



I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

Thursday November 10, 2011

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 June 30, 2011, of the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION:

A MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM.

VIII. REPORTS

A. I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS Engineering Update – Oral Report by URS

10 Min

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

B. I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS Environmental Update– Oral Report by LSA

10 Min

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

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

10 Min

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

D. Traffic Analyses Update – Oral Report by URS

30 Min

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

E. Update on Water Key Findings – Oral Report by URS

30 Min

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

- F. I-710 EIR/EIS Update on Review Period and Translation of Executive Summary
– Oral Report by MTA/COG Staff

10 Min

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

- G. I-710 Early Action Projects – Oral Report by MTA

10 Min

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

- H. Measure R Funds Update – Oral Report by MTA

10 Min

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

- I. Gateway Cities COG Engineer Report by Jerry Wood – Oral Report

5 Min

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

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

X. MATTERS FROM THE CHAIR

XI. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 8:30 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, December 29, 2011, 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

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

**A Meeting Held at Progress Park
15500 Downey Avenue
Paramount, CA**

June 30, 2011

I. Call to Order

Co-Chairman 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; Ana Maria Quintana, City of Bell; Sergio Infanzon, City of Bell Gardens; Jim Dear, City of Carson; Denise Robles, City of Commerce; Lillie Dobson, City of Compton; Frank Gurule, City of Cudahy; Gene Daniels, City of Paramount; Larry Forester, City of Signal Hill; Patrick De Chellis, County of Los Angeles; Dr. Mike Walter, Port of Long Beach; Douglas Krause, Port of Los Angeles; Joe Aguilar, I-5 JPA; Ron Kosinski, Caltrans; Diane DuBois, MTA; Alison Linder, SCAG; Barbara Messina, SGVCOG; Sylvia Southerland, Southern California Edison (ex officio).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Bob Foster, City of Long Beach, Co-Chair; Luis Marquez, City of Downey; Elba Guerrero, City of Huntington Park; Maria T. Santillan, City of Lynwood; Felipe Aguirre, City of Maywood; William Davis, City of Vernon; Susan Seamans, SBCCOG (ex officio); Mark Sedlacek, LADWP (ex officio).

ALSO PRESENT: Bell Councilmember Dan Harber; Commerce Senior Administrative Analyst Fernando Mendoza; Vernon Director of Community Services Kevin Wilson; James Yang, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works; Eric Shen, Port Of Long Beach Director of Transportation Planning; Garret Damrath, Caltrans; Frank Quon, Executive Officer, Highway Programs, MTA; Ernesto Chaves, Transportation Planner, MTA; Adrian Alvarez, Project Manager, MTA; Lucy Olmos, MTA; Ivy Tsai, Deputy General Counsel, GCCOG; Richard Powers, Executive Director, GCCOG; Jack Joseph, Deputy Executive Director, GCCOG; Jerry Wood, GCCOG Engineer; Jack Waldron, Project Manager, URS; Dave Levinsohn, Deputy Project Manager, URS; Shannon Willits, Engineering Manager, URS; Rob McCann, President, LSA;

Jayna Goodman, Senior Planner, LSA; Amit Shah, AECOM; Elaine Carbrey, Gruen Associates; Esmeralda Garcia, Project Manager, MIG; Scott Broten, ICF; J. D. Douglas, InfraConsult; Michael Ippoliti, CALSTART.

III. Pledge of Allegiance

Member Daniels 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 Member Walter, seconded by Member Daniels, to approve the minutes of the meeting of January 31, 2011. The motion was approved unanimously.

VIII. Reports

A. I-710 Draft EIR/EIS Circulation and Review Period

Frank Quon, MTA Executive Officer for Highway Programs, presented a report regarding the review period for environmental impact reports similar to the I-710 corridor project. He said the typical review period is 45 calendar days, consistent with the legal requirements under CEQA and NEPA. He said the current I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS schedule assumes a 60 day calendar day review period.

Mr. Quon reported on the May 19, 2011, meeting of the Corridor Advisory Committee (CAC), at which time the CAC recommended extending the review period to 180 days so that the community would have adequate time to read the document and formulate comments because of the size and complexity of the project. He said the CAC also expressed a strong desire to have the information in the document available in Spanish.

Mr. Quon recommended that the Project Committee acknowledge the

recommendation of the CAC for a 180 day review period and to request the project team to assess current environmental processes and review period requirements and to direct the project team to explore potential regulatory and other implications associated with extending the review period to 180 days.

Evangelina Ramirez, Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma, said that she has been coming to meetings for three years and lives near the freeway and hears the noise. She said she doesn't understand that we are still at a point where we can't define things. She said it's going to be impossible to understand the document and that she supports the longer time to review it.

Mark Lopez, East Los Angeles, asked that the review period be extended to 180 days and that there be a Spanish translation.

Robert Cabrales, Communities for a Better Environment, said he supported a 180 day review period and translation of at least the executive summary into Spanish.

Mischa Velasquez, Communities for a Better Environment, said she supported translation of the EIR into Spanish and a 180 day review period.

Jocelyn Vivar, East Yards Communities for Environmental Justice, asked that the review period be extended to 180 days and the executive summary be translated into Spanish. She asked for additional public/private partnerships to be included.

Bertalina Chaves, Communities for a Better Environment, said she supported the review period extension to 180 days and for a Spanish translation.

Jennifer Canata, Communities for a Better Environment, spoke in favor of an extension of the review period to 180 days, which is the longest legally permissible amount of time. She said a Spanish translation is necessary for the community which is impacted by the project.

Member Forester said the normal review process is 45 to 60 days, but, if something comes up during that period, it can be extended. He said he doesn't like the idea of 180 days and would like staff to report on the impact.

The GCCOG Deputy General Counsel said that the CEQA law calls for a minimum review period of 30 days and a maximum of 60 days except when there are unusual circumstances.

Member DuBois said she thought 180 days is too long, but perhaps it could be extended to 90 days.

Member Quintana said, at a minimum, the executive summary should be translated, and then when the document is released a request for extra time could be considered.

Member Infanzon said it is important to understand why a 180 day period is required.

Robert Cabrales, Communities for a Better Environment, said a normal EIR is 800 pages and this document may be 10,000 pages covering many cities.

Member DuBois said it is difficult to make a decision regarding a document we haven't seen.

It was moved by Member DuBois, seconded by Member Forester, to adopt staff's recommendation.

Member Messina said these meetings have been going on for years and there has been public participation all along.

Member Daniels said the leaders in the communities should review the document and relay information to the community.

Member Infanzon said the problem is that the document is not ready.

Member Kosinski said the environmental document by necessity has to be user-friendly. He said the executive summary would be no more than 25 pages, with a total of 500 pages in the document. He said it would be available on CD.

Member Dear said this Committee slowed down the process and incorporated the citizens along the corridor who are affected. He asked how much of the EIR is taken from the community meetings. Member Kosinski responded that almost every aspect of the document's development has been based on community involvement. He said it's basically a product of community involvement.

Member Dear said he supported the staff recommendation and supported translation of the executive summary into Spanish and that it be made available on the internet. He said he supported translation into other languages as well.

Members DuBois and Forester said they would accept Member Dear's amendment of the motion to include translation of the executive summary into Spanish and other languages as we've done before.

Member Daniels said he has been on the Committee from the beginning and that they had listened to the residents and made the commitment that air quality is the top priority.

Member Quintana said that there is an Arabic community in Bell.

There being no further discussion, the motion, as amended, was approved unanimously.

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

B. Private/Public Partnership (P3) Study Presentation

J. D. Douglas, InfraConsult, gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding the study undertaken to measure the traffic effects of tolling trucks on I-710. He said the reasons for the study included the total cost of improvements to the freeway and that the Major Corridor Study had identified a truck-way toll as a potential revenue source. He said a P3 project with toll financing could provide an opportunity for earlier project delivery with less public funding. He said the basic assumptions are that the tolls would be imposed on trucks only, not passenger vehicles, and that the per-mile toll would be on the lower end of truck tolls found on other southern California toll roads. He estimated a \$10 toll per container.

Mr. Douglas then presented an evaluation of the impacts on traffic congestion under various scenarios. He said the traffic impacts of tolling the freight corridor only are similar to Alternative 6 with no tolls. The advantages are that it attracts a high volume of trucks into the freight corridor and reduces truck traffic on the I-110 and I-605 freeways, as well as the parallel arterials. He said the study showed that tolling trucks on both the freight corridor and general purpose lanes produces a notably different result in that it diverts most trucks out of the general purpose lanes without providing relief to the I-110 and I-605 freeways or the parallel arterials.

Alex Charin, Harbor Trucking Association, said he was expressing the concerns of his organization, which represents 150 trucking companies. He said he had three concerns: the legality of the tolling structure, the competitive impact on shippers and beneficial cargo owners, and the question of who would pay for the enforcement of the toll lanes. He said staff should look at current litigation. He said the costs should be borne by the beneficial cargo owners, not the truckers.

Member Forester asked what kind of revenue generation is being forecasted

for the tolling option. Mr. Douglas responded that the current estimate is that it could bond about \$2.5 to \$3 billion in its initial term.

Member Forester asked where things stand on an understanding of the effect on us of an expanded Panama Canal. Member Walter responded that we can't currently give an answer, but the Port is studying this. He said, personally, he doesn't think it would greatly affect our situation; resulting in perhaps a maximum 10% diversion.

Member DuBois asked if the \$10 toll estimate is in current dollars. Mr. Douglas responded that those are 2011 dollars.

Frank Quon, MTA, said the recommendation by staff is for the Project Committee to concur with the recommendation of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee to incorporate the version of the public private partnership (P3) tolling option that assumes tolls will be assessed only on the freight corridor. This P3 tolling option will be labeled as Alternative 6C in the I-710 EIR/EIS. He said staff further recommended that the Project Committee support the Community Advisory Committee's recommendation to further study the version of the P3 tolling option that assumes tolls will be assessed on trucks using the I-710 general purpose lanes and the freight corridor in order assess its viability as a project alternative. This P3 tolling option will be labeled as Alternative 6D. He said staff would report back on the findings of the viability of Alternative 6D at the next Project Committee meeting.

Member Dear asked how tolling would be done. Mr. Douglas responded that electronic tolling would be used.

It was moved by Member Forester, seconded by Member Walter, to approve staff's recommendation. The motion was approved unanimously.

C. Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) Update

Scott Broten, ICF, gave a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the work completed thus far on the Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP). He reviewed the participation framework, discussed the tasks currently in process or pending, and reviewed the project schedule.

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

D. Report by CALSTART on Green Trucks

Michael Ippoliti, Director of Clean Transportation Solutions for CALSTART,

gave a PowerPoint presentation on the opportunities for zero-emission trucks on the I-710 freight corridor. Mr. Ippoliti said that CALSTART's research found that trucks can deliver zero-emission goods movement in the I-710 corridor within the time frame of the project. He described several options for zero-emission technology, including electric hybrid, full battery electric, and road connected power. He summarized the barriers to implementation, including design factors, costs, infrastructure, and, especially, the business case.

Member Forester asked if an overhead power system could accommodate light rail. Mr. Ippoliti responded that it could.

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

E. Sound Walls Feasibility Study Update

Frank Quon reported that MTA was reviewing six proposals for the sound walls feasibility study and that he expected to go to the MTA Board for award in September.

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

F. Utilities Relocation Studies Update

Frank Quon introduced Amit Shah of AECOM, who gave a PowerPoint presentation on the I-710 Project South End Utility Study. Mr. Shah summarized the project limits, utility conflicts, study scope, and the draft schedule. Mr. Quon said he expected to go to the MTA Board with the proposals for the I-710 north study in October and the I-710 central study in November.

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

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

Jack Waldron, URS, gave a PowerPoint presentation updating the Committee on the status of the engineering work. He reviewed the alternatives being studied, the changes made to the geometric plans, and the recent technical studies. He provided a snapshot of the work to be

conducted over the next three months and outlined the remaining project schedule.

Elaine Carbrey, Gruen Associates, provided an update on the urban design and aesthetics study. She said a unified theme for the corridor through color, materials, structural elements, and other design features could achieve a unified freeway corridor and provide unique branding for individual communities. She summarized the work of the subject working group and provided illustrations of the various architectural treatments and landscaping that could enhance the aesthetics of the project.

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

H. I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS Environmental Update

Rob McCann, LSA, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the environmental studies. He reviewed the environmental process, discussed the current work in progress, discussed the visual impact study at several key locations along the freight corridor, and provided a three month look ahead on the environmental work.

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

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

Esmeralda Garcia, MIG, reviewed the recent meetings of the subject working groups, local advisory committees, and the Community Advisory Committee. She provided a look ahead at upcoming meetings of the local advisory committees and Community Advisory Committee.

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

J. I-710 Early Action Projects Report

Jerry Wood reported on the south bound on ramp from Firestone Blvd. in South Gate, which was recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) as an early action project. He said that the City of South Gate is proceeding with widening the bridge on Firestone Blvd. just west of the freeway, but that Caltrans is requesting that the City correct the existing south bound onramp, which just "touches" the bridge widening project as a condition of approval. The proposed work on the onramp would correct existing nonstandard features. Mr. Wood said the estimated cost of the

onramp improvements is between \$2 and \$3 million. He said the TAC recommendation is to proceed with this project for design and construction as an early action project as soon as possible and for MTA to proceed with an RFP for the design work.

It was moved by Member Forester, seconded by Member Messina, to approve the recommendation by the Technical Advisory Committee to proceed with the design and construction of the southbound onramp from Firestone Blvd. as an early action project. The motion was approved unanimously.

K. Gateway Cities COG Engineer Report

Jerry Wood reported that the ITS Implementation Plan project will have its formal “kickoff” the next week. He said the construction staging plan for the freeway corridor project will call for the freight corridor to be built first.

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

L. Review of I-710 Draft Schedule of Topics

Jerry Wood reviewed the draft schedule of topics to be presented to the subject working groups, Technical Advisory Committee, and Community Advisory Committee over the next few months. He said key milestones in the Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) will be reached in early November, namely the visual impact analysis report and the noise study report. Because of their importance relative to the project schedule, he recommended that the Project Committee schedule a special meeting sometime during the first two weeks of November to receive these reports.

It was moved by Member Dear, seconded by Member Forester, to schedule a meeting of the Project Committee during the first two weeks of November. The motion was approved unanimously.

Co-Chairman Hurtado asked staff to survey the members of Project Committee to determine a date that works best for the November meeting.

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

There were no matters from Project Committee members.

X. Matters from the Chair

There were no matters from the Chair.

XI. Adjournment

It was moved by Member Dear to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 9:10 p.m.

VIII. REPORTS

ITEM A

I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS Engineering Update – Oral Report by URS

VIII. REPORTS
ITEM B
I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS
Environmental Update– Oral Report by
LSA

VIII. REPORTS
ITEM C
I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS
Community Participation Update – Oral
Report by MIG

VIII. REPORTS

ITEM D

**Traffic Analyses Update – Oral Report by
URS**

**VIII. REPORTS
ITEM E**

**Update on Water Key Findings – Oral
Report by URS**

VIII. REPORTS
ITEM F

**I-710 EIR/EIS Update on Review Period
and Translation of Executive Summary –
Oral Report by MTA/COG Staff**

VIII. REPORTS
ITEM G
I-710 Early Action Projects – Oral Report
by MTA

VIII. REPORTS
ITEM H
Measure R Funds Update – Oral Report
by MTA

Attachments

[I-710 PC Engineering Update Nov 2011.pdf](#)

[I-710 Environmental Status Report - PC Meeting Nov 2011.pdf](#)

[Community Participation Status Report - PC Meeting 11-10-11.pdf](#)

[Traffic Technical Studies Presentation PC Meeting Nov 10 2011.pdf](#)

[Water Key Findings November 10 2011 - PC Meeting.pdf](#)