

APPENDIX G.2
Elected Officials

Review Comments and Responses

Project Name: SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study QC Reviewer: **Assembly member, Anthony J. Portantino** Date: 11-18-09

Project Phase: Task Order No.4 –Geotechnical Report Project Number: 378312.04 Sheet: 1 of 1

I.D. No.	Section/ Page No.	Reviewer Comments	Responses
1	ES-1, 1-1, 1-4, and 2-3	The draft Geotechnical Summary Report SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study makes several erroneous references to the 2006 Parsons Study as a “feasibility study”. After its completion, the Parson’s study was correctly re-labeled a “fatal flaw analysis” by representatives of SCAG and MTA. At a minimum, the Geotechnical study should refrain from validating a document that has been universally discredited.	The title of the final 2006 report is: <i>Route 710 Tunnel Technical Feasibility Assessment Report</i> . Reference to the 2006 Metro assessment in this study is consistent with the title of the 2006 report. We have included a statement in Section 1.2.2 of the geotechnical summary report stating that “this feasibility assessment was considered as a fatal flaw analysis”.
2	1-4	...a reference is made...that states “The scope of the previous Metro study included technical, operational, and financial feasibility in addition to geotechnical feasibility.” In fact the Parsons study goes to great lengths to qualify its own findings as insufficient, cursory, preliminary and in need of significant further review. It also has as one of its most blatant flaws a lack of any complete financial analysis.	The scope of the 2006 report as discussed in this study is consistent with that stated in the final 2006 Metro assessment. We have included a statement in Section 1.2.2 of the geotechnical summary report stating that “this feasibility assessment was considered as a fatal flaw analysis”.

Review Comments and Responses

Project Name: SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study QC Reviewer: **City of Glendale Mayor, Frank Quintero** Date: 12-09-09

Project Phase: Task Order No.4 -Geotechnical Report Project Number: 378312.04 Sheet: 1 of 1

I.D. No.	Section/ Page No.	Reviewer Comments	Responses
1		Submitted letter on behalf of the City of Glendale in opposition to the "SR-710 tunnel alternative or gap closure alternative." Does not believe that any gap closure is in the best interest of the City and the region. Suggested other alternatives to address traffic concerns such as expansion of mass transit systems, upgrades and improvements to existing infrastructure and limiting long distance movement of cargo/freight from the ports to only rail. Thanked Caltrans for the opportunity to comment on Draft Geotechnical Summary Report.	Comment noted. It is not within the scope of the Geotechnical Summary Report.

CAPITOL OFFICE
STATE CAPITOL
P.O. BOX 942849
SACRAMENTO, CA 94249-0044
(916) 319-2044
FAX (916) 319-2144

DISTRICT OFFICE
215 N MARENGO AVENUE
SUITE 115
PASADENA, CA 91101
(626) 577-9944
FAX (626) 577-2868

Assembly California Legislature



STANDING COMMITTEES
CHAIR, HIGHER EDUCATION
GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION
PUBLIC SAFETY
TRANSPORTATION

ANTHONY J. PORTANTINO
ASSEMBLYMEMBER, FORTY-FOURTH DISTRICT

November 18, 2009

Abdi Saghafi
MS#2 Program and Project Management
Caltrans, District 7
100 S. Main Street, Suite 100
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Saghafi:

Thank you for the work that you and your team have done to review the soils, groundwater and seismic conditions contained in the scope of the SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study. I was pleased to see that you ceased referring to this limited study as an evaluation of the project's feasibility. I am hopeful that this type of straightforward approach can continue to be fostered if the decision is made to move forward. As I have stated from the beginning of this study, it is imperative that winning back the public's trust must be a top priority of all parties involved in the process. The clear understanding of the results of this study, how the report will be used, and the decision making process as it moves forward are integral to that goal.

In reviewing the draft report, obtaining expert and public input on the report and the future actions that will follow become ever more important in my estimation. Unfortunately, the process and timeline for input on the draft report seem to appear somewhat confusing at this juncture. I think it is important for the community to understand how the groupings and locations of the public meetings were chosen. While I can appreciate that you would like to consolidate some of these public review meetings, it appears that communities were grouped together based on their overall support or opposition to a potential tunnel option. Moreover, the Steering Committee, which is largely comprised of elected officials and their representatives, are required to provide input on the report prior to their opportunity to hear from the community members to whom they are accountable. Again, I point to the importance of winning back the public's trust and the overriding importance that such an aim should be central to all of these types of decisions. A strong suggestion for the integrity of the process would be to afford each affected city the opportunity to present this report to its residents in order to allow Steering Committee members to accurately reflect the reaction of his or her constituents prior to commenting on the report.

It is still unclear as to what will be done with this report once it has been made final. Whenever I or my staff has asked, or hear the question asked, of who will make the decision as to what will be done with this study and how it will be used to determine the next course of action, the answer has been that it will be decided by Caltrans with some possible input by the Metro Board of

Representing Cities

Altadena, Arcadia, Duarte, East Pasadena, La Cañada Flintridge, Los Angeles, Mayflower Village, Monrovia, Pasadena, South Pasadena, and Temple City



Printed on Recycled Paper

Directors. It is necessary for Caltrans to be transparent about exactly what decisions it plans on making and what factors will be considered in how it will make them. I truly believe that there is an absence of understanding throughout the region as to what will happen once this report becomes final. There continues to be two key pieces of information that most policy makers would like to know before moving a project of this magnitude forward in any manner: 1) What will the project cost and 2) how many and what types of vehicles will actually make use of this option? The second point is critical as the proponents of this project continue to tout a Public Private Partnership funding strategy.

The actions that will occur as this study nears its conclusion are of significant concern to me. As I have frequently reminded Caltrans and Metro, a commitment was made to this region that an impartial feasibility study identifying the viability of a tunnel project would be completed prior to consideration of a move toward an EIR/EIS process. As it has been established, the SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study is an analysis of the soils, groundwater and seismic conditions of 5 route neutral zones. This falls far short of what could honestly be considered the true feasibility study that we were promised. Therefore, I would like to know if and when the commitment made to the residents of this region will be honored and if an impartial feasibility study will be conducted. The draft Geotechnical Summary Report SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study makes several erroneous references to the 2006 Parsons Study as a "feasibility study". After its completion, the Parson's study was correctly re-labeled a "fatal flaw analysis" by representatives of SCAG and the MTA. At a minimum, the Geotechnical study should refrain from validating a document that has been universally discredited. Please correct these references on pages ES-1, 1-1, 1-4 and 2-3. In addition, a reference is made on page 1-4 that states: "The scope of the previous Metro study included technical, operational, and financial feasibility in addition to geotechnical feasibility." In fact the Parsons study goes to great lengths to qualify its own findings as insufficient, cursory, preliminary and in need of significant further review. It also has as one of its most blatant flaws a lack of any complete financial analysis. Saying it did is just untrue.

Furthermore, more than twelve million dollars was allocated to conduct an impartial feasibility study. It is my understanding that significantly less money has been utilized to fund the SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study. I would like to know how much of the original funding remains and the intention for how the balance will be spent. I would expect the balance to go towards funding the promised feasibility study. Any allocation of these particular funds to an EIR/EIS prior to the completion of the promised study would surely be inappropriate.

In regard to the draft report itself, the technical aspects of the report require adequate vetting by members of the community, representatives of the affected cities and their technical experts. These issues are of significant concern and all stakeholders deserve ample time to appropriately evaluate the adequacy of the geotechnical study prior to submitting their final input.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity to address these issues with you and look forward to our continued work in addressing the transportation challenges throughout the region and the state. I strongly believe that the public deserves significant time to digest this draft work product before it is finalized. Given the fast approaching holidays, it seems prudent to forgo any conclusions

until after each community holds proper public meetings, consults with impartial geological experts and reports back to the drafters of this important document. To propose anything other than a thoughtful and deliberative process will further cement the perception that this is a massive, run-a-way project being rushed by advocates toward the starting gate.

Sincerely,



ANTHONY J. PORTANTINO

Assemblymember, 44th District

AJP:jh

T3

cc: Hon. B. Bogaard, City of Pasadena
Hon. E. Garcetti, City of Los Angeles
Hon. J. Huizar, City of Los Angeles
Hon. L. Olhasso, City of La Cañada Flintridge
Hon. F. Quintero, City of Glendale
Hon. E. Reyes, City of Los Angeles
Hon. D. Sifuentes, City of South Pasadena



CITY OF GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA
Office of the Mayor

613 East Broadway, Suite 200
Glendale, California 91206-4391
Tel. 818 548-4844 Fax 818 547-6740
www.ci.glendale.ca.us

March 3, 2010

Abdi Saghafi
Project Manager
SR 710 Tunnel Technical Study
Community Office
3412 North Eastern Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90032

Dear Mr. Saghafi:

This letter is in response to a request for public comment on the SR 710 Draft Geotechnical Summary Report. The position of the City of Glendale remains consistent with Resolution No. 09-111 as approved by the Glendale City Council on July 28, 2009, which addresses the tunnel feasibility specifically and the general subject of "gap closure" alternatives for the SR 710 freeway from I-10 to SR 134/I-210. On behalf of my colleagues and the citizens of Glendale I want to reiterate our opposition to the SR 710 tunnel alternative or any "gap closure" alternative that has or could be developed. I would like to express our opposition as well to the continued effort and expenditure of tax payer monies in exploring, studying or developing any type of "gap closure" project. We do not believe that any type of "gap closure" alternative is in the best interest of the City or the region. I would like to once again state our belief and desire to instead look at other alternatives in addressing the concerns of mobility, congestion and the movement of freight from our ports. These alternatives would include the expansion of mass transit systems, upgrades and improvements to existing infrastructure and limiting the long distance movement of cargo/freight from the ports to only rail.

I would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment of the Draft Geotechnical Summary and to express the position of the City of Glendale.

Frank Quintero
Mayor