



**Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
S.R. 710 Tunnel Technical Study**



**July 15, 2008 10:00 a.m.
Cal State University Los Angeles, Salazar Hall C260**

<p><u>Attendees:</u></p>	
<p>Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), Steering Committee (SC) & Elected Officials</p> <p>Members/Representatives:</p> <p>Naresh Amatya, Program Manager I, Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)</p> <p>Shahrzad Amiri, Project Manager, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)</p> <p>Harry Baldwin, Mayor, City of San Gabriel, (Representing San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG))</p> <p>Lynda Bybee, Deputy Executive Officer of Community Relations, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)</p> <p>Michael Cano, Transportation Deputy, Office of Los Angeles County Supervisor, Michael D. Antonovich, 5th District</p> <p>Tony Catenacci, Interim Transportation Manager, City of South Pasadena</p> <p>Arturo Chavez, District Director, Office of Senator Gilbert Cedillo, 22nd District</p> <p>Nicholas Conway, Executive Director, San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG)</p>	<p>Caltrans District 7 Staff:</p> <p>Douglas R. Failing, District 7 Director</p> <p>William H. Reagan, P.E., Deputy Director, Design</p> <p>James McCarthy, Deputy Director, Planning</p> <p>Deborah Harris, Chief, Media Relations & Public Affairs</p> <p>Abdi Saghafi, Project Manager</p> <p>Derek Higa, P.E., Senior Transportation Engineer</p> <p>Consultants:</p> <p>Rebecca Barrantes, The Sierra Group</p> <p>Ed Salcedo, The Sierra Group</p> <p>Enrique Gasca, The Sierra Group</p> <p>Katherine Padilla, The Sierra Group</p> <p>Rena Salcedo, The Sierra Group</p> <p>John Limon, The Sierra Group</p> <p>Ayman Salama, CH2M HILL, Project Manager</p>
<p>Attendees Continued:</p> <p>Marcella Cortez, Field Deputy, Office of Los</p>	



**Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
S.R. 710 Tunnel Technical Study**



**July 15, 2008 10:00 a.m.
Cal State University Los Angeles, Salazar Hall C260**

<p>Angeles City Councilmember Jose Huizar, 14th District, (Alternate for Paul Habib, Northeast Area Director and Public Works Manager)</p> <p>Michael Davies, Assistant Field Representative, Office of U.S. Senator Dianne Feinstein</p> <p>Stephen A. Del Guercio, Mayor, City of La Cañada Flintridge</p> <p>Dan Farkas, Senior Assistant, Office of Senator Gilbert Cedillo, 22nd District</p> <p>Richard A. Gutschow, A.E., Geotechnical Engineer, City of South Pasadena</p> <p>Julianne Hines, District Director, Office of Assemblymember Anthony Portantino, 44th District</p> <p>John Hisserich, Constituent Services, Office of Assemblymember Paul Krekorian, 43rd District</p> <p>Yvonne Hsu, District Representative, Office of Congressman Adam Schiff, 29th District</p> <p>John Koo, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, Civil Engineer (Alternate for Ing Jones, Civil Engineering Associate)</p> <p>Subodh Kumar, Strategic Management Consulting Executive, City of Pasadena</p> <p>Philip Law, Corridor Planning, Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)</p> <p>Borja Leon, P.E., Transportation Policy Analyst, Office of the Mayor of Los Angeles</p> <p>Daisy Ma, District Director, Office of Assemblymember Mike Eng, 49th District</p> <p>Stephen Zurn, Director of Public Works, City of Glendale</p>	<p>Joseph Martinez, Transportation Liaison, Office of Congresswoman Hilda L. Solis, 32nd District</p> <p>Thomas E. Mitchell, P.E., Assistant Traffic and Transportation Administrator, City of Glendale</p> <p>Steven T. Placido, D.D.S, Councilmember, City of Alhambra</p> <p>Allison Rose, Legislative Assistant, Office of Congressman Adam Schiff, 29th District</p> <p>David Sifuentes, Mayor Pro Tempore, City of South Pasadena, (Alternate for Mayor Phillip Putnam)</p> <p>Eugene Sun, Councilmember, City of San Marino</p> <p>Mary Swink, , Director of Public Works , City of Alhambra</p> <p>Steve Veres, District Director, Assemblymember Kevin de Leon, 45th District</p> <p>Edel Vizcarra, Assistant Planner, Office of Los Angeles City Councilmember Jose Huizar, 14th District</p> <p>Ann Wilson, Senior Management Analyst, City of La Cañada Flintridge</p> <p>Alana Yanez, Field Representative, Office of Assemblymember Kevin de Leon, 45th District</p> <p>June Yotsuya, City Manager, City of Monterey Park</p>
---	--



Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
S.R. 710 Tunnel Technical Study



July 15, 2008 10:00 a.m.
Cal State University Los Angeles, Salazar Hall C260

<p><u>Absent/No Alternate Present:</u></p> <p>Steering Committee (SC) Members:</p> <p>Veronica Cobla, Transportation Assistant Deputy, Office of Los Angeles County Supervisor, Gloria Molina, 1st District (Alternate for Nicole Englund, Transportation Deputy)</p> <p>Sharon Martinez, Mayor, City of Monterey Park (Steering Committee Member)</p> <p>Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members: All TAC members present or represented</p>	
--	--

For the purpose of review, Committee Member’s names are spelled out during the question and answer periods. Project Staff names are denoted by their first initial and spelling of their last name.

The meeting started at approximately 10:15 a.m.

Welcome

Douglas R. Failing, Caltrans District 7 Director, opened the meeting by welcoming Steering Committee (SC) and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members and other attendees. He described the purpose of the study as exploring corridor options for closing the State Route 710 “gap” (SR-710) and the possibility of using tunnel options. He acknowledged the cities and districts that were represented by Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Committee Members at the meeting and discussed the roles of the committees.

Agenda Overview

Rebecca Barrantes of The Sierra Group thanked participants for attending and introduced herself and Katherine Padilla as meeting facilitators and as part of the Community Outreach Team for the study. Barrantes also provided a brief overview of the agenda and summarized topics to be discussed later in the meeting. Ground rules for meeting communications were also identified.



Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
S.R. 710 Tunnel Technical Study



July 15, 2008 10:00 a.m.
Cal State University Los Angeles, Salazar Hall C260

Statement by Congressman Adam Schiff

On behalf of Congressman Adam Schiff, Allison Rose, Legislative Assistant, and Yvonne Hsu, District Representative read the Statement on 710 Tunnel Study prepared by the Congressman, who was unable to attend. The Statement outlined SR-710 Study Legislative Language and Intent (H.R. 1195).

Questions, Answers and Comments Related to Statement by Congressman Adam Schiff:

- David Sifuentes: What is the feasibility of an open forum? Can we open this up to the public?
- R. Barrantes: Gave a brief outline and schedule of the public participation process which includes: public forums, interviews, and meetings with the public. The SC and TAC are also comprised of members of the public. Public forums, interviews, and meetings with the public will be scheduled within the next couple of months.
- D. Failing: Stated that the SC and TAC meetings are not closed meetings to the public, as was evidenced by stakeholders present in the back of the room. However, this was a joint committee meeting and as such was a working session for the committees. The public will have an opportunity for input throughout the study.
- Lynda Bybee: Asked if the term "Route Neutral" would be discussed during the meeting.
- Stephen Del Guercio: Stated that he wanted Caltrans to define what issues/items would be studied. He also asked that questions and comments raised during Metro's Tunnel Feasibility Study be incorporated and followed-up on during the course of the S.R. 710 Tunnel Technical Study.
- Nicholas Conway: Raised the issues of ensuring that study's budget was in line with the scope of study.
- Mike Cano: Expressed the need to reconcile the term 710 "gap" and Route Neutral. He also expressed a desire by Supervisor Antonovich to ensure the integrity of the process.

Study Overview & Corridor Options



Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
S.R. 710 Tunnel Technical Study



July 15, 2008 10:00 a.m.
Cal State University Los Angeles, Salazar Hall C260

Abdi Saghafi, the SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study's Project Manager, provided a brief project background and history of SR-710 extension studies and efforts. His overview included the Metro commissioned 2006 Feasibility Study and the 2007 Caltrans Request for Proposal (RFP) that resulted in selection of the Community Outreach and Technical Consultants. He introduced the Community Outreach consultant as The Sierra Group, which is represented by Rebecca Barrantes, and the Technical consultant as CH2M Hill, which is represented by Ayman Salama. He also stated that a principal concern of the study is related to geotechnical conditions that may be encountered. He stated that several corridors will be presented and that the SC and TAC would be asked to screen the corridor options and narrow down the options to 2 or 3. Saghafi mentioned that the SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study is not a full depth environmental review but will review current noise and air quality studies to develop opportunities and constraints criteria for each corridor option. The remaining corridor options, as selected by the SC and TAC will be explored further.

The following options were proposed:

Option A - Connects to South End of S.R. 2

Option B - Connects to I-5/S.R. 2 Interchange

Option C - Connects to S.R. 210 between I-5 & S.R. 134

Option D - Connects to S.R. 710 South of the I-210/S.R. 134 Interchange

Option E - Connects to S.R. 110

Option F - Connects to S.R. 110 and I-210 (Two Separate Tunnels)

Option G - Connects to I-210

Option H - Connects to I-605

After options were presented, Saghafi provided the study deadline as the end of 2008 and stressed the importance of keeping on track with the study schedule. He also briefly discussed budget constraints, noting that the study's funding was derived from \$2.4 million from Congressman Schiff's HR budget line item, \$5 million from the Metro, and \$4 million from Caltrans. A question and answer period ensued at the conclusion of Saghafi's presentation.

Question & Answers, Comments following Corridor Options presentation:

Mike Cano: Stressed the need to gauge the magnitude of "constraints" posed by each corridor option:



**Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
S.R. 710 Tunnel Technical Study**



**July 15, 2008 10:00 a.m.
Cal State University Los Angeles, Salazar Hall C260**

- A. Saghafi: Stated that both opportunities and constraints would be presented to both committees.
- K. Padilla: Stated the vital role of committee members in reviewing the opportunities and constraints of each corridor option in the process of selecting 2 to 3 options for a more in-depth review.
- John Hisserich: Asked if Caltrans would be evaluating fault lines during the study.
- A. Salama: Stated that the 90% of the faults have been identified by the State and that any information found would be recorded.
- Tony Catenacci: Asked to combine Options E and F into one and making that another option to review.
- Steve Veres: Expressed that Options A and B would be very sensitive options to discuss with the communities surrounding the S.R. 2 southern terminus. These options would require a discussion on how to complete the S.R. 2 in addition to how to close the “gap” for SR-710.
- Borja Leon: Asked what the next step would be after the completion of the study.
- A.Saghafi: Stated that there are no actions planned after the completion of this study. However, it would be logical to include this study in any future environmental review process.
- Naresh Amatya: Asked if the study’s goal was to arrive at “an” alternative with potential costs and revenue sources or alternatives based on geotechnical/ environmental constraints?
- A. Saghafi: Stated that the study’s final outcome would reflect both potential costs and geotechnical constraints. The goal of the study is to use all available data to narrow down the corridor options in order to conduct a more thorough opportunities and constraints review.
- Nicholas Conway: Asked if there is currently available data that has already determined what would be the vehicular impact of closing the “gap”.
- A. Saghafi: Stated that various traffic data is available. He went on to state that the team will be applying this data to the SCAG or Caltrans forecasting models as they analyze the various corridor options.



**Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
S.R. 710 Tunnel Technical Study**



**July 15, 2008 10:00 a.m.
Cal State University Los Angeles, Salazar Hall C260**

- Arturo Chavez: Stated that Mr. Catenacci's suggested option is not a new route but rather a hybrid of Corridor Options E-F.
- A. Saghafi: Suggested naming it Option I
- Arturo Chavez: Asked if there was a limit to the number of corridor options that could be studied.
- A. Saghafi: Stated that while there is no limit on the number of corridor options that could be studied there are time and budget constraints that require a selection of only 2-3 options for a more thorough review.
- Stephen Del Guercio: Inquired as to tunnel size and the size of a tunnel vs. multiple smaller tunnels would serve the transportation needs.
- A. Salama: Stated that the study would be using some of the data from the previous Metro feasibility study. Using the forecasting methodologies mentioned already, the size of the tunnel or tunnels to be studied must take into account that traffic is the key parameter to drive feasibility and size of options.
- John Hisserich: Stated that on Corridor Options A and B – there are right-of-way limitations that would complicate those options.
- Allison Rose: Asked if Caltrans team could further explain the difference between the screening level review and the more in depth review?
- A. Salama: Explained that a screening level review uses existing data such as maps and geotechnical data but does not include any soil testing or borings. The screening process is the first phase of this study and will be used to narrow down the Corridor Options.
- Mike Cano: Stated that a cost feasibility analysis needs to be used in order to select the most viable option. The objective of the study should be to select an alternative that will work out financially as well as provide a reasonable alignment.
- A. Saghafi: Stated that cost is an item that may be reviewed at a later phase of the study. There are currently many options available but that will be reviewed once the corridor options to be studied in-depth are selected.



**Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
S.R. 710 Tunnel Technical Study**



**July 15, 2008 10:00 a.m.
Cal State University Los Angeles, Salazar Hall C260**

- Julianne Hines: Stated that deciding upon funding mechanisms right now would change the nature of the study, which has yet to determine if a tunnel is to be built.
- Stephen Del Guercio: Stated that both the feasibility of a tunnel and the costs associated with building it need to be reviewed in order to decide what the best alternative is for us.
- Steve Veres: Stated that costs should be considered as a factor in determining the best corridors but discussing budget allocations would be premature. The focus of the study needs to be centered on choosing the most viable corridor option followed by a review of funding options.
- Dan Farkas: Stated that a cost discussion should be separated from the process of selecting a corridor option. A design/build option, similar to Metro's previous projects, might be the best suited for this.
- Shahrzad Amiri: Stated the need to develop a cost benefit analysis for the community in order to agree upon a corridor option.
- Julianne Hines: Stated that it seemed to her that a method to pay for construction had already been determined and that meant that a decision on what will be built has also already been made.
- A. Saghafi: Stated that neither a corridor nor a funding mechanism has been selected. It is the committee's responsibility to make those decisions in the course of the study.
- John Hisserich: Stated that two different items were now being discussed, one is to determine if and how a tunnel could be built. The other issue is deciding about placing tolls.
- Dan Farkas: Stated that there are many different options for funding.
- Naresh Amatya: Stated the need to look at public-private partnerships as a revenue alternative to building this project
- Nicholas Conway: Stated that there was a need to put a discussion on cost in the scope of the study and allocate the necessary resources to ensure a thorough review.



Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
S.R. 710 Tunnel Technical Study



July 15, 2008 10:00 a.m.
Cal State University Los Angeles, Salazar Hall C260

- Stephen Del Guercio: Stated that the study's budget and focus needs to be centered on producing an outcome all can agree upon that this was a good study.
- Lynda Bybee: Stated that the study also needs to be an educational process. Caltrans needs to tell committee members what they know and have the committee members tell Caltrans what information they need to know.
- D. Harris: Discussed the integration of the Resource and Education Panel that will serve to answer technical questions throughout the course of the study.
- Richard Gutschow: Asked if the committee had been presented with all the corridor options that would be reviewed.
- Nicholas Conway: Asked to have the study's decision-making process clarified.
- Rebecca B: Relayed that no process has been adopted and that a discussion on the committee's guiding principles was next on the agenda.

Committee Guiding Principles Discussion & Development

Rebecca Barrantes and Katherine Padilla facilitated a discussion with the Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Committee regarding guiding principles for the study. The following are responsibilities and expectations related to the roles of both committees:

- 1.) Recommend alternative corridors to further study based upon technical feasibility
- 2.) Recommendations will be made to Caltrans Project Management Team
- 3.) At the conclusion of the study, define next steps to Caltrans and Metro Boards

A discussion related to the committees' guiding principles followed.

Discussion Related to Guiding Principles:

- Mike Cano: Stated that the outcomes of the study need to be based on the facts.
- Eugene Sun: Stated that decisions and recommendations needed to be "Route Neutral"; avoiding a cost discussion in order to select the best corridor option for the community and region.
- Shahrzad Amiri: Stated that a cost benefit analysis is part of the technical analysis, but that the discussion on cost should not be linked to a revenue stream



**Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
S.R. 710 Tunnel Technical Study**



**July 15, 2008 10:00 a.m.
Cal State University Los Angeles, Salazar Hall C260**

- A. Saghafi: Stated that the cost benefit analysis looks at the opportunities and constraints posed by each corridor option. A cost benefit analysis does not just focus on hard money costs but also cost of quality of life issues lost or gained.
- Richard Gutschow: Stated that “Cost” just means cost of construction and that benefits have nothing to do with costs.
- Arturo Chavez: Asked the study to define feasibility.
- Ann Wilson: Stated that defining feasibility would be essential to the ability of making a corridor option decision.
- Shahrzad Amiri: Stated that a project that would bring no benefit to the area should not move forward.
- Ann Wilson: Stated that feasibility would only be determined after a full Environmental Impact Report (EIR).
- Tony Catenacci: Stated that the foundation of the study is the technical component and that the public outreach is conceptual. The scheduling and integration of the two need to be clarified.
- K. Padilla: Stated that a combined schedule would be designed to clearly illustrate the integration of both the technical and outreach teams.
- John Hisserich: Stated that some of the corridor options would require right-of-way acquisition. He then asked if the project had determined how many and what kind of properties needed to be acquired in order to determine the footprint of the project.
- A. Saghafi: Stated that right-of-way and project footprint are issues that would be answered in a potential EIR. The EIR would fully conform to the environmental process.
- A. Salama: Stated that the key evaluation parameters will be included in the screening process of the various corridor alternatives.
- Mike Cano: Inquired as to the boring and geotechnical review budget and asked to see a budget breakdown in order to understand what is the study’s most critical goal and what are the budget priorities



**Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
S.R. 710 Tunnel Technical Study**



**July 15, 2008 10:00 a.m.
Cal State University Los Angeles, Salazar Hall C260**

- A. Saghafi: That the study's budget was \$11.3 million, which includes the technical and public outreach. The technical budget also incorporates other critical studies such as: geotechnical, air, noise, right-of-way, and traffic.
- Steve Placido: Asked who has the authority to make appointments to the committees.
- Mike Cano: Stated that the motion by Metro Board Director, John Fasana, was that each city would have a vote.
- D. Harris: Stated that each community has one member on the SC and TAC. Additionally- SCAG, Metro and the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG) are also represented.
- Eugene Sun: Asked that since he represented the City of San Marino on both, would that give him two votes?
- R. Barrantes: Stated that while each city is represented in the committees, the study depends on the commitment of each committee member in order to maintain the consistency and integrity of the process.
- Steve Placido: Stated that the committee members would be making recommendations and asked to have a list of those members.
- R. Barrantes: Stated that a SC & TAC Roster was included in everyone's information packet.
- Tony Catenacci: Asked to have the technical team's milestones schedule.
- Mike Cano: Stated that committee membership was through a nomination process. Each city nominated or asked someone to sit on this body.
- R. Barrantes: Stated that the TAC is meant to have a more technical focus in order to provide technical feedback to the Steering Committee.
- Eugene Sun: Stated that everyone in attendance was here to make a recommendation. Additionally, he asked to have the MTA Feasibility Study webpage link emailed to everyone.



**Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
S.R. 710 Tunnel Technical Study**



**July 15, 2008 10:00 a.m.
Cal State University Los Angeles, Salazar Hall C260**

Next Steps

The committee members asked for the following action items be provided for the next meeting:

- 1.) Technical milestones aligned with outreach process illustrated schedule
- 2.) Guiding principles
- 3.) Decision making process
- 4.) Decision making criteria (feasibility)
- 5.) Discussion of corridor options
- 6.) Future meeting schedule
- 7.) Organizational chart illustrating reporting and decision-making capabilities.
Organizational chart need to demonstrate relationship between the public, Technical Advisory Committee, Steering Committee, and Caltrans Project Manager.

Per request from the guiding principles discussion, the Community Outreach Team agreed to provide the following source documents:

- 1.) Study source documents
- 2.) Budget with major line items

The Community Outreach Team also agreed to begin preparations for the next committee meeting.

The committee membership asked the Community Outreach Team to keep the following guidelines in mind:

- 1.) Steering Committee (SC) members prefer evening meetings (6 pm – 8 pm)
- 2.) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members prefer meeting during the day (3 pm – 5pm)
- 3.) The TAC meeting should precede the SC meeting
- 4.) Tuesday and Thursday evening meetings usually will not work for Steering Committee members

The tentative meeting date that will be polled is August 7, 2008 and the alternate meeting date was given as August 14, 2008.

The meeting concluded at 2:00 p.m.