

GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

SR-91/I-605/I-405 Corridor Cities Committee AGENDA

Wednesday, May 25, 2022 - 6:00 PM
Gateway Cities Council of Governments

MEETING REMOTE LOCATION:

https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_v2MthMjdTRyDm0XSu_Md9Q

Please register in advance for the webinar

OR JOIN BY PHONE:

1.669.900.6833

MEETING NUMBER:

841 2803 8819

After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the webinar.

AGENDA REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE ON THE GATEWAY CITIES COG WEBSITE AT WWW.GATEWAYCOG.ORG.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: To address the 91/605/405 Corridor Cities Committee on any agenda item or a matter within the Committee's purview, you may provide written comments by 10:30 a.m. the day of the meeting, via email to info@gatewaycog.org. All written comments timely received will be distributed to the 91/605/405 Corridor Cities Committee and will become part of the official record. You may also make oral public comment during the Public Comment period on the agenda

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

III. **AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).

IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS: The 91/605/405 Corridor Cities Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item that is not on the agenda but within its subject matter jurisdiction. The 91/605/405 Corridor Cities Committee cannot discuss or take action on any item not on the agenda. The limit for each speaker is three minutes unless otherwise specified by the Chair. Please use the “Raise Hand” feature on Zoom to indicate that you wish to make a comment. If you are calling in, please dial *9 to use the “Raise Hand” feature.

V. MATTERS FROM STAFF

VI. 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 Committee.

A. Approval of Minutes for the meeting of February 24, 2021 of the 91/605/405 Corridor Cities Committee

VII. REPORTS

15 Min

- A. 91/I-605/405 Program Update – Report by Metro.
- 605 CIP (EIR) Update
 - Hot Spots - Freeway Updates
 - Local Hot Spots Updates

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

10 Min

- B. Measure M Non-Freeway Funding Request for \$21,011,308 approved in January 2022 by the TAC – Report by Yvette Kirrin (GCCOG)

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO APPROVE

10 Min

- C. Current Program Funding Update – Report by Carlos Montez (Metro).
- MSP Update – All (Non-Freeway) Projects Listing
 - Cash Flow & Invoicing Status (Measure R Non-Freeway Funds)
 - Cash Flow & Invoicing Status (Measure R Highway Funds)
 - Cash Flow & Project Status (Measure M)

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

15 Min

- D. Gateway Cities COG Engineer Report by Yvette Kirrin and/or Kekoa Anderson

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

VIII. COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

IX. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 7:00 PM unless the Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next meeting.

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.

**VI. CONSENT CALENDAR
Item A.**

**Approval of Minutes for
February 24, 2021**

**MINUTES OF THE
SR-91/I-605/I-405
CORRIDOR CITIES COMMITTEE (CCC) MEETING
Webex Meeting
February 24, 2021**

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Raymond Dunton at 6:05 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Roll Call was taken and presented below.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

	Name	City / Agency	Present	Absent
1	Tony Lima	Artesia	X	
2	Raymond Dunton	Bellflower	X	
3	Naresh Solanki	Cerritos		X
4	Michelle Chambers	Compton		X
5	Claudia M. Frometa	Downey	X	
6	Luis Roa	Hawaiian Gardens	X	
7	Bing Hyun	Industry		X
8	Ariel Pe	Lakewood	X	
9	Stacy Mungo	Long Beach		X
10	Jennifer Perez	Norwalk	X	
11	Laurie Guillen	Paramount	X	
12	Raul Elias	Pico Rivera	X	
13	Joe Angel Zamora	Santa Fe Springs	X	
14	Fernando Dutra	Whittier	X	
15	Luke H. Klipp	LA County Supervisor, District 4	X	
		Totals =	11	4

OTHER ATTENDEES:

Webex attendance record. (See attached)

III. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

Nominations for Chair was Councilman Raymond Dunton and for Vice-Chair was Mayor Claudia M. Frometa, The Chair and Vice-Chair were approved unanimously.

IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA

There were no amendments to the agenda.

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

All written comments timely submitted were distributed to the 91/605/405 Corridor Cities Committee members as part of the agenda packet and are included as part of the official record. Additional Public comments were received orally, limited to 3-minutes.

Written comments included in the agenda packet have been provided to Metro's I-605 Corridor Improvement Project team and will be evaluated as part of the preparation of the Environmental Document Process. Once the draft Environmental Document is circulated written comments will be received and responses included in the Final Environmental Document.

VI. MATTERS FROM STAFF

There were no matters from staff.

VII. CONSENT CALENDAR

Approval of Minutes for the Meeting of June 26, 2019, of the SR-91/I-605/405 Corridor Cities Committee.

It was moved by Mayor Frometa, seconded by Councilman Dutra, to approve the minutes of the meeting of June 26, 2019. The motion was approved unanimously.

VIII. REPORTS

A. Metro Highway Program Update on Measure R/M Funding – Oral Report by Ernesto Chaves (Metro)

Ernesto Chaves provided an update on Measure R/M Funding programs. He addressed funding prioritization efforts and impacts due to lost revenue, fares, and tolls, as well as increased costs in response of the pandemic. Altogether, an estimated \$1.8 billion reduction in revenue affecting Metro's programs.

Metro was concerned that both the Freeway and Non-Freeway programs may be impacted by these losses. Earlier in 2020, Metro had divided all projects and programs into two buckets. Bucket 1 projects were defined as "work to continue" and Bucket 2 projects were being evaluated to be deferred three to six months.

The good news is that the financial outlook is much better now and, generally, Bucket 2 projects that were slowed down are recovering and the GCCOG's projects are back on track.

Councilman Dutra questioned if the losses of revenue over the past year would have a long term affect and set back the timing of the construction phases of the Gateway Cities projects. Ernesto stated that their long-term effects are definitely anticipated. Most of the Gateway Cities projects are currently in the environmental or design phase and are not anticipated to be impacted in the short term. However, as these projects complete pre-construction phases, there may be challenges in securing enough funds to advance to construction for some.

It was moved by Councilman Dutra, seconded by Mayor Frometa to receive and file the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

B. I-605 Corridor Improvement Project – Presentation by Isidro Panuco (Metro)

Isidro Panuco provided a presentation and overview of the I-605 Corridor Improvement Project. He reported that the I-605 Corridor Improvement Project (CIP) was currently evaluating four alternative (including the no-build Alternative) which includes 28 total miles of freeway improvements, as well as improvements to I-105, I-5, SR-60 and I-10 freeway interchanges. The project's purpose and need are to ease congestion, improve mobility and operations, enhance regional connectivity and system efficiency, improve safety and enhance travel experience.

He reviewed the project's schedule, past scoping and community meetings held, as well as COG, city and regulatory meetings undertaken to date. He also briefly touched on future activities which included the incorporation of a locally collaborated and supported design alternative (pending support from the CCC) and an update to technical studies needed to finalize the draft environmental document. Upon the completion of these tasks, a draft EIR/EIS can be share for public review (i.e. circulation) and to receive public comment.

He provided an overview of activities for the past 6 months on the I-605 CIP. In September 2020 Metro received a letter from the GCCOG requesting delay circulation of I-605 EIR/EIS, which was supported by the Metro Board. The letter asked for Metro staff to develop a less impactful alternative for the I-605 CIP to reduce property impacts, especially in Downey and Santa Fe Springs. Metro's design team conducted more than six meetings with the local jurisdictions including the GCCOG, the I-5 JPA, and Caltrans to develop locally supported design alternatives to reduce property impacts. This locally supported alternative developed with the COG, JPA, and cities, balances design standards and improves operations, safety and minimizes right of way and environmental impacts.

Isidro reviewed the overall project schedule and highlighted that the project is currently only funded through the environmental phase. The project schedule assumed that funds are available, but at this time funding for any phase past environmental has not been secured. The design and right-of-way phases are currently not funded and will not start, even if the environmental document is completed, thus properties will not be impacted as part of the environmental process. If funding for future phases does become available, it will take at least 5 years to complete the design and right of way phases and another 5-10 to construct the project. Local sales tax revenues which are expected to be available for this Project over the next 30 years (approx. \$1 billion) are insufficient to cover the cost of constructing the project. A substantial amount of outside funding/revenue (over \$4 billion), beyond Metro's capacity, is needed to start and complete design/construction of the project.

A question was raised by Mayor Frometa regarding the meetings held with various Cities in the past. Where were the community meetings held and what was the number of people who attended? Since Downey has a large number of the projects, property impact was their outreach in this community?

Isidro responded that meetings were held in 2018 in the cities of Norwalk, Whittier and Pico Rivera, which together had 240 people attended. 14,000 residents were contacted via mail and 2,300 project informational materials were placed on cars at park and ride lots to inform them of the project. Once the draft document is ready and when approvals are secured, Metro will be reaching out to the City of Downey as well as the other affected cities to be involve them in the public review and comment process.

Luke Klipp, with LA County Supervisor, District 4, stated that numerous comments were received on this agenda item, more than 70, which is unique compared to other similar projects. This shows the significance of holding appropriate community outreach. Luke asked what is Metro's plan to determine the number of future meetings held? He also pointed out the 45-day comment period would appear to be too short for a project of this magnitude. Is there an opportunity to expand the review period and if so, how much? Additionally, he questioned how many of the technical meetings were open to the public? Given that these property impacts are significant to individuals, what is the impact on their homes' value and what if their homes are in the path of demolition? How are homes with a lower tax base made whole and what is the process for their relocation to an area of greater tax base? Lastly what type of increased transit services are referenced in the environmental document and will be part of this evaluation and how much of the total project costs are for augmented transit services? The small amount of community engagement seen in the past for this project has not addressed these questions and needs to clearly be expanded in the future steps of the process.

Isidro responded that they will be providing a robust community outreach plan for the project during the circulation of the EIR. He also noted that until the draft project

environmental documents and design are reviewed by the required agencies like Caltrans and cities, detailed information regarding property impacts will not be released to the public. Instead, this information will be provided as part of the public circulation process. If properties are purchased for the project, the owner is compensated at or above market price and all efforts are made to accommodate their relocation within their city and special or elderly needs are compensated as well. Property taxes are also transferable. Homeowners do not need to disclose the plans for this project as part of any real estate transaction. After the environmental document is approved, it would be the responsibility of the realtor to disclose and research the project as part of their due diligence.

Councilman Dutra expressed similar concerns of the lack of community outreach and asked if there are opportunities to separate the project into segments with significant operational improvement without the residential impacts. Ernesto responded that for the purpose of the environmental review, the project is evaluated as one, but based on comments from the EIR/EIS, smaller project segments (without property impacts) could be identified for implementation.

Councilwoman Guillen raised the concern that beyond residential impacts, there are other environmental impacts that are important to the community and should not be ignored by Metro. She requested that Metro address other environmental concerns and explain why improvements such as auxiliary lanes are needed and why these impacts are necessary. A lot of the residents do not know what an auxiliary lane is and why it is needed at the expense of their home, as well as adding capacity for added congestion and the impacts that come from more traffic.

Councilman Zamora pointed out that the release of the EIR is the start of formal public comment process necessary to formally capture the public's concerns. This is the start of public engagement process to move the project forward. There is clearly a traffic bottle neck in Santa Fe Springs and there are other impacts to our communities which are not being discussed; these include people sitting in traffic, traffic that travels through our communities to avoid the congested freeway and impacts safety and creates wear and tear on our local roads. There needs to be a balance of the direct impacts to the people who live adjacent to the project, and the indirect impacts to our residences that daily deal with the poor existing conditions of the freeway. Additionally, if there is a toll lane planned at the expense of our residences, then they need to benefit from those toll revenues. We need to move forward and be proactive with a decision that balances the impacts. We need the local input from our Cities and we need you to come to these communities to keep this project moving forward. We want the traffic reduced, we want less travel time and more time with our families. If we allow this project to stop the funds will be used elsewhere; we have the need and need the funds to stay in the area to improve the negative existing conditions.

Councilwoman Perez agreed we need to get to the next phase by initiating the circulation and allowing the process to continue. Based on past history, like along

the I-5 corridor, this process never seems to move forward. Planning has been on-going for 25 years and we are still not there.

Mark Dierking, with Metro community, relations stated that they are happy to conduct the amount of community engagement this committee feels necessary. They will work with the CCC to develop an engagement plan that meets their needs and will come back to this committee with a written plan for approval prior to the circulation of the draft EIR/EIS.

Kekoa Anderson commented that the community and CCC have only seen limited technical information in the form of a presentation and a few past public outreach meetings which took place almost 2-years ago. The data presented has focused primarily on four build alternatives, it is important to understand that there are two additional alternatives, the no-build and the locally collaborated alternative that will be part of the EIR/EIS evaluation. Those that opposed the project, would support the no-build alternative which maintains the existing conditions with no improvements, no impacts and no benefits. The locally collaborated alternative provides an additional build alternative developed to reduce the negative impacts while maintaining and enhancing the positive benefits. The circulation of the draft environmental document would provide detailed technical information and supporting documents, with this information the committee and community could review and make an informed decision with the range of alternatives that would lead to the development of a locally preferred alternative. Once a preferred alternative is identified, then the committee could develop phased improvements, based on funding available, that provide local benefits to the corridor that are compatible with this preferred alternative.

The CCC members are not supporting the construction of the local collaborated alternative, rather only the inclusion of it into the environmental document that will go through a public review process to determine the impacts and benefits.

Mayor Frometa reiterated her support to move forward and the possibility of breaking this project into phases, but we need to eliminate the most impactful parts of the project. With this new design variation, we still have impacts to around 170 residences which are significant impacts along the corridor. We want to move forward and provide alternatives, but we do not want to decimate neighborhoods, and eliminating the generational wealth, so we must be thoughtful. We want to support releasing the environmental so we can receive public comment, but we need an alternative that will eliminate the most significant parts of the project.

Luke Klipp, with LA County Supervisor, District 4, stated there has been a lot of discussion about the bottle neck of the I-5 segment within the Cities of Norwalk and Santa Fe Springs, would the completion of this project move the bottle neck north to the Rio Hondo. Are there any plans to widen the I-5 north of the I-710 and would this widening have similar right of way impacts to the Communities of Montebello, Commerce and East Los Angeles. We need to keep this in mind, as

community impacts along the corridor are not just limited to the segment of the freeway we are currently discussing, but likely the case moving north.

Ernesto Chaves stated there is a line item in the Measure M Expenditure Plan to continue the I-5 HOV lane north to the I-710 interchange. However, this funding is not available until 2034.

A motion by Councilman Dutra, seconded by Mayor Frometa to approve the locally collaborated alternative, and to include it into the EIR, and to circulate the document, as well as, to bring a comprehensive Public Outreach Strategy Plan back to the CCC, for approval, prior to the circulation of the EIR. Roll call was taken and the motion was approved unanimously.

C. SR-91 Corridor Aesthetic Master Plan - Presentation by Kekoa Anderson (GCCOG – Consulting Engineer)

Kekoa Anderson, GCCOG, provided an overview of the SR-91 Corridor Aesthetic Master Plan. The corridor master plan unifies and compliments the existing corridor. Project Aesthetics Goals and Objectives are kept at the forefront to create a visually pleasing corridor, ensure visual unity within the corridor, enhance community identity, promote design for safety, functionality, and maintainability.

Due to the size of the document, the complete SR-91 Corridor Aesthetic Master Plan could not be included in the meeting agenda packet, however the full document can be viewed/downloaded from the link provided in the agenda packet or contact the GCCOG to obtain a copy.

He reported that the Technical Advisory Committee received the same presentation and had approved the SR-91 Corridor Aesthetic Master Plan unanimously at their last TAC meeting on January 26, 2021.

Councilman Dutra commented that specifications should be included to minimize the potential of future utility additions and modifications which created unsightly conditions to the freeway aesthetics.

It was moved to approve the SR-91 Corridor Aesthetic Master Plan by Councilman Dutra, seconded by Councilman Zamora to approve the SR-91 Corridor Aesthetic Master Plan. Roll call was taken and the motion was approved unanimously.

IX. COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

There were no comments from the committee members.

X. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:18 p.m.

VII. REPORTS
Item A

91/I-605/405 Program Update
Report by Metro

VII. REPORTS
Item B.

**Measure M Non-Freeway Funding
Request for \$21,011,308 approved in
January 2022 by the TAC**

Report by Yvette Kirrin (GCCOG)

91/605/405 Corridor Cities Committee

TO: 91/605/405 CCC

FROM: Yvette Kirrin, P.E. – GCCOG Transportation Engineer

SUBJECT: Measure M Non-Freeway Funding Request for \$21,011,308 approved in January 2022 by the TAC

Background

On October 26, 2021, the TAC voted to authorize the preparation of a second round of Measure M MSP projects. This package was quantified at the subregional level and led to a TAC vote recommending approval to this 91/605/405 CCC. Ultimately the Metro Board will approve the package for funding and is scheduled for approval during their June 2022 meeting.

The TAC authorized \$26 million of the total \$65 million available, for non-freeway projects that would fund projects through 2024/2025. Based on the approval process from the October TAC, significant communications, along with deadlines and requests for the completion of required Metro paperwork was coordinated, with all 91/605/405 agencies.

Based on the completed coordination with the TAC agencies, following the authorization to proceed with the preparation of a Round 2 submittal package, the table below shows the “allocation change” also recommended for new/additional funding. The new projects proposed by Bellflower, Long Beach, and Pico Rivera, along with a minor allocation increase on an existing project in Bellflower, with the grand total of \$21,011,308.

Gateway Cities Subregion
Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Plan - I-605 Corridor "Hot Spot" Interchange Improvement (Expenditure Line 61)

Agency	Project ID No.	Project/Location	Funding Phases	Note	Pror Alloc	Alloc Change	Current Alloc	FY 2019-20	FY2020-21	FY2021-22	FY2022-23	FY2023-24	FY2024-25
1 Bellflower	MM5509.01	Lakewood Blvd Arterial Improvement Project	PS&E Construction	chg	\$ 1,450,000	\$ 57,041	\$ 1,507,041		\$ 217,500	\$ 1,232,500	\$ 57,041		
2 Bellflower	MM5509.08	Foster Road Traffic Signal Upgrades	PS&E Construction	new		850,000	850,000				100,000	750,000	
3 Cerritos	MM5509.02	Del Amo Blvd Bridge Replacement & Traffic Signal Synch Project	Environmental PS&E Construction		2,400,000		2,400,000	400,000	1,000,000	1,000,000			
4 Downey & Pico Rivera	MM5509.03	Telegraph Rd Traffic Safety Enhancements Phase II	PS&E Construction		350,000		350,000	350,000					
5 LA County	MM5509.04	Carmenita Rd and Imperial Hwy Intersection Improvements	PS&E Construction		1,930,000		1,930,000	300,000	630,000	1,000,000			
6 Long Beach	MM5509.05	Studebaker Rd - Loynes Dr Complete Streets	Environmental PS&E Construction		8,750,000		8,750,000		2,942,000	5,808,000			
7 Long Beach	MM5509.09	Artesia "Great" Street Project (CFP F7316/F9130 + MR312.70/MR315.70)	PS&E Construction	new		13,668,000	13,668,000			1,560,000	5,520,000	6,588,000	
8 Norwalk	MM5509.06	Firestone Blvd Widening Project, Phase I	Environmental PS&E Construction	chg	13,284,900		13,284,900				3,284,900	5,000,000	5,000,000
9 Pico Rivera	MM4302.01	Pico Rivera Regional Bikeway Project	PS&E Construction	new		2,697,000	2,697,000				1,527,000	1,170,000	
10 Pico Rivera	MM5509.10	Washington Blvd Bridge Reconstruction	PS&E Construction	new		3,739,267	3,739,267					527,767	3,211,500
11 Whittier	MM5509.07	Beverly Blvd at Norwalk Blvd Realignment Project	PS&E ROW Construction		2,100,000		2,100,000	150,000	550,000	1,400,000			
Total Programming Amount					\$30,264,900	\$21,011,308	\$51,276,208	\$1,200,000	\$5,339,500	\$12,000,500	\$10,488,941	\$14,035,767	\$8,211,500

Recommendation

It is recommended that the TAC approve the three (3) Agency submittals in the amount of **\$21,011,308**, which will be forwarded to the Metro Board for funding agreements.

VII. REPORTS
Item C.

Current Program Funding Update
Report by Carlos Montez (Metro)