



Steering & Technical Committee Joint Meeting Minutes
SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study
August 4, 2009 4:00 p.m.
San Marino Center
Final Draft



I. CALL TO ORDER –

The meeting was called to order at 4:15 pm.

INTRODUCTIONS AND MEETING OVERVIEW

The following people attended the meeting:

SC Members:	TAC Members:
Naresh Amatya, Manager of Transportation Planning, Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	Amir Alam, Senior Civil Engineer, Representative for County Supervisor Gloria Molina, 1st District
Lynda Bybee, Deputy Executive Officer of Regional Communications, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)	Shahrzad Amiri, Deputy Executive Officer, METRO
Michael Cano, Transportation Deputy, Office of Los Angeles County Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich, 5 th District	Nicholas Conway, Executive Director, SGVCOG
Stephen A. Del Guercio, Councilmember, City of La Cañada Flintridge	Pat DeChellis, Deputy Director, Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Representative for County Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich, 5th District
Lee Dolley, Representative, City of Alhambra	Leland Dolley, Representative, City of Alhambra
Ms. Nicole Englund, Transportation Deputy, Office of Los Angeles County Supervisor Gloria Molina, 1 st District	Richard A. Gutschow, Representative, City of South Pasadena
Mike Ten, Councilmember, City of South Pasadena (Alternate for Philip C. Putnam)	Paul Habib, Northeast Area Director/Public Works Manager, Office of Los Angeles Councilman Jose Huizar, 14 th District
Eugene Sun, Mayor, City of San Marino	Bahman Janka, Transportation Administrator, City of Pasadena
Marisa Creter, SGVCOG (Alternate for Robert Urteaga)	Philip Law, Corridors Program Manager, Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)
Edel Vizcarra, Planning and Transportation Deputy, Office City of Los Angeles Councilmember Jose Huizar, 14th District	Pratheep Piratheepan, Senior Transportation Engineer, Caltrans District 7
David Worrell, Representative, City of Pasadena	Eugene Sun, Mayor, City of San Marino
	Mark Alexander, City Manager, City of La Cañada Flintridge (Alternate for Ann Wilson)
	Rey Alfonso, Assistant City Engineer, City of Monterey Park (Alternate for June Yotsuya)



Steering & Technical Committee Joint Meeting Minutes
SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study
August 4, 2009 4:00 p.m.
San Marino Center
Final Draft



<p>Absent/No Alternate Present:</p> <p>Borja Leon, P.E., Transportation Policy Director, Office of the Mayor of Los Angeles</p> <p>Thomas E. Mitchell, Assistant Traffic & Transportation Administrator, City of Glendale</p> <p>Stephen Zurn, Director of Public Works, City of Glendale</p> <p>Elected Officials:</p> <p>Yvonne Hsu, District Representative, Office of Congressman Adam Schiff, U.S House of Representatives, 29th District</p> <p>Julianne Hines, District Director, Office of Assemblymember Anthony Portantino, 44th District</p> <p>Barbara A. Messina, Councilmember, City of Alhambra</p> <p>Steven Placido, Mayor, City of Alhambra</p> <p>Caltrans District 7 Staff:</p> <p>Doug Failing, Caltrans District 7 Director</p> <p>Abdi Saghafi, Project Manager</p> <p>Deborah Harris, Chief, Media Relations & Public Affairs</p> <p>Maria Raptis, Public Information Officer</p> <p>Derek Higa, Senior Transportation Engineer</p> <p>Kaz Kayoda, Design</p>	<p>Community Facilitation Consultants:</p> <p>Rebecca Barrantes, The Sierra Group</p> <p>Glenda Silva, The Sierra Group</p> <p>Rena Salcedo, GCAP Services</p> <p>Debbie Rusas, GCAP Services</p> <p>Katherine Padilla, KP&A</p> <p>John Limon, KP&A</p> <p>Technical Consultants:</p> <p>Yoga Chandran, Project Manager, CH2M HILL</p> <p>Steve Klein, GE, PE, Tunnel Structure Lead, Jacobs Associates</p> <p>Loren Bloomberg, Traffic Expert, CH2M HILL</p> <p>Mark Bennett, Air Quality Expert, CH2M HILL</p> <p>Farshard Farhang, Noise Expert, CH2M HILL</p> <p>Heiner Sanders, Ventilation Expert, IQF</p>
--	---

For the purpose of review, Committee Member’s names are spelled out during the question and answer periods. Staff names are denoted by their first initial and last name.



Steering & Technical Committee Joint Meeting Minutes
SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study
August 4, 2009 4:00 p.m.
San Marino Center
Final Draft



The meeting started at approximately 4:15 p.m.

Welcome: Doug Failing, Caltrans District 7 Director

Doug Failing, Caltrans District 7 Director, welcomed meeting attendees and facilitated the introductions of present Steering Committee (SC) members, Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members, Caltrans staff, consultants, representatives of elected officials and additional guests.

Meeting Overview: Doug Failing, Caltrans District 7 Director

Mr. Failing proceeded to explain the meeting objectives, which were to review the Study's guiding principles, committee roles, group consensus process, and discuss Task Order No. 5. He stressed the need for Committees to develop a series of recommendations for Caltrans with regards to Task Order No. 5.

The following were provided as roles of SC:

- Receive presentations and become experts in the Study
- Review Study deliverables
- Act as informed spokespersons
- Bring forward their community's values, questions and issues

The following were provided as roles of TAC:

- Review technical data
- Provide technical guidance to Caltrans
- Review Study deliverables
- Provide input to SC members

The study group process was described as Collaborative Consensus, in which minority opinions of the group are explored and win-win solutions are sought. Mr. Failing added that they were looking for ownership and understanding of decisions being made by Committee members.

Mr. Failing reviewed the guiding principles, which were to develop reliable geotechnical data for tunnel options, respect route neutrality, and to consider all practical routes for the proposed extension of SR-710.

Community Perspectives: R. Barrantes, Community Facilitation Team

Rebecca Barrantes addressed the feedback received by the Committees at the SC and TAC meetings in June 2009, by providing a summary of their input. Feedback provided by the TAC on June 9, 2009 included a request for real-time applications of geologic conditions for tunneling in the five zones, unbiased information, and a glossary of terms. On June 25, 2009 the SC was presented information from the TAC meeting and also the proposal for Task Order No. 5. The SC communicated that they needed sufficient time to review and comment on the task order as



Steering & Technical Committee Joint Meeting Minutes
SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study
August 4, 2009 4:00 p.m.
San Marino Center
Final Draft



well as geotechnical studies. Ms. Barrantes informed meeting attendees that the team would spend a considerable amount of time explaining rationale for the proposed expanded studies under Task Order No. 5.

Ms. Barrantes then reviewed comments and questions provided at the community meetings for each of the nine cities represented. These communities are South Pasadena, El Sereno, Pasadena, Glendale, La Canada Flintridge, Monterey Park, San Marino, Alhambra, and Northeast Los Angeles. It was noted that over 640 people attended the community meetings. Emerging themes from different communities included: how geology in the five zones would influence tunneling; traffic; air quality; tunnel safety; ventilation design; vibration during tunnel construction; cost of the Study and tunnel; and interest in the Study outcome.

A table summarizing issues and concerns of each community was provided, showing concerns in almost every category. Ms. Barrantes emphasized this was the main reason Caltrans proposed the expansion of the study scope.

Review of Draft Task Order No. 5: Yoga Chandran, CH2M HILL Geotechnical Team

Mr. Chandran acknowledged the comments received by the Committees about Task Order No. 5, outlining major concerns raised, including air quality, noise, and traffic. He stated that the main reason for expanding the scope of the Study was to be responsive to feedback from the community. He supported this by adding that without jeopardizing the environmental document process, Caltrans wants to complete a conceptual level study and use that data to determine impacts to each zone in terms of traffic, air quality, and noise. Mr. Chandran added that in expanding the scope to include additional studies, they would like to address the pros and cons of each zone. He reminded the Committee that most of the detailed analysis should be and will be done in the environmental phase and this is not an environmental study.

Mr. Chandran reviewed the expanded scope including:

- Traffic
- Tunnel configuration
- Tunnel systems
- Impact to the community, including noise and air quality
- Portal impacts
- Cost considerations

The Study schedule was discussed. Mr. Chandran informed the Committee that when Task Order No. 5 was presented, the Technical Team was hoping to get consensus of the Steering Committee to start the additional technical studies; however Caltrans held off on starting the work to obtain comments from both Steering and Technical Committees. The schedule presented assumed that the additional studies would begin sometime in the mid August 2009 and that each of the technical studies would be completed late October or early November 2009, with the final report due January 2010. He informed them that they would present the findings in the summary



Steering & Technical Committee Joint Meeting Minutes
SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study
August 4, 2009 4:00 p.m.
San Marino Center
Final Draft



report, which would include a comparison of each of the technical areas and the potential impact of a tunnel in each of the zones.

Mr. Chandran added that CH2M HILL will make presentations to the SC & TAC in two sets of meetings: one at the end of the preliminary findings and one once they have completed the final report.

He discussed the comments from Committee members:

- Couple of members stated that it was premature to proceed with the Study
- Couple of members stated that the Study should be completed as scoped
- Few indicated that they needed clarification on the expanded scope
- Few requested clarification on the roles and responsibilities of SC &
- Several members requested adequate notification for future meetings was necessary

Mr. Chandran addressed comments on technical areas for each category. He also stated that Caltrans would provide detailed response to these comments within the next couple of weeks. Comments previously provided by the SC and TAC for the following technical areas were addressed:

- Traffic Modeling: Committee members felt that time should be spent on getting the input from the technical group to determine the appropriate modeling to be used for traffic studies. The technical team will be meeting with Caltrans, Metro and Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) traffic experts to develop performance measures to be analyzed,
- Truck Usage: Based on the comments provided during community meetings, two tunnel traffic scenarios will be evaluated: one with trucks and one without trucks. Also included in the proposed expanded scope was peak hour traffic analysis; however based on comments from the Committees, adjustments will be made to look at morning and afternoon peak hour traffic.
- Tunnel Configuration: For the purpose of analysis, an assumption is made that the tunnel would have a circular cross-section and be a four lane tunnel. A number of the committee members questioned and stated that the final configuration should be based on traffic patterns. Comments related to the tunnel configuration are to be addressed in the Study response. To evaluate the traffic patterns, assumptions are made about where the termini may be in each zone, which allows for the evaluation of any potential impacts. This is necessary to come up with relative costs.
- Tunnel Ventilation System Evaluation: The overall size of the tunnel will account for the ventilation system. Cross passages, emergency exits and ventilation using the tunnel configuration itself will be considered in this analysis. This tunnel system evaluation will



Steering & Technical Committee Joint Meeting Minutes
SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study
August 4, 2009 4:00 p.m.
San Marino Center
Final Draft



also determine if any zones require an intermediate ventilation shaft, and propose methods of minimizing or eliminating the ventilation shaft in the tunnel. This was a major concern that came up in many of the community meetings.

- Air quality: Air quality and noise are dependent on the outcome of the traffic studies. Both are highly dependent on the level of detail from traffic studies. Air quality impacts will be evaluated in areas such as freeways and major arterial.
- Noise: Land use along the freeways, roads and bridges potentially impacted by the Study area will be evaluated. In those areas, estimated traffic noise changes will be assessed based on traffic volumes. Based on that the traffic information, noise impact in those areas and adjacent areas will be part of the analysis. For example, will the tunnel in each of the zones will increase or reduce traffic noise?
- Portal impacts: In order to evaluate this, determinations about where the termini may be located in each zone must be made. The southern portal is fairly fixed. This will be done assuming a typical connection from the tunnel to freeways to capture impact. Some zones may favor a certain amount of space; some may contain contamination.

Mr. Chandran summarized that because this is a conceptual level study, all of these factors will be evaluated in determining costs.

Mr. Failing asked that each group directly inform him, in writing, if they wanted to proceed with Task Order No. 5 and the rationale for this decision. He also asked the Committee to provide this letter within a week, adding that it would help Caltrans decide its direction. He explained that the technical consultants have ceased from moving forward on items in the task order.

Questions, Answers, and Comments following the presentation:

NOTE: Committee Member's names are spelled out during the question and answer periods. Staff names are denoted by their first initial and last name.

Mike Cano: Supervisor Antonovich represents several cities on this project, including the directly affected and indirectly affected La Canada Flintridge, La Crescenta, Alhambra, South Pasadena, Pasadena and San Marino. Moving into a new expansion of scope is not going to sit very well. This was supposed to be a discrete task, providing an assessment of geotechnical feasibility. As far as I have heard, there is no problem with the feasibility of constructing a tunnel. These issues on the screen, in terms of a task order, move into items that Supervisor Antonovich believes are an environmental discussion. An appropriate place for that will be at the Metro Board, where the environmental document will be assessed, voted on, and if the Metro Board approves to move forward with it, these concerns that have come up in the various jurisdictions (that are



Steering & Technical Committee Joint Meeting Minutes
SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study
August 4, 2009 4:00 p.m.
San Marino Center
Final Draft



important) should be addressed in that document. They should not be addressed here in the expansion of the scope. When we first started this Committee, there was concern over whether this Committee would be used as a pseudo environmental review because there are trust issues. There was concern about whether or not the intent of this Committee would bleed into a new focus or become a parallel Committee to the Metro Board. If you are getting into cost issues, and how we will pay for this, that is Metro's purview. We have \$750 million invested in this project by more than two-thirds the vote of Los Angeles County. That \$750 million is the San Gabriel Valley Council of Government (SGVCOG) portion of Measure R funds. We are now looking at potential public-private partnerships, different revenue streams, and different ways to finance the tunnel if this were to move forward. That has to be done in a comprehensive manner by the people elected to make those decisions. The letter by Supervisor Antonovich will ask Mr. Doug Failing to end this. I would like to know what the original end date for the original scope for this task was.

- D. Failing: The contract was to end in 2010. Caltrans anticipated completing the geotechnical studies in November 2009.
- Mike Cano: Was it the intent to go to Metro with the findings and recommendations on a preferred route? What was the original intent?
- D. Failing: The original intent was to answer the question that was originally posed: Is it feasible to tunnel in the San Gabriel Valley?
- Mike Cano: At this point, is the answer yes or no?
- D. Failing: I will be able to answer that question in November; however the preliminary indication is that yes, it is feasible.
- Mike Cano: When we talk about issues of cost and mitigations, it exceeds the scope of this task force. Are you looking for a narrowing of routes from the zone by the I-605 Freeway to the zone in the Elysian Park area? Are we looking to narrow down options in terms of recommendations from this Committee?
- D. Failing: No, we are not looking to the Committee for that type of recommendation.
- Mike Cano: At some point, Metro is going to have to decide how discreet the EIR document is going to be if they move forward in that direction. Is that correct?



Steering & Technical Committee Joint Meeting Minutes
SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study
August 4, 2009 4:00 p.m.
San Marino Center
Final Draft



- D. Failing: That would be a joint Metro-Caltrans decision process going through the CEQA/NEQA appropriate scoping. Certainly, the Metro Board would be very involved.
- Mike Cano: What you are proposing to work on is very important but our concern is the venue. Supervisor Antonovich does not support this Committee moving forward on this proposed scope when it should go back to Metro. At that point, we should discuss routes, etc. We need to have closure with the Committees [SC and TAC] and move this on to the Metro Board.
- Nicole Englund: For expedience, I would like to let you know that Supervisor Molina wholly agrees with Supervisor Antonovich.
- Lee Dolley: We share many of the concerns discussed by Supervisors Antonovich and Molina. May I ask you to go back to the presentation slide with the timeline? We were expecting the completion of the tunnel boring analysis by December 2009. If you decide to move ahead with these particular studies, they will have a total report in January 2010. Is it about a month difference?
- D. Failing: We are actually ahead of that December 2009 date. We plan to have the report on the tunneling itself in November 2009. That report will only contain the geotechnical issues. The difference is actually about a couple months.
- Lee Dolley: Without giving prejudice to our letter, I would say that the schedule is compact and that is a good thing.
- Paul Habib: I would like to concur with both Supervisors Antonovich and Molina in their positions that we [the Committee] were given a simple charge. The charge was to explain to the community that we were going to look at whether tunneling was feasible or not. All of these things are important to look into but that is not what we communicated to the community. That is not what was communicated to us. There is a real concern that we are changing gears at the last minute. We are about being transparent. This has always been a controversial issue. That is why route neutrality is a big part of this. Changing gears does not make any sense in maintaining a transparent process and the simple concept of this Committee. If they want to look at that in the future, that can be discussed. For now, Councilmember Huizar joins in opposing changing the scope of this task force.
- Mike Ten: You received the City of South Pasadena's letter, which is very extensive and asks a lot of questions. The City of South Pasadena awaits answers to our letter to Caltrans, knowing that we will get those answers prior to you



Steering & Technical Committee Joint Meeting Minutes
SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study
August 4, 2009 4:00 p.m.
San Marino Center
Final Draft



making a decision about whether to move forward or not. Is that right? Will we get a response to the questions in our letter to Caltrans prior to someone making a decision?

D. Failing: The letter was very extensive and I am going to do my best. Certainly, we will be in correspondence with you on the status of the response. I am not sure how quickly we can arrive to an answer on some of the issues. That is our intent at this point; however, I am not sure how long it will take to answer each of the questions.

Mike Ten: I think a response is important for the City of South Pasadena to make that decision. The roles of the Steering Committee were shown in the presentation. South Pasadena has always been concerned about the role of the Steering Committee. It can be simply put that the Committee is either steering or a passenger. I would hope that the Steering Committee is not just a passenger in this procedure and controls where the study is going.

Stephen Del Guercio: La Cañada Flintridge also sent an extensive letter, which we hope to have a detailed response to. I think it is important to look back and determine how we got here. There was an original feasibility study performed by Metro. At the end of that study, there was a lot of criticism that it was not really a feasibility study, that the public was not involved, and that very few determinations were made, in terms of this project, in various areas. There were many questions about the study. It went to the Metro Board, who said before we spend what would clearly be \$50 million on an environmental study, if Mr. Failing's numbers are correct from a couple of years ago, more should be done. That was in line with Congressman Schiff's funding and his comments. He sent in a letter dated July 16th, which all of you should read if you have not. His letter stated that something more should be done, the public should be involved, and there needed to be more trust in this process that the information provided to the decision makers is accurate information and has been properly vetted with the public and through the process. When we met as a Steering Committee for the first time, it was the first step of the process. Part of that, was defining what we were going to be doing at this point. What Caltrans said they were prepared to do with the consensus of committee was to have a limited geotechnical study as a first step. We have gone through a deliberate process to do that. We do not have conclusions yet, which is ironic considering that we are here discussing the next step before we have a conclusion for what the study is. That was the first step. I do not believe that when we get to the end of this study, the Metro Board will have enough information to make a decision to spend that type of money, particularly in these economic times, in terms of going forward with the environmental study. I do not necessarily think this is the end of the road



Steering & Technical Committee Joint Meeting Minutes
SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study
August 4, 2009 4:00 p.m.
San Marino Center
Final Draft



for this process, but it is a completion of the first step. From that, there should be discussion and review of what the appropriate next step is. There are other important areas of the study that I thought that we could do good work as a Committee; study those areas and build confidence, consensus, and trust from the public by working together. I do not think it is the end of the road for the Committee but the end of step one. Where do we go from here? I would like the opportunity to have that discussion. I personally do not think that the way we are going about it with Task Order No. 5 and to rush to complete the study, and to include a bunch of items at the conceptual level is appropriate. I do think there is an opportunity to say “what is the next step?” Shall we look at cost considerations? Many important things have come out of these public meetings. People do want answers to all of these questions. I would think that the Metro Board would want to have answers to those questions in terms of cost considerations or alternatives or impacts before they go and spend all of this money on an environmental study because that is not necessarily a good way to build public confidence. That is a legal document that is going to get many people riled up and there is a lot of controversy if we jump off in that direction and abandon the collaborative process.

Richard Gutschow: The proposed draft of Task Order No. 5 came between two meetings, the Technical Advisory Committee meeting and the Steering Committee meeting. I feel left out of situation. It was not planned correctly. The timing was off. It should have been the focus of both committee meetings. What are missing from this project schedule are the tasks associated with Task Order No. 5. I am curious about the project schedule. One where you show the geotechnical studies along with the proposed studies. You show the summary report, which is at the bottom of the schedule. What is it the summary report for? What studies follow that and depend upon that? Those should be on the schedule. We should be aware of your long-term plan for this particular project.

Edel Vizcarra: We have a route neutral study and you are proposing to analyze the air quality, noise, and traffic impacts. If there is no specific route, how are these studies supposed to represent what is actually going to happen when the tunnel is constructed?

D. Failing: The studies could not possibly do so. That is why the proposed studies would be conducted at a very cursory level. We can assess what the traffic might generally be, which can allow us to assess roughly what the air quality may be. However at such time, there is full acknowledgement that there would have to be a very detailed study in an environmental document before making decisions about whether this is a project or not yet. There is no commitment to move forward with that process.



Steering & Technical Committee Joint Meeting Minutes
SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study
August 4, 2009 4:00 p.m.
San Marino Center
Final Draft



- Edel Vizcarra: If the reason we are moving forward with this study is to answer constituent questions, these results are going to be rather vague. Should we not wait until we have an actual environmental document, so that when we go back to them our answers are valid?
- D. Failing: We can answer their questions to a certain extent but it is not going to be a finite answer until you really spend the money and complete an environmental document. Task Order No. 5 was an attempt on our part to address a series of questions within a limited manner. The input we hear now needs to go back to the Metro Board and others who need to weigh in on that.
- Nicholas Conway: When we started this effort a year ago, we discussed the scope of the study and the specific tasks and trying to match that with the budget. When those discussions were occurring, I remember there was quite a bit of concern expressed by all parties that the budget was not sufficient to address all of the issues associated with this study. Because of those discussions, we moved forward with a scope that allocated the identified budget that we had at that time. I thought that the project schedule was designed to capture the scope for that budget. Now we are talking about a completely new level of effort. I am curious about where the additional money is coming from. Will the money that is spent be cost effective, given the resources that we have devoted thus far? Will it be sufficient in terms of any payback that would be the value added once those tasks are completed?
- D. Failing: The cursory look at items would be within the original allocated budget. We will not be asking for additional money at this time. The value of these items would not be to a point that they are considered environmental documents. The questions that we perceive from the public are if we can generally quantify what these answers may be and what these items might look at. Task Order No. 5 is an attempt to answer those questions. Cost effectiveness is in the eye of the beholder and some people may say that there is no value, when other people would find value to it. I think that I will reserve on answering the rest of your questions until we get input from everyone else. What I am hearing clearly is that there is a desire for the Metro Board to weigh in before the next step.
- Nicholas Conway: I speak for one member of the Metro Board, John Fasana, who represents the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments. His sentiments support those of Supervisors Molina, Antonovich and Councilmember Huizar.
- R. Barrantes: Are there any other comments from the Committee?



Steering & Technical Committee Joint Meeting Minutes
SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study
August 4, 2009 4:00 p.m.
San Marino Center
Final Draft



Recap and Committee Recommendations: R. Barrantes, Community Facilitation Team

Ms. Barrantes then provided a summary of the comments from the Committee, asking that if others had additional comments to contribute, they could share them. She asked for clear recommendations from Committee. She re-capped Committee comments to ensure that they represent this correctly:

- We heard that we should complete the current scope of study before going to next steps and that Metro should weigh in on what those next steps are.
- We also heard that we should not change gears from what we are currently studying.
- We are awaiting formal comment from Caltrans to all of your questions, including the City of South Pasadena and the City of La Canada Flintridge.
- Councilmember Del Guercio reviewed the Committee consensus process and how we reached this point in the Study. He asked us to complete this step [the current Study] and based on that decide, what the next steps are and if we need more studies before we proceed to an environmental report.
- Katherine Padilla also noted that the Committee raised the issue of cost effectiveness. She reiterated concerns about whether the cursory study would provide the level of detail that will help decision-making and if so, if it was the best use of money.

Lee Dolley:

This is the first time that I have seen a proposal that a committee be part of decision making for an environmental process. This is an advisory board. An advisory board is intended to provide input to be considered by decision makers, who then will complete an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Perhaps some of this information can get into an EIR and it may be appropriate that it should. The voice here representing the public should be heard. Clearly during the EIR process, there is a huge window for that. That window is when the EIR will be circulated and will generate thousands of comments, as I am sure this one will. Litigation has always been the highest degree of threat for all of this. It has been used for years. It is now pending. Think carefully about whether Caltrans and Metro want to do the things they are discussing to get a good project and look at it all the way, or whether it is do not ever do it. I want to say that politely but do not know how to say that other than directly.

[Mr. Dolley was asked to provide further clarification.]

There is an environmental process, by law, by which this project and any other project must go through. There is an opportunity at that time for members of the public and elected officials to make comments in the EIR



Steering & Technical Committee Joint Meeting Minutes
SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study
August 4, 2009 4:00 p.m.
San Marino Center
Final Draft



when it is evaluated. It is my recommendation that this is not a deciding body, but a recommending body. Mr. Failing has asked for letters on a very important issue regarding whether or not these particular studies should go forward. I would like to say on behalf of the people here that have been waiting a long time that we want no delay. I first touched this issue in 1971 and that is before a lot of you guys were born. These have always been subject to litigation and we want to do this right. I do not see a committee doing that right. I see the professionals doing that right. CH2M Hill is a great firm and they will do a great job. There is litigation pending at this moment.

Nicholas Conway: Can we get a breakdown of man hours and level of effort required to complete this next level of work, so as you move forward in collecting data we can see the cost of that and weigh it relative to the perceived benefit?

D. Failing: Absolutely. I have asked Abdi Saghaifi to get this information together so we can email that to Steering and Technical Advisory Committee members tomorrow.

Nicholas Conway: Just so we are clear, that would provide a line item by each one of these tasks (not the task level, but the summary activity/function level). We would know for example, for public communications or air quality, how many hours are proposed. Then we could know the level of effort needed in each of these communities for gathering additional information and the costs associated with that level of effort.

D. Failing: Abdi Saghaifi will provide you the greatest level of detail available.

Mike Cano: It is very important to understand that when this process started we did not have Measure R or \$750 million dedicated to this project. One of the major concerns that the Metro Board did have, concerning moving forward into any environmental stage was that we did not have a dedicated source of funding to even consider it, so this was an appropriate step. I want to make sure that is reflected in the minutes that the funding dynamic has changed tremendously from when we first started this task and it is important for Metro Board to consider that in making their decisions.

Eugene Sun: I would like to commend the Sierra Group and CH2M Hill for a job well done. Questions from community need to be addressed. Whether they are addressed through Task Order No. 5, or other measures, I hope that I speak on behalf of the council when I say that the City of San Marino will support the study either way as long as the issues raised by the community are addressed.



Steering & Technical Committee Joint Meeting Minutes
SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study
August 4, 2009 4:00 p.m.
San Marino Center
Final Draft



Mike Ten: What is the point of order when you say that you are looking for letters from each group? What do you mean by group?

D. Failing: The Committee is structured of representatives of individual supervisors, the Council of Governments (COG) and a variety of cities. For example, South Pasadena would be a city, and Councilmember Huizar represents the City of Los Angeles. I would defer to each of you if you wish to send one. You would need to discuss whether you are sending one for the Technical Advisory Committee representative and/or the Steering Committee representative. I am assuming that most of you would send one letter jointly. I would like to add that this Committee is an advisory committee, hence this is not a Brown Act meeting and we do not have a public comment period during these meetings. It is very important that we hear from you, the Technical Advisory Committee and Steering Committee as we are going forward through this process. At the request of many at our first joint meeting, these meetings are open to the public and I would not want the public to think that they cannot weigh in and send a letter as individuals, but I do have that one specific request to our members on the Committee.

Rebecca Barrantes continued to review input received from the Committee during the meeting and facilitated a discussion regarding action items. The Committee is asked to send the letters to Doug Failing by August 11, 2009 to: 100 S. Main Street, Los Angeles CA 90012. One request brought up earlier in the meeting was highlighted: the desire to include the long-term overall schedule for the task order and for the entire study (not only expanded scope studies). Ms. Barrantes asked a series of questions of Doug Failing regarding action items resulting from the meeting.

R. Barrantes: Can the letters coming from the cities regarding their position on Task Order No. 5 be submitted before Caltrans formally responds to their comments?

D. Failing: Yes, they certainly can. Many of the issues communicated in the letters by the cities go beyond simply whether they support or do not support the task order. I would like to highlight that issue in discussion with a number of people as we move forward in the very near future. I would like to begin to take that on immediately. The other issues are equally important and will be responded to but I think we can pull that issue out and respond to it separately.

R. Barrantes: Is August 11th a feasible due date for the letters from each group?

D. Failing: Yes this date is fine for letters to me; however I am not going to guarantee an answer back from Caltrans by August 17th.



Steering & Technical Committee Joint Meeting Minutes
SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study
August 4, 2009 4:00 p.m.
San Marino Center
Final Draft



- R. Barrantes: The next item is linked to cost effectiveness in relation to Task Order No. 5 and the level of effort needed. We will provide the Committees a breakdown of anticipated man-hours by task, costs of associated elements, and a grand total.
- Eugene Sun: Can you list the cities that you hope to receive a letter from by August 11th?
- D. Failing: They are South Pasadena, San Marino, Alhambra, Monterey Park, Pasadena, La Canada Flintridge, San Gabriel, Glendale, the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments, the City of Los Angeles through the Councilmember Jose Huizar's office, SCAG, Metro, and anyone else that I have missed. I think that I got them all.
- Mike Ten: Weren't comments originally due on July 21st? Then they were due at the end of July 27th. Yet, we are still talking about this now.
- D. Failing: What we are talking about now is a very specific letter regarding Task Order No. 5. Many people may have used the previous requests for comments as an opportunity to comment on the technical issues contained in the Task Order. We want your input regarding whether to pursue Task Order No. 5 provided in a letter.
- Most cities sent a copy of their individual letter to all of the members on the Committee. I will direct staff to double check and make sure we send out a copy of every letter received to the Steering and Technical Advisory Committee. We will address our responses directly to those cities and agencies that we have received the letter from but will also copy the Committee members. I assume we will send an informal letter to all Committee members regarding what is going to happen with Task Order No. 5.
- Nick Conway: Will Caltrans be the determining agency? Who has the authority to make what decisions at key points in time? Is it Caltrans, Metro, the Steering Committee, or the Technical Advisory Committee? I would like to clarify roles and responsibilities and make sure that they are consistent with those that were articulated at the start of this process.
- D. Failing: The Technical Advisory Committee is very much an advisory committee. We are looking for the Steering Committee to provide guidance on how to steer the study. I think it has been made very clear that the decisions will be made by Caltrans and Metro on proceeding with issues related to the contract. This was a big issue on getting people to volunteer on the committees and there was a concern that the decisions are being made by



Steering & Technical Committee Joint Meeting Minutes
SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study
August 4, 2009 4:00 p.m.
San Marino Center
Final Draft



Caltrans and Metro. We really value the input of our Steering and Technical Advisory Committees.

Summary of Next Steps:

Katherine Padilla summarized the due dates related to official comments regarding the proposed task order. She reminded attendees that everyone on the Committee would be copied on all letters received. She also highlighted the following milestones:

- August 5, 2009- Caltrans has committed to provide Committee members with the big picture of this whole process and next steps, as well as a breakdown of man hours for tasks related to Task Order No. 5.
- August 11, 2009- Letters from all cities communicating how they feel about Task Order No. 5 are due.
- August 17, 2009- Caltrans will provide responses to the letters it receives from the cities.

In closing, Ms. Padilla stated that once these milestones are completed, Caltrans and Metro will decide how to proceed regarding Task Order No. 5 and will communicate that to Committee members.

Mike Cano: Is the schedule going to include the no action alternative if Task Order No. 5 does not go forward?

D. Failing: We will definitely make sure that it is there.

R. Barrantes: I do not think that we have arrived to the point where we have topics for next meeting. We will let you know as soon as we have something to bring to you to discuss. [She then asked Mr. Failing when the next meeting will be.]

D. Failing: I am anticipating that we will be ready in October for another meeting to address what we have gone over today. We will have a chance to make some decisions, communicate those decisions, and solicit feedback from them. We will have a list of suggestions for agenda items at the next meeting.

Mike Ten: From the two non-decision making boards that are here today, I think I only saw 1.5 opinions to go forward with Task Order No. 5. Am I correct?



Steering & Technical Committee Joint Meeting Minutes
SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study
August 4, 2009 4:00 p.m.
San Marino Center
Final Draft



D. Failing: We are going to wait until we count the letters received. My perception is that there is an overwhelming majority concerned about proceeding ahead with Task Order No. 5.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:45 PM.