Steering Committee DRAFT Meeting Minutes
SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study
June 25, 2009 - 6:00 p.m.
South Pasadena Public Library Community Room
1100 Oxley Street, South Pasadena, California

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:15 pm.

II. INTRODUCTIONS AND MEETING OVERVIEW

The following people attended the meeting:

SC Members:	**Absent/No Alternate Present:**
Naresh Amatya, Manager of Transportation Planning, Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Lynda Bybee, Deputy Executive Officer of Regional Communications, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) Stephen A. Del Guercio, Councilmember, City of La Cañada Flintridge Lee Dolley, City Representative, City of Alhambra Philip C. Putnam, Councilmember, City of South Pasadena Eugene Sun, Mayor, City of San Marino Edel Vizcarra, Planning and Transportation Deputy, Office City of Los Angeles Councilmember Jose Huizar, 14th District David Worrell, Representative, City of Pasadena **SC Member Alternates Present:** Steven Placido, Vice Mayor, City of Alhambra (Alternate for Lee Dolly) Subodh Kumar, IFMA Fellow, Representative, City of Pasadena (Alternate for David Worrell) Ms. Suzanne Manriquez, Senior Field Deputy, Office of Los Angeles County Supervisor, Gloria Molina, 1st District (Alternate for Nicole Englund, Transportation Deputy)	Michael Cano, Transportation Deputy, Office of Los Angeles County Supervisor, Michael D. Antonovich, 5th District Borja Leon, P.E., Transportation Policy Analyst, Office of the Mayor of Los Angeles Robert Urteaga, Mayor Pro Tem, San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments Stephen Zurn, Director of Public Works, City of Glendale **Elected Officials:** Suzanne Jimenez, Field Deputy, Office of Councilmember Ed P. Reyes, 1st Council District Yvonne Hsu, District Representative, Office of Congressman Adam Schiff, U.S House of Representatives, 29th District Casey Lo, Field Representative, Office of Senator Carol Liu, 21st District Elizabeth Garcia, Field Representative, Assemblymember Anthony Portantino, 44th District

Caltrans District 7 Staff:	**Technical Consultants:**
Abdi Saghafi, Project Manager	Yoga Chandran, Technical Lead Engineer, CH2M HILL
Deborah Harris, Chief, Media Relations & Public Affairs	Steve Klein, GE, PE, Tunnel Structure Lead, Jacobs Associates
Pratheep Piratheepan, Geotechnical Lead Design Unit, Caltrans District 7	Ramon Chavez, Senior Geologist, CH2M HILL
John Ehsan, Geotechnical Design (South)	
Garret Damrath, Senior Planner	
Community Facilitation Consultants:	
Rebecca Barrantes, The Sierra Group	
Ed Salcedo, GCAP Services	
Glenda Silva, The Sierra Group	
Alma Villegas, The Sierra Group	
Rena Salcedo, GCAP Services	
Debbie Rusas, GCAP Services	
Claudia Gonzalez, GCAP Services	
Katherine Padilla, KP&A	
Thelma Herrera, KP&A	
John Limon, KP&A	

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

The meeting started at approximately 6:15 p.m.

Welcome: Abdi Saghafi, Project Manager, Caltrans District 7

Abdi Saghafi, Project Manager Caltrans District 7, opened the meeting by explaining that Mr. Doug Failing, Caltrans District 7 Director, could not attend the meeting and that he is representing him during the meeting. He welcomed the Steering Committee (SC) members and other attendees. Introductions of SC members (or alternates), Caltrans staff, consultants, representatives of elected officials and additional guests followed shortly.

Mr. Saghafi proceeded to explain that after receiving feedback from several community meetings and elected official briefings, Caltrans decided to expand the scope of the Study to address community member concerns about the geotechnical feasibility study. He highlighted that elected officials such as Assemblymember Anthony Portantino expressed that they wanted Caltrans to do more within the Study. A copy of the draft Task Order #5, outlining the additional analyses, was provided to the SC at the meeting, and they were informed that it will be discussed later in the meeting. Mr. Saghafi added that the expansion of the scope is effective immediately.

Meeting Overview: R. Barrantes, Community Facilitation Team

Rebecca Barrantes reminded all attendees to sign-in in order to record their participation as well as provide updates or corrections for the roster. She provided a summary of the meeting purpose, which was to: describe outreach that has been conducted since the last meeting; review the exploration program efforts, data collected and geologic conditions for every zone within the Study area; and to discuss the Committee and public process for review of the summary report and next steps. Ms. Barrantes also briefly reviewed the purpose of the SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study and the guiding principles before turning the meeting over to Yoga Chandran, CH2M Hill Technical Lead Engineer, who presented the exploration activities to date.

Exploration Program Update and Data Analysis: Yoga Chandran, CH2M Hill Team

Mr. Chandram provided the Committee with an overview of the exploration program performed in the five designated zones and reviewed the exploration plan objectives, which were to: investigate five potential zones, collect geotechnical, geological and hydro-geological information for each zone, and to use this information for screening purposes. He then reviewed the Exploration Summary chart, showing the number of borings, seismic reflection, and surface wave lines completed to date by zone. An update was also provided regarding review and evaluations performed on existing data within the five zones, including the Superfund sites, as well as the new data collected through borings, seismic surveys and survey waves completed. It was noted by Mr. Chandran, that the existing information reviewed and evaluated allowed a reduction in the total number of proposed borings, as highlighted in the presentation. An example given was the existing information for the San Gabriel Basin, which was available from a number of studies completed by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (federal) and Los Angeles Department of Water Resources.

Specific exploration activities for the Study were provided, and included:

- Contaminated ground water sites for affected Zones 1, 4 and 5 along with status of containment and/or clean-up process.
- Current boring status including number of borings (25) completed, number of vertical and inclined drillings completed (1), and boring depths and numbers of borings (22) converted to piezometers.
- Four types of in-situ testing performed for the borings to measure strength and stress-strain properties in all types of soil and rock.
- Types of material identified in core samples from Zone 1, 2, 3, and 4 borings.
- Total number of geophysical tests completed to date: 17 Seismic Reflection Lines and 79 Surface Wave Lines.

Mr. Chandran also provided a review of the geotechnical factors that affect tunneling and specifically discussed these factors for the five zones in the Study area. A detailed cross-section was shown of each zone to discuss the geotechnical factors in relation to the findings from the data collected. For an overview of these findings, a summary table was provided, breaking down the findings by the following factors: predominant geologic formations, the number and percent of geologic formations, the number of reported/mapped faults, the number of active faults, the potential for gassy conditions and the number of superfund sites. He also reported that the team has been using all the available data collected to evaluate the existing subsurface conditions for the preliminary findings/evaluation report. Mr. Chandran ended his presentation by going over the current project timeline and the project's next steps.

Finally, Mr. Chandran informed the SC that they had been provided with a Draft Outline of the Geotechnical Summary Report. The SC was asked to review the report after the meeting and provide comments and suggestions. Lastly, Mr. Chandran went over the next steps, which were to begin comparisons of subsurface conditions between zones and begin the Geological Summary Report.

<u>Questions, Answers, and Comments following the presentation:</u>

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

Philip Putnam: I do not have any questions regarding the results reported during presentation. Can you report on comments made by the Technical Advisory Committee? Did they have any issues with the exploration program results?

Y. Chandran: The TAC expressed that they want the report to be presented in a simplified manner so it is easy to understand and read. They want the data to be presented by discussing the constraints without making any conclusions. They want the committee and Caltrans to come up with their own conclusions without our interpretation of the data.

R. Barrantes: The TAC wanted to know what this all means in terms of tunneling and tunnel conditions. The TAC requested the information to be put in non-technical terms and felt the exploration program and testing was thorough, and the Study Outline was fairly complete. They also requested a Glossary of Terms because of the technical language in the presentation.

Steve Worrell: I did not have enough time to review the Study Outline because the email sent contained a large file and could not be opened.

Stephen Del Guercio: As you move forward and continue analyzing the data and preparing the draft report, will this draft then go to the TAC and the SC? If so, I ask that it is communicated to the members well in advance because we have consultants and people who need to analyze it. We also have our constituents and public process where we have to meet to discuss the report. I would ask for due time consideration for circulation of the report to obtain meaningful input from SC and TAC. The turnaround time for comments depends on the scope of the report and the level of analysis but it takes a couple of weeks for our council to review the report.

R. Barrantes: Yoga, what is the timeline for receiving comments?

Y. Chandran: We will discuss with Caltrans their expected timeline to receive comments. We want to make sure everyone has enough time to review it.

Naresh Amatya: Based on technical activities, are you able to conclude anything about alignments?

Y. Chandran: At this point, we are only gathering facts and have not been able to eliminate alignments.

Lee Dolley: Send out the report in a hardcopy before you send it electronically. The glossary should be expanded to include more terms.

Suzanne Manriquez: Will the report be made available to the public and at what point? The public needs enough time to review the report before a public meeting.

A. Saghafi: The report will go to Caltrans and Metro for review, then to SC and TAC. Comments received will be incorporated and that version will be put on the website for the public to review.

Stephen Del Guercio: Was Task Order #5 provided previously to anyone or is this the first time the document has been released?

A. Saghafi: This is the first time you are receiving this. The TAC has not seen this yet and we were directed by Mr. Failing, our District Director, to show the SC before the TAC. We were given until July 7 to receive input on the task order. We are going to ask you to review and provide comments by July 7 to stay on schedule.

Stephen Del Guercio: Next weekend is July 4th and July 7th is not enough time to provide you with any input. This is a significant change and this will take some analysis and comment.

A. Saghafi: As we proceed with the draft report, you will have a chance to continue to provide input. You will have the opportunity after July 7th, but we would like to see your input sooner.

Phillip Putnam: I concur completely with Mr. Del Guercio. At our first Steering Committee meeting, we agreed that we were not going to do traffic studies and now they are going to be done without our previous approval. There was consensus that we would not be looking at traffic, air quality, noise and other issues, and now we are. How did the scope of this study get changed, with none of us having agreed to it?

A. Saghafi: We went out to the community and at every community, town hall meeting, and council meeting, we were told we are not doing enough. We were also told by elected officials such as Assemblymember Portantino that the scope needed to be expanded so that we could include such studies to make this a true feasibility study. [Mr. Saghafi asked Ms. Garcia from Assemblymember Portantino's office to comment on this issue]

Elizabeth Garcia: The Assemblymember and I are not aware of the expanded scope and did not request that this be done. According to Assemblymember Portantino, this is not a feasibility study and his intention was not to go out and make this a feasibility study. The Assemblyman asked Caltrans to correctly state that this was not a true tunnel feasibility study and did not request that they embark on one. How are you going to have a report by September, which is your timeline?

A. Saghafi: We did respond to Mr. Portantino's letter request and we can provide a copy of the letter where he asked for the scope to be expanded.

Phillip Putnam: During a Metro meeting there were restrictions placed on this Study. Your expanded scope falls under this restriction. I take exception to this and you will not have our support if you proceed with this. What does Metro have to say about this? How did the scope of this study get changed without any of us agreeing to it?

Lynda Bybee: I recall the vote to move ahead with the geotechnical survey but I am not sure if restrictions were in place.

Stephen Del Guercio: Going back to the first SC meeting where the scope was discussed, we were concerned about what a feasibility study was. We need to be clear about the definition of feasibility and about the costs and benefits on a macro level to know how this affects my community.

This addition is a sweeping scope. I do not see how you can embark on this and complete the scope in the timeframe you have in a meaningful way. This has to be done in the proper manner so we have confidence that the scope answers the questions our communities are asking.

R. Barrantes: Let us take the time to review the document and what it contains before we have a discussion about it.

A. Saghafi: We need to have a schedule and time frame to complete this study and this is why we offered July 7th. By simply looking at the Task Order, what is the proper time frame that we will need to get input from you?

Stephen Del Guercio: We have not taken a good look at the document and we need time to review it and reflect on it.

R. Barrantes: Let us review the document in detail, by task, to help you with the context of the document for comment.

Y. Chadran: Caltrans expanded the scope because during our outreach, community members have asked questions about traffic, pollution, and traffic patterns. The additional scope would provide answers to these questions.

David Worrell: Are we now taking a geotechnical study that was originally to be conducted by CH2M HILL and having them conduct traffic studies? Why would we want CH2M HILL to do traffic evaluation related studies for us?

There are an awful lot of firms here that have experience with traffic models and work in this field. I do not have a problem with this work, but I do not see any logic in the way we are going to do it. One example is Subtask 2, Traffic Evaluation. Why are we not looking at these pieces and

having some of this work done by people who have been doing it for 20 to 30 years? If we are doing this work, why are we not asking the best firm to do this?

Y. Chandran: Both CH2M HILL and Caltrans have the expertise to conduct these traffic studies and possess over 20-30 years of experience. We are also bringing in very qualified experts to help us.

David Worrell: Is everything on the Task Order new?

Y. Chandran: Yes, it was not part of the geotechnical study.

R. Barrantes: These task orders were part of the original scope and were not authorized before. Now they are being considered.

Edel Vizcarra: We have a number of neighborhood councils in our district that we have to go back to and inform about this report. How are we going to explain that you are now also doing traffic, air, and noise studies, if you have not finished the geotechnical studies to determine if tunneling is feasible in the study area?

Y. Chandran: The studies will help in the comparison and refinement of alignments to see if they make logical sense.

David Worrell: Are you going to do this five times?

Y. Chandran: Yes.

Lee Dolley: Are we being asked to look at this [Task Order #5] document and provide comments on this draft and return them to you? I think that we [SC] are able to quickly do this because many of these studies have already been done by Metro or SCAG or regional agencies.

Y. Chandran: Yes.

[Yoga proceeded to review the document task by task for the SC]

Edel Vizcarra: Are there any zones that could be eliminated based on the data collected?

Y. Chandran: None have been excluded at this point.

Suzanne Manriquez: What is the estimated additional cost to expand the scope to include these other tasks?

Y. Chandran: $1 million.

Stephen Del Guercio: What do you mean by done at a "conceptual level"? What is the appropriate level of detail to make a decision once you have meaningful information? Is the scope of work that you are proposing really going to do that? It' is not possible to obtain meaningful data in your timeframe for all of the new tasks for $1 million.

Phillip Putnam: Who makes the decision about moving forward with the expanded scope? What if the SC would say unanimously that we did not want to expand the scope and want to go back to the original scope? Who is going to make the decision about moving forward or not? Is this decision made by Caltrans or MTA?

A.Saghafi: The decision has been made to expand the scope. It has been approved.

Lynda Bybee: We have some important process decisions that need to be addressed and further discussion is required. As the Steering Committee you might want to make some recommendations on how to address this tonight.

Phillip Putnam: Comments received from SC should be circulated to the entire committee and we should have enough time to provide our responses and reconvene. We have been fairly unanimous in our decisions until now, we had consensus that we would only conduct a geotechnical study and this needs further discussion.

Lee Dolley: Are we only being asked to do comment on the new scope?

A.Saghafi: Yes.

Edel Vizcarra: Will the public have a chance to comment?

A.Saghafi: The committees represent the community members and the summary report outline document will not be released to the public for comment.

Edel Vizcarra: We need some time to take this back to the community and neighborhood councils to give you meaningful comments.

Stephen Del Guercio: I also want to share that there are other unrepresented groups that would really like to participate in this [SC Committee]. La Crescenta Valley Town Council was concerned about the Study and felt that they needed to be included in the process.

R. Barrantes: We provided a presentation to the La Crescenta Valley Town Council and they were invited to attend community meetings.

A. Saghafi: Note that the public told us they wanted these studies.

R. Barrantes: This is a good transition to report on the comments received during the community meetings held. We held nine community meetings with over 600 people in attendance. The public asked many questions that could only be answered during an environmental phase.

Most of the questions were concerning, tunnel design, portals, traffic, cost benefit, and impacts to neighborhoods. Other questions were concerning reasoning for tunnel option, traffic studies that support tunnel idea, and start of EIR process

[Ms. Barrantes reviewed the emerging themes from the meetings (See PowerPoint Presentation for emerging themes)]

Member of Public: All of these questions were asked and Doug Failing told us these could be answered during an EIR. My understanding is that Metro precluded you to use funding for other studies besides geotechnical. How can you address this if you are precluded from funding for and EIR? Go back to the MTA to request funding for an EIR instead of Caltrans deciding on their own to expand the scope of this work.

Lynda Bybee: I think there are process issues and definitions that need to be addressed that raise important questions about the conceptual look at these studies before an EIR.

Stephen Del Guercio: It is out of sync to move forward with the next steps if we do not have conclusions about the geotechnical study.

R. Barrantes: I think the consensus from SC is that we give everyone enough time to review the expanded scope of work and provide TAC a copy of scope. We can take this back to Mr. Failing and we will get back to you with the timing of when we are going to need these comments and be able to meet with you and discuss them. We will also discuss how comments will be addressed and if the public process will change now that the scope has been expanded. Clarification is needed on each task item that is being proposed.

Eugene Sun**:** I suggest that Mr. Failing attend the next meeting.

R. Barrantes: Mr. Failing had a family emergency and really wanted to be here but could not. At the next meeting we will discuss the draft geotechnical study report outline comments received from SC and TAC and Task Order No. 5. We will send out an email with information about the process for review of Task No. 5 and the next meeting date. Both Committees will be receiving Task Order No. 5 for review and we will circulate comments between Committees for their information and review.

Meeting was adjourned at 7:44 PM.