



San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

3452 East Foothill Blvd., Suite 910, Pasadena, California 91107-3970 Phone: (626) 564-9702 FAX: (626) 564-1116 E-Mail SGV@sgvcog.org

Transportation Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: August 11th, 2010

Time: 4:30 pm

Location: West Covina City Hall (1444 W. Garvey Ave. S., West Covina)

1.0 Call to Order

J. Fasana called the meeting to order at 4:35 pm.

1.1 Pledge of Allegiance

1.2 Roll Call / Introductions

Members Present

Alhambra	B. Messina, J. Keating
Claremont	S. Pedroza
Covina	A. Gonzalez
Diamond Bar	D. Liu
Duarte	J. Fasana
Glendora	D. Tessitor
Industry	T. Spohn
La Verne	S. Johnson
LA County District 5	M. Cano
Rosemead	S. Ly
San Gabriel	J. Costanzo
Walnut	T. King

Members Absent

La Canada-Flintridge
Montebello
South El Monte
South Pasadena

Guests:

J. Allred, City of Rosemead
S. Armenta, City of Rosemead
G. Arrellano, Arrellano Associates/CHSRA
L. Bybee, MTA
R. Charles, Office of Assemblymember Hernandez
A. Clifford, MTA
K. Duran, City of San Dimas
B. Escobedo, Office of Assemblymember Eng
K. Etheridge, Office of Representative Miller
C. Freeland, City of West Covina
J. Fuentes, City of Rosemead
M. Gleason, SCAG
M. Gouveia, Office of Senator Liu
O. Hernandez, City of South El Monte
C. Marcarello, City of Rosemead
A. Marcuska, City of San Gabriel
J. Martinez, CHSRA
V. Martinez, CHSRA
M. Messina, City of Alhambra
A. Naftali, Advantee Consulting
R. Richmond, ACE
S. Rubio, City of Baldwin Park
R. Simon, CHSRA
I. Taylor, MTA
M. Thai, City of El Monte
G. Trauss, City of Rosemead

F. Travis, City of Rosemead
M. Travis, City of Rosemead
P. Travis, City of Rosemead
S. Yauchzee, City of West Covina

SGVCOG Staff:

N. Conway, Executive Director,
K. Boyd, Staff
M. Creter, Staff
M. Echternach, Staff

2.0 Public Comment

There were no comments from the public.

3.0 Consent Calendar

- 3.1 June 18th, 2010 Transportation Committee Meeting Minutes
- 3.2 Transit Operators
 - 3.2.1 Foothill Transit
 - 3.2.2 Montebello Bus Lines
 - 3.2.3 Metro San Gabriel Valley Service Sector
- 3.3 Correspondence/Media Publications
 - There was a motion to approve the consent calendar (M/S/C: S. Ly / D. Tessitor / Unanimous).

4.0 Presentation on California High Speed Rail Project

Staff from the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) gave a presentation on this item. They provided background on the entire CHSRA project, including all of the routes State-wide, and also indicated that the Los Angeles-San Diego Segment was included Phase II of the project and that it was currently undergoing an Alternative Analysis (AA).

In response to the specific concerns in the San Gabriel Valley, CHSRA staff indicated that leadership at their organization had requested that the following issues be communicated to the Transportation Committee:

1. As the Los Angeles-San Diego Segment is included in Phase II of the CHSRA Project, it is still early in the early planning stages. However, the CHSRA would like to keep building momentum on this project.
2. There are still several alignments (UPRR ROW, UPRR Adjacent, SR-60 ROW, I-10 ROW, and Metro/Metrolink ROW) under consideration. As such, there has been limited focus on “being creative” and assessing all of the specific options (i.e. above, at, and below-grade) within each of the alignments.
3. In order to strengthen the lines of communication between the San Gabriel Valley and the CHSRA, the Authority is interested in exploring the possibility developing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the SGVCOG, similar to the arrangement with the Gateway Cities COG. This will allow for a new, more in-depth, level of partnership between the two agencies.
4. As the I-10 ROW alignment between downtown Los Angeles and the I-605 was added after the Public Scoping sessions, the CHSRA recognizes that there have not been regional community meetings held in the jurisdictions along this corridor. For this reason, the CHSRA is committed to hosting community meetings in each of the jurisdictions prior to the Alternative Analysis being presented to the CHSRA Board of Directors.

The Chair stated that the information exchange process should be bi-directional and the SGVCOG should explore the opportunity to develop an MOU with the CHSRA. He also suggested that the CHSRA delay any action on the AA until early 2011 (February), and that all horizontal alignments (including below grade) be examined.

Committee discussed the following issues:

- The importance having adequate time and resources to address community members’ concerns and fears
- The need for CHSRA to continue to work with Caltrans to identify an alignment that remains within existing ROW

- The need to coordinate rather than compete with other projects in the area (I-10 HOV lanes, Gold Line SR-60 Alignment, El Monte Transit Village, etc.)
- The ongoing opposition from the UPRR regarding an alignment within their ROW
- Clarification that participating in an MOU with the CHSRA would not represent an endorsement of the CHSRA Project, either explicit or implicit
- The importance of displaying all horizontal alignments in printed materials
- Clarification regarding the process for reducing the number of alignments under consideration

The Committee directed staff to re-draft the letter to the CHSRA authority to reflect the following issues:

- Expressing concern over the potential impact of any of the alignments (not just the I-10 alignments) on the community, and underscoring the need to continue studying all vertical and horizontal alignment options
- Requesting further information from the CHSRA regarding a possible MOU with the SGVCOG
- Requesting community meetings be held in each of the jurisdictions along the I-10 from downtown to the I-605 to inform residents about the project and together feedback from residents. These meetings should to be held prior to action by the CHSRA Board of Directors regarding the AA.
- Requesting the CHSRA Board of Directors delay any action on the AA until February 2011.

There was a motion to authorize the Executive Director to submit a letter to the CHSRA addressing the SGVCOG's concerns, subject to review and approval via email from the Transportation Committee (M/S/C: D. Tessitor / S. Pedroza / Unanimous).

S. Armenta, Councilmember from the City of Rosemead, expressed residents' concerns regarding the impact the Project could have on their homes and that their primary source of information was newspaper articles rather than direct communication from the CHSRA.

5.0 Partnering Agency Reports

5.1 Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)

The Chair provided a brief update on the scheduled public hearings regarding possible service/routing changes. He also indicated the Metro Board was not meeting in August.

5.2 Alameda Corridor-East Construction Authority

T. Spohn reported on this item. He indicated that ACE staff was working on a TIGER II application for the Nogales Grade Separation. He also congratulated Supervisor Knabe on being elected Chair of the Metro Board.

5.3 Gold Line Foothill Extension Status Report

S. Pedroza reported on this item. He stated that the GL Construction Authority had received initial funding from Metro for \$10 million, which is the first official construction funding from Metro for Phase 2A.

6.0 New Business

Possible items for future meetings include:

- Status of a possible MOU with the CHSRA
- SR-60 Coalition's effort to raise awareness of this alignment, including a possible press conference
- Update on Metro's Public-Private Partnership initiative (for October meeting)

7.0 Next Meeting

The date of the next meeting will be on September 23rd.

8.0 Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.