

**MINUTES OF THE
SR-91/I-605/I-405 CORRIDOR CITIES
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) MEETING
via Zoom
October 26, 2021**

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 1:37 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Roll Call was taken and presented below.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

	Name	City / Agency	Present	Absent
1	Okina Dor	Artesia		X
2	Jerry Stock (Vice Chair)	Bellflower	X	
3	Kanna Vancheswaran	Cerritos		X
4	Ernesto Munoz	Compton	X	
5	Ed Norris	Downey	X	
6	Vacant	Hawaiian Gardens		X
7	Bing Hyun	Industry		X
8	Max Withrow (Bill Pagett) for	Lakewood	X	
9	Carl Hickman	Long Beach	X	
10	Glen Kau	Norwalk		X
11	Bill Padgett	Paramount	X	
12	Terry Rodrigue	Pico Rivera	X	
13	Noe Negrete (Chair)	Santa Fe Springs	X	
14	Michelle Chapman	Whittier		X
15	Mahdad Derakhshani	County of Los Angeles	X	
16	Eric Shen	San Gabriel Valley COG		X
17	Ernesto Chaves	Metro	X	
18	Nancy Pe	Caltrans	X	
		Total =	11	7

OTHER ATTENDEES: Nancy Pfeffer, Kekoa Anderson, Yvette Kirrin, Joel Arevalos, COG Staff; George Medina, City of Long Beach; Maggie Cheung, La County; Carlos Montez, Julio Perucho, Isidro Panuco, Lucy Delgadillo, Metro; Tony An, Keith Hoey, City of Long Beach; Pouya Banibayat, GFNET; Georgia Medina, Stephanie Oslick, Moffat & Nichol; Shahram Vahdat, HNTB; Joe Linton, Streetsblog; David Woo, AYC Inc; Eric Diaz, Opti Tran; Len Gorecki, City of Bellflower; Nancy Pe, Siew Mei Tan, Caltrans; Luke Klip, Jamie Hwang, LA County; Sherri Terrell, JM Diaz; Rafael Anaya, Trans Systems; Wayne Richardson, Diego Cadena, HDR, Inc; Eric Spangler, MK

Baker; Mouhsen Habib, MSN; Michael Te, Harris & Associates; Jeff Fromhertz, WSP; Kandice Nguyen, Ayce, Inc.; Traci Gleason, Koa Consulting;

III. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA

There were no amendments to the agenda.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

V. CONSENT CALENDAR

Approval of Minutes for the Meeting of June 22, 2021, of the SR-91/I-605/405 Technical Advisory Committee.

It was moved by Bill Pagett (Paramount) and seconded by Downey (Ed Norris). Without objection, the vote was passed, with one abstention from Pico Rivera.

VI. REPORTS

A. 91/605/405 Hots Spots Update

Metro provided a brief update regarding the freeway and local hot spots. A PowerPoint was provided by Mr. Carlos Montez that summarized the status of each freeway project. It was noted that approximately \$245 million in freeway funds, and \$14 million in non-freeway funds remained available in Measure R.

The Program Funding Update (or Item C) for convenience was also provided by Carlos Montez. Handouts were provided to further detail the current allocations by agency along with funds allocated to date as well as spent to date on both the freeway and non-freeway side.

It was moved by Dan Garcia (Compton) and seconded by Bill Pagett (Paramount) to receive and file report. It was approved without objection.

B. SR-91 Pioneer Interchange – Request to Perform Redesign

The motion to support the redesign of the SR-91 Pioneer Interchange requiring \$1.4 million additional Measure R freeway funds along with acknowledging an additional 6 months of delay. Carlos noted that the city of Artesia requested the change to Design Option 2, in order to reduce the right of way impacts, even though the project was nearly design complete with approximately 80% done.

Several questions were asked including if an environmental revalidation was needed, as well as the anticipated changes in the construction capital amounts. Carlos noted that he didn't expect a significant change in the construction capital, and that impacts had been reduced by 4 homes, even though they were willing sellers, that were no longer needed.

It was moved by Ed Norris (Downey) and seconded by Paramount (Bill Pagett). Roll call alphabetically by jurisdiction occurred noting those absent, those present and voting to approve and/or abstain.

The motion was approved unanimously.

C. Current Program Funding Update

The Program Funding Update by Carlos Montez was incorporated into Item A.

D. Status of Measure Funds (Measure R and M)

Ms. Kirrin presented a PowerPoint that incorporated 3 main topics, including Topic 1: the Measure R (Contingency vs. Drawdown), Topic 2: the Measure M (MSP) – Prioritization and Topic 3: the Measure M Process.

Regarding Topic 1, Ms. Kirrin provided information including the Measure R – History, the Budgeted Allocations vs. Actual Allocation, along with two options for how the remaining funds are handled. The TAC discussed Option A (Contingency) vs. Option B (Draw Down). Based on a robust discussion, the TAC determined that they wanted to leave all remaining non-freeway Measure R funds available for cost overruns or other items that were specific to existing freeway agreements with the agencies, so that a new agreement for Measure M MSP would not be required to finish a phase and/or job.

A motion was made to approve Option A, which is to keep the remaining Measure R Non-Freeway Funds in Contingency for existing Projects, as needed.

It was moved by Ed Norris (Downey) and seconded by Paramount (Bill Pagett). Roll call alphabetically by jurisdiction occurred noting those absent, those present and voting to approve and/or abstain.

The motion was approved unanimously.

Regarding Topic 2: Measure M (MSP) – Prioritization, issues discussed included the Measure M Cashflow (Moving Forward), a possible Local set aside (for eligible projects) – ATP, Complete Streets, Intersections and Freeway Improvements, and

how to handle Misc. - scope changes, cost changes, contingency, schedule changes/reprogramming.

This issue raised significant discussion regarding how many Agencies were likely to submit a project request, how much should we be saving for large freeway capital projects, and should the TAC differentiate non-freeway projects into intersections, complete streets/arterials and/or active transportation projects. It was decided to deter the conversation of the non-freeway categories of arterials, intersections and AT uses and keep the split at the freeway/non-freeway higher level. It was also noted that the TAC should be pursuing outside funds to leverage Measure funds. Several TAC members provided input to the conversation.

A Motion was made to split the allocated Measure M MSP funds totaling \$65 million dollars by 60% (or \$39 million) for freeway projects, and 40% (or \$26 million) for non-freeway projects.

It was moved by Bill Pagett (Lakewood) and seconded by Terry Rodrigue (Pico Rivera). The motion was approved with five (5) yes votes and four (4) no votes, with Caltrans and Metro abstaining.

Regarding Topic 3, the Measure M Process was discussed and the logistics surrounding the Round 2 (MSP) Submittal was agreed upon. This included a discussion of the history during the round 1 submittal, the logistics regarding a round 2 submittal, that included a recommendation to conduct an annual MSP call for projects - as cash flow allows based on GCCOG prioritize, and the need for any Bi-Annual programming requirements, or need to re-affirmation priority major projects requiring future funds savings. A series of dates were provided including the need to submit the required forms prior the Metro 60 day review clock starting, which was needed prior to placing the package on the Metro Board for approval. Optimistically, it was noted that the MSP could be approved in the March/April timeframe if everyone could stay on schedule. It was noted that all necessary dates, documents and relevant information would be shared via email post the meeting and that GCCOG staff was available to help facilitate the preparation of the package for submittal.

A Motion was made to Commence with the Round 2 (MSP) Submittal.

It was moved by Carl Hickman (Long Beach) and seconded by Jerry Stock (Bellflower). The motion was approved without objection (9-0), with Caltrans and Metro abstaining.

E. Measure R Funding Request

Artesia "Great" Street Complete Street Project

This project request was to be submitted in a 2-meeting request due to the amount being requested being greater than \$5 million. Mr. Carl Hickman

provided the presentation and noted that the City of Long Beach is leveraging funds from several funding sources. Following the presentation, the TAC directed Long Beach to submit their project as part of the Measure M MSP Round 2 submittal as they had already determined that they wanted to leave the remaining Measure R funds, which was almost consistent with the amount of Long Beach's request, as contingency funds for existing projects that might require them. No vote was taken.

I-605 Soundwall Project

This project request is a one meeting project request, lead by the City of Long Beach. The City is requesting \$1.3 million to fully fund the soundwall along northbound I-605 at Spring Street. It was noted that the design is nearly complete and ready to advertise in the first quarter of 2022.

It was noted that the original funding of \$3,169,033 was categorized as non-freeway funds, and reallocated those funds to freeway funds was discussed and verbally approved by Metro, since the soundwalls along the I-710 are being paid for with Measure R freeway funds.

A motion to approve \$1.3 million in non-freeway Measure R funding to augment the City's current Funding Agreement for the I-605 soundwall at Spring Street.

It was moved by Carl Hickman (Long Beach) and seconded by Jerry Stock (Bellflower). The motion was approved without objection (9-0), with Caltrans and Metro abstaining.

F. Gateway Cities COG Engineer's Report

No Report.

VII. COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Noe noted that this was the longest TAC meeting in recent history and that he appreciated that everyone participated and that significant progress was made during the meeting. He thanked everyone for their participation and adjourned the meeting.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:04 p.m.