



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

Transportation Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: January 20th, 2011

Time: 4:00 pm

Location: SCE CTAC (6090 N. Irwindale Ave., Irwindale CA)

1.0 Call to Order

J. Fasana called the meeting to order at 4:10 pm.

1.1 Pledge of Allegiance

1.2 Roll Call / Introductions

Members Present

Alhambra	B. Messina
Claremont	S. Pedroza
Covina	A. Gonzalez
Diamond Bar	D. Liu
Duarte	J. Fasana
Glendora	D. Tessitor
Industry	T. Spohn
La Canada Flintridge	D. Spence
LA County District 5	M. Cano, G. Sund
Montebello	A. Jackson
Rosemead	S. Ly, M. Clark
South El Monte	J. Gonzales
Walnut	T. King

Members Absent

San Gabriel
South Pasadena

SGVCOG Staff:

N. Conway, Executive Director

M. Creter, Staff

Guests:

S. Amiri, MTA

J. Ballas, Industry

P. DeChellis, LA DPW

N. Englund, LA County District 1

D. Failing, MTA

P. Hubler, ACE

J. Keating, Alhambra

T. Melendrez, Montebello

R. Richmond, ACE

G. Sund, LA County District 5

J. Walker, LA DPW

A. Wilson, La Canada Flintridge

M. Yamarone, Pasadena

J. Yang, LA DPW

S. Yauchzee, West Covina

2.0 Public Comment

There were no comments from the public.

3.0 Consent Calendar

3.1 November 18th, 2010 Transportation Committee Meeting Minutes

3.2 Transit Operators

3.2.1 Foothill Transit

3.2.2 Montebello Bus Lines

3.2.3 Metro San Gabriel Valley Service Sector

3.3 Partnering Agency Reports

3.3.1 Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)

3.3.2 Alameda Corridor-East Construction Authority

3.3.3 Gold Line Foothill Extension Status Report

3.4 Correspondence/Media Publications

There was a motion to approve the consent calendar (M/S/C: S. Ly, T. King, Unanimous).

4.0 SGVCOG Public Works' TAC Alameda Corridor-East Phase II Report Review Subcommittee

The Chair of the Public Works' TAC Alameda Corridor-East Phase II Report Review Subcommittee, S. Yauchzee (West Covina), indicated that Subcommittee was seeking further clarification as to the Transportation Committee's September 2010 request to "review and comment" on the ACE Phase II report.

M. Cano presented a motion from Supervisor Antonovich which was intended to provide clarification as to the subcommittee's role and expected tasks. This motion directed the subcommittee to develop a report that accomplished the following:

1. Performs a full review, analysis and critique of the ACE Phase II Grade Separation Traffic Study and Concept Plans ("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, develops a cost/benefit assessment of the projects in the Study and creates a priority ranking for these projects.

The subcommittee was also directed to present this Report to the SGVCOG Public Works TAC and the SGVCOG City Managers' Steering Committee for discussion and input. In reviewing this report, the SGVCOG City Managers' Steering Committee is being directed to 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 Transportation Committee.

The motion directed that the process for input on the Report be as follows:

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

There was extended discussion on this item. Committee members expressed the following input and concerns:

- Is there enough funding to accomplish the intent of the ACE Project and complete the projects that the SGVCOG committed to do?
- It is important to make a distinction between a technical review of the projects and the political reality of funding.
- There exists, particularly within the Federal government, a new economic reality and new sources of funding are unlikely. Therefore it is important that the SGVCOG assess what can be completed with the funding that exists and prioritize projects accordingly.
- Is this review process adding an additional, unnecessary layer of bureaucracy? How will this potential delay and re-evaluation process impact our competitiveness with other regions?
- What is the timeline for this review process? Will it impact the SGVCOG and ACE's ability to advocate for projects during the March 2011 advocacy delegation?
- What is the level of effort associated with undertaking the tasks requested in Supervisor Antonovich's motion? This could be very time-consuming for the subcommittee.
- Some items, such as property acquisitions and cost increases, were not fully included in the original study that developed a cost estimate. It is important that the ACE Project be completed.
- It is important to maintain the distinction between the policy body (SGVCOG Governing Board) and the implementing body (ACE Board).
- Reviewing the projects and taking into account the current economic and political realities could be useful to both the SGVCOG and ACE.
- How is "regional benefit" metric defined or who defines it? It is difficult to assess regional benefit for individual projects without taking into account the regional benefit of the ACE Project as a whole.
- Will the subcommittee be reviewing all 34 remaining grade crossings or limit their review to the six approved projects?
- The development of "priority rankings" is not a technical issue, but rather a policy issue.
- In order to affectively advocate for projects, it is important that the SGVCOG and the ACE Board remain cohesive. What problem is this effort aiming to fix?
- Cost-overruns are concerning. Which projects have the greatest benefit-cost ratio?
- How will this effort impact that action from September 2010 to initiate engineering for two of the six approved projects?
- Cost estimates only exist for six of the projects, and it is not possible to conduct a cost-benefit analysis for the remaining projects without cost estimates. In order to develop the requested report, the Subcommittee would need the support of ACE, in terms of funding for its consultant, to complete cost estimates for additional projects.

M. Cano clarified the original motion as follows:

- 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.
- The Subcommittee will be provided the latitude to complete the identified tasks to the extent reasonable, given the time constraints
- 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 the cost-benefit analysis and priority rankings. The ACE Board of Directors is being asked to provide funding for the cost-estimates for up to eight additional projects as a part of this effort.

There was a motion by M. Cano to call for the questions and the Chair instructed that the vote would be done by roll call (Ayes – Alhambra, Claremont, Covina, Diamond Bar, Glendora, La Canada Flintridge, LA County District 5, Montebello, Rosemead, South El Monte; Noes – Duarte, Industry, Walnut; Motion carries).

There was a roll call vote on the motion (Ayes – Alhambra, Covina, Glendora, La Canada Flintridge, LA County District 5, Montebello, Rosemead; Noes – Claremont, Diamond Bar, Duarte, Industry, South El Monte, Walnut; Motion carries).

There was a request that the final version of the motion be distributed to the Committee.

5.0 Presentation on MTA’s Public Private Partnership Initiative

D. Failing presented on this item. He reviewed the various Public Private Partnership models including: Design-Build, Design-Build-Operate, and Design-Build-Operate-Maintain. He reminded the committee that PPPs provide an alternative for project delivery and are not intended to provide a source of revenue generation. He also indicated that effective PPPs share risk between both parties. He review the MTA projects that have been identified as having potential for PPP. These include: High Desert Corridor, lower 710, 710 gap closure (tunnel), Regional Connector, Westside Subway, and Crenshaw Transit Corridor. He also discussed how PPPs focused on operations and maintenance only could be developed, even given organized labor issues. He also reviewed the criteria that make projects likely candidates for PPPs, including size and uniqueness of opportunity.

6.0 San Gabriel Valley Transportation Projects seeking Federal Reauthorization

The Executive Director indicated that this item was agendized in preparation for the upcoming Strategic Planning session, where it is anticipated that there will be a discussion on prioritization of transportation projects in the Valley.

There was a request to review MTA’s PPP policy as it relates to federal advocacy and determine if a similar approach would be advantageous for the SGVCOG.

7.0 Update on the I-10/I-605 Interchange

D. Failing provided an update on this item. He stated that this is a Caltrans project that is being funded with SHOPP funds. There is an effort to accelerate delivery of this project, including the recent release of a design-build RFP.

8.0 Update on SGVCOG High-Speed Rail Working Group

The Executive Director provided a recap of the January Working Group meetings. He also indicated that the SGVCOG is working on drafting correspondence to the CHSRA Board of Directors that summarizes the jurisdictions’ along the possible alignments concerns. In order to assist with that effort, the SGVCOG staff is requesting that cities submit their comment letters to the SGVCOG by February 3rd.

There was a request that there be an effort to schedule a meeting with the CEO of the CHSRA prior to the CHSRA Board’s meeting in March.

9.0 New Business

10.0 Next Meeting

Items for the next meeting include: High Speed Rail Correspondence, Federal Reauthorization, and possible PPP Federal policy.

11.0 Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 p.m.