I-710 Technical Advisory Committee  
Wednesday, May 18, 2011  
1:30 – 3:30 PM

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

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 Technical Advisory 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 Technical Advisory 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 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

A. AGENDA ITEM: at this time the I-710 Technical Advisory 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 Technical Advisory 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 Technical Advisory Committee.

A. Approve Minutes for the Meeting of March 16, 2011, of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee

CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION:
A MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM.

VIII. REPORTS


SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO HEAR REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF


SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO HEAR REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF


SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO HEAR REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

D. Community Participation Report on I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS – Oral Report by MIG

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO HEAR REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

E. I-710 Early Action Project Update – Oral Report by COG

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO HEAR REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF
F. South Bound Firestone Boulevard On-Ramp Early Action Project Report – Oral Report by COG and City Staff

SUGGESTED ACTION: 1. Re-affirm decision as early action project and/or; 2. Recommend to I-710 PC to proceed with this project for design and construction as early action project as soon as possible and for MTA to proceed with RFP and SOW; and/or Give Direction to Staff

G. AQAP Status Report and Update – Oral Report by MTA

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO HEAR REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

H. Public/Private Partnership (P3) Alternative - by MTA

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO HEAR REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

I. Green Trucks Discussion – Oral Report by COG

SUGGESTED ACTION: CONSIDER REQUEST FOR PARTICIPATION AND INFORMATION; AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

J. Gateway Cities COG Engineer Report by Jerry Wood – Oral Report

SUGGESTED ACTION: CONSIDER REQUEST FOR PARTICIPATION AND INFORMATION; AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

IX. MATTERS FROM THE I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

X. MATTERS FROM THE CHAIR

XI. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 4:00 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory 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 Technical Advisory Committee meeting scheduled for Wednesday, June 15, 2011, 1:30 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.

Approve Minutes of
March 16, 2011
I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Bill Pagett at 1:37 p.m.

II. Roll Call

PRESENT: Bill Pagett, City of Paramount and City of Maywood, Chair; Steve Hilton, City of Bell Gardens; Farrokh Abolfathi, City of Carson; Alex Hamilton, City of Commerce; Wendell Johnson, City of Compton; Mark Christoffels, City of Long Beach; Daniel Ojeda, City of Lynwood; Charlie Honeycutt, City of Signal Hill; Mohammad Mostahkami, City of South Gate; Kevin Wilson, City of Vernon; James Yang, County of Los Angeles; Ron Kosinski, Caltrans; Adrian Alvarez, MTA; Jolene Hayes, POLB; Kerry Cartwright, POLA; Susan Nakamura, SCAQMD; Art Goodwin, ACTA (ex officio); Garry Garrigue, SCE (ex officio).

ABSENT: Carlos Alvarado, City of Bell and City of Cudahy; Ed Norris, City of Downey; Wes Lind, City of Huntington Park; Michelle Noch, FHWA & FTA; Tommi Tyler, CHP; Phillip Law, SCAG; Mark Sedlacek, LADWP (ex officio).

Other attendees included: Lucy Olmos, MTA; Jerry Wood, GCCOG; Jack Joseph, GCCOG; Dave Levinsohn, URS; Rob McCann LSA; Esmeralda Garcia, MIG; Tom Ionta, CH2MHill; Juan Carlos Velasquez, CH2MHill; Rubina Chandhary, MARRS; Wayne Richardson, MARRS; Bruce Schmith, HNTB; JD Douglas, InfraConsult; Robert Garin, InfraConsult Steve Huff, RBF Consulting; Jocelyn Vivar, EYCEJ.

III. Pledge of Allegiance

Kevin Wilson led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. Amendments to the Agenda

There were no amendments to the agenda.

V. Public Comments

There were no public comments.
VI. Matters from Staff

There were no matters from staff.

VII. Consent Calendar

It was moved by Mark Christoffels, seconded by Mohammad Mostahkami, to approve the minutes of the meeting of February 16, 2011. The motion was approved unanimously.

VIII. Reports

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

Dave Levinsohn of URS presented a description of the I-710 Corridor Project Alternatives for a review by the TAC members. He said the project team is very busy again. In the March-April period they will complete the geometric refinements for alternatives 6a and 6b and the associated technology studies.

Mohammad Mostahkami asked if the geometric changes have been shared yet with the Community Advisory Committee. Jerry Wood responded that they have been shared with the local advisory committees, but not yet with the CAC.

B. Engineering Report on I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS

Dave Levinsohn of URS gave a short power point presentation on the engineering status for the project. He discussed the revised schedule and the status of the updated geometric plans. He said meetings will be held with TAC members from the affected cities for each segment sometime in April and May to review the updated geometric plans in detail.

It was moved by Mohammad Mostahkami, seconded by Daniel Ojeda, to receive and file reports A and B. The motion was approved unanimously.

C. Environmental Studies Report on the I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS

Rob McCann of LSA made a short presentation on the status of the associated environmental studies for the I-710 project. He reported minimal progress waiting on the updated engineering reports from URS.

Rob McCann of LSA made a short power point presentation regarding the I-5 EIR/EIS and the coordination for Segment 7 for the I-710 EIR/EIS for the I-5/I-710 interchange. He reported that Caltrans is in the process of providing the information from this other project to be used for the I-710 EIR/EIS. He said URS is designing the project from Long Beach to Washington Blvd., but Caltrans is designing the project north to SR-60 because of the I-5 project.

It was moved by Kevin Wilson, seconded by Charlie Honeycutt, to receive and file the reports C and D. The motion was approved unanimously.

E. Community Participation Report on I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS

Esmeralda Garcia of MIG gave a short power point presentation on the recent community meetings. Jerry Wood asked if there would be an updated newsletter issued soon. Ms. Garcia responded that a newsletter would be issued in a few weeks. Mohammad Mostahkami said that he would like an updated meeting schedule distributed to the TAC.

It was moved by Kevin Wilson, seconded by Mohammad Mostahkami, to receive and file the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

F. I-710 Early Action Projects Update

Adrian Alvarez briefed the TAC on the RFP for the sound wall feasibility study. He said he would have a better sense of the release date next month.

Jerry Wood recommended that the TAC appoint members to a review team for the RFP for the two utility studies. Mark Christoffels, Daniel Ojeda, and Kevin Wilson volunteered to serve on the review team. It was the consensus of the TAC to form a sub-committee of those three TAC members to review the proposals for the central and north utility relocation projects. A member from this sub-committee will represent the TAC on the selection panel.
It was moved by Mark Christoffels, seconded by Charlie Honeycutt, to receive and file the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

G. Air Quality Action Plan Report

Adrian Alvarez of MTA gave a power point presentation on this project. He reported the status and that a Fact Sheet and FAQ sheet should be available next month. He reported that the COG Board of Directors had approved the participation framework and that the consultants and MTA were proceeding with populating the various groups and committees. He said the working groups should be populated in April and the technical and advisory groups in May or June.

Wendell Johnson volunteered to serve as the TAC representative for the AQAP technical roundtable. Mark Christoffels volunteered to serve as the TAC alternate. It was moved by Kerry Cartwright, seconded by Kevin Wilson, to appoint Wendell Johnson as the representative and Mark Christoffels as the alternate to the AQAP technical roundtable. The motion was approved unanimously.

H. Public/Private Partnership (P3 Study) Presentation

Dave Levinsohn of URS said that a public/private partnership (P3) tolling option was studied as a potential alternative to go with alternatives 6A and 6B. JD Douglas of InfraConsult gave a power point on the preliminary results and recommendations from the P3 Study about a potential tolling alternative that could be added as an alternative for the I-710 EIR/EIS for either or both the freight corridor or the general purpose lanes. Dave Levinsohn said that the tolling option would be a new Alternative 6C with respect to the I-710 EIR/EIS alternatives.

It was moved by Kerry Cartwright, seconded by Mark Christoffels, to recommend to the I-710 Project Committee that Alternative 6C as a tolling option for the freight corridor only be included in the I-710 Corridor EIR/EIS. The motion was approved unanimously.

It was moved by Steve Hilton, seconded by Kevin Wilson, to receive and file the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

I. SR-91/I-605/I-405 – I-605 Congestion Hot Spots Feasibility Study Transportation Strategic Plan Presentation
Steve Huff of RBF gave a power point presentation on this project, which is being funded out of Measure R. He identified the project team and delivery schedule approach. He said they will complete traffic counts this month and initiate the data collection and prepare aerial photo base maps.

After some discussion it was moved by Mark Christoffels, seconded by Kevin Wilson, to provide participation from the I-710 cities for this other project and to receive and file the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

J. Gateway Cities COG Engineer Report

Jerry Wood reported on his impressions from the Green Truck Summit that he attended in Indianapolis and that there was a lot of development of different types of “green” trucks. He also reported that CALSTART should be submitting their report on assessing the status of the various technologies for these green trucks and that it should be available soon. He also reported that the ITS Implementation Plan for Goods Movement was moving forward with a consultant selected and was expecting that project to start in a few months.

Matters from the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee

There were no matters from Committee members.

X. Matters from the Chair

There were no matters from the Chair.

XI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 3:35 p.m.
VIII. Reports
Item F
South Bound Firestone Boulevard On-Ramp Early Action Project
TO: I-710 EIR/EIS Technical Advisory Committee

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG

BY: Jerry Wood, COG Engineer

SUBJECT: South Bound Firestone Boulevard On-Ramp Early Action Project

Background

The I-710 TAC previously voted unanimously to proceed with the reconstruction of the South bound Firestone Blvd. on-ramp (from East bound Firestone) as an early action project. The City of South Gate asked for this as they are proceeding with widening the bridge on Firestone just west of I-710. That work is currently proceeding. The widening project just “touches” the existing South Bound on-ramp which has many non-standard features. Caltrans continues to request the City of Southgate to improve this on-ramp to eliminate these undesirable non-standard features at its current location. However, the City would prefer to re-construct the on-ramp a little later at its ultimate location and does not have the funding to proceed with it at this time.

The City has been working on the design of federally funded Firestone Blvd. widening over the LA River for the past few years and it keeps getting delayed by Caltrans. As stated above, this widening requires minor modification to the I-710 Southbound on-ramp. However, Caltrans is requiring the City to reconstruct this entire ramp to current standards (it currently has numerous non-standard features). If designed and built at its current location, the $3 plus million ramp would have to be removed and reconstructed at its ultimate location in a few years as part of the I-710 project. For that reason, the City requested a design exemption. However, Caltrans agreed to it provided Caltrans receives a commitment letter that the new ramp will be constructed as an Early Action project for the I-710 Freeway Corridor project.

Previously the TAC, on August 19, 2009, unanimously approved this project as an early action project. That vote was not forwarded to the Project Committee. However, Metro provided a letter to Caltrans concerning this vote but, despite Metro’s letter, Caltrans still asked the City for a letter of understanding. The letter would commit the City to fund the new ramp or commit to look for funding for the new ramp if the Early Action project does not take place. That is the reason for this action request of the TAC at this meeting. A delay in the project of approximately a year has taken place with the project funding in jeopardy. The City needs to complete construction by the end of the year – which is not going to happen. The City will be meeting with the Metro TAC to explain the project status and the reasons for the delay at the TAC meeting on June 1, 2011.
Issue

The issue of the timing of the improvement to the South bound on-ramp remains an unresolved issue between the City and Caltrans. The vote by the I-710 TAC to proceed with this on-ramp improvement as an early action project did not satisfy Caltrans concerns with not improving the existing on-ramp. They are unsure when the ultimate project would be built. The City will make a presentation to the TAC at the meeting to bring the TAC up to date. The City will likely request that the TAC move forward with this project at its ultimate location as soon as possible to resolve the issue between the City and Caltrans. The cost for the on-ramp improvement at its current location is between $2 and $3 M.

Recommended Action

1. Receive and File Report and/or; 2. Re-affirm decision as early action project and/or; 3. Recommend to I-710 PC to proceed with this project for design and construction as early action project as soon as possible and for MTA to proceed with RFP and SOW; and/or 4. Give Direction to Staff
VIII. Reports
Item H
Public/Private Partnership (P3) Alternative
Background

MTA has been conducting numerous studies to evaluate the application of public-private partnerships (P3) for different transportation projects in LA County. One of those projects is the I-710 proposed improvements – with emphasis on the freight corridor. InfraConsult has been retained by MTA and has been working on this study for many months, working closely with the MTA staff and the project team and funding partners for the I-710 EIR/EIS Corridor Project. They have completed their preliminary evaluation and presented the initial results.

Issue

A private-public partnership (P3) could be used to develop an approach for getting private investment for the project, with the primary benefits of (1) obtaining additional funds needed to build the project and (2) speeding up project implementation. For the I-710 Corridor EIR/EIS, the objective of including a tolling option is to environmentally clear an alternative that analyzes the unique impacts of needing to prepare a supplemental environmental document later, the tolled alternative needs to be analyzed in comparison to the “No-Build” alternative to the same level of detail as the other Build alternatives in the Draft EIR/EIS. This alternative would evaluate realistic tolling assumptions so that the tolled alternative selected for evaluation in the EIR/EIS is feasible to construct and operate. If enabling legislation is needed, it will be clearly identified in the project description.

InfraConsult has made presentations to the I-710 TAC and to the Funding Partners for this tolling alternative completed to date. Both groups reviewed this information and previously agreed that a freight corridor only toll option is reasonable and should be evaluated in the I-710 Corridor EIR/EIS and is recommended its inclusion at that time so that the project can stay on schedule.

Subsequent to previous actions on this tolling option, the CAC had similar presentations on it made to them. They voted to have both the freight corridor only tolling option and the freight corridor and general purpose lane tolling option (general purpose lane tolling for trucks only) considered in the EIR/EIS and that recommendation was forwarded to the PC.
InfraConsult presented to the TAC at its last meeting their analysis the rationale and reasons that would permit tolling of trucks in the General Purpose lanes. This might be possible but is subject to special conditions.

The CAC agreed that a toll alternative be included in the EIR/EIS. As stated above the I-710 TAC agreed and supported the option to include in the EIR/EIS the tolling of trucks on the Freight Corridor only for Alternatives 6A and 6B as reasonable and should be included to keep the project on schedule. The I-710 CAC extensively discussed this TAC recommendation and recommended including a second tolling alternative in the EIR/EIS. This second tolling alternative includes tolling trucks on both the Freight Corridor and the General Purpose lanes for Alternatives 6A and 6B and was recommended to provide additional flexibility in the eventual choice of a preferred alternative and P3 financing strategy. The CAC also indicated they would like to have further dialogue and discussion about this P3 financing option at a future meeting.

Based on the recent InfraConsult presentation on the conditions that would be required to toll trucks in the General Purpose lanes along with the Freight Corridor, this might be possible but is uncertain. However, in support of the CAC, it is recommended to the TAC that consideration and a comparative and sufficient analysis of this second tolling alternative be evaluated as part of the tolling analysis for its inclusion in the EIR/EIS.

**Recommended Action**

Concur with recommendations for two versions of the Public/Private Partnership (P3) Tolling Alternatives and proceed with a comparative and sufficient analysis for both to determine effectiveness and feasibility and then include them as Alternatives 6C and 6D and report this analysis to the TAC, CAC and PC. Alternative 6C will assume tolls are assessed on only the trucks using the Freight Corridor for Alternatives 6A and 6B, while Alternative 6D will assume tolls are assessed on trucks in the I-710 General Purpose Lanes and on the Freight Corridor for Alternatives 6A and 6B.