

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF  
THE MONTCLAIR CITY COUNCIL HELD ON  
MONDAY, MAY 6, 2013, AT 5:45 P.M. IN THE  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 5111 BENITO  
STREET, MONTCLAIR, CALIFORNIA

---

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Eaton called the meeting to order at 5:45 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Present: Mayor Eaton; Mayor Pro Tem Ruh; Council Members Paulitz, Raft, and Dutrey; City Manager Starr; Deputy City Manager/Economic Development Executive Director Staats; Director of Community Development Lustro; Director of Public Works Hudson; Deputy City Clerk Smith

III. PUBLIC COMMENT - None

IV. COUNCIL WORKSHOP

A. Major Road, Interchange, and Grade Separation Projects Update

Director of Public Works Hudson gave a PowerPoint presentation reviewing the following major transportation-related projects in the City over the last several years, the status of the design and construction of ongoing projects, and a major project the City hopes to accomplish in the next few years provided funding becomes available:

*PAST PROJECTS*

*Mission Boulevard*

Mission Boulevard was the state highway connecting Pomona to Riverside and points beyond prior to arrival of the I-60 and I-10 Freeways and, as such, was not a priority for pedestrian amenities or landscaping improvements because it only served to carry traffic. No substantial funding for further improvements was provided when Mission Boulevard was relinquished to the **County of San Bernardino** and later to Montclair, and the City and **County** both struggled with maintenance of the corridor for a number of years.

Mission Boulevard became a focus of the Public Works Department to mitigate some drainage issues in the mid-1990s. In 1998, the City Council authorized funding for the first significant corridor improvements; and the first few projects were drainage related. Significant flooding was occurring at **Hacienda Mobile Home Estates** south of Mission Boulevard in 1997 or 1998, and the City authorized funding for drainage improvements. Many street, drainage, and median landscape—including new trees, uprighting, shrubs, ground cover, and street lighting system—improvements; traffic signal upgrades; pavement rehabilitation; sidewalk construction; and parkway landscaping were performed over the next 13 years. A total of ten different construction phases took place during that time, and it is fitting that the project should begin and end with storm drain work—the first two phases and Phase 10 were storm drain projects. Total funding for the Mission Boulevard Improvement Project was provided mostly through Measure I with additional funding provided by the former Redevelopment Agency, Gas Tax Fund, **San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG)**,

and federal funds for some segments, which allowed the City to avoid spending local funds for improvements that extended into County area within the City's Sphere of Influence (generally east of Central Avenue).

#### *Ramona Avenue/Union Pacific Railroad Grade Separation Project*

This project also had its beginnings in the mid-to-late 1990s with seed money from the former Redevelopment Agency for a design study to determine the scope, cost, and source of funding to complete the grade crossing. The cost was estimated in 2000 and several funding sources identified including federal, which required compliance with the **National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)** that was completed in 2003. Design and right-of-way acquisition were completed in 2008, and the project was advertised for construction. Funding for the project was provided by the former Redevelopment Agency, **Union Pacific Railroad, South Coast Air Quality Management District** grant, **California Public Utilities Commission** Grade Separation Program, California Congestion Relief Program, and funding from the federal **Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century**. Total project cost was approximately \$18 million—\$12 million for the actual construction and the balance for design, property acquisitions, and construction management.

#### *Palo Verde Street Storm Drain Project*

The completed project had a significant impact on reducing flooding along Palo Verde Street and Monte Vista Avenue in years past. A temporary solution to the flooding/drainage problem in the mid-1980s was use of a 21-inch **Southern California Edison** waterline that originally moved brine created by the **Etiwanda Generating Station** to a La Verne treatment facility until the pipeline was sold to **Chino Basin Municipal Water District (CBMWD)**. **CBMWD** had no use for the pipeline at that time, so an agreement was negotiated to allow the City to construct two catch basins along Palo Verde Street and an outlet structure just north of Basin No. 4, a drainage basin located south of Palo Verde Street, east of Helena Avenue. The catch basins helped somewhat but were good for only nuisance flows and light rainfalls. **CBMWD**, which became the **Inland Empire Utilities Agency** several years ago, notified the City in 2005 that the pipeline was going back in service to move brine generated by treatment plants in Upland. The City removed the catch basins and restored the integrity pipeline, replacing it with the mile long Palo Verde Street storm drain comprised of 24- to 60-inch pipes that cost approximately \$3.5 million with funding provided by a combination of Redevelopment Agency and Gas Tax funds.

#### *CURRENT PROJECTS*

#### *Monte Vista Avenue/Union Pacific Railroad Grade Separation Project*

**The Traffic Congestion Relief Act of 2000** created the **Traffic Congestion Relief Fund (TCRF)**, which provided \$95 million worth of improvements for grade separations in San Bernardino County and identified **SANBAG** as the authority for prioritizing the work. The Monte Vista Avenue/Union Pacific Railroad Grade Separation Project was ranked fifth and was to be fully funded with **TCRF** funds. Unfortunately, at the completion of the **California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)** process and as the City began the design phase and was ready to begin acquiring right-of-way, the state withdrew all funding for the project. After lying dormant for two to three years, partial funding was restored in 2006; and the City began acquiring the right-of-way necessary for the project. The Redevelopment Agency provided just over \$1 million to complete the right-of-way acquisition, and it is hoped the project will commence as early as 2014. The lack of state funding caused the City to seek additional funding. Fortunately, **SANBAG** assisted in securing the same federal

funding used to complete the Ramona Avenue grade crossing, thus requiring the project to meet **NEPA** requirements, a process that is ongoing. Of eight technical studies required for a categorical exclusion—meaning that the project would have no significant effect on the quality of the human environment, seven have been approved by the federal government and the **California Department of Transportation**. The remaining noise study is expected to be approved by the end of the month, at which time staff expects to be awarded the **NEPA** categorical exclusion; and the required design work could then be completed.

A temporary detour road will connect Monte Vista Avenue to State Street similar to the bypass road constructed for the Ramona Avenue project. In addition, a private street will be constructed to provide access to a property that will lose its frontage along Monte Vista Avenue.

The project will cost a total of \$32 million—\$19 million for construction and the balance for design, right-of-way acquisitions, and construction management. The higher cost compared to the Ramona Avenue grade separation can be attributed to the tight right-of-way that required high retaining walls on all four quadrants. With the funding provided by **SANBAG**, the project would be 100 percent funded; and construction should begin sometime next year.

Council Member Dutrey inquired as follows:

1. Is the federal funding left over from the Ramona Avenue grade crossing project included in the total funding cost?

Director of Public Works Hudson answered, "We are trying to get the \$1.6 million that was not used for the Ramona Avenue grade separation project transferred to this project. We have our lobbyist in Washington, D.C., working on such transfer.

2. Does the \$32 million total cost of the project include the \$1.6 million transfer?

Director of Public Works Hudson answered, "The transfer funds are not included in the total cost. What it means is the projects of National and regional significance that **SANBAG** is providing would be reduced by that amount. We are not counting on the residual funds at this time; but if eligible for transfer to this project, it would make available other money. The \$1.6 million will either be used for our project or it will transfer back to the federal budget."

Mayor Pro Tem Ruh commented that residual money would be used for similar grade separation projects.

Director of Public Works Hudson stated, "That is correct. I am optimistic that that we will be eligible for the transfer; but it depends on whether **Congress** is amenable to switching funds from one grade separation project to another when members of **Congress** no longer support earmarks."

### *I-10 Corridor Project*

This project is being sponsored by **SANBAG** and **Caltrans** and has a local angle. Intended to improve commute time between San Bernardino and Los Angeles counties, the project limits are from approximately two miles west of Montclair in Pomona to Ford Street in Redlands. Three project alternatives under consideration are as follows: (1) no build and allow traffic to continually worsen; (2) extend existing high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes from just west of the I-15 Freeway easterly to Redlands; and (3) implement an

express lane concept whereby one lane would be added on either side of the freeway and existing HOV lanes on either side would be incorporated into the second express lane. The local angle of the project would occur if the preferred alternative is to build express lanes because part of the project would include widening the Monte Vista Avenue bridge, thereby allowing the City to widen Monte Vista Avenue. If the City were to widen Monte Vista Avenue on its own, sacrificial elements of the freeway would have to be built. A meeting has been scheduled in two weeks with **SANBAG** to negotiate a Memorandum of Understanding to include all parties' intents, and the **City of Upland** would be a party to the MOU inasmuch as the city contributes a certain amount of traffic to the interchange, so it would be responsible for under 10 percent of the construction cost.

#### *FUTURE PROJECT*

##### *Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension*

Regarding Phase II, Segment 1 of the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension project, a contract for a bridge to carry the **Gold Line** across the eastbound lanes of the I-210 Freeway in Arcadia was awarded in 2010; and the project was completed last December and turned over to the second design/build contractor, who will extend the tracks from Pasadena across the bridge to Azusa. It is estimated this phase of the project will be completed in 2015. The next phase of the project will extend from the Azusa/Glendora area to Montclair. The **Metro Gold Foothill Extension Construction Authority** recently approved an updated expenditure plan for the extension project; the cost for both segments is estimated at \$1.7 billion. The cost for Segment 2 to extend the **Gold Line** from Azusa to Montclair is \$950 million, \$55 million of which would be paid by **SANBAG** or an agency east of the county line because Los Angeles County Measure R funds only apply to rail alignment construction in Los Angeles County. It is imperative that **SANBAG** provides support for the extension project.

The original schedule indicated the project would be completed through to Montclair by 2017—the latest estimate slates completion by 2022. Part of the reason for the five-year delay is in anticipation of using federal funds, it will take a few years to obtain federal environmental clearance—the project already has **CEQA** clearance. Further extension of the **Gold Line** to Ontario is in the planning stages.

Mayor Eaton stated that as a member of the **SANBAG** Commuter Rail and Transit Committee, he has learned that the agency is not receptive to extension of the **Gold Line** to Montclair. He stated, "We need to put pressure on **SANBAG**."

Director of Public Works Hudson concurred, noting he has learned the same. The City Council's action in September 2012 to join the **Metro Gold Line Phase II Joint Powers Authority** required 100 percent approval of all other member agencies. He stated that all Los Angeles County cities have approved Montclair's membership and that **SANBAG** is the only organization which has not. He expressed his opinion that **SANBAG** staff has neglected to present an item regarding Montclair's membership to the **San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors** for approval.

Mayor Eaton stated, "Let us work on that, and I will do it with your help."

Director of Public Works Hudson concurred.

Council Member Dutrey noted Mayor Pro Tem Ruh and he met with members of **Congress** or their representatives who represent the

Foothill communities including **U.S. Representatives Judy Chiu, Grace Napolitano, Gary Miller, and Gloria Negrete McLeod** three weeks ago in Washington, D.C., regarding extension of the **Gold Line** to Montclair. He noted **Representative Negrete McLeod** had indicated that **SANBAG** does not appear to have a strong interest in the project. He expressed his appreciation of Mayor Eaton's efforts as a member of the **SANBAG** Commuter Rail and Transit Committee on behalf of Montclair.

Mayor Eaton stated, "Absolutely."

Council Member Dutrey emphasized that extension of the **Gold Line** to Montclair is important to all cities in the West End of San Bernardino County and suggested staff obtain the support of the cities of Upland, Ontario, Chino, and Chino Hills on behalf of Montclair. He added that if the project terminates at Claremont, which by no means has the parking capacity of Montclair, it will likely not be extended to Montclair or to **LA/ Ontario International Airport**.

Mayor Eaton stated, "Upland and Ontario are supportive; I'm not sure about Chino and Chino Hills because I'm not hearing that those cities would support it."

Director of Public Works Hudson stated, "**Ontario Mayor Paul Leon** has just been appointed South Pasadena's representative to the **Metro Gold Foothill Extension Construction Authority**. The fact that there is representation on the east end here is good for all of us."

Mayor Eaton stated, "It sure is." He noted he had to wait for the **Metrolink** train to pass in Claremont today because it blocked South College Avenue as a result of the station configuration.

Mayor Pro Tem Ruh noted there has been a tremendous amount of private sector transit-oriented development taking place because of the **Gold Line**. He expressed his opinion that Montclair should take an aggressive approach with **SANBAG** to let the organization know that Montclair will not surrender future private sector development because **SANBAG** is too parochial to support extension of the **Gold Line** to Montclair. He noted **SANBAG** "may be well-intentioned in many of its ideas; however, pushing for more off-ramps and many of these other projects really does not fit the 21st century model of how we are going to move ourselves through the Southland. Every think tank agrees that mass transit, like the **Metrolink** commuter rail and **Gold Line** light rail, is the way to go, not building out freeways, not widening them, and not putting in more off-ramps. The **Gold Line** ties into the focus of express lanes—we would not need express lanes if **SANBAG** would instead fund the **Gold Line** through to Montclair. I think it is ludicrous to talk about tolling freeways—creating **Lexus** lanes—at a time when they have done this in Los Angeles and proven that it does nothing except for the affluent—they are able to use them to speed to work—the rest of us who cannot afford to pay have an extra 20 minutes added to our commutes. That would be what happens here. Using that money to fund the **Gold Line** would be a far better use of funds; it would convey commuters into Los Angeles County, which is what the **Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority** wants to do, it would transport persons from Los Angeles County into San Bernardino County, which is what we would like to do. I believe **SANBAG** is being very shortsighted in not seeing that. It is times like this that I wonder if Montclair would not be better off if we could just move the county line to be a part of Los Angeles County. I appreciate **Assembly Member Norma Torres's** effort in February 2012 of introducing **Assembly Bill 1600** that clearly authorized the **Gold Line** route as essentially Azusa/Glendora to

Montclair. That is certainly beneficial at the federal level when they can see it clearly codified into state law and that there is a clear designation for what it is."

Director of Public Works Hudson stated, "It also means that when the **Gold Line** reaches Montclair, the **MTA**, whose jurisdiction ends at the county line, will legally move into San Bernardino County to maintain that portion. The **MTA** will be responsible for maintaining the entire line, even though part of it extends beyond Los Angeles County."

Mayor Pro Tem Ruh concurred, expressing his belief that the **Gold Line** reaching Montclair "is one of the critical issues of our time. The population of Southern California is not shrinking; it is growing. We can certainly see, with rising gasoline prices, a day when people may not have the option of the single-family car. They are going to have to use mass transit. I personally use it on many different occasions and find it very convenient. I have used the **Gold Line** in the Pasadena area, and I would love to be able to use it here."

Council Member Dutrey inquired as follows:

1. What is the cost of construction to extend the **Gold Line** from Claremont to Montclair?

Director of Public Works Hudson advised that \$55 million is what the **Metro Gold Line Phase II Joint Powers Authority** has estimated.

2. Is that the total amount that **SANBAG** would need to contribute?

Director of Public Works Hudson answered, "No, that would be all San Bernardino County's cost, which we assume would be **SANBAG's** contribution. It is hoped there will be an opportunity for some federal funds with a local match through regional Measure I funds.

Mayor Pro Tem Ruh stated, "We also have another opportunity in the region on the issue. Just to the north of us, Upland is represented by **Assembly Member Chris Holden**, who represents the 41st District from La Cañada to Rancho Cucamonga. **Assembly Member Holden** is considered by many to be the 'father of the **Gold Line**' because of his early work years ago with Pasadena. I believe there is an opportunity to work with him to put some pressure on **SANBAG** as well. I know **Assembly Member Holden** fairly well and am willing to facilitate that. I believe that rather than a city-by-city approach, we need a representative who has a little more clout to be able to discuss this further with **SANBAG**. Although I cannot speak for him, I certainly believe **Assembly Member Holden** would like to have the **Gold Line** through to Montclair."

Mayor Eaton stated, "It would certainly be worth trying."

Council Member Dutrey suggested that, with Mayor Eaton's concurrence, **SANBAG** Executive Director **Dr. Raymond W. Wolfe** be invited to a future workshop to discuss the constraints of **SANBAG** staff with extension of the **Gold Line** to Montclair. He stated, "I will, of course, let you make a decision on that, **Mr. Mayor**."

Mayor Eaton stated, "OK, it is just a little premature yet; but we will look at it."

#### *Replacement of the Central Avenue Bridge Over the Union Pacific Railroad Tracks*

Director of Public Works Hudson noted he presented an item to the City Council in July 2012 for funding necessary to have an

application prepared for federal Highway Bridge Program funding regarding this project. He stated that the present bridge was constructed in 1967 and advised that a bridge or any structure of this type built in 1967 has a 50-year life expectancy. The bridge is now 46 years old. It did have some seismic upgrades in the 1980s; but by today's standards, those upgrades are no longer considered sufficient. The bridge is structurally deficient but that does not mean that it is in danger of falling down anytime soon. It just means that the City should be making plans for its replacement. It is also functionally obsolete, meaning that it needs to have six lanes of traffic; it currently only has four and has no capability of adding additional lanes because of its structural deficiencies. The solution is tearing it down and building a new bridge. There are structural issues related to concrete spalling over rebar in many locations on the bridge, requiring the bridge to be replaced at some point. Staff submitted an application for federal Highway Bridge Program funding in January 2013; sometime later this year we will find out if our project is successful in obtaining the necessary funds. The estimated cost of a new bridge is \$18 million, and there will probably be a small amount of right-of-way acquisition. Issues related to a loop road connecting north- and southbound lanes would need to be addressed and resolved. One possible solution was considered several years ago when consideration was given to locating a **Home Depot** in the area, the solution being installation of a traffic signal at the crossover point so the road between the **Monte Vista Water District** and the frontage road would be a T-intersection across Central Avenue connecting into whatever develops across the street. In that manner, the loop road could be completely abandoned.

Council Member Dutrey thanked Director of Public Works Hudson for his thorough presentation. He stated, "We have done many public works projects in Montclair under your leadership. There are more projects to go, and we hope they will be completed before you leave!"

Director of Public Works Hudson thanked Council Member Dutrey for his comments.

Mayor Eaton thanked Director of Public Works Hudson for his excellent report.

## V. ADJOURNMENT

At 6:21 p.m., Mayor Eaton adjourned the City Council.

Submitted for City Council approval,

---

Yvonne L. Smith  
Deputy City Clerk