

## **Supplemental Agenda Item No. 31B**

### **Board of Directors Meeting**

**December 4, 2013**

**10:30 a.m.**

Location:

San Bernardino Associated Government  
*Santa Fe Depot – SANBAG Lobby 1<sup>st</sup> Floor*  
1170 W. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
San Bernardino, CA

### **DISCUSSION CALENDAR**

#### **Project Delivery**

#### **31B. Interstate 10 (I-10) and Interstate 15 (I-15) Corridor Improvement Projects**

1. Direct staff to complete the Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Studies (PA/ED) for the High Occupancy Vehicle and the Express Lane alternatives on the I-10 Corridor Improvement Project.
2. Direct staff to prepare a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the preparation of the Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Document (PA/ED) for the I-15 Corridor Improvement Project.

*This Supplemental Agenda Item is being presented to the Board to request direction on the I-10 and I-15 Corridor Improvement Projects and provide recent input from the Community Advisory Groups (CAGs). These items were also discussed at the Express Lane Ad Hoc Committee meeting held on Tuesday, November 26, 2013. The information provided was not available at the time the agenda package was mailed.*



- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
- San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

*Minute Action*

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA ITEM: 31B

**Date:** December 4, 2013

**Subject:** Interstate 10 (I-10) and Interstate 15 (I-15) Corridor Improvement Projects

- Recommendation:\***
1. Direct staff to complete the Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Studies (PA/ED) for the High Occupancy Vehicle and the Express Lane alternatives on the I-10 Corridor Improvement Project.
  2. Direct staff to prepare a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the preparation of the Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Document (PA/ED) for the I-15 Corridor Improvement Project.

**Background:** **Recommendation 1 and 2:** Information was provided at the October Board Workshop and other related meetings regarding the design, traffic & revenue, finance, and equity results related with express lanes on the I-10 and I-15 corridors. The express lane design and financing plans were found to be viable based on preliminary engineering and traffic and revenue studies along with financial analysis. In addition, an Equity Study was completed and addressed concerns about the potential impacts express lanes may have on low income populations who utilize these corridors. Lastly, a robust public outreach program has been conducted to inform the public of the proposed improvements and to receive community feedback.

To gain additional public input before seeking direction from the Board, the information provided at the October Board meeting was shared with the three I-10 and I-15 Corridor Improvement Projects Community Advisory Groups (CAGs) in October. The CAG members shared the information with their community

*Approved  
 Board of Directors*

*Date:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Moved:* \_\_\_\_\_ *Second:* \_\_\_\_\_

*In Favor:* \_\_\_\_\_ *Opposed:* \_\_\_\_\_ *Abstained:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Witnessed:* \_\_\_\_\_

COG		CTC		CTA	X	SAFE		CMA	
-----	--	-----	--	-----	---	------	--	-----	--

Check all that apply.  
 BRD1312a-gc  
 Attachment: BRD1312a1-gc

stakeholders and requested feedback. The feedback and the opinions of the CAG members were discussed at the CAG meetings held in November. From the discussion the CAG members were asked to develop a message that they would like to convey to the Board. The CAG meeting minutes from November 19<sup>th</sup> thru 21<sup>st</sup> are attached here as "Attachment A" and include more specific details of their feedback and comments. A general summary of the message the CAG members would like to convey are as follows:

- **East Valley CAG**  
**Express Lanes should be considered for the region, but there are some questions that should be addressed as the projects move forward.**
- **West Valley CAG**  
**Express Lanes should be considered for the region as it would provide many benefits for the County.**
- **High Desert CAG**  
**Express Lanes should be considered for the region and 'No-Build' is not an option.**

With the preliminary engineering, advanced traffic & revenue studies along with the financial analysis complete, the next steps include the completion of the engineering and environmental studies for I-10 and to begin the environmental studies for the I-15. These studies will provide information to assist the Board and/or Committee in making policy decisions.

There are additional future decision points during the environmental process where Board direction will be sought. These include the selection of a Locally Preferred Alternative which occurs after the completion of the technical studies and the selection of the Preferred Alternative to be constructed which occurs after responding to public comments and prior to the approval of the environmental document.

The I-10 Corridor Improvement project environmental technical studies are well underway, but there is still a lot of work to be completed to obtain environmental approval scheduled for 2017. It should be noted that if the express lane alternative is dropped and only the HOV alternative is considered that the environmental approval date would probably be advanced.

If the express lane alternative is selected there are additional tasks that need to be completed to allow the design-build construction contract procurement to proceed. Some of the tasks include obtaining State legislation for tolling and design-build, lease agreements with Caltrans, an agreement with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and updating the traffic & revenue and financial analysis (investment grade study) prior to the bonds being sold. In other words,

there is a lot of work to be completed prior to the I-10 improvement project proceeding to construction.

The I-15 Corridor Improvement project preliminary engineering is wrapping up which will be documented in a Project Study Report. As you know, due to lack of funding, the only build alternative being considered on this corridor is the express lane. To determine the environmental viability of the proposed improvements, the environmental phase needs to commence that will study the no-build and express lane alternatives. The next step includes the preparation and release of a RFP to select a consultant to complete the preliminary engineering and environmental document. The release of the RFP would be brought before the Board for their consideration.

Staff requests approval of both recommendations.

***Financial Impact:*** This item has no impact to the current SANBAG Fiscal Year 2013/2014 budget. However, this item may have an impact to future SANBAG Fiscal Year budgets as related to Express Lane project development work.

***Reviewed By:*** This item has not received prior policy committee or technical advisory committee review.

***Responsible Staff:*** Garry Cohoe, Director of Project Delivery



**SANBAG I-10 and I-15 Corridor Projects**

SANBAG CAG Meeting #5 – November 19 – 21, 2013  
 Discussion Questions for Break out Groups

**High Desert CAG, November 20, 2013 – Victorville**

**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
<b>I10 - No Build</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No cost</li> <li>2. No environmental impact</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased congestion, poor air quality</li> <li>2. Economic Stagnation</li> <li>3. Road rage</li> <li>4. Unhappy constituency</li> <li>5. No build on I-15</li> <li>6. Unrealistic option (“head in the sand”)</li> </ol>
<b>I10 – HOV</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No cost to drivers</li> <li>2. More riders using HOV</li> <li>3. Faster travel times</li> <li>4. Less cars in general purpose lanes</li> <li>5. More affordable for multiple low income riders</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Most costly alternative to taxpayers.</li> <li>2. Eliminates I-15 additional lanes = no build for I-15.</li> <li>3. Perception of single driver that their tax dollars paid for lanes</li> </ol>
<b>I10 – Express Lanes</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pays for itself/recoups cost over time (mostly).</li> <li>2. Two lanes versus one</li> <li>3. Relieves the most congestion</li> <li>4. Trip reliability for the long term.</li> <li>5. Better traffic management/flexible pricing.</li> <li>6. Allows for I-15 Express Lanes.</li> <li>7. Pro- growth</li> <li>8. Reliable commuter bus service</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Low income inequality</li> </ol>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. Faster trip times</li> <li>10. Less road rage</li> <li>11. HOV 3+ = Free</li> <li>12. Better sociological impact to community</li> <li>13. Increased quality of life</li> </ul>	
<b>I-15 No Build</b>	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Congestion gets worse</li> <li>2. Economic stagnation</li> <li>3. Inequity to High Desert residents.</li> <li>4. Property values in High Desert will crash.</li> <li>5. Politicians would face an unhappy constituency.</li> <li>6. Emergency services may be compromised in the event of a disaster.</li> <li>7. Reasonable access to four year colleges in the Valley will be limited for High Desert residents.</li> <li>8.</li> </ul>
<b>I-15 Express Lanes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Same as I-10 Express Lane Alt.</li> <li>2. Increase ability to manage traffic</li> <li>3. Economic growth prospects for High Desert.</li> <li>4. Improved air quality.</li> <li>5. Reduces commuter time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Low income inequality</li> <li>2. Direct connector to the I-15 Express Lanes not included.</li> <li>3. Leaves no room for growth of general purpose lanes.</li> <li>4. public perception/concern that lanes have already been paid for under the I-15 Rehab Project therefore no need for toll lanes) <i>NOTE: it was clarified that the bridges/structures were not modified to accommodate continuous lanes</i></li> <li>5. No plan for Express Lanes north of 395.</li> <li>6. No commuter rail in the Cajon Pass contemplated.</li> </ul>

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

- Are there any checks and balances in place to protect the revenues generated on I-15?  
(Tolling policy needed – revenues for I-15 stay with I-15).

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

- Skeptical of timelines presented (Many residents feel projects take much longer to complete than originally planned)
- Recommend reaching a wider variety of groups (youth)
- Repeat the message with groups who have already attended presentations
- Increase media involvement

**3. Given the Alternatives presented for I-10 and I-15, what message does the CAG want to convey to the SANBAG Board?**

- No build is not an option, Express Lanes on I-10 and Express Lanes on I-15 are needed.
- Action is needed on I-15 Now.
- I-15 option should be the driver not the rider (I-15 project should not be contingent on I-10 Project).
- Public skeptical of decisions/priorities of elected officials.
- If I-15 is the higher priority for future demands then the decisions made now need to reflect that.



## SANBAG I-10 and I-15 Corridor Projects

SANBAG CAG Meeting #5 – November 19 – 21, 2013  
 Discussion Questions for Break out Groups

East Valley CAG, November 19, 2013 – Gonzalez Community Center, Colton

**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
<b>I10 - No Build</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No cost incurred.</li> <li>2. Encourage people to take public transportation.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Incurred cost to maintain the lanes.</li> <li>2. Increased pollution, fuel cost, lower quality of life for region.</li> <li>3. Added congestion on side streets.</li> <li>4. Does not free up funding for the I-15 corridor.</li> <li>5. This is not a viable option.</li> <li>6. Heading for Grid lock.</li> </ol>
<b>I10 – HOV</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No toll.</li> <li>2. Free to carpoolers.</li> <li>3. Short term congestion reduction.</li> <li>4. Lower construction costs than toll lanes.</li> <li>5. Less right of way required compared to Express Lanes Alt.</li> <li>6. Easier to use.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Non income producing.</li> <li>2. Limited restricted use.</li> <li>3. Does not free up funding for the I-15.</li> <li>4. Increased costs to keep up lanes with no revenue generation.</li> </ol>
<b>I10 – Express Lanes</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Relieve congestion on freeways and surface streets.</li> <li>2. Reliable travel times.</li> <li>3. Long term congestion relief.</li> <li>4. Free up excess funds for the I-15 corridor.</li> <li>5. More cost effective.</li> <li>6. Income producing.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Monthly maintenance fee for occasional HOV lane user.</li> <li>2. High tolls.</li> <li>3. Are toll roads even necessary?</li> <li>4. Drivers have already paid for highway/freeways – we don't want to pay again.</li> <li>5. Direct cost to users.</li> <li>6. Require greater public outreach</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. Lower cost of construction and maintenance in long term.</li> <li>8. Choice to use.</li> <li>9. Reduced congestion in general purpose lanes.</li> </ol>	and education.
<b>I-15 No Build</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Same as I-10 No Build Alt.</li> <li>2. Relieve congestion.</li> <li>3. Generate revenue for future expansion.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Same as I-10 No Build Alt.</li> <li>2. Impacts from out of state/out of area vehicles.</li> </ol>
<b>I-15 Express Lanes</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Building infrastructure now will produce benefits for the future.</li> <li>2. Same as I-10 Express Lane Alt.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Direct cost to users.</li> <li>2. Require greater public outreach and education.</li> </ol>

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

- What was the reason for creating the Ad-Hoc Committee at this time?
- Will there be more detail given on the finances related to the Project?
- Has the SANBAG Board taken any position regarding a Preferred Alternative?
- No additional clarification needed.

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

- Equity questions.
- Public Education.
- How to exit lanes, especially for smaller cities.
- How will it affect business along the corridors?
- What is it going to cost? Are toll roads even necessary?
- Don't want to pay services charges for transponder.
- Don't want to pay fees (\$50 up front and \$4 monthly fee).
- Truck lanes – extending to other roadways with grades. Add run-away lanes.

**3. Given the Alternatives presented for I-10 and I-15, what message does the CAG want to convey to the SANBAG Board?**

- Concern that the board is moving too slowly in choosing a path.
- Concerned about the timeline for the AD-HOC Committee.
- We believe the Express Lanes are the best choice for the future of the region.
- It provides the best choice for the freeway users and provides the most cost effective way to build and maintain the infrastructure of our region and building the express lanes will fund both the I-10 and I-015 corridors.
- Building infrastructure now will produce benefits far into the future.
- Usage cost is a concern.
- Monthly service fees a concern.
- Make accessible for low income.



## SANBAG I-10 and I-15 Corridor Projects

SANBAG CAG Meeting #5 – November 19 – 21, 2013

Discussion Questions for Break out Groups

West Valley CAG, November 21, 2013 – Rancho Cucamonga

**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
<b>I10 - No Build</b>	<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>
<b>I10 – HOV</b>	<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>
<b>I10 – Express Lanes</b>	<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> </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>9. Provides improved traffic flow.</li> <li>10. Reduces accidents.</li> <li>11. Increase flow of traffic in general purpose lanes.</li> <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>	
<b>I-15 No Build</b>	<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>
<b>I-15 Express Lanes</b>	<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</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>

	<p>pricing and occupancy.</p> <p>9. Available to all travelers.</p> <p>10. Maximizes the opportunity for transit.</p> <p>11. Traditional funds are not used as much.</p> <p>12. Maximizes revenue by use of inter-regional travelers "recreational travelers".</p>	
--	--	--

**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.

- 
- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
  - San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies
- 

## Supplemental Agenda Item No. 31B

### Board of Directors Meeting

December 4, 2013  
10:30 am

Location:  
San Bernardino Associated Government  
*Santa Fe Depot – SANBAG Lobby 1<sup>st</sup> Floor*  
1170 W. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
San Bernardino, CA

### DISCUSSION CALENDAR

#### Project Delivery

#### **31B. Interstate 10 (I-10) and Interstate 15 (I-15) Corridor Improvement Projects**

1. Direct staff to complete the Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Studies (PA/ED) for the High Occupancy Vehicle and the Express Lane alternatives on the I-10 Corridor Improvement Project.
2. Direct staff to prepare a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the preparation of the Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Document (PA/ED) for the I-15 Corridor Improvement Project.

*This Supplemental Agenda Item is being presented to the Board to request direction on the I-10 and I-15 Corridor Improvement Projects and provide recent input from the Community Advisory Groups (CAGs). These items were also discussed at the Express Lane Ad Hoc Committee meeting held on Tuesday, November 26, 2013. The information provided was not available at the time the agenda package was mailed.*



- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
- San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

*Minute Action*

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA ITEM: 31B

**Date:** December 4, 2013

**Subject:** Interstate 10 (I-10) and Interstate 15 (I-15) Corridor Improvement Projects

- Recommendation:\***
1. Direct staff to complete the Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Studies (PA/ED) for the High Occupancy Vehicle and the Express Lane alternatives on the I-10 Corridor Improvement Project.
  2. Direct staff to prepare a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the preparation of the Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Document (PA/ED) for the I-15 Corridor Improvement Project.

**Background:** **Recommendation 1 and 2:** Information was provided at the October Board Workshop and other related meetings regarding the design, traffic & revenue, finance, and equity results related with express lanes on the I-10 and I-15 corridors. The express lane design and financing plans were found to be viable based on preliminary engineering and traffic and revenue studies along with financial analysis. In addition, an Equity Study was completed and addressed concerns about the potential impacts express lanes may have on low income populations who utilize these corridors. Lastly, a robust public outreach program has been conducted to inform the public of the proposed improvements and to receive community feedback.

To gain additional public input before seeking direction from the Board, the information provided at the October Board meeting was shared with the three I-10 and I-15 Corridor Improvement Projects Community Advisory Groups (CAGs) in October. The CAG members shared the information with their community

*Approved  
 Board of Directors*

*Date:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Moved:* \_\_\_\_\_ *Second:* \_\_\_\_\_

*In Favor:* \_\_\_\_\_ *Opposed:* \_\_\_\_\_ *Abstained:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Witnessed:* \_\_\_\_\_

COG		CTC		CTA	X	SAFE		CMA	
-----	--	-----	--	-----	---	------	--	-----	--

Check all that apply.  
 BRD1312a-gc  
 Attachment: BRD1312a1-gc

stakeholders and requested feedback. The feedback and the opinions of the CAG members were discussed at the CAG meetings held in November. From the discussion the CAG members were asked to develop a message that they would like to convey to the Board. The CAG meeting minutes from November 19<sup>th</sup> thru 21<sup>st</sup> are attached here as "Attachment A" and include more specific details of their feedback and comments. A general summary of the message the CAG members would like to convey are as follows:

- **East Valley CAG**  
**Express Lanes should be considered for the region, but there are some questions that should be addressed as the projects move forward.**
- **West Valley CAG**  
**Express Lanes should be considered for the region as it would provide many benefits for the County.**
- **High Desert CAG**  
**Express Lanes should be considered for the region and 'No-Build' is not an option.**

With the preliminary engineering, advanced traffic & revenue studies along with the financial analysis complete, the next steps include the completion of the engineering and environmental studies for I-10 and to begin the environmental studies for the I-15. These studies will provide information to assist the Board and/or Committee in making policy decisions.

There are additional future decision points during the environmental process where Board direction will be sought. These include the selection of a Locally Preferred Alternative which occurs after the completion of the technical studies and the selection of the Preferred Alternative to be constructed which occurs after responding to public comments and prior to the approval of the environmental document.

The I-10 Corridor Improvement project environmental technical studies are well underway, but there is still a lot of work to be completed to obtain environmental approval scheduled for 2017. It should be noted that if the express lane alternative is dropped and only the HOV alternative is considered that the environmental approval date would probably be advanced.

If the express lane alternative is selected there are additional tasks that need to be completed to allow the design-build construction contract procurement to proceed. Some of the tasks include obtaining State legislation for tolling and design-build, lease agreements with Caltrans, an agreement with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and updating the traffic & revenue and financial analysis (investment grade study) prior to the bonds being sold. In other words,

there is a lot of work to be completed prior to the I-10 improvement project proceeding to construction.

The I-15 Corridor Improvement project preliminary engineering is wrapping up which will be documented in a Project Study Report. As you know, due to lack of funding, the only build alternative being considered on this corridor is the express lane. To determine the environmental viability of the proposed improvements, the environmental phase needs to commence that will study the no-build and express lane alternatives. The next step includes the preparation and release of a RFP to select a consultant to complete the preliminary engineering and environmental document. The release of the RFP would be brought before the Board for their consideration.

Staff requests approval of both recommendations.

***Financial Impact:*** This item has no impact to the current SANBAG Fiscal Year 2013/2014 budget. However, this item may have an impact to future SANBAG Fiscal Year budgets as related to Express Lane project development work.

***Reviewed By:*** This item has not received prior policy committee or technical advisory committee review.

***Responsible Staff:*** Garry Cohoe, Director of Project Delivery



**SANBAG I-10 and I-15 Corridor Projects**

SANBAG CAG Meeting #5 – November 19 – 21, 2013  
 Discussion Questions for Break out Groups

**High Desert CAG, November 20, 2013 – Victorville**

**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
<b>I10 - No Build</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No cost</li> <li>2. No environmental impact</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased congestion, poor air quality</li> <li>2. Economic Stagnation</li> <li>3. Road rage</li> <li>4. Unhappy constituency</li> <li>5. No build on I-15</li> <li>6. Unrealistic option (“head in the sand”)</li> </ol>
<b>I10 – HOV</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No cost to drivers</li> <li>2. More riders using HOV</li> <li>3. Faster travel times</li> <li>4. Less cars in general purpose lanes</li> <li>5. More affordable for multiple low income riders</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Most costly alternative to taxpayers.</li> <li>2. Eliminates I-15 additional lanes = no build for I-15.</li> <li>3. Perception of single driver that their tax dollars paid for lanes</li> </ol>
<b>I10 – Express Lanes</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pays for itself/recoups cost over time (mostly).</li> <li>2. Two lanes versus one</li> <li>3. Relieves the most congestion</li> <li>4. Trip reliability for the long term.</li> <li>5. Better traffic management/flexible pricing.</li> <li>6. Allows for I-15 Express Lanes.</li> <li>7. Pro- growth</li> <li>8. Reliable commuter bus service</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Low income inequality</li> </ol>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. Faster trip times</li> <li>10. Less road rage</li> <li>11. HOV 3+ = Free</li> <li>12. Better sociological impact to community</li> <li>13. Increased quality of life</li> </ul>	
<b>I-15 No Build</b>	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Congestion gets worse</li> <li>2. Economic stagnation</li> <li>3. Inequity to High Desert residents.</li> <li>4. Property values in High Desert will crash.</li> <li>5. Politicians would face an unhappy constituency.</li> <li>6. Emergency services may be compromised in the event of a disaster.</li> <li>7. Reasonable access to four year colleges in the Valley will be limited for High Desert residents.</li> <li>8.</li> </ul>
<b>I-15 Express Lanes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Same as I-10 Express Lane Alt.</li> <li>2. Increase ability to manage traffic</li> <li>3. Economic growth prospects for High Desert.</li> <li>4. Improved air quality.</li> <li>5. Reduces commuter time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Low income inequality</li> <li>2. Direct connector to the I-15 Express Lanes not included.</li> <li>3. Leaves no room for growth of general purpose lanes.</li> <li>4. public perception/concern that lanes have already been paid for under the I-15 Rehab Project therefore no need for toll lanes) <i>NOTE: it was clarified that the bridges/structures were not modified to accommodate continuous lanes</i></li> <li>5. No plan for Express Lanes north of 395.</li> <li>6. No commuter rail in the Cajon Pass contemplated.</li> </ul>

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

- Are there any checks and balances in place to protect the revenues generated on I-15?  
(Tolling policy needed – revenues for I-15 stay with I-15).

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

- Skeptical of timelines presented (Many residents feel projects take much longer to complete than originally planned)
- Recommend reaching a wider variety of groups (youth)
- Repeat the message with groups who have already attended presentations
- Increase media involvement

**3. Given the Alternatives presented for I-10 and I-15, what message does the CAG want to convey to the SANBAG Board?**

- No build is not an option, Express Lanes on I-10 and Express Lanes on I-15 are needed.
- Action is needed on I-15 Now.
- I-15 option should be the driver not the rider (I-15 project should not be contingent on I-10 Project).
- Public skeptical of decisions/priorities of elected officials.
- If I-15 is the higher priority for future demands then the decisions made now need to reflect that.



## SANBAG I-10 and I-15 Corridor Projects

SANBAG CAG Meeting #5 – November 19 – 21, 2013  
 Discussion Questions for Break out Groups

East Valley CAG, November 19, 2013 – Gonzalez Community Center, Colton

**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
<b>I10 - No Build</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No cost incurred.</li> <li>2. Encourage people to take public transportation.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Incurred cost to maintain the lanes.</li> <li>2. Increased pollution, fuel cost, lower quality of life for region.</li> <li>3. Added congestion on side streets.</li> <li>4. Does not free up funding for the I-15 corridor.</li> <li>5. This is not a viable option.</li> <li>6. Heading for Grid lock.</li> </ol>
<b>I10 – HOV</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No toll.</li> <li>2. Free to carpoolers.</li> <li>3. Short term congestion reduction.</li> <li>4. Lower construction costs than toll lanes.</li> <li>5. Less right of way required compared to Express Lanes Alt.</li> <li>6. Easier to use.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Non income producing.</li> <li>2. Limited restricted use.</li> <li>3. Does not free up funding for the I-15.</li> <li>4. Increased costs to keep up lanes with no revenue generation.</li> </ol>
<b>I10 – Express Lanes</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Relieve congestion on freeways and surface streets.</li> <li>2. Reliable travel times.</li> <li>3. Long term congestion relief.</li> <li>4. Free up excess funds for the I-15 corridor.</li> <li>5. More cost effective.</li> <li>6. Income producing.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Monthly maintenance fee for occasional HOV lane user.</li> <li>2. High tolls.</li> <li>3. Are toll roads even necessary?</li> <li>4. Drivers have already paid for highway/freeways – we don't want to pay again.</li> <li>5. Direct cost to users.</li> <li>6. Require greater public outreach</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. Lower cost of construction and maintenance in long term.</li> <li>8. Choice to use.</li> <li>9. Reduced congestion in general purpose lanes.</li> </ol>	and education.
<b>I-15 No Build</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Same as I-10 No Build Alt.</li> <li>2. Relieve congestion.</li> <li>3. Generate revenue for future expansion.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Same as I-10 No Build Alt.</li> <li>2. Impacts from out of state/out of area vehicles.</li> </ol>
<b>I-15 Express Lanes</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Building infrastructure now will produce benefits for the future.</li> <li>2. Same as I-10 Express Lane Alt.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Direct cost to users.</li> <li>2. Require greater public outreach and education.</li> </ol>

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

- What was the reason for creating the Ad-Hoc Committee at this time?
- Will there be more detail given on the finances related to the Project?
- Has the SANBAG Board taken any position regarding a Preferred Alternative?
- No additional clarification needed.

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

- Equity questions.
- Public Education.
- How to exit lanes, especially for smaller cities.
- How will it affect business along the corridors?
- What is it going to cost? Are toll roads even necessary?
- Don't want to pay services charges for transponder.
- Don't want to pay fees (\$50 up front and \$4 monthly fee).
- Truck lanes – extending to other roadways with grades. Add run-away lanes.

**3. Given the Alternatives presented for I-10 and I-15, what message does the CAG want to convey to the SANBAG Board?**

- Concern that the board is moving too slowly in choosing a path.
- Concerned about the timeline for the AD-HOC Committee.
- We believe the Express Lanes are the best choice for the future of the region.
- It provides the best choice for the freeway users and provides the most cost effective way to build and maintain the infrastructure of our region and building the express lanes will fund both the I-10 and I-015 corridors.
- Building infrastructure now will produce benefits far into the future.
- Usage cost is a concern.
- Monthly service fees a concern.
- Make accessible for low income.



## SANBAG I-10 and I-15 Corridor Projects

SANBAG CAG Meeting #5 – November 19 – 21, 2013  
 Discussion Questions for Break out Groups

West Valley CAG, November 21, 2013 – Rancho Cucamonga

**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
<b>I10 - No Build</b>	<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>
<b>I10 – HOV</b>	<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>
<b>I10 – Express Lanes</b>	<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> </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>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. Provides improved traffic flow.</li> <li>10. Reduces accidents.</li> <li>11. Increase flow of traffic in general purpose lanes.</li> <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> </ul>	
<b>I-15 No Build</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Funds would be available for other projects.</li> <li>2. No construction traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Continued congestion.</li> <li>2. Diminishes quality of life.</li> </ul>
<b>I-15 Express Lanes</b>	<ul 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</li> </ul>	<ul 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> </ul>

	<p>pricing and occupancy.</p> <p>9. Available to all travelers.</p> <p>10. Maximizes the opportunity for transit.</p> <p>11. Traditional funds are not used as much.</p> <p>12. Maximizes revenue by use of inter-regional travelers "recreational travelers".</p>	
--	--	--

**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.