FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The 91/605/405 Corridor Cities Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The 91/605/405 Corridor Cities Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the 91/605/405 Corridor Cities Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the 91/605/405 Corridor Cities Committee at the following times:

A. AGENDA ITEM: at this time the 91/605/405 Corridor Cities 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 91/605/405 Corridor Cities Committee agenda; and

C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL – BY SELF INTRODUCTIONS

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

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

VI. MATTERS FROM STAFF

VII. 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 Committee.

A. Approval of Minutes for the Meeting of October 24, 2012

VIII. REPORTS

A. Purpose and Need Statement and Typical Standard Cross Section

10 Min

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO CONCUR WITH TAC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE PURPOSE AND NEEDS STATEMENTS FOR BOTH PSR-PDS AND FORWARD TO CALTRANS; RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT, AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

B. Early Action Hot Spot Projects for Arterial Highway Improvement Projects

10 Min

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO CONCUR WITH TAC RECOMMENDATIONS; RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT, AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

IX. COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

X. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 6:00 p.m. unless the Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next scheduled meeting.

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.
VII. CONSENT CALENDAR

Item A.

Approval of Minutes for October 24, 2012
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
SR-91/I-605/I-405 CORRIDOR CITIES COMMITTEE

A Meeting Held at the
Gateway Cities Council of Governments
16401 Paramount Blvd., Paramount, CA
October 24, 2012

I. Call to Order

Chairman Daniels called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Roll Call was taken by self-introductions.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:  Gene Daniels, City of Paramount, Chair; Jim Edwards, City of Cerritos; Lillie Dobson, City of Compton; David Gafin, City of Downey; Diane DuBois, City of Lakewood; Cheri Kelley, City of Norwalk; Bob Archuleta, City of Pico Rivera; Luis Gonzalez, City of Santa Fe Springs; Owen Newcomer, City of Whittier; James Yang, County of Los Angeles.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:  Tony Lima, City of Artesia; Raymond Dunton, City of Bellflower; Reynaldo Rodriguez, City of Hawaiian Gardens; Gerrie Schipske, City of Long Beach.

ALSO PRESENT:  Pico Rivera Director of Public Works Art Cervantes; Pico Rivera Deputy Director of Economic Development Julia Gonzalez; Ernesto Chaves, Project Manager, MTA; Lucy Olmos, Transportation Planner, MTA; Steve Huff, Senior Project Manager, RBF Consulting; Gary Hamrick, Vice President, Iteris, Inc.; Jack Joseph, Deputy Executive Director, GCCOG; Jerry Wood, GCCOG Engineer.

III. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Member Gonzalez.

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 Member DuBois, seconded by Member Newcomer, to approve the minutes of the meeting of September 26, 2012. The motion was approved unanimously.

VIII. Reports

A. Feasibility Study and Supporting Reports

Steve Huff, Senior Project Manager, RBF Consulting, gave a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the content of the final Feasibility Report. He said the report included freeway congestion hot spot problem analysis and solution project definition. He said the freeway congestion improvement and benefit/cost assessment was based on preliminary cost ranges, 2035 level of service, accidents greater than 30% over the statewide average, environmental and right of way considerations, congestion score, and a qualitative benefit/cost statement.

Mr. Huff presented a sample freeway congestion hot spot problem and improvement analysis for the westbound SR-91 freeway from Artesia Blvd. to the N/B connector to I-605. He then described a SR-91/I-605/I-405 “hybrid” concept for improvements along these freeway corridors.

It was the consensus of the Committee to receive and file the report.

B. Congestion Areas and Options

Steve Huff of RBF Consulting gave a PowerPoint presentation on the recommended improvement projects and next steps for the freeway corridors. He said the next step per the Caltrans process is the preparation of a Project Study Report (PSR). He said three options had been presented to the Technical Advisory Committee: 1) individual area PSRs; 2) corridor level PSRs; and 3) congestion area PSRs. He said the Technical Advisory Committee had recommended option 3, congestion area PSRs as providing the best balance of project segregation flexibility, minimization of overlap,
logical separation of high and low value hot spot improvement areas, and flexibility for phased project development.

Mr. Huff reported that the Technical Advisory Committee’s recommendation is that the Corridor Cities Committee:

1) Proceed with PSR/PDSs under Option 3 for the following three congestion hot spots areas: SR-91/I-605 (labeled Congestion Area PSR No. 1); I-605/I-105/I-5 north to the Gateway Cities boundary (labeled Congestion Area PSR No. 2); and I-405/I-605 (labeled Congestion Area PSR No. 4), the latter of which would be deferred pending OCTA Board direction for I-405 widening locally preferred alternative in Orange County and to include a hybrid concept alternative for one lane widening, pending further coordination with the City of Long Beach;

2) Include an alternative for Congestion Area PSR No. 2 that would include HOV connector ramps at the I-605/I-105 interchange;

3) Concur with the TAC recommendation for Congestion Area PSR No. 5 (I-605/SR-60 interchange) that it be performed by other agencies (Caltrans, MTA, or San Gabriel Valley COG) and that the Gateway Cities COG cooperate with that effort; and

4) Review and concur with the TAC recommendation to defer preparing the Congestion Area PSR No. 3 for the SR-91/I-710 interchange until a decision is made on the I-710 project and that the Congestion Area PSR No. 3 would be a joint effort between the two TACs.

It was moved by Member Newcomer, seconded by Member Archuleta, to concur with the TAC recommendation. The motion was approved unanimously.

C. I-405 DEIR/EIS and Inter-County Planning Update

Ernesto Chaves, MTA, reported that meetings had been held with OCTA for the past two months concerning the impacts of the I-405 project in Orange County on the City of Long Beach. He said OCTA had agreed to do further analysis which should be completed in mid-November. He said that, now that OCTA had approved the alternative of adding one lane in each direction on I-405, it may impact the current analysis of the I-605/I-405 interchange and I-405 in Long Beach.

It was moved by Member DuBois, seconded by Member Dobson, to receive and file the report. The motion was approved unanimously.
IX. Comments from Committee Members

Chairman Daniels announced the upcoming Economic Development Summit to be held in Lakewood on October 31.

X. Adjournment

It was moved by Member DuBois, seconded by Member Dobson to adjourn. The motion was approved unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 6:57 p.m.
ITEM A.
Purpose and Need Statement and Typical Standard Cross Section
TO: SR-91/I-605/I405 Corridor Cities Committee

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director

BY: Jerry Wood, Director of Transportation and Engineering, Gateway Cities Council of Governments

SUBJECT: Purpose and Need Statement and Typical Standard Cross Section

**Background**

The preparation of the PSR-PDS underway for the 91/605 and the 105/605/5 interchange areas requires the preparation and approval of a purpose and need statement. The attached purpose and need statements have been prepared for both PSR-PDS and was submitted to the TAC for review and the TAC concurred and are recommending concurrence of the Corridor Cities Committee.

The analysis of the freeways requires that the cross-section be selected and then be analyzed using standard typical cross-sections. A memo on the recommendations for these standard typical cross-sections is attached for review and for information. Option 2 shown in the attached memo was selected with concurrence of Caltrans.

**Recommended Action**

1. Concur with TAC recommendations for the purpose and need statements for both PSR-PDS and forward to Caltrans and/or give direction to staff.

2. Receive and File information on the selected standard typical cross section and/or give direction to staff.
I-605/I-5 INTERCHANGE AREA PURPOSE AND NEED STATEMENT (6/4/2013)

Purpose

The I-605/I-5 system interchange area currently experiences significant congestion which is forecast to increase in the future absent physical and operational improvements to the facility. Congestion is a result of insufficient I-605 and I-5 freeway mainline capacity, closely spaced freeway entrance and exit ramps and inadequate older design issues at the freeway-to-freeway interchange. The existing freeway geometry has many features which do not meet current Caltrans Highway Design Manual Standards and there are a number of areas within the project limits with a high concentration of accidents. There are currently no separate HOV lanes on I-5 in the study area. The purpose of the project is to reduce congestion and improve freeway operations (both mainline and ramps), improve safety and improve local and freeway interchange operations while minimizing adjacent right-of-way, environmental and economic impacts.

Need

The project is needed in order to improve existing and future mainline I-605 and I-5 capacity deficiencies, improve system interchange ramp connectors where volumes exceed available capacity, provide separate I-5 HOV lanes, and improve inadequate merging and weaving distances between freeway entrance and exit ramps.

I-605/SR-91 INTERCHANGE AREA PURPOSE AND NEED STATEMENT

Purpose

The I-605/SR-91 system interchange area currently experiences significant congestion which is forecast to increase in the future absent physical and operational improvements to the facility. Congestion is a result of insufficient SR-91 and I-605 freeway mainline capacity, closely spaced freeway entrance and exit ramps, and inadequate older design issues at the freeway-to-freeway interchange. The existing system interchange geometry has many features which do not meet current Caltrans Highway Design Manual Standards and there are a number of areas within the project limits with a high concentration of accidents. The purpose of the project is to reduce congestion and improve freeway operations (both mainline and ramps), improve local and freeway interchange operations and improve safety while minimizing adjacent right-of-way, environmental and economic impacts.

Need

The project is needed in order to address existing and future mainline SR-91 and I-605 capacity deficiencies, improve system interchange ramp connectors where volumes exceed available capacity, and improve inadequate merging and weaving distances between freeway entrance and exit ramps.
TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

To: Jerry Wood, GCCOG
    Esteban Chavez,
    Metro

From: Gary Warkentin, RBF

Date: June 6, 2013

Subject: PSR-PDS Standard Typical Cross Section Recommendation

Metro, Gateway Cities Council of Governments (GCCOG) and Caltrans District 7 are preparing PSR-PDS's for improvements to the I-805/I-5 interchange and to the I-605/SR-91 interchange and adjacent areas. The PSR-PDS's will each have three build alternatives in addition to a no-build alternative. Alternative 1 will be the Hybrid Concept presented in the 605 Hot Spots Feasibility Study. Alternative 2 will apply Caltrans Highway Design Manual standards to the Alternative 1 design concept. Alternative 3 will be a combination of Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 with a goal of incorporating Caltrans standards to the improvement concept and keep construction of improvements within the existing state right-of-way to the maximum extent possible. The goal of this memorandum is to document the Project Team's recommendation on the Typical Cross Section standards to be used in the development of these PSR-PDS alternatives.

Exhibit A illustrates the basic standard median, shoulder and lane widths that will be used in developing Alternative 2. There are three options for the width of the freeway median and HOV lanes. These alternatives are included in the Caltrans 2003 HOV Design Guidelines.

Option 1, the Buffer-Separated HOV Facility with Enforcement Shoulders cross-section is the widest with a width of 62 feet between the edges of travel way of the No. 1 general purpose lanes.

Option 2, the Buffer-Separated HOV Facility cross section has a width of 54 feet between the edges of travel way of the No. 1 general purpose lanes. The reduction in width is the 10 foot wide left shoulder compared to the 14 foot wide left shoulder in Option 1.

Option 3, the Continuous Ingress/Egress Access HOV Facility has a width of 46 feet between the edges of travel way of the No. 1 general purpose lanes. The reduction in width is the elimination of the 4 foot wide HOV buffers.

All three median concepts meet Caltrans standards. Option 1 is not recommended because of existing right-of-way constraints. Option 3 is not recommended because Caltrans District 7 has not adopted a policy for continuous access HOV lanes. Therefore, Option 2 is the recommended standard median that will be incorporated in the PSR-PDS Alternative 2 standard preliminary geometric plans. Option 1 will also be assessed in order to provide an understanding of the additional right-of-way requirements of continuous enforcement shoulders.
EXHIBIT A
I-605/SR/91 & I-605/I-5 PSR-PDS’s
STANDARD TYPICAL CROSS SECTIONS

OPTION 1
BUFFER-SEPARATED HOV FACILITY
With Enforcement Shoulders
(2003 HOV DESIGN GUIDELINES)

OPTION 2
BUFFER-SEPARATED HOV FACILITY
(2003 HOV DESIGN GUIDELINES)

OPTION 3
CONTINUOUS INGRESS/EGRESS ACCESS HOV
(2003 HOV DESIGN GUIDELINES)

SINGLE & TWO-LANE
Freeway-To-Freeway Connections
VIII. REPORTS
ITEM B
Early Action Hot Spot Projects for Arterial Highway Improvement Projects
TO:          SR-91/I-605/I-405 Corridor Cities Committee
FROM:        Richard Powers, Executive Director
BY:          Jerry Wood, Director of Transportation and Engineering, Gateway Cities Council of Governments

SUBJECT:     Early Action Hot Spot Projects for Arterial Highway Improvement Projects

Background

Early in 2012, MTA proposed a programming approach for the initial programming of Measure R funds for the SR-91/I-605/I-405 corridors for the $590 M of Measure R funds allocated to those corridors. The attached Exhibit 1 summarizes the programming approach and approval that was forwarded and approved by the MTA board earlier this year. The TAC concurred with proceeding with the initial 33 intersections in the SR-91/I-605/I-405 Freeway Corridors that are the worst congested and that have been identified for improvements. The TAC reviewed the final list over many meetings to decide if the local agencies preferred with proceeding with doing (or having) the work done by themselves.

Issue

As a result of the reviews by the TAC, Table 1 summarizes the list of the 33 intersections to be improved and the type of environmental clearance that is anticipated. This also shows the latest requests by the local cities and communities input to assume responsibilities for some intersections. Table 1 show these intersections (highlighted) with the gold color to make it clear all (and which) of the intersections the local cities or communities are assuming the responsibility for.

Analysis

Funding agreements with MTA will be necessary for the intersections highlighted in gold in Table 1 with the local cities or communities for them to assume the responsibility to environmentally clear. The TAC recommended that the remaining intersections in Table 2 that no local city or community requested responsibility for be “packaged” by MTA and that MTA proceed with environmentally clearing them.

Recommended Action

For the Corridor Cities Committee to concur with the following TAC recommendations:

1. To proceed with the final list of the early action arterial highway projects as analyzed and proposed in Table 1 (either by local agency or by MTA) for environmental clearance and preliminary engineering;
2. To remove intersection #57 (ranked #14 – Los Alamitos /Katella) from the list as it is located in Orange County;

3. For the local agencies to proceed with the environmental clearance and preliminary engineering for the intersections highlighted in gold in Table 1 and proceed with the necessary funding agreements and MOUs between the local agencies and MTA;

4. To request MTA to proceed with the remaining 10 intersections shown in revised Table 2 and retain consultants to perform the environmental clearance and perform the preliminary engineering;

5. To request that these recommendations be forwarded to MTA for implementation and action by the MTA board; and/or Give Direction to Staff.
## Table 1 (Revised 7/24/13)
### Arterial Highway Improvement Hot Spots Initial Projects
### SR-91/I-605/I-405
### Early Action Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined Ranking</th>
<th>Study Intersection #</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Additional R/W Required</th>
<th>Environmental Document</th>
<th>Consistent with Feasibility Study</th>
<th>Proceed with Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Santa Fe Springs - Whittier</td>
<td>Whittier</td>
<td>$1,740,000</td>
<td>Y (1)</td>
<td>CE or R/ND</td>
<td>IS/ND</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Lakewood - Telegraph</td>
<td>Downey/Pico Rivera</td>
<td>$2,120,000</td>
<td>Y (1)</td>
<td>CE or R/ND</td>
<td>IS/ND</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Painter - Whittier</td>
<td>Whittier</td>
<td>$1,360,000</td>
<td>Y (1)</td>
<td>CE or R/ND</td>
<td>IS/ND</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I-605 SB</td>
<td>I-605 SB - Washington</td>
<td>LA County</td>
<td>$9,380,000</td>
<td>Y (2)</td>
<td>Freeway ED</td>
<td>Freeway ED</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lakewood - Del Amo</td>
<td>Long Beach/Lakewood</td>
<td>$1,370,000</td>
<td>Y (1)</td>
<td>IS/ND or IS/ISD</td>
<td>R/ISD</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Rosemead - Beverly</td>
<td>Pico Rivera</td>
<td>$4,040,000</td>
<td>Y (1)</td>
<td>CE or R/ND</td>
<td>IS/ND</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Studebaker - Rosecrans</td>
<td>Norwalk</td>
<td>$1,670,000</td>
<td>N N</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Painter - Milbury</td>
<td>Whittier/Whittier</td>
<td>$3,120,000</td>
<td>Y (1)</td>
<td>CE or R/ND</td>
<td>IS/ND</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Painter - Colima</td>
<td>Whittier</td>
<td>$1,810,000</td>
<td>Y (1)</td>
<td>CE or R/ND</td>
<td>IS/ND</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Rosemead - Whittier</td>
<td>Pico Rivera</td>
<td>$960,000</td>
<td>N N</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Bloomfield - Imperial</td>
<td>Santa Fe Springs/Norwalk</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
<td>N N</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Valley View - Imperial</td>
<td>LA County/La Mirada</td>
<td>$1,640,000</td>
<td>N N</td>
<td>CE or R/ND</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Los Alamitos - Katella</td>
<td>Los Alamitos</td>
<td>$1,230,000</td>
<td>N N</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Florence - Orr and Day</td>
<td>Santa Fe Springs</td>
<td>$2,380,000</td>
<td>Y (2)</td>
<td>IS/ND or IS/ISD</td>
<td>EIR</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lakewood - Alondra</td>
<td>Bellflower/Parmount</td>
<td>$970,000</td>
<td>N N</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lakewood - Spring</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>$990,000</td>
<td>N N</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lakewood - Imperial</td>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>$2,760,000</td>
<td>N N</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Norwalk - Whittier</td>
<td>Whittier/LA County</td>
<td>$4,830,000</td>
<td>N N</td>
<td>IS/ISD</td>
<td>IS/ISD</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Bellflower - Spring</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>$720,000</td>
<td>N N</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Pioneer - Imperial</td>
<td>Norwalk</td>
<td>$1,510,000</td>
<td>Y (1)</td>
<td>CE or R/ND</td>
<td>IS/ND</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lakewood - Firestone</td>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>N N</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Rosemead - Slauson</td>
<td>Pico Rivera</td>
<td>$7,770,000</td>
<td>N N</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Valley View - Rosecrans</td>
<td>La Mirada/Santa Fe Springs</td>
<td>$3,050,000</td>
<td>N N</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Rosemead - Washington</td>
<td>Pico Rivera</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>N N</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Norwalk - Washington</td>
<td>Santa Fe Springs/LA County</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td>N N</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Carmenita - Telegraph</td>
<td>Santa Fe Springs/LA County</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>Y (1)</td>
<td>CE or R/ND</td>
<td>IS/ND</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>R61</td>
<td>I-605 NB Ramps - Telegraph</td>
<td>Santa Fe Springs</td>
<td>$2,160,000</td>
<td>Y (2)</td>
<td>Freeway ED</td>
<td>Freeway ED</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Valley View - Alondra</td>
<td>Santa Fe Springs/LA Mirada</td>
<td>$9,500,000</td>
<td>Y (1)</td>
<td>CE or R/ND</td>
<td>IS/ND</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Valley View - Artesia</td>
<td>Carmenita</td>
<td>$3,610,000</td>
<td>Y (1)</td>
<td>CE or R/ND</td>
<td>IS/ND</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>R60</td>
<td>I-605 SB Ramps - Telegraph</td>
<td>Santa Fe Springs</td>
<td>$13,250,000</td>
<td>Y (2)</td>
<td>Freeway ED</td>
<td>Freeway ED</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Studebaker - Alondra</td>
<td>Norwalk/Cerritos</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
<td>N N</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lakewood - Florence</td>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>$7,410,000</td>
<td>N N</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Carmenita - South</td>
<td>La Palma/Cerritos</td>
<td>$470,000</td>
<td>N N</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total for all 33 intersection locations:** $377,080,000

**Notes:**
1. Bloomfield/Artesia has higher unit cost for special traffic signal facilities
2. I-605 SB Ramp/Washington includes bridge widening cost for arterial widening over the San Gabriel River
3. I-605 SB Ramp/Telegraph includes bridge widening cost for arterial widening over the San Gabriel River
4. Costs are in 2012 dollars and are not escalated for any particular year of construction
5. (#) - Number of legs of intersection that require additional right-of-way
Table 2 (revised 7/24/13)
Arterial Highway Intersections for Early Action
Environmental Groupings Analysis
SR-91/I-605/I-405

| Intersection that local cities are **not** taking responsibility to clear environmentally |
|---|---|---|
| CE | IS/ND | IS/MND |
| 16 (#7) | 1 (#83) | 3 (#92) |
| 17 (#1) | 31 (#44) | 10 (#42) |
| 20 (#48) | | 32 (#77) |
| 25 (#45) | | |
| 40 (#84) | | |

S:\COG2013\91-605-405_2013\ArterialHwysImpHotSpots\InitialProj\EAP-91-605-405Table2_7.24.13
ATTACHMENT 1

SR-91/I-605/I-405 “INITIAL” EARLY ACTION HOT SPOT PROJECTS

POSSIBLE PROGRAMMING APPROACH

ATERIAL HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

BY GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

NOVEMBER, 2012

Measure R programmed $590 for SR-91/I-605/I-405 Early Action Hot Spot Projects. Recently the SR-91/I-605/I-405 TAC and the COG Transportation Committee and Board approved the programming of these funds (see attached memo – Exhibit 1 – from MTA that was approved). It may be possible to begin selecting (or programming) some “initial” early action hot spot projects. To date, only the Phase II Transportation Strategic Plan and the corridor level PSR-PDSs have been selected for implementation. No other projects have been selected to date. Now that the SR-91/I-605/I-405 Feasibility Study has been completed and both arterial highway improvement projects and freeway improvement projects have been identified, it may be possible to select some arterial highway improvement projects from the initial 33 list as early action hot spot projects that could proceed.

The following is an outline of steps for a process for the SR-91/I-605/I-405 TAC members to nominate some additional, initial early action hot spot projects from the initial list of the 33 arterial highway intersections and begin that process. Additional projects are expected to be identified at a later date.

The SR-91/I-605/I-405 TAC members will nominate these initial arterial highway improvement projects for early action hot spot projects following the process outlined below. This will occur over the next few months and then the nominated projects will be finalized by the TAC and forwarded to the SR-91/I-605/I-405 Corridor Cities Committee for comments and/or concurrence.

The process to be followed for the SR-91/I-605/I-405 TAC members to nominate arterial highway improvement projects follows. The TAC members will make presentations to the TAC that will answer the questions listed below. These questions are:
1. Is the initial project consistent with the SR-91/I-605/I-405 Feasibility Study as currently defined (see attached exhibits for current list of arterial highway projects other than the actual freeway construction)?
   • How is the project consistent (provide details)?
2. Can the initial project stand alone by itself?
   • Does it have independent utility?
   • Can it be built consistent with existing and ultimate conditions in the SR-91/I-605/I-405 corridors improvements?
   • Are there any costs that could be “lost” to make the project consistent with the potential ultimate configuration?
     o Is so, how much?
3. What are the “risk” costs estimated to be associated with building the project early if the SR-91/I-605/I-405 corridors design changes as currently proposed?
4. What clearance(s) does this initial project already have (or will have)? What is the status of the clearance(s)? What clearance(s) will be needed to environmentally clear the project and what is the complexity for that environmental clearance?
   • PSR
   • PR
   • Environmental
   • Design
   • R/W
5. Is there local support (or opposition) for this initial project? Is this project a local priority?
6. Can this initial project proceed independently of the SR-91/I-605/I-405 Corridors Projects?
7. What funding is being requested? What is the time frame for that funding request? Are there any existing funds, potential funding or matching funds (identify sources or potential sources)? Is the project consistent with the funding programmed for Measure R (see attached MTA staff report for details)?
8. What is the schedule for this potential initial early action hot spot project?
9. Does the local city or community want to proceed with this project on its own or have MTA to proceed with it?
10. Is there any other information that should be presented?
EXHIBIT 1

TO: SR-91/I-605/I-405 Corridor Project Technical Advisory Committee
FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG
BY: Frank Quon, MTA
DATE: March, 2012
SUBJECT: Measure R Programming Approach

Background

At its February, 2012 I-710 TAC meeting, the SR-91/I-605/I-405 TAC requested that MTA develop a programming approach to allocate the $590 for the SR-91/I-605/I-405 Projects to a few categories for the TAC to review and comment upon. A meeting was held with MTA staff and some TAC members and this was discussed in some detail.

Issue

Attached is a memo from MTA to the 91/605/405 TAC with the recommendations for programming the Measure R funds and amounts to various project categories. After review and comment and concurrence from the 91/605/405 TAC, its final recommendations will be forwarded to the Transportation Committee and the COG Board for review and concurrence and then to the MTA board for action at its May board meeting. After that time, MOUs (as explained in the attached memo from MTA) will be executed with each city and the process for allocating the programmed funds can proceed.

Recommendation

To recommend to the Transportation Committee that the 605 Congestion Hot Sports projects $590 M Measure R funds for the 91/605/405 corridors be programmed as outlined in the attached memo by MTA which the 91/605/405 TAC concurs with, or as modified and approved by the 91/605/405 TAC and/or Give Additional Direction to Staff. Further it is recommended that the Transportation Committee (assuming its concurrence) forward this recommendation to the COG board for action with a recommendation to forward to the MTA board for their action at their May board meeting.
Dear TAC members:
At the request of the SR-91/I-605/I-405 TAC, Metro has prepared a proposal for the allocation and programming of Measure R I-605 Hot Spots funds. Since individual projects have not been defined yet, the allocation is categorical or by program as we discussed. The funds available each year is limited by the funding levels already defined by the MTA Board in the Long Range Transportation Plan (see table below).

These may not be the only funds available for the project and Metro expects that Measure R funds can provide “matching funds” for future State or Federal funds when those opportunities arise. As we stated, Measure R funds should be “leveraged” to the maximum extent possible because it is unlikely that Measure R funds can be used to fund 100% of the construction of any one project.

We understand that this proposal will be discussed at the TAC meeting later this month and then at the COG Transportation Committee early in April.

We intend to take this programmatic allocation to the MTA Board for approval to the May 2012 Metro Board. Your feedback and support on this proposal is very important.

**Allocation**
**I-605 Hot Spots**

**Total Budget:** $590

**Allocated to Date:**
- Feasibility Study $6
- **Net:** $584

**Non-Freeway Improvements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strategic Transportation Implementation Plan</td>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Arterial Highway Intersections</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Arterial Highway Corridor Improvements</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. TSM/ITS/Safety</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Misc. (local Oversight, Outreach &amp; Contingency)</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Freeway Improvements** $448

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSRs</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Env/Design</td>
<td>$105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Programming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>10-15</th>
<th>15-20</th>
<th>20-25</th>
<th>25-30</th>
<th>30-35</th>
<th>35-40</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Freeway</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway (PPP)</td>
<td>$51</td>
<td>$79</td>
<td>$169</td>
<td>$105</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td></td>
<td>$454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$71</strong></td>
<td><strong>$139</strong></td>
<td><strong>$225</strong></td>
<td><strong>$105</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$590</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please contact Ernesto Chaves or myself, if you have any questions or concerns. We look forward to working with all of you and the rest of the TAC.

Frank

Frank Quon, P.E.
Executive Officer – Highway Program
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority – Metro
(213) 922-4715  Direct
(213) 922-7465  Fax
quonf@metro.net