

GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

AGENDA

Chair – Bonnie Lowenthal, Director, MTA

April 2, 2008, 4:30 PM
Gateway Cities COG Offices
16401 Paramount Blvd.
Paramount, CA

Item No.	Description	Recommended Action
I.	Call to Order – Self Introductions	
II.	Pledge of Allegiance	
III.	Approval of Meeting Minutes of March 5, 2008	
IV.	Reports:	
1.	Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan Draft Comment Letter	Discussion & Recommendation
2.	Congestion Mitigation Plan Fee - Motion by City Managers Steering Committee	Discussion & Recommendation
3.	MTA Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) - Update By Brad McAllester - MTA	Discussion & Recommendation
4.	OCTA/MTA Inter-County Transportation Study – Presentation By Bill Delo, Project Team	Receive & File
5.	Gateway Sector Report – Alex Clifford Gateway Cities Service Sector General Manager	Receive & File
6.	Update – I-5 JPA	Receive & File
7.	Update – I-710 EIR/EIS	Receive & File
8.	Update – SR 91/ I-605/I-405 Major Corridor Study	Receive & File
9.	ITS Integration Plan	Receive & File
10.	Truck Inspection Station Study	Receive & File
11.	New Business/Date of Next Meeting	
12.	Adjournment	

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

Item III

Approval of Minutes for the Meeting of March 5, 2008

**Transportation Committee Minutes of
March 5, 2008**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
Chair – MTA Director Bonnie Lowenthal
Gateway Cities Office, 16401 Paramount Blvd. , Paramount
March 5, 2008**

Call to order and roll call. The meeting was called to order by Mayor Gene Daniels at 4:35 p.m. Roll call was taken by self introduction.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Stan Carroll – La Habra Heights, Frank Gurule – Cudahy, Ken Farfing – Signal Hill, Ray Harris – Supervisor Knabe’s Office, Brynn Kernaghan – Long Beach Transit, Gene Daniels - Paramount.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Chair Bonnie Lowenthal – Long Beach, Elba Guerrero – Huntington Park, Fred Latham – Santa Fe Springs, Anne Bayer – Downey, Eric Shen – Port of Long Beach, Bill Pagett – Paramount.

OTHERS PRESENT: Karen Heit – Gateway Cities COG, Nancy Pfeffer – Gateway Cities COG, Alex Clifford – Gateway Service Sector General Manager, Wally Shidler – Gateway Service Sector Council, Yvette Kirrin – I-5 JPA, Roy Reynolds – PRS Strategies, Sumire Gant – Long Beach, Sam Morrissey – Wilbur Smith Associates, Sharad Mulchand – Metro, Michelle Smith – Metro, Shahrzad Amiri – Metro, Diego Cardoso – Metro, Philbert Wong – Metro.

A quorum was reached and the Minutes of the February 6, 2008 meeting were approved.

Roy Reynolds introduced Personal Rapid Transit (PRT) technology and discussed its potential as an alternative for the West Santa Ana Branch Pacific Electric right-of-way. He reviewed the off-line nature of the stations and the on-call automated, single-use vehicles. He reviewed the potential for goods movement and private sponsorship. He answered questions about the PRT technology.

Shahrzad Amiri, MTA Director, San Gabriel Valley Area Team, presented the Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan (MCGMAP) goals and objectives. She introduced Wilbur Smith project manager, Sam Morrissey who gave a presentation on the MCGMAP Action Plan recommendations. He discussed the challenge and the relationship of the plan and the activities of other agencies such as the San Pedro Bay Ports Clean Air Action Plan. He reviewed the modal split and the trucking aspect of the plan and strategies to reduce the number of trucks (land-use strategies, on-dock rail). Morrissey reviewed suggested project scenarios highlighting \$1.4 billion worth of Freeway/highway projects in the Gateway Cities subregion. Morrissey reviewed next steps including east/west non-freeway freight movement corridor, looking at user fees and other nontraditional funding sources.

Transportation Committee Minutes of

March 5, 2008

Nancy Pfeffer gave a report on the GCCOG response to the SCAG RTP. She discussed the recommendation for SCAG to utilize the "baseline forecast" for the RTP, and not consider the "growth forecast" for this current RTP development. Pfeffer also outlined the COG response to the potential conflict and relationship between the SCAG High Speed Rail Transit (HSRT) system and the potential alternatives with the I-710 EIR/EIS. She mentioned the 3/19/06 special meeting of the SCAG Transportation and Communication Committee to discuss the RTP.

Gateway Service Sector General Manager, Alex Clifford discussed the results of the Gateway Sector public hearings and the comments received affecting Metro bus service in the subregion. The GCCOG response letter was discussed.

Yvette Kirrin, I-5 JPA Executive Director gave the I-5 update. She reviewed the I-5 710-605 environmental process that is not currently fully funded. She discussed the Carmenita process and the upcoming cost increase and the request for additional funds from the MTA.

Jerry Wood, COG Transportation Engineer, gave updates on the I-710 project where the review of scheduling has occurred and project planning has begun.

Wood went on to discuss the 91/605/405 project and the issuance of a draft report. The OCTA/MTA draft report is under review by the partnering agencies and will be presented to the GCCOG Transportation Committee next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:29 pm.

IV. Reports

- 1. Multi-County Goods Movement
Action Plan
Draft Comment Letter**

Transportation Committee Agenda of

April 2, 2008

TO: Transportation Committee

FROM: Bonnie Lowenthal, Chair

BY: Karen Heit, Transportation Deputy

SUBJECT: Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan (MCGMAP)
Draft Comment Letter

Issue

COG staff has prepared comments on the draft final of the above mentioned plan. The attached comments fall into the three following areas:

- General Comments on a review of how the previous comments made by the GCCOG as the MCGMAP was being developed (various Tech Memos) and were or were not addressed.
- Comments on the Draft Action Plan
- Comments on the Los Angeles County Action Plan.

Background

The MTA has been the project manager for a six-county effort to create a framework for goods movement. This effort has culminated in a set of draft goods movement recommendations for each county as well as an action plan. These products are the final activities for the multi-county effort. There have been eight prior technical memos covering most functional areas of goods movement.

GCCOG staff has participated in the stakeholders meetings and prepared comments on the previous products, which have been presented at previous Transportation Committee.

The recommended plan actions build a foundational framework on which to base specific Los Angeles County Projects. The MTA Board approved a Motion by Directors Fasana and Lowenthal to pursue a Los Angeles County Goods Movement Strategy based upon the framework created with the MCGMAP Action Plan.

Attachment

Draft MCGMAP Final Comments

March 19, 2008

Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Ms. Shahrzad Amiri
Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan
Project Team
Attention: Michelle Smith
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Ms. Amiri:

**Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan – Draft Action Plan
And Los Angeles County Action Plan**

The Gateway Cities Council of Governments (GCCOG) has reviewed the final drafts of the Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan (MCGMAP). In particular we are providing comments on the final, draft action plan and the draft of the Los Angeles County Action Plan. The GCCOG very much appreciates the cooperation of the Metro project team in meeting with us and addressing many of our concerns and issues, many of which we feel are now addressed by these final documents. However, as this report is “just a guide in preparation of plans” for goods movement, the GCCOG still had a number of comments that are attached.

Our intent with these final comments and suggestions is that they be included in future efforts for goods movement planning. The GCCOG appreciates that Metro and the stakeholders have brought focus and attention with this study on goods movement which so significantly impacts the communities that make up GCCOG. We are particularly interested in the tremendous body of data gathered for the study and in the trends that were analyzed.

We are very appreciative of the responsiveness from the MTA staff and the consultant team in working with the GCCOG. The issue of goods movement and the environmental and economic consequences affect every aspect of the quality of life for the residents of southeast Los Angeles County and is continually at the top of the GCCOG agenda.

Transportation Committee Agenda of

April 2, 2008

Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan

Project Team

March 19, 2008

Page 2

We are looking forward to continuing the established collaborative in working through the specifics of the Los Angeles County Goods Movement Strategic Plan.

For questions or information concerning the content of this letter, please contact Karen Heit or Jerry Wood at 562.663.6850.

Sincerely,

Richard Powers
Executive Director

Cc: Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan Committee
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Orange County Transportation Authority
Riverside County Transportation Authority
San Bernardino Associated Governments
Southern California Association of Governments
Ventura County Transportation Authority
Caltrans, District 7
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments
Mr. Mark Watts, Lobbyist

IV. Reports

2. Congestion Mitigation Plan Fee – Motion by City Managers Steering Committee

Transportation Committee Agenda of

April 2, 2008

TO: Transportation Committee

BY: Ken Farfsing, Chair, City Managers Steering Committee

SUBJECT: Congestion Mitigation Plan Fee – Motion by City Managers Steering Committee

Background

The MTA has circulated the Draft Congestion Mitigation Fee Feasibility Study Report for review and comment. The report outlines the CMP Fee program and how it will be structured. The report has been sent to all LA County City Managers, Planning, Public Works and Transportation Directors. Comments on the study are due April 25, 2008. The results of the final study report will be placed before the MTA Board in June of 2008. This study is the first major milestone in the adoption of the fee. The next phase will be the determination of local projects of regional significance and the fine-tuning of growth forecasts. The MTA is coming to the April Transportation Committee and Board of Directors to present the study report.

Issues

Regions were required to implement Congestion Mitigation Plans under a state law adopted in 1992. The MTA created the existing “debit and credit” system, along with a toolbox of congestion reduction strategies to comply with the law, which our local Cities have used extensively. Each of our communities completes a review of their congestion mitigation debits and credits annually. No Gateway Cities are out of compliance and not have deficits of congestion credits.

Cities found out of compliance are refused Section 2105 Highway Users Tax funds (the per capita distribution of sales taxes on gasoline sales). It is important to note that the Gateway Cities receives \$11.1 million in annual gas tax revenues under Section 2105.

As part of the 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan, the MTA Board instructed staff to investigate the possible adoption of a Congestion Mitigation Fee to replace the existing system of debits/credits for the Congestion Management Program (CMP). During the past four years the MTA has been exploring the development of an alternative to the existing system of debits/credits. A congestion mitigation fee is a development impact fee, which would be paid by homeowners and businesses, when constructing new development. The estimated range of fees is \$2,000 to \$16,000 per residential unit, with a corresponding commercial/industrial charge.

Transportation Committee Agenda of

April 2, 2008

The Gateway Cities COG has expressed concerns with the imposition of the fee program and the possible negative impacts on development within our Cities, forcing cities to fund projects outside of their boundaries, and concern over the MTA reducing regional funds.

In addition the Study states that because of the time lapsed between the original CMP Modeling and the 30-Year Plan to the subsequent MTA Long Range Transportation Plans; there would be a push to update the CMP Program anyway. The number of deficiencies attributed to new trips generated by new development under the more modest LRTP financial outlook would necessitate a change in the existing system. If the fee proposal is not adopted there would be a change to reflect the greater need for local mitigation of regional impacts to the transportation system. The Study does not offer any alternatives.

As part of this Study, the MTA has offered different revenue scenarios based upon different levels of fee for single residence equivalents (from \$2000 - \$16,000 per residential equivalent). The Gateway Cities estimates are attached at the end of this report. The trip generation is based upon SCAG Growth Forecasts; the MTA expects to work with cities to refine the growth forecasts.

Issues

The following captures the issues expressed by Gateway Cities COG City Managers Steering Committee relating to the CMP Fee program. The Gateway Cities COG City Managers Steering Committee has reviewed the Draft Congestion Mitigation Program (CMP) Fee Feasibility Study Report and is recommending that the Gateway Cities Council of Governments oppose the adoption of the fee process for Los Angeles County and recommend retaining the current system of debits and credits.

The major concern of the City Managers is that the MTA cannot be trusted to administer the congestion mitigation fee. The Gateway Cities have generated over \$1.97 billion in Proposition A and C Tax Revenues from the 1996-2006 period. The City Managers believe that our region has not received its "fair share" return of these locally generated taxes in sub-regional highway and transit improvements. The MTA has refused repeated requests by the City Managers to provide a transparent accounting of these funds. The City Managers are concerned that the mitigation fees paid in the Gateway Cities will be used to fund projects in other subregions, since the funds and project eligibility will be administered by the MTA.

The other issues are the following:

- The CMP Fee study does not adequately examine the impacts and benefits of the fee in older built-out areas of the county where there is less opportunity for new development or development intensity. The "one size fits all" fee does not recognize that development costs vary widely in Los Angeles County, based on land costs and other factors. Nor does the study examine situations where the regional infrastructure is mature and the potential for arterial widening or increased street capacity isn't available. The fee may function as a deterrent to

Transportation Committee Agenda of

April 2, 2008

in-fill development, requiring the City or local redevelopment agencies to fund the fee to entice development.

- The SCAG growth forecasts are cited as the foundation for projecting growth. There is substantial concern with these growth forecasts that requires resolution before they can be used as a determinant for mitigation improvements.
- Since the flat Countywide fee may act as a deterrent to development in more economically challenged areas, a subregional fee should be examined.
- The study does not specifically address the possibility of a smaller jurisdictions contributing to approved local projects of regional significance outside of the city boundaries.
- The study is silent on whether administrative costs for accelerated financing mechanism (including bond sales or assessment districts) would be covered by the fee.
- There is no assurance to developers that CEQA mandated mitigations will also meet the test for the CMP Fee.
- Cities would be refused their Section 2015 Gas Tax funds if they do not adopt the congestion mitigation fees proposed by the MTA.
- Cities would be required to hold local “protest hearings” when adopting these new impact fees.

Attachment

Gateway Cities estimates.

Recommended Action

A motion to approve City Manager’s Steering Committee comments and forward to MTA.

IV. Reports

3. MTA Long Range Transportation Plan Update

Transportation Committee Agenda of

April 2, 2008

TO: Transportation Committee

FROM: Bonnie Lowenthal, Chair

BY: Karen Heit, Transportation Deputy

SUBJECT: MTA Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) - Update

Issue

The MTA is circulating the Draft LRTP document for public review. Comments are due to the MTA by April 25, 2008. The MTA has established a series of public meetings in addition to making presentations to COGs. The Gateway Cities Meeting will be held:

April 10, 2008 6pm
Progress Park Plaza West
15500 Downey Ave.
Paramount, CA 93550

Background

The MTA is in the process of updating the LRTP. This document is the Los Angeles County vision and funding plan for infrastructure and mobility improvements through the year 2030. The LRTP revision has been delayed several times to accommodate influential external events such as the suspension of state transportation funding and the passage of Prop.1B.

The Draft LRTP documents changes and growth that have occurred in Los Angeles County since the 2001 LRTP. The LRTP retains commitments to projects and programs in the constrained element of the 2001 Plan and lists projects and programs that can be moved forward if new sources of funding are found.

The attached plan excerpts list the Strategic Unfunded Project Lists for Transit and for Highways. The Phasing of Committed Funds Chart is also attached.

Attachments

Strategic Unfunded Project Lists
Phasing of Committed Funds Chart

**Transportation Committee Agenda of
April 2, 2008**

Phasing of Committed Funds

ESCALATED \$ IN BILLIONS

Committed Projects	Years	Years	Years	Years*	Years	Plan
	'05-'09	'10-'14	'15-'19	'20-'25	'26-'30	Total
Bus						
Operations	7.0	8.3	9.8	13.4	12.9	51.3
Capital	1.9	1.9	2.1	2.8	2.4	11.2
<i>Subtotal</i>	8.8	10.2	11.9	16.2	15.3	62.5
Rail and Transit Corridors						
Operations	1.5	2.0	2.3	3.2	3.1	12.1
Capital	2.7	3.8	2.0	3.2	1.8	13.5
<i>Subtotal</i>	4.1	5.7	4.3	6.4	5.0	25.6
Highway, Streets, Roads, Multimodal						
Operations	3.3	4.2	4.5	6.0	5.5	23.6
Capital	5.8	6.5	2.4	4.1	4.2	22.8
<i>Subtotal</i>	9.1	10.6	6.9	10.1	9.7	46.4
Debt Service						
<i>Subtotal</i>	1.4	2.1	3.1	4.3	3.8	14.7
Other						
<i>Subtotal</i>	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.9	0.8	3.3
Total Committed Funds	23.9	29.2	26.9	37.8	34.6	152.5

*Note that this is a six-year period.

Numbers may not add up due to rounding

Excerpts from Draft 2008 Long Range Transportation Plan Public Transportation

Figure M

Tier 1: Currently Under Planning Study or Environmentally Cleared/Route Refinement Study

Regional Connector

Metro Subway Westside Extension to La Cienega

Harbor Subdivision Alternate Rail Technology (ART) between LA Union Station and Metro Green Line Aviation Station

Metro Subway Westside Extension from La Cienega to City of Santa Monica (*Rank equal to project above*)

Burbank/Glendale Light Rail from LA Union Station to Burbank Metrolink Station

Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension from Atlantic/Pomona Station to City of Whittier (*At-grade or Aerial Light Rail*)

Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension from Sierra Madre Villa Station to Azusa

Metro Green Line Extension from Redondo Beach Station to South Bay Galleria

Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension from Sierra Madre Villa Station to Montclair

Metro Green Line Extension between Norwalk Station and Norwalk Metrolink Station

Metro Green Line Extension to LAX (*Not ranked*)

West Santa Ana Branch ROW Corridor Maglev between LA Union Station and Santa Ana Metrolink Station

(Capital and operating costs to be funded by others)

Tier 2: Candidates for Further Project Definition

Metro Red Line Extension from North Hollywood Station to Burbank Airport Metrolink Station

Vermont Corridor Subway

“Yellow” Line Light Rail between Metro Red Line North Hollywood Station and Regional Connector

I-405 Corridor Busway between Metro Orange Line Sepulveda Station and Metro Green Line Aviation Station

“Silver” Line Light Rail between Metro Red Line Vermont/Santa Monica Station and City of La Puente (*Rank equal to project above*)

Metro Green Line Extension from LAX to Expo Santa Monica Station

SR-134 Transit Corridor BRT between Metro Red Line North Hollywood Station and Metro Gold Line Del Mar Station

(Rank equal to project above)

Metro Green Line Extension between South Bay Galleria and Pacific Coast Hwy Harbor Transitway Station

Countywide Transit Programs

Metro Rapid Bus Expansion Corridors Beyond Funded Plan (*Not ranked*)

Additional Metrolink Expansion Beyond Funded Plan (*Not ranked*)

Additional Sub-regional projects not included in Metro’s performance evaluation (see *Technical Document*)

Transportation Committee Agenda of

April 2, 2008

Highways

Figure G

Tier 1: Currently Under Planning Study or Environmentally Cleared

SR-710 Gap Closure (*Assumes partial funding by fees, public/private partnerships or tolls*)

Freeway Operational Improvements (Auxiliary Lanes), for example:

> I-405 NB Auxiliary Lane: Hawthorne Bl to I-105

> I-405 SB Auxiliary Lane: Rosecrans Av to Inglewood Av

US-101 Corridor: Add carpool lane in each direction between SR-27 (Topanga Canyon Bl) and SR-2 in Downtown Los Angeles and restripe for mixed-flow lane in each direction between SR-27 and Ventura County Line

US-101: Add carpool lane in each direction between SR-27 and the Ventura County Line (*This would be in addition to the mixed-flow lane proposed in the project above*)
(*Rank equal to project above*)

I-5 Carpool and Mixed-Flow Lanes: I-605 to I-710

I-5 HOV and Truck Lane Improvements: SR-14 to Kern County Line (*Assumes partial funding by fees, public/private partnerships or tolls*)

I-710 South (*Rank equal to project above*) (*Assumes partial funding by fees, public/private partnerships or tolls*)

SR-14: I-5 to Kern County Line (*Carpool and mixed-flow improvements*)

SR-138: I-5 to SR-14 (*Add 2 mixed-flow lanes in each direction*)

SR-138: Pearblossom Hwy to San Bernardino County Line: Widen to 4 lanes (*Rank equal to project above*)

High Desert Corridor (*Assumes partial funding by fees, public/private partnerships or tolls*)

Additional Soundwalls Beyond Funded Plan

Transportation Committee Agenda of

April 2, 2008

Tier 2: Candidates for Further Project Definition

I-605 Carpool Lanes: I-210 to I-10

I-10 Carpool Lanes: Lincoln Bl to I-5

SR-57 Carpool Lanes: SR-60 to I-210

SR-60 Carpool Lanes: US-101 to I-605

I-5/I-10 Interchange

I-5/I-405 Interchange

I-5/SR-2 Interchange

I-5/SR-134 Interchange

I-5/SR-14 Interchange

I-5/SR-170 Interchange

US-101/SR-170 Interchange

US-101/SR-170/SR-134 (complete two connectors) Interchange

I-405/US-101 Interchange

I-5/I-605 (*partial HOV connector – from west to south and from west to north*)

I-10/I-605 (*partial HOV connector – from east to south and from west to south*)

SR-60/I-605 (*partial HOV connector – from east to south and from east to north*)

SR-91/I-110 (*partial HOV connector – from east to south and from east to north*)

SR-91/I-605 (all) HOV connectors

I-105/I-605 (*partial HOV connector – from west to north and from west to south*)

Additional Caltrans corridors not included in Metro's performance evaluation (see
Technical Document)

Additional Sub-regional projects not included in Metro's performance evaluation (see
Technical Document)

IV. Reports

4. OCTA/MTA Inter-County Transportation Study Presentation

Transportation Committee Agenda of
April 2, 2008

TO: Transportation Committee

FROM: Bonnie Lowenthal, Chair

BY: Karen Heit, Transportation Deputy

SUBJECT: OCTA/MTA Inter-County Transportation Study - Presentation

The attached is the Executive Summary and presentation materials for the OCTA/MTA Inter-county Transportation Study.

Attachments

Executive Summary
Powerpoint Presentation

Transportation Committee Agenda of
April 2, 2008