I-710 EIR/EIS PROJECT COMMITTEE

Thursday, April 30, 2009
6:00 PM Buffet
6:30 PM Meeting

Gateway Cities Council of Governments
2nd Floor Conference Room
16401 Paramount Boulevard
Paramount, CA

AGENDA

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. APPROVAL OF MINUTES of the January 29, 2009, meeting of the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

VII. APPOINTMENTS

A. Consideration of Appointment of Southern California Edison Company and City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power as Ex Officio Members to the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

SUGGESTED ACTION: 1. Approve the Addition of the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power to the Project Committee as an ex-officio, Non-voting Member by a Two Thirds Majority Vote; 2. Approve the Addition of Southern California Edison Company to the Project Committee as an ex-officio, Non-voting Member by a Two Thirds Majority Vote, Subject to Execution of an Agreement by the Funding Partners Granting Authorization; or Give Direction to Staff
B. Consideration of Appointment of Three Members to the Environmental Subject Working Group

**SUGGESTED ACTION:** Appoint the Three Individuals to the Environmental Subject Working Group; or Provide Direction to Staff

VIII. PRESENTATION
A. Los Angeles River Goods Movement Project – Presentation by Ramon Grijalva, President, Addison Burnett Group

**SUGGESTED ACTION:** Received and File and/or Give Direction to Staff

IX. REPORTS
A. Status Report on the I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS

**SUGGESTED ACTION:** Received and File Status Report and/or Give Direction to Staff

B. Alternatives Screening Recommendations

**SUGGESTED ACTION:** Concur with the Recommendations of the Technical Advisory Committee and Corridor Advisory Committee to proceed with the Alternatives outlined in Attachment A, Alternative 1 (no-build) and Alternative 5A, 6A and 6B to be analyzed in the EIR/EIS; and/or Give Direction to Staff
C. Refined Geometric Plans Presentation

**SUGGESTED ACTION:** Concur with the recommendations from the Local Advisory Committees (LAC’s), Corridor Advisory Committee (CAC) and the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to proceed using the Refined Geometric Plan in the EIR/EIS analysis. Subject to comments being addressed in the next phase and schedule of the process; and/or Give Direction to Staff.

D. Air Quality Action Plan Update by Gateway Cities COG

**SUGGESTED ACTION:** Receive and File Status Report; and/or Give Direction to Staff

X. COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

XI. ADJOURNMENT
VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Of the January 29, 2009, Meeting of the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee
I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Minutes
January 29, 2009

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
THE I-710 EIR/EIS PROJECT COMMITTEE

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

January 29, 2009

I. Call to Order

Co-Chair Hurtado called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

II. Roll Call

Roll Call was taken by Self-Introductions

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Gil Hurtado, City of South Gate, Co-Chair; George Mirabal, City of Bell; Lillie Dobson, City of Compton; Frank Gurule, City of Cudahy; Anne Bayer, City of Downey; Elba Guerrero, City of Huntington Park; Val Lerch, City of Long Beach; Felipe Aguirre, City of Maywood; Gene Daniels, City of Paramount; Larry Forester, City of Signal Hill; Pat DeChellis, County of Los Angeles; Dr. Mike Walter, Port of Long Beach; Joe Aguilar, I-5 JPA; Abdi Saghafi, Caltrans, Barbara Messina, SGVCOG; Susan Seamans, SBCCOG.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Mario Beltran, City of Bell Gardens; Jim Dear, City of Carson; Hugo Argumedo, City of Commerce; Maria T. Santillan, City of Lynwood; William Davis, City of Vernon; Jerilyn Lopez Mendoza, Port of Los Angeles; Diane DuBois, MTA; Rich Macias, SCAG.

ALSO PRESENT: Bill De Witt, Councilmember, South Gate; Bill Pagett, City Engineer, City of Paramount, I-710 TAC Chair; Mark Christoffels, City Engineer, City of Long Beach; Tom Modica, Manager of Government Affairs, City of Long Beach; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Los Angeles; Sue Lai, Senior Transportation Engineer, Port of Los Angeles; Mimi Gutierrez, Engineering Associate, Port of Los Angeles; Jolene Hayes, Transit Development Manager, Port of Long Beach; Samara Ashley, Director of Government Affairs, Port of Long Beach; Jacki Bacharach, Executive Director, SBCCOG; Doug Failing, District Director, Caltrans District 7; Ernest Morales, Deputy Executive Officer, Metro; Devon Cichoski, Communications Manager, Metro; Adrian Alvarez, Transportation Planner, Metro; Connie Turner, Region Manager, Southern California Edison; Bob Eula, City of Commerce LAC; Mario Sotelo, City of Commerce LAC; Dave Randall, Transportation Director, Montebello School District; Ed Thicksten, CCDoTT/CSULB; Ken James, CSULB; Chuck Taylor, Butterfield Communications Inc.; Bob Stiles, CEO, Citi Car Co.; Jack Waldron, URS; Dave Levinsohn, URS; Sandy Stadtfeld, URS;
Esmeralda Garcia, MIG; Pat McLaughlin, MIG; Michael Fischer, Cambridge Systematics; Rob McCann, LSA; Richard Powers, Executive Director, GCCOG; Jack Joseph, Deputy Executive Director, GCCOG; Jerry Wood, GCCOG Engineer.

III. Pledge of Allegiance

Member Mirabal led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. Amendments to the Agenda

There were no amendments to the agenda.

V. Public Comments

GCCOG Engineer Jerry Wood introduced Caltrans District 7 Director Doug Failing to the Project Committee.

Bob Eula, Commerce LAC, spoke on the need to alleviate truck traffic on Washington Blvd. in the City of Commerce. He said the project map since 2004 has shown truck lanes going directly from the freeway into the rail yards and he asked whether this was still in the plan. He said that he wants the southbound connection to I-5 to be down Bandini Blvd.

Elina Green, Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma, expressed concern about the community participation effort. She presented the Project Committee with a series of questions regarding the strategy for outreach and the status of the development and membership of the community participation groups. She requested that agendas, notices, and minutes for the subject working groups and community advisory committees be posted on the project website. Co-Chair Hurtado asked staff to get back to Ms. Green regarding her questions.

Erika Olvera, resident of Long Beach, said that she represented many families affected by asthma. She said her family will be highly impacted by decisions coming out of this and other meetings. She asked the Project Committee to focus on cleaning the air before work on the project begins.

Elena Rodriguez, Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma, said that she was concerned that affected communities receive information about the project. She said pollution should be reduced before beginning construction. She asked that an item regarding implementation of the Air Quality Action Plan be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.
Elena Ramirez, Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma, said that she had many questions about how noise and contamination from the freeway will be dealt with. She said she wondered how the project will help families in the area.

Martha Cota, resident of Long Beach, asked the Project Committee to listen to the community. She said that her son has asthma. She said that she had three recommendations: 1) have a better public participation process; 2) provide information on how and when she can become involved in this process; 3) organize a meeting where we can dialogue about a plan. She said the Committee should consider premature deaths that result from bad air quality.

Angelo Logan, East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice, read a letter requesting support and leadership in implementing a corridor level Air Quality Action Plan. He asked that an item be placed on the next Project Committee agenda that will instruct the Gateway Cities COG to proceed with the development and implementation of the AQAP without any further delay. He provided a list of recommended early action items to advance air quality in the I-710 cities.

Sonny Roque, resident of Commerce, thanked the Project Committee for doing a good job. He said that there is very bad air quality and bumper to bumper traffic in the area of the I-5/I-710 junction and said that he hopes the Committee does the right thing to address these problems.

Miguel Ortega, East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice, said he urged the Committee to make the right decisions. He asked that an interpreter be present at all meetings.

Candice Kim, Coalition for Clean Air, asked the Project Committee to move forward with the Air Quality Action Plan.

Adrian Martinez, NRDC, said that he supports the letter read by Angelo Logan. He said it is very important to everyone that we stay up to date on recent science.

Bob Stiles, Citi Car Company, said that he was amazed that additional truck lanes are still being considered. He said he has proposed an automatic electric rail system that would eliminate 35% of all trucks.

Darryl Molina, Communities for a Better Environment, said that he echoes what has already been said earlier. He said the project will add a lot of pollution. He said the Committee should try to clean the air now before the project allows even more trucks to drive through.
Gabriel Santillan, resident of Huntington Park, said the area is already polluted and this project will only add to it.

Co-Chair Hurtado said that he appreciates that these organizations exist. He said he wondered why they didn’t exist eight years ago when our predecessors made these decisions. He said that he and his son both have respiratory problems and that all of the things that have been talked about are the reasons that he is here. He said the elected representatives that sit on the Project Committee all come from the communities along I-710. He said that the concerns of the people that spoke are their concerns, too. He said they are always welcome to come by and express those concerns.

Member Daniels said that what the Committee is doing is to uphold the commitment to address the air quality issues before moving forward on the project.

GCCOG Executive Director Richard Powers said that the vast majority of the EIR/EIS process is addressing the air quality issues. He said that the next agenda will list the plans for air quality improvement projects.

Member Aguirre said that he would like a translator at the next meeting. He requested a report on air quality on the next agenda.

Member Walter said that he wanted to reiterate that what the ports are doing to improve air quality, including the ban on pre-1989 trucks and the July 1 CARB requirement that ships convert to low sulfur fuel. He said these actions should reduce pollution at the ports by 80%. He said the ports are paying $10 million to advance the timelines for these measures. He said it is a financial problem, but the results are significant.

VI. Approval of Minutes

It was moved by Member Gurule, seconded by Member Walter, to approve the minutes of the meeting of November 13, 2008. The motion was approved unanimously.

VII. Appointment of Additional Members to the Corridor Advisory Committee

The GCCOG Executive Director reported that the Project Committee had recommended two additional appointments to the Corridor Advisory Committee—one representative of the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy and one community member from the San Pedro/Wilmington area. He recommended the appointment of Belinda Faustinos of the Rivers and Mountains Conservancy and requested that the
Project Committee hold open the San Pedro/Wilmington area representative position.

It was moved by Member Forester, seconded by Member Guerrero, to appoint Belinda Faustinos to the Corridor Advisory Committee. The motion was approved unanimously.

VIII. Reports

A. Status Report on the I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS

Jack Waldron of URS provided a briefing on the status of the project. Esmeralda Garcia of MIG reported on the community participation effort. Jerry Wood, GCCOG Engineer said that the project was still on its original schedule. It was moved by Member Forester, seconded by Member Daniels, to receive and file the status report. The motion passed unanimously.

B. Presentation of Initial Feasibility Study Results and Recommendations for Cargo Forecast

Dave Levinsohn of URS reviewed the studies leading to the Initial Feasibility Study (IFA) and the results of the IFA. Those results indicated that the three cargo forecasts that were analyzed in the various studies did not have an appreciable difference for transportation impacts to the I-710 Corridor. Technical Advisory Committee Chairman Bill Pagett recommended that the Project Committee concur with the TAC recommendation, as outlined in the staff report, to proceed with the High Port Cargo Growth Scenario without near-dock rail yard expansion for the reasons in the IFA and as outlined in the staff report.

Member Messina asked if it was anticipated that there would be public-private partnership funding for the project. Caltrans District Director Doug Failing responded that he does expect that.

Co-Chair Hurtado asked what the basis is for the projection of port cargo growth. Mr. Levinsohn responded that SCAG’s projections were used for one piece, and that the ports are continually hiring experts to update their cargo forecasts. He said those growth forecasts have been as high as 6% a year. Mr. Failing said that, if we looked at projections made 25 years ago as to where cargo volumes would be today, they would be on the low side.

Member Aguilar asked if the Committee goes with Scenario 1 will it mean that the Commerce rail yards will grow. Michael Fischer of Cambridge
Systematics responded that rail yard facilities will be built somewhere, but we just don’t know where.

It was moved by Member Walter, seconded by Member Forester, to concur with the TAC recommendation to proceed with Scenario 1, the high cargo forecast without near-dock rail yard expansion for the two ports. The motion passed unanimously.

C. Alternative Screening Methodology Overview/Approach

Dave Levinsohn of URS reviewed the approach and the criteria to be used to screen the alternatives for selection of final alternatives to be analyzed in the EIR/EIS. Bill Pagett, TAC Chairman, informed the Project Committee members that the TAC had reviewed the criteria and approach and was recommending that the Project Committee concur with the TAC’s recommendation to proceed with this analysis and criteria.

It was moved by Member Forester, seconded by Member Walter, to concur with the TAC recommendations for the alternatives screening methodology and approach. The motion passed unanimously.

IX. Comments from Committee Members

Member Aguilar said that he was requesting on behalf of the City of Commerce that hard copies of the agendas be available to the local advisory committees.

Member Walter said that the number one goal at the ports is to reduce pollution without killing off customers and jobs. He said the ports want to go to off dock rail as soon as possible.

X. Adjournment

It was the consensus of the Project Committee to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned by Co-Chair Hurtado at 9:05 p.m.
VII. APPOINTMENTS

Item A
Consideration of Appointment of Southern California Edison Company and City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power as Ex Officio Members to the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee
TO:       I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

FROM:    Richard R. Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG

SUBJECT: Consideration of Appointment of Southern California Edison Company and City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power as Ex Officio Members to the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

Background

With the adoption of the I-710 Major Corridor Study in 2004, the adopted hybrid design envisioned utilizing the power transmission rights of way of Southern California Edison and the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power.

Issue

Southern California Edison has expressed a desire to participate on the Project Committee, however, the current Memorandums of Understanding (MOU's) among the funding partners limits participation to public agencies.

Amendments to the MOU's are currently before the funding partners for approval. These amendments would provide ex-officio, non-voting membership on the Project Committee to a non-governmental agency subject to the following:

1. Upon a finding by a two-thirds majority vote of the Project Committee that the resources and/or expertise of the agency under consideration is an important resource for resolving matters under consideration by the Project Committee.

2. The agency being considered for ex-officio, non-voting membership secure a letter of support from one of the parties to the MOU (funding partners). Attached you will find a letter of support from Anne Bayer, President of the Gateway Cities COG.

As to the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, only a two thirds vote of the Project Committee is required to be added as an ex-officio, non-voting member of the Project Committee because they are a public agency.

Recommended Action

1. Approve the addition of the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power to the Project Committee as an ex-officio, non-voting member by a two thirds majority vote.

2. Approve the addition of Southern California Edison Company to the Project Committee as ex-officio, non-voting member by a two thirds majority vote, subject to
execution of an agreement by the funding partners granting authorization; or give direction to staff,
VII. APPOINTMENTS

Item B
Consideration of Appointment of Three Members to the Environmental Subject Working Group
TO: I-710 Technical Advisory Committee Members

FROM: Richard R. Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG

SUBJECT: Consideration of Appointment of Three Members to the Environmental Subject Working Group

Background

The Gateway Cities COG is in receipt of requests from the following three individuals expressing interest in serving on the Environmental Working Group, Dr. Paul Simon of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, Andrea Hricko of the Community Outreach and Education Southern CA Environmental Health Sciences Center, USC, and Alina Green of the Center for Occupational and Environmental Health, UCLA.

Recommended Action

Appoint Dr. Paul Simon, Andrea Hricko and Alina Green to the Environment Subject Working Group.
VIII. PRESENTATION

Item A

Los Angeles River Goods Movement Project – Presentation by Ramon Grijalva, President, Addison Burnett Group
TO: I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG

SUBJECT: Los Angeles River Goods Movement Project Presentation

Background

Various concepts have been developed by private industry to move the large number of containers to and from the San Pedro Bay Ports along the I-710 Corridor using innovative technologies. It has been the practice of the COG to be receptive to providing a forum for all inventive advocates of new goods movement technologies.

Issue

A request has been made for the Project Committee to hear a presentation on the use of the Los Angeles river bed for goods movement.

Recommended Action

Receive and File
IX. REPORTS

Item A

Status Report on I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS

Oral Reports

TO: I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee
FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG
BY: Project Team Representatives and Consultants
SUBJECT: Status Report on I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS

Background

An oral status report on the work initiated to date will be presented. This includes a summary report on the following:


The project has been underway for over one year and is currently on schedule. The schedule will also be discussed along with a 3-month look ahead for each of these areas. The project is moving into the environmental analysis phase of the work.

Recommended Action

Receive and File Status Reports and/or give direction to staff.
IX. REPORTS

Item B

Alternatives Screening Recommendations
TO: I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG

BY: Bill Pagett, Chair of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee

SUBJECT: Alternatives Screening Recommendations

Background

At the previous I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee meeting, the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee concurred with using the High Port Growth Cargo Forecast without Near-Dock Expansion for use in the Alternative Screening Methodology and the methodology to be used to evaluate and develop alternatives to be analyzed in detail in the EIR/EIS. The following draft studies were prepared and reviewed with the Corridor Advisory Committee and I-710 Technical Advisory Committee:

1. Alternative Screening Methodology Study/Decision Matrix

The purpose of this study was to present an evaluation framework by which existing and potential new alternatives can be screened for the I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS. To identify viable alternatives, specific qualitative and quantitative measures were chosen to draw upon key issues within the Draft I-710 Purpose and Need. These criteria provided comparative information, which was then used to highlight major differences, determining the varying levels of performance for each alternative. The ultimate objective of this screening process was to identify viable alternatives that best meet the Purpose and Need, to be analyzed in the EIR/EIS. The alternatives were based on the initial set of alternatives identified at project initiation.

The presentation for this study was to present the proposed approach and screening methodology for review and comment. The presentation summarized the approach that was presented briefly at the previous meeting. A decision matrix that was used in the screening of alternatives was also presented and reviewed. Finally, the role for alternative technology in this decision process was presented for review and consideration by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee and Corridor Advisory Committee.

2. Screening Alternatives Review and Recommendations

Based on the alternative screening methodology previously described, an Alternatives Screening Analysis was prepared that described the process and key technical findings used to identify a reduced set of alternatives for
the I-710 Corridor project. For that screening phase, a conceptual level of analysis was performed on the initial set of six alternatives to provide comparative information on their relative benefits, costs and impacts. The measures used to distinguish the differences between these alternatives addressed areas such as improvements to traffic mobility, traffic safety, air quality and health effects, impacts to environmental resources, and right of way impacts.

The ten goals that were previously approved by the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee that were used in this analysis consisted of the following:

- Improve Air Quality and Public Health
- Improve Traffic Safety
- Eliminate Highway Design Deficiencies
- Increase Mobility
- Accommodate Growth in Population, Employment and Activities Related to Goods Movement
- Minimize Right of Way Impacts
- Minimize Impacts to Section 4(f) Properties
- Reduce Energy Consumption
- Ensure Environmental Justice
- Promote Cost Effectiveness

These goals were evaluated against the six initial alternatives listed below:

- Alternative 1 (no-build) (consists of only those transportation projects already planned or committed to)
- Alternative 2 – Transportation System Management/Transportation Demand Management/Transit/ITS
- Alternative 3 – Goods Movement Enhancement by Rail and/or Advanced Technology
- Alternative 4 – Arterial Highways and I-710 Congestion Relief Improvements
- Alternative 5A and 5B – Ten General Purpose Lanes or Eight General Purpose Lanes with Two Car-pool Lanes
- Alternative 6 – Alternative 5 with Addition of Four (4) Separated Freight Movement Lanes

Alternatives 2, the rail enhancements of Alternative 3, Alternative 4 and Alternative 5 are included in subsequent alternatives.

The results of these studies were presented to the Corridor Advisory Committee and the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee. Their recommendations are included in Attachments A and A-1.
Recommended Action

Concur with the recommendations of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Corridor Advisory Committee (CAC) to proceed with the Alternatives outlined in Attachment A, Alternative 1 (no-build) and Alternative 5A, 6A and 6B to be analyzed in the EIR/EIS; and/or give direction to staff.
Attachment A

I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS

Recommended Screened Alternatives for Study in the Draft Project Report/Environmental Document

Alternative 1 (No Build): Required to be evaluated under CEQA and NEPA.

Alternative 5A (Widen to 10\(^i\) general purpose lanes without the freight corridor): Recommended as a less impacting alternative than Alternative 6, but one which still provides measurable benefits. The number of general purpose lanes will be evaluated and modified, if necessary, for each segment of I-710 based upon refined traffic forecasting. Study of this alternative at the same level of detail as Alternative 6 will also allow for a meaningful comparison of the benefits, costs and impacts of the freight movement corridor in Alternatives 6A and 6B. Alternative 5A (without the freight corridor) also includes the projects identified for Alternative 1 and the improvements determined for Alternatives 2, 3 (maximum goods movement component by rail) and Alternative 4 as follows:

- Alternative 1 projects
- Alternative 2 improvements for TSM/TDM/Transit/ITS
- Alternative 3 – Maximum Goods Movement by Rail component
- Alternative 4 – Arterial Highways and freeway congestion relief projects

Alternative 6A (Widen to 10\(^i\) general purpose lanes + 4 Freight Movement lanes [conventional trucks*]): Recommended due to the high level of benefits and consistency with the original community-based LPS and Purpose and Need. The number of general purpose lanes will be evaluated and modified, if necessary, for each segment of I-710 based upon refined traffic forecasting.

* - Conventional Trucks – Assumes newer (post-2007) projected diesel-/fossil-fueled trucks (new or with retrofitted engines required per new regulations and standards and normal fleet turnover with a mix of CNG and LNG trucks assumed as well)

Alternative 6A also includes the projects identified for Alternative 1 and the improvements determined for Alternatives 2, 3 (maximum goods movement component by rail), Alternative 4 and Alternative 5A as follows:

- Alternative 1 projects
- Alternative 2 improvements for TSM/TDM/Transit/ITS
- Alternative 3 – Maximum Goods Movement by Rail component
- Alternative 4 – Arterial Highways and freeway congestion relief projects
• Alternative 5A – Freeway improvements with 10\textsuperscript{1} general purpose lanes

This alternative will assume design and usage of the freight movement corridor by conventional trucks.

**Alternative 6B (Widen to 10\textsuperscript{1} general purpose lanes + 4 Freight Movement lanes [zero emissions trucks]):** Recommended due to the high level of benefits and consistency with the original community-based LPS and Purpose and Need. The number of general purpose lanes will be evaluated and modified, if necessary, for each segment of I-710 based upon refined traffic forecasting.

Alternative 6A also includes the projects identified for Alternative 1 and the improvements determined for Alternatives 2, 3 (maximum goods movement component by rail), Alternative 4 and Alternative 5A as follows:

• Alternative 1 projects
• Alternative 2 improvements for TSM/TDM/Transit/ITS
• Alternative 3 – Maximum Goods Movement by Rail component
• Alternative 4 – Arterial Highways and freeway congestion relief projects
• Alternative 5A – Freeway improvements with 10\textsuperscript{1} general purpose lanes

This alternative will assume design and usage of the freight movement corridor by zero emission trucks. This technology would include, but not be limited to, battery powered trucks as well as trucks powered by overhead electrical lines, linear induction motor or linear synchronous motor systems (or other concepts), or future zero emission technologies to be developed designed as part of the Freight Movement corridor. The design of the freight corridor would also assume possible future conversion (or addition) to add a fixed track guideway family of alternative technologies (e.g. – maglev) as an option.

– See Attachment for number of general purpose lanes subsequent evaluations
Alternatives Not Recommended (as “Stand-Alone Alternatives”)

Alternatives 2 (TSM/TDM/Transit), 4 (Arterial Highway and I-710 Congestion Relief Improvements) and 5B (8 general purpose lanes + 2 HOV lanes) are not recommended to be carried into the engineering and environmental technical studies for the EIR/EIS as “stand alone” projects or alternatives. Alternatives 2 and 4 do not provide adequate improvements by themselves to address the purpose and need for the project as required by future traffic generated by population growth and the selected cargo forecast. However, the referenced studies indicated the value of the improvements identified for Alternatives 2 and 4 and, therefore, they are included as part of the recommended Alternatives 5A, 6A, and 6B. Alternative 5B is not recommended as it has similar impacts as 5A and lower benefits.

Alternative 3 (Goods Movement Enhancement by Rail and/or Advanced Technology) is not recommended to be carried forward as a “stand alone” alternative for the EIR/EIS.

The design of the freight corridor will also assume possible future conversion, or initial construction, as feasible, (which may require additional environmental analysis and approval) of a fixed track guideway family of alternative technologies eg. Maglev. The I-710 Funding Partners wish to continue to encourage the goods movement industry to explore different options for Advanced Technology for Zero Emissions Container Movements Systems (ZECMS) that can serve the minimum required future container volumes to be moved in the Freight Movement lanes using fixed track guideway family of alternative technology systems as an initial element of the project, or as a future option with zero emission trucks (or zero emission transportation methods to move trucks) assumed at this time. New ZECMS concepts or methods that are adequately developed or demonstrated by other agencies or others in the future may be considered for subsequent analysis as part of a supplemental environmental report (including other alignments) to be prepared in the future for application and effects for the I-710 Corridor Project.

Maximum goods movement (or enhancements) by rail projects are assumed in the no-build alternative and included in all subsequent alternatives.

Therefore, the maximum goods movement by rail component of Alternative 3 is recommended to be included in Alternatives 5A, 6A and 6B but not as a “stand alone” alternative and the use of zero emission technologies (zero emission trucks with an option for adding a fixed track guideway alternative technology system at a later date) is recommended to be included in Alternative 6B.
Attachment A-1

I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS

Recommended Screened Alternatives
for Study in the
Draft Project Report/Environmental Document

This attachment includes some additional technical details that are to be included with the Recommended Alternatives:

1. The list of projects that was previously developed for Alternative 1 should be updated.
2. The maximum rail components of Alternative 3 should be included in the analysis of the recommended alternatives, excluding the expansion or addition of new near dock intermodal facilities.
3. The freight corridor design should include the following design factors:
   a. Use of highway design standards
   b. The freight corridor should be designed so as not to preclude conversion to a fixed guideway system in the future.
   c. Performance criteria should be established for the design and operation of the freight corridor.
4. The Alternative Technology Report is recommended to be sent to the industry representing the technologies evaluated in the Ports’ Zero Emissions/Electric Container Systems (or other interested parties) study for the purposes of providing them an opportunity to comment and make subsequent presentations on how their technologies would operate and fit within the I-710 freight corridor.
5. That the consultants contact other industries concerning zero emission trucks (or technologies to move trucks with zero emissions) and request information, comments and presentations.
6. An analysis of arterial highway improvements should be identified early in the environmental process as possible for review by the staffs of the local communities.
7. A phasing plan should be developed for the alternatives (this would include an analysis of population and cargo forecast capacities).
8. Projects are requested to be identified for early implementation that would address existing congestion and safety issues.
9. The recommended alternatives should be presented to the relevant Subject Working Groups and Corridor Advisory Committee.
10. The number of general purpose lanes be evaluated and adjusted (up or down), if necessary, for each segment of I-710 based upon subsequent refined traffic forecasting and other studies that reflects only the general purpose lanes needed to satisfy the Purpose and Need for the project.
IX. REPORTS

Item C

Refined Geometric Plans Presentation
TO: I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG

BY: Bill Pagett, Chair of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee

SUBJECT: Refined Geometric Plans Presentation

BACKGROUND

When the Major Corridor Study (MCS) was completed, there were a number of design issues with respect to the design for the Locally Preferred Strategy (LPS) that required higher levels of engineering. Therefore, the consultants prepared a Locally Preferred Strategy Concept Map Update and Summary Analysis. The purpose of this effort was to further define the Locally Preferred Strategy alternative for alternative screening and subsequent preliminary engineering and environmental analysis. The main components of this analysis included an existing conditions assessment, an assessment of the 2004 Major Corridor Study Locally Preferred Strategy plans and a comparative evaluation of interchange configurations and alignment options, including the input of updated preliminary traffic modeling forecasts. Meetings were held with the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee members, Caltrans, FHWA in order for them to provide guidance and feedback on the analysis and options.

Once this initial analysis was completed the results – defined as the refined geometric plans for the Locally Preferred Strategy – were presented to each of the Local Advisory Committees for review and comment. The results of their reviews were assessed and their comments and suggestions presented to the Corridor Advisory Committee to be forwarded to the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee members also reviewed these refined geometric plans and their reviews and comments are also being forwarded to the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee.

These refined geometric plans and the comments and reviews of the Local Advisory Committees, Corridor Advisory Committee and I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will be presented to the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee. The list of comments and responses will be provided at the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee meeting. The refined geometric plans that will be presented have concurrence from these various committees with more detailed analyses to follow during the environmental phase of the project. Therefore, these refined geometric plans represent the revised LPS to be analyzed for impacts and mitigation measures for the selected alternatives during the environmental phase for the project, after which point they will be further refined and finalized.
**Recommended Action**

Concur with the recommendations from the Local Advisory Committees (LAC’s), Corridor Advisory Committee (CAC) and the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to proceed using the Refined Geometric Plan in the EIR/EIS analysis. Subject to comments being addressed in the next phase and schedule of the process; and/or Give Direction to Staff.
IX. REPORTS
Item D

Air Quality Action Plan Update by Gateway Cities COG
TO: I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG

SUBJECT: Air Quality Action Plan Update by Gateway Cities COG

Background

When the Major Corridor Study was completed and adopted by the Oversight Policy Committee (OPC) in November, 2004, the number one issue was air quality and health. In recognition of that, the OPC requested that the GCCOG move forward with an Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) for the corridor. Attached is a fact sheet that summarizes the AQAP content and status.

Issue

Funds in the approximate amount of $2 million have been reserved. The Gateway Cities COG and the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) will be partnering in the fiscal administration and implementation of the Air Quality Action Plan. Board action by the MTA is expected within 60 days.

Recommended Action

Receive and File Status Report
AIR QUALITY ACTION PLAN

GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

FACT SHEET AND STATUS

The Major Corridor Study was approved by the Oversight Policy Committee in November, 2004 with the following condition:

“That the Gateway Cities Council of Governments return with suggested steps for initiating the development and implementation of a corridor level Air Quality Action Plan to include not only technical, but also funding, institutional structure and legislative strategies as well as an approach for holding public agencies with jurisdiction in the Corridor accountable for progress in meeting air quality and public health objectives in the Corridor and Region”

AIR QUALITY ACTION PLAN (AQAP) DESCRIPTION

MISSION STATEMENT – To proactively develop a strategy to reduce the existing levels of emissions by:

- Inventorying existing programs,
- Analyzing the effectiveness of existing and proposed pollution reduction programs, plans and regulations,
- Developing suggestions for additional air quality program improvements,
- Holding public agencies with jurisdiction accountable for progress in meeting air quality and public health objectives in the Corridor and region

To accomplish this, the AQAP would be designed with the following elements:

1. Data collection of existing studies and review, including status with detailed analysis
2. Evaluating and analyzing existing studies and programs
3. Advocating for adequate funding from all sources for air quality improvement programs
4. Monitoring existing programs for strategies, progress and effectiveness to quantify the potential air quality benefits of these programs for GCCOG area that have substantial or moderate benefits
5. Reporting function for elected officials, staff and communities
6. Suggestions for existing or additional air quality programs (e.g., additional air monitoring stations in the I-710 corridor) to achieve additional air quality improvements, based on a quantified study
7. Advocating for health related issues and programs
8. Providing testimony and input to other agencies
9. Developing a priority list of near-term air quality strategies that will be monitored twice each year for progress with specific status reports of timelines, time-tables, funding, status, benefits and issues.
10. Working with local communities to implement local air quality improvement strategies and programs
11. Participating in air quality programs where applicable
12. Determining health risks and benefits of the air quality improvements plans for the residents in the I-710 Corridor, including development of a sub-regional Health Risk Assessment to evaluate the public health benefit of the full implementation of the air quality measures included in the AQAP

STATUS

1. Developed a Compendium of Existing and Proposed Near-Term Air Quality Improvement Strategies for the I-710 Corridor – March, 2006
2. Prepared an update, status and estimated schedule of Existing and Proposed Near-Term Air Quality Improvement Strategies for the I-710 Corridor in September, 2006
3. Developed the report – “Development of the Air Quality Action Plan for the I-710 Corridor”, which was completed in June, 2007. This report included interviews with various officials and groups, early action projects recommended by the environmental community, a proposed scope of work for the AQAP, and an update of existing and proposed near-term air quality strategies. It summarized the process that resulted in the creation of the AQAP and the expectations that stakeholders have for the AQAP.
4. Developed an air quality plan for the I-710 EIR/EIS, which also included a health risk assessment (the first of its kind for a major freeway corridor). That plan, with its health risk assessment, is being prepared in 2009, including protocols for greenhouse gases and climate change emissions analyses.
5. Secured federal funds in 2008 for funding for the AQAP and initiated the process of preparing the scope of work to retain consultants to proceed with the AQAP in 2009.

NEXT STEPS

1. Continue working with MTA to access federal funds to be used for the Air quality Action Plan (AQAP).
2. Work with air agencies to establish additional air quality monitoring stations in the I-710 Corridor as soon as possible, as well as developing a protocol for reporting the information collected by these stations to the public.