I-710 Technical Advisory Committee  
Wednesday, June 17, 2020  
1:30 – 3:30 PM

Gateway Cities Council of Governments  
MEETING REMOTE LOCATION: VIA ZOOM  
ADDRESS: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83005951794  
Or by phone at 1-253-215-8782; Meeting ID #83005951794

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., June 17, 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 May 20, 2020 of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee.

CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION:

A MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM.

VI. REPORTS

45 Min

A. I-710 FEIR/FEIS Project
   • Status Update
   • Freeway Early Action Project – 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

15 Min

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

5 Min

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, July 15, 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
May 20, 2020

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:36p.m.

II. Roll Call

PRESENT: Bill Pagett, Chair, City of Bell and Paramount;
          Chau Vu, City of Bell Gardens;
          Daniel Hernandez- City of Commerce;
          Dan Garcia, City of Compton;
          Alvin Papa, City of Long Beach;
          Kevin Ko, City of Maywood;
          Kelli Tunnicliff City of Signal Hill;
          Art Cervantes, City of South Gate;
          Mahdad Derakhshani, LA County
          John Vassiliades, Cal Trans;
          Ernesto Chavez, Metro;
          Theresa Dau Ngo, POLB;
          Kerry Cartwright, POLA;

ABSENT:  Richard Garland, City of Carson;
          Aaron Hernandez Torres, City of Cudahy
          Delfino Consunji, City of Downey;
          Sergio Infanzon, City of Huntington Park
          Tom Thornton, City of Lynwood;
          Dan Wall, City of Vernon;
          Jacob Waclaw, FHWA & FTA;
          Garrett Damrath, Cal Trans;

Other attendees included: Yvette Kirrin, Kekoa Anderson,
Nancy Pfeffer & Karen Heit, GCCOG; Adriana Figueroa,
Paramount; Bo Burick, Mark Thomas; KeAndra Cylear Dodds,
Brett Roberts, Shannon Willits, Mark Dierking, Julio Perucho,
Lourdes Ortega, Lucy Delgadillo & Steve, Metro; Traci
Gleason, GWMA; Rachel Roque & Jocelyn Rivera-Olivas,
Supervisor Hahn; Ed Norris, Downey; Nina Turner, POLB;
Birgitta Ongawan, Jacobs Engineering; Dave Levingsohn &
III. Amendments to the Agenda

There were no amendments to the agenda.

IV. Public Comments

There were no public comments

V. Matters from Staff

Ms. Kirrin requested that Item D be moved ahead of Item A to minimize the risk of losing a quorum.

VI. Consent Calendar

It was moved by Daniel Hernandez (Commerce), seconded by Alvin Papa (Long Beach), to approve the minutes of the meeting of April 15, 2020. The motion was approved without objection.

VII. Reports

D. I-710 Early Action Projects – Request Funds

City of Paramount – Rosecrans HBR Bridge Improvement Project over the LA River

Adriana made the presentation for the Rosecrans Bridge Funding Request. She noted that it’s 2 structures that need retrofitting. Request includes design, environmental, design and construction. Funding request is for the local match portion for a total of $800,000.

Motion to approve the City of Paramount’s Funding Request for $800,000.

Questions: Ernesto brought up the consistence of how we review the projects, and requested that the City explain the traffic benefits or expand on it. Adriana added that outside shoulders would be added on each side of the road to help move traffic in an event that additional space is needed.
Ernesto noted that leveraging Measure R funds, like this project proposes to do, is great.

Ed Norris wanted to confirm the funds are in the FTIP. Adriana noted that it is.

It was moved by Chau Vu (Bell Gardens) and seconded by Alvin Papa (Long Beach) to approve the request. The item was approved without objection with abstention from South Gate and Signal Hill.

City of Long Beach – Shoemaker Bridge Project

Alvin Papa made the presentation for the Shoemaker Bridge funding request. He noted that the project is nearing the Environmental Phase, and moving into Design. He provided the Alternatives including Alternative - No Build, Alternative 2 – New Bridge south of the existing bridge, and Alternative 3 – New Bridge south of the existing bridge and to remove the existing bridge in its entirety. Design Option A included an elevated roundabout option, and Design Option B “Y” Intersection. The preferred option to move into design is Alternative 3, Design Option A. Alvin noted that the City has come to the TAC multiple times for additional funds for this project, including October 2012 (for $5.5m), April 2018 (for $5.5m) and June 2019 (for $2.8m). The request is $12.2 million to fill a funding gap for the design phase, as they have an additional $14 million in STIP funds that need to be allocated by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) on June 30, 2020. The total project cost is approximately $482.2 million, with the Design cost = $30.7m. Funding request is on schedule for May 28, 2020 Board meeting in order to meet CTC deadline requirements.

Ernesto provided comments in support of the request, including that leveraging of Measure R funds is important since Measure R/M cannot cover the entire cost of the Project. Ernesto also urged the TAC to approve this request in one meeting (instead of the normal 2-step approval process required for requests and beyond $5 million), due to the urgency of the matter with the CTC allocation deadline. He noted that Metro would work with the City for the timely use of the funds.

It was moved by Theresa Dau Ngo (Port of Long Beach) and seconded by Ernesto Chaves (Metro) to approve the item. The item was approved without objection.

A. I-710 EIR/EIS Update

   Item a: Status Update
Ernesto noted that a meeting has been scheduled (executive leadership level) with the EPA to discuss how to move ahead with the path to project resolution. The goal is still to get an approved document by year end. Kerry Cartwright requested clarification regarding Metro’s commitments to EPA. Ernesto stated that the commitment would include the $50 million allocation to the Clean Truck program, as well as developing the phasing for the project under the umbrella of the Goods Movement Strategic Plan. Metro is going to conduct a virtual Corridor-wide meeting to provide an update to the general-public on the status of the EIR/EIS, the Clean Truck Program, the Early Action Program, and to receive any feedback. The date is June 16, 2020 at 6pm.

Regarding the funding update, Ernesto noted that they want to continue to leverage funding. Alvin from Long Beach asked if the Measure R funds are protected from the effects of COVID-19 and the reduced sales tax revenue. Ernesto noted that the amount is safe, but the timeline may be impacted over the next 6-9 months, including cash flow issues during this time.

**Item b: TCEP Funding Opportunity**

Ernesto gave a brief update regarding the TCEP Funding, following the recommendation to prepare an application to fund the ICM and Truck Program plus other GCCOG subregional projects (including SR-91 projects) in the package. He noted that the Sound Walls are not TCEP eligible, but Metro will apply for Local Partnerships funds. A final number hasn’t been quantified.

**Item d: Equity Considerations**

KeAndra Cylear Dodds presented Metro’s Equity Program. She noted that equity in transportation matters because it’s about understanding and supporting people’s varying starting points and ability to access and/or move to where they need to go. She defined the 4 pillars of equity including define and measure, listen and learn, focus and deliver, and train and grow. Race and income are the two greatest determinations of inequities in the region which is why they are factors in Metro’s equity focused community definition. She noted that equity is both an outcome and process. She plans to create an equity advisory board to assist with the program. Metro is developing equity tools to help determine how do we achieve equitable outcomes. The first tool requires a process that includes stating the goals, analyzing disaggregated data to identify disparities, engagement with the community to further understand their needs, using information gathered to plan for equitable project
outcomes, project implementation, project evaluation and strengthening and reporting back. Regarding the 710, there is an Equity Focused Communities (EFC) map which is slightly different than the environmental justice map (under the poverty level). The EFC map covers less of the 710 project area because, several of these areas are heavily reliant on cars and the third factor in the EFC is zero car ownership. Several maps were presented with overlaps, including the CalEnviroScreen 3.0 Map. The burdens and benefits of the Corridor are not shared equally meaning the broader region gets benefits and the burdens tend to be localized especially amongst the vulnerable residents and communities living right along the Corridor. Benefits could include local hire policies, minimizing construction impacts and increased active transportation amongst other things.

Ernesto asked if there are any questions from the TAC. Dan Garcia from Compton asked (on behalf of Compton) about issues related to past financial and political problems and history, as they are not able to promote their ability to deliver projects.

B. Current I-710 Early Action Project Update

Ernesto provided his funding update handout, and no presentation was provided. He noted to direct any questions to him.

It was moved by John Vassiliades (Caltrans) and seconded by Adriana Figueroa (Paramount) to receive and file the item. The item was approved without objection.

C. Development of Bylaws for I-710

Nancy Pfeffer, COG Executive Director, presented the I-710 Bylaws – current draft of May 2020, including the draft outline, with a goal to consolidate its policies and procedures in moving ahead with large scale recommendations.

A few comments included the concern that this meeting approved large funding request for Long Beach that was well in excess of $5 million as part of a 1 meeting process, while other agencies have not had that opportunity when quorum was not met, which in effect penalized and keeping them from receiving funds.

Long Beach also commented that considerations such as Motion 22.1 and environmental justice could be considered, the ability to leverage local funds, and the number of jobs these projects could create.
It was moved by Bill Pagett (Bell) and seconded by Daniel Hernandez (Commerce) to receive and file the item. The item was approved without objection.

Back to reports Item A (out of Order)
Item C: Freeway Program EAP Development Screening Process and Initial Findings

Ernesto provide an introduction, and then turned it over to Shannon, regarding the high-level screening criteria that we’d look at the next meeting

It was moved by John Vassiliades (Caltrans) and seconded by Daniel Hernandez (Commerce) to receive and file the item. The item was approved without objection.

VIII. COG Engineers Report

IX. Matters from the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee

Alvin from LB wanted to get a clarification from Ernesto to receive and file his report, but the recommended action may be something different? He asked for clarity on next steps. Ernesto noted that he’ll provide a timeline before the next meeting.

X. Matters from the Chair

XI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:42 p.m.
VI. REPORTS
Item A
I-710 TAC EAP
Freeway Program EAP Development
Screening Process Recap and Initial Findings

June 15, 2020

Developing the I-710 Freeway Program
EAP – Screening Results

4 Candidate Segments – Identified at May TAC
➢ Elements within 1st Decade Measure Funding
➢ Follow Board Motion Criteria
➢ Lower Schedule Risks
➢ Have Logical Termini & Independent Utility

Goals
➢ Identify Best Value (i.e. “Bang for the Buck”)  
➢ Deliver Improvements by 2028
➢ Leverage Additional Funding Sources
➢ Equity (Multiple Factors) – Presented at May TAC
Freeway EAP – Screening Methodology

Benefits – *Project Purpose & Need*
- Mobility – *Findings presented at May TAC*
- Safety – *Findings presented at May TAC*
- Air Quality – *July TAC*

Costs / Impacts
- Right of Way Impacts – *Today*
- Project Cost Breakdowns – *Today*

Other Factors
- Community Benefit Program – *July TAC*
- Schedule / Risks – *Today*

---

Mobility / Safety Recap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criterion</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Bottleneck Relief</td>
<td>How well does the EAP address the worst traffic bottlenecks on I-710?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>How well does the EAP reduce operational conflict areas that contribute to vehicle collisions on I-710?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation Access / Safety</td>
<td>How well does the EAP promote bicycle/pedestrian use and provide traffic controls and safety features at ramp termini?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Reduction/Mitigation</td>
<td>How well does the EAP improve freeway operation and reduce congestion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight System Reliability</td>
<td>What is the comparative truck usage where improvements are proposed?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mobility / Safety – Combined Rankings

1st
PCH to 405

3rd
Del Amo to 91

Candidate Segments

2nd
105 to Firestone

4th
Firestone to Florence

Cost & Right of Way Impacts

$490M
PCH to 405

$310M
Del Amo to 91

17 Residential Relocations
(16% of Corridor Total)

53 Non-Residential Relocations
(34% of Corridor Total)

$350M
105 to Firestone

$620M
Firestone to Florence

Costs and relocations subject to geometric refinement
Right of Way Requirements

Principal Components:

• **Footprint** – Area outside of the existing freeway and street right of way needed for the project improvement.

• **Access Control** – Limits along the roadway with restricted access to ensure safe and effective traffic operation consistent with current Caltrans standards and the CA Streets and Highways Code.

• **Temporary Construction Easements** – Workspace outside the permanent footprint needed for the contractor to construct the improvements.

---

Right of Way Assumptions

• Some right of way requirements along local streets are the result of access control.

• In these cases for disclosure in the EIR/EIS, it is assumed that the existing use is not viable. As such, a full parcel acquisition is assumed and relocation of the existing use is required. These costs, which are expected to be the highest, are accounted for in planning estimates.

• Geometric refinement, access exceptions, and/or other mitigation may be considered for the EAP. These actions may eliminate the need for some relocations and reduce project costs.
Right of Way Impacts / Costs

Breakdown:
- **Real Property Acquisition:** Fee (Full Parcel or Partial) or Easement
- **Temporary Construction Easements**
- **Relocations & Relocation Assistance**
- **Utility & Railroad Involvement**

Full Parcel with Relocation
- **Residential:**
  - Single Family Homes
  - Multi-Unit Apartments
  - Mobile Homes
- **Non-Residential:**
  - Businesses (Commercial or Industrial)
  - Non-Profit Organizations
  - Billboards
  - Cell Towers

Project Costs / Risks

Principal Costs:

- **Construction** – Roadway and structure components, including contingencies.
- **Right of Way** – Real property acquisition and relocation assistance, utility relocation, and railroad involvement.
- **Support** – Design, Right of Way, Construction Management, and Administration.
- **Risk** – Uncertainties which potentially affect the project’s scope, cost, and/or schedule.

All estimates are reported in current $M (Millions) and are subject to escalation
PCH to I-405 – Limits

Existing

Proposed

2.4 Miles

PCH to I-405 – Relocations

Along Willow St
Along Hill St
Along Spring St

Proposed

Metro
Relocations along Willow St

Residential:
- 1 Storage (Zoned Res)

Non-Residential:
- 14 Retail
- 2 Service
- 1 Non-Profit
- 1 Billboard
- 1 Cell Tower

Totals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Res</th>
<th>Bus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WB Willow St</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB Willow St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relocations at Hill St

Residential:
- 1 SF Home
- 1 Duplex (2 Relocations)

Non-Residential:
- None

Totals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Res</th>
<th>Bus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hill St</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relocations at Spring St

Residential:
• 3 SF Homes

Non-Residential:
• None

Totals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Res</th>
<th>Bus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring St</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PCH to I-405 – Costs / Schedule Risks

Cost Summary
Roadway $141
Structure $182
Right of Way $73
Total Capital $296
Support $94
Total Cost $490

Agreements / Risks
• County / USACE agreements needed for new river bridges and replacements
• Freeway agreement needed for Willow Street access restrictions
• City agreements needed for pump stations
• Freeway agreement needed for Wardlow Ramp Closures
Del Amo to SR-91 – Limits

Existing

Proposed

1.9 Miles

Del Amo to SR-91 – Relocations

Along Del Amo Blvd

Proposed
Del Amo to SR-91 – Relocations

Residential:
• None

Non-Residential:
• 1 Service (Self Storage)
• 1 Retail
• 5 Warehouses
• 9 Small Office/Retail
• 1 Billboard

Totals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Res</th>
<th>Bus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Dominguez</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Del Amo to SR-91

Cost Summary

- Roadway $106
- Structure $78
- Right of Way $64
- Total Capital $248
- Support $62
- Total Cost $310

Key Cost/Schedule Risks

- County / USACE agreements needed for river bridge replacement
- Freeway agreement needed for Del Amo Blvd access restrictions
- Complex Business Acquisitions
- Major Utility Relocations

Metro
I-105 to Firestone – Limits

Existing

2.2 Miles

Proposed

I-105 to Firestone – Relocations

Along Imperial Hwy

Proposed

Metro
Relocations along Imperial Hwy

Residential:
- 6 Unit Multiplex

Non-Residential:
- 5 Retail
- 1 Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Relocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Res</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gate</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynwood</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I-105 to Firestone – Costs / Schedule Risks

**Cost Summary**
- Roadway $139
- Structure $106
- Right of Way $30
- Total Capital $275
- Support $75
- **Total Cost** $350

**Agreements / Risks**
- County / USACE agreements needed for river bridge replacements
- Freeway agreement needed for Imperial Highway access restrictions
- Parque Dos Rios mitigation

Metro
Firestone to Florence – Limits

Existing

2.2 Miles

Proposed

Firestone to Florence – Relocations

Near Southern Ave
Near Clara St

At Florence Ave

Metro
Relocations at Florence Interchange

Residential:
- None

Non-Residential:
- 1 Large Service (Self Storage)
- 7 Service
- 1 Billboard

Totals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Res</th>
<th>Bus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relocations Near Clara Street

Residential:
- 2 SF Homes
- 4 Unit Multiplex

Non-Residential:
- None

Totals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Res</th>
<th>Bus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bell Gardens</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relocations near (New) Southern Ave

Residential:
- None

Non-Residential:
- 2 Billboards

Totals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Res</th>
<th>Bus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Gate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Firestone to Florence – Costs / Schedule Risks

Cost Summary
- Roadway: $235
- Structure: $170
- Right of Way: $90
- Total Capital: $495
- Support: $125
- Total Cost: $620

Agreements / Risks
- County / USACE agreements needed for river bridge replacements
- Freeway agreement needed for Florence Ave and Southern Ave
- Complex Business Acquisitions
- Railroad Agreement
- West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor
Humphreys Ave Ped Xing

No Relocations

Cost Summary
Roadway $1
Structure $5
Right of Way $0
Total Capital $6
Support $2
Total Cost $8

Freeway EAP – July Look Ahead

Benefits – Project Purpose & Need
➢ Air Quality

Other Factors
➢ Community Benefit Program
VI. REPORTS
Item B
I-710 Measure R Freeway Status
# 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)</td>
<td>$40,496</td>
<td>$32,404</td>
<td>$5,900,000</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</td>
<td>$1,306</td>
<td>$733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-710 Early Action Project (EAP) s</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-710 Soundwalls EAPs (PAEDE &amp; PS&amp;I &amp; Construction)</td>
<td>$72,918</td>
<td>$13,073</td>
<td>$74,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-710 Freeway EAPs (Shoemaker Bridge, Firestone On-Ramp/Bridge)</td>
<td>$12,450</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>$170,039</td>
<td>$76,661</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>$259,961</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.
VI. REPORTS
Item B
710 Measure R Non Freeway Status Update
## 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 Name</th>
<th>Programmed</th>
<th>Expended</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCCOG</td>
<td>MID.308.03</td>
<td>GCCOG Eng Support Services</td>
<td>$3,109</td>
<td>$2,337</td>
<td>$772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>P5472-334</td>
<td>Program/Project Management System</td>
<td>$872</td>
<td>$289</td>
<td>$583</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>MR305.01</td>
<td>Whittier Blvd Corridor</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Gardens</td>
<td>MR306.37</td>
<td>Eastern at Bandini Rickenbacker</td>
<td>$179</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Gardens</td>
<td>MR306.44</td>
<td>Sepulveda Ave Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>$67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Gardens</td>
<td>F9111</td>
<td>Florence Ave (CPP Match)</td>
<td>$283</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Gardens</td>
<td>MR306.30/7120</td>
<td>Florence Ave/Eastern Ave (CPP Match)</td>
<td>$1,185</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>MR306.23</td>
<td>Washington Blvd Widening and</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruction (Completized)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>MR306.45</td>
<td>Atlantic Blvd Improvements Project</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Completized)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>MR306.20</td>
<td>Paramount Blvd Redstone</td>
<td>$3,069</td>
<td>$3,048</td>
<td>$26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Completized)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>MR306.42/1705</td>
<td>Preston Ave Improvement</td>
<td>$323</td>
<td>$286</td>
<td>$37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>MR306.31</td>
<td>Lakewood Blvd Improvement</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$4,506</td>
<td>$1,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Completized)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>MR306.69</td>
<td>Paramount Blvd at Imperial Hwy</td>
<td>$3,185</td>
<td>$154</td>
<td>$3,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>Stratton Ave Congestion Relief</td>
<td>$790</td>
<td>$224</td>
<td>$476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>MR306.22</td>
<td>Atlantic Ave/Willow St (Completized)</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$224</td>
<td>$76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>MR306.60</td>
<td>Lynwood Drive Realignment</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynwood</td>
<td>MR306.59</td>
<td>Impala Ave Capacity</td>
<td>$850</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MR306.54</td>
<td>Impala Ave/Highway Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maywood</td>
<td>MR306.56</td>
<td>Stratton 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</td>
<td>$2,825</td>
<td>$2,823</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Completized)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Long Beach</td>
<td>MR306.05</td>
<td>Pier B Street Freight Corridor</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$5,131</td>
<td>$4,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gate</td>
<td>MR306.17</td>
<td>Atlantic Ave/Freeway Blvd</td>
<td>$12,400</td>
<td>$12,400</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Completized)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gate</td>
<td>MR306.33</td>
<td>Firestone Blvd Capacity Enhancement</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$4,615</td>
<td>$1,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gate</td>
<td>MR306.58</td>
<td>Firestone Blvd at Olys St</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Nuys</td>
<td>MR306.25</td>
<td>Atlantic Blvd Bridge Widening and</td>
<td>$2,070</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,070</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**TOTAL NON-FREeway ($000s)** $160,000

**REMAINING TO BE PROGRAMMED ($000s)** $85,277
## Measure R I-70 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>$8,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCE</td>
<td>$19,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOWNY</td>
<td>$12,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTINGTON PARK</td>
<td>$710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA COUNTY</td>
<td>$710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYNWOOD</td>
<td>$901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYWOOD</td>
<td>$443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARAMUS MT</td>
<td>$2,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORT OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>$10,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN GATE</td>
<td>$20,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERNON</td>
<td>$2,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEDCO</td>
<td>$3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>$437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARSON</td>
<td>$3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPTON</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUDAHY</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNAL HILL</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RE PROGRAMMED</strong></td>
<td><strong>79,722,450</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REQUISITIONED</strong></td>
<td><strong>104,680,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REMAINING</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,977,650</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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