



**OCTA  
I-405 Improvement Project  
Policy Working Group**

**Minutes of Meeting  
Wednesday, August 22, at 8 a.m.**

**Orange County Transportation Authority  
600 S. Main Street, Orange CA 92868  
Conference Room 103/104**

**Policy Working Group Participants**

**Members**

Ron Casey  
The Honorable John Collins  
The Honorable Larry Crandall  
The Honorable Tyler Diep  
The Honorable Don Hansen  
The Honorable Mark McCurdy  
The Honorable Gary Miller  
The Honorable John Moorlach  
The Honorable Jim Righeimer

**Organization**

Rossmoor Community Services District  
Councilmember, City of Fountain Valley  
Councilmember, City of Fountain Valley: OCTA Director  
Councilmember, City of Westminster  
Mayor, City of Huntington Beach  
Councilmember, City of Fountain Valley  
Mayor Pro Tem, City of Seal Beach  
County of Orange Supervisor, 2<sup>nd</sup> District: OCTA Director  
Councilmember, City of Costa Mesa

**Non Roster Attendees**

The Honorable Eric Bever  
Mark Bloeser  
Steve Bos  
Diana Carey  
Sean Crumby  
Christy Delp  
Ray Kromer  
Mark Lewis  
Eddie Manfro  
Ernesto Munoz  
Pamela Newcomb  
Jake Ngo  
Adolfo Ozaeta

**Organization**

Mayor, City of Costa Mesa  
Office of Long Beach City Councilman, Patrick O'Donnell, 4<sup>th</sup> District  
City of Long Beach  
City of Westminster  
City of Seal Beach  
Office of Orange County Supervisor Janet Nguyen, 1<sup>st</sup> District  
City of Fountain Valley  
City of Fountain Valley  
City of Westminster  
City of Costa Mesa  
Office of Orange County Supervisor John Moorlach, 2<sup>nd</sup> District  
City of Westminster  
City of Westminster

Rachel Powers  
The Honorable Margie Rice  
Raja Sethuraman  
Bridgett Sramek

Office of Long Beach City Councilmember Gerri Schipske, 5<sup>th</sup> District  
Mayor, City of Westminster  
City of Costa Mesa  
Office of Long Beach City Councilman Patrick O'Donnell, 4<sup>th</sup> District

### **Agencies and Consultants**

<b><u>Name</u></b>	<b><u>Agency</u></b>
Kirk Avila	OCTA
Niall Barrett	OCTA
Jim Beil	OCTA
Ellen Burton	OCTA
Christina Byrne	OCTA
Rose Casey	OCTA
Will Kempton	OCTA
Lance Larson	OCTA
Ted Nguyen	OCTA
Kenneth Phipps	OCTA
Dave Simpson	OCTA
Breanna Todd	OCTA
Andrea West	OCTA
Macie Cleary	Parsons
Neal Denno	Parsons
Kevin Haboian	Parsons
Matt Cugini	Caltrans
Smita Deshpande	Caltrans
Adnan Maiah	Caltrans
James Pinheiro	Caltrans
Iffat Qamar	Caltrans
Lisa Ramsey	Caltrans
Gloria Roberts	Caltrans
Gary Slater	Caltrans
Katie Angotti	Consensus Inc.
Jeannie Kim	Consensus Inc.
Veronica Yniguez	Consensus Inc.

### **I. Welcome, Self Introductions and Opening Remarks**

Christina Byrne opened the meeting, welcomed those in attendance and asked for self introductions.

Ms. Byrne thanked the group for all their efforts on the I-405 Improvement Project. She announced the release date of the draft environmental document on May 18, 2012.

Will Kempton thanked the group for taking time out of their busy schedules to attend the meeting. He gave an overview of the agenda including the environmental process, public review period, design refinements, and next steps moving forward. He stated the public comment period began May 18 and ended July 17, 2012. Since the close of the public

comment period, OCTA and Caltrans have begun reviewing the comments and worked closely with the technical consultant, Parsons, to develop possible design refinements.

## **II. Presentation, Community Outreach**

Ms. Byrne explained that community engagement during the environmental phase of the I-405 Improvement Project began in the fall of 2009 with a series of four public scoping meetings in Fountain Valley, Huntington Beach, Rossmoor, and Westminster. Since that time OCTA has continued to communicate with the public and stakeholders by conducting regular Policy Working Group and Stakeholder Working Group meetings and presenting to more than 150 civic and community organizations as well as regular briefings to the Measure M Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), Citizens Advisory Committee, public works/city staff and elected leaders including LA Metro, Long Beach and other regional partnerships on the status of the project. Christina further explained OCTA has a demonstrated history of working with the community to mitigate impacts not only on this project but every project. Since the major investment study phase of this project, OCTA has been able to reduce full residential acquisitions from more than 100 properties to 0 due to the input from the public.

Ms. Byrne shared important highlights from the public comment period. She stated that more than 800 people attended the public hearings strategically held throughout the project area. Spanish and Vietnamese translation was available and OCTA adhered to title 6 requirements at all meetings. She explained that OCTA also attended a community meeting in Seal Beach with more than 200 attendees. OCTA has received letters from the cities of Cypress, Fountain Valley, Huntington Beach, Long Beach, Los Alamitos, La Palma, Seal Beach, Rossmoor, Westminster, and Costa Mesa in addition to a letter signed by several corridor cities. Christina Byrne noted that it is not uncommon or unique to the 405 project to receive more negative comments than positive for a project of this scale and complexity. It is understandable that a complex project like the 405 has the potential to generate opposition because of the perceived impacts. However, as we refine the project design, construction impacts are minimized to the extent possible.

Ms. Byrne outlined some of the key issues OCTA has identified as a result of feedback from the corridor cities throughout the public comment period including the Fairview bridge replacement in Costa Mesa, noise and visual impacts with the proposed SR-73 connector in Costa Mesa, business relocations in Fountain Valley, parking impacts in Westminster, Almond Avenue sound wall reconstruction in Seal Beach, the potential traffic impacts at the Los Angeles and Orange County line transition, air quality impacts in the city of Seal Beach, sound wall heights, perception of tolling and high-occupancy vehicle 2+ conversions, and lastly funding questions.

## II. Presentation, City Concerns

Jim Beil presented each issue city by city and the recommended approach to resolving each city's concern.

In Costa Mesa a common theme from the City of Costa Mesa is the belief that congestion on the I-405 is primarily north of the City. Jim explained there is a desire from the City to begin all project improvements at Euclid Street. The City feels they have done their share to widen the 405 with the 405/55 and 405/73 projects and the recently widened (not rebuilt) Fairview Bridge. Some residents are concerned about perceived visual/noise impacts associated with the 405/73 HOV direct connector under Alternative 3. In consideration of the concerns from the residents and City of Costa Mesa, OCTA is proposing truncating the express facility under alternative 3 north of Fairview Avenue. This approach, Jim explained will avoid reconstruction of Fairview bridge, eliminates the SR-73 direct connector and associated impacts with that structure, addresses the city's concerns, and it also reduces the overall project cost. Mr. Beil explained one downside is it may require additional environmental review and recirculation of the document however OCTA is not expecting this.

Mr. Beil explained that in the City of Fountain Valley the main issue is the braided ramps between Magnolia and Warner Avenues that requires up to four business relocations under all three alternatives. He stated the recommended approach is to use a collector/distributor configuration that will address the City's concerns by eliminating the need for business relocations however it may require non-standard design exceptions and would require Caltrans approval.

The City of Westminster's main concerns are the impacts to business parking and residential acquisitions under all three alternatives. Mr. Beil noted that OCTA and Caltrans worked closely with the City of Westminster and Director Nguyen's office during the major investment study and project study report phases to reduce these right of way impacts. As a result of this collaborative process, the over 100 full residential acquisitions were reduced to 0, all parking impacts to Sears were eliminated and parking impacts to El Torito were reduced from 35 to 3. He went on to point out that these 3 spaces may be mitigated during the right of way process and relocated on Caltrans property adjacent to the restaurant. The City is mindful of the fact that the reduction of the aforementioned right of way impacts may require non-standard widths on city streets.

Mr. Beil then presented the three major issues that the City of Seal Beach has articulated. The first issue is the replacement of the Almond Avenue soundwall under Alternatives 2 and 3. The residents of the College Park East community have been specifically concerned about the possible replacement of this wall. After exploring a number of options including non-standard design options, OCTA and Caltrans concluded that under Alternative 2, the wall must be relocated and cannot be avoided and under Alternative 3, operation and/or design variations could be pursued to avoid relocating the wall. This is because Alternative 3 adds one general purpose lane in each direction along this stretch of the I-405, whereas Alternative 2 adds two general purpose lanes in each direction. He also stressed the importance of balancing local concerns with safety considerations.

Mr. Beil went on to explain that Seal Beach residents are also concerned with air quality impacts under all three alternatives. He shared that the No-build Alternative has the worst air quality impact, Alternatives 2 and 3 are the best for air quality and Alternative 1 provides approximately half the benefits of Alternatives 2 and 3.

Lastly, Mr. Beil addressed both Seal Beach and Rossmoor's concerns with the perceived bottleneck at the Los Angeles County line. Cities that border the Orange County/Los Angeles County line are concerned about the lane transition between the counties under all three proposed alternatives. He explained that although the current technical analysis shows that there will be a manageable transition under all three alternatives, the technical team will review the lane drop locations to optimize traffic flow and will continue to conduct additional traffic analysis.

The issues raised by the City of Long Beach were the final city specific concerns that Mr. Beil discussed. He explained that the City of Long Beach and the Gateway Council of Governments submitted comments stating that the draft environmental document does not adequately consider traffic impacts in Los Angeles County. To address these concerns, he said that staff is proposing to conduct additional traffic analysis in Los Angeles County. He pointed out that OCTA has been working with the City of Long Beach regularly and will continue to meet with the City, LA Metro and the Gateway Council of Governments.

### **III. Presentation, Policy Issues**

Mr. Beil identified several key issues that surfaced in comments from throughout the project corridor. He explained that some residents would like the soundwalls constructed to be the maximum height possible.

Based on federal reasonability and feasibility criteria, soundwall locations and heights vary; they are constructed between 12 and 16 feet. He said that staff will conduct soundwall surveys and meetings with the community to ascertain their preference regarding their heights. Based on these preferences, Mr. Beil said that OCTA staff will look into to using local funds to increase the height of the walls that do not meeting the maximum height of 16 feet.

Mr. Beil explained that aside from soundwalls, much of the feedback that was received during the public review period was related to Alternative 3. Several key issues with this alternative were the overall perceptions of tolling as a transportation funding mechanism, the perceived take-away when converting from HOV2 to HOV3 and the lack of awareness of how congestion pricing works, the costs of transponders, account fees and other aspects of tolling. To address these issues, he explained that staff has requested that Stantec model options that include part-time opportunities for HOV2. Additionally, an HOV exclusive account is being proposed that does not require a monthly fee-this is similar to the Special Access account of the 91 Express Lanes.

Mr. Beil described that another misperception regarding Alternative 3 is that Measure M funds are paying for the toll road. He clarified that Measure M funds under all three proposed

alternatives will deliver the base M project which is one general purpose lane in each direction. He referred to the slide titled “Funding the Alternatives” which detailed the additional funding needed for Alternatives 2 and 3 and the potential funding sources. Mr. Beil highlighted that the incremental cost of adding the toll lanes under Alternative 3 would be paid for by the toll facility revenue and not Measure M. He assured that OCTA will continue to provide information about the funding sources for each alternative.

Mr. Beil then turned the presentation over to CEO Will Kempton to conclude the discussion about Alternative 3 and next steps. Mr. Kempton explained that there have been questions regarding the use of potential net revenue under Alternative 3. He said that the express lanes proposed for Alternative 3 differ from traditional toll roads in that the priority for setting toll rates is not merely to collect revenue but optimize traffic throughput. In addition to funding the project, express lanes can also produce “net revenues” which can be used for additional mobility improvements which are usually made within the same corridor. Mr. Kempton referred to the existing Streets and Highway Code 143 (j) (1) which allows for toll revenue to be used to operations, maintenance, indebtedness, improvements to the project, and improving public transportation in and near the project limits. He also mentioned that the use of the net toll revenues would be subject to authorizing legislation and OCTA Board of Directors policy.

#### **IV. Presentation, Upcoming Analysis & Policy Discussions**

Mr. Kempton presented a list of upcoming analyses and policy discussions for each alternative for the Board to consider prior to the selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) in September. For Alternative 1, Design-Build opportunities must be assessed and the financial and schedule implications must be analyzed with and without design-build. For Alternative 2, Design- Build opportunities must be analyzed similar to Alternative 1 as well as funding and potential project tradeoffs. He explained that selection of this alternative could impact the schedule of M2 projects. Finally, Mr. Kempton outlined the discussions and further analysis that needs to be conducted for Alternative 3 which include modifying the option to respond to public comments, revising traffic and revenue projections under multiple scenarios and looking at part-time use of the Express Lanes HOV2+.

#### **VI. Policy Working Group Feedback and Questions**

John Moorlach: I was elected to the Board of Supervisors 2006 and I remember one of my first tasks as an OCTA Board of Director was to reevaluate and address the I-405 widening. One of the biggest areas of discussion was surrounding the city of Westminster and the need to get them involved in the process. We have been holding these meetings now for seven years and a couple of years ago the toll lane alternative was added. I just wanted to give a little background on the project up until this point and open it up for discussion.

Ray Kromer: There is a \$100 million difference between Alternative 1 and 2. If you eliminate the braided ramps that is a cost savings of \$50 million so is there only a funding gap of \$50 million left?

*Will Kempton: Yes, it does result in a cost savings and will continue to look for ways that will result in a cost savings for this project.*

Eric Bever: There has been some confusion as to whether or not letters have been received by the Board. I, along with four Mayors and one Mayor Pro Tem from the corridor cities signed a letter on August 17<sup>th</sup>. In the city of Seal Beach sound walls are an issue as they are also an issue in the city of Costa Mesa. But what we came to is a collective and philosophical opposition to toll lanes under any alternative. Mr. Beil just confirmed my fears with Alternative 3A that there is a possibility for toll lanes to be built out in the future. I want our position to be known. The corridor cities' LPA is Alternative 2. We are against tolling taxpayers who will not have access to the Express Lanes unless they have a transponder and are willing to pay a toll. Even with the intermediate access points, for example my city does not have access.

*Will Kempton: One thing I would like to say is we did receive a letter, much later but we did, and we will also circulate the new letter to the Board.*

Gary Miller: Our community held a meeting and took a vote opposing Alternative 3. Toll lanes are not acceptable to our constituents. We also sent in our comments and analysis on the EIR. I also wanted to say that I do agree with Supervisor Moorlach in that we should study a blended alternative that combines Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 to avoid the replacement of the sound wall in College Park East. I still do not understand why Alternative 2 is wider than 3. Why do you use the term throughput when only 25% is going through to Long Beach?

Jim Righeimer: Why does Alternative 3A still cost \$200 million more than Alternative 2, minus the direct connector? How much will the cost of Alternative 3A be reduced with the elimination of Fairview/73 Connector?

*Niall Barrett: The cost estimate for the direct connector is about \$100 million. Currently the estimated cost for Alternative 3 is \$1.7 billion so without the direct connector it would be about \$1.6 billion.*

Jim Righeimer: But my question relates more to concrete costs. What is the difference? Could you also use a phased approach where you build free general purpose lanes and in ten years make those lanes toll lanes?

*Will Kempton: In terms of putting in the toll lanes in ten years from an engineering perspective, you could do this but policy prohibits us from doing it. Current legislation prohibits the conversion of general purpose lanes to express lanes. Hard costs in Alternative 3 include striping and gantries for toll operation.*

Jim Righeimer: In Costa Mesa the problem was not just tearing down the Fairview Bridge it was the tearing down of something we just bought and I think that is everything wrong with government. What is the annual revenue from tolls in 2035?

*Kirk Avila: It is estimated at more than \$1 billion but this figure depends on the selected occupancy requirement whether it is HOV3 free or not. This revenue is after paying down the debt and addressing maintenance.*

Jim Righeimer: So right now we have a project where the funding gap of about \$200 million could be filled pretty quickly if there is \$60 million in revenue a year. Then the excess toll revenue policy says it will be reinvested into public transportation. That to me means buses, trains, and transit. It doesn't say road improvements instead it says public transportation. So now I am going to have all of these excess dollars going into public transportation which I don't think helps people who use the I-405 corridor. From what I hear in our community we should build it so someday, just not now.

*Will Kempton: Let me go ahead and comment on the public transportation portion of it and then I will comment on the conceptual portion of it. We have had attorneys both in house and externally evaluate this. We are assuming that the excess toll revenue will not be only applied to public transit. In fact today we will be going to the Finance and Administration Committee and discussing some possible scenarios and policies of how we can invest the excess net dollars.*

Jim Righeimer: I think with where the economy is at right now you are going to have a lot of support in Sacramento and in Congress for the creation of jobs. What I am saying is help us get there, and I think you can do that. I think someday I am going to be paying a toll to get to the airport. I kind of get that and I will want to pay it because I will want to get to the airport in forty five minutes and not three hours. But I don't want to do it in the next five to ten years. For \$200 million dollars I feel it is unnecessary to be paying \$60 million dollars a year for that.

John Collins: Let's take a step back from the technical aspects of this project. Six cities that represent a lot of people came out against toll lanes and opposed Alternative 3. Is the emotional aspect of this request being considered?

*Will Kempton: I am not the final decision maker the Board is. But what I can tell you based on my conversations with the Board is that they are absolutely listening, as well as staff, to the cities and public responses. The ultimate decision will have to be a balance in terms of what makes sense from a transportation perspective. What are the identifying hard community impacts-which we have identified, and there are obviously emotional and philosophical considerations that have to be taken into consideration as well. I can't tell you today what the ultimate outcome will be. The Board of Directors is the ultimate decision maker.*

John Collins: I understand that and I appreciate it. I just want to make sure the basic message that people do not want toll lanes comes across. One more thing I want to bring up is the end zone of this project at the Los Angeles and Orange county line. This end zone happens under any and each of the alternatives. One of things brought up at the Fountain Valley public hearing was maybe we can talk to Caltrans and they can do something about this, but the fact is that end zone is going to condense traffic and push it back.

Don Hansen: At the end of the day this decision will be based on one issue and it's whether to toll it or not. What we have found is that as we have gone through and done the community meetings and the outreach, we have done major mitigation in Fountain Valley, Westminster, to minimize construction impacts etc, and people are still against Alternative 3 because it's a toll.



I think some may say no way will I ever be in favor of a toll and others say maybe in the future. There is a wide range of opinions. I also think the accusations against Staff that they have been pushing hard for the toll lanes is unfair. Staff is responsible for bringing us the best options to solve the congestion. So I just want to say that all of the community input has been noted. With regards to congestion at the county line, there will be a bottleneck regardless of the alternative chosen. If this County takes a back seat and we wait for Los Angeles to do their part, where are we going to be? We force the issue of spending money on roads to be raised in Los Angeles. We should be proud of our own investment in our roads. But that bottleneck will happen regardless of what we do just like in the I-5. When you are traveling on the I-5 you know when you are in Orange County and we should be proud of that. We should be happy that we have created the infrastructure for our residents and our county. This decision will be for a lifetime, not just a generation, and we need to consider the future and future population growth. If we hold off the work for the future, there will be more property taxes, like the homes in Westminster, they will not be spared the next time this is visited.

Larry Crandall: The Board does know what the corridor cities are saying. We listened to what folks had to say and have made progress. The I-5 Gateway project worked really well. We want to be a leader in this. The design-build law will be a major hurdle to get over if Alternative 1 or 2 is selected because it will need to be passed in the California legislature and that's going to be difficult because the Sacramento unions are very much against design-build. The sooner we get to working on that I think the better. I would like to address one thing on the matrix and that is under Alternative 3 on the south side, 10 feet of Mike Thompson RV is still being taken. That really impacts Fountain Valley and I would like to see that added to the matrix.

Ron Casey: With all of this information how can we possibly get to any firm answers about anything prior to September 24<sup>th</sup>, if in fact that is a firm date? There is so much to consider.

*Will Kempton: It is a firm date. There is not statutory requirement that says we have to go to the Board on that date but we would like to because we want to get these improvements underway as fast as we can. So, you are right there are some tough decisions to be made. Especially with some of the design refinements we have proposed and the coordination that needs to happen with Caltrans, who has been in an excellent partner in all of this. We actually will be taking this to our Regional Planning Highways Committee the week before on September 17<sup>th</sup>.*

Margie Rice: I am concerned about the OCTA Board members who are termed out at the end of this year and are not concerned politically. I feel like there is a possibility that they don't care. You have two off ramps for the City of Westminster; this will severely damage our city. People will not be able to get off at our City and shop, has that been considered at all? There needs to be a place to get off the toll lanes in Westminster.

John Moorlach: I have been thinking about this a lot as you are driving on the toll lanes and are unable to get off, you would only do that once. If you are traveling to the Westminster Mall and aren't able to get off, the next time you will remember that and not use the toll roads. You would enjoy the one additional general purpose lane or exit the toll lanes sooner.

Margie Rice: Another thing, Staff has done a great job at meeting all of the City's concerns. But on the toll lanes they need a place to get off in Westminster otherwise people will take the tolls and drive from Los Angeles on through to South County or Irvine and completely bypass our City.

Diana Carey: OCTA staff has been great and they continue to meet our concerns throughout the process. I think the toll lanes are a very big issue. I am concerned that Alternative 3 is a pass through to South Orange County as well. I also don't feel like if you have to buy a transponder to use it that the lane is considered free. One of the issues I have with Measure M2 is when Staff does their presentation they always say that M2 promised one lane in each direction. I was in those meeting and when the OCTA Board adopted M2 at that time it was only one lane in each direction and there were residential impacts, but they did promise to work with the cities, which they have. But in the actual M2 document (references page 13) it doesn't say anything about one lane in each direction it actually says "add new lanes to the San Gabriel freeway between the I-605 and SR-55, generally within the existing right-of-way," then it says "in cooperation with local jurisdictions." There is no place in this document that says one lane in each direction. To me, Alternative 2 is great, because I will not be using the toll lanes because I live in Westminster and there is no access to it.

Gary Miller: Just one thing to clarify, was it said that you can't take HOV lanes and make them into toll lanes?

*Will Kempton: No. I said you can't take free lanes, there are a few exceptions to federal law, but in general you can't take general purpose lanes.*

Steve Bos: I want to thank OCTA, the community outreach has been unbelievable. Ms. Byrne's has been willing to join us and present at the drop of a dime and it is much appreciated. The City is very appreciative to be involved in this project and we have been involved since June 2009. Much of the discussion today has surrounded toll lanes and Alternative 3, the City of Long Beach appreciates that too but we want to be certain our concerns are voiced as well including air quality and pollution and coordination do not get lost in that discussion. There have been some comments made by Mr. Miller regarding bottleneck and we share that concern. We don't necessarily agree that it is going to happen whether or not something is done about it. We believe there is something that can be done about it. Our concern is that the EIR, in its current form, completely disregards that study area and doesn't take into consideration the county line or look to Lakewood Blvd. on the 405 or to Carson on the 605, or to PCH on the SR-22. We are concerned that bottleneck will result in an overflow of traffic onto City streets. There were some comments made earlier about no project in LA county. To the best of knowledge there are no projects currently there was a study in by OCTA and Metro 2005 that looked at one general purpose lane that went north of the Los Angeles/Orange county line. There is also a study called the I-605 Hot Spots feasibility study, and although it is not apparent in the title it is looking at the I-405. All of this is not addressed in the environmental document and that is a big concern to us. We are pleased to hear that the study area will be expanded and more coordination being done.

*Will Kempton: There has been an assumption that we haven't made contacts with LA County during this project which is not true. When the I-5 was built there was some lack of coordination and when our 10 lanes met the Los Angeles' 6 lanes it did cause some problems. Now, they are looking into ways to solve that part of the corridor. We went to LA Metro very early on in the process to try and do some coordination. Art Leahy and I had some good discussions and he in fact did initiate a study, perhaps it is the I-605 study. We did get a complaint from the Gateway Cities Council of Governments and in response to that complaint Art Leahy, the MTA chair, the OCTA chair, and myself will be meeting with the COG and Supervisor Knabe. We will address any impacts that are a result of the project. By participating in these types of discussions we are doing what we need to do.*

John Collins: This is a Policy Working Group and we have looked at everything. I think one of the things we should do is make a recommendation. I would like to offer a motion that this group makes a recommendation to the OCTA Board that we believe Alternative 2 to be the best one for this project.

Eric Bever: Second.

John Moorlach: After five years this is our first motion. I don't know if we are out of order.

John Collins: I don't think there is anything wrong with this group saying we have analyzed everything. We recommend Alternative 2. The Board can do what they want with our recommendation but at least it is on the record.

John Moorlach: Any discussion on the motion?

Eric Bever: I would like to point out that Alternative 3A was rolled out after public comment. Our City has significant impacts and input on Alternative 3A, which we can't put into the record because the public comment period has closed. I think there's technical problem with how this occurred, chronologically speaking. To that affect I still support John Collin's motion. But I do think we need to go back and reopen the public comment period. My staff has a lot of technical comments. I think we have issues that need to be addressed.

Larry Crandall: This is actually addressed on the matrix. This is one of the things I brought up. We may need to recirculate the EIR but we don't know for sure at this time.

*Will Kempton: This is exactly how the environmental process is supposed to go. You have Draft Environmental Document, then you have public comment, before you make a final decision you react to the public comment. If we didn't make changes to address the public comment we wouldn't be doing our job. We are still waiting on the final decision if we need to recirculate the DEIR but we don't anticipate it. We are happy to take any technical information you want to provide us, it won't be part of the public record, but we will give the information to the Board before a final decision is made.*

John Moorlach: Is anyone opposed to the motion?

*Ron Casey, Larry Crandall, Don Hansen, and John Moorlach abstained. The rest of the PWG Committee members vote to support Alternative 2.*

Larry Crandall: At the last OCTA Board meeting we had an interesting discussion comparing the I-405 to SR-91. On the 91 there is a canyon constraining people to go through there. On the 405 there is political canyon and there are alternatives to getting out of the canyon and that is PCH and using my surface streets in Fountain Valley. There are ways to get around the toll road area and that is very disconcerting because we already face that issue. I imagine Westminster also has this issue.

## **V. Next Steps**

Mr. Kempton concluded the presentation by discussing the Project's next steps. He stated that a stakeholder working group meeting will be taking place the following day in the same room and that the recommended LPA will be presented to the Regional Planning and Highways Committee on September 17<sup>th</sup> and then presented to the full Board on September 24<sup>th</sup>.