

COMMUNITY IMPACT MITIGATION AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT WORK GROUP

Co-chairs

Mark Pisano, Director, Southern California Association of Governments
Second Co-Chair Pending

Introduction

Improving the movement of goods in California is among the highest priorities for Governor Schwarzenegger. It is the policy of this Administration to improve and expand California's goods movement industry and infrastructure. The Schwarzenegger Administration has established a Cabinet Work Group to lead the implementation of this policy for goods movement and ports by working collaboratively with the logistics industry, local and regional governments, neighboring communities, business, labor, environmental groups and other interested stakeholders to achieve shared goals.

Beginning in June 2004, the Schwarzenegger Administration began a concerted effort to assemble goods movement stakeholders to learn about the problems, opportunities, and challenges facing the future of goods movement within the State. These efforts led to the formation of the Administration Goods Movement Policy, "Goods Movement in California," in January 2005. The "Goods Movement Action Plan, Phase I, Foundations," was published in September of 2005. Part of a two-phase process, it is an attempt to characterize the "why" and the "what" of the State's involvement in goods movement in the following four segments: (1) the goods movement industry and its growth potential; (2) the four "port-to-border" transportation corridors that constitute the state's goods movement backbone and the associated inventory of infrastructure projects being planned or are underway; (3) the extent of environmental and community impacts—as well as a description of mitigation approaches; and (4) key aspects of public safety and homeland security issues. Substantial effort was focused on developing the inventory of existing and proposed goods movement projects. The listing includes previously identified projects in various Regional Transportation Plans (RTP) and Regional Transportation Improvement Programs (RTIP) prepared by Municipal Planning Organizations (MPOs), Transportation Commissions and Councils of Governments (COGs). In addition, the listings include a wide range of outlined projects underway or under consideration by the ports, railroads, and other third parties.

The Phase II Action Plan, to be completed by December 2005, will develop a statewide implementation plan for goods movement capacity expansion including financing options for facilities, environmental impact mitigation, community impact mitigation, and enhancement of homeland security and public safety. It will define the "how," "when," and "who" required to synchronize and to integrate efforts to achieve relief and improvement as quickly as possible.

The Phase II effort will be executed by work groups comprised of stakeholders, technical experts, and members of the public in conjunction with support from BTH and Cal/EPA staffs.

Work Group Focus

This Work Group will seek stakeholder input on actions needed to address two aspects of goods movement activities that relate to communities adjacent to goods movement corridors: mitigating impacts of community-specific factors (like traffic, visual blight, noise, night-time lights, etc.)¹ and expanding outreach that improve opportunities for residents to secure jobs and careers within the goods movement industry.

Community Impact Mitigation

Over the course of many decades, communities adjacent to goods movement facilities and corridors have faced the community-specific impacts of increased goods movement activity. At the same time, the expansion of goods movement facilities and the expansion of homes within corridor communities have compounded the problem. Consequently, more residents incur impacts that affect quality of life than in years past.

While such circumstances are not unique to goods movement facilities, the problem is exacerbated by the fact that goods movement facilities need to be interconnected and therefore have limited opportunity for relocation. Similarly, closing or reducing activities at any one facility to reduce localized impacts has economic consequences along the entire corridor that can negatively impact the community, region, and the state at large. The challenge is to identify actions that can mitigate community impacts while enabling the facilities to operate efficiently and effectively.

This Work Group will solicit public input on options and priorities for community impact mitigation.

Workforce Development

In years past, the goods movement industry has been characterized as a relatively low paying industry with the exception of a small fraction of high paying union jobs within the ports. That characterization is changing. As the management of global supply chains requires ever growing sophistication to maintain competitive advantage, new jobs, new fields, and new career ladders have unfolded that have the potential to expand the range of high paying jobs throughout the industry.

The growth of the industry coupled with the increased specialization of many job categories has created the prospect of significant worker shortages in the years ahead. While several institutions at the high school, community college, and four year university levels have taken steps to expand programs and curricula to meet industry needs, there appears to be substantial opportunities to recruit residents in goods movement corridor-adjacent communities to fulfill these jobs. There are many reasons to pursue such an alignment. The most obvious is proximity. Recruiting individuals living near goods movement facilities improves the jobs-housing balance within the communities, reduces

¹ Environmental impacts, primarily air pollution, are addressed in the Environmental Impact Mitigation Work Group and the Air Resources Board Emission Reduction Plan process.

extended commutes, and provides opportunities for higher wage jobs that might otherwise be lacking in the community.

This Work Group will examine ways to engage the educational institutions and workforce developers to target and expand outreach efforts within the impacted communities.

Framing Questions

Community Impact Mitigation

- *Are there steps the State can take to mitigate the community-specific impacts?*
- *Should the State use the Community Benefits Agreement developed for the Los Angeles Airport as a model?*

(This agreement addressed air pollution mitigation, traffic routing, health/research studies, job training, early access to hiring, community preparedness for emergencies, and green building principles)
- *Should the State attempt to create buffer zones for infrastructure expansions? If so, what should happen where encroachment has already occurred?*
- *Should we apply the same mitigation approaches statewide or adapt them for individual communities?*
- *How should the State prioritize among the multiple mitigation needs?*
- *What steps can we take to ensure that local communities share in the benefits of growth in goods movement?*
- *What is the role of the federal government in this mitigation?*

Workforce Development

- *What are the future goods movement occupations that require specialized preparation?*
- *What are the career ladders that are emerging in the goods movement field?*
- *What are education institutions at the high school, community college, and four year university doing now to develop appropriate curricula?*
- *What outreach efforts are needed by educational institutions and workforce developers to target impacted communities?*