project Team: Eric Carlson, Gerry Alvarez, Ann Kerman, Ray Sosa, Virginia Jackson, Helene Kornblatt, Kansai Uchida, Clarissa Filgioun, Ginny Brideau
- Attendees: Chris Aihara, Edwin Barker, Kristin Fukashima, Darryl Garibay, Bobby Garza, Yukio Kawaratani, Chris Komai, Diane Tanaka, Alan Kumamoto, Joanne Kumamoto, Kei Nagao, Alan Nishio, Wilbur Takashima, Satoro Uyeda, Robert Volk, Bill Watanabe, Jason Yamaguchi, Evelyn Yoshimura
- Action Items:
- Metro to consider extension for receipt of DEIS/R materials from the LTWG to April 29, 2010
 - Metro and Doug Kim to provide introductory materials ("EIR 101") to LTWG for review by March 25, 2010 in preparation for the next meeting
 - Metro and Doug Kim to present "EIR 101" as a portion of the April 1 LTWG meeting

Summary:

Chris Aihara called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m., and led introductions of those in attendance. Chris reviewed the agenda, which focused on Doug Kim's presentation of the approach to the action plan and proposed calendar. Two changes were made to the March 8, 2010 meeting summary, correcting the start time to 6:00 p.m. and the FEIR availability date to Fall 2011.

Doug updated the LTWG with his work to date. Doug has reviewed 2 of the 7 technical reports available to Metro. He also anticipates hosting 3 stakeholder workshops prior to the end of April 2010, which would be focused on Business, Residents, and Nonprofit/Cultural/Religious stakeholders respectively. Chris clarified that community members will be encouraged to attend the workshop that best fits their schedule. The first meeting is tentatively scheduled for April 22, 2010.