

# GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

## AGENDA

Wednesday, May 5, 2004, 4:30 PM

@

Cerritos Senior Center  
12340 South Street  
Cerritos, CA

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Recommended Action</b>
1.	Call to Order – Roll Call by Self Introductions	
2.	Pledge of Allegiance	
3.	Approval of Minutes – Minutes of the Transportation Committee Meeting of April 7, 2004	Approve
4.	Proposed MTA Gateway Service Sector By-Law Revisions	Possible Action
5.	Proposed Proposition A and Proposition C Guideline Revisions	Possible Action
6.	SB 1397 Escutia Re: Locomotive Emissions by Jim Clouet of AQMD	Possible Action
7.	High Speed Rail EIR/EIS Update	Receive & File
8.	New Business/Date of Next Meeting	
9.	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 3

## Approval of Minutes

MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
Cerritos Senior Center 12340 South Street, Cerritos  
April 7, 2004

1. Call to Order and Roll Call. The meeting was called to order by Chair Beatrice Proo at 4:45 p.m. Roll call was taken by self-introduction.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT. Beatrice Proo, Chair; Ed Norris for Desi Alvarez; Ken Farfsing; Gloria Kappe; Marina Sueiro for Fred Latham; Bill Pagett.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT. COG President Frank Colonna; Supervisor Don Knabe; Geraldine Knatz, Port of Long Beach; Edward Wilson, COG Vice-President.

OTHERS PRESENT. Richard Powers, Gateway Cities COG Executive Director; Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities COG; Deborah Chankin, Gateway Cities COG; Don Camph, Gateway Cities COG; Jerry Wood, Gateway Cities COG; Josef Bray-Ali, Assemblymember Bermudez; Bridget Sramek, Assemblymember Lowenthal; Norman Fassler- Katz, Assembly Select Committee on California Ports; Alex Clifford, MTA Sector General Manager; Vivian Garcia, Huntington Park; Tina Hansen, Pico Rivera staff; David Hershenson, MTA; Nancy Michali, MTA; Sharad Mulchand, MTA; Ralph Webb, I-5 JPA staff;

A quorum was not present. Therefore only discussion items were entertained at this time.

2. Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chair Proo.
3. Introduction of MTA Gateway Service Sector General Manager. Chair Proo introduced newly appointed MTA Gateway Cities Service Sector General Manager Alex Clifford and asked him to describe his personal background. Mr. Clifford advised that he had served eight years on the Riverside City Council where he was involved in transportation affairs. Since joining the MTA he has rotated through various operational management positions. He expressed his pleasure at his new appointment and his hope that by combining the policy perspective of a former Councilmember with the administrative experience he would be able to serve the region well and improve customer service in bus operations. Mr. Clifford also introduced Gateway Cities Service Sector Governance Council members Jacqueline Rynerson and Wally Shidler who were in the audience.
4. Presentation on Bus Service Restructuring. Nancy Michali, MTA Director of Service Planning and Analysis addressed the current effort at restructuring bus service. She advised that this would be the first major systemwide restructuring in over 20 years. Since that time population and job growth, an increase in the proportion of elderly and student riders and the introduction of train service contributed to a change in the operating environment. The restructuring project intends to improve service and increase ridership by recognizing the multi-centered urban form of Los Angeles, moving toward a “hub and spoke” or center and corridor approach, making shorter lines to improve on-time service and paying closer

attention to partnerships and connectivity. MTA staff has reviewed best practices of other transit providers and will incorporate what they have learned from others, for example Seattle. More amenities at both stops and centers will also be included. A working group of municipal and local transit providers is advising the study. Member Kernaghan is participating in that group. Mr. Powers and Member Sueiro both emphasized the importance of keeping all cities well informed about the study process not just the municipal operators.

Member Brynn Kernaghan and Member Keith McCarthy arrived at approximately 5:00

5. Discussion and Possible Action on State Legislation: AB 2024, AB 2041, AB 2042, AB 2043.

Ms. Chankin advised that a quorum was now present.

Chair Proo invited legislative staff to describe their bills. Member Farfsing requested that comments be held until the conclusion of all the presentations. Josef Bray-Ali from Assemblymember discussed AB 2024. The bill calls for a study to be completed in six months by the Secretary of the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency to recommend any statutory changes necessary to implement incentives and disincentives to bring about extend hours of freight movement. Mr. Bray-Ali stated that the bill was in an early form and suggestions were welcome.

Norman Fassler-Katz, Sr. Consultant to the Assembly Select Committee on California Ports addressed the three Lowenthal bills. AB 2041 will create a Port Congestion Management District charged with establishing a fee for the privilege of transporting cargo in or out of the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles on week days between 8:00 am and 5:00 p.m. Mr. Fassler-Katz stated that this bill was intended to motivate the goods movement industry to bring about the necessary changes itself and that indications are good that they may still do so. He emphasized that Assemblymember Lowenthal fully intends to withdraw the bill if the industry solves the problem itself. In the meanwhile, the bill is evolving as comments are received from various stakeholders. AB 2042 would require the South Coast Air Quality Management District working with information to be developed by the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles to establish a baseline inventory of port generated air pollution. It would further require that “all future growth” at the ports must result in zero net increase in air pollution. AB 2043 would create a Task Force to develop a statewide Maritime Port Strategic Master Plan. Mr. Fassler-Katz stated that Assemblyman Lowenthal is encouraged by the success of his truck idling bill and is determined to initiate additional real solutions to port issues before leaving the Assembly at the end of this year.

Mr. Camph advised that the MTA is neutral on all the bills and has concerns about funds from the port fees funding projects outside of the regional transportation planning structure. Mr. Fassler-Katz advised that the Long Beach City Council will hear a committee recommendation to endorse all three bills next week. Member Pagett stated that the I-710 Tier 2 Community Advisory Committee feels that port emissions must be reduced from current levels, not maintained at current levels. Mr. Farfsing suggested that the COG be represented on the Board of the Congestion Management District and that it should be a local agency not a state agency. Member McCarthy suggested that the I-710 Technical Advisory

Committee review the bills and consider whether freight diversion would damage the local economy. Mr. Fassler-Katz stated that the bills are in very early form and suggestions from all stakeholders are welcome. Chair Proo suggested that no action be taken this month because the cities are still deliberating on their positions and because the bills are undergoing significant change. No action was taken.

6. Update on I-5. Ralph Webb, Executive Director of the I-5 Joint Powers Authority (JPA) gave a brief update on the project. Mr. Webb explained that the project was broken into constructible segments. Construction of the first Los Angeles County segment which will be up to the I-605 now appears ready and feasible. The MTA has made this one of its two top priority highway projects in its Short-Range Transportation Plan and funding is being sought, possibly through the use of "Garvee" bonds. The cities involved and the JPA unanimously adopted a 10-lane at-grade alternative as the preferred alternative. However, the Federal Highway Administration prefers to construct as many lanes as possible, 12 or even 14. Legislation is now being proposed within the federal transportation funding bill to prohibit funds from being spent on other than the locally preferred alternative. Mr. Powers pointed out that the time may come when the I-710 will face a similar problem and the COG should be prepared to take legal or legislative action if needed.
7. Update on 710. COG Executive Director Richard Powers provided an update on the I-710 major corridor study. Mr. Powers expressed the COG's appreciation for Supervisors Knabe and Molina's leadership in obtaining additional study funds from the County of Los Angeles above and beyond the County's normal study contribution. This contribution has provided support for the community engineering facilitator, Mr. Jerry Woods. Mr. Woods has 25 years experience in working with state and federal highway projects on behalf of communities. The study is moving forward through a consensus building process and consensus is emerging. An example of how the community engineering has been successful is the Long Beach design concept now being circulated to the residents of Long Beach. This design provides 10 general purpose lanes and 4 truck lanes while taking no residences. The full corridor concepts take very few residences.
8. Draft Program EIR/EIS for the Proposed California High Speed Train System. Mr. Powers explained that the Cities of La Mirada, Pico Rivera and Santa Fe Springs have concerned about the proposed High Speed Train which would go through the same communities that have been looking at the Triple Track proposal. The Cities requested that the COG consider the Draft Environmental Document now being circulated. Member Sueiro of Santa Fe Springs explained that the three cities are reviewing the document and formulating their comments. They believe it is especially important that the document take into account and be consistent with the Triple Track environmental documents. The cities would like their comments to be submitted under the COG's auspices as they feel this would carry more weight. Ms. Chankin pointed out that another alternative in the document would utilize the West Santa Ana Branch right of way. Mr. Powers clarified that this is the right of way the Orange Line Development Authority hopes to develop. After some discussion of procedure it was agreed that the cities would work with COG staff to present a draft comment letter at the May meeting. It was moved by Member Farfsing, seconded by Member Daniels and passed unanimously to recommend to the Executive Committee that comments on the Draft Program EIR/EIS for the Proposed California High Speed Train System be submitted

under the umbrella of the COG.

9. New Business/Date of Next Meeting. There was no new business. The next meeting will be May 5, 2004.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

# Item 5

## Proposed Proposition A and Proposition C Guideline Revisions

Guidelines Area	1999 Guidelines	Proposed Changes	Reason/Impact
Project Description Form - Form A	Current language reads:  Required for all transit, paratransit, administration projects with a 25% or greater change in approved project budget	Language will be changed to read: Required for <u>all operating and capital projects</u> with a 25% or greater change in approved project budget	All project budgets, including operating and capital budgets, that change more than 25% should be approved by MTA.
Annual Project Update Form B	Current language reads: To provide current information on approved, ongoing and carryover LR projects.	Language will be changed to read: To provide current information on all approved, ongoing operating and capital LR projects.	The wording is changed to clarify language and ensure all projects are reported.
Bus Stop Improvements (codes 150,160,170)	Current language reads: Amenities should be within 8 feet to the stop	Language will be changed to read: Amenities should be within 25 feet to the stop	MTA Stops & Zones staff recommended the bus stop area be expanded because of the multitude of street furniture items and possible power source to light the shelter and Ad panel.
Transit Security (project codes 220 & 230)	The language currently exists under Rail (project codes 360,370 & 390)	Language will be added under project code for Transit Security: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transit security at Commuter Rail stations and Park &amp; Ride facilities</li> </ul>	The proposed change will consolidate transit security projects for all modes.
Ridesharing (project code 260)	The language currently reads: Project code set to allow for vanpool/carpool formation/subsidy/operation, new rider subsidy programs, and ride matching programs.	Deleted project code since the projects are eligible under existing TDM (project code 410) – TDM projects allow for formation of vanpool formation, new rider subsidy programs, and ride matching programs.	Recommend deleting redundant project code.

Guidelines Area	1999 Guidelines	Proposed Changes	Reason/Impact
TDM (project code 410) (PROP C ONLY)	The language currently reads: TDM projects require a public transit benefit.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The language “require a public transit benefit” will be deleted and new language will be added to read: TDM projects will be evaluated on their proposed impact on reduction of single occupancy vehicle trips and potential to increase transit use.</li> <li>Added the language: Providing matching funds for eligible Safe Routes to School projects.</li> </ul>	The new language allows for clearer evaluation criteria for eligible projects. Additionally, allowing jurisdictions to match eligible projects funded under the state’s Safe Routes to school program will reduce congestion during peak school drop off and pick-up times.
Transit Enhancement (project code 390) (PROP C ONLY)	Current language does not exist.	Category added: Eligible projects may include building rehabilitation and restoration for transportation-related purposes.	These projects are funded by the federal government as important transportation projects. Local Return funds could be used to match federal funds.
Synchronized Signalization (project code 400) (PROP C ONLY)	Current language does not exist.	Language added to allow eligibility of Countywide Information Exchange Network (IEN) operational costs as approved by the MTA and LACoDPW	The capital costs of the IEN are funded through MTA’s regional call-for-projects (CFP) process. This would allow the continued funding for operation of the systems.
Bikeways & Pedestrian Improvements (project code 430) (PROP C ONLY)	Eligible projects allowed but not clearly defined.	Language added that provides descriptions of eligible pedestrian projects	Current practice was MTA was approving pedestrian projects that demonstrated a public transit benefit. Change codifies examples of eligible projects.

<b>Guidelines Area</b>	<b>1999 Guidelines</b>	<b>Proposed Changes</b>	<b>Reason/Impact</b>
Maintenance of Effort Requirements (under street improvements) (PROP C ONLY)	Current language referenced Prop. 111	Language added that does not reference Prop. 111. MTA will accept the State Controller's finding of a jurisdiction's compliance with the California Streets and Highways Code.	The MOE requirement did not change – the language was updated to exclude any specific reference to Propositions.
Direct Administration (project code 480)	Current guidelines are not clear on the cap, i.e. "shall not exceed 20% of the LR approved project budget".	Language will be added under project 480 to clarify the 20% cap.	Change made for clarity, however, cities will now get audit findings if they exceed the 20% cap and will be asked to reimburse their LR fund.
Service Coordination process	Current language did not identify current responsible department.	Updated language to reflect current responsible department	No impact – change made for clarity.
National Transit Database (NTD)	Policy and procedures did not exist.	Updated language to reflect current NTD policies and examples of applicable projects	No impact – change made for clarity.
Capital Reserve	Current audit does not specifically call for a capital reserve schedule.	The annual audit will include a detailed audit of the jurisdiction's capital reserve account.	No impact to jurisdictions – change made for clarity.
Reimbursement	No current language exists. Current practice is to clarify reimbursement on Form A	Includes language that allows jurisdictions to use LR funds to advance for other grant funds as long as LR funds are returned to the fund.	No impact to jurisdictions – change made for clarity.
Audit Findings	Although current guidelines include language that administrative expenses are subject to a cap, there is no finding listed. Furthermore, although the guidelines state that ongoing and carryover projects should be identified on the Form B and Form C, there is no finding if the jurisdiction fails to comply.	Added two additional audit findings/items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administration expenses over 20% cap result in an audit finding and reimbursement of the LR account</li> <li>• Failure to report all approved projects on Form B or Form C results in an audit exception. MTA reserves the right for further action as necessary for repeated failure to comply with this requirement.</li> </ul>	These changes are to consolidate and clarify other areas of the guidelines. Jurisdictions have expressed confusion over reporting all projects on the Form B and Form C.

Item 6  
SB 1397 Escutia Re: Locomotive  
Emissions by Jim Clouet of AQMD

**Gateway Cities Council of Governments  
Transportation Committee**

**May 5, 2004  
Item 6 - SB 1397  
Escutia Re: Locomotive Emissions by  
Jim Clouet of AQMD**

See Attached PDF Version of SB 1397