AGENDA

AGENDA REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE ON THE GATEWAY CITIES COG WEBSITE AT WWW.GATEWAYCOG.ORG.

ON MARCH 4, 2020, GOVERNOR NEWSOM PROCLAIMED A STATE OF EMERGENCY TO EXIST IN CALIFORNIA AS A RESULT OF THE THREAT OF COVID-19. THE GOVERNOR HAS ISSUED EXECUTIVE ORDERS THAT TEMPORARILY SUSPEND REQUIREMENTS OF THE BROWN ACT, INCLUDING ALLOWING PUBLIC AGENCIES TO HOLD PUBLIC MEETINGS VIA TELECONFERENCING AND TO MAKE PUBLIC MEETINGS ACCESSIBLE TELEPHONICALLY OR OTHERWISE ELECTRONICALLY TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: To address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee on any agenda item or a matter within the Executive Committee’s purview, please provide written comments by 10:30 a.m., August 19, 2020, via email to info@gatewaycog.org. All written comments submitted will become part of the official record.

A. AGENDA ITEM: at this time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and

B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and

C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time all submitted written comments will be read.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.
I. CALL TO ORDER

II. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).

III. PUBLIC COMMENTS - Three minutes for each speaker.

IV. MATTERS FROM STAFF

V. CONSENT CALENDAR: All items under the Consent Calendar may be enacted by one motion. Any item may be removed from the Consent Calendar and acted upon separately by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee.

   A. Approve Minutes for the Meeting of June 17, 2020 of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee.

CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION:

   A MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM.

VI. REPORTS

   A. I-710 FEIR/FEIS Project
      • Status Update
      • Early Action Program Update – Continued Discussion

      SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

   B. Current 710 Early Action Project Update (Freeway & Non-Freeway) – Oral Report by Metro
      • Jurisdictional Equity – Table/Pie-Chart
      • Cash Flow (Freeway & Non-Freeway)/Invoicing Status

      SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

VII. COG ENGINEER’S REPORT – ORAL REPORT BY YVETTE KIRRIN AND/OR KEKOA ANDERSON

   SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF
VIII. MATTERS FROM THE I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

IX. MATTERS FROM THE CHAIR

X. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 4:00 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting scheduled for Wednesday, September 16, 2020, 1:30 PM.

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.
V. CONSENT CALENDAR
   Item A
   Approval of Minutes
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
I-710 CORRIDOR PROJECT EIR/EIS
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Via Zoom
June 17, 2020

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:41p.m.

II. Roll Call

PRESENT: Bill Pagett, Chair, City of Bell and Paramount; Delfino Consunji, City of Downey; Alvin Papa, City of Long Beach; Jose Loera, City of South Gate; Ernesto Chavez, Metro; Theresa Dau Ngo, POLB; Dan Garcia, City of Compton; Kerry Cartwright, POLA; Mohammed Mostahkami: City of Commerce; Kevin Ko, City of Maywood; Bill Zimmerman, City of Signal Hill

ABSENT: John Vassiliades, Caltrans; Chau Vu, City of Bell Gardens Aaron Hernandez Torres, City of Cudahy; Sergio Infanzon, City of Huntington Park; Richard Sandzimier, City of Lynwood Mahdad Derakhshani, County of Los Angeles Aaron Hernandez Torres, City of Cudahy; Dan Wall, City of Vernon; Jacob Waclaw, FHWA & FTA; Garrett Damrath, John Vassiliades, Cal Trans;

Other attendees included: Yvette Kirrin, GCCOG; Art Cervantes, South Gate; Jackie Martinez, CPSI; Shelly McCarthy, ARUP; Dave Levinsohn, AECOM; David Woo, AYCE Consulting; Derya Thompson; Diego Cadena, WKE-Inc; Enrique Rosas; James Shankel; Jeff Fromhertz, PB World; Jennifer Ganata, CBE Cal.; Julie Rush, AECOM; Kathy Tegeler, Epic Land; Kevin Minn; Nicolas Velazquez, Moffatt & Nichol; Romeo Firme, Kleinfelder; Sam Bucher, Montez Group; Terence Pao, HDR; Tom Lonta; Wayne Richardson,
HDR; Lourdes Ortega, Metro; Lucy Delgadillo, Metro; Nina Turner, POLB; Shannon Willits, Metro; Georgia Medina, Moffatt Nichol; Andrea Russell, Transystems; Julio Perucho, Metro; Mark Dierking, Metro; Michael Huynh, SCE; M. Grossman, SCE;

III. Amendments to the Agenda

There were no amendments to the agenda.

IV. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

V. Matters from Staff

There were no matters from staff.

VI. Consent Calendar

It was moved by Alvin Papa (Long Beach), seconded by Dan Garcia (Compton), to approve the minutes of the meeting of May 20, 2020. The motion was without objection.

VII. Reports

A. I-710 EIR/EIS Project Update

1. Air quality conformity is the outstanding issue requiring resolution before the Final EIR/EIS can be released for public availability. A high level meeting with EPA and AQMD took place on June 9th and all agencies agreed to work together on a path forward and to find consensus.

2. A corridor-wide virtual community meeting was held on 6/16/20. This meeting included the following topics:
   a. EIR/EIS update; next steps on early action program; next steps on clean truck program. Most questions were regarding ways in which the community can provide input on all active phases of the project. This forum (the TAC), the individual city councils, as well as existing Local Advisory Committees for some cities were all mentioned as the primary places for the community to provide input. It was noted that the TAC members have a stronger responsibility to bring the info conveyed here back to their communities.
Metro and Gateway COG can support the cities with materials and presentations.

b. Trade Corridor Enhancement Program (TCEP) Update: Moving forward with TCEP state SB1 grant application will include a funding request for the ICM (integrated corridor management). The Clean Truck Program will not be an element for TCEP since not enough detail has been developed to request funds. The soundwalls will be a separate request for the local partnerships program, not TCEP funding.

3. Shannon Willits provided an update on the continued discussion regarding the possible early action freeway segments to be prioritized. A presentation was provided to the group titled Freeway Program EAP Development. This included the metrics to evaluate the pros and cons of the various freeway segments, including mobility and safety. Four candidate segments have been identified (identified at May TAC). A recap on previously-discussed mobility/safety criteria was provided.

a. The segment ranked highest was PCH to I-405 (a 2.4 mile segment which includes 3 interchanges and costs $490 million).

b. The 2nd ranked segment is from 105 to Firestone, with a total cost of $350 million.

c. The 3rd ranked segment is from Del Amo to SR-91, which is 1.9 miles and a total cost equal to $310 million.

d. The 4th ranked segment is from Firestone to Florence, which costs $620 million.

The 3rd and 4th ranking segments are very close in the criteria metric measurements. Willits discussed the right of way requirements and the principal components, and definitions, including access control, the footprint and the temporary construction easements. Principal costs include construction, right of way, support and risk, and all costs are today’s cost and not escalated for when a segment might be constructed.

Ernesto would like to see one of these segments move into final design. Metro’s recommendation with the parameters from the Board is the PCH to I-405 segment. Detail has been provided regarding the recommendation. Metro envisions a healthy discussion of the pros and cons of these segments. They still want to present Air Quality benefits (next month) which isn’t tied to the geographical location. Metro asks each City to provide feedback to the group on these candidates. It’s also noted that Local Hire is in the parameters set by the Metro Board; current federal policy prohibits the use of local hire provisions on a project that has any federal funds. Metro is looking at what it would take (legislatively) to change that.
Yvette asked what the timeline is for a segment recommendation? Ernesto noted anytime prior to the end of the year.

Yvette asked about the methodology to come to a recommendation, which seems unclear. Ernesto explained that Metro envisions each City will need to go through its own review process over the next three months. By October, the TAC would be asked to either concur with Metro’s recommendation, or develop and support an alternative approach.

Mohammad Mostahkami asked the following questions:
1. How much freeway money is available, and how much is available in the next 10 years or so? Ernesto noted that about $300 million is available in Measure R, with an infusion of Measure M funds in 2024 and leveraging of State and Federal funds. Metro thinks they can afford about a $500 million project in the next 10 years.

2. The line item for total costs includes contingencies for uncertainty, as well as design, construction management, construction, and right of way.

3. The candidate with the most right-of-way impacts, in raw numbers of relocations, is the southern segment with approximately 25 relocations with the others lower, at 19, 12 and 17, respectively by priority.

4. In the criteria used to rank the segments, how close were the rankings to each other? The 1st and the 2nd were relatively close, with the 1st being 1st almost on every criteria, similarly to the 2nd. There was mixed bag between the 3rd and 4th.

5. Is there consideration for getting all segments shovel ready and designed, so if funds become available, they can move forward with right-of-way and construction? Ernesto noted that these are large projects with millions invested in final design. He worries that plans that sit on the shelf would have to be updated at additional costs, which presents risk. They’d recommend limiting to 2 vs. all 4 due to the design costs alone.

Chino with the City of Downey asked a few questions concerning the $500-$600 million available to construct a project over the next 10 years (estimated), which is a combination of funds (local, state and federal). If Metro is recommending segment 1 (for approximately $500 million) for example, does this mean that the other segments won’t be done until after 10 years? Ernesto noted that a funding plan would have to wait until the next decade, and the entire freeway is approximately $6 billion, so it will take time to fund the program.
Chino also commented that the Firestone and 105 segment might be more viable due to total cost, and could be delivered while the final design for another segment is initiated with the extra/left over funds.

Bill Pagett asked about Caltrans SB 1 funds, and their allocation of $200 million per year, with the I-710 being a high priority within the state. He also supports getting 2 or 3 segments project ready. He also noted some clarifications on the agreements necessary for the segment from Firestone up to Florence. Ernesto noted that Metro is listening to the alternative approach of project readiness in getting multiple segments ready for design and that SB1 is a prime target for leveraging local funds.

Alvin Papa also noted that he supports designing the top 2 projects, noting that if we have a few ready to go, that we will be ready for federal grants as they become available. This will also allow us to look at the agreements and the right-of-way impacts, and to obtain community input during the design. He asked if Metro has a plan for community engagement for the four segments, while the TAC contemplates the merits of the projects. Ernesto noted that the TAC is the central focus which is connected to the City Councils which is connected to the LAC’s, and with Metro support, they’d like to work with everyone until October, and hopefully get a decision.

Yvette confirmed that TAC’s recommendation will go directly to the Metro Board. It will be reported to the GCCOG Board and Transportation Committee but will not be subject to a vote.

Bill also noted that the Shoemaker Bridge could be competing for funds. Ernesto noted that this isn’t necessarily the situation as Shoemaker would not be a good TCEP candidate, but we are all competing for funding, just not from the same programs.

Mohammad noted the importance of actually delivering the highway improvements and pushing for funds from wherever possible, furthering the argument for designing all 4 segments and having them project ready. The goal should be to get the project delivered as quickly as possible. Ernesto noted that they also share the sense of urgency to deliver the project and lobby for funds.

Jose Loera asked for a copy of the criteria used for the rankings, so it can be shared with City Councils. Also, a the 105 express lanes project being taken into account? Lastly, have the 2028 Olympics been taken into account when making recommendations? Ernesto noted that they can share the criteria used in making the recommendation, but factors such as the Olympics weren’t included, vs. maximizing safety, mobility and air quality, while minimizing right-of-way impacts. There are no major improvements to the 710/105 interchange as it was built in 1991, so there are no major improvements proposed for the interchange. Shannon went through the criteria in May and it will be sent back out.
It was moved by Mohammed Mostahkami (Commerce) moved to receive and file with second from Delfino Consunji (Downey), without objection or abstentions, the motion passed.

B. Current 710 Early Action Project Update

Measure R handout was provided and shown, as well as status of the Funding Agreements (monthly report) for the local projects. There is approximately $81 million left in the total non-freeway funds.

It was moved by Dan Garcia (Compton) and seconded by Mohammed Mostahkami (Commerce) to receive and file.

VIII. COG Engineers Report

GCCOG Engineer Yvette Kirrin’s report noted the many Complete Streets studies ongoing, as well as the Metro Active Transportation (MAT) Application submitted for the Randolph Corridor. She thanked everyone for the participation in the many meetings.

IX. Matters from the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee

No further matters

X. Matters from the Chair

XI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:21 p.m.
VI. REPORTS
Item A
Early Action Program Update
I-710 South Corridor Project

Early Action Program Update

August 19, 2020

Alternative 5C

- Modernizes the freeway
- Enhances safety
- Improves capacity
- Improves air quality
- Funds complementary programs

~ $6 Billion Total Cost
Early Action Program (or EAP)

$1.2 BILLION
($600 MILLION FIRST 10 YEARS)

* NOT TO SCALE

- INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENTS
  - AUX LANES
- NEW/IMPROVED SIGNALS
- SIGNAL SYNCHRONIZATION
- NEW LA RIVER CROSSINGS
- CLEAN TRUCK PROGRAM
- COMMUNITY HEALTH BENEFIT

**Metro**

$6 BILLION

Current Community Participation Structure

**Legend:**
- Information Sharing
- Submit Recommendations

October 2018
I-710 Freeway Program EAP

Constraints / Requirements

➢ Within 1st Decade Measure Funding
➢ Board Motion Criteria
➢ Schedule Risks
➢ Must Have Logical Termini & Independent Utility
➢ Result: 4 Candidate Segments

Goals

➢ Identify Best Value (i.e. “Bang for the Buck”)
➢ Deliver Improvements by 2028
➢ Leverage Additional Funding Sources
➢ Equity (Multiple Factors)

EAP Candidate Segments Summary Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Bottleneck Relief</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Active Transportation Improvements</th>
<th>Congestion Reduction</th>
<th>Freight System Reliability</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Average Score &amp; Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firestone to Florence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-105 to Firestone</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Amo to SR-91</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCH to I-405</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relative “1 to 10” Score & Ranking

Technical Recommendation
# Metro’s Technical Recommendation

## Rationale for PCH to 405 EAP
- The comparative score is significantly higher than the other candidates.
- Potential bottleneck relief and congestion reduction are the most significant factors.
- As an EAP, it is likely the most competitive 710 segment for grant funds, like TCEP.
- The segment arguably provides the best value, even if down-scoping is required by funding limitations.

---

## PCH to 405 is the most deficient candidate with the greatest need

---

## Funding Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure R Freeway Funding Available</th>
<th>Approx. $230 Million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>710 Early Action Segment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCH to 405</td>
<td>Approx. Design Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$49 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approx. ROW Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$77.2 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$490 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-105 to Firestone</td>
<td>Approx. Design Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$35 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approx. ROW Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$31.9 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$350 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Amo to SR91</td>
<td>Approx. Design Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$31 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approx. ROW Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$78.3 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$310 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firestone to Florence</td>
<td>Approx. Design Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$65 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approx. ROW Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$88.8 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$620 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Freeway EAP Cost</td>
<td>Approx. Design Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$180 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approx. ROW Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$276.2 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,770 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP Statewide</td>
<td>$1.4 Billion (min 30% match)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure M is available starting 2024</td>
<td>$500 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Right of Way Capital Costs

Breakdown:

- Acquisition: Real Property Fee or Easement (Including TCEs)
- RAP: Relocation Assistance Program (residents, business, railroad)
- Title & Escrow
- Demo: Hazardous Materials Mitigation
- Utility Relocations

Segment Analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Home / Business Relocations</th>
<th>Partial Acquisitions and TCEs</th>
<th>Demolition</th>
<th>Utility Relocations</th>
<th>Total ROW Cost ($M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firestone to Florence</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-105 to Firestone</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Amo to SR-91</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCH to I-405</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35% EAP Design

Purpose: Minimize risks to scope changes that affect the project's cost and schedule.

- Key Tasks Include:
  - Standalone Traffic Report
  - Subsurface Field Investigations: Geotechnical, Materials, and Hazardous Waste
  - Design Surveys and Positive Utility Locating (i.e. potholing)
  - Structure Type Selection: Bridges, Walls, and Pump Stations
    - Preliminary Foundation Reports
    - Preliminary Hydraulic Reports (LA River Bridges)
  - Preliminary Storm Water Engineering: Pumping and Treatment
  - Right of Way Requirements
  - Right of Way Engineering: Title Investigations and Appraisal Mapping
  - Utility Engineering: Preliminary Relocation Design and Prior Rights Determinations

- Key Agreements / Approvals:
  - Cooperative Agreements
    - LA County: River Bridges, Flood Control Facilities/Encroachments, and Right of Way
    - Cities: City Streets and Facilities
  - Freeway Agreements
    - Access Changes: Interchange Modifications and Removals/Restrictions
  - FHWA Approval
    - Interstate Access Modifications
    - Design Exceptions for Controlling Criteria
  - US Army Corp Section 408 Permits

- Design Costs
  - Approximately $3 to $5 Million per EAP
    - Design Engineering
    - ROW / Utility Engineering
  - Requires active 3rd party cooperation and may require additional support cost for 3rd parties
Other EAP Components

- Arterial Street Improvements
  - Can advance independent of freeway EAP
- Active Transportation Improvements
  - Some new crossings over LA River may be included with freeway EAP; others can advance independently
  - Freeway improvements will include new or improved bike lanes on the crossing arterial streets
- Clean Truck Program – Deploy NZE and/or ZE Trucks
- Soundwalls
- Community Benefits Program

Integrated Corridor Management

- Bridge the gap between local agency systems and Caltrans in coordinating strategies to respond to major traffic incidents and non-recurrent congestion.
- Leverage existing systems deployed to date and recommend any necessary improvements to integrate local arterials and the I-710 freeway.
  - Detection, traffic signal equipment upgrades, communications, traffic management centers, traffic control system, changeable message signs, dynamic ramp metering
- Costs
  - Design (PS&E): $5 M
  - Implementation (Capital): $35 M ($24 M could come from TCEP)
Pedestrian/Bicycle-Only Crossings

- Crossing can be constructed independently before freeway, with redesign
- Crossing can be constructed independently before freeway, without redesign
- Crossing cannot be constructed independently before freeway

Measure R I-710 EAP Non-freeway Funding
I-710 Clean Truck Program

The 710 Clean Truck Program (CTP) was added into the 710 environmental document as a Programmatic Element based on strong community support.

- Leverage additional investment to support cleaner air quality for corridor communities
- CTP to be implemented by 2035 along with overall 710 Project

CTP scope:

- Deploy 4,000 Near Zero-Emission (NZE) or Zero-Emission (ZE) trucks
- Fueling and charging stations for ZE trucks

Soundwall Program (Packages 2 & 3)

Package 2 (North of SR-91)

- New SW: 2,713 LF
- Aesthetically Treated: 2,659 LF
- Project Total Cost: $11.6 million
- Potential LPP: $5.8 million
- Anticipated Start date: Fall 2021

Package 3 (South of SR-91)

- New SW: 13,776 LF
- Retrofit SW: 4,131 LF
- Aesthetically Treated: 4,750 LF
- Project Total Cost: $52 million
- Potential LPP: $25 million
- Anticipated start date: 2022

Total

New Soundwall – 4.6 Miles
Aesthetically Treat Existing Soundwall – 7.1 Miles
I-710 Community Health & Benefit Program

Objective
- Makes funding available to implement projects and outreach activities to improve air quality/public health

Examples of Eligible Projects
- HEPA filters in schools, day care facilities, senior, clinics and hospitals
- School bus or senior transport vehicle retrofit/replacement
- Community health testing, education, and outreach, mobile asthma clinics
- Greenhouse gas reduction projects: renewable power, energy efficiency upgrades, tree-planting

Eligible Grant Receipts
Communities close to I-710:
- Cities/Unincorporated LA County
- Day Care Centers/Senior Centers
- Community Health Providers
- Non-Profit Organizations (with an air quality or public health mandate)

Metro’s Technical Recommendation

Rationale for PCH to 405 EAP
- The comparative score is significantly higher than the other candidates.
- Potential bottleneck relief and congestion reduction are the most significant factors.
- As an EAP, it is likely the most competitive 710 segment for grant funds, like TCEP.
- The segment arguably provides the best value, even if down-scoping is required by funding limitations.

PCH to 405 is the most deficient candidate with the greatest need
Metro’s Recommendation cont.

- Arterial Street Improvements
  - Prepare final Design for ICM (Metro)
  - Continue to advance arterial improvements (cities)
- Active Transportation Improvements
  - Evaluate inclusion of bike/ped crossing in EAP (TAC)
- Clean Truck Program – Deploy NZE and/or ZE Trucks
  - Begin Initial Phase (Metro)
- Soundwalls
  - Continue with construction/leverage funding (Metro)
- Community Benefits Program
  - Define Program detail and determine funding opportunities (GCCOG, TAC, Metro)
VI.REPORTS
Item B
Current 710 Early Action Project Update

- Jurisdictional Equity – Table/Pie-Chart
- Cash Flow (Freeway & Non-Freeway) Invoicing Status
Measure R I-710 South/EAP Nonfreeway Funding

### Non Freeway Programming By City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>PROGRAMMED (000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BELL</td>
<td>$245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELL GARDENS</td>
<td>$6,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCE</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOWNEY</td>
<td>$12,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTINGTON PARK</td>
<td>$700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA COUNTY</td>
<td>$700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>$3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYNWOOD</td>
<td>$865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYWOOD</td>
<td>$445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARAMOUNT</td>
<td>$2,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORT OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH GATE</td>
<td>$20,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERNON</td>
<td>$2,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCCOG</td>
<td>$3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>$437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARSON</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPTON</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUDAHY</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNAL HILL</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL NF PROGRAMMED** $78,723.40
**TOTAL NONFREEWAY (NF)** $160,000.00
**TOTAL REMAINING** $81,276.60
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### I-710 Early Action Projects (NON-FREEWAY) - Project Budget and Work Progress Summary ($000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Programmed</th>
<th>Expended</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCCOG</td>
<td>MOU306.03</td>
<td>GCCOG Eng Support Services</td>
<td>$3,100</td>
<td>$2,388</td>
<td>$712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>PS4720-3334</td>
<td>Program/Project Management Support (Complete)</td>
<td>$372</td>
<td>$289</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>MR306.38</td>
<td>710 Livability Grant Match</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$27</td>
<td>$38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA County</td>
<td>MR306.01</td>
<td>Whittier Blvd Corridor</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>MR306.37</td>
<td>Eastern at Bandini Rickenbacker (No FA)</td>
<td>$179</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>MR306.44</td>
<td>Gage Ave Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>$67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Gardens</td>
<td>F9111</td>
<td>Florence/Jabonera (CFP Match)</td>
<td>$283</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Gardens</td>
<td>MR306.30/F7120</td>
<td>Florence Ave/Eastern Ave (CFP Match)</td>
<td>$1,185</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Gardens</td>
<td>MR306.52</td>
<td>Garfield Ave &amp; Eastern Ave</td>
<td>$4,352</td>
<td>$283</td>
<td>$4,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>MR306.23</td>
<td>Washington Blvd Widening and Reconstruction (Complete)</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>MR306.45</td>
<td>Atlantic Blvd Improvements Project (Complete)</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>MR306.20</td>
<td>Paramount Blvd/Firestone (Complete)</td>
<td>$3,069</td>
<td>$3,043</td>
<td>$26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>MR306.42/E1705</td>
<td>Firestone Blvd Improvement (E1705)</td>
<td>$323</td>
<td>$323</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>MR306.31</td>
<td>Lakewood Blvd Improvement (Complete)</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$4,506</td>
<td>$1,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>MR306.49</td>
<td>Paramount Blvd at Imperial Hwy</td>
<td>$1,185</td>
<td>$154</td>
<td>$1,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Park</td>
<td>MR306.53</td>
<td>Slauson Ave Congestion Relief</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$276</td>
<td>$424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>MR306.22</td>
<td>Atlantic Ave/Willow St (Complete)</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$224</td>
<td>$76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>MR306.60</td>
<td>Shoreline Drive Realignment</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynwood (Metro)</td>
<td>MR306.59</td>
<td>Imperial Hwy Capacity Enhancements</td>
<td>$865</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynwood (Metro)</td>
<td>MR306.54</td>
<td>Imperial Hwy Corridor Congestion Relief</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maywood</td>
<td>MR306.56</td>
<td>Slauson Ave and Atlantic (No FA)</td>
<td>$445</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramount</td>
<td>MR306.32</td>
<td>Garfield Ave Improvements (Complete)</td>
<td>$2,825</td>
<td>$2,823</td>
<td>$2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Long Beach</td>
<td>MR306.55</td>
<td>Pier B Street Freight Corridor</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$531</td>
<td>$9,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gate</td>
<td>MR306.17</td>
<td>Atlantic Ave/Firestone Blvd (Complete)</td>
<td>$12,400</td>
<td>$12,400</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gate</td>
<td>MR306.33</td>
<td>Firestone Blvd Capacity Enhancement</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$4,635</td>
<td>$1,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gate</td>
<td>MR306.57</td>
<td>Imperial Highway Improvements</td>
<td>$1,456</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gate</td>
<td>MR306.58</td>
<td>Firestone Blvd at Otis St</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>MR306.25</td>
<td>Atlantic Blvd Bridge Widening and Rehab</td>
<td>$2,070</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,070</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL PROGRAMMED ($000s) $78,723**

**TOTAL NONFREEWAY ($000s) $160,000**

**REMAINING TO BE PROGRAMMED ($000s) $81,277**
## Measure R I-710 South/EAP Freeway Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Committed</th>
<th>Spent to Date</th>
<th>Est. Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-710 EIR-EIS (Enviro/Outreach)(^1)</td>
<td>$40,496</td>
<td>$32,499</td>
<td>$5,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-710 Utility Studies</td>
<td>$17,963</td>
<td>$17,963</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Party Support (SCE, USACE)</td>
<td>$5,223</td>
<td>$4,743</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Cities I-710 EIR-EIS Review(^2)</td>
<td>$1,306</td>
<td>$733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710 Clean Truck Program</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-710 Early Action Project (EAPs)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-710 Soundwalls EAPs (PA&amp;ED &amp; PS&amp;E &amp; Construction)</td>
<td>$72,918</td>
<td>$13,092</td>
<td>$74,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-710 Freeway EAPs (Shoemaker Bridge, Firestone On-Ramp/Bridge)</td>
<td>$28,350</td>
<td>$6,924</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-710/I-5 Interchange Project Development</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS Grant Match</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COMMITTED</strong></td>
<td>$228,855</td>
<td>$76,776</td>
<td>$5,974,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FREEWAY FUNDS</strong></td>
<td>$430,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REMAINING FUNDS</strong></td>
<td>$201,145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Committed Measure R funds only.

\(^2\) Total committed for Gateway Cities I-710 EIR-EIS Review includes funds that may have lapsed already.

\(^3\) Includes construction cost (if applicable) & may include additional funding sources.

\(^4\) Full funding is not committed unless otherwise stated.