



# San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

3452 E. Foothill Blvd. Suite 810, Pasadena, California 91107 Phone: (626) 564-9702 FAX: (626) 564-1116 E-Mail SGV@sgvcog.org

## TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Commercial Room – CTAC

Irwindale, CA

July 19, 2007

### I. Call to Order/Roll Call/Introductions

J. Fasana, called the meeting of the Transportation Committee to order at 4:23 p.m. at the CTAC Center in Irwindale, CA.

The roll was called and self-introductions were made and so noted as follows:

#### Representatives Present

B. Messina  
A. Bejarano  
J. Fasana  
D. Barnes  
M. Kelly, D. Tessitor\*  
P. Marcellin  
J. Blickenstaff  
S. Martinez  
H. Baldwin  
M. Su  
B. Johnson  
M. Cano

#### COG Staff

N. Conway  
K. Boyd  
M. Creter

#### Guests

S. Neely  
R. Richmond  
T. Schultz  
D. Tessitor

#### Absent

Diamond Bar  
El Monte  
Metro (*Ex-officio*)  
Montebello  
Pasadena  
Sierra Madre  
South Pasadena  
LA County District 4

Alhambra  
Baldwin Park  
Duarte  
Foothill Transit (*Ex-officio*)  
Glendora  
Industry  
La Verne  
Monterey Park  
San Gabriel  
Walnut  
LA County Sup. District 1  
LA County Sup. District 5

COG Executive Director  
COG Staff  
COG Staff

ACE  
ACE  
City of Alhambra  
City of Glendora

---

\* Alternate

D. Spence	City of La Canada Flintridge
M. Yamarone	City of Pasadena
A. Huang	City of San Gabriel (Councilmember)
P. Doudar	Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
S. Afshari	Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
P. Faust	Metro
B. Jong	Metro
M. Echternach	Metro
G. Neely	Office of Assemblymember Bob Huff

**II. Public Comments**

There were not public comments.

**III. Consent Items**

A motion was made to approve the consent items (M/S/C: S. Martinez/ M. Su/ Unanimous).

**IV. Action Items**

**A. Approval of the Positions on State Legislation**

S. Neely gave an update on the budget. She stated that the budget must be passed by Tuesday July 23. It is expected that the transportation budget will be cut by approximately \$1.3B statewide (\$336M in LA County), and that half of this cut could affect capital projects such as the I-10/605 Interchange project. Additionally, she stated that representatives from Metro, ACE, and SGV member cities attended a press conference earlier on July 19 to oppose these proposed budget cuts. There is speculation that some of the cuts to transit may be permanent and cuts to capital projects could affect the 2008 STIP. There has been limited progress on the bond bills, which have been consolidated from 42 bills to 15.

S. Neely highlighted the following transportation bills:

- ✓ **SB 9:** This bill allocates \$2B for goods movement. Currently, there is a 50% local match requirement. ACE staff is working with Senator Lowenthal to ensure that any funds expended from now until the actual allocation of funds (which could be in the next fiscal year) be counted as part of the local match requirement.
- ✓ **SB 974:** This bill would implement a \$30 container fee, with half of the funding being allocated to goods movement projects and half to air quality mitigation projects. It is expected to raise approximately \$528M annually. This bill has passed the policy committee, and is now before the Assembly Appropriations Committee. This been supported by Metro and SCAG among others and is opposed by the California Chamber of Commerce.
- ✓ **SB 286:** This bill provides \$2B in funding to local jurisdictions for street and road repair. This bill as amended does not provide a mechanism for allocating all of the \$2 billion of Proposition 1B funding expeditiously. The voters' intent was to have this money allocated to local jurisdictions as expediently as possible to solve urgently needed street repairs. Previously, the

SGVCOG had a position of “oppose unless amended,” but in order to take a position more congruent with the League of California Cities and SGVCOG member agencies, the Transportation Committee had previously changed its position to “support if amended.” This new position must now go before the full Governing Board for consideration. There was extended discussion over the new amendment to the bill. There was a motion made to maintain the current position of “support if amended” and send a strongly worded letter to the League of California Cities urging them to advocate on behalf of its member agencies for expedited allocation of these funds (M/S/C: H. Baldwin/ M. Kelly/ Unanimous).

A motion was made to approve the updated legislative matrix (S. Martinez / M. Cano / Unanimous).

## V. Information and Project Status Reports

### A. SGVCOG Arterial Transportation Corridors

N. Conway gave a presentation on this item. In 2004, COG member cities participated in an effort by SCAG called the Summit on Growth. The purpose of this project was to address the population growth that would be occurring in the Valley over the next thirty years. This included 5 Sub-area workshops that addressed specific issues in the various areas throughout the Valley. There was a general agreement among SGVCOG member agencies that growth should be directed along transportation corridors rather than R-1 zoned areas.

N. Conway presented Transportation Committee members with a map of the SGV highlighting the major highways in the Valley (defined as roads at least 100 ft. wide).

In March 2007, the SGVCOG was approached by SCAG and a team of consultants with the opportunity to participate in its planning exercises, known as the Compass Blueprint 2%. COG staff believed that this was an excellent opportunity to once again revisit the issue of corridor planning. This issue was discussed at length at the April 2007 Planning Director’s TAC, and three corridors emerged as primary candidates for this type of planning:

- **Arrow Highway:** Key issues associated with Arrow Hwy. include interjurisdictional issues (with different jurisdictions on the north and south sides of the corridor), and under-utilization of land.
- **Rosemead Boulevard:** Key issues associated with Rosemead Blvd. included the ongoing divestment by CalTrans, and the tension between visions of Rosemead as a “Main Street” and a “Corridor.”
- **Valley Boulevard:** This corridor was split into East & West projects.
  - **West Valley Boulevard:** This project area would include the portion of Valley Boulevard in the cities of Alhambra, San Gabriel, Rosemead and El Monte. The proposed project for this portion of the corridor would focus on developing a “toolbox” which would guide cities through the process of developing the area surrounding the corridor especially given that it may be outside their redevelopment areas.

Additionally, the “toolbox” would provide information on how to access grant opportunities, with a particular focus on affordable housing and mixed use development.

- **East Valley Boulevard:** This project area would include the portion of Valley Boulevard in the cities of Industry and La Puente, as well as the portion in County unincorporated. Because this area is heavily industrial and commercial it is not practical to pursue mixed used and housing development opportunities. Instead, this project area would focus on beautification and maintenance issues. Additionally, it would address jurisdictional issues as some portions of Valley Boulevard in this area abut property owned by Union Pacific Railroad.

More recently, the cities of Baldwin Park and El Monte have identified Ramona Boulevard as another corridor of interest. COG staff will be working with these cities to gather additional information on potential projects along this corridor.

After discussions with city managers, planning directors, and public works directors from cities along these corridors, COG staff presented a summary of the major issues and possible projects for each corridor to the Planning Directors’ TAC in May. The Planning Directors’ TAC voted to approve the preliminary list of corridors for study and planning efforts, and to dedicate the \$100,000 in available consultant resources to an interjurisdictional project along Arrow Highway. This site was selected because of its project-readiness, and its usefulness as a case study for other corridors.

While the Arrow Highway project is currently underway, COG staff is continuing to pursue other fund sources to complete similar planning projects along the other major corridors in the Valley. SCAG staff has indicated that additional funding may be available in December 2007. Similarly, COG staff is working with Metro staff to leverage potential funding from this agency.

J. Fasana requested that COG staff prepare a presentation on the transportation corridors for the full Governing Board for September.

## **B. Alameda Corridor East Construction Authority**

R. Richmond referred attendees to the ACE update memo included in the packet.

## **C. Gold Line Phase II Update**

J. Blickenstaff reviewed items in this report. Specifically, he stated that the FTA has accepted the new forecast outcomes for the travel demand models for Phase 2 through Azusa. Additionally, he stated that the TAC has been working to launch an initiative to connect the Gold Line to the Ontario Airport. They have received funding for this study from SANBAG and SCAG.

## **VI. Metro Report**

J. Fasana stated that the Metro Budget was approved and adopted at the June 21 meeting. The Metro Board will be holding a Long Range Transportation Plan workshop on August 16. He also stated initial projections indicate that the Metro fare increases did not bring in as much revenue as projected. He stated that there was only 30% recovery, while the previous estimate had been 38%.

J. Fasana also referred attendees to a copy of a motion made by himself and Antonovich, Katz, and Fleming authorizing the development of a working group that would study congestion pricing the Los Angeles County. J. Fasana stated that the congestion pricing could take the form of toll roads or a fee to enter downtown business areas. He also stated that they would be working to develop strategies to address the perception that this would serve as a “double tax” on top of the gas tax.

## **VII. Transit Operators Report**

### **A. Foothill Transit**

D. Barnes stated that Foothill Transit is working on developing a proposal that would allow for fare increases without decreasing the funding it receives from the County. It is expected that these fare increases could take effect on January 1<sup>st</sup> 2008, in order to allow for a balanced budget.

### **B. Montebello Bus Lines**

There was no report from MBL.

### **C. Metro San Gabriel Valley Service Sector**

Metro staff also announced several route changes that will be occurring in the San Gabriel Valley. Additionally, they stated that E. Gutierrez (El Monte) was nominated to the Metro San Gabriel Valley Governing Board, and it is expected that he will be seated in October.

## **VIII. New Business**

There was no new business.

## **IX. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 pm.