

GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

AGENDA

Chair – Bonnie Lowenthal, Director, MTA

November 7, 4:30 PM
Gateway Cities COG Offices
16401 Paramount Blvd. , Paramount, CA

Item No.	Description	Recommended Action
I.	Call to Order – Self Introductions	
II.	Pledge of Allegiance	
III.	Approval of Meeting Minutes of September 19, 2007	Receive & File
IV.	Reports:	
1.	Congestion Pricing Initiative Ashad Hamideh-MTA-Oral Report	Discussion & Recommendation
2.	SCAG Release of the Draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)	Receive & File
3.	Draft Congestion Mitigation Fee Feasibility Study Report	Discussion & Recommendation
4.	Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan	Receive & File
5.	Gateway Cities Service Sector Report-Alex Clifford MTA Gateway Cities Service Sector General Manager	Receive & File
6.	Update – I-5 JPA	Receive & File
7.	Update – I-710 EIR/EIS	Receive & File
8.	Update – MTA/OCTA Intercounty Study	Receive & File
9.	Update – SR 91/ I-605/I-405 Major Corridor Study	Receive & File
10.	New Business/Date of Next Meeting	Receive & File
11.	Adjournment	Receive & File

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.

Item III

Approval of Minutes for the Meeting of September 19, 2007

**Transportation Committee Minutes of
September 19, 2007**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
Chair – MTA Director Bonnie Lowenthal
Gateway Cities Office, 16401 Paramount Blvd. , Paramount
September 19, 2007**

Call to order and roll call. The meeting was called to order by Chair Lowenthal at 4:31 p.m. Roll call was taken by self introduction.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Bonnie Lowenthal – Long Beach, Len Gorecki,– Paramount, Ray Harris – Supervisor Knabe’s Office, Mohammed Mostahkami – South Gate, Gene Daniels – Paramount, Brynn Kernaghan – Long Beach Transit, Anne Bayer- Downey, Frank Gurule – Cudahy.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Elba Guerrero – Huntington Park, Fred Latham – Santa Fe Springs, Kerry Cartwright – Port of Long Beach, Ken Farfsing – Signal Hill, Stan Carroll – La Habra Heights.

OTHERS PRESENT: Sharad Mulchand - Metro, Karen Heit – Gateway Cities COG, Deborah Chankin – Gateway Cities COG, Shashank Patil – David Rubinaw – SCAG, Richard Powers – Gateway Cities COG, Alex Clifford – Gateway Cities Service Sector General Manager.

A quorum was reached and the Minutes of the August 1, 2007 meeting were approved.

David Rubinaw – SCAG, gave a report on the upcoming 2008 RTP. He reviewed the process for plan adoption, the 35-year time frame for the 2008 RTP, and the projects to be identified in the plan. He indicated that that escalating project costs will be scrutinize carefully and cited that highway programs were at issue.

He went on to discuss regional growth expected in the RTP timeframe as well as traffic delay and speed denigration. He discussed \$238 billion in regional funding trying to cover \$239 billion in project costs. He went on to outline upcoming workshops and the expectation that the draft RTP be released in November.

Several questions were asked; including how unfunded transit projects would be handled and how the draft plan would be communicated to the cities.

Karen Heit, Transportation Deputy to Director Lowenthal, went over the financial update for the MTA Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) where the anticipated \$5 billion in new revenue has dwindled to an anticipated \$4 billion. The difference is due to higher anticipated transit capital and operations costs and increased project costs. The planning process anticipates additional projects in the last 10 years covered by the plan.

Transportation Committee Minutes of

September 19, 2007

Heit gave a brief overview of the Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan (MCGMAP) she briefly summarized the issues presented to the MCGMAP consultant team by the GCCOG. Jerry Wood, COG Transportation Engineer, presented the MCGMAP recommendations in the format of the twelve recommended "bundles" of improvements. These recommendations were made in absence of community impact analysis, potentially resulting in loss of freeway adjacent homes and businesses. COG Executive Director Richard Powers explained that the COG's recommendation is to push the MTA and consultant team towards alternatives other than widening freeways and expanding freeway r.o.w.s. Wood presented the alternative for a freight movement corridor utilizing rail lines or utility lines. Questions arose concerning getting the railroads involved in working towards a collaborative model.

Alex Clifford, Gateway Cities Service Sector General Manager, gave an overview of the service changes that were adopted by the MTA Board. The changes will take place in December. The Gateway Service Sector held public hearings and several recommendations were placed for further study

There was no activity on the MTA Call for Projects, approval of funding expected to occur later in September.

There was no update on the I-5 project progress.

Jerry Wood gave an update on the I-710 EIR/EIS progress, project start-up is imminent, awaiting approval of funding agreements.

All received and file items were moved and approved.

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

IV. Reports
2. SCAG Release of the Draft
Regional Transportation Plan
(RTP)

Transportation Committee Agenda

November 7, 2007

TO: Transportation Committee

FROM: Bonnie Lowenthal, MTA Board of Directors

SUBJECT: SCAG Release of the Draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

Background

The release of this RTP is of critical interest to the Gateway Cities: unless publicly funded regional transportation projects are included in the RTP, they cannot move forward.

The RTP is being developed with “Constrained” (Funding is reasonably available for construction Operations and Maintenance) and “Strategic” (will require new funding) elements.

Gateway Cities’ projects of interest that are tentatively recommended for inclusion in the “Constrained” RTP are:

- I-710 Truck Lanes
- Freight Rail Expansion and Grade Separations
- Freight and Passenger Rail Cleaner Technology
- High Speed Regional Transport: freight spur from ports to eastern warehouses and freight terminals
- Alternative Technology Conveyance for Freight (could end up being same project as above item)

Gateway Cities Projects of interest that are tentatively recommended for inclusion in “Strategic” element of the Plan are:

- Orangeline
- LOSSAN Strategic Plan
- High Speed Regional Transport LAX to Orange County along 405 California High Speed Rail

Issue

Los Angeles County Projects are in a particularly difficult competitive position because the MTA is still in the process of adopting its Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). SCAG has noted that it may not include projects within the Strategic or “Core” RTP unless the MTA has programmed or committed funding to the project. The MTA is in the process of updating the LA County LRTP and many of these project specific issues have not been made. Additionally there are projects recommended in the RTP workshops that have not been acknowledged or modeled in any MTA LRTP.

Transportation Committee Agenda

November 7, 2007

The SCAG Transportation and Communication Committee (TCC) will discuss the project matrices at the TCC Meeting of November 1st. SCAG anticipates maybe releasing the draft RTP at a special meeting to be held November 27th, or possibly the regular meeting of December 6th.

Recommended Action

It is recommended that the Gateway Cities review the RTP document and comment. COG staff will continue reviewing the documents (as they become available) and coordinating with Gateway Cities Planning Directors and Public Works Officers on a GCCOG comprehensive and coordinated review and response to advise the COG's Officers, Board and Committees.

COG staff has been actively engaged with the RTP development process. In addition, the COG arranged for a meeting of SCAG staff with Gateway Cities Planning Directors and Public Works Officers. Nevertheless, there are many project and forecast details which are not available and will not be available until the Draft RTP is released. We will also monitor the development of the MTA LRTP which may also impact the final RTP.

IV. Reports
**3. Draft Congestion Mitigation Fee
Feasibility Study Report**

Transportation Committee Agenda

November 7, 2007

TO: Transportation Committee

FROM: Bonnie Lowenthal, MTA Board of Directors

SUBJECT: Draft Congestion Mitigation Fee Feasibility Study Report

Background

The MTA recently released the above referenced report for review by the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC). This draft study report is based upon input from the PAC that consisted of COGs, interested cities, the building industry and others. The purpose of the study report is to ensure a technically sound approach for the upcoming nexus study (required before the fee can be implemented). This report contains the first draft of a fee program for Los Angeles County. The MTA will be submitting the Draft Study to cities and COGs and others for review and input starting in November.

Issue

As part of the 2003 Short Range Transportation Plan, the MTA Board instructed staff to investigate the possible adoption of a Congestion Mitigation Fee to replace the existing system of debits/credits for the Congestion Management Program (CMP).

Jurisdictions are required to conform to the CMP in order to continue to receive their share of gas tax revenues under Section 2105 of the State Streets and Highways Code. For the past four years the MTA has been exploring the development of an alternative to the existing system of debits/credits.

The process schedule is as follows:

Work Plan Component	Preliminary Schedule	Dates for MTA Board Action
Step 1: Feasibility Study and Program Guidelines - Review with PAC, COGS, Cities, others	October '07 – Feb. '08	March '08
Step 2: Local project identification - Work with cities to identify local projects with regional benefit - Work with cities to confirm growth forecasts	April '08 – Sept, '08	October '08
Step 3: Nexus Study - Technical work effort to determine nexus - final MTA Board action to authorize program	Nov. '08 – Feb. '08	March '09

Transportation Committee Agenda

November 7, 2007

Step 4 Local implementation - Work with cities to adopt local ordinances	April '09 +	
---	-------------	--

The GCCOG has expressed concerns with the imposition of the fee program and the possible negative impacts on development within the cities, forcing cities to fund projects outside of their boundaries, and concern over the MTA reducing regional funds. Some of these issues were recognized and addressed with the development of the Guiding Principles. Other concerns are addressed, to a varying degree, in the Study. The Attachment "A" matrix looks at the GCCOG concerns and the Feasibility Study.

The Study states that because of the time lapsed between the original CMP modeling and the 30-Year Plan to the subsequent MTA Long Range Transportation Plans; there would be a push to update the CMP Program anyway. The number of deficiencies attributed to new trips generated by new development under the more modest LRTP financial outlook would necessitate a change in the existing system. If the fee proposal is not adopted there would be a change to reflect the greater need for local mitigation of regional impacts to the transportation system. The Study does not offer any alternatives to the fee proposal.

As part of this Study, the MTA has offered different revenue scenarios based upon different levels of fee for single residence equivalents (from \$2,000 - \$16,000 per residential equivalent) The Gateway Cities estimates are attached at the end of this report. The trip generation is based upon SCAG Growth Forecasts; these estimates are rough and the MTA expects to work with cities to refine the growth forecasts based upon General Plans, and the cities' own growth projections.

Recommended Action

Review the Draft Plan when it is distributed, engage the MTA in a dialog to resolve the outstanding GCCOG specific areas of concern, and explore viable alternatives to the fee proposal including an update to the current system.

Attachments

Attachment "A" GCCOG Concerns Feasibility Study
Attachment "B" Fee Revenue Estimates GCCOG cities.

Transportation Committee Agenda
November 7, 2007

GCCOG Concern	Feasibility Study
<p>The MTA has not done sufficient analysis on issues that face built-out cities within an urbanized area like the Gateway Cities subregion.</p>	<p>The Study does not look at specific subregional areas for impact analysis; therefore the potential impact to Gateway Cities is still unknown. The study does recognize developer mitigations if they are included and identified as regional projects.</p> <p>Previous scenarios contemplated a subregional fee; the recommendation is to set a countywide minimum that cities could succeed.</p>
<p>The proposed Fee may act as a deterrent to encouraging development within urbanized areas and unduly burden redevelopment efforts with additional fees the cities may end up subsidizing.</p>	<p>The study recommends exempting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low/very low income housing as defined by the State Department of housing and Community development. 2. High density residential with ¼ mile of a fixed rail passenger system. 3. Mixed-use development with ¼ mile of a fixed rail passenger system. 4. Projects not requiring local entitlements. 5. Structural replacement of 50% or more by fire or other disaster. 6. Projects with a development agreement prior to 7/10/89. <p>The study recommends a process whereby a city can be exempt from the fee if the revenue generated by the fee is less than the cost of administering the fee.</p>
<p>The Fee may function as a deterrent to in-fill housing efforts or commercial development in economically challenged areas.</p>	<p>The Study recommends exemptions for low or very low income housing but not development of market rate or work force housing.</p> <p>Debit and credits currently apply to commercial development and developer mitigations that qualify as regional could satisfy the fee requirement.</p>
<p>The Fee may require smaller cities to contribute to a regional project outside of the city's boundaries.</p>	<p>The Study does not address this specifically but has a discussion on the benefit of cities banding together to fund a regional project.</p>
<p>There is no provision for maintenance of effort to regional funding of projects by the MTA.</p>	<p>The adopted Guiding Principles have an assurance that CMP Fee generated funds will not supplant regional funds.</p> <p>The Study does acknowledge that the fee might help make up for the lag in revenues since 1993 and the ensuing failure of the transportation system to effectively accommodate growth.</p>
<p>Cities that do not adopt the Fee (should it be adopted for CMP compliance by the MTA) would face losing their Section 2105 highway users gas tax funds.</p>	<p>This is consistent with the current system: cities must comply with the deficiency plan and adopt measures to offset the development debits.</p>

Transportation Committee Agenda

November 7, 2007

Subregional Area	Proxy Hypothetical Fee Amount per SFD	Fee per New Trip (Average Daily Trips)	Number of New Trips	Hypothetical Total Fee Revenue
Gateway Cities COG Subregion	\$2,000	\$200	466,145	\$249,212,800
	\$4,000	\$400		\$498,425,699
	\$6,000	\$600		\$727,638,400
	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$1,993,702,400
Artesia	\$2,000	\$200	9,242	\$1,848,400
	\$4,000	\$400		\$3,696,800
	\$6,000	\$600		\$5,545,,200
	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$14,787,200
Avalon	\$2,000	\$200	6,149	\$1,229,,800
	\$4,000	\$400		\$2,459,600
	\$6,000	\$600		\$3,689,400
	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$9,838,400
Bell	\$2,000	\$200	49,096	\$9,819,200
	\$4,000	\$400		\$19,638,400
	\$6,000	\$600		\$29,457,600
	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$78,553,600
Bell Gardens	\$2,000	\$200	14,038	&2,807,600
	\$4,000	\$400		\$5,615,200
	\$6,000	\$600		\$8,422,800
	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$22,460,800
Bellflower	\$2,000	\$200	38,425	\$7,685,000
	\$4,000	\$400		\$15,370,000
	\$6,000	\$600		\$23,055,000
	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$61,480,000
Cerritos	\$2,000	\$200	50,360	\$10,072,000
	\$4,000	\$400		\$20,144,000
	\$6,000	\$600		\$30,216,000
	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$80,576,000
Commerce	\$2,000	\$200	69,533	\$13,906,600
	\$4,000	\$400		\$27,813,200
	\$6,000	\$600		\$41,719,800
	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$111,252,800
Compton	\$2,000	\$200	46,471	\$9,294,200
	\$4,000	\$400		\$18,588,400
	\$6,000	\$600		\$27,882,600
	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$74,353,600
Cudahy	\$2,000	\$200	12,251	\$2,450,200
	\$4,000	\$400		\$4,900,400
	\$6,000	\$600		\$7,350,600
	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$19,601,600
Downey	\$2,000	\$200	43,698	\$8,739,600
	\$4,000	\$400		\$17,479,200
	\$6,000	\$600		\$26,218,800

Transportation Committee Agenda

November 7, 2007

	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$69,916,800
Hawaiian Gardens	\$2,000	\$200	4,350	\$87,000
	\$4,000	\$400		\$1,740,000
	\$6,000	\$600		\$2,610,000
	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$6,960,000
Huntington Park	\$2,000	\$200	37,176	\$7,435,200
	\$4,000	\$400		\$14,870,400
	\$6,000	\$600		\$22,306,600
	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$59,481,600
City	Proxy Hypothetical Fee Amount per SFD	Fee per New Trip (Average Daily Trips)	Number of New Trips	Hypothetical Total Fee Revenue
La Habra Heights	\$2,000	\$200	2,280	\$564,000
	\$4,000	\$400		\$1,128,000
	\$6,000	\$600		\$1,592,000
	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$4,512,000
La Mirada	\$2,000	\$200	4,982	\$10,996,400
	\$4,000	\$400		\$21,992,800
	\$6,000	\$600		\$32,989,200
	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$87,971,200
Lakewood	\$2,000	\$200	39,162	\$7,832,400
	\$4,000	\$400		\$15,664,800
	\$6,000	\$600		\$23,497,200
	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$62,659,200
Long Beach	\$2,000	\$200	376,601	\$75,320,200
	\$4,000	\$400		\$150,640,400
	\$6,000	\$600		\$225,960,600
	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$602,561,600
Lynwood	\$2,000	\$200	21,650	\$4,330,000
	\$4,000	\$400		\$8,660,000
	\$6,000	\$600		\$12,990,000
	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$34,640,000
Maywood	\$2,000	\$200	10,814	\$2,162,800
	\$4,000	\$400		\$3,325,600
	\$6,000	\$600		\$6,488,400
	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$17,302,400
Montebello	\$2,000	\$200	39,540	\$7,908,000
	\$4,000	\$400		\$15,816,000
	\$6,000	\$600		\$23,724,000
	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$63,264,000
Norwalk	\$2,000	\$200	50,096	\$10,019,200
	\$4,000	\$400		\$20,038,400
	\$6,000	\$600		\$30,057,600
	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$80,153,500
Paramount	\$2,000	\$200	30,309	\$6,061,800
	\$4,000	\$400		\$12,123,600
	\$6,000	\$600		\$18,185,400

Transportation Committee Agenda

November 7, 2007

	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$48,494,400
Pico Rivera	\$2,000	\$200	36,200	\$7,240,000
	\$4,000	\$400		\$14,480,000
	\$6,000	\$600		\$21,920,000
	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$57,320,000
Santa Fe Springs	\$2,000	\$200	34.967	\$6,993,400
	\$4,000	\$400		\$13,986,800
	\$6,000	\$600		\$20,980,200
	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$55,947,200
Signal Hill	\$2,000	\$200	45,927	\$9,185,400
	\$4,000	\$400		\$18,370,800
	\$6,000	\$600		\$27,556,200
	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$73,483,200

Transportation Committee Agenda

November 7, 2007

City	Proxy Hypothetical Fee Amount per SFD	Fee per New Trip (Average Daily Trips)	Number of New Trips	Hypothetical Total Fee Revenue
South Gate	\$2,000	\$200	26,747	\$5,349,400
	\$4,000	\$400		\$10,698,800
	\$6,000	\$600		\$16,048,200
	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$42,795,200
Vernon	\$2,000	\$200	97,256	\$19,451,200
	\$4,000	\$400		\$38,902,400
	\$6,000	\$600		\$58,353,600
	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$155,609,600
Whittier	\$2,000	\$200	48,102	\$9,620,400
	\$4,000	\$400		\$19,240,800
	\$6,000	\$600		\$28,861,200
	\$16,000	\$1,600		\$76,963,200

Transportation Committee Agenda

November 7, 2007

Congestion Mitigation Fee Hypothetical Fee Revenue Scenarios

The following fee scenarios were developed by MTA's consultant using SCAG and state Department of finance land-use and employment growth forecasts for a period of 25-years (from 2005-2030). If the plan is adopted the growth forecasts will change as each city adjusts the forecasts to their General Plans and growth expectations.

The different hypothetical fee amounts were an outcome of the working group; they represent a low of \$2,000 per Single Family Dwelling (SFD) to a high of \$16,000. The SFD is used as a proxy for all land uses for the purpose of this exercise.

The fee amount per new trip is calculated by taking the hypothetical congestion mitigation fee amount and dividing it by the number of average daily new trips generated by a single family residence (approximately 10 trips). The next step is to multiply the fee amount per trip with the total number of trips that jurisdiction is expected to generate resulting in the revenue estimate.