



# San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

1000 S. Fremont Ave., Unit 42, Alhambra, CA 91803 Phone: (626) 457-1800 FAX: (626) 564-1116 E-Mail [SGV@sgvcog.org](mailto:SGV@sgvcog.org)

## Transportation Committee Meeting Agenda

February 16<sup>th</sup>, 2012  
4:00 pm

West Covina City Hall  
1<sup>st</sup> Floor Community Center  
1444 W. Garvey Avenue, South  
West Covina, CA

- 1.0 Call to Order**
  - 1.1 Pledge of Allegiance
  - 1.2 Roll Call / Introductions
- 2.0 Public Comment**
- 3.0 Consent Calendar**
  - 3.1 January 19<sup>th</sup>, 2012 Transportation Committee Meeting Minutes – Page 1
  - 3.2 Transit Operators
    - 3.2.1 Foothill Transit - Page 3
    - 3.2.2 Montebello Bus Lines – Page 5
    - 3.2.3 Metro San Gabriel Valley Service Sector
  - 3.3 Partnering Agency Reports
    - 3.3.1 Alameda Corridor-East Construction Authority – Page 7
    - 3.3.2 Gold Line Foothill Extension Status Report - Page 9
  - 3.4 Correspondence/Media Publications
- 4.0 The ACE Project**
  - 4.1 ACE Phase II Subcommittee Recommendations (*Discussion with possible action*)- Page 10
- 5.0 Transportation Priority Projects Matrix** (*Recommended Action: Review and provide changes and additions to staff*)- Page 50
- 6.0 SCAG's Draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/ Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)** (*Discussion with possible action*)- Page 54
  - 6.1 East-West Freight Corridor (*Discussion with possible action*)
- 7.0 MTA Report**
  - 7.1 Highway 39 (*Recommended Action: Recommend to the Governing Board to oppose any efforts by Caltrans to abandon State Route-39 and submit a letter to Caltrans requesting that the agency continue its efforts to complete the State Route-39 reopening Project*)- Page 57
  - 7.2 Legislation – Page 60
    - 7.2.1 AB 1444 (Feuer) (*Recommended Action: Recommend that the SGVCOG Governing Board support legislation which would establish an expedited process for transit projects subject to environmental lawsuits and seek an amendment to include highway projects in the legislation*)
    - 7.2.2 AB 1446 (Feuer) (*Recommended Action: Recommend no position at this time due to the lack of detailed financial analysis of the impacts of the legislation which would extend Measure R*)
- 8.0 New Business**
- 9.0 Next Meeting**
- 10.0 Adjourn**

Please RSVP at [mcreter@sgvcog.org](mailto:mcreter@sgvcog.org) or at (626) 457-1800

For Meeting Notice and Minutes, Please access [www.sgvcog.org](http://www.sgvcog.org)

**NOTICE: City Clerks please post this notice (agenda)**

Written materials relating to an item on any Regular Meeting Agenda of the this Committee of the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments that are distributed to the Committee within 72 hours of the Meeting will be available for public inspection at the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments, 1000 S. Fremont Ave., Unit 42, Bldg. A10, Suite 210, Alhambra, CA 91803 during normal business hours.



# San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

1000 S. Fremont Ave., Unit 42, Alhambra, CA 91803 Phone: (626) 457-1800 FAX: (626) 564-1116 E-Mail [SGV@sgvcog.org](mailto:SGV@sgvcog.org)

## Transportation Committee Meeting Minutes

**Date: January 19<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

**Time: 4:00 pm**

**Location: SCE CTAC**

### 1.0 Call to Order

J. Fasana called the meeting to order at 4:05 pm.

1.1 Pledge of Allegiance

1.2 Roll Call / Introductions

#### Members Present

Alhambra	B. Messina
Claremont	S. Pedroza
Diamond Bar	C. Herrera, D. Liu
Duarte	J. Fasana
Industry	T. Spohn
La Canada Flintridge	D. Spence
LA County District 1	N. Englund
LA County District 5	M. Cano, G. Sund
South El Monte	J. Gonzales

#### Members Absent

Covina  
Glendora  
Rosemead

#### SGVCOG Staff:

N. Conway, Executive Director  
K. Boyd, Staff  
M. Creter, Staff  
G. Blanche, Staff

#### Public:

H. Ikhata, SCAG	D. King, Alvarez-Glasman & Colvin
S. Neely, SCAG	A. Cervantes, Pico Rivera
R. Richmond, ACE	B. Archuleta, Pico Rivera
J. Ballas, Industry	R. Bates, Pico Rivera
G. Neely, Office of Senator Huff	M. Yamarone, Pasadena
A. Eskandari, City of Pomona	J. Waclaw, FHWA
S. Scauzillo, SGV Newspapers	D. Sepulveda, MTA
D. Guitierrez, San Gabriel	J. Gulager, MTA
S. Yauchzee, West Covina	C. Lieu, Office of Congresswoman Chu

### 2.0 Public Comment

Public comments were held until item 5.0, as they were related to that item.

### 3.0 Consent Calendar

- 3.1 November 17<sup>th</sup>, 2011 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 Partnering Agency Reports
  - 3.3.1 Alameda Corridor-East Construction Authority
  - 3.3.2 Gold Line Foothill Extension Status Report
- 3.4 Correspondence/Media Publications

There was a motion to approve the consent calendar (M/S/C: M. Cano/ S. Pedroza/ Unanimous).

**4.0 SCAG's Draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/ Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)****4.1 East-West Freight Corridor**

The Executive Director of SCAG presented on this item. Action on this item was deferred until the February meeting.

**5.0 ACE Phase II Subcommittee Recommendations**

The Executive Director provided an overview on the work that has been completed to date related developing a project list for ACE Phase II, including review by the ACE Phase II Subcommittee, the Public Works TAC, and the City Managers' Steering Committee.

Representatives from the City of Pico Rivera spoke in favor of the inclusion of the Durfee Road grade separation in the ACE Phase II project list.

B. Messina requested that action on this item be delayed until representatives from the City of Montebello were able to attend.

D. King, representing the City of Montebello, read a statement requesting that action on this item be delayed until the next meeting.

R. Richmond requested clarification regarding the wording of the recommendation and stated that this item was scheduled for action at the January ACE Board of Directors meeting.

M. Cano requested clarification regarding the implication of this proposed action on several policy issues, including the funding gap and ongoing efforts to upgrade Metrolink safety.

There was a motion to hold this item over to the February meeting (M/S/C: B. Messina / J. Gonzales / Unanimous).

**6.0 California High Speed Rail Authority MOU and Proposed Southern California Rail Investments**

The Executive Director of SCAG and staff from MTA provided an update on the status of this MOU and efforts to implement a "blended approach."

There was a motion to recommend to the Governing Board adopting a position of support for the MOU and the "blended approach" and sending a letter to MTA (M/S/C: B. Messina / T. Spohn / Unanimous).

**7.0 MTA Report****7.1 Metro TOD Planning Grant Round 2**

MTA staff presented an overview of this grant program and responded to questions.

**8.0 New Business****9.0 Next Meeting****10.0 Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 pm.

# Foothill Transit Update for the month of February 2012

**Judy Wright, 1939 -2012** – We were sad to hear of the loss of someone who many consider the mother of Foothill Transit. Judy Wright was instrumental in helping our agency evolve from a passionate idea to long lasting reality for the San Gabriel and Pomona valleys. Judy -

local historian, former Mayor of the City of Claremont and founding member of Foothill Transit’s Executive Board – suffered a heart attack on January 1<sup>st</sup> and fell into a coma. She left us on Saturday, January 7<sup>th</sup>.



We were honored to be the recipient of her tenacious advocacy and support and owe her more than we can fully express. She worked side by side with then County Supervisor Pete Shabarum to carve out a place for Foothill Transit, securing much needed funding through repeated trips to Washington, D.C. and working closely with Congressman David Dreier and the California delegation. Transportation was a passion for her and she worked tirelessly on behalf of our customers, setting the bar high for what would become our standard of excellence.

**GO RIO Student Pass Program** – Community Outreach Coordinator Linda Apodaca promoted the GO RIO student pass program at the Rio Hondo College rideshare fair. Full time students are eligible for a pre-loaded TAP card that allows them to ride five local transit providers (Foothill Transit included) at no charge during the semester. We’re happy to report GO RIO student participation grows steadily each year, especially when gas prices rise and student parking becomes scarcer



**Walnut High School Career Presentation** – Foothill Transit Facilities Manager Aaron Lim, Transportation Safety Officer

Miguel Rodriguez, Transit Technology Manager David Suarez and Community Outreach Coordinator Linda Apodaca spoke to students in the workability class at Walnut High School. Linda has been working with this special needs class for some time, helping them navigate public transportation. This visit focused on potential careers in the public transportation industry. As usual, the workability students asked many insightful questions and were enthusiastic about the information provided.



**Pomona Inland Valley MLK Jr. Project** – Foothill Transit sponsored the Pomona Inland Valley MLK Jr. Project Awards at Pilgrim Congregational Church in Pomona. Executive Board Member and Pomona City Council Member Paula Lantz was among the dignitaries presenting the awards to the scholarship recipients. For over 20 years the Project has honored more than 90 students who have made a significant impact in their communities. Following the late Reverend Martin Luther King’s vision of social justice reform, the Project’s vision is to address the needs of local students to obtain their educational goals.



## Foothill Transit Update for the month of February 2012

**Solar Power Systems Update** – We received the ‘Permission to Operate’ notification from Southern California Edison for the Arcadia/Irwindale Operations and Maintenance Facility. This notification allows Foothill Transit to interconnect and operate the newly installed solar photovoltaic (PV) panels in parallel with SCE’s electric system. General contractor Earl Corporation turned the solar power switch on under the watchful eyes of Director of Facilities Roland Cordero, Project Manager Sharlane Bailey and MV Transportation Facility Manager Daniel Gonzalez. Also, the project team members including NAC Architecture, Building Solutions Group and VCA Engineers performed the final construction punch-list walk down at the Arcadia operations and maintenance facility.



**Irwindale Chamber of Commerce Installation** – On January 20, Director of Planning LaShawn King Gillespie was installed as the 2012 Chair of the Board for the Irwindale Chamber of Commerce at their 32nd Annual Installation and Awards Banquet at the Pomona Valley Mining Company. Foothill Transit has been active with the Irwindale Chamber of Commerce for several years. Executive Board Member Paula Lantz attended along with a number of other Foothill Transit staff.

**Rose Bowl Service** – On January 2, Foothill Transit provided free shuttle service to the Wisconsin vs. Oregon football game at the Rose Bowl Stadium in Pasadena. Along with the help of MV Transportation, Foothill Transit shuttled over 10,000 fans to and from the Rose Bowl and Parsons parking lot. A total of 60 buses were used for the special service. Foothill Transit staff coordinated the service and loading of the buses. Additionally our Safety and Security team made a presence ensuring a peaceful and safe experience.

**Covina Chamber of Commerce Installation of Officers & Citizen of the Year Award** – The 102<sup>nd</sup> Annual Covina Chamber of Commerce Installation of Officers and Citizen of the Year the Award was held on January 26 at South Hills Country Club in West Covina. Among the attendees was Covina Councilmember and Foothill Transit Governing Board member Peggy Delach. A number of Foothill Transit staff attended including Director of Facilities Roland Cordero who represents Foothill Transit on the Covina Chamber Board. At the event, Roland was recognized as the *Director of the Year* for his support and service to the community. Roland is now in his third year on the Board of Directors and will serve on the Covina Chamber’s Executive Committee as the Chief Financial Officer for 2012.





# Transit Express

Volume 1 Issue 4

Winter 2012



## MBL Keeps it Moving During FRWY Catastrophe

As Montebello Bus Lines motor coach operator Louie Guillen entered the west-bound 60 Freeway onramp, he noticed something strange on tanker truck that was approaching the bridge on the eastbound side of the freeway. "As I entered the onramp, I saw sparkles shooting up between the two tankers on a truck – it looked like the Fourth of July between the two tanks." Guillen heard the explosion and saw the white smoke billowing up from underneath the bridge and he immediately notified the dispatcher. In his 33 years as a driver, Guillen has seen his share of accidents, but witnessing an explosion of this magnitude was a first. "I've been stuck on the freeway before because of accidents, but I've never seen anything like this." Guillen's quick thinking allowed Montebello Bus Lines to immediately notify other bus drivers of the accident and begin re-routing buses.



### Inside this issue:

MBL Keeps it Moving	1
Call 511 for Bus Info	1
Welcome to Montebello	1
New Year, New Buses!	2
Montebello Police in Transit!	2
Video Contest Winner	2
Employee of the Month (ETM)	2

Visit us. Follow us!

#MontebelloBusL



## Call 511 for Bus Info!

511 offers free transit and traffic information for Southern California. Obtain trip planner information, bus schedules, or find out traffic conditions anywhere in LA County and beyond. You can go online at Go511.org. Look up your local transit agency specific location or line information, and it will provide the next scheduled bus trip. MBL is working closely with 511 to ensure patrons receive accurate information 24 hours a day, seven days a week. 511 is also working on new mobile phone apps and real-time bus arrival information.

GO 511!



Immediately following the accident, Montebello Bus Lines saw ridership plummet as confused riders tried to locate detoured buses. However, in the upcoming days as detoured bus routes were communicated to regular riders and commuters traded traffic jams for public transportation, the ridership sky-rocked by 65%. Besides putting up detour notices, Montebello Bus Lines uses social media to alert bus riders of route detours. The bus lines used Facebook and Twitter to link riders to their website which listed the route detours.

## Welcome to Montebello!

Congratulations to the new graduating class of January 2012. The class included 8 new Part-Time Bus Operators: Lesly Campos, Javier Morales, Lydia Flores, Arthur Silvas, Gerardo Vargas, Eduardo Urbie, Nicholas Mercurio, and Laura Ebeling. Also, two new Service Equipment Service Workers: Michelle Hernandez and Christian Aguilar.



## New Year, New Buses!

MBL began the new year with the arrival of four new Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) buses from New Flyer of America. The 40-foot low-floor buses are sporting MBL's new exterior design, which is featured in two 2012 calendars! MBL now has seven CNG buses as part of its green fleet. Fourteen CNG buses are planned to replace the remaining diesel buses left within the next 2 to 3 years.

MBL broke ground last fall for our new CNG fueling station facility. It is located at the Taylor Ave. bus yard facility. This project was funded entirely by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) grant the agency received specifically for capital projects and job creation. The 4,000 square foot facility is anticipated to be fully operational in mid-March.



## 80-Video Contest Winner

Montebello Bus Lines continues its 80th Anniversary celebration by hosting a video contest "Why it's better to ride the bus and go green." Contestants were asked to produce a short video and post it up on MBL's Facebook page and have the public (aka Facebook friends) vote. Rio Hondo College student, Josue Mendez' winning video depicted a



young man leaving his keys at home and riding his skateboard to catch a local MBL bus instead. The video ends with the message "Leave your keys at home. Save Money. Go Green!" Josue directed, wrote, and starred in the short film. Josue Mendez had the most "likes" and won the grand prize of a \$200 gift card from courtesy of The Shops at Montebello.

Check out his winning video and more on MBL's Facebook page!

## Montebello Police is in Transit!

Effective January 16th, Lt. Ricardo Rojas and Sgt. David Kim are officially part of the MBL team. Two of Montebello's finest will be assigned to help our agency launch our own Transit Police Bureau and Security Program. Some of their responsibilities will include improving communications with emergency personnel, training MBL supervisors and operations staff, and developing/implementing a security program for MBL's transit system. The officers are also tasked to train other police officers on Transit Police tactics and strategies to improve safety for our passengers and bus operators. Undercover police will randomly ride buses throughout the service system and will follow up with fare evasion reports and general crime. *Welcome to the family!*



## Congratulations Employees of the Month!

The Employee of the Month (ETM) program was launched September 2011 to recognize employees that are not part of the department paid incentive program.

This includes employees from the Administration Dept. and some management staff.

Every month an employee is nominated by his or her manager for displaying exceptional teamwork, reliability, professionalism, and dedication that ultimately makes MBL look good!

Although the ETM does not receive monetary compensation for their good deeds, they do receive a designated parking spot for one month, lunch with the Director and their direct Supervisor, an ETM photo display, and mention in the Transit Express! Congratulations to our nominees!



**Robert Portillo**  
**Chief Management Analyst**  
**November 2011**



**Ani Chukhuryan**  
**Customer Service Representative**  
**December 2011**



# Alameda Corridor-East Construction Authority

4900 Rivergrade Rd. Ste. A120 Irwindale, CA 91706 (626) 962-9292 fax (626) 962-3552 www.theaceproject.org

MEMO TO: SGVCOG Governing Board Members & Alternates  
 FROM: David Gutierrez, Chairman  
 DATE: February 6, 2012  
 SUBJECT: Monthly Report

The following are items of note since the last meeting:

**Tours of Archaeological Site** – A memo was mailed out on January 27 offering tours for SGVCOG Governing Board members and alternates of the ACE archaeological excavation in the railroad right-of-way near the San Gabriel Mission, founded in 1771. The area being excavated was once part of the extended grounds of the Mission, and the archaeological findings may prove important to our understanding of California’s Mission period. The archaeological excavation is scheduled to be completed in mid-March and must precede the start of the main construction work on the San Gabriel Trench. The tours are being offered at 10 a.m. on Friday, February 17 and at 10 a.m. on Friday, February 24. Please RSVP to ACE staff if there is interest in participating.

**Final Phase 2 Recommendation** – The ACE Board voted unanimously in January to recommend to the SGVCOG Governing Board the adoption of the following eight grade separation projects to complete the ACE program in the San Gabriel Valley:

Crossing	Jurisdiction	Conceptual Cost Estimate (in millions)	Daily 2025 Vehicle-Hrs. Delay
Fullerton Road (LA*)	Industry/LA County	\$131.8	115.4
Greenwood Avenue (LA)	Montebello	\$61.7	57.9
Hamilton Boulevard (Alh/LA)	Pomona	\$68.1	36.8
Fairway Drive (Alh*)	Industry/Walnut	\$72.9	87.6
Turnbull Canyon Road (LA)	Industry/LA County	\$84.8	38.9
Fairway Drive (LA)	Industry/LA County	\$100.1	62.5
Puente Avenue (Alh)	Industry/LA County	\$82.8	31.5
Durfee Avenue (LA)	Pico Rivera	\$64.5	34.0
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$698 (with inflation allowance)</b>	
*LA = Union Pacific Railroad Los Angeles (southerly) mainline route			
*Alh = UPRR Alhambra (northerly) mainline route			

The ACE Board recommendation is consistent with the SGVCOG City Managers’ Steering Committee recommendation, now pending at the SGVCOG Transportation Committee.

**Community Outreach Update** – Staff conducted the following project outreach activities:

- Distributed construction alert notices in English, Spanish and Chinese regarding demolition and site-clearing activities for the Baldwin Avenue grade separation project;
- Organized tours of the San Gabriel archaeological excavation site for community groups, residents, and more than 500 students from area schools;
- Staffed an ACE Project information booth at the **Owners' Night expo of the Construction Management Association of America, Southern California Chapter**; and,
- Conducted ongoing community outreach and support activities for the San Gabriel Trench, Baldwin Avenue, and Nogales Street grade separation projects.



## LIAISON REPORT SGVCOG Governing Board

Below is an update on the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority's projects:

### Pasadena to Azusa Update

Kiewit Parsons Joint Venture, the project's design-builder, has initiated design and pre-construction activities. Starting in January, and continuing through the next few months, crews will be out conducting surveying, geotechnical work and utility locating activities all along the 11.5-mile corridor. The information provided from these activities will be used by the design team to detail the project's design submittals. Major construction is anticipated to begin in late 2012 and will generally be completed from east to west (starting in Azusa and moving west toward Arcadia and Pasadena).

### I-210 Bridge Construction Update

In the coming weeks, installation of the temporary support structure (called falsework) will begin. This activity will take a number of weeks to complete, and will require multiple partial and up to 20 full closures of the eastbound lanes of the I-210 Freeway. Closures will occur on consecutive nights, and all will take place starting at 10:00 p.m. for partial closures and midnight for full closures. Lanes will reopen starting at 5:00 a.m.

Below is a rendering of what the falsework will look like:



### Other Updates:

This week, the House of Representatives' Transportation and Infrastructure Committee released their draft Reauthorization bill language. In it, they included a pilot program to allow states to utilize local environmental regulations (CEQA in California) in lieu of NEPA for public transportation capital projects. This is similar to a program that was used successfully for highway projects awarded ARRA funding, and was a priority issue when San Gabriel Valley representatives traveled to DC recently. Although Reauthorization has a long road ahead before it is finalized, this included language is an important step that could help streamline projects like the Foothill Extension from Azusa to Montclair.

To request additional copies of this document, please contact Lisa Levy Buch at 626-305-7004 or [llevybuch@foothillextension.org](mailto:llevybuch@foothillextension.org)



# San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

---

Date: February 16<sup>th</sup>, 2012  
To: Transportation Committee  
From: Nicholas T. Conway, Executive Director  
Re: ACE Phase II Projects and Funding List

## **Recommended Action**

Affirm the recommendations of the City Managers' Steering Committee as follows and submit to the ACE Board of Directors for review and comment:

1. Recommend funding of the top eight rated projects – after removing project alternatives for the same grade crossing – (Fullerton Road, Montebello-Greenwood, Hamilton Boulevard, Fairway Drive (Alh), Turnbull Cyn Road (LA), Fairway Drive (LA), Puente Ave. (Alh), and Durfee Ave. (LA) ) as ranked by the SGVCOG's ACE Phase II Subcommittee.
2. Require ACE submit project schedules and budgets for all active Phase II projects prior to commencing further work.

## **Background**

In January 2011, the COG Transportation Committee and the COG Governing Board adopted a motion that outlined a process to be followed in evaluating the projects to be undertaken in the second and final phase of the COG's Alameda Corridor East Construction Authority project.

In response to the Board's directive, the Public Works Directors formed a subcommittee that included the following:

- Shannon Yauchzee, City of West Covina
- Pat DeChellis/James Yang, Los Angeles County Public Works Department
- John Ballas/Joshua Nelson, City of Industry
- Thomas Melendrez, City of Montebello
- Ati Eskandari, City of Pomona

The committee developed a process, including a methodology for evaluating and ranking projects (see Attachment 1), that was utilized in undertaking the required analysis. Please note the following regarding their methodology and project ranking:

1. **Project Alternatives:** The committee elected to include in the ranking all variations of projects that are currently being studied by ACE (i.e. underpass, overpass, trench), with the recognition that only one project would move forward.
2. **Projects Recommended for Funding:** The committee **did not** develop a constrained list of projects that could be completed with available funding. After performing a cursory review of all 34 grade crossings included in the Phase II report, the Committee narrowed the list of projects to 16 (including multiple alternative designs for some projects). They evaluated and ranked ordered **all** of these projects. It was the committee's assessment that determining a final list of projects to

be funded was a policy question to be determined by the COG Governing Board. See Attachment 1 for the ACE Phase II Subcommittee's proposed project prioritization.

**ACE Board of Directors Review and Action**

In a memo to the ACE Board of Directors dated October 24, 2011 (see Attachment 2), ACE's CEO presented a separate list of projects recommended using the project rankings the Phase II Subcommittee developed. The projects recommended by ACE CEO for funding were as follows (the numbers in parentheses indicate the ranking given by the ACE Phase II Subcommittee):

- Fullerton Road (1)
- Hamilton Boulevard (3)
- Fairway Drive (Alh) (4)
- Turnbull canyon Road (5)
- Fairway Drive (LA) (6)
- Puente Avenue (7)

A total of six projects were recommended for funding and included the top-ranked projects, with the exception of the Montebello-Greenwood project. At the ACE Board of Directors' meeting, Supervisor Molina's motion to add Montebello-Greenwood project was passed, and that project added back in to the list of projects recommended for Phase II funding.

In a November 1 transmittal memo, ACE CEO submitted a list of seven projects to the COG Transportation Committee and the COG Governing Board for their consideration and adoption (See Attachment 3). This process and decision making framework was not consistent with the motion adopted by the COG Governing Board and the Transportation Committee. Based on the approved motion, the next step in the Phase II prioritization process was to have the City Managers' Steering Committee review and approve the financial plan submitted by ACE Executive Director that identifies the resources needed to implement the final phase of this project (see Attachment 4). Once that was completed, the City Manager Steering Committee was intended to forward their recommendations to the Transportation Committee and the COG Governing Board for consideration and adoption.

**ACE Financial Plan**

In the October 24<sup>th</sup> ACE memo discussed above, the CEO estimates a total of \$428 million will be available to complete the remaining projects. The anticipated sources of revenue are as follows:

State (CPUC)	\$ 20 million
MTA (17% Share)	\$ 32 million
UPRR	\$ 13 million
<u>Measure R</u>	<u>\$358 million</u>
Total	\$428 million

In that Board report, he notes that the prospect for additional Federal funding for the remaining projects is unclear pending the passage of a new national transportation bill and the current economic challenges in Washington, DC. Similarly, it is noted that the current funding opportunities for State and UPRR resources are limited at best. That leaves the largest remaining source of funds needed for the completion of the adopted projects resting with the local funds provided by MTA. The good news is that the majority of MTA Measure R funding should be available and ready to support construction. However, the other identified source of MTA funds is a result of a prior MTA board action committing to support up to 17% of the revised ACE project budget of \$1.6 billion. It is unclear if that motion can be applied to costs above the adopted revised adopted ACE project budget. For this reason, I am recommending that the funding assumed to be available for ACE Phase II completion exclude the additional MTA 17% share, and be lowered to \$396 million.

**City Managers’ Steering Committee Recommendation**

At their December meeting, the City Managers’ Steering Committee reviewed the information provided by both ACE and the ACE Phase II subcommittee and recommended the following to the Transportation Committee:

3. Funding of the top eight projects – after removing project alternatives for the same grade crossing – (Fullerton Road, Montebello-Greenwood, Hamilton Boulevard, Fairway Drive (Alh), Turnbull Cyn Road (LA), Fairway Drive (LA), Puente Ave. (Alh), and Durfee Ave. (LA) ) as ranked by the SGVCOG’s ACE Phase II Subcommittee.
4. Requiring ACE submit full project schedules and budgets for all active Phase II projects prior to commencing further work.

Table 1 provides a listing of the top eight projects as ranked by the ACE Phase II Subcommittee, as well as their conceptual cost estimates. Based on the estimated conceptual costs, along with an inflation allowance, the total cost of these projects would be approximately \$700 million. When compared to the estimated available funding, this creates a funding gap of \$272 million with the MTA 17% match or \$304 million without it. It is important to note this estimate of available funding is based on the successful completion of three projects currently or soon to be under way: Baldwin, Puente and San Gabriel. Any unanticipated increase or decrease in those project costs will impact the gap in the available funding resources for Phase II.

Ranking	Crossing	Jurisdiction	Conceptual Cost Estimate
1	Fullerton Road (LA)	Industry/LA County	\$ 131.8
2	Montebello - Greenwood (LA)	Montebello	\$ 61.7
3	Hamilton (Alh/LA)	Pomona	\$ 68.1
4	Fairway Drive (Alh)	Industry/Walnut	\$ 72.9
5	Turnbull Cyn Road (LA)	Industry/LA County	\$ 84.8
6	Fairway Drive (LA)	Industry/LA County	\$ 100.1
7	Puente Ave (Alh)	Industry/LA County	\$ 82.8
8	Durfee Ave. (LA)	Pico Rivera	\$ 64.5
	Total		\$ 666.7
	Total Adjusted for Inflation*		<b>\$ 700.0</b>

\*Assumes an estimated inflation allowance of 5% for total life of project

**Table 1.**  
**ACE Phase II Priority Project (Rankings 1-8) and Conceptual Cost Estimates**



# San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

1000 S. Fremont Ave., Unit 42, Alhambra, CA 91803 Phone: (626) 457-1800 FAX: (626) 564-1116 E-Mail SGV@sgvcog.org

DATE: September 22, 2011  
 TO: Public Works TAC  
 FROM: Shannon Yauchzee, Chair of ACE Phase II Study Subcommittee  
 RE: Update on ACE Phase II Study Subcommittee

## **Recommended Action:**

For information only

## **Background:**

The ACE Phase II Review Subcommittee met on September 22, and representatives from all subcommittee member agencies as well as SGVCOG, ACE, and Pico Rivera staff, were present. The purpose of the meeting was as follows: 1) to review and approve the August 2011 revised estimates and rankings for the 17 crossings and 2) to discuss the feasibility of the subcommittee acknowledging matching contributions from Cities to fund projects.

## **Review of Revised Cost Estimates**

The Subcommittee reviewed the August 2011 Revised Estimates. In general, the Subcommittee does not take issue with the revised estimates. There was a concern regarding feasibility of the Lemon Avenue overpass project. The ACE CEO states they originally included this project due to the high number of deaths at the crossing but did not intend to complete both Lemon Avenue underpass and overpass projects. ACE recommends completing only the Lemon Avenue underpass project due to the overpass's low feasibility and preference.

## **Review of City Funding**

The subcommittee met with Pico Rivera to discuss their request to include local funding availability and match contributions in the Subcommittee's project ranking. ACE staff confirmed that local funding availability was not considered in computing the rankings. Pico Rivera proposed to the Subcommittee to acknowledge matching contributions as it directly decreases ACE's project cost and facilitates their ability to fund additional projects. The challenge with which the Subcommittee grappled is the potential of a bidding war arising among the agencies. Additionally, the Subcommittee states that Pico Rivera's request lies outside the Subcommittee's role and suggested Pico Rivera to formally submit their request to ACE.

The Subcommittee unanimously took action to agree to approve the ACE Study Plans, Public Works TAC Review and Ranking with August 2011 Revised Estimates and remove the Lemon Avenue overpass project pending approval from Diamond Bar. The Lemon Avenue Underpass project will then stand as a separate project.

## **Next Steps:**

- Subcommittee Chair will present the ACE Study Plans, Public Works TAC Review and Ranking with August 2011 Revised Estimates to the Public Works TAC at their September 26<sup>th</sup> meeting

- Pending the results of the meeting, the Subcommittee will present the rankings to the City Manager at their October meeting
- Pending the results of the meeting, the Subcommittee will present the rankings to the Transportation Committee at their October meeting
- ACE CEO will present the ACE PHASE II report to the Council of Governments Governing Board meeting in November.

## ACE Study Plans, Public Works TAC Review and Ranking with August 2011 Revised Estimates

Ranking	CROSSING	ALTERNATE DESCRIPTIONS
1	Fullerton Road (LA)	
2	<b>Montebello Option 1 (LA)<sup>1</sup></b>	Greenwood bypass with Montebello crossing remaining at grade
3	Hamilton Blvd. (Alh/LA)	
4	<b>Fairway Drive Option 1 (Alh)<sup>2</sup></b>	Railroad flyover
5	Turnbull Cyn Road (LA)	
6	Fairway Drive (LA)	
7	Puente Ave. (Alh)	
8	<b>Fairway Drive Option 2 (Alh)<sup>2</sup></b>	Railroad flyover including Lemon Ave
9	<b>Montebello Blvd. Option 2 (LA)<sup>1</sup></b>	Montebello crossing only
10	Durfee Ave. (LA)	
11	Rose Hills Rd. (LA)	
12	<b>Montebello Blvd. Option 3 (LA)<sup>1</sup></b>	Railroad flyover/underpass includes Greenwood & Maple
13	<b>Montebello Blvd. Option 4 (LA)<sup>1</sup></b>	Full railroad lowering includes Greenwood, Maple, & Vail
14	Lemon Ave. (LA)	Underpass
15	<b>Montebello Blvd. Option 5 (LA)<sup>1</sup></b>	Partial lowering includes Greenwood
16	San Antonio Ave. (Alh/LA)	

<sup>1</sup> Multiple options were analyzed for Montebello (LA). Only one of these projects will be eligible for construction.

<sup>2</sup> Two options were analyzed for Fairway (Alh). Only one of these projects will be eligible for construction.

## ACE Study Plans, Public Works TAC Review and Ranking Details with August 2011 Revised Estimates

CROSSING	ALTERNATE DESCRIPTIONS	Conceptual Cost Estimate (x \$ Million)	Daily 2025 Veh. Delay S.T.	Cost/Daily Hour Relief S.T. (x \$ Million)	Cost Benefit Ranking	Priority CPUC Index	CPUC Priority Index Ranking	Averaged Cost & CPUC Rankings	Combined Ranking*
1 Fullerton Road (LA)		\$131.836	115.4	\$1.142	3	776	2	2.500	1
2 <b>Montebello Option 1 (LA)<sup>1</sup></b>	Greenwood bypass with Montebello crossing remaining at grade	\$61.714	57.9	\$1.066	2	289	5	3.500	2
3 Hamilton Blvd. (Alh/LA)		\$68.148	36.8	\$1.852	7	462	4	5.500	3
4 <b>Fairway Drive Option 1 (Alh)<sup>2</sup></b>	Railroad flyover	\$72.907	87.6	\$0.832	1	182	10	5.500	4
5 Turnbull Cyn Road (LA)		\$84.836	38.9	\$2.181	9	554	3	6.000	5
6 Fairway Drive (LA)		\$100.080	62.5	\$1.601	5	230	8	6.500	6
7 Puente Ave. (Alh)		\$82.832	31.5	\$2.630	13	965	1	7.000	7
8 <b>Fairway Drive Option 2 (Alh)<sup>2</sup></b>	Railroad flyover including Lemon Ave	\$145.947	118.2	\$1.235	4	182	10	7.000	8
9 <b>Montebello Blvd. Option 2 (LA)<sup>1</sup></b>	Montebello crossing only	\$97.158	43.5	\$2.234	10	289	5	7.500	9
10 Durfee Ave. (LA)		\$64.545	34.0	\$1.898	8	247	7	7.500	10
11 Rose Hills Rd. (LA)		\$45.842	26.9	\$1.704	6	185	9	7.500	11
12 <b>Montebello Blvd. Option 3 (LA)<sup>1</sup></b>	Railroad flyover/underpass includes Greenwood & Maple	\$174.073	68.0	\$2.560	12	289	5	8.500	12
13 <b>Montebello Blvd. Option 4 (LA)<sup>1</sup></b>	Full railroad lowering includes Greenwood, Maple, & Vail	\$389.354	87.8	\$4.435	15	289	5	10.000	13
14 Lemon Ave. (LA)	Underpass	\$81.435	28.8	\$2.828	14	268	6	10.000	14
15 <b>Montebello Blvd. Option 5 (LA)<sup>1</sup></b>	Partial lowering includes Greenwood	\$266.568	57.9	\$4.604	16	289	5	10.500	15
16 San Antonio Ave. (Alh/LA)		\$83.430	37.2	\$2.243	11	124	11	11.000	16

\* When there is a tie in the previous column, the crossings are then ranked by giving the crossing with the higher CPUC Priority Index Number a higher ranking.

<sup>1</sup> Multiple options were analyzed for Montebello (LA). Only one of these projects will be eligible for construction.

<sup>2</sup> Two options were analyzed for Fairway (Alh). Only one of these projects will be eligible for construction.

S.T. = Single Track on the Alhambra Subdivision



## Alameda Corridor-East Construction Authority

4900 Rivergrade Rd. Ste. A120 Irwindale, CA 91706 (626) 962-9292 fax (626) 962-3552 www.theaceproject.org

MEMO TO: ACE Construction Authority Board Members & Alternates

FROM: Rick Richmond  
Chief Executive Officer

DATE: October 24, 2011

SUBJECT: Approval of Recommended Scope for Remainder of ACE Program

**RECOMMENDATION:** Based on the project rankings approved by the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG) Public Works Directors Technical Advisory Committee, staff recommends that the remaining scope of the ACE Project (beyond the 14 grade separations built or under development) consist of the following grade separations (alphabetic order):

Hamilton Boulevard  
Fairway Drive (Alh)\*  
Fairway Drive (LA) \*  
Fullerton Road  
Puente Avenue\*  
Turnbull Canyon Road\*

In the event the project priority rankings now pending before the SGVCOG Transportation Committee change, staff intends to bring the recommendation back to your Board for further consideration.

Staff requests that this recommended change to the scope of the ACE Project be forwarded to the SGVCOG Transportation Committee and the SGVCOG Governing Board for their consideration.

In the event this project scope, or something similar, is approved by both the ACE and SGVCOG Boards, staff will return with a project phasing plan before any work beyond that already authorized (preliminary design on Fairway Drive (LA) and Puente Avenue) proceeds.

### **BACKGROUND**

**Phase II Study:** In 2009, as progress was being made on Phase II of the ACE Project, a Phase II study was begun to renew the information used in establishing the scope of the ACE Project in the late 1990s, and to revisit the remaining six adopted separations

\* Included in originally adopted ACE Project.

not already in project development, including nearby alternative locations. The purpose of the study was to provide the necessary information for the ACE and SGVCOG Boards to adopt a scope for the completion of the ACE Project.

The study consisted of two parts – an updated traffic analysis and concept plans for alternative grade separations.

Traffic Analysis: The traffic analysis recorded current vehicular and train traffic at all 34 remaining corridor crossings and, using adopted SCAG traffic projections, updated the vehicular projections to the year 2025. The 34 crossings are all those not accounted for as a result of grade separations already complete or committed.

Estimated future congestion levels at each crossing were projected using essentially the same methodology as employed in the 1997 study which formed the basis of the ACE Project adoption. This new crossing congestion forecast resulted in changes in the relative congestion rankings as compared to the 1997 study (Exhibit I). Some of the crossings with the highest anticipated congestion levels are not part of the currently adopted ACE Project (which was also the case with the results of the 1997 study).

The consultant also analyzed the 34 crossings under the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) criteria which is used for scoring grade separation applications statewide. The CPUC formula puts a relatively heavy emphasis on accident history and other safety factors. Predictably, analyzing the crossings under the CPUC criteria produced different rankings than did the congestion formula (Exhibit II).

Concept Plans: As mentioned above, the study also included the development of concept plans for the six adopted grade separations, including alternative locations or configurations. For the adopted six locations preliminary concepts totaled 17 different locations or configurations. These preliminary options were reviewed with each of the host jurisdictions to determine acceptability at a cursory level.

Based on those discussions a lesser set of 12 concept plans was prepared to a greater level of detail. These concept plans addressed approximate project limits, engineering or railroad issues, utility relocation and property acquisition requirements and coarse level cost estimates. The concept plans were re-circulated to the host jurisdictions to confirm their interest in seeing these projects move forward to the next stage of project development.

SGVCOG Review: In September 2010 the Phase II study was referred by the SGVCOG Governing Board to its Public Works Directors' Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for review and comment. That referral was expanded upon in January 2011 to ask the TAC to review the candidate projects and up to eight additional locations, and make

recommendations on the priority of the projects under consideration in light of their cost benefit and regional benefit.

The TAC established a volunteer subcommittee to carry out the requested review. The subcommittee, after receiving thorough briefings on how the Phase II study had been conducted by the consultant (KOA Corp.) and subconsultant (JL Patterson and Associates), decided to consider both ranking methods addressed in the study - the congestion-based ranking method and the CPUC-based ranking for candidate projects. After merging the top ten ranked projects for each ranking method, and dropping projects that the subcommittee felt were either infeasible to construct, ineffective in correcting the crossing deficiency, or lacked regional significance, the subcommittee added four locations to those already studied, for a total of 16. The final list of projects study, grouped by location, was:

- Fairway Dr. Rail Flyover (Alh.)
- Fairway Dr./Lemon Ave. Rail Flyover (Alh.)
- Fairway Dr. Underpass (LA)
- Lemon Ave. Underpass (LA)
- Montebello Blvd. Underpass
- Montebello Partial Rail Lowering
- Montebello Full Rail Lowering
- Montebello Partial Rail Flyover
- Greenwood Ave. Underpass
- Puente Ave. Underpass
- Turnbull Canyon Rd. Underpass
- Rose Hills Rd. Overpass
- Fullerton Rd. Underpass (LA)
- Hamilton Blvd. Underpass
- San Antonio Ave. Underpass
- Durfee Ave. Underpass

The subcommittee considered at length different methods of arriving at a priority listing and decided to consider the 16 candidate projects under both a coarse level cost-benefit, congestion relief-based ranking and a CPUC-based ranking. The two rankings were then merged with equal weighting, and the projects with the best combined

rankings were the highest recommended priorities (Exhibit III). In case of a tie in combined rankings, the project with the higher CPUC ranking prevailed.

The TAC subcommittee recommendations were approved by the full TAC and are pending at the SGVCOG City Manager's Steering Committee before going to the SGVCOG Transportation Committee.

In ACE staff's view, the method used by the subcommittee in arriving at its priority rankings, while not the only way of doing so, is valid and would recommend it be used as the basis for setting the remaining scope of the ACE Project.

As mentioned above, during the course of the Phase II study staff sought the input of the host jurisdictions on different project alternatives. The concept plans for the four grade separation alternatives added by the subcommittee were also distributed to the host jurisdictions for comment. While it is premature for the jurisdictions, or ACE, to commit to a particular project, we would not recommend going to the design and environmental impact review stage on a project to which the host jurisdiction objects.

Project Financing – Thus far the ACE Project has been almost entirely financed by Federal, State and local MTA transportation funding programs. A substantial effort was made in the 2005-07 period to generate funds from private sector beneficiaries of goods movement growth (container fees in this case) which was unsuccessful, then became infeasible due to declines in traffic. A resurgence in goods movement activity could make it practical to revive private sector funding, but it should not be relied upon at this point.

The prospects for the primary future funding sources are as follows:

Federal: There are two potential sources of additional Federal funding.

Multi-year surface transportation program authorization legislation, now long overdue, has been the most significant source of federal funds for the ACE projects, with nearly \$200 million committed through two prior bills. While deficit reduction is a priority in Washington, road and highway projects traditionally attract strong bipartisan Congressional support. New for this reauthorization round are freight infrastructure grant programs, with as-yet unspecified funding levels, which have been proposed in the House and Senate. Staff is working with our Congressional supporters to ensure the eligibility of the ACE Construction Authority and projects for freight programs.

Also, before the end of October, ACE will submit applications for the Nogales Street and San Gabriel Trench projects seeking discretionary capital grant funding through the TIGER 3 grant program. The ACE projects are a good fit with this program which

makes nearly \$527 million available to be awarded on a competitive basis for projects of national or regional significance. However, the TIGER programs have been heavily oversubscribed and previous applications submitted by ACE, while recommended following review by USDOT technical teams, have not been awarded funds.

While there are two prospects for additional Federal funding, particularly in the program reauthorization, neither one can be counted on as an assured source at this point.

State: There are three existing sources of State funding from which we can seek funding.

First is the ongoing State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). We were successful in obtaining \$39 million from this source at the beginning of the project but for many years now the STIP has been oversubscribed with conventional highway construction projects nominated by Caltrans and regional agencies.

Second, there have been periodic infusions of one-time State funding into transportation, the most recent being the Prop 1B (2006) program. Prospects for another infusion in the near future are dim given the State's budget pressures and general economic distress. There is a potential for capturing any Prop 1B funds from projects failing to meet deadlines or from widespread cost underruns, but this would be speculative to rely on at this point.

A third State source would be the Section 190 Grade Separation Fund administered by the Public Utilities Commission and Caltrans. We have received \$5 million from this program in the past and have projects pending at this time. Given our ambitious program staff believes it is reasonable to expect securing \$20 million from the Section 190 source over the remaining life of the ACE Project.

Local: MTA funding comes from two sources: The MTA made an initial commitment to a 17% share of the total project costs dating back to the beginning of the ACE Project, and reaffirmed in 2007. In addition, the ACE Project was included in the Measure R local sales tax program passed by the voters in 2008 in the amount of \$400 million.

A large portion of the 17% share has been programmed already by the MTA but a modest portion of additional funding (approximately \$32 million), depending on the size of the adopted program, would be eligible. There is substantial likelihood that favorable bidding on our three projects ready for construction in the next few months will free up funding already allocated by the MTA. In the interest of being fiscally conservative we are not including it in this forecast, but it is a very real possibility.

ACE Board Members & Alternates  
 October 24, 2011 Meeting  
 Recommended Scope for Phase II  
 Page 6

Of the Measure R funding, \$358 million should be available for completion of the remainder of the ACE Project.

To summarize, the MTA funding for the remainder of the program is estimated as:

Probable additional 17% share	\$32 million
Measure R	<u>\$358 million</u>
	\$390 million

UPRR Contributions: While it has not been a significant source of project funding to date, we can expect the Union Pacific Railroad will make contributions to future grade separations. Based on past experience, \$13 million in aggregate UPRR contributions (\$2.0-\$2.5 million per project) is a reasonable expectation.

Funding Summary: Based on the foregoing, staff believes a conservative estimate of the funding we can rely on for the future program from the sources cited above is as follows:

State (CPUC)	\$20 million
MTA (17% share and Measure R)	390 million
UPRR	<u>13 million</u>
	\$428 million

Grade Separations Recommended for Adoption – As mentioned above, ACE staff believes the method used by the technical subcommittee is valid and can be used for determining future priorities. Also as mentioned, the subcommittee's priority list was compiled while ACE's outreach to host jurisdictions was still in process, and therefore was not completely vetted with the respective cities to determine whether a proposed project configuration could be supported by the host jurisdictions. That consultation has gone on simultaneously with the review of subcommittee's recommendations.

The result of that process is that of the five alternative projects in Montebello, only one – the full railroad lowering – has the support of the City Council. A written request was made for a declaration of support specifically for the highly-rated Greenwood Avenue underpass alternative but the Council declined to do so. Therefore, staff is reluctant to recommend it as part of the scope of the remaining ACE Project.

Aside from Montebello, other potential host jurisdictions are in support of continuing the projects into detailed development.

Working from the technical subcommittee's priority list, removing Montebello projects not supported by the City and duplicative projects, the remaining list, in priority order, is:

<u>Crossing</u>	<u>Conceptual Cost Estimate</u> <u>(In millions)</u>
Fullerton Rd. (LA)	\$131.8
Hamilton Blvd. (Alh/LA)	68.1
Fairway Dr. (Alh)	72.9
Turnbull Canyon Rd. (LA)	84.8
Fairway Dr. (LA)	100.1
Puente Ave. (Alh)	82.8
Durfee Ave. (LA)	64.5
Rose Hills Rd. (LA)	45.8
Montebello Blvd. Full Rail Lowering (LA)	389.4
Lemon Ave. (LA)	81.4
San Antonio Ave. (Alh/LA)	83.4

Matching known and potential revenue over a 5-7 year period (which is what it would take to build out the current and probable future projects) to the above priority list, ACE staff recommends that the following projects be adopted into the scope of the ACE Project:

<u>Grade Separation</u>	<u>Conceptual Cost Estimate</u> <u>(In millions)</u>
Fullerton Rd. (LA)	\$131.8
Hamilton Blvd. (Alh/LA)	68.1
Fairway Dr. (Alh)	72.9
Turnbull Canyon Rd. (LA)	84.8
Fairway Dr. (LA)	100.1
Puente Ave. (Alh)	82.8
Total	\$540.5 million

Cost Estimates – The cost estimates consist of four major components – design, construction, right of way (including utilities) and a number of agency costs (internal labor, third parties and indirect costs). Construction costs estimates were prepared by JL Patterson and Associates based on past experience with underpass construction on

ACE and other similar projects, and on ACE cost estimates for trench construction. Railroad costs (track, signal, flagging, etc.) were developed from similar sources. Construction and railroad estimates include a 30% contingency for factors that can't be predicted when no design has been done. Design costs are estimated at 10% of construction costs.

Right of way costs are based on estimated full and part take requirements with a conservative, uniform property value multiplier and a significant allowance for acquisition costs and contingencies.

Not included in the consultant cost estimates was a future inflation allowance. Based on the current construction climate staff has added an escalation allowance based on these assumptions:

- Inflation allowances should be included for all cost estimate components except right of way where conservative property value and significant contingency is already in the estimates;
- Construction inflation will continue to be insignificant through June 2013;
- The remaining projects will be designed and constructed over a seven-year period. Four of the six projects will move as expeditiously as possible; two remaining projects would begin design in 2013;
- Inflation allowances of 2%/year (adopted U.S. Army Corps Of Engineers allowance) applied to all projects starting in July 2013.

When inflation allowances are added to the baseline cost estimates as described above an additional \$30.3 million would be added to the total:

Current Dollar Total Cost Estimate	\$540.5 million
Inflation Allowance	<u>30.3 million</u>
Total	\$570.8 million

Comparing the cost estimate for the recommended program to the known available funding described above:

Cost of Recommended Project	\$571 million
Available Funding	<u>423 million</u>
Shortfall	\$143 million

Staff believes it is prudent to establish the future project list as described above, despite the funding shortfall, based on a number of considerations:

- The estimate of available funds is a conservative one. It assumes that projects ready to go to bid now will not come in under estimates. Bids below estimates has become the rule, not the exception, in construction;
- The funds estimate includes no new Federal or State funding. While none can be assured, our experience and continued diligent efforts should make some funding available over the next 2-3 years. As a matter of policy, we should not walk away from continuing to seek Federal or State funding for worthwhile projects;
- Specific to the State bond issue source, there is a reasonable likelihood that additional revenue could become available from other projects not proceeding or widespread underbidding;
- The remaining projects would be phased so that no financial commitments would be made for the last 1-2 without an improved revenue outlook. Moving into new projects beyond the projected fund availability would be conditioned on ACE and SGVCOG Board authorization which would take into account both the cost experience on early projects and the future funding prospects;
- The recommended program represents the same number of grade separations as originally adopted – 20 – and makes relatively minor changes in terms of the remaining projects (four of the six are already a part of the Project).

As mentioned above, to eliminate the risk of spending beyond available funding, if the above program, or something close to it, is approved by both the ACE and SGVCOG Boards staff will return in the near future with a phasing strategy that expedites project implementation but avoids financial risk. In the meantime, engineering work already begun on the Fairway Dr. (LA) and Puente Ave. projects will continue.

Attachments

# Exhibit I

## Total Daily Vehicular Delay Future (2025) Traffic Conditions – Single-Tracked (Sorted by Ranking)

Korve Study Ranking	2010 Ranking	Street/UPRR Sub.	Alhambra Subdivision Single-Tracked
6	1	Fullerton Rd *(Alh)	192.3
11	2	Fullerton Rd *(Alh)	115.4
3	3	Fairway Dr *(Alh)	87.6
1	4	Fairway Dr *(Alh)	62.5
20	5	Stimson Ave *(Alh)	52.7
8	6	Montebello Blvd *(Alh)	43.5
29	7	Workman Mill Rd *(Alh)	42.2
28	8	Turnbull Canyon Rd *(Alh)	38.9
13	9	San Antonio Ave *(Alh/LA)	37.2
14	10	Hamilton Blvd *(Alh/LA)	36.8
22	11	Durfee Ave *(LA)	34.0
16	12	Park Ave	32.7
2	13	Puente Ave *(Alh)	31.5
5	14	Lemon Ave *(Alh)	30.6
25	15	Tyler Ave *(Alh)	30.1
9	16	Temple Ave *(Alh)	30.1
17	17	Lemon Ave *(Alh)	28.8
26	18	Palomares St *(Alh)	28.7
23	19	Rose Hills Rd *(Alh)	26.9
7	20	Brea Canyon Rd *(Alh)	22.8
27	21	Vail Ave *(Alh)	19.8
12	21	California Ave *(Alh)	14.7
30	22	Greenwood Ave *(Alh)	14.4
31	23	Maple Ave *(Alh)	10.1
18	24	Vineland Ave *(Alh)	9.1
32	25	Main St *(Alh)	8.7
11	26	Temple City Blvd *(Alh)	8.1
10	27	Lowe Azusa Rd *(Alh)	6.7
21	28	Cogswell Rd *(Alh)	6.6
15	29	Walnut Grove Ave *(Alh)	6.1
33	30	Bixby Dr *(Alh)	5.7
34	31	Mission Mill Rd *(Alh)	4.5
19	32	Arden Dr *(Alh)	3.0
24	33	Encinita Ave *(Alh)	2.7

\*Preempted by railroad interconnected to traffic signal system.

**Exhibit II**

**Priority Index Ranking Based on CPUC Formula  
(Sorted by Ranking)**

<b>CPUC Ranking</b>	<b>Cong. Ranking</b>	<b>Street/UPRR Sub.</b>	<b>Priority Index Number</b>
1	16	Temple Ave (Alh)	2439
2	13	Puente Ave (Alh)	965
3	2	Fullerton Rd (Alh)	776
4	5	Stimson Ave (Alh)	711
5	8	Turnbull Canyon Rd (Alh)	554
6	10	Hamilton Blvd (Alh)	462
7	1	Fullerton Rd (Alh)	302
8	6	Montebello Blvd (Alh)	289
9	17	Lemon Ave (Alh)	268
10	11	Durfee Ave (Alh)	247
11	4	Fairway Dr (Alh)	230
12	19	Rose Hills Rd (Alh)	185
13	3	Fairway Dr (Alh)	182
14	14	Lemon Ave (Alh)	163
15	29	Cogswell Rd (Alh)	151
16	18	Palomares St (Alh)	134
17	15	Tyler Ave (Alh)	133
18	22	California Ave (Alh)	128
19	9	San Antonio Ave (Alh)	124
20	25	Main St (Alh)	105
21	12	Park Ave (Alh)	97
21	32	Mission Mill Rd (Alh)	92
22	26	Vineland Ave (Alh)	91
23	20	Brea Canyon Rd (Alh)	87
24	7	Workman Mill Rd (Alh)	87
25	21	Vail Ave (Alh)	77
26	23	Greenwood Ave (Alh)	69
27	27	Temple City Blvd (Alh)	67
28	24	Maple Ave (Alh)	54
29	28	Lower Azusa Rd (Alh)	53
30	30	Walnut Grove Ave (Alh)	41
31	31	Bixby Dr (Alh)	39
32	33	Arden Dr (Alh)	38
33	34	Encinita Ave (Alh)	30

## Exhibit III

### Candidate ACE Grade Separations Public Works TAC Review and Ranking

Overall Ranking	Crossing	Cost & Benefit Ranking	CPUC Index Ranking	Average Cost Benefit/CPUC Ranking
1	Fullerton Rd. (LA)	3	2	2.5
2	Montebello Greenwood Option (LA)	2	5	3.5
3	Hamilton Blvd. (Alh/LA)	7	4	5.5
4	Fairway Dr. (Alh)	1	10	5.5
5	Turnbull Canyon Rd. (LA)	9	3	6.0
6	Fairway Dr. (LA)	5	8	6.5
7	Puente Ave. (LA)	13	1	7.0
8	Fairway Dr./Lemon Ave. (Alh)	4	10	7.0
9	Montebello Blvd. Option (LA)	10	5	7.5
10	Durfee Ave. (LA)	8	7	7.5
11	Rose Hills Rd. (LA)	6	9	7.5
12	Montebello Rail Flyover Option (LA)	12	5	8.5
13	Montebello Full Lowering Option (LA)	15	5	10.0
14	Lemon Ave. (LA)	14	6	10.0
15	Montebello Partial Lowering Option (LA)	16	5	10.5
16	San Antonio Ave. (Alh/LA)	11	11	11.0

Note: Rankings for cost-benefit and CPUC Index reflect relative position among projects remaining for consideration (i.e., not ranking among the original 34 crossings in the study).



## Alameda Corridor-East Construction Authority

4900 Rivergrade Rd. Ste. A120 Irwindale, CA 91706 (626) 962-9292 fax (626) 962-3552 www.theaceproject.org

MEMO TO: Angel Carrillo  
President  
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

John Fasana  
Chairman  
Transportation Committee  
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

FROM: Tim Spohn   
Chairman  
ACE Construction Authority

DATE: November 1, 2011

SUBJECT: **RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS TO SCOPE OF THE ACE PROJECT**

At its October 24<sup>th</sup> meeting the ACE Construction Authority voted to recommend two amendments to the scope of the overall ACE Project which require approval of the Governing Board of the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG).

**IRRIS Project.** The first is the removal of the Integrated Rail Roadway Interface System (IRRIS) from the scope of the ACE Project. An advanced signal system demonstration project, later to be known as IRRIS, was included in the original adoption of the ACE Project by SGVCOG in the late 1990's. The ACE Construction Authority began implementing IRRIS in 2000 and continued system installation, testing, modification and failure analysis through mid-2009 at which time we suspended further work on the project. At this time, ACE concluded that successful completion of the project was by no means assured and the time it would take and ultimate cost could not be reliably predicted. Further, the difficulties and cost of keeping a relatively sophisticated, integrated series of technical components operating accurately and reliably over an extended period – a responsibility which would shift to the City of Pomona by prior agreement – would be a significant burden.

Attached to this recommendation is a more detailed explanation of the history of the project which went to the ACE Board in June 2009 (Attachment I).

MTA, Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration have all approved the closeout of the demonstration project. No grant reimbursement is being requested.

**Grade Separations.** The second recommended amendment is to the scope of the remaining grade separations in the overall project.

**Phase II Study.** As you know, 14 of the 20 grade separations originally adopted by the SGVCOG in the late 1990's are either in service, in construction or fully funded and ready to start construction. ACE began a study in 2009 to update all of the original data used by

Angel Carillo, John Fasana  
 Recommended Amendments to Scope of the ACE Project  
 November 1, 2011  
 Page 2

SGVCOG in the original project selection and review options for the remaining grade separations to be built. As the study was nearing completion in 2010 it was referred by SGVCOG to its Public Works Directors Technical Advisory Committee which empanelled a subcommittee to do the requested review. That review has been completed and is working its way through the SGVCOG approval process.

ACE Staff Recommendation. ACE staff prepared a recommendation to incorporate the projects ranked highest by the SGVCOG subcommittee. The recommendation matched the ranked projects against an estimate of project funding which can be relied upon at this point from all sources used in the past and possible in the future. The estimate, very conservative by its nature, set the readily available funding at \$423 million. The recommended program consisted of the six highest ranked projects, save one project in Montebello (which the City Council declined to support), was estimated to cost \$571 million. The funding shortfall, \$148 million, was seen as reasonable by virtue of the very conservative funding estimates and, more importantly, manageable since not all project would go forward simultaneously. The last 1-2 projects would only go ahead if funding prospects became positive and only with ACE and SGVCOG Board approval.

A copy of the full ACE staff analysis and recommendation is attached. (Attachment II).

ACE Board Action. At its October 24 meeting the ACE Board voted unanimously to approve staff's recommended program and include the highly ranked Montebello project mentioned above—an underpass at Greenwood Avenue. The decision to include the Montebello project was based on a number of considerations:

- The Greenwood Avenue project is highly rated, appears to be cost effective, and is the only project in the City meeting that standard;
- It was premature to exclude the City of Montebello from the ACE Program until the last possible decision point at which a decision has to be made;
- Keeping Greenwood Avenue project within the ACE Project will provide time during which the sentiment of the City council regarding this project might change;
- Like 1-2 projects on the recommended list, no expenditures will be made on this project unless funding prospects improve and only if approved by the ACE and SGVCOG Boards.

Based on the ACE Board's action, the following amendment to the remaining scope of the ACE Project is recommended:

**Existing**

Fairway Drive (Alh)  
 Fairway Drive (LA)  
 Montebello Boulevard  
 Puente Avenue

**Proposed Amended**

Hamilton Boulevard  
 Fairway Drive (Alh)  
 Fairway Drive (LA)  
 Fullerton Road

Angel Carillo, John Fasana  
Recommended Amendments to Scope of the ACE Project  
November 1, 2011  
Page 3

Rose Hills Road  
Turnbull Canyon Road

Greenwood Avenue  
Puente Avenue  
Turnbull Canyon Road

Should the project ranking recommend by the technical subcommittee change during the remaining SGVCOG approval process, the ACE Board will reconsider its recommendation.

ACE staff will return to the ACE and SGVCOG Boards with a staged implementation plan for the adopted program which will insure that no project goes forward until adequate funding will be available. This would not apply to previously authorized work – preliminary engineering of the Fairway Drive (LA) and Puente Avenue projects which has begun

The more detailed memoranda on the two requested amendments are attached.

I and my fellow ACE Board Members look forward to discussing our recommendation with your Governing Board.

Attachments

cc: Nicholas Conway



**MEMO TO:** ACE Construction Authority Board Members & Alternates

**FROM:** Rick Richmond  
Chief Executive Officer

**DATE:** June 22, 2009

**SUBJECT:** Approval of Suspension of IRRIS Project

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends that we suspend the continued development of the Integrated Rail Roadway Interface System (IRRIS), transfer ownership of traffic control components to the City of Pomona, and monitor future train control technology to consider its usefulness in achieving the original objectives of the IRRIS program.

**BACKGROUND:** Development of an advanced signal system demonstration project was one of the elements of the Alameda Corridor-East (ACE) Project adopted by the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG) in the late 1990s. The demonstration project, later named IRRIS, was intended to improve mobility for motorists trying to get across future unseparated grade crossings by:

- Accurately predicting crossing gate down times, and
- Where warranted redirect traffic to nearby grade separated crossings through changeable message signs and traffic signal timing adjustments, and
- Provide crossing delay information to emergency responders.

An implementation plan for the project selected Pomona as the most promising location to test the application of advanced signalization techniques. The demonstration project was to consist of three project elements:

- A traffic subsystem including upgraded control software, upgraded signal equipment, changeable message signs and vehicle detectors encompassing an approximate 112 square block area of central Pomona;
- A railroad subsystem which would detect train location, length and speed at 19 separate locations over a 12-mile length, and communicate the necessary information to;
- A traffic control center which would "read" the train information and determine whether to activate the traffic re-routing advisory.

Project cost was estimated at \$7.2 million, consisting of \$5.65 million for hardware, software and construction and \$1.55 million for technical services.

ACE Construction Authority Board Members & Alternates  
June 22, 2009 Board Meeting  
Request for Approval of Suspension of IRRIS Project  
Page 2

Contracts for the field communications and train detection equipment were awarded in 2001, traffic control system software was purchased in late 2002 and a contract for the upgraded traffic control system was awarded in late 2003. A pilot installation of the train detection system was conducted in 2003; full installation of the system was authorized with the scheduled completion of late 2004 with acceptance testing to follow.

Testing in early 2005 revealed that the train detection component of the system was not meeting the requirements for reliable and accurate train detection. The train detection system vendor, EVA Signal Corporation, performed a series of upgrades and retests throughout 2005 continuing up to August 2006. By this time the firm was experiencing severe financial difficulties and obvious trouble with supporting their installation in Pomona. In October 2006 we found them in default of their contract. About the same time EVA filed for bankruptcy. Through Counsel we pursued remedy through their performance bond; Counsel advised us that preliminary acceptance of the pilot installation (3 of 19 sites) and the relatively small value of the bond made meaningful recovery unlikely.

In March 2007 you authorized a contract with Automated Switching and Controls, Inc. (ASCI), who provided the project's communications system, to evaluate alternative train detection systems. ASCI evaluated five different technologies, recommended a new generation of magnetometers (the type of detection which failed earlier), and estimated their installed cost at \$421,000.

Current Situation: Staff is recommending that we suspend further development of the IRRIS Project based on these considerations:

- Remaining Uncertainties – while the evaluation of a replacement train detection system has been thorough and appears sound, the remaining project components would still have to be integrated at an undetermined cost and duration, technical support resources (consultants) would have to be remobilized and, if our experience is any guide, there will be still be significant challenges in store;
- Prospects for Long Term Success – Beyond the challenge of getting the system to meet accuracy and reliability expectations, the system will require long term operation and maintenance attention. This was recognized at the outset of the project and we have a project agreement with the City of Pomona to support the project after acceptance. Again, our experience has shown us that maintaining a moderately sophisticated technological application like IRRIS in the demanding environment of an operating railroad will not be easy or inexpensive. In recent

ACE Construction Authority Board Members & Alternates  
June 22, 2009 Board Meeting  
Request for Approval of Suspension of IRRIS Project  
Page 3

discussion on this subject City of Pomona staff have expressed concerns over this.

- Evolution of Alternative Relevant Technology – in the aftermath of last year's Metrolink/UPRR accident in Chatsworth, major attention is going into the development of a more effective train control system using newer technologies. Positive Train Control is expected to generate train tracking and communications capabilities which could potentially be used for purposes akin to IRRIS, and the urgency associated with this effort is expected to produce results within the next few years.

Financial Considerations – A total of \$6,445,027 has been charged to the IRRIS project to date. All contract work and professional services were completed and accepted with the exception of the train detection system mentioned above. The amount paid on that contract was \$1,041,542.

Of the \$6.445 million spent, \$3.5 million was spent on the planning, design and installation of the upgraded traffic signal system and changeable message signs, most of which has been in use since 2005 and will have lasting public benefit. A total of \$2.9 million was spent on the planning, design and installation of the railroad and communications components of the project, which would not be used if this recommendation is approved.

Next Steps – As mentioned above, we have had initial discussions with Pomona staff regarding the future use of the traffic equipment already installed. Should the project be suspended we will also need to discuss with the Union Pacific the disposition of equipment installed on their right-of-way.

If suspension is approved, a request will have to be made to the SGVCOG for an amendment to the scope of this adopted ACE Project.

Finally, if further work on IRRIS is suspended, staff intends to follow the progress of Positive Train Control and its potential applicability to the objectives of the IRRIS project.



MEMO TO: ACE Construction Authority Board Members & Alternates

FROM: Rick Richmond  
Chief Executive Officer

DATE: October 24, 2011

SUBJECT: Approval of Recommended Scope for Remainder of ACE Program

**RECOMMENDATION:** Based on the project rankings approved by the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG) Public Works Directors Technical Advisory Committee, staff recommends that the remaining scope of the ACE Project (beyond the 14 grade separations built or under development) consist of the following grade separations (alphabetic order):

- Hamilton Boulevard
- Fairway Drive (Alh)\*
- Fairway Drive (LA) \*
- Fullerton Road
- Puente Avenue\*
- Turnbull Canyon Road\*

In the event the project priority rankings now pending before the SGVCOG Transportation Committee change, staff intends to bring the recommendation back to your Board for further consideration.

Staff requests that this recommended change to the scope of the ACE Project be forwarded to the SGVCOG Transportation Committee and the SGVCOG Governing Board for their consideration.

In the event this project scope, or something similar, is approved by both the ACE and SGVCOG Boards, staff will return with a project phasing plan before any work beyond that already authorized (preliminary design on Fairway Drive (LA) and Puente Avenue) proceeds.

**BACKGROUND**

Phase II Study: In 2009, as progress was being made on Phase II of the ACE Project, a Phase II study was begun to renew the information used in establishing the scope of the ACE Project in the late 1990s, and to revisit the remaining six adopted separations

\* Included in originally adopted ACE Project.

not already in project development, including nearby alternative locations. The purpose of the study was to provide the necessary information for the ACE and SGVCOG Boards to adopt a scope for the completion of the ACE Project.

The study consisted of two parts – an updated traffic analysis and concept plans for alternative grade separations.

Traffic Analysis: The traffic analysis recorded current vehicular and train traffic at all 34 remaining corridor crossings and, using adopted SCAG traffic projections, updated the vehicular projections to the year 2025. The 34 crossings are all those not accounted for as a result of grade separations already complete or committed.

Estimated future congestion levels at each crossing were projected using essentially the same methodology as employed in the 1997 study which formed the basis of the ACE Project adoption. This new crossing congestion forecast resulted in changes in the relative congestion rankings as compared to the 1997 study (Exhibit I). Some of the crossings with the highest anticipated congestion levels are not part of the currently adopted ACE Project (which was also the case with the results of the 1997 study).

The consultant also analyzed the 34 crossings under the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) criteria which is used for scoring grade separation applications statewide. The CPUC formula puts a relatively heavy emphasis on accident history and other safety factors. Predictably, analyzing the crossings under the CPUC criteria produced different rankings than did the congestion formula (Exhibit II).

Concept Plans: As mentioned above, the study also included the development of concept plans for the six adopted grade separations, including alternative locations or configurations. For the adopted six locations preliminary concepts totaled 17 different locations or configurations. These preliminary options were reviewed with each of the host jurisdictions to determine acceptability at a cursory level.

Based on those discussions a lesser set of 12 concept plans was prepared to a greater level of detail. These concept plans addressed approximate project limits, engineering or railroad issues, utility relocation and property acquisition requirements and coarse level cost estimates. The concept plans were re-circulated to the host jurisdictions to confirm their interest in seeing these projects move forward to the next stage of project development.

SGVCOG Review: In September 2010 the Phase II study was referred by the SGVCOG Governing Board to its Public Works Directors' Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for review and comment. That referral was expanded upon in January 2011 to ask the TAC to review the candidate projects and up to eight additional locations, and make

recommendations on the priority of the projects under consideration in light of their cost benefit and regional benefit.

The TAC established a volunteer subcommittee to carry out the requested review. The subcommittee, after receiving thorough briefings on how the Phase II study had been conducted by the consultant (KOA Corp.) and subconsultant (JL Patterson and Associates), decided to consider both ranking methods addressed in the study - the congestion-based ranking method and the CPUC-based ranking for candidate projects. After merging the top ten ranked projects for each ranking method, and dropping projects that the subcommittee felt were either infeasible to construct, ineffective in correcting the crossing deficiency, or lacked regional significance, the subcommittee added four locations to those already studied, for a total of 16. The final list of projects study, grouped by location, was:

- Fairway Dr. Rail Flyover (Alh.)
- Fairway Dr./Lemon Ave. Rail Flyover (Alh.)
- Fairway Dr. Underpass (LA)
- Lemon Ave. Underpass (LA)
- Montebello Blvd. Underpass
- Montebello Partial Rail Lowering
- Montebello Full Rail Lowering
- Montebello Partial Rail Flyover
- Greenwood Ave. Underpass
- Puente Ave. Underpass
- Turnbull Canyon Rd. Underpass
- Rose Hills Rd. Overpass
- Fullerton Rd. Underpass (LA)
- Hamilton Blvd. Underpass
- San Antonio Ave. Underpass
- Durfee Ave. Underpass

The subcommittee considered at length different methods of arriving at a priority listing and decided to consider the 16 candidate projects under both a coarse level cost-benefit, congestion relief-based ranking and a CPUC-based ranking. The two rankings were then merged with equal weighting, and the projects with the best combined

rankings were the highest recommended priorities (Exhibit III). In case of a tie in combined rankings, the project with the higher CPUC ranking prevailed.

The TAC subcommittee recommendations were approved by the full TAC and are pending at the SGVCOG City Manager's Steering Committee before going to the SGVCOG Transportation Committee.

In ACE staff's view, the method used by the subcommittee in arriving at its priority rankings, while not the only way of doing so, is valid and would recommend it be used as the basis for setting the remaining scope of the ACE Project.

As mentioned above, during the course of the Phase II study staff sought the input of the host jurisdictions on different project alternatives. The concept plans for the four grade separation alternatives added by the subcommittee were also distributed to the host jurisdictions for comment. While it is premature for the jurisdictions, or ACE, to commit to a particular project, we would not recommend going to the design and environmental impact review stage on a project to which the host jurisdiction objects.

Project Financing – Thus far the ACE Project has been almost entirely financed by Federal, State and local MTA transportation funding programs. A substantial effort was made in the 2005-07 period to generate funds from private sector beneficiaries of goods movement growth (container fees in this case) which was unsuccessful, then became infeasible due to declines in traffic. A resurgence in goods movement activity could make it practical to revive private sector funding, but it should not be relied upon at this point.

The prospects for the primary future funding sources are as follows:

Federal: There are two potential sources of additional Federal funding.

Multi-year surface transportation program authorization legislation, now long overdue, has been the most significant source of federal funds for the ACE projects, with nearly \$200 million committed through two prior bills. While deficit reduction is a priority in Washington, road and highway projects traditionally attract strong bipartisan Congressional support. New for this reauthorization round are freight infrastructure grant programs, with as-yet unspecified funding levels, which have been proposed in the House and Senate. Staff is working with our Congressional supporters to ensure the eligibility of the ACE Construction Authority and projects for freight programs.

Also, before the end of October, ACE will submit applications for the Nogales Street and San Gabriel Trench projects seeking discretionary capital grant funding through the TIGER 3 grant program. The ACE projects are a good fit with this program which

makes nearly \$527 million available to be awarded on a competitive basis for projects of national or regional significance. However, the TIGER programs have been heavily oversubscribed and previous applications submitted by ACE, while recommended following review by USDOT technical teams, have not been awarded funds.

While there are two prospects for additional Federal funding, particularly in the program reauthorization, neither one can be counted on as an assured source at this point.

State: There are three existing sources of State funding from which we can seek funding.

First is the ongoing State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). We were successful in obtaining \$39 million from this source at the beginning of the project but for many years now the STIP has been oversubscribed with conventional highway construction projects nominated by Caltrans and regional agencies.

Second, there have been periodic infusions of one-time State funding into transportation, the most recent being the Prop 1B (2006) program. Prospects for another infusion in the near future are dim given the State's budget pressures and general economic distress. There is a potential for capturing any Prop 1B funds from projects failing to meet deadlines or from widespread cost underruns, but this would be speculative to rely on at this point.

A third State source would be the Section 190 Grade Separation Fund administered by the Public Utilities Commission and Caltrans. We have received \$5 million from this program in the past and have projects pending at this time. Given our ambitious program staff believes it is reasonable to expect securing \$20 million from the Section 190 source over the remaining life of the ACE Project.

Local: MTA funding comes from two sources: The MTA made an initial commitment to a 17% share of the total project costs dating back to the beginning of the ACE Project, and reaffirmed in 2007. In addition, the ACE Project was included in the Measure R local sales tax program passed by the voters in 2008 in the amount of \$400 million.

A large portion of the 17% share has been programmed already by the MTA but a modest portion of additional funding (approximately \$32 million), depending on the size of the adopted program, would be eligible. There is substantial likelihood that favorable bidding on our three projects ready for construction in the next few months will free up funding already allocated by the MTA. In the interest of being fiscally conservative we are not including it in this forecast, but it is a very real possibility.

Of the Measure R funding, \$358 million should be available for completion of the remainder of the ACE Project.

To summarize, the MTA funding for the remainder of the program is estimated as:

Probable additional 17% share	\$32 million
Measure R	<u>\$358 million</u>
	\$390 million

UPRR Contributions: While it has not been a significant source of project funding to date, we can expect the Union Pacific Railroad will make contributions to future grade separations. Based on past experience, \$13 million in aggregate UPRR contributions (\$2.0-\$2.5 million per project) is a reasonable expectation.

Funding Summary: Based on the foregoing, staff believes a conservative estimate of the funding we can rely on for the future program from the sources cited above is as follows:

State (CPUC)	\$20 million
MTA (17% share and Measure R)	390 million
UPRR	<u>13 million</u>
	\$423 million

Grade Separations Recommended for Adoption – As mentioned above, ACE staff believes the method used by the technical subcommittee is valid and can be used for determining future priorities. Also as mentioned, the subcommittee's priority list was compiled while ACE's outreach to host jurisdictions was still in process, and therefore was not completely vetted with the respective cities to determine whether a proposed project configuration could be supported by the host jurisdictions. That consultation has gone on simultaneously with the review of subcommittee's recommendations.

The result of that process is that of the five alternative projects in Montebello, only one – the full railroad lowering – has the support of the City Council. A written request was made for a declaration of support specifically for the highly-rated Greenwood Avenue underpass alternative but the Council declined to do so. Therefore, staff is reluctant to recommend it as part of the scope of the remaining ACE Project.

Aside from Montebello, other potential host jurisdictions are in support of continuing the projects into detailed development.

Working from the technical subcommittee's priority list, removing Montebello projects not supported by the City and duplicative projects, the remaining list, in priority order, is:

<u>Crossing</u>	<u>Conceptual Cost Estimate</u> <u>(In millions)</u>
Fullerton Rd. (LA)	\$131.8
Hamilton Blvd. (Alh/LA)	68.1
Fairway Dr. (Alh)	72.9
Turnbull Canyon Rd. (LA)	84.8
Fairway Dr. (LA)	100.1
Puente Ave. (Alh)	82.8
Durfee Ave. (LA)	64.5
Rose Hills Rd. (LA)	45.8
Montebello Blvd. Full Rail Lowering (LA)	389.4
Lemon Ave. (LA)	81.4
San Antonio Ave. (Alh/LA)	83.4

Matching known and potential revenue over a 5-7 year period (which is what it would take to build out the current and probable future projects) to the above priority list, ACE staff recommends that the following projects be adopted into the scope of the ACE Project:

<u>Grade Separation</u>	<u>Conceptual Cost Estimate</u> <u>(In millions)</u>
Fullerton Rd. (LA)	\$131.8
Hamilton Blvd. (Alh/LA)	68.1
Fairway Dr. (Alh)	72.9
Turnbull Canyon Rd. (LA)	84.8
Fairway Dr. (LA)	100.1
Puente Ave. (Alh)	82.8
Total	\$540.5 million

Cost Estimates – The cost estimates consist of four major components – design, construction, right of way (including utilities) and a number of agency costs (internal labor, third parties and indirect costs). Construction costs estimates were prepared by JL Patterson and Associates based on past experience with underpass construction on

ACE and other similar projects, and on ACE cost estimates for trench construction. Railroad costs (track, signal, flagging, etc.) were developed from similar sources. Construction and railroad estimates include a 30% contingency for factors that can't be predicted when no design has been done. Design costs are estimated at 10% of construction costs.

Right of way costs are based on estimated full and part take requirements with a conservative, uniform property value multiplier and a significant allowance for acquisition costs and contingencies.

Not included in the consultant cost estimates was a future inflation allowance. Based on the current construction climate staff has added an escalation allowance based on these assumptions:

- Inflation allowances should be included for all cost estimate components except right of way where conservative property value and significant contingency is already in the estimates;
- Construction inflation will continue to be insignificant through June 2013;
- The remaining projects will be designed and constructed over a seven-year period. Four of the six projects will move as expeditiously as possible; two remaining projects would begin design in 2013;
- Inflation allowances of 2%/year (adopted U.S. Army Corps Of Engineers allowance) applied to all projects starting in July 2013.

When inflation allowances are added to the baseline cost estimates as described above an additional \$30.3 million would be added to the total:

Current Dollar Total Cost Estimate	\$540.5 million
Inflation Allowance	<u>30.3 million</u>
Total	\$570.8 million

Comparing the cost estimate for the recommended program to the known available funding described above:

Cost of Recommended Project	\$571 million
Available Funding	<u>423 million</u>
Shortfall	\$143 million

Staff believes it is prudent to establish the future project list as described above, despite the funding shortfall, based on a number of considerations:

- The estimate of available funds is a conservative one. It assumes that projects ready to go to bid now will not come in under estimates. Bids below estimates has become the rule, not the exception, in construction;
- The funds estimate includes no new Federal or State funding. While none can be assured, our experience and continued diligent efforts should make some funding available over the next 2-3 years. As a matter of policy, we should not walk away from continuing to seek Federal or State funding for worthwhile projects;
- Specific to the State bond issue source, there is a reasonable likelihood that additional revenue could become available from other projects not proceeding or widespread underbidding;
- The remaining projects would be phased so that no financial commitments would be made for the last 1-2 without an improved revenue outlook. Moving into new projects beyond the projected fund availability would be conditioned on ACE and SGVCOG Board authorization which would take into account both the cost experience on early projects and the future funding prospects;
- The recommended program represents the same number of grade separations as originally adopted – 20 – and makes relatively minor changes in terms of the remaining projects (four of the six are already a part of the Project).

As mentioned above, to eliminate the risk of spending beyond available funding, if the above program, or something close to it, is approved by both the ACE and SGVCOG Boards staff will return in the near future with a phasing strategy that expedites project implementation but avoids financial risk. In the meantime, engineering work already begun on the Fairway Dr. (LA) and Puente Ave. projects will continue.

Attachments

# Exhibit I

## Total Daily Vehicular Delay Future (2025) Traffic Conditions – Single-Tracked (Sorted by Ranking)

Korve Study Ranking	2010 Ranking	Street/UPRR Sub.	Alhambra Subdivision Single-Tracked
6	1	Fullerton Rd *(Alh)	192.3
11	2	Fullerton Rd *(Alh)	115.4
3	3	Fairway Dr *(Alh)	87.6
1	4	Fairway Dr *(Alh)	62.5
20	5	Stimson Ave *(Alh)	52.7
8	6	Montebello Blvd *(Alh)	43.5
29	7	Workman Mill Rd *(Alh)	42.2
28	8	Turnbull Canyon Rd *(Alh)	38.9
13	9	San Antonio Ave *(Alh/LA)	37.2
14	10	Hamilton Blvd *(Alh/LA)	36.8
22	11	Durfee Ave *(LA)	34.0
16	12	Park Ave	32.7
2	13	Puente Ave *(Alh)	31.5
5	14	Lemon Ave *(Alh)	30.6
25	15	Tyler Ave *(Alh)	30.1
9	16	Temple Ave *(Alh)	30.1
17	17	Lemon Ave *(Alh)	28.8
26	18	Palomares St *(Alh)	28.7
23	19	Rose Hills Rd *(Alh)	26.9
7	20	Brea Canyon Rd *(Alh)	22.8
27	21	Vail Ave *(Alh)	19.8
12	21	California Ave *(Alh)	14.7
30	22	Greenwood Ave *(Alh)	14.4
31	23	Maple Ave *(Alh)	10.1
18	24	Vineland Ave *(Alh)	9.1
32	25	Main St *(Alh)	8.7
11	26	Temple City Blvd *(Alh)	8.1
10	27	Lowe Azusa Rd *(Alh)	6.7
21	28	Cogswell Rd *(Alh)	6.6
15	29	Walnut Grove Ave *(Alh)	6.1
33	30	Bixby Dr *(Alh)	5.7
34	31	Mission Mill Rd *(Alh)	4.5
19	32	Arden Dr *(Alh)	3.0
24	33	Encinita Ave *(Alh)	2.7

\*Preempted by railroad interconnected to traffic signal system.

**Exhibit II**

**Priority Index Ranking Based on CPUC Formula  
(Sorted by Ranking)**

<b>CPUC Ranking</b>	<b>Cong. Ranking</b>	<b>Street/UPRR Sub.</b>	<b>Priority Index Number</b>
1	16	Temple Ave (Alh)	2439
2	13	Puente Ave (Alh)	965
3	2	Fullerton Rd (Alh)	776
4	5	Stimson Ave (Alh)	711
5	8	Turnbull Canyon Rd (Alh)	554
6	10	Hamilton Blvd (Alh)	462
7	1	Fullerton Rd (Alh)	302
8	6	Montebello Blvd (Alh)	289
9	17	Lemon Ave (Alh)	268
10	11	Durfee Ave (Alh)	247
11	4	Fairway Dr (Alh)	230
12	19	Rose Hills Rd (Alh)	185
13	3	Fairway Dr (Alh)	182
14	14	Lemon Ave (Alh)	163
15	29	Cogswell Rd (Alh)	151
16	18	Palomares St (Alh)	134
17	15	Tyler Ave (Alh)	133
18	22	California Ave (Alh)	128
19	9	San Antonio Ave (Alh)	124
20	25	Main St (Alh)	105
21	12	Park Ave (Alh)	97
21	32	Mission Mill Rd (Alh)	92
22	26	Vineland Ave (Alh)	91
23	20	Brea Canyon Rd (Alh)	87
24	7	Workman Mill Rd (Alh)	87
25	21	Vail Ave (Alh)	77
26	23	Greenwood Ave (Alh)	69
27	27	Temple City Blvd (Alh)	67
28	24	Maple Ave (Alh)	54
29	28	Lower Azusa Rd (Alh)	53
30	30	Walnut Grove Ave (Alh)	41
31	31	Bixby Dr (Alh)	39
32	33	Arden Dr (Alh)	38
33	34	Encinita Ave (Alh)	30

# Exhibit III

## Candidate ACE Grade Separations Public Works TAC Review and Ranking

Overall Ranking	Crossing	Cost & Benefit Ranking	CPUC Index Ranking	Average Cost Benefit/CPUC Ranking
1	Fullerton Rd. (LA)	3	2	2.5
2	Montebello Greenwood Option (LA)	2	5	3.5
3	Hamilton Blvd. (Alh/LA)	7	4	5.5
4	Fairway Dr. (Alh)	1	10	5.5
5	Turnbull Canyon Rd. (LA)	9	3	6.0
6	Fairway Dr. (LA)	5	8	6.5
7	Puente Ave. (LA)	13	1	7.0
8	Fairway Dr./Lemon Ave. (Alh)	4	10	7.0
9	Montebello Blvd. Option (LA)	10	5	7.5
10	Durfee Ave. (LA)	8	7	7.5
11	Rose Hills Rd. (LA)	6	9	7.5
12	Montebello Rail Flyover Option (LA)	12	5	8.5
13	Montebello Full Lowering Option (LA)	15	5	10.0
14	Lemon Ave. (LA)	14	6	10.0
15	Montebello Partial Lowering Option (LA)	16	5	10.5
16	San Antonio Ave. (Alh/LA)	11	11	11.0

Note: Rankings for cost-benefit and CPUC Index reflect relative position among projects remaining for consideration (i.e., not ranking among the original 34 crossings in the study).

January 20, 2011

**MOTION**  
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments  
Transportation Committee

Following direction from the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG) to review the ACE Phase II Grade Separation Traffic Study and Concept Plans (Study), the SGVCOG Public Works Technical Advisory Committee (PWTAC) created a subcommittee to complete this task. The PWTAC subcommittee has since requested further guidance from the SGVCOG Transportation Committee as to the scope of their work.

**I, THEREFORE, MOVE** that the SGVCOG Transportation Committee direct the Public Works TAC subcommittee for ACE Phase II to develop a Report that:

- (1) Performs a full review, analysis and critique of the Study that includes an analysis and critique of the methodology used by the Study consultant for its data collection and forecasts, including but not limited to existing count data, future motor vehicle traffic forecasts, future railroad train movement forecasts, vehicle delay, and CPUC rankings
- (2) Creates an evaluation of “regional benefit” of all of the grade crossings in the Study and ranks the projects based on this developed metric of “regional benefit”
- (3) Analyzes and critiques both the cost assumptions for current Phase II projects and estimated costs for the other grade crossing projects analyzed in the Study.

(4) Using the “regional benefit” metric and the cost analysis for all the grade crossings analyzed in the Study, develop a cost/benefit assessment of the projects in the Study and create a priority ranking for these projects.

(5) Present this Report to the SGVCOG Public Works TAC and SGVCOG City Managers Steering Committee for discussion and input.

**I ALSO MOVE** that the SGVCOG Governing Board City Managers Steering Committee analyze and critique the current revenue assumptions used by ACE for Phase II and include this analysis as part of the Report prior to sending it to the SGVCOG Transportation Committee.

**I FURTHER MOVE** that the SGVCOG Governing Board direct that the process for input on this Report be as follows:

1. SGVCOG Public Works TAC and SGVCOG City Managers Steering Committee receive report from the SGVCOG Public Works TAC Subcommittee, provide written input on the report and send it to the SGVCOG Transportation Committee.
2. SGVCOG Transportation Committee reviews the Report and additional input, provides written input on the report, and sends Report plus all additional input to the ACE Board of Directors
3. ACE Board of Directors reviews report and additional input, provides written input on the Report, and sends Report and all additional input back to the SGVCOG Transportation Committee and ultimately the SGVCOG Governing Board for review and consideration.

**During discussion at the SGVCOG Transportation Committee, this motion was clarified as follows:**

1. The Subcommittee will aim to complete its tasks by June 1, 2011, to allow for the Report to move forward during the June 2011 SGVCOG committee and board cycle.
2. The Subcommittee will be provided the latitude to complete the identified tasks to the extent reasonable, given the time constraints.
3. The Subcommittee will perform a cursory review of all 34 grade crossings, and narrow the list of projects for further review and consideration to no more than 14 (six adopted projects plus up to eight additional projects). These 14 projects will be given further analysis including cost, benefit, cost-benefit analysis and priority rankings. The ACE Board of Directors is being asked to provide the funding for the cost-estimates for the additional projects (up to eight beyond the original six for a total of 14) as part of this effort.



# San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

---

DATE: February 3, 2012  
TO: SGVCOG Transportation Committee Members and Alternates  
FROM: Nicholas Conway, Executive Director  
SUBJECT: San Gabriel Valley Transportation Priority Project Matrix

## **Recommendation**

Review and provide changes and additions to staff on the draft San Gabriel Valley Transportation Priority Project Matrix.

## **Background**

At the January 2012 Strategic Planning Session, the following objectives were identified for the Transportation Committee:

- Recommend to the Governing Board for action an updated COG Transportation Priority List and create a matrix listing key milestones or status and timelines.
- Develop a white paper outlining policy principles related to Transportation Priority List and present it to the Governing Board for action.
- Coordinate and convene a Transportation Summit.

As a first step, SGVCOG staff, in coordination with MTA staff, has prepared the attached matrix. This provides information on all of the previously adopted San Gabriel Valley priority transportation projects. Staff is seeking input from the committee on the format and information included in the matrix as well as next steps.

SGV Transportation Priority List				
Category	Project	Description	Cost	Status
Goods Movement	ACE Project	The ACE Construction Authority is a single purpose construction authority created by the SGVCOG in 1998 to mitigate the impacts of the 70 miles of mainline railroad in the San Gabriel Valley. The ACE Project consists of multiple construction projects including near-term, low cost mobility improvements that encompass safety upgrades and grade separations. The project components are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety improvements at 39 crossings.</li> <li>• Grade separations at 20 rail crossings, resulting in 22 grade crossing eliminations.</li> </ul>	Safety improvements, first 14 grade separations: \$1.136 billion  Remaining grade separations: Final eight grade separations recommended by ACE Board to the SGVCOG Governing Board (subject to adoption). Estimated conceptual cost: \$697.5	ACE has completed Jump Start safety improvements at 39 crossings. Construction is complete on seven grade separations, with one grade separation awaiting track installation by UPRR and another six grade separations to commence construction in 2012. ACE has access to \$423 million in local, state and federal funds to design and construct the final eight grade separations and will seek to secure funds for the remaining balance or shortfall of \$275 million.
Highway - Carpool Lane Completion	I-605	This project is intended to provide a High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lane in each direction along the I-605 Freeway from I-10 to the I-210 (approximately 5.5 miles).	TBD	This project is in the Strategic (Unfunded) section of the 2009 LRTP, and is in the pre-planning stage. A Project Study Report is yet to be initiated on this project.
Highway - Carpool Lane Completion	SR 60 (I-605 to SR-57/Brea Canyon Road)	This project was completed and opened in 2010.		
Highway - Carpool Lane Completion	SR 60 (US-101 to I-605)	The project widens the freeway to construct one HOV lane in each direction. The project length is approximately 12.0 centerline miles.	TBD	This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) Section of the 2009 LRTP. The project is in the preplanning phase, and Project Study Report is yet to be completed. There may be consideration to phase the project in two segments (US-101 to SR-710 and SR-710 to I-605) to accelerate delivery of a segment.
Highway - Carpool Lane Completion	SR-57	This project is intended to provide a High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lane in each direction along the SR-57 Freeway from SR-60 to the I-210 (approximately 7.1 miles).	TBD.	This project is in the Strategic (Unfunded) section of the 2009 LRTP, and is in the pre-planning stage. A Project Study Report is yet to be initiated on this project.
Highway - Carpool Lane Completion	I-10 (I-605 to Puente Avenue to Citrus Avenue)	The project widens the freeway to construct one HOV lane in each direction. The project length is 2.2 centerline miles.	\$168.6 Million.	This project is included in the 2009 LRTP Constrained list, Caltrans had begun construction in 2009. Caltrans is scheduled to open the HOV lanes to traffic December of 2012.
Highway - Carpool Lane Completion	I-10 (Puente Avenue to Citrus)	The project widens the freeway to construct one HOV lane in each direction. The project length is 4.1 centerline miles.	\$182.8 Million.	This project is included in the 2009 LRTP Constrained list and is in design. Construction is scheduled to begin in late 2012/early 2013 and continue for about three years.
Highway - Carpool Lane Completion	I-10 (Citrus Avenue to SR-57)	The project widens the freeway to construct one HOV lane in each direction. The project length is 4.9 centerline miles.	\$170 Million.	This project is included in the 2009 LRTP Constrained list and is in design. Construction is scheduled to begin in late 2013 and continue for about three years.
Highway - Gap Closure	Highway 71 Completion - Interstate 10 to Mission Boulevard	This project replaces the current bridge structure with a wider structure and widens the roadway to provide an additional mixed flow and High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane in each direction. The Mission Blvd/State Route 71 Interchange Project, opened in December 2011 and will eliminate the most congested at-grade intersection.	TBD. The LRTP includes a total budget of \$115 Million (escalated)	This project is in the Constrained (Funded) section of the 2009 LRTP. The project is in the design phase but design has been suspended when it was determined that construction funds were scheduled for the later years of the 2001 LRTP. Pomona is providing partial funding for Caltrans environmental reassessment for an at grade profile freeway. Environmental Reassessment due to complete early 2013. The project is scheduled for opening in 2027 per the 2009 LRTP.
Highway - Gap Closure	Highway 71 Completion - Mission Boulevard to Rio Rancho Road/State Route 60	The project widens the roadway to provide an additional mixed flow and HOV lane in each direction. This project is being completed in conjunction with the companion project as well as the current Mission Blvd/State Route 71 Interchange project by the City of Pomona that opened in December 2011.	TBD. The LRTP includes a total budget of \$330 Million (escalated).	This project is in the Constrained (Funded) section of the 2009 LRTP. The project is in the design phase but design has been suspended when it was determined that construction funds were scheduled for the later years of the 2001 LRTP. Pomona is providing partial funding for Caltrans environmental reassessment for an at grade profile freeway.

SGV Transportation Priority List				
Category	Project	Description	Cost	Status
Highway - Gap Closure	SR-710 Gap Closure	The I-710 freeway serves as a major north-south link in the Los Angeles County transportation network. Currently, this freeway extends from its southern terminus in the City of Long Beach to Valley Boulevard, just north of the Interstate 10 (I-10) freeway. Beyond this northern terminus is a 4.5 mile gap in the I-710 until the freeway resumes at Del Mar Boulevard, in the City of Pasadena. This gap contributes to growing congestion on nearby freeways, local arterials and the highway network during peak periods of travel. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), Metro and SGVCOG support the completion of Route 710 to relieve regional and local traffic congestion and to enhance regional air quality. Over many decades, alternative concepts have been proposed and evaluated to complete the I-710 Freeway. The most recent studies conducted by Metro and Caltrans found tunneling to be a viable option to a project to be completed in 2029. ppropriate mitigation measures and funding.	TBD.  Measure R provides \$780 million in funding in the near future through 2040 for development of this project. In addition, potential Public Private Partnership funding opportunities for the project will be explored.	At its June 2010 meeting, the Metro Board of Directors accepted previous tunnel study findings and adopted motions to initiate the environmental review phase of the project, with the understanding that a full range of multi-modal alternatives and mitigation measures would be studied. Scoping, the first step in the environmental review process, was completed in April 2010.  The Metro Board of Directors awarded the environmental contract to CH2M Hill in October 2011. At its January 2012 meeting, the Metro Board of Directors awarded a separate public involvement and community outreach contract to Consensus Inc. to help support the environmental contract.
Highway - Interchange Improvements	SR-60 / I-605 Mixed Flow and HOV Direct Connectors	The project proposes improvements to the mixed-flow connectors and two sets of High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) direct connectors Westbound SR-60 to Southbound I-605 (and reverse move) and Westbound SR-60 to Northbound I-605 (and reverse move). HOV Direct connectors would lessen the mainline weaving moves of vehicles that have to transfer from one freeway to another helping lessen congestion in the vicinity of freeway to freeway interchanges.	TBD.  The Project Study Report (PSR) that was completed in 2003 estimated the Westbound to Northbound (and reverse move) HOV direct connectors at \$130-280 million depending on the alternative configuration that would be selected.  The Westbound SR-60 to Southbound I-605 HOV direct connectors have not been studied but are likely to be even costlier as the existence of one set of connectors will require more complicated and longer structures for the second set of HOV connectors.	The HOV direct connector projects are included in the Strategic (Unfunded) section of the 2009 LRTP. The mixed flow connector improvements have not been identified and are not included in the 2009 LRTP. While funding has not been identified for these projects, this interchange was included in the Gateway COG's study of "605 Hotspots." As part of Measure R, \$590 million has been identified to address these "605 Hotspots"; however, the specific list of projects to be funded through this program is yet to be determined. A new PSR which takes into account all the potential improvements at this interchange should be produced.
Highway - Interchange Improvements	SR-57 / SR-60	Routes 57 and 60 share a common alignment for a distance of about 2 miles and within this shared alignment area is the Grand Avenue Interchange. Severe congestion occurs in the confluence area and cut through traffic on local roads is evident. The Grand Avenue interchange, situated in the middle of the confluence area, reduces the freeway lane capacities due to lane drops when Route 57 traffic merges with Route 60 traffic at the connectors and significant weaving of freeway traffic to ingress or egress Grand Avenue.	TBD based on the design alternative that is selected. The LRTP includes a budget of \$475 Million (escalated) for this project.	This project is included in the Constrained (Funded) section of the 2009 LRTP. The 57/60 interchange Improvements Feasibility Study evaluated three alternatives for improving the interchange. A system of collector roads with freeway to freeway HOV and mainline connectors appears to be the consensus alternative. The project will move to the Project Study Report phase at the appropriate time. The LRTP has \$475 million in escalated dollars for the project however if all elements of the collector road project alternative are constructed, the project budget will have to be increased.  In order to satisfy environmental mitigation issues associated with development north of the freeway and adjacent to Grand Ave, the City of Industry began design & construction in May 2011 for proposed projects that improves Grand Ave and the 57/60 interchange operations using local and Metro Call For Projects funds. Their project is a subset of the collector road concept in the Study. The 2009 LRTP scheduled this interchange project to be completed in 2029.
Highway - Interchange Improvements	I-10/I-605 (Southbound (SB) I-605 to Eastbound (EB) I-10 Transition Connector (mixed flow))	The project will construct a flyover connector from Southbound I-605 to the Eastbound I-10 which would replace the existing shared at-grade connector.	\$71.0 Million.	This project is being funded by State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP) funds. State may bond the SHOPP revenues via Grant Anticipation Revenue Vehicles (GARVEE) bonds to deliver the project faster than if the SHOPP funds are not bonded. The project will be constructed through a design-build contract and is anticipated to begin construction in mid 2012. This schedule minimizes duo contractor work in the same work area as the I-10 carpool lanes project currently in construction should be complete before this contract begins

SGV Transportation Priority List				
Category	Project	Description	Cost	Status
Highway - Interchange Improvements	I-10/I-605 (Northbound (NB) I-605 to Westbound (WB) I-10 Transition Connector (mixed flow))	The project will construct a flyover connector from Northbound I-605 to the Westbound I-10 and would replace the existing shared at-grade connector.	Up to \$230 Million depending on alternative configurations.	This project is not currently included in the 2009 LRTP. A Project Study Report for this project was completed in 2008.
Highway - Interchange Improvements	I-10/I-605 ((Partial HOV connector - from Westbound to Southbound and Eastbound to Southbound))	The project proposes two sets of HOV direct connectors westbound I-10 to southbound I-605 (and reverse move) and Eastbound I-10 to Southbound I-605 (and reverse move).	TBD	This project is in the Strategic (Unfunded) section of the 2009 LRTP. A Project Study Report that was completed in 2003 estimated the eastbound to southbound (and reverse move) connectors at \$130-210 Million depending on the alternative configuration that would be selected. However, the estimates are dated. The westbound to southbound connectors have not been studied but are likely to be even costlier as the existence of one set of connectors will require more complicated and longer structures for the second set of HOV connectors. A new PSR which takes into account all the potential improvements should be produced.
Rail	Regional Connector	The Metro Regional Connector is an approximate 2 mile light rail project that will connect the Metro Gold, Metro Blue and Metro Exposition light rail transit systems through downtown in Los Angeles, providing through service across Los Angeles County. In October 2010, Metro Board designated the fully underground alternative as its Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). The LPA would add three underground stations located in Little Tokyo/Arts District (1st/Central), Broadway (2nd/Broadway) and Bunker Hill (2nd/Hope).	\$1.3 billion (Year of Expenditure). Measure R provides \$117 million for the project.	The Final EIS/EIR was completed and released for public review in January 2012. The Federal Transit Administration authorized the Regional Connector to begin Preliminary Engineering (PE) in January 2011. PE is anticipated to be completed in February 2012. The Record of Decision (ROD) is anticipated in the Spring 2012. This project has been included in the "30/10 Initiative," which was initiated by the City of Los Angeles and is intended to accelerate LA County Metro rail and highway projects. If this effort is successful, this project could be completed as early as 2017. The Regional Connector is included in the Constrained (Funded) section of the 2099 LRTP. This project is scheduled to be completed in 2019.
Rail	Gold Line Foothill Extension - Phase 2A	The project will extend the Gold Line's double track light rail line from Sierra Madre Villa Station in the City of Pasadena to the City of Azusa, a distance of 11.34 miles, with 6 new stations (Cities of Arcadia, Monrovia, Duarte, Irwindale, Azusa Downtown and Azusa Citrus). The projected ridership when completed to Azusa is estimated at 3,310,750 yearly boardings.	\$735 Million	This project is included in the Constrained (Funded) section of the 2009 LRTP. Measure R provides \$810.5 Million (escalated) with a \$32 Million local match to fund the Project. A light rail maintenance yard is required to be built with funds dedicated to this project and must be completed prior to Foothill Gold Line operations commencing. A groundbreaking ceremony for this segment was held in June 2010 and construction may be completed as early as 2015.
Rail	Gold Line Foothill Extension - Phase 2B	This project would extend the Gold Line Foothill extension double track light rail line from the City of Azusa Citrus station to Montclair Station, a distance of 12.57 miles, with 6 new stations (Cities of Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, Claremont and Montclair). The projected ridership when completed from Pasadena to Montclair is estimated at 6,334,353 yearly boardings. Additionally, an alternatives analysis study is for the Montclair-Ontario Airport segment is expected to begin in 2012.	\$550 Million	This project is included in the Strategic (Unfunded) section of the 2009 LRTP. The project is currently in the environmental review process with a draft EIR/E's expected to be released in 2012. This project has been included in the "30/10 Initiative," which was initiated by the City of Los Angeles and is intended to accelerate LA County Metro rail and highway projects.
Rail	Gold Line Eastside Phase 2 Transit Corridor	This project proposes to extend the Gold Line East Side via a double track light rail line from its current terminus at Atlantic Boulevard /Pomona Boulevard Station to either the City of South El Monte via an alignment mostly adjacent to State Route 60, or to the City of Whittier via Washington Boulevard. When completed, the projected ridership to the City of South El Monte or the City of Whittier is estimated to be 18,300 to 20,800 average weekday daily boardings, respectively.	\$1.51 billion to \$1.65 billion (2008 dollars), depending on which alignment is selected and other variables.	This project is included in the Constrained (Funded) section of the 2009 LRTP. Measure R provides \$1.27 billion to fund the project, which would be available beginning FY 2022-2024. This project is not expected to be completed until FY 2033-2035, and matching funds could be required to fully fund this extension. This project has been included in the "30/10 Initiative," which was initiated by the City of Los Angeles and is intended to accelerate LA County Metro rail and highway projects. If this effort is successful, this project could be completed as early as 2017.



# San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

1000 S. Fremont Ave., Unit 42 Alhambra, CA 91803 Phone: (626) 457-1800 FAX: (626) 564-1116 E-Mail SGV@sgvcog.org

---

DATE: February 16<sup>th</sup>, 2012

TO: SGVCOG Transportation Committee

FROM: Nicholas T. Conway, Executive Director

RE: **SCAG's Draft 2012 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)**

## **Recommended Action**

1. Adopt a position on the Draft 2012 RTP/SCS that addresses the issues of concern to the San Gabriel Valley, as identified by the Transportation Committee.
2. Direct the Executive Director to submit a letter to SCAG outlining the SGVCOG's position.

## **Background**

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is a long-range transportation plan that is developed and updated by SCAG every four years. The RTP provides a plan for transportation investments throughout the region. Federal and state regulations require SCAG, as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) and Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), to develop an RTP every four years in order for the region's transportation projects to qualify for federal and state funding. The RTP is updated to reflect changes in trends, progress made on projects, and to adjust the growth forecast for population changes. The last RTP was adopted by SCAG's Regional Council in 2008, and work is now underway for the 2012 RTP. The RTP includes the following focus areas:

- Aviation
- Environmental Mitigation
- Goods Movement
- Growth Forecast
- High-Speed Regional Transport
- Highways and Arterials
- Land Use
- Non-Motorized Transportation
- Transit
- Transportation Demand Management
- Transportation Finance
- Transportation Safety and Security

In addition, the 2012 RTP is being developed in conjunction with a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), as required by SB 375 (Steinberg), which will identify land use planning and transportation strategies for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

## **Major Components of the Draft RTP/SCS**

Several policy initiatives that are to be pursued in the region as follows:

## ***Alternatives***

The draft RTP/SCS includes 4 alternatives as follows:

- **Alternative A:** This alternative includes only currently committed policies and investments as reflected in the 2008 RTP. This alternative also includes updated land use and socio-economic forecasts based on 2012 RTP local jurisdiction input. Based on the preliminary model results, this alternative will not meet all state and federal requirements.
- **Alternative B (SCAG staff recommended):** This alternative would include all transportation projects included in Alternative A, as well as projects intended to address system preservation, transportation demand management (TDM), and goods movement. It also incorporates congestion pricing projects. Examples of strategies and projects included in this alternative include: MTA's 30/10 initiative, *narrowing East-West Clean Freight Corridor Alignment from 60 miles to 5 miles for further study*, high occupancy toll (HOT) network and cordon pricing demonstration project, added bus rapid transit services, and expansion to Metrolink services. In terms of land use, this Alternative expands upon Alternative A, and is considered to be more a more accurate representation of 2035 land use. This includes adjustments to the expected location of growth within cities to reflect growth near planned transit.
- **Alternative C:** This alternative is similar to Alternative B, except that it includes more aggressive growth in fixed guideway TOD districts, and reflects more aggressive transit/transportation funding to reflect these changes. Currently, SCAG staff does not believe that there is stakeholder support for this more aggressive land use scenario.
- **Alternative D:** This alternative is identical to Alternative A, except it tests the impact of \$8/gallon fuel prices on travel behavior. This alternative is for research purposes only.

## ***Transportation Funding***

In order to have a financially constrained plan, SCAG staff is recommending inclusion of the following funding strategies:

- **Existing Gas Tax:** In the short term, the plan assumes a modest increase and indexing of gas taxes, in the amount of \$0.30 per gallon from 2017-2024.
- **County Sales Tax:** This plan assumes the passage 0.25% county sales tax measures as needed from 2020-2035.
- **Increased Public-Private-Partnerships**
- **Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Tax:** This would be deployed beginning in 2025 and assumes a fee of \$0.05 per mile to replace and augment existing gas taxes.
- **Congestion Pricing:** This plan assumes the targeted application of an HOT (toll) network as well as a demonstration cordon pricing project around downtown Los Angeles.

## ***Passenger/High Speed Rail***

Staff is recommending that the following projects be included in the constrained RTP:

- Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo Rail Corridor (LOSSAN)
- Metrolink Improvements
- California High Speed Rail Phase I (San Francisco to Anaheim via LA Union Station)  
*(\*Note: This project was initially being recommended for inclusion in the Strategic Plan of the RTP. However CHSRA staff contends that this project must be included in the Constrained plan in order to SCAG to receive federal assistance for the Metrolink and LOSSAN projects).*

### ***Goods Movement***

As noted above, the Draft RTP/SCS is generally a “framework” document that does not yet have details about projects that are going to be included. However, it does specifically include a recommendation regarding the East-West Freight Corridor. **Specifically, SCAG staff is recommending that the study area for this corridor be narrowed from a 60-milewide alignment alternative analysis (that includes alignments within and adjacent to the I-10, SR-60 and SR-91) to a 5-mile wide alternative analysis, limited to the areas adjacent to the SR-60 and the Union Pacific Railroad alignment.**

The adoption of SCAG staff’s recommendation would limit any future study and implementation of truck/freight lanes in the region onto the SR-60 and adjacent routes and eliminate from consideration the I-10, SR-91, along with any other possible routes, which carry comparable level of truck activity based on SCAG’s research.

### **Next Steps**

At their December meeting, the SCAG Regional Council authorized the release of the Draft 2012 RTP/SCS for public review and comment on December 1.

The Draft RTP/SCS as well as the East-West Corridor was be presented and discussed in detail at the November and Transportation Committee meetings. This item will also be brought to the Governing Board for action.



# San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

---

DATE: February 3, 2012  
MEMO TO: SGVCOG Transportation Committee Members and Alternates  
FROM: John Fasana, Chair of the Transportation Committee  
SUBJECT: State Route 39 (SR-39) Closure

## **Issues**

Caltrans has notified the US Forest Service of its proposal to terminate the State Route-39 Project and its intent to abandon the entire Route.

## **Recommendation**

It is recommended that the SGVCOG oppose any efforts by Caltrans to abandon State Route-39 and to request that Caltrans continue their efforts to complete the State Route-39 reopening Project.

## **Background**

Originally, State Route 39 (SR-39) was a state highway, traversing Orange and Los Angeles Counties. Its southern terminus is at Pacific Coast Highway (SR1) in Huntington Beach and its northern terminus is at Islip Saddle on Angeles Crest Highway (SR-2) in the Angeles National Forest. Caltrans has relinquished (abandoned) all of SR 39 in LA County to local jurisdictions except this last segment within the US Forest Service.

SR-39 was constructed in several segments from the teens through the fifties. The segment from Azusa to Route 2 was envisioned as part of the State Highway System from its inclusion in the Third State Highway Bond Measure of 1919. This section was intended to give the motoring public access to recreational pursuits in the Angeles National Forest.

Several funding partners have been involved at various stages of construction including the State of California, U.S. Forest Service, the County of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County Flood Control, and the City of Pasadena. Caltrans obtained a permit to construct, operate and maintain the portion of SR-39 on federal lands from the U.S. Forest Service sometime in the 1920's. The permit is still in effect.

In January of 2009, Caltrans approved the Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment (EIR/EA) for State Route-39 (SR-39 San Gabriel Canyon Road) Rehabilitation/Reopening Project SR-39, in the Angeles National Forest, from just south of Snow Spring to State Route-2 (Post mile 40.0 to 44.4). This portion has been closed to the public since 1978 due to a massive rock and mudslide caused by heavy rains and floods.

In September 2009, the CTC approved for future consideration of funding this project, which was described as a “project in Los Angeles County that will rehabilitate, re-open, and construct roadway improvements on Route 39 within the Angeles National Forest north of the city of Duarte.” It was noted that the project was fully funded and was programmed in the 2008 State Highway Operation and Protection Program for \$47,592,000, capital and support. Construction was estimated to begin in Fiscal Year 2011-12.

August 31, 2011, Ronald Kosinski, Deputy District Director for Caltrans District 7 Environment Planning, sent a letter to the US Forest Service stating Caltrans had determined that it is “not realistic or cost effective to continue pursuing the implementation of this reopening project.” Five primary reasons for terminating the SR-39 Reopening Project were listed:

- 1) The cost to reopening the road (In 2008, the cost was estimated at \$32 million)
- 2) The cost to maintain the road (approximately \$1.5 million)
- 3) The probability of major slides causing long term closure
- 4) Environmental Factors (Californian Department of Fish and Game that the Nelson’s Big Horn sheep are now fully protected)
- 5) Statewide Significance (Caltrans believes that a road that has been closed for 33 years “does not and would not serve any meaningful State purpose)

With the State’s \$9.2 billion shortfall, Caltrans is looking for ways to save money and has been trying to persuade either the County of Los Angeles or the U.S. Forest Service to take over responsibility for this segment of SR-39. So far, both agencies have declined. Caltrans believes SR-39 is a USFS owned road on federal land that benefits federal property users and to a lesser degree, Los Angeles County which needs access to three dams for flood control.

Caltrans would need State legislation in order to move forward with their proposed abandonment. However, there is another rather interesting issue with their permit with the U.S. Forest Service that dates back to the 1920’s. The permit contains a 2 step permit abandonment requirement:

- If Caltrans abandons the road they must restore it to its original condition
- If Caltrans fails to restore the abandoned road, the USFS would be responsible for restoring it and would then bill Caltrans for the work per their permit wording.

SR-39 provides critical access to Angeles Forest not only for recreation, but for access for fire suppression forces, search and rescue, emergency personnel, and Los Angeles County Flood Control efforts.

Furthermore, the approved EIR/ES for restoration of SR-39, “Alternative 1, or the “No-Build Alternative” proposes to maintain the existing conditions of the roadway without any improvements. Caltrans stated that this alternative is not recommended since it does not reopen the closed section of SR-39 or address persisting safety issues that the proposed project intends to resolve.

Until recently, it has been the intent of Caltrans to reopen the closed portion of SR-39 multiple reason. Caltrans needs to abandon their plans to terminate the State Route Reopening Project. Caltrans needs to continue to honor their permit to operate and maintain the roadway within the U.S. Forest Service boundaries and not seek abandonment of the roadway. It is recommended that the SGVCOG oppose any efforts by Caltrans to abandon State Route-39 and to request Caltrans continue their efforts to complete the State Route-39 reopening Project.



# San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

1000 S. Fremont Ave., Unit 42, Bldg. A6, Suite 6425, Alhambra, CA 91803 Phone: (626) 457-1800 FAX: (626) 564-1116 E-Mail SGV@sgvcog.org

DATE: February 16<sup>th</sup>, 2012  
TO: SGVCOG Transportation Committee  
FROM: John Fasana, Chair of Transportation Committee  
RE: AB 1444 (Feuer) and AB 1446 (Feuer)

## **Recommendation:**

Recommend to the Governing Board the following positions on legislation:

- AB 1444 (Feuer): Recommend that the SGVCOG support legislation which would establish an expedited process for transit projects subject to environmental lawsuits and seek an amendment to include highway projects in the legislation.
- AB 1446 (Feuer): Recommend no position at this time due to the lack of detailed financial analysis of the impacts of the legislation which would extend Measure R.

## **Background**

### ***AB 1444 (Feuer)***

Currently, public transit projects that experience a lawsuit under California environmental laws first proceed to a Superior Court hearing and are frequently appealed to the Appellate Court level. This process causes significant delays and cost increases to projects. Last year, legislation was adopted which required that an environmental lawsuit challenging the proposed football stadium in downtown Los Angeles would proceed straight to the Appellate Court and must be processed within a specific timeframe. Companion legislation was adopted that allowed this process for similar projects but did not include transit related projects.

AB 1444 contains language stating the author's intent to allow environmental lawsuits on transit projects to proceed straight to the Appellate Court. At the January 2012 meeting of the Metro Board of Directors, the Board adopted a support position on this bill.

### ***AB 1446 (Feuer)***

Measure R, adopted by voters in November 2008, is a half-cent sales tax for Los Angeles County that would sunset in 30 years. The Measure R expenditure plan devotes its funds to seven transportation categories as follows: 35% to new rail and bus rapid transit projects, 3% to Metrolink projects, 2% to Metro Rail system improvement projects, 20% to carpool lanes, highways and other highway related improvements, 5% to rail operations, 20% to bus operations, and 15% for local city sponsored improvements. AB 1446, as introduced by Assembly Member Feuer (Los Angeles), would require Metro to amend the expenditure plan to accelerate the Measure R transit projects first and then Measure R highway projects for the extension period. The current version of the bill does not include extension of the local return or bus and rail operation funding.

***MTA Position***

The Metro Board Executive Management Committee was not the sponsor of AB 1446 and staff did not bring the idea to the Assembly Member. The Assembly Member did contact MTA to discuss potential legislation but MTA was not consulted regarding the introduction of language or the specific language that would be included in the introduced version. MTA staff was clear in indicating that their board did not have a position and any legislation would have to be reviewed by their board.

From our work with the Assembly Member, I can relay to you that his intent was to introduce legislation that would accelerate the transit projects first then the highway projects. The current version of the bill does not include extension of the local return or operations segments of Measure R.

Upon introduction of the bill MTA staff took the bill to the MTA Board for discussion purposes and suggested that further analysis be done. The analysis will include an extension of the entirety of Measure R and it will include acceleration of the transit projects in Measure R and possible acceleration of highway