

**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 9<sup>th</sup> 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 2<sup>nd</sup> ranked segment is from 105 to Firestone, with a total cost of \$350 million.
  - c. The 3<sup>rd</sup> ranked segment is from Del Amo to SR-91, which is 1.9 miles and a total cost equal to \$310 million.
  - d. The 4<sup>th</sup> ranked segment is from Firestone to Florence, which costs \$620 million.

The 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> 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 1<sup>st</sup> and the 2<sup>nd</sup> were relatively close, with the 1<sup>st</sup> being 1<sup>st</sup> almost on every criteria, similarly to the 2<sup>nd</sup>. There was mixed bag between the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>.
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.