**State Route 710 Tunnel Technical Study**
**FINAL Joint Steering and Technical Advisory Committee Meeting No. 7**
**Tuesday, March 30, 2010**
**South Pasadena Library**
**4 - 6 p.m.**

# AGENDA

I. **Welcome: Deborah Robertson, Caltrans Deputy District Director, External Affairs**
   a. **Opening Remarks**
   b. **Meeting Objectives**

II. **Product Delivery: Abdi Saghafi, SR-710 Project Manager**

III. **Final Draft Geotechnical Summary Report: Yoga Chandran, Geotechnical Team**
   a. **Geotechnical comments received and responses**
   b. **Geotechnical updates and revisions incorporated into Final Report**

IV. **Public Outreach Summary: Deborah Harris, SR-710 Study Outreach Contract Manager**
   a. **Public outreach components**
   b. **Public outreach results**

V. **Next Steps: Doug Failing, Executive Director of Highway Programs, Metro**

VI. **Discussion**

VII. **Closing**

**Meeting Minutes of the**
**State Route 710 Tunnel Technical Study**
**FINAL Meeting for the Technical Advisory Committee and the Steering Committee**
Held on Tuesday, March 30, 2010
At the South Pasadena Public Library

Submitted by: California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
District 7, Los Angeles and Ventura Counties
Thursday, June 10, 2010

**The meeting started at 4:00 p.m.**

**Welcome: Deborah Robertson, Deputy District Director, External Affairs, Caltrans**
Deborah Robertson began by identifying the meeting as the final State Route 710 Tunnel Technical Study Meeting and a joint meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Steering Committee (SC). She stated that the meeting was a committee meeting, not a public meeting – as were the past seven community meetings, and advised that questions from the public and directed to the panel be delegated to and presented by the respective community representative.

She requested that committee members and panel members use the tabletop microphones and identify themselves for purposes of the audio and written recording.
(Note: A Spanish language translator was available for those who required services).

Ms. Robertson next introduced Michael Miles, District 7 Director, Caltrans, and panel members Abdi Saghafi, Project Manager, Caltrans; Doug Failing, Executive Director of Highway Programs, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro); Dr. Yoga Chandran, Project Manager, CH2M HILL; Deborah Harris, Chief, Public Affairs and Media Relations, Caltrans; and Steve Klein, Tunnel Structure Lead, Jacobs Associates.

The following committee members stated their names and identified the community, agency or organization they represent as part of the SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study:
**Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)**: Richard Gutschow, City of South Pasadena; Bahman Janka, City of Pasadena; Pratheep Piratheepan, Caltrans; Ann Wilson, City of La Cañada Flintridge; Rey Alfonso, City of Monterey Park; Pat DeChellis, for Los Angeles County Supervisor Michael Antonovich; Amir Alam, for Los Angeles County Supervisor Gloria Molina; Barbara Messina, City of Alhambra; and Eugene Sun, City of San Marino (TAC and SC).
**Steering Committee (SC)**: Lynda Bybee, Metro; Michael Cano, Los Angeles County Supervisor Michael Antonovich; Nicole Englund, Los Angeles County Supervisor Gloria Molina; David Worrell, City of Pasadena; Dennis Woods, for City of South Pasadena Councilmember Philip Putnam; Naresh Amatya, Southern California Association of Governments; Stephen Del Guercio, City of La Cañada Flintridge; Edel Vizcarra, for Los Angeles Councilmember Jose Huizar; and Nicholas Conway, San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SC and TAC).
**The following alternate committee members were present:** Marisa Creter, San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments; Steven Placido, City of Alhambra; and Subodh Kumar, City of Pasadena.

**The following committee members were absent: Technical Advisory Committee-** Shahrzad Amiri, Metro; Philip Law, Southern California Association of Governments; Philip Putnam, City of South Pasadena; and Paul Habib, for City of Los Angeles Councilmember José Huizar. **Steering Committee-** Stephen Zurn, City of Glendale; and Lee Dolley, City of Alhambra (SC and TAC).

**Deborah Robertson** stated that this final meeting of the SC and TAC will complete the Geotechnical Report along with comments heard from those present at the most recent seven community meetings.

**Introduction of Elected Officials or their representatives: Abdi Saghafi**

Saghafi acknowledged and thanked the elected officials present: Yvonne Hsu, District Representative, Office of Congressman Adam Schiff, U.S. House of Representatives, 29th District; and Julianne Hines, District Director, Office of Assemblymember Anthony Portantino, 44th District.

**Comment by Abdi Saghafi, Project Manager, Caltrans**

Saghafi thanked all committee members for their endurance over the past 18 months through this process to deliver a product, which is the Final Geotechnical Study Report. The report itself contains several volumes and nearly 14,000 pages. This impressive amount of data collected was unprecedented as compared to similar studies and the geographical area studied was a very large area. Saghafi stated that the result is a very good, solid report and he is pleased with the work that was accomplished by Caltrans staff and the geotechnical consultant CH2M HILL. Caltrans and Metro have accomplished most, if not all**,** of the goals that they set out to do and he is happy to present the report to the committees before it is finalized**.**

**Meeting Overview: Dr. Yoga Chandran, CH2M HILL**

A visual PowerPoint presentation was used in conjunction with the verbal presentation**.** Chandran introduced other consultant staff who were part of the SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study Team and who helped to shape the final report: Bruce Schell, senior geologist, Earth Mechanics; Ramon Chavez, senior geologist, CH2M HILL; and Tom Ionta, CH2M HILL.

Chandran acknowledged the TAC and SC and thanked them for their interest in the Study and for their help in reviewing the Draft Report. He also said that many community members were interested in the Study and that the final report is reflective of their comments and incorporated their feedback. He concluded that the Study has addressed all purposes and all items within its scope and recapped and identified the three main purposes of the Study which are:

1. To consider all practical routes for the extension of State Route 710;
2. To gather information on sub-surface conditions;
3. To provide opportunities for public input and involvement.

The scope of the Geotechnical Feasibility Study required Caltrans:
1. To collect and review existing geotechnical information;
2. To complete field exploration;
3. To evaluate data;
4. To prepare the Geotechnical Summary Report;
5. To submit the Final Report in an easy to read format.

Chandran referred to an illustration chart of the five zones identified for the Study, and reviewed the geotechnical feasibility of tunneling. He stated that, from a geotechnical perspective, it is feasible to tunnel in all five zones. The report concluded that:
1. Tunneling is feasible in all five study zones;
2. Each zone presents unique geotechnical conditions;
3. Technology exists to address these conditions; and
4. New tunneling technology has successfully been implemented on past and recent projects in Los Angeles and around the world.

**Comments on the Final Draft Study Report, following its review by SC and TAC.**
Chandran listed the comments received from the committee members and addressed the following items that they requested to be included in the Final Report. He also described how these comments have reshaped the Final Report and made comparisons from the Draft Report to the Final Report noting what was or was not covered and what was expanded upon or changed.
The following list comprises many of the comments:
1. Provide comparison of the geotechnical conditions;
2. Provide construction concepts to address the geotechnical conditions and address some of the challenges;
3. Evaluate portal location in relation to south of Valley Boulevard. Could a portal be constructed south of Valley Boulevard?;
4. Explain and expand on how exploration locations were selected;
5. Explain the basis for fault displacement and how it was calculated;
6. Differentiate faults that are within the Study area from those outside the area;
7. Distinguish between active faults and potentially active faults. What would the impacts from an earthquake be to a proposed tunnel?;
8. Characterize significance of geotechnical issues or conditions for each zone;
9. Provide ground motion data including near fault effects (Not included in the Final Report because a specific alignment is first required.);
10. Effects of liquefaction on shafts (Not included in the Final Report);
11. Clarification on groundwater data regarding depths and elevations;
12. Provide additional outreach specifically in Zone 4 and Zone 5.

**Tunneling Construction Concepts to Address Geotechnical Conditions, presented by Steve Klein, Jacobs Associates**

Klein provided additional explanation of the tunnel construction concepts included in the revised Final Report to address the geotechnical conditions identified for the various zones. Some previous comments from committee members requested more information on how construction issues would be handled. Klein's presentation addressed the significance of some of the concepts for construction and provided additional clarification on the significance of these different factors with respect to the five Study zones. The Final Draft Report expands on these identified issues and how the following factors could be mitigated using modern tunneling technology including: special safety precautions, pressurized face Tunnel Boring Machine (TBM), watertight tunnel lining; specialized tunneling equipment and tunnel design.

In order to evaluate tunnel feasibility, it was necessary to look at the following geotechnical conditions:

1. Variable soil/rock conditions;
2. Unstable soil/rock;
3. Fault crossing;
4. Contaminated soil and groundwater;
5. Gassy conditions;
6. Groundwater conditions.

**Comparison of Geotechnical Conditions**

Klein presented an approach for comparing the geotechnical conditions in the zones using risk assessment techniques as prescribed in the Caltrans Project Risk Management Guidelines Handbook and the British Tunneling Society Code of Practice for Risk Management. He explained that these techniques are widely used in the United States for major tunnel construction.

Klein gave examples of determining the significance of a potential risk issue for comparison purposes in each of the five zones. For example, one would look at the likelihood that a certain condition that might be encountered while tunneling and the impact of that condition, if encountered. Then, one would examine and determine the significance of the results and compare them for each of the five Study zones. For each condition and each zone, the Geotechnical Study Team evaluated these two factors:

1. Likelihood of the condition; and
2. Potential impact, if encountered.

In order to determine the significance of a potential issue, one would consider both factors. For example, if an issue had a very high likelihood of the condition and a very high potential impact, it would be very significant. Whereas, if an issue had a very high likelihood of the condition, but a very low potential impact, then that issue would be less significant.

**Evaluation Criteria: Likelihood Factor (LF) and Impact Factor (IF), presented by Steve Klein**

A chart displayed in the PowerPoint presentation illustrated the Likelihood Factor of occurrence scores, ranging from one to five (1 – 5), and respective Probability or Percentage of Zone Percentages. A second chart illustrated the Impact Factor of occurrence scores, ranging from one to five (1 – 5), and respective relative Cost Increase Percentage.

The Study involved looking at each condition or each factor independently of the others to rank the significance of an impact --- if it was present in that zone. In order to evaluate impacts, the condition or factor has to be related to a potential cost increase, which would be required to mitigate that factor if it was present in that zone.

Klein explained that based on the Technical Study Team's experience and judgment, a mitigation cost was assigned a percentage to determine a qualitative description of the cost if a potential issue had to be mitigated. Different types of tunneling methods for different approaches are used to mitigate those conditions and there is a cost related to that mitigation.

To determine the significance of a potential issue in each zone for comparison purposes, the Study Team estimated Likelihood Factor and multiplied by the probability of the Impact Factor score. The significance rating is determined from the product of the likelihood and potential impact scores using a rating system described in both the Caltrans Project Risk Management Guidelines Handbook and the British Tunneling Society Code of Practice for Risk Management. The significance rating can be low, moderate or high, depending on the product of the two scores.

**Results of Comparison for Each Zone, presented by Steve Klein**

Referring to the chart, "Results of Comparison for Each Zone," Klein said that the significance ratings for each condition within each zone were determined. The comparison chart used in the PowerPoint presentation gives a picture of how significant a geotechnical factor is in each of the five Study zones and that evaluation is described in detail in the Final Report.

**Portal Approach at Valley Boulevard**

Chandran referred to the PowerPoint presentation to further explain and clarify a question received during the Draft Report regarding the approach at Valley Boulevard. For Study purposes only, the Draft Report described a location - south of Valley Boulevard - as a potential portal. The approach at Valley Boulevard was used as an illustration for tunneling as all five Study zones include this location as a starting point.

Chandran stated that is a preliminary concept to better answer the question of where a portal could be near Valley Boulevard because in all of the five Study zones, this is a fixed point. For a tunnel to be constructed, excavation would start approximately at 1,000-plus feet from Interstate 10. The tunnel would be more than 50 feet underground approaching Valley Boulevard and would be completely underground just north at the Hellman Bridge. Using this as an example, there could be a portal somewhere between I-10 and Valley Boulevard.

**Comments from Elected Officials**

Chandran addressed the following comments that were submitted by elected officials:

1. Include commentary in the Final Report on the next or future steps.
2. Provide clarification on reference to a study conducted by the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro).
3. Additional studies are needed.
4. Maintain transparency**.**
5. Perform a detailed feasibility study considering traffic, air quality, noise and cost.

Chandran explained the following for each of the five items listed above:

- Regarding #1, this is beyond the scope of this geotechnical feasibility study.
- Regarding #2, some changes were made to the Final Report to reflect the 2006 Feasibility Study conducted by Metro.
- Regarding #3, this is the first step in a series of studies.
- Regarding #4, the Study Team presented everything they knew about the Study area and presented that in a series of meetings.
- Regarding #5, this is beyond the scope of this 710 Tunnel Technical Study.

**Comments from the community and citizens**

Chandran listed some of the comments received:

1. What is the purpose and need of this Study?
2. Evaluate other modes of transportation besides vehicular extension.
3. Cost of the project.
4. What are the next steps following this Study?
5. Clarification on the portal location south of Valley Boulevard.
6. Impacts to properties, property values – especially around Valley Boulevard.
7. Ventilation shaft locations and potential impacts to community.
8. Need a more thorough feasibility study–include traffic, noise, air quality impacts, cost and other features.
9. Extend SR-710 to Huntington Drive.
10. This report is thorough and responsive to the direction received by the committees.
11. The closure of 710 freeway gap is long overdue.
12. Support tunnel option to minimize traffic and air quality impacts to various communities.
13. Need this project to relieve traffic on local streets.
14. Close the gap to improve commute between San Gabriel Valley and Los Angeles.
15. This Study is biased; there is too much focus on Zone 2 and Zone 3.
16. Detailed evaluation of the data has not been done.
17. Do not build a tunnel in my backyard.
18. Do not build this tunnel.
19. Evaluation of gassy conditions was not done correctly.
20. Evaluation criteria expanded from three items to five items without approval.

Chandran commented on the following for item #19 and item #20 listed above:
Regarding item #19 (gassy conditions), Chandran said that gas measurements were based on experience of the local conditions. Results of this Study's boring (data) showed very low levels of hazardous material content. The measurements were done primarily for worker safety during drilling operations. Sometimes, that does not reflect exact content of gassy conditions. However, the Study Team knows from other tunneling experience that there has been exposure and that is the Study Team's basis for its conclusions and findings in this report. Regarding item #20, Chandran said that with regard to the evaluation criteria, the Study Team has been transparent on what factors they have been looking at relating to geology, faulting, seismicity, contamination, and gassy conditions. These factors that have been listed in a number of presentations and the Study Team have been transparent in those factors.

**Revisions to the Final Study Report**

Revisions to the Final Study Report include:

1. In Section 1: reference to a Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Study and background on some of the previous studies that have been done to extend State Route 710;
2. In Section 3: additional explanation of how the geotechnical exploration program was determined;
3. In Section 4: reorganized to clarify and separate seismic faults within and outside of Study area;
4. In Section 13: revision to clarify a comparison of geotechnical conditions and also tunnel construction concepts to address geotechnical conditions;
5. Appendix G: contains all comments and responses to the comments;
6. Editorial changes: reflective of some comments received from all sources.

**Study Accomplishments**

Chandran stated that the SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study accomplished the following:

1. Collected an extensive amount of geotechnical data in a vast study area;
2. Compiled and completed the targeted investigations to supplement existing geotechnical data;
3. Evaluated key issues that could impact a tunnel and reviewed tunnel case histories;
4. Determined that tunneling in all five Study zones is geotechnically feasible.

Chandran summarized by stating that through this Final Report, Caltrans has reached its final milestone to complete the State Route 710 Tunnel Technical Study. The timeline for the Study has been met and the Final Draft Report was submitted to the committee two weeks ago. This is the meeting to present the changes and the Final Report will be submitted to Caltrans and Metro in a few weeks.

**Public Outreach Plan – presented by Deborah Harris, Chief, Public Affairs and Media Relations, Caltrans**

Harris reviewed the public outreach plan enacted, and plan components and outcomes. The plan was led under contract by Rebecca Barrantes of The Sierra Group. Part of that contract included Katherine Padilla and Associates. The contract has now concluded. The public outreach office on Eastern Avenue has been closed. All calls to the Study office are now being forwarded to Caltrans Public Affairs. Public Outreach Campaign was initiated to promote public awareness of the Study's purpose and progress, and to actively inform community members about the Study and Exploration Program.

**Outreach Efforts and Components of the Public Outreach Plan**

1. Project Information Office and telephone hot line.
2. Study website is still available to the public. However it is currently in transition to the Caltrans District 7 website.
3. Database development and maintenance.
4. Title VI compliance with the Civil Rights Act for language assessment and translation services were provided at public community meetings.
5. Logged in and responded to all inquiries.
6. Neighborhood canvassing to alert residents and businesses of exploration and boring program in their area.
7. Exploration and Boring sites.
8. Community meetings and briefings.
9. Display boards.

**Public Outreach Outcomes**

1. Over 2,000 residents, business and stakeholders were contacted during the neighborhood canvassing efforts.
2. The website pages were visited 56,506 times over the course of the study.
3. The Study database collected 909 email addresses.
4. The Explorer Newsletter was distributed in Fall 2009.
5. 29 briefing to elected officials and/or representatives.
6. 16 presentations to stakeholders and community groups.
7. 11 Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Committee meetings.
8. 15 Community Meetings – totaling nearly 1,000 attendees
   - Round 1: Summer 2009. 625 attendees signed in at nine meetings
   - Round 2: January and February 2010. 322 attendees signed in at six meetings

**Next Steps, presented by Doug Failing, Executive Director of Highway Programs, Metro**

Failing thanked the combined Committees and expressed appreciation for comments made on the Final Draft Report. Failing said that this Study has been an arduous effort and that Caltrans and Metro had received many comments and that is very much appreciated. He thanked the committee members for all the time invested into the Study especially with the large amount of data that was put forward during the Study.

Failing said that because of the input and comments by the committees, the result is a very technical report that is readable to all citizens and that this is an important quality for a public document. Had Caltrans and Metro not gone through the Study process, he said that he was not sure that the results would be so transparent in an easy to read document. Failing said that at the end of the day it is the public that needs to know what is or is not moving forward – and that is so important. And for that, he thanked the committee members for their efforts.

Failing commented on the Final Summary Report and the next steps by the Metro Board of Directors. As this is the final meeting of the SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study by Metro and its partner Caltrans, the Metro Board is looking forward to receiving the Final Report over the next week or two. Failing stated that the report would be presented at the next Metro Board Meeting tentatively set for the April cycle. Failing said that he anticipates the Metro Board of Directors to direct a series of next steps and to provide further direction on where they would like to go next. He said that he and Mike Miles (Caltrans, District 7 Director) will have a conversation where they will discuss presenting the Study to the California Transportation Commission (the Board that oversees Caltrans) during its May, 2010 meeting.

**Conclusion**
The presentation portion of the meeting concluded.

**Questions and Answers, moderated by Deborah Robertson, Caltrans**
Robertson reminded to the audience that this is a committee meeting, not a public meeting. Therefore, if members from the public who are present have any issue or question that they would like their respective community representative to address on their behalf, they are welcome to approach the committee membership and speak to that person directly.

Robertson asked the SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study committee members if they first had any questions for the Caltrans or Metro panel members regarding the presentation or the next steps. Hearing none, the Question and Answer period began.

**Question: Steve Del Guercio, City of La Cañada Flintridge**
Del Guercio posed several questions and referred to the segment of the presentation that addressed tunneling through active faults, particularly those that have been built successfully in Los Angeles:
1. Isn't there a difference between highway tunnels that have a continuous traffic and tunnels such as the (Metro) Red Line that does not have a continuous stream vehicular traffic?
2. Is it true that a highway tunnel has never been built through an active fault?
3. Isn't it true that the (Metro) Red Line has not survived an actual fault displacement?

**Responses provided by Steve Klein**
**Klein:** (in response to Question 1): Yes, there is a difference between a highway tunnel and a mass transit tunnel.
**Del Guercio:** It is designed differently because there are different considerations in terms of mass transit traveling through?

**Klein:** In either case, we would consider the design to maintain and promote public safety. There are different issues because of the nature of traffic, but the objective would be the same.
**Del Guercio:** Is it true that a highway tunnel has never been built through an active fault?):
**Klein:** (in response to Question 2): That may be correct; I don't know of any.
**Del Guercio:** I think that's true; that's what our [La Cañada Flintridge] technical experts tell us.
**Klein:** There are tunnels that have been built across active fault lines. We talked about the Metro Red Line through the Hollywood Hills.
**Del Guercio:** Our technical experts are telling us that there is a fundamental difference between a highway tunnel that has a continuous flow of traffic and a subway tunnel that has intermittent, periodic vehicles traveling through and there would be different considerations.
**Klein:** The point is that at any point in time, either type of tunnel could be occupied at that location. You would have to consider what would happen should an earthquake occur at that particular moment.
**Del Guercio:** Well, then, let's focus on that. (Question #3: Isn't it true that the (Metro) Red Line has not survived an actual earthquake displacement?) So, it has never happened. We haven't had that type of displacement along the Red Line.
**Klein:** Right, not on that particular segment. When we discussed the comparison of significance (in the PowerPoint presentation) we looked at the return periods for these types of fault offsets and the probability of occurrence is very low.
**Del Guercio:** That's because earthquakes happen on geologic time.
**Klein:** It's the same because it's the probability of having an earthquake in a 100-year design life. It's not geologic time, it's within a 100 year design life, and that is a standard way of determining that.
**Del Guercio:** I understand, but if it happens (an earthquake), what happens? That concerns me, the public and the people using the system. We understand that the odds are low. We've all experienced things where experts tell us that the odds are low. The Wall Street experts told us that what happened would never happen in 2009; nobody could program for that. But, we do have to look at those things. We have those situations where we are told that the odds are low. Are people going to die? Is it going to work? That's, I think, an important question, where if I was making those decisions, I would want to know.
**Klein:** In previous meetings, we talked about ways of mitigating for a fault hazard or designing a tunnel with a vault section that can accommodate fault movement and maintain traffic flow and maintain serviceability and the ability to evacuate the tunnel should a very extreme seismic event occur. It is a very unusual and low probability event. Now, you may not be convinced that you can do it safely, but it can be done. I don't know who your seismic experts are, but I'd be happy to discuss it with them.
**Del Guercio:** They have submitted their comments and additional supplemental comments were given to you. (A letter containing comments from the consultants hired by the City of La Cañada Flintridge was given to other committee members at this meeting.) If any committee members have your own consultants, I would certainly like to hear their take. If our consultants are wrong on these issues, I would like to know that. But I continue – because of the consultant's comments --- to have concerns about the issues that have been raised.

**Del Guercio:** I have another question. We did get some information now on the evaluation criteria which assign a cost percentage increase on these different factors. I've been asking to talk about the cost since the very first meeting. Without having any discussion about what those costs were, you've told us that you haven't designed it.
Then, how do you know the factors that determine an increase for those costs? How do you do that when you haven't even covered that base to begin with?
**Klein:** We wanted to come up with a system of evaluating the impact so we'd address how to mitigate those factors to determine the significance. Those relative cost factors are based on our experience with other projects where we kind of know what it costs to address those certain issues. They are broad cost figures that range from 5% to 20%, so it's really based on our experience with other projects of what it would cost. The real issue might be is how sensitive would it be if we were off a little bit. It's not that sensitive --- these are broad ranges and we're just trying to characterize these factors into three categories: low significance, moderate significance and high significance. It really says nothing about the ultimate cost of the project. We're just trying to see how significant those factors are in terms of a geotechnical issue for a tunnel in that zone.
**Del Guercio:** It strikes me as a broad brush approach, but it's so broad that it really doesn't tell us anything. I understand that you've based some of this on the Caltrans Risk Management Handbook. But, we're talking about a highway tunnel that has never been built before in California through an active fault. So, what does a Caltrans manual have to say about that? Is there something in there that says "yes, it is.?" I understand that you say it's 'low probability'…. and therefore the significant factor is less than 5 percent, well, I don't find that very helpful not knowing what the beginning costs were and having something to validate that, because we really haven't plowed that ground in any meaningful way at least to my knowledge and the committee. I just don't feel that this is very helpful.

**Question from Barbara Messina, City Councilmember, City of Alhambra:**
**Barbara Messina**: On the section where you have revisions to report and you have Section One reference to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) study and background…. which study was that?
**Response: by Yoga Chandran, CH2M HILL**
**Chandran** responded that he would have to review the report to identify the SCAG reference. One of the comments we received from SCAG asked us to refer to one certain section for the purpose of this Study in terms of air quality, the regional mobility improvements. So that statement was included in the text. I don't recall right now.
**Messina**: Was that from the RTP or part of the RTP?
**Chandran**: I think it could be. I will check for you.

**Question from Steve Del Guercio, City of La Cañada Flintridge**
**Del Guercio:** Is this the last opportunity to comment? Is the meeting over after this?
**Deborah Robertson, Caltrans**: Yes.

**Comment from Steve Del Guercio**

**Del Guercio:** For the reasons we've already stated in writing and at prior meetings, the City of La Canada Flintridge does not agree that this Study has accomplished its stated purpose. While the Study gathers a variety of data, it fails to evaluate the data in a meaningful way that is helpful to the public and their elected representatives in evaluating whether or where a tunnel should be built. I do believe that there are political considerations that were decided outside of this room that have directed this Study. I know that all of you who worked so hard on it would like to get into those things but it didn't get into those things and are disappointed that we were not allowed an opportunity to ask some questions and understand this in the detail that would allow us to draw some meaningful conclusions.

**Question from Mike Cano, representing Los Angeles County Supervisor Michael Antonovich**:

**Cano**: This question is directed to Doug Failing. In your experience, with the next study, the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) if the Metro Board does approve that, will it cover many of the issues that were not in the scope of this Study but that would help define the issues brought by the constituencies along that corridor?

**Response by Doug Failing, Metro**

**Failing:** The simple answer is yes.

**Question from Dennis Woods, representing the City of South Pasadena for Councilmember Philip Putnam**

**Woods:** You stated that the next step is to go to the Metro Board and the California Transportation Commission (CTC). I would like to understand more about how is staff going to present this to the Metro Board and the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and what recommendation you are looking for? We just heard a comment about an EIR, yet I saw nothing in tonight's presentation that mentioned an EIR (Environmental Impact Report). Metro has put in some money in for further evaluation of a tunnel; I'm not sure what the CTC is doing. For clarification for all of us, I would like more information on that.

**Response by Doug Failing, Metro**

**Failing:** The presentation to the Metro Board would be a shorter PowerPoint -- about 10 to15 slides-- to capture the essence of the conversations that have been held. I'll know what our (Metro) recommendation is when the Board report is final as so many of these things are written by committee. I do know that there are basically three options that will be presented to our (Metro) Board: Option 1 is to do an EIR. Option 2 is to do much more detailed studies that stops short of doing an EIR, but captures a host of other questions that have been raised from the public. Option 3 is to tell us to 'go away' and do nothing. These are the three options that will be in front of our (Metro) Board and I will know more about what the recommendation is when the Board report is final. (Failing looked to Mike Miles, for Caltrans concurrence with his response). Mike agrees.

**Question from Ann Wilson, City of La Cañada Flintridge**

**Wilson:** My understanding was that Parsons in Pasadena had been awarded an on-call [contract] EIR for this project. Is that correct or is that incorrect?

**Response by Doug Failing, Metro; Mike Miles, Caltrans; and Abdi Saghafi, Caltrans and Deborah Robertson, Caltrans.**

**Failing**: That's a Caltrans contract. It's an on-call project to perform EIR types of activities.
**Wilson:** Related to this project?
**Failing**: I have to defer to Caltrans. I don't know if that's the only project listed. Quite often there are multiple projects or an area listed. So it could be more than that. Do you know, Mike?
**Miles**: I don't know if it's for multiple projects, but typically, our on-call contracts are for multiple areas, multiple projects.
**Wilson:** I was told by Parsons that they had been awarded this contract.
**Miles**: It would be an on-call, so if we need to have some geotechnical type of investigations done, then they would do it, no matter where it was at.
**Wilson:** I'm not talking about geotechnical. I'm talking about EIR.
**Miles:** It would be on-call, as we needed it.
**Wilson:** Right, I understand that; that was my question.
**Failing:** I would note that Metro has on-call contracts, bench contracts that could perform EIR or geotechnical or other activities that are not necessarily associated with the 710 also. It is not an uncommon practice for a public agency to have resources available for this type of activity.
**Wilson:** Yes, but specifically for this project, that I'm told.
**Robertson**: We can certainly verify it and let you know. To our knowledge, we have not had a contract let for any specific project for Parsons.
**Wilson:** Yes, if you could. This was last December or something like that.
**Saghafi**: There was a contract awarded to Parsons Group, not Parsons PB, but Parson's Group. The title of the contract is "Route 710 Corridor," so it can apply for any [work] from the beach [Port of Long Beach] to where it ends.
**Deborah Robertson**: We tend to forget that there is a southern part of [Interstate] 710 [Long Beach Freeway] that we need to focus on as well.

**Meeting Concluded**

Deborah Robertson, Caltrans, thanked all for participating in this part of the project and this process. She stated that the State Route 710 Tunnel Technical Study is now concluded.

The meeting concluded at approximately 5:20 p.m.