



San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

3452 East Foothill Blvd., Suite 810, Pasadena, California 91107-3970 Phone: (626) 564-9702 FAX: (626) 564-1116 E-Mail SGV@sgvcog.org

Transportation Committee Meeting Notes - DRAFT

Date: March 20th, 2008

Time: 4:45 p.m.

Location: SCE CTAC

1.0 Call to Order

*****Please note a quorum was not present at this meeting, so no official action was taken. These notes are for informational purposes only.*****

1.1 Roll Call / Introductions

Members Present

Alhambra	S. Placido
Diamond Bar	C. Herrera
Duarte	J. Fasana
La Verne	J. Blickenstaff
Montebello	L. Cornejo
San Gabriel	H. Baldwin
South Pasadena	P. Putnam
Walnut	M. Su
LA County District 5	M. Cano

Members Absent

Baldwin Park
El Monte
Glendora
Industry
Monterey Park
Pasadena
Sierra Madre
LA County District 1
LA County District 3

Ex-Officio Members

Foothill Transit, D. Barnes
SGVCOG Metro TAC Representative, L. Stevens

SGVCOG Staff

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

Guests

B. Bogaard, Pasadena
M. Camaronne, Pasadena
R. Charles, Office of Assembly member Ed Hernandez
P. Doudar, LAC DPW
A. Gonzalez, West Covina
B. Kuhn, SGBWQA
L. Jones, SCAG
B. McAllester, Metro
S. Neely, ACE Construction Authority
R. Richmond, ACE Construction Authority
A. Wilson, La Canada Flintridge
R. Yeung, SCAQMD

2.0 Public Comment

3.0 Consent Calendar

There was not action taken on this item.

3.1 Transportation Committee Meeting Minutes , 1/17/08

3.2 ACE Construction Authority Meeting Minutes

- 3.3 Transit Operators
 - 3.3.1 Foothill Transit
 - 3.3.2 Montebello Bus Lines
 - 3.3.3 Metro San Gabriel Valley Service Sector
- 3.4 Correspondence/Media Publications

4.0 Discussion Items (Recommended)

4.1 Metro: Congestion Mitigation Fee Update

Representatives from Metro conducted a presentation on the topic. They introduced the subject by providing background. Metro began looking at the congestion mitigation fee in 2003. It is currently a feasibility study. They are asking for comments back from all the agencies by April 25th, 2008, and plan to be ready for action in June, where the next steps would be a nexus study. It was mentioned that the fee would be a one-time fee, with a county-wide minimum. The cities would collect and control all fees.

The following issues were discussed:

- **Ensuring local control & distribution of fees:** One the guiding principles identified in Metro’s outreach efforts was that “Local jurisdictions adopt, collect, and administer congestion mitigation fee.” Despite this principle, several jurisdictions have expressed concern that the program could be changed over time to be administered by Metro which would result in administrative fees being charged and loss of control over project selection.
- **Ensuring other transportation funds are not diverted:** Another guiding principle included in Metro’s Feasibility Report is that “Fees are to augment other regional funds, not replace or redirect them.” However, given that the San Gabriel Valley is anticipated to have the second highest amount of revenue generated, after the City of Los Angeles, there is concern that other transportation funds that may be diverted to subregions, such as the Westside Cities COG, which have significantly lower projected revenue.
- **Feasibility of Multi-Jurisdictional Projects:** While the San Gabriel Valley comprises approximately 20% of LA County’s population, it also represents 40% of the cities in the County. This means that the Valley has a disproportionate number of small and medium sized cities and these cities may not have major regional corridors located within their boundaries. SGVCOG requests further study of the feasibility of multi-jurisdictional projects that could complete utilizing this funding. In addition, as the San Gabriel Valley borders three other counties, some cities have expressed interest in the possibility of using this funding for cross-county projects that would provide benefits to their residents.
- **Identification of a Project List:** In the feasibility study, Metro staff identifies four project types that are eligible for funding under this program:
 - State Highway improvements (i.e. HOV lane an carpool interchange connector construction)
 - Regional surface transportation improvements (i.e. arterial widening, bottleneck intersection improvements, closure of gaps in the arterial system, and grade separations)
 - Signal synchronization, bus speed improvements, bottleneck intersection improvements, traffic control and monitoring, and Intelligent Transportation System.
 - Transit improvements (i.e. bus and rail transit capital and/or construction of transit stations and centers, park and ride lots, commuter rails stations, transit stop improvements and transit vehicle purchases).

In order for this program to be implemented effectively with inter-jurisdictional cooperation, there needs to be consensus within the San Gabriel Valley and within any identified subareas about a project list and prioritization of these projects. One concern that has been concerned by several jurisdictions is that Caltrans or transit operators may request that their projects be included in the project lists. Given the costs of such projects, they have the potential to either increase the fee level or, alternatively, these multi-million dollar projects could absorb all of the revenue that is raised.

- **Fit with Local Fee Programs:** Several cities within the San Gabriel Valley already have existing mitigation fee programs. According to Metro’s feasibility study, “local jurisdictions with existing fee programs receive dollar-for-dollar credit for local projects with a regional benefit consistent with an agreed upon guidelines.” There is some question as to whether a part or all of a city’s existing fee would be eligible under this new program. For example, in the case of Pasadena, 50% of the mitigation is used for transit services and it still needs to be determined if this is would eligible for credit under the program.

The Executive Director discussed the COG's interest in creating a pilot program that works for all the Valley's member agencies. A committee consisting of 3 planning directors, 3 public works members, and 3 city managers is being established. This committee will create a scope based on the needs of the cities and the needs of Metro that will then be presented to Metro.

The SGVCOG will submit a consensus list of broad-range comments regarding the Draft Congestion Mitigation Fee Feasibility Report to Metro by April 25th. Staff asked that all member agencies submit their concerns to COG by April 15th.

4.2 Metro 2008 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update

Metro staff distributed the Executive Summary of this report and encouraged committee members to attend the public hearing on April 8th.

4.3 State Legislation

ACE staff gave an update on this item. She stated it is anticipated that Propositions 98 or 99, which deal with eminent domain, would be discussed at next month's meeting. Additionally, she stated that SB 974, which deals with the creation of a container fee and was deferred last year, is undergoing amendments which should be favorable to the San Gabriel Valley. She also stated that COG and ACE staff are working to plan a SGV Legislative Caucus meeting for April 16th.

4.4 SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update

SCAG staff stated that the adoption date for the RTP has been moved to May 8th. ACE staff asked for clarification regarding the identification of a specific preferred route for the proposed truck lanes (i.e. SR 60, I-10, I-210, or SR 91). COG staff will follow up on this item.

4.5 Caltrans Route 210 Congestion Relief Metering Project Update

The Executive Director stated that carpool ramp metering and freeway-to-freeway metering along the 210 freeway. Cities along this corridor have stated that there has been increased congestion along the arterials as drivers avoid these meters. The Chair stated that Caltrans staff will be coming back to the Committee at a later date to determine if the performance advantages of this metering. At the outset, they expected a 20 – 30% increase in travel speeds.

4.6 Washington DC Update

The Executive Director and H. Baldwin gave a report on this trip. They stated that over 30 SGV elected officials participated in this event and they were successful in having productive meetings with key elected officials and staff.

4.7 Congestion Pricing Demonstration Application

The Chair stated that Metro is working with members of the State legislature to pursue the legislation that would allow for Metro's project (210, 10, 60, 110) to be considered as a single corridor. Additionally, he is working to secure assurances that any funding raised through congestion pricing would be reinvested into that corridor.

5.0 Alameda Corridor-East Construction Authority

ACE staff stated that a dedication ceremony is being planned for the El Monte grade separation.

6.0 Gold Line Foothill Extension Report

J. Blickenstaff referred committee members to the written report in the packet. He stated that Gold Line staff is still advocating to have this project moved from the Metro LRTP's Strategic Plan into the constrained plan.

7.0 Metro Report (LACMTA)

8.0 New Business

9.0 Next Meeting – April 17, 2008

10.0 Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.