

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
I-710 CORRIDOR PROJECT EIR/EIS
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
16401 Paramount Blvd., Paramount, CA
December 13, 2017**

I. Call to Order

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

II. Roll Call

PRESENT: Bill Pagett, Chair, City of Bell and City of Paramount; Douglas Benash, City of Bell Gardens; Richard Garland, City of Carson; Wendell Johnson, City of Compton; Ed Norris, City of Downey; Sean Crumby, City of Long Beach; Ray Abassi, City of Lynwood; Art Cervantes, City of South Gate; Dan Wall, City of Vernon; Paul Barbe, County of Los Angeles; Ron Kosinski, Caltrans; Ernesto Chaves, MTA; Theresa Dau Ngo, POLB; Connie Rivera, ACTA (ex officio).

ABSENT: Maryam Babaki, City of Commerce; Aaron Hernandez, City of Cudahy; Sergio Infanzon, City of Huntington Park; Dan Garcia, City of Maywood; Kelli Tunnicliff, City of Signal Hill; Jacob Waclaw, FHWA & FTA; Kerry Cartwright, POLA; Annie Nam, SCAG; Representative from the California Highway Patrol; Mike Krause, SCAQMD; Donald Johnson, SCE (ex officio); Steve Broyles, LADWP (ex officio).

Other attendees included: Clint Herrera, City of South Gate; Lance Grindle, County of Los Angeles; Lucy Olmos, Metro; Julia Brown, Metro; Yvette Kirrin, GCCOG; Kekoa Anderson, GCCOG; Jack Joseph, GCCOG; Julie Rush, AECOM; Traci Gleason, Koa Consulting; Sam Ekrami, Parsons; Stephanie Dolor, TY Lin; Camilo Rocha, HDR; Try Khou, HDR; Mario Montes, HDR; Rob McCann, LSA; Jim Girouard, WSP; Mazen Mneimneh, Biggs Cardosa Associates.

III. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Ray Abassi.

IV. Amendments to the Agenda

There were no amendments to the agenda.

V. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

VI. Matters from Staff

There were no matters from staff.

VII. Consent Calendar

It was moved by Ray Abassi, seconded by Paul Barbe, to approve the minutes of the meeting of September 20, 2017. The motion was approved unanimously.

VIII. Reports

A. I-710 EIR/EIR Project Updates

- **Summary of Public Comments**
- **Project Alternatives Evaluation**
- **Community Outreach Update**

Ernesto Chaves introduced Julie Rush, AECOM, who gave a PowerPoint presentation on the technical findings regarding the two build alternatives. She said he would summarize the key findings comparing the two build alternatives to show which performs better.

The first item was air quality, which had a mix of sub-items showing either alternative 7 or 5C performing better. She continued to provide a detailed presentation, noting the difficulty of phasing the project alternatives, including the need to rebuild the entirety of I-710 in order to place the columns for the freight corridor under Alternative 7, since the freight corridor cannot be constructed in pieces. She said Alternative 5C could be constructed and utilized in pieces. Other topics of comparison included rights-of-way, level of service, travel times, and other mobility benefits and impacts.

Ernesto Chaves then presented a summary of the public review of the I-710 RDEIR/RDEIS. He noted that over 2,300 comments were received following three public hearings and multiple community meetings. He said the key issues were heard multiple times. He said a comparison of zero emission and near-zero emission trucks was provided, including information on subsidies and affordability. He said the staff recommendation was to do the same as the ports, with a phased approach by purchasing near-zero emission trucks with a transition to zero emission trucks as the technology becomes available and less expensive. Lastly, he said, there was a discussion of the design options 3A and 3B for the East Los Angeles area, with the conclusion that there isn't enough benefit to justify the cost of either option. Similarly, there is a design option 2A in Long Beach, which only goes with Alternative 5C, to save \$35 million and avoid business impacts.

Mr. Chaves concluded that Metro staff are recommending Alternative 5C, but are not asking the TAC to make a recommendation at this time.

Several questions were answered dealing with the technical components that went into the mobility improvements, as well as the zero and near-zero emission truck purchases. Mr. Chaves noted that there was an assumption of the purchase of 4,000 trucks as the base (which was from a per unit cost and guess of funding availability) versus 18,350 to match the travel demand of the truck corridor.

Art Cervantes commented that the side by side comparisons of the two build alternatives provides transparency and recommended that the charts move forward to the policy makers. He recommended another side by side comparison of funding levels versus performance expectations. For example, he said, is Alternative 7 truly the best for air quality based on the anticipated funding levels for the project? He said the answer may be “no”, and the leaders need to understand what their decisions can lead to, as it would like support Alternative 5C. While there are more boxes on the engineering technical side regarding the alternatives, the policy measures and other factors that are important to the common person may not be aligned with the technical team and they may not understand the implication of their recommendation.

Mr. Chaves pointed out that both options assume that the SCIG and ICTF are implemented. He said the ports are doing everything they can via putting cargo on trains, but there is a high need for containers on trucks due to the destination of so much cargo being the southern part of the state.

Connie Rivera noted that the Alameda Corridor does not compete with the freeway for multiple reasons, but primarily that cargo needs to travel 300-500 miles (i.e. beyond the Rocky Mountains) to be cost effective to be shipped by train.

Mr. Chaves said Metro will be back at the January meeting for more questions and answers and a recommendation. He said the recommendation if a locally preferred alternative would go to the Metro Board in February, which would then advance a recommendation to Caltrans, after which the final environmental process would take place to lead to a Record of Decision. He also noted that staging the project in buildable portions still would need to be worked out in 2018 so that final design packages can be completed. Requests for proposals for design would be issued in winter 2019.

It was moved by Ray Abassi, seconded by Ed Norris, to receive and file the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

B. I-710 Early Action Projects Status Update and Request for Funds
• **Shoemaker Bridge PS&E Phase—City of Long Beach**

Ernesto Chaves passed out a monthly status report on the Early Action cash flow showing allocations and expenditures. He noted that Metro is working on several agreements.

Sean Crumby gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Shoemaker Bridge Replacement Project in the City of Long Beach. He said the bridge is over 60 years old, with many issues. He said \$5.5 million had been received so far on this project just to get through the CEQA process on design.

Traci Gleason, Koa Consulting, reviewed the City's response to the nine questions used by the TAC to determine a project's consistency with the adopted funding criteria.

Mr. Crumby summarized the project, saying it is consistent with the I-710 project goals, provides active transportation improvements, and maximizes usable Cesar Chavez Park areas. He said the construction cost estimate for the project is between \$250 and \$350 million. He said the anticipated request at this time is for \$5.5 to \$15.5 million to complete design.

It was moved by Art Cervantes, seconded by Wendell Johnson, to receive and file the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

IX. Matters from the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee

There were no matters from committee members.

X. Matters from the Chair

There were no matters from the chair.

XI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 3:21 p.m.