VII. CONSENT CALENDAR
ITEM D
Status Report from Lobbyist - Edington, Peel & Associates
Monthly Report by Jim Dykstra to Gateway Cities COG
October 23, 2014

I and the firm Edington, Peel & Associates continue to provide a range of services in support of the Gateway Cities Council of Governments. These include participation in a number of meetings, telephonic, email and fax exchanges and other communications.

I continue to closely coordinate with Gateway Cities COG staff regarding efforts on behalf of the Gateway Cities COG’s priorities and interests in the second session of the 113th Congress. I have had telephonic and electronic exchanges regarding possible funding opportunities and legislation of interest. I also work with the staff of the I-5 Joint Powers Authority on the I-5 widening initiative, the COG’s number one priority.

I continue to track the Fiscal Year 2015 transportation appropriations process as Congress prepares for its post-election lame duck session. The House Appropriations Committee approved its version of the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations bill on May 21 by a vote of 28-21, sending it to the House floor for consideration, where it was passed on June 10 by a vote of 229-192. The Senate Appropriations Committee approved its version of the bill on June 5. The THUD appropriations measure was to have been considered as part of a package with the Agriculture and Science/Justice Commerce appropriations bills, but was pulled from the Senate calendar on July 24 because of the majority leadership’s concern over possible amendments to the package. Prior to Congress’s recess until after the election, it approved, on September 18, a Continuing Resolution, rather than individual appropriations bills, providing funding through December 11. This prevented a government shutdown and provided the opportunity in a lame duck session to revisit appropriations for FY15.

I have continued to provide information regarding the Highway Trust Fund, whose funding would have run out in August, and MAP-21, the surface transportation bill, which would have expired on October 1. A short term fix for the Trust Fund and extension of MAP-21 through May of next year were approved by Congress prior to the August recess.

I have been in contact with the Gateway Cities COG regarding the US Department of Commerce announcement that the Advanced Manufacturing Partnership for Southern California (AMP So Cal), in which Gateway Cities COG is a partner, is one of the first 12 Manufacturing Communities designated as part of the Investing in Manufacturing Communities Partnership (IMCP). I provided information to the offices of Members of Congress representing Gateway Cities to be sure they are aware of Gateway Cities COG’s participation and to request meetings with Members and their district staff to discuss the initiative and how efforts can be undertaken to help the cities in the region receive their fair share of funds for their economic revitalization effort. Meetings with a number of delegation members have already been held. A week ago I provided the offices an update prepared by Jerry Caton on the status of the initiative.
I have kept the Gateway Cities COG updated regarding membership, leadership and staff changes, as well as committee priorities in the 113th Congress, in the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the Senate Environment and Public Works and Commerce Committees, and regarding changes in leadership of the US Department of Transportation.

I participate on behalf of the Gateway Cities COG in conference calls and email exchanges with staff of the Coalition for America’s Gateways and Trade Corridors (CAGTC) and provide Gateway Cities with information on CAGTC activities in Washington, DC.

I have continued discussions and email exchanges with staff of Members of Congress representing Gateway Cities COG members, as well as other key congressional staff, regarding the COG’s legislative priorities.

As part of my responsibilities, I closely monitor legislation, as well as seminars, hearings, meetings and publications of key interest to legislators and senior executive branch officials for articles and information of possible interest and importance to member cities of the Gateway Cities COG. I attend Senate and House committee hearings, follow Senate and House floor proceedings, and track legislative initiatives pertinent to Gateway Cities COG interests and priorities.
VIII. REPORTS
ITEM A
Proposed Structure for Strategic Transportation Plan Oversight
TO: Board of Directors  
FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director  
SUBJECT: Proposed Structure for Strategic Transportation Plan Oversight

Overview

This report is intended to summarize a proposed structure to oversee the development, adoption, and implementation of the Gateway Cities Strategic Transportation Plan (STP).

Background

For the past year, the firm of Cambridge Systematics, retained by MTA through funding from Measure R, has been engaged to develop the Gateway Cities Strategic Transportation Plan, which is intended to serve as a “blueprint” for current and planned transportation projects of all modes in the Gateway Cities subregion over the next several decades. Additionally, the STP is intended to show the interrelationships among all of these projects so that they may be intelligently planned and implemented. It is the goal of the STP to better position these projects for funding from various potential funding sources.

A crucial element for the success of the STP development is the participation of the COG’s member agencies in its development and adoption. In this regard, over the past few months the COG’s consulting engineer has been meeting with cities on an individual basis, as well as through the monthly meetings of the Gateway Cities Public Works Officers, to make sure that the various elements of the STP are consistent with each city’s vision and planned projects.

Proposed Structure

In order to formalize the continued participation of our member agencies in the development and execution of the STP, it is proposed that an STP Technical Advisory Committee (STP TAC), made up of the subregion’s Public Works Officers, be created and meet on a regular basis immediately following the monthly meeting of the Public Works Officers Committee. The STP TAC would have two co-chairs from different geographic locations with the COG subregion.

Furthermore, it is proposed that a Strategic Transportation Plan Oversight Committee be created, consisting of two elected officials, two city managers, and the two co-chairs of the STP TAC, to meet on an as needed basis and to make recommendations to the COG’s Transportation Committee regarding the adoption of the STP and its implementation. Those recommendations, if approved, would be forwarded to the COG’s Board of Directors for adoption.
It is the hope that this structure would maximize the opportunity for participation by all COG member agencies and to develop a subregional consensus to advance the projects contained in the STP.

This proposed structure has been reviewed and approved by Transportation Committee Chair Diane DuBois.

**Recommended Action**

Approve the proposed structure for the oversight of the Gateway Cities Strategic Transportation Plan and seek nominations from board members to fill the two positions for elected officials on the STP Oversight Committee. Elected officials would be entitled to a $100 meeting stipend based on attendance.
Gateway Cities Member Agencies
Artesia ~ Avalon ~ Bell ~ Bellflower ~ Bell Gardens ~ Cerritos ~ Commerce ~ Compton ~
Cudahy ~ Downey ~ Hawaiian Gardens ~ Huntington Park ~ Industry ~ La Mirada ~ Lakewood ~
Long Beach ~ Lynwood ~ Maywood ~ Montebello ~ Norwalk ~ Paramount ~ Pico Rivera ~ Santa
Fe Springs ~ Signal Hill ~ South Gate ~ Vernon ~ Whittier ~
Los Angeles County, Supervisorial Districts 1, 2, & 4 ~ Port of Long Beach
VIII. REPORTS
ITEM B
Proposed Gateway Cities COG Committee on Sustainability
TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Mike Egan, Chair, City Managers Steering Committee

SUBJECT: Proposed Gateway Cities COG Committee on Sustainability

Background

The state has begun receiving revenues from the new cap-and-trade program, which reduces greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Approximately $1 to $1.5 billion in annual revenue can be expected statewide. In the current fiscal year, a total of $832 million has been appropriated for these programs, including roughly $500 million in programs directly applicable to the Gateway Cities. Continuing appropriations have been identified on a percentage basis for future program years.

The revenues will be available on a competitive basis to fund local projects that reduce GHG emissions. The state has directed a portion of these revenues to “disadvantaged communities.” The state defines “disadvantaged communities” as census tracts meeting criteria that reflect environmental pollution burdens and demographic characteristics such as poverty and unemployment levels. The nineteen specific indicators used by the state are listed in an attachment. Over half of the population of the Gateway Cities lives in census tracts that meet this definition, and unemployment in the Gateway Cities remains persistently higher than in the region, state, and nation. A map is also attached showing these census tracts.

The set-aside of funds for disadvantaged communities constitutes an entitlement based on the demographics of our communities. For example, SB 535 requires that 25% of the cap-and-trade funds be dedicated to projects that benefit disadvantaged communities directly. The Strategic Growth Council has dedicated 50% of its Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities program to disadvantaged communities. In some programs, such as weatherization of homes for energy efficiency, 100% of the current funds are to be directed to disadvantaged communities. The Gateway Cities will need to compete with other areas of the state for these funds.

Issue

Because of the “disadvantaged communities” set-asides in state law, the Gateway Cities should be extremely competitive in applying for these grants. Increasing our competitiveness still further are the extensive planning efforts already conducted jointly by the Gateway Cities through the COG. In particular, the Sustainable Communities Strategy, Air Quality Action Plan, and ongoing Strategic Transportation Plan have already identified multi-year investment programs that will help the state reach both its goals to reduce emissions and to help disadvantaged communities.

The Gateway Cities need an accountable, transparent mechanism for managing the investment of cap-and-trade funds. In support of this need, the City Managers are recommending that the COG serve this function given its history of successful planning and collaboration for the benefit of its member cities, both individually and collectively. The City Managers recommend the
formation of a new COG Committee on Sustainability that can provide policy oversight. This committee would report to the COG Board of Directors and would have the following functions:

1) Recommend grant application priorities to the Board for cap-and-trade programs, and any other similar sustainability programs that may be established at the federal, state, or local level.
2) Monitor and assist state agencies in developing grant guidelines.
3) Monitor the state’s three-year and annual cap-and-trade investment plans.
4) Monitor opportunities for co-benefits through projects that can meet multiple goals for GHG reduction.
5) Recommend to the Board the receipt and investment of funds in specific projects.
6) Oversee the administration of the grants received by Gateway Cities under the cap-and-trade and other sustainability programs.
7) Report to the Board regularly on the status of grant applications, project progress, and project outcomes in the Gateway Cities.

It is envisioned that the COG Committee on Sustainability would handle grants involving groups of cities that choose to collaborate. An individual city would retain the option to apply for specific grants on its own for projects within its jurisdiction.

The City Managers Steering Committee further recommends that the Committee on Sustainability have eleven members, as follows:

1) Five members who are elected officials from member jurisdictions
   a. These may be, but need not be, COG Board members
   b. At least one must be a Los Angeles County representative
   c. One of these members will serve as Chair
2) One member representing the Transportation Committee
3) One member representing the City Managers
4) One member representing the Gateway Water Management Authority
5) One member representing the Economic Development Working Group
6) One member representing the Public Works Officers
7) One member representing the Planning Directors.

The Committee on Sustainability would meet monthly or as needed to ensure accountability and credible oversight of sustainability grant funds directed to the Gateway Cities.

**Recommended Action**

Receive and file this report; approve the recommended committee structure and provide further direction to COG staff.

**Attachments**

CalEnviroScreen 2.0 Indicators and Component Scoring
Map of Gateway Cities CalEnviroScreen 2.0 Scores
Figure 1. CalEnviroScreen 2.0 Indicator and Component Scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollution Burden</th>
<th>Population Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exposure Indicators</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sensitive Populations Indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone Concentrations</td>
<td>Children and Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2.5 Concentrations</td>
<td>Low Birth-Weight Births</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel PM Emissions</td>
<td>Asthma Emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Water Quality</td>
<td>Departmental Visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticide Use</td>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic Indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxic Releases from Facilities</td>
<td>Educational Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Density</td>
<td>Linguistic Isolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Effects Indicators</strong></td>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanup Sites (1/2)</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater Threats (1/2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Waste (1/2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired Water Bodies (1/2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Sites and Facilities (1/2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Approaches To Identifying Disadvantaged Communities, California Environmental Protection Agency, Office Of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, August 2014
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VIII. REPORTS
ITEM C
Alignment Recommendations and Further Study for the Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension Phase II (MGLEII) Project
TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Diane Dubois, MTA Director

BY: Karen Heit, Transportation Deputy

SUBJECT: Alignment Recommendations and Further Study for the Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension Phase II (MGLEII) Project

Issue

MTA staff has made the following recommendations for the MGLEII project.

A. Approve carrying forward two build alternatives and the associated maintenance yard(s) into further technical study as described below:

1. SR 60 North Side Design Variation (NSDV) which would extend the existing Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension from the Atlantic/Pomona Station, approximately 6.9 miles to Peck Rd. in the City of South El Monte. The Alternative would operate primarily within the southern portion of the SR 60 Freeway right-of-way (ROW). The NSDV, which would transition to the north side of the SR 60 just west of Greenwood Ave. and back to the south side just west of Paramount Blvd. is selected so as to minimize potential impacts to the Superfund site.

Coordination and refinements to the Alternative would be carried out to address comments received from Cooperating and Public Agencies;

2. Washington Blvd. Alternative which extends the existing Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension from the Atlantic/Pomona Station, approximately 9.5 miles to Lambert Rd. in the City of Whittier. The Alternative includes two grade separated design variations at Rosemead Blvd and at San Gabriel River/1-605/Pioneer Blvd. in order to minimize potential traffic impacts and physical constraints, respectively.

Refine the Alternative to identify an alternate north-south connection to Washington Blvd.

Coordination and refinements to the Alternative would be carried out to address comments received from Cooperating Agencies, Public Agencies and stakeholder concerns;
3. Analyze environmental impacts and performance with both Alternatives in operation, including conducting cost containment studies.

B. Eliminate from further study as described below:
   1. State Route 60 (SR 60) Baseline Alternative from further study due to potential Environmental impacts and concerns expressed by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA);


The staff recommendation recognizes the environmental issues associated with each alignment and proposes further study to resolve outstanding issues. Moving forward with the technical studies will allow time to conduct the technical analysis to address comments received by Cooperating Agencies and Public Agencies, further define project costs, and analyze potential impacts and performance of having both alternatives in operation.

The Planning and Programming Committee of the MTA will have heard this item during the Committee Meeting held November 5, 2014. An oral report of this meeting will be presented at the Transportation Committee. This full Board will consider the issue at the November Board meeting Thursday November 13, 2014.

Attachment

Item # 12 EASTSIDE TRANSIT CORRIDOR PHASE 2 - pages 1-9 of the staff report.
PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 5, 2014

SUBJECT: EASTSIDE TRANSIT CORRIDOR PHASE 2

ACTION: APPROVE ALIGNMENT RECOMMENDATIONS AND FURTHER TECHNICAL STUDY

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Approve carrying forward two build alternatives and the associated maintenance yard(s) into further technical study as described below:

1. SR 60 North Side Design Variation (NSDV) (Attachment A) which would extend the existing Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension from the Atlantic/Pomona Station, approximately 6.9 miles to Peck Rd. in the City of South El Monte. The Alternative would operate primarily within the southern portion of the SR 60 Freeway right-of-way (ROW). The NSDV, which would transition to the north side of the SR 60 just west of Greenwood Ave. and back to the south side just west of Paramount Blvd. is selected so as to minimize potential impacts to the OII Superfund site.

Coordination and refinements to the Alternative would be carried out to address comments received from Cooperating and Public Agencies;

2. Washington Blvd. Alternative (Attachment B) which extends the existing Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension from the Atlantic/Pomona Station, approximately 9.5 miles to Lambert Rd. in the City of Whittier. The Alternative includes two grade separated design variations at Rosemead Blvd and at San Gabriel River/I-605/Pioneer Blvd. in order to minimize potential traffic impacts and physical constraints, respectively.

Refine the Alternative to identify an alternate north-south connection to Washington Blvd.

Coordination and refinements to the Alternative would be carried out to address comments received from Cooperating Agencies, Public Agencies and stakeholder concerns;

3. Analyze environmental impacts and performance with both Alternatives in operation, including conducting cost containment studies.
B. Eliminate from further study as described below:

1. State Route 60 (SR 60) Baseline Alternative (Attachment A) from further study due to potential Environmental impacts and concerns expressed by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA);


C. Receive the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 (Eastside Phase 2) Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIS/EIR). Attachment C contains the Executive Summary. The full Draft EIS/EIR is available upon request.

ISSUE

The adopted Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) includes the Eastside Phase 2 project in the Constrained Element with funding becoming available starting in 2026, and also identifies a second Eastside Phase 2 project for the corridor not selected in the Strategic Unfunded Plan, Tier 1. Measure R allocates $1.27 billion (2014 dollars) to the Eastside Phase 2 project.

The Draft EIS/EIR contains the technical analysis to inform the public and decision makers of the potential adverse and beneficial impacts of the alternatives. Coordination efforts with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the project’s three Cooperating Agencies, EPA, United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and Caltrans, helped inform the development of the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, a strong public participation process supported the technical analysis. While the Draft EIS/EIR demonstrates a need for both alternatives and community support for having service to the two subregions was strong, further technical and environmental analysis is warranted in order to provide additional detail that is necessary to address environmental comments received during the public comment period from Cooperating Agencies, Public Agencies and stakeholders. Board approval of conducting further technical studies before entering the Final EIS/EIR is being requested.

DISCUSSION

Per the Draft EIS/EIR, both build alternatives studied would provide environmental and social benefits for the project area and would help address mobility challenges faced by the project area by 2035, including connecting the project area to Metro’s regional rail network and providing much needed transportation services.

Comments received from stakeholders and project cities during the public comment period indicated strong support for both alternatives. Comments received from Cooperating and Public Agencies indicated a need to conduct additional technical
studies in order to provide the additional detail that is necessary to address comments provided in their area of expertise and jurisdictional oversight.

SR 60 North Side Design Variation Alternative

The SR 60 NSDV would extend the existing Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension from the Atlantic/Pomona Station, approximately 6.9 miles to Peck Rd. in the City of South El Monte. The alternative is approximately 94% grade separated and would operate primarily within the southern portion of the SR 60 Freeway ROW. The NSDV, would transition to the north side of the SR 60 just west of Greenwood Ave. and back to the south side just west of Paramount Blvd. was analyzed in coordination with the project’s three Cooperating Agencies. Potential impacts to the south side of the Oil Superfund Site are minimized. This alternative proposes four stations with supporting park and ride lots.

The SR 60 NSDV is estimated to generate approximately 16,700 daily boardings with an estimated travel time of 13 minutes from the Peck Rd. terminus to the existing Metro Gold Line station at Atlantic/Pomona. The capital cost in 2010 dollars is estimated to range between $1.2 and $1.3 billion. Travel time savings are estimated at 21.9 minutes per boarding.

Moving forward into the technical study, the following areas would require continuing resolution and coordination with the following jurisdictions and agencies:

- EPA to further address comments regarding the Oil Superfund site;
- USACE in further addressing Executive Orders and Federal Regulations as they relate to the operation of the SR 60 NSDV and location of the proposed Santa Anita Station and supporting park and ride;
- Caltrans to address comments regarding design of SR 60 NSDV;
- Department of Interior and California Department of Fish and Wildlife to address comments related to habitat and wetlands delineation;
- Southern California Edison (SCE);
- City of Monterey Park to address comments regarding visibility.

Washington Blvd Alternative

As studied in the Draft EIS/EIR, the Washington Blvd. Alternative would extend the existing Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension from the existing Atlantic/Pomona station approximately 9.5 miles to Lambert Rd. in the City of Whittier. It includes both at-grade and aerial configurations, beginning at-grade as it departs the Atlantic/Pomona station, transitioning to an aerial configuration running on the south side of SR 60 Freeway ROW to Garfield Ave. It would turn south onto Garfield Ave. remaining in an aerial configuration. The aerial configuration would continue as it turns southeast along Washington Blvd. At Montebello Blvd., the alternative would transition to an at-grade configuration within the center of Washington Blvd to the terminus station at Lambert
Rd., in the City of Whittier. This Alternative proposes six stations with supporting park-and-ride lots at five stations.

Two design variations were studied as part of the Washington Blvd. Alternative. The first is an aerial crossing at Rosemead Blvd. in order to minimize potential traffic impacts at that intersection. The second design variation is an aerial crossing over the San Gabriel River/I-605 freeway and Pioneer Blvd. in order to address potential physical constraints.

As studied in the Draft EIS/EIR, the Washington Blvd Alternative is estimated to generate approximately 19,900 daily boardings. Travel time from the Lambert Rd terminus to the existing Metro Gold Line station at Atlantic/Pomona is estimate to range between 17 and 22 minutes. The capital cost in 2010 dollars is estimated between $1.4 and $1.7 billion. Travel time savings are estimated at 21.3 minutes per project boarding.

Per the Draft EIS/EIR, after implementation of mitigations, the aerial configuration on Garfield Ave. between Via Campo and Whittier Blvd. would have unavoidable adverse effects/significant impacts. The aerial configuration would require removal of community resources, thereby altering the social and physical character within the immediate community. Changes in the visual character of Garfield Ave. would also result due to shade and shadow impacts along Garfield Ave. between Via Campo and Whittier Blvd. created by the aerial guideway. In addition, this configuration received strong community opposition. Eliminating the aerial configuration would address the potential environmental impacts and stakeholder concern.

Moving forward into the technical study, the following areas would require continuing resolution and coordination with jurisdictions and agencies:

- EPA to address comments regarding the Omega Superfund site;
- Refine the Washington Blvd Alternative to identify an alternate north south connection to Washington Blvd.

**Maintenance Yards**

Under the SR 60 NSDV, one potential Maintenance Yard Option has been identified. Referred to as the Mission Junction Yard, this site is approximately 11 acres and is located in the City of Los Angeles, generally bounded by 1-5 to the east, I-10 to the south, the Los Angeles River to the west and the Union Pacific rail line to the north as shown in Attachment A.

In addition to the Mission Junction Yard Option, the Washington Alternative also considers two additional locations (Attachment B). The Commerce Maintenance Yard Option is approximately 12 acres in size and is proposed to be within the City of Commerce, located west of Garfield Ave. in the SCE transmission line corridor.
A third Washington Blvd. Maintenance Yard option is within the City of Santa Fe Springs. This site is approximately nine acres in size and is located south of Washington Blvd. and east of Alport Ave.

In addition to the sites being analyzed, the Eastside Phase 2 project may also consider using the Monrovia facility that is currently under construction as part of the Metro Gold Line to Montclair.

All Maintenance Yard Options would be carried forward for further technical study.

**SR 60 NSDV and Washington Blvd Alternatives**

The Draft EIS/EIR analyzed each build alternative independent of one another. Given the demonstrated need for transit service in each subregion, strong community support from the subregions for their respective alternative and the identification of two Eastside Phase 2 alternatives in the LRTP, it is worthwhile to study potential impacts, performance and cost of having both alternatives in operation.

Technical work to evaluate how the two alternatives could be operated would allow us to build upon the analysis in the Draft EIS/EIR to identify potential environmental impacts of constructing and operating both alternatives, impacts on ridership, identify potential frequencies and operational configuration. Cost containment strategies, including analyzing a minimum operable segment would also be studied. Analysis carried out through the technical studies would also help inform project phasing within the LRTP reserved amount.

**Draft EIS/EIR Environmental Process and Community Participation**

The environmental study was initiated in 2007 with the Alternatives Analysis study (AA) wherein 47 alternatives were reviewed. Through technical analysis and community input, the 47 alternatives were narrowed down to four build alternatives with the No Build and the Transportation System Management (TSM). The four build alternatives were carried into an AA Addendum where additional technical screening was carried out. In 2009, the Board authorized staff to carry forward into the Draft EIS/EIR phase the No Build, the TSM and two build alternatives, SR 60 Light Rail Transit (LRT) and Washington Blvd. LRT.

The Draft EIS/EIR phase was initiated in 2010 with the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) in the Federal Register and the Notice of Preparation (NOP) being sent to the California State Clearinghouse and Los Angeles County Clerk on January 25, 2010. The 80 day scoping period extended through April 14, 2010, during which time four public scoping and one resource agency meeting were held. Over 300 stakeholders participated in the five meetings. In addition, over 20 briefings with Councils of Governments (COGs), community organizations and city staff took place.
In May, 2014, in anticipation of releasing the Draft EIS/EIR, the Gateway Cities and San Gabriel Valley COGs were updated. Briefings for elected officials and agencies, and eight open houses and city council presentations in the project cities were held. In total more than 330 meetings were held during the Draft EIS/EIR phase with over 2,800 attendees.

The Notice of Availability (NOA), which serves as a notice to the public regarding the availability of the Draft EIS/EIR, was published in the Federal Register and filed with the California State Clearing House and Los Angeles County Clerk’s office on August 22, 2014. A 60 day public comment period extended through October 21, 2014. Four public hearings and one agency meeting were held during this time. Open Houses were held prior to the start of each public hearing. The Draft EIS/EIR was made available on Metro’s website and library as well as over 15 public locations within the project area. The document was also made available via CD upon request.

Outreach for the public hearings was robust with the NOA being mailed to almost 3,500 project stakeholders and over 22,000 postcards mailed to residents, property and business owners along the proposed corridors. In addition just under 1900 e-mails were sent informing stakeholders of the availability of the Draft EIS/EIR. Other notification methods used included press notices sent to over 50 media outlets; display ads in multiple publications, including Chinese and Spanish language papers; “take-ones” distributed on buses and trains, and delivered to cities hosting the public hearings and other key locations along the two corridors.

More than 525 people attended the four public hearings. Over 1,130 comments were received, including 120 verbal comments taken at the public hearings. Comments from community residents, local businesses and organizations expressed strong support for their respective alternatives with many expressing support for both alternatives. Concerns expressed relate to potential traffic impacts, potential property acquisitions, safety and design. Included within the total count are comments received from almost 40 federal, state, regional and local agencies.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT**

**Impact to the Budget**

The Fiscal Year (FY) 15 budget included $350,000 in Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) funds to carry out work on the Draft EIS/EIR phase. Staff will work with Regional Programming, Budget and Local Programs and the Office of Financial Services to identify a funding source for the required technical studies and will bring back a request to the Board to amend the budget when we return to award the technical study contract modifications.
ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The Board could consider:

1. Choosing not to approve further technical study on both alternatives and instead select one alternative to move forward;

2. Choosing not to approve further technical study on the alternatives and instead select that neither alternative move forward.

These options are not recommended because the technical analysis and community outreach conducted to date reflect that both alternatives meet the project purpose and goals and would address the needs of the project area. A high degree of community support for both alternatives exists.

Moving forward with the technical studies will allow us to conduct technical analysis to address comments received by Cooperating Agencies and Public Agencies, further define project costs, and analyze potential impacts and performance of having both alternatives in operation.

NEXT STEPS

Upon Board approval, a scope of work will be developed for technical work and community facilitation. Staff will return to the Board to request authorization to award the contract modifications and amend the budget.

ATTACHMENTS

A. SR 60 and SR 60 NSDV Map
B. Washington Alternative Map
C. Draft EIS/EIR Executive Summary

Prepared by: Laura Cornejo, Director 213-922-2885
           David Hershenson, Community Relations Manager 213-922-1340
           Diego Cardoso, Executive Officer 213-922-3076
           Cal Hollis, Managing Executive Officer 213-922-7319
Martha Welborne, FAIA
Chief Planning Officer

Arthur T. Leahy
Chief Executive Officer
VIII. REPORTS
ITEM D
Approval of Nominations to the Board of the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy
TO: Executive Committee

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Approval of Nominations to the Board of the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy

Background

The State legislation which created the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy states that the thirteen members of the Conservancy Board shall include: “Two members of the Board of Directors of the Gateway Cities Council of Governments, one of whom shall be the Mayor of the City of Long Beach or a city council member appointed by the mayor, and one of whom shall be appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly from a list of potential members submitted by the Executive Committee of the Board of Directors of the Gateway Cities Council of Governments.” The legislation further states: “The Executive Committee shall submit lists of potential members to the Speaker of the Assembly until an acceptable member is appointed.” Board Member Patrick O’Donnell presently holds the seat appointed by the Mayor of Long Beach, and Board Member Edward H. J. Wilson presently holds the seat appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly.

Issue

President Tercero has been notified by Assembly Speaker Toni G. Atkins that Board Member Wilson’s term on the Conservancy Board expires November 29, 2014 (letter attached). Speaker Atkins has requested, in accordance with the state legislation, that the Executive Committee submit a list of nominations to her office for this position. The Executive Committee has customarily submitted a list of the names of three Board Members to the Speaker.

Recommended Action

It is recommended that the Executive Committee approve a list of nominees from the Board of Directors for submittal to the Speaker of the Assembly for her consideration for appointment to the Board of the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy.
October 15, 2014

The Honorable Brent Tercero
President, Board of Directors
Gateway Cities Council of Governments
16401 Paramount Blvd.
Paramount, CA 90723

Dear Mayor Tercero:

In reviewing the status of Speaker appointees, it has come to my attention that the term of Edward Wilson as my appointee to the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy will expire on November 29, 2014. Pursuant to 32602 of the Public Resources Code I am requesting two or more nominations to be considered for appointment.

Please submit your list of nominees to me at the address listed on the bottom of the letterhead as soon as possible. If you have any questions please contact Lisa Dominguez at the phone and address below.

Sincerely,

TONI G. ATKINS
SPEAKER OF THE ASSEMBLY

TGA:ld