

# CAG Meeting Minutes

**Subject:** West Valley Community Advisory Group (WV CAG) Meeting #5  
 I-10 and I-15 Corridor Projects, San Bernardino County

**Date:** November 21, 2013 at 6:00 PM

**Location:** Etiwanda Gardens, Rancho Cucamonga, CA

**Participants:** A total of 6 CAG Members participated in the meeting.

<b>WV CAG Members in Attendance</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Jonnie Long	Retired, Inland Empire resident for 65 years
Lynda Gonzalez	M.A.S. Auto & Truck Electric Corp.
Matthew Slowik	Retired - Land Use Services Department, San Bernardino County
Michael Krouse	Ontario Convention Center and Visitors Bureau
Phillip Cothran	Cothran Insurance Agency Inc.
<b>Other CAG Members in Attendance (non-WV CAG)</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Valerie Henry (EV CAG Member)	Devore Rural Protection Association (DRPA)
<b>WV CAG Members not in Attendance</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Beth Kranda	Valley Transportation Services (VTrans)
Christine C. Pham	Victoria Gardens
Danny Marquez	SB County Veterans Advisory Board / Veterans Partnering with Communities
David Buxbaum (attended EV CAG)	Buxbaum & Chakmak
Dennis Gutierrez	Inland Empire
Dr. D. C. Nosakhere Thomas	Rainbow Community Praise Center
Dr. Kenneth Alpern	The Transit Coalition
Faiz Shah	Islamic Center
Jeff Caldwell	ATU Local 1704
John Heimann	Building Industry Association
Johnson Bobi	Representative of Assemblymember Chris Holden
Lina Chu	Asian Real Estate Association of America (AREAA)
Linda Sargent	ThorneSarge Consulting
Luis Vaquera	Fontana Unified School District
Marie E. Shahani	Fontana Community Senior Center
Michael (Mike) James	Ceramic Tile Contractor
Michael P. Biagi	California Polytechnic, Pomona
Roy Mabry	Association of Black Correctional Workers (ABCW)
Toni Levyssohn	Community Senior Services
William Waddingham	Rotolo Chevrolet
<b>Other (non-CAG Members)</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Mark Hager	HDR Engineering/Resident
Arnold San Miguel	SCAG
Deborah Barmack	Inland Action

San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) and Consultants	
Chad Costello	SANBAG
David Speirs	Parsons
Annette Cortez	Lee Andrews Group, Inc.
Tito Corona	Lee Andrews Group, Inc.

### ***I. Welcome***

CAG Members were greeted by Annette Cortez, Lee Andrews Group.

### ***II. CAG Member Reports***

CAG member report forms were provided to CAGs prior to the meetings and were returned to the Outreach Team via email. Ms. Cortez introduced Chad Costello to discuss project status and potential next steps. Mr. Costello informed the CAG of the recent development by the SANBAG Board to form an Ad Hoc Committee to review and further discuss the Express Lanes alternative. He announced that the Ad Hoc Committee's first meeting is scheduled on Tuesday, November 26, 2013.

PowerPoint Presentation – Following the Board update, the remaining agenda items were discussed with the use of a PowerPoint presentation (a hard copy of the presentation was given to each of the CAG Members), which included the following discussion topics outlined in the sections below.

### ***III. Summary of feedback on Equity Study – Presented by Annette Cortez, Lee Andrews Group***

Ms. Cortez provided a summary of the CAG member feedback received to the question below.

- Do you have any remaining concerns with regards to the fairness of an Express Lanes Alternative for low-income travelers?

#### **A total of 28 responses were received (EV: 10, HD: 6, WV: 12)**

- 18 CAG members responded with “no additional concerns or comments on Equity Study”.
- 10 CAG member provided comments.

#### **Comments received included the following topics:**

- Monthly maintenance fee on non-frequent user accounts.
- Financial assistance plan (equity plan) similar to Metro ExpressLanes.
- Employer programs that offer access to express lanes with tax deductible incentives.
- Strong outreach and advertisement campaign on how to use express lanes, purchase and register transponders.
- Improvement in travel speed even in the general purpose lanes used by non-paying travelers.
- Reduced price for low income seniors and disabled drivers.

Ms. Cortez concluded this presentation by thanking the members for providing feedback and also informing them that the comments received reinforced many of the concepts included in the Equity Study Report as well as encouraged the continue exploration of options to reduce the potential cost for low-income users.

### ***IV. Breakout Sessions - Presented by Annette Cortez, Lee Andrews Group***

Ms. Cortez explained the goal, discussion topics and format for the breakout sessions.

- **Goal - To discuss and capture feedback regarding project elements presented to date.**

Discussion topics include the following:

- I-10 and I-15 Project Alternatives – Pros and Cons.
- Questions and comments regarding information presented at previous CAG meetings.
- Questions and comments received from affiliated groups.
- Given the Alternatives presented for I-10 & I-15, what message does the CAG want to convey to the SANBAG Board?

- Breakout group format:  
**Break out group sessions (45 minutes)**
  - Small group discussions facilitated by Project Staff.
  - Select two CAG members to:
    - Record comments on flipchart
    - Report back to entire CAG

**Reconvene (30 minutes)**

- Selected CAG member to report back to entire CAG.
- What is the overall message this CAG wants to convey to the Board?

**V. Breakout Groups Reconvene**

Ms. Cortez facilitated the meeting while the selected CAG members reported back to the entire CAG. The 2 selected CAG members shared the responses received to the questions discussed in the breakout groups. The discussion questions and responses reported to the entire CAG are as follows:

1. What have you identified as the Pros and Cons of the three Alternatives for I-10 and two Alternatives for I-15? Why?

Corridor Alternative	Pros	Cons
I10 - No Build	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Funds would be available for other projects.</li> <li>2. No construction traffic.</li> <li>3. No ROW acquisition.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Forces more traffic onto local streets.</li> <li>2. Does not solve traffic issues.</li> <li>3. Does not provide revenue for maintenance.</li> <li>4. Continued congestion.</li> </ol>
I10 – HOV	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Encourages more carpooling.</li> <li>2. Less pollution.</li> <li>3. Fewer cars in general purpose lanes.</li> <li>4. Additional capacity.</li> <li>5. Rewards carpoolers.</li> <li>6. Continuous access.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Limited to 2+or 3+.</li> <li>2. Does not bring in any revenue – for maintenance or improvements.</li> <li>3. Limited usage.</li> <li>4. Can’t manage traffic.</li> <li>5. One less lane in each direction.</li> <li>6. Continuous access slows traffic.</li> </ol>
I10 – Express Lanes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provides flexibility (don’t need a carpool).</li> <li>2. Time savings = cost savings.</li> <li>3. It may forestall tax increases</li> <li>4. Access for anyone.</li> <li>5. Decreases travel time.</li> <li>6. Provides new revenue source for maintenance and new improvements.</li> <li>7. Reduces stress of being late.</li> <li>8. Provides reliable trip time.</li> <li>9. Provides improved traffic flow.</li> <li>10. Reduces accidents.</li> <li>11. Increase flow of traffic in general purpose lanes.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Too expensive.</li> <li>2. Low income inequity.</li> <li>3. Must have a transponder.</li> <li>4. Monthly maintenance fee.</li> <li>5. Higher initial cost to build.</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>12. Avoids/reduces stop and go.</li> <li>13. Improved fuel economy.</li> <li>14. Reduces air emissions.</li> <li>15. Creates happy travelers.</li> <li>16. Encourages people to use freeways.</li> <li>17. Less trips on local streets.</li> <li>18. Less wear and tear on local streets.</li> <li>19. Maximizes travel lanes in the corridor.</li> <li>20. Allows traffic management by pricing and occupancy.</li> <li>21. Available to all travelers.</li> <li>22. Maximizes the opportunity for transit.</li> <li>23. Traditional funds are not used as much.</li> </ol>	
I-15 No Build	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Funds would be available for other projects.</li> <li>2. No construction traffic.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Continued congestion.</li> <li>2. Diminishes quality of life.</li> </ol>
I-15 Express Lanes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Helps travel times through Cajon Pass</li> <li>2. May provide a benefit during snow conditions.</li> <li>3. Helps/traffic relief during weekends.</li> <li>4. Lots of space within R/W.</li> <li>5. Greater separation from large trucks.</li> <li>6. Helps distribute traffic to other freeways (60, 10, 210, and 215).</li> <li>7. Maximizes travel lanes in the corridor.</li> <li>8. Allows traffic management by pricing and occupancy.</li> <li>9. Available to all travelers.</li> <li>10. Maximizes the opportunity for transit.</li> <li>11. Traditional funds are not used as much.</li> <li>12. Maximizes revenue by use of inter-regional travelers “recreational travelers”.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Too expensive.</li> <li>2. Low income inequity.</li> <li>3. Must have a transponder.</li> <li>4. Monthly maintenance fee.</li> <li>5. Higher initial cost to build.</li> </ol>

1. Is there any information from the last CAG Meeting that you need clarification on?

- Has the board made any policy decisions for low income/student users?
- Information overload at CAG Meeting #4.
- How do we reach groups needing additional information?

2. What are some of the most common questions received from your affiliated groups? How have you responded?

- Positive feedback from contractors/constructors.

- Hispanic Chambers (5- Moreno Valley, Riverside, Inland Empire, Ontario and Pomona) all support Express Lanes.
  - All business, small and large supports Express Lanes.
  - When is it going to start?
  - How long will it take to construct?
  - How much will it cost?
  - Why are there no other alternatives for the I-15?
  - What will the toll cost be (range)?
  - Can the state take toll revenues for use elsewhere? Who decides how and when toll revenue will be used and when are these decisions made?
3. Given the Alternatives presented for I-10 and I-15, what message does the CAG want to convey to the SANBAG Board?
- Board members need to drive I-10 and I-15 during peak hour. We need improvements ASAP.
  - Expedite it.
  - Get it done.
  - This is a no brainer – we need Express Lanes.
  - The commute is getting worse and worse – we need better transportation ASAP.
  - Express Lanes are an excellent source of revenue for road projects.
  - There are no other options.
  - Building Express Lanes will create jobs.
  - Inland Empire goods movement is an important issue – we need improved mobility to support
  - We are daily users and we are directly impacted. We want Express Lanes.
  - This is important to the “logistics” sector of the Inland Empire; relative to economic recovery/sustainability.
  - We should proceed with the studies of Express Lanes alternatives.
  - A Robust public outreach should continue throughout the project.
  - We want assurance that toll revenues will be used in these 2 corridors.

**VI. Next Steps – Presented by Annette Cortez, Lee Andrews Group**

Ms. Cortez announced the following meetings:

- SANBAG Ad Hoc Committee Meeting  
November 26, 2013  
SANBAG Office – Santa Fe Depot  
Closed Session
- SANBAG Board Meeting  
December 4, 2013, 10AM  
SANBAG Office – Santa Fe Depot  
1170 W. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92410
- Potential 2014 CAG Meetings  
TBD based on December 4<sup>th</sup> Board meeting

**VII. Action Items – Presented by Annette Cortez, Lee Andrews Group**

Ms. Cortez encouraged the CAG members to continue with the following action items:

- Emailing feedback and comments to [SANBAG@leeandrwsgroup.com](mailto:SANBAG@leeandrwsgroup.com)
- Visiting project website for updates
- Recruiting people to “Like” our Facebook page and to “Follow” us on Twitter (@SANBAGnews)

***VIII. Additional Questions and Comments***

There were no additional questions or comments provided by the CAG members at the conclusion of the presentations.

**Project Material Distributed**

The following Project materials were provided to all CAG meeting attendance:

- Meeting Agenda
- CAG Meeting #5 PowerPoint presentation copy
- Breakout group discussion questions
- Updated I-15 Corridor Project Fact Sheet (English and Spanish)
- I-10 Corridor Project Fact Sheet (English and Spanish)
- Comment Card
- CAG Meeting #4 PowerPoint presentation copy (available upon request)

**Next CAG Meeting**

- *2014 EV CAG Meetings*—To be determined based on December 2013 SANBAG Board meeting. CAG members will receive notice via email and phone call about the next proposed CAG meetings.