I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee
Wednesday, September 12, 2012
6:30 PM
Progress Park
15500 Downey Avenue
Paramount, CA

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 16401 PARAMOUNT BOULEVARD, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 EIR/EIS Project 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 I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee at the following times:

A. AGENDA ITEM: at this time the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and

B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 EIR/EIS Project 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 - Three minutes for each speaker.

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 I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee.

A. Approve Minutes for the Meeting of May 31, 2012, of the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee.

CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION:

A MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM.

VIII. REPORTS

A. Initial Early Action Projects Presentation - Report by Gateway Cities COG

SUGGESTED ACTION: CONCUR WITH I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) INITIAL EARLY ACTION PROJECTS AND SUBMIT THE NOMINATIONS TO THE MTA BOARD FOR FUNDING CONSISTENT WITH THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS OUTLINED IN ATTACHMENT 2; AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

IX. MATTERS FROM THE I-710 EIR/EIS PROJECT COMMITTEE

X. MATTERS FROM THE CHAIR

A. Schedule and Approach for Future I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Meetings

XI. COMMUNICATION

A. Caltrans 30-day Notice of Extension

XII. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 8:00 p.m. unless the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee meeting scheduled for Thursday, November 29, 2012, 6:30 PM.
IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.
VII. CONSENT CALENDAR

Item A

Approval of Minutes

May 31, 2012
I. Call to Order

Co-Chairman Hurtado called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Roll Call was taken by self-introductions:

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Gil Hurtado, City of South Gate, Co-Chair; Sergio Infanzon, City of Bell Gardens; Jim Dear, City of Carson; Denise Robles, City of Commerce; Frank Gurule, City of Cudahy; Elba Guerrero, City of Huntington Park; Felipe Aguirre, City of Maywood; Gene Daniels, City of Paramount; Larry Forester, City of Signal Hill; Patrick V. De Chellis, County of Los Angeles; Thomas Fields, Port of Long Beach; Joe Aguilar, I-5 JPA; Ron Kosinski, Caltrans; Diane DuBois, MTA; Mike Jones, SCAG; Susan Seamans, SBCCOG (ex officio).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Bob Foster, City of Long Beach, Co-Chair; Ana Maria Quintana, City of Bell; Lillie Dobson, City of Compton; Luis Marquez, City of Downey; Sal Alatorre, City of Lynwood; William Davis, City of Vernon; Douglas Krause, Port of Los Angeles; Barbara Messina, SGVCOG; Mark Sedlacek, LADWP (ex officio); Garry Garrigue, Southern California Edison (ex officio).

ALSO PRESENT: Long Beach Director of Government/Strategic Affairs Tom Modica; Signal Hill Public Works Director Steve Myrter; James Yang, Department of Public Works, County of Los Angeles; Ivan Carrillo, Field Representative, Assemblyman Ricardo Lara; Frank Quon, Executive Officer, Highway Programs, MTA; Ernesto Chaves, Transportation Planning Manager, MTA; Adrian Alvarez, Transportation Planning Manager, MTA; Lucy Olmos, Transportation Planner, MTA; Danielle Valentino, MTA; Ivy Tsai, Deputy General Counsel, GCCOG; Richard Powers, Executive Director, GCCOG; Jack Joseph, Deputy Executive Director, Karen Heit, GCCOG Transportation Deputy; GCCOG; Jerry Wood, GCCOG Engineer; Jack Waldron, Project Manager, URS; Dave Levinsohn, URS; Rob McCann, President, LSA; Julia Lester, Environ;
Esmeralda Garcia, Project Manager, MIG; J. D. Douglas, InfraConsult; Juan Carlos Velasquez, CH2M Hill; Melissa de la Pena, CH2M Hill.

III. Pledge of Allegiance

Member Gurule led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. Amendments to the Agenda

There were no amendments to the agenda.

V. Public Comments

Co-Chairman Hurtado said that public comments would be taken up at the time of the report regarding the public review period for the Draft EIR/EIS.

VI. Matters from Staff

There were no matters from staff.

VII. Consent Calendar

It was moved by Member Forester, seconded by Member Guerrero, to approve the minutes of the meeting of March 29, 2012. The motion was approved unanimously.

VIII. Reports

A. I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS Engineering Update

Jack Waldron, URS, gave a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the status of the engineering work on the project. He said the final draft engineering project report had been submitted to Caltrans after coordination with key resource agencies and stakeholders, including the Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, and Southern California Edison. He said over the next three months the project team would be coordinating with Caltrans’ new geometrician and would be supporting the public hearings on the Draft EIR/EIS.

It was moved by Member DuBois, seconded by Member Forester, to receive and file the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

B. I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS Environmental Update
Rob McCann, LSA, gave a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the activities completed in the last month and the activities in progress. He said the Draft EIR/EIS was being revised to address Caltrans' comments. He said notices of availability would be published and the Draft EIR/EIS would have a 60 day review period, during which three public hearings would be conducted. He said the Draft EIR/EIS would be released by the end of June.

It was moved by Member DuBois, seconded by Member Forester, to receive and file the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

C. I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS Community Participation Update

Esmeralda Garcia, MIG, gave a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the recent community participation activity. She discussed the schedule of upcoming meetings and ongoing public information efforts.

It was moved by Member Forester, seconded by Member Gurule to receive and file the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

D. Gateway Cities Technology Plan for I-710

Jerry Wood, Gateway Cities COG Engineer, introduced a PowerPoint presentation prepared by Cambridge Systematics which summarized work to date on developing alternative concepts for the use of technology on I-710. The PowerPoint presentation included a discussion of zero emissions catenary systems, which may be a viable alternative for the freight corridor. Siemens has deployed analogous systems internationally that can be scaled for the I-710 concept. The study project schedule was discussed, which has an estimated completion date of December 2012.

Member Forester asked if the PowerPoint presentation would be made available to the Committee. Jerry Wood responded that it would be added to the I-710 project website.

It was moved by Member Forester, seconded by Member DuBois, to receive and file the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

E. Status of Current Early Action Projects

Frank Quon, Executive Officer for Highway Programs, MTA, discussed the status of the current early action projects. He said that $590 million in Measure R funding for early action projects had been apportioned as $30 million for environmental studies; $400 million for freeway projects; and $160 million for non-freeway projects such as sound wall, intersection improvements, and arterial improvements. He said the three utility studies
are proceeding as early action projects, as well as the sound wall feasibility study.

Mr. Quon introduced Juan Carlos Velasquez of CH2M Hill, who gave a PowerPoint presentation on the sound walls feasibility study. Mr. Velasquez said the objective of the study is to deliver meaningful early improvements, build on existing work through coordination with the I-710 EIR/EIS to streamline approval, review existing and proposed sound wall locations for compatibility with current and proposed projects, and to select walls that are feasible and consistent with community values. He displayed a map showing potential wall locations along the I-710 corridor. He said the next steps are to complete a comprehensive list of feasible sound walls, conduct additional technical studies, incorporate stakeholder comments, and then present a final list of feasible sound walls. He said a list would be presented to the Project Committee in August.

Member Forester asked if part of the $590 million can be used to coordinate with Caltrans on a project to mitigate TMDL impacts on stormwater. Mr. Quon responded that it could.

Member Dear asked for an example of a sound wall project that can't be done as an early action project. Mr. Quon responded that the focus would be on projects outside of the existing right-of-way where acquisition would not be required.

It was moved by Member Guerrero, seconded by Member Dear, to receive and file the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

F. Recommendation Regarding Review Period for Draft EIR/EIS

Ron Kosinski, Caltrans, said that 45 days is the legally mandated time period for environmental review for a project of this size. Caltrans added an additional 15 days and, the review period was set at 60 days. He shared that Caltrans staff completed their internal review in 30 days, and noted that the technical reports only need to be read if you want more detailed information. He said we have already gone through a lot of the information that is in the document through the various stages of this project, so a few of the chapters in the Draft EIR/EIS will present familiar information. Mr. Kosinski said one of the negative risks with extending a comment period is the longer the information sits, it runs the risk of becoming stale. However, he said, Caltrans is open to providing formal extensions beyond the 60 days, if a reviewer feels he needs extra time.

Co-Chairman Hurtado opened the meeting to public comments.
Angelo Logan, East Yards Communities for Environmental Justice, encouraged the Project Committee to press Caltrans to extend the review period for the Draft EIR/EIS to 120 days. He said more time and resources are required to dig through the technical studies.

Mark Lopez, East Los Angeles, said he is troubled that the Health Impact Assessment is in the Air Quality Action Plan rather than the EIR. He said he is troubled that Caltrans has the final say.

Robert Cabrales, Communities for a Better Environment, asked for an extension of the review period for the Draft EIR/EIS.

Ivan Carrillo, Field Representative for Assemblyman Ricardo Lara, said that the Assemblyman had concluded that the community needs more than 60 days to review the Draft EIR/EIS document.

Patty Ochoa, Physicians for Social Responsibility, said that her organization had sent a letter to Caltrans asking for a 120 day review period and to include the HIA in the EIR. She asked the Project Committee to concur with their request.

Eva Ramirez, Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma, said she leaves near I-710 and needs help to review the EIR since she doesn’t speak English. She said she was demanding her rights as a member of the community.

Eva Judith Sanchez, Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma, requested a 120 day review period for the EIR.

Yolanda Lopez, Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma, said she was disappointed that the community is not being heard. She said they are suffering from intolerable pollution. She asked that the review period be extended to 120 days and the HIA be included in the EIR.

Silvia Reyes, Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma, requested a 120 day review period.

Jonathan Farias, Communities for a Better Environment, requested a 120 day review period so the community could be heard.

Raymond Chavarria, Long Beach, requested a 120 day review period and the inclusion of the HIA in the EIR.
Iris Verduzco, Communities for a Better Environment, urged a 120 day review period. She said people have to devote time to other issues.

Andrea Hricko, Keck School of Medicine, University of Southern California, said she was concerned about how short the review time for the EIR is because she will need to fill out what is missing, particularly with regard to the health effects of near-roadway air pollution and the impact of an elevated truckway. She said the public has not been able to see the elevations.

Martha Herrera, Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma, requested a 120 day review period and inclusion of the HIA in the EIR.

Martha Cota, Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma, said a freeway with thousands of trucks would have more impact on the community than a stadium. She said this project affects thousands of families in 14 cities.

There being no other speakers, Co-Chairman Hurtado closed public comments.

Member Infanzon said that he supported all of the arguments presented by the audience. He said the community needs time to review the document and our role is to represent the community.

It was moved by Member Infanzon, seconded by Member Dear, to recommend to Caltrans that the review period for the Draft EIR/EIS be extended to 120 days.

Co-Chairman Hurtado said he had taken all weekend to go over a 400 page document regarding a development in South Gate. He said he objected to the reference that people would procrastinate if given a longer time to review the document.

Member Daniels said that all of the Committee members are representatives of our communities. He said that he took as a positive the fact that Caltrans took more time to review the draft document. He said that the Committee from the beginning had made air quality the top priority.

Member Gurule said that he has lived in Cudahy for over 45 years and has two daughters with asthma. He said he appreciates the comments from the community and supports the extension to 120 days.

Member Guerrero said she also appreciates all of the comments. She said she also has a daughter with asthma and supports the extension.

Member Aguirre said he supports the extension to 120 days, as well as the inclusion of the HIA into the EIR.
Member Kosinski said a lot of the information from the HIA has been incorporated into the EIR, but the HIA document itself will be released regardless.

Member Dear said that, as a public school teacher, he has seen incidents of asthma because of the prevalence of diesel pollution. He said when the public unanimously requests an extension, it carries a great deal of weight with him. He asked if staff had a recommendation.

Karen Heit, Gateway Cities COG Transportation Deputy, responded that any recommendation that the Committee makes is just that, a recommendation. She said the State makes the final decision. She said staff feels that 60 days is adequate.

Member Dear said that he thinks, at this point, the public review process is pivotal. Member Forester said we can make any recommendation we want, but Caltrans has to follow legal rules. He said he thinks 60 days is probably enough time. He said the Health Risk Assessment is more reliable than the Health Impact Assessment. He said we need to look at the risks; Caltrans’ hands are tied by the law.

Member DuBois said the language issue was decided by this Committee. She said if her child had asthma she would not want further delays but to deal with it as soon as possible.

Karen Heit said the Health Impact Assessment would be released at the same time as the Draft EIR/EIS and will be available for public inspection.

The motion was approved by a show of hands by a vote of 8 to 4 with 2 abstentions.

Member Daniels asked when the Committee will know of the decision regarding the review period. Member Kosinski said the decision will be made in mid to late June.

I. Gateway Cities COG Engineer Report

There was no report from the Gateway Cities COG Engineer.

IX. Matters from the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

There were no matters from the Project Committee.
X. **Matters from the Chair**

There were no matters from Co-Chairman Hurtado.

XI. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 8:35 p.m.
VIII. REPORTS

Item A

Initial Early Action Projects Presentation
- Report by Gateway Cities COG
TO: I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS Project Committee

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG

BY: Jerry Wood, Director of Transportation and Engineering for Gateway Cities COG

SUBJECT: Initial Early Action Projects Presentation - Report by Gateway Cities COG

Background

Measure R allocates $590 Million for the I-710 Corridor Project including the potential for “Early Action Projects” and studies related to the project implementation. Some of these funds are currently being used to study utility impacts and to analyze possible sound walls for early construction. The I-710 Draft EIR/EIS is now in circulation; the detailed analyses of the proposed improvements and mitigation measures are explained in the Draft EIR/EIS and various technical studies.

The TAC has begun a process to identify potential “initial” early action projects which can be constructed in advance of any I-710 improvements and are consistent with any proposed improvements. Attachment 1 shows the guidelines that were adopted by the TAC in May, 2012 for the cities and communities to nominate any “initial” early action projects. The guidelines specify that “initial” early action projects have to have independent utility, be consistent with the proposed I-710 project and be able to be constructed independent of any I-710 improvements.

The TAC recommended programming of the Measure R funds earlier in 2012 and this was presented and concurred to by the PC. This programming exercise recommends project categories that will be replaced as discrete projects are developed. The recommendation was forwarded to the MTA for action. Attachment 2 is the MTA staff report that was approved by the MTA Board of Directors in May 2012.

As additional early action projects are developed, they will be nominated for funding and implementation by the TAC members in the coming months and years. All future TAC recommendations will be forwarded to the PC for recommendation to the MTA Board for approval and funding allocation.

Issue

TAC members have begun to nominate “initial” early action projects pursuant to the guidelines shown in Attachment 1. The projects nominated by the TAC members that have been reviewed and recommended to the PC are included in the summary power point presentation. These projects are summarized below:

Shoemaker Bridge (City of Long Beach) – The project has independent utility, has a
PSR, will have its own environmental clearance and can be built consistent with existing or proposed I-710 freeway improvements. The TAC recommended approving the budget of $5M for 100% of the design costs plus $500,000 for 50% of the R/W costs for a total of $5.5 M.

Firestone Blvd. and Atlantic Ave. Intersection (City of South Gate) – The project has independent utility, the project is consistent with I-710 Corridor Projects as one of the intersections to be improved, has environmental clearance, the design is completed and project has been bid. The TAC recommended approving $8.8 M or $10.3 M (the difference is if the use of Measure R funds results in the loss of Metro’s 2007 Call monies, the larger amount is needed). Note: The MTA Board approved this action in July of 2012 to expedite the construction of this project.

Atlantic Blvd. Bridge Widening (City of Vernon) - The project has independent utility, will be needed during the construction of any I-710 improvements due to traffic recirculation, is consistent with I-710 corridor improvements, has environmental clearance and the design is complete. The TAC recommended approving $2.07 M - $3.39 M for the local portion of the projects for R/W acquisition and construction and construction management and contingencies.

Firestone Blvd. at Paramount Blvd. intersection (City of Downey) – The project has independent utility, the project is intersection no. 62 identified for mitigation in the I-710 Draft EIR/EIS and is consistent with the I-710 Corridor Projects as one of the intersections to be improved, has environmental clearance and the design is being completed in 2012. The TAC recommended approving $2.27 M of the city’s request of $3.39 M of the remaining cost assuming no loss of Metro’s 2007 Call for projects funds. If there is the loss of those Metro 2007 Call for project funds, the city staff was advised to return to the TAC to request the remaining $1.12 M to complete the project.

The TAC unanimously approved these requests (except the County representative voted no for the first two).

**Recommended Action**

Concur with the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) “initial” early action projects and submit the nominations to the MTA Board for funding consistent with the programming of funds outlined in Attachment 2; and/or give direction to staff.
ATTACHMENT 1

I-710 “INITIAL” EARLY ACTION PROJECTS
PROGRAMMING APPROACH
BY GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
MAY, 2012

Measure R programmed $590 for I-710 Corridor/Early Action Projects. Recently the I-710 TAC and the COG Transportation Committee and Board approved the programming of these funds (see attached memo from MTA that was approved). It may be possible to begin selecting (or programming) some “initial” early action projects. To date, only possible sound walls and the S/B Firestone Blvd. on-ramp have been selected for early action. No other projects have been selected to date. Now that the I-710 DEIR/EIS is going to be released, it may be possible to select some additional early action projects that could proceed. The following is an outline for the I-710 TAC members to nominate additional, initial early action projects.

The I-710 TAC members can nominate other initial projects for early action following the process outlined below. This process will occur over the next few months and then the nominated projects will be finalized by the TAC and forwarded to the I-710 Project Committee for comments and/or concurrence.

The process to be followed for the I-710 TAC members to nominate 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 I-710 Alternatives as currently defined (see attached exhibits for current list of projects other than the actual freeway construction)?
   - How is the project consistent (provide details)?
2. Can the initial project standalone by itself?
   - Does it have independent utility?
   - Can it be built consistent with existing and ultimate conditions in the I-710 corridor?
   - Are there any costs that could be “lost” to make the project consistent with the potential ultimate configuration?
     - Is so, how much?
3. What are the “risk” costs estimated to be associated with building the project early if the I-710 corridor 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)?
   - PSR
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 I-710 Corridor Project?
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 $ (see attached MTA staff report for details)?
8. What is the schedule for this potential initial early action project?
9. Is there any other information that should be presented?
SUBJECT: I-710 SOUTH AND/OR EARLY ACTION PROJECTS MEASURE R HIGHWAY PROGRAM

ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION

Authorize the Chief Executive Officer to:

A. Approve the proposed strategic positioning of categorical amounts for freeway and non-freeway projects to provide a framework for the future allocation of Measure R funds for I-710 South and/or Early Action Projects as shown in Attachment A; and

B. Execute any necessary agreement(s) with the Gateway Cities Council of Government (GCCOG) and I-710 Corridor Cities to provide support in the development and implementation of individual projects as shown in Attachment B; and

C. Enter into funding agreements with GCCOG and I-710 Corridor Cities for the review of the I-710 Corridor Improvement Project Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (DEIR/EIS).

ISSUE

Measure R identified $590 million (unescalated) for I-710 South and/or Early Action Projects in the Gateway Cities. In consultation with the corridor cities and the GCCOG, Metro staff developed a proposed categorical funding allocation plan that covers the life of Measure R. The categorical allocation will guide the future programming of individual projects (Attachment A). The first project identified by the I-710 Project Committee (PC) is the I-710 Firestone Blvd On-Ramp Project and it is included in the I-710 South Project List (Attachment B). Additionally, due to the State’s budget constraints and cities budget limitations, the GCCOG cities requested the use of I-710 South and/or Early Action Projects Measure R money to fund staff’s time to review the DEIR/EIS for the I-710 Corridor Project (Project). This proposed plan was supported by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), GCCOG’s Transportation Committee and GCCOG Board.
Projects utilizing Measure R dollars will require approval and programming of funds by the Board. Staff will report back to the Board periodically on the programming of funds for the individual projects and for approval of any proposed changes to the categorical funding plan.

POLICY IMPLICATION

The Constrained element of the 2009 adopted Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) generally identifies the I-710 South and/or Early Action improvements, but does not contain a specific project list. Metro staff and the GCCOG have developed a proposed categorical funding allocation plan to cover the life of Measure R to guide the future programming of funds for specific projects. This funding allocation plan is intended to help leverage other fund sources for the completion of such projects. In March 2010, the Board adopted near-term strategies and priority setting criteria to allow projects to move forward, considering the economic downturn, ongoing structural deficit in the State budget and uncertainty regarding the reauthorization of federal surface transportation funding this action is consistent with the adopted priorities.

DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT

The I-710 South and/or Early Action Projects Measure R Highway Program will have no impact on safety.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Implementation of potential early action projects is not expected to commence until FY13. The I-710 Corridor Cities review of the DEIR/EIS for the Project will commence in June 2012. Necessary funds for planning and environmental work for this fiscal year are already included in FY12 budget. Since these are multi-year projects, the cost center manager and the Executive Director, Highway Program, will be responsible for project budgeting in future years.

Impact to Budget

The source of funds for this project will be from Measure R 20% Highway Funds. No other sources of funds were considered as these have been identified for this project. These funds are not eligible for bus and rail operating and capital expenditures.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The Board could elect not to approve the I-710 South and/or Early Action Projects funding allocation plan or the I-710 South Measure R Project List or funding for the
necessary implementation agreements. This alternative is not recommended as the funding plan was developed through consensus of the I-710 TAC, GCCOG Transportation Committee, and GCCOG Board and not approving the necessary funding agreements may delay the implementation of near-term Measure R projects.

NEXT STEPS

Upon Board approval, Metro staff will work with the GCCOG and corridor cities to identify candidate projects for programming of funds. Metro staff will report back to the Board with a listing of projects for programming. Metro staff will execute funding agreements with individual corridor cities and the GCCOG, to fund their review of the I-710 EIR/EIS. Metro staff will execute Memorandums of Understanding (MOU's) with Corridor Cities and the GCCOG, so that they may initiate planning activities for the I-710 Early Action projects and budget dollars in the FY13 budget to reimburse them for the work. Metro staff will continue to monitor and participate in the ongoing efforts of the Gateway Cities Measure R Highway Plan.

ATTACHMENT

A. I-710 South and/or Early Action Projects Measure R Funding Allocation Plan
B. I-710 South Measure R Program List

Prepared by: Lucy Olmos, Transportation Planner
              Ernesto Chaves, Transportation Planning Manager
Douglas R. Failing, P.E.
Executive Director, Highway Program

Arthur T. Leahy
Chief Executive Officer
Attachment A – I-710 South and/or Early Action Projects Measure R Funding Allocation Plan

**Allocation**

I-710 Early Action Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>710 EIR/EIS</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710 Utility and APS Studies</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710 Sound Wall Feasibility Study</td>
<td>$4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Party Support</td>
<td>$0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>$2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net</strong></td>
<td><strong>$559</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Freeway Improvements

- **1. Soundwalls**                                        $40
- **2. Arterial Highway Intersections**                    $40
- **3. Arterial Highway Corridor Improvements**            $30
- **4. TSM/ITS**                                          $30
- **5. Misc. (local Oversight, AQ Studies, Outreach & Contingency)** $20

**Subtotal** $160

Freeway Improvements $399

---

**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>$30</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$22</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$23</td>
<td></td>
<td>$160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway (PPP)</td>
<td>$36</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$68</td>
<td>$316</td>
<td></td>
<td>$430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$66</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27</strong></td>
<td><strong>$108</strong></td>
<td><strong>$339</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$590</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I-710 South and/or Early Action Projects Measure R Highway Program
## Attachment B – I-710 South Measure R Project List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lead Agency (Design By)</th>
<th>FY11-12</th>
<th>FY12-13</th>
<th>FY13-14</th>
<th>FY14-15</th>
<th>FY15-16</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ramp</td>
<td>I-710</td>
<td>Firestone Blvd</td>
<td>Early Action: Reconfiguration of Firestone Blvd on-ramp to Southbound I-710 freeway</td>
<td>City of South Gate</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XI. COMMUNICATION

Item A.

Caltrans 30-day Notice of Extension
August 8, 2012

Agencies, Organizations, and Individuals Interested in the Interstate 710 Corridor Project

Notice of Availability of Environmental Impact Report/Statement

Due to the complexity of I-710 Corridor Project, the California Department of Transportation, in cooperation with the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, the Gateway Cities Council of Governments, the Southern California Association of Governments, the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, and the I-5 Joint Powers Authority have extended the comment period for an additional 30 days.

The Draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement may be viewed on the following website:
http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist07/resources/envdocs/docs/710corridor/


Please send your comments to:

Ronald Kosinski
Caltrans District 7, Division of Environmental Planning
100 South Main Street, MS 16A
Los Angeles, CA 90012

If you have any questions, please contact Garrett Damrath at (213) 897-9016. Thank you for your interest in this important transportation study.

Sincerely,

RONALD KOSINSKI
Deputy District Director, Environmental Planning
Caltrans District 7

“Caltrans improves mobility across California”