

**Meeting Summary**  
**Good Movement Action Plan**  
**Infrastructure Work Group Meeting**  
**November 15, 2005**

**Comments on Principles**

- There are conflicting priorities in the principles that needs to be sorted out
- The plan should include market based strategies or incentives to reduce costs to the public and private sectors

**Overview of How the Current Infrastructure List Was Constructed**

- Started with the “global gateway: corridors—major routes in the state
- Identified projects more than \$10 million
  - Start with projects that may not be otherwise funded due to size/cost
- Looked at multi-modal projects—tried to be as inclusive as possible
- Initial list was \$48 billion; pared down to current list by focusing on highest priority projects

**Additional Projects Suggested for Inclusion**

- Port of Oakland: Outer Harbor Intermodal terminal
- Orange County Transportation Agency: improvements to 91 corridor
- Union Pacific: ICTF modernization/expansion
- Port of San Diego: two grade separations along Harbor Drive
- Shuttle trains in Bay Area and along 710?
  - Need to discuss with railroads

**Criteria for Evaluating Infrastructure Projects**

- Mitigation for projects must be identified and funded up front
- Invest to solve problems system wide—don’t just move bottlenecks
- POLB will submit SCAG’s criteria for evaluating projects

**Metrics for Evaluating Infrastructure Projects**

- Need to value congestion relief/ improvement for overall mobility
  - Especially for grade separation projects—grade separations help relieve truck congestion
- Measure improvements/impacts to throughput, velocity, and reliability
- Measure reduction in number of trucks on the road per day
- Measure delay for motorists or containers
  - Need to do this on a system wide basis (regional analysis)
  - Can also put velocity measures on Freeways
- Look at actual AQ monitoring data to make decisions (as opposed to modeling)
  - This can be done quickly
  - BNSF can provide technical information

- Throughput/acre
- Fuel efficiency/ton cargo
  - BNSF to provide industry averages
- Understand emissions from ships
- How quickly can a truck be turned in a facility
  - Boxes moved per acre
  - Set statewide velocity goals
  - Mersk can provide industry numbers on the number of boxes per acres in US and internationally—will provide numbers for similar ports (apples to apples comparison)

### **Other Observations**

- Shuttle trains
  - promote exports
  - relieve congestion (e.g., 80 and 580 in the Bay Area and 710 in Southern California)
  - require operating subsidies to start
  - allow containers to go inland—increase throughput at Ports
- Fuel infrastructure will also have to be considered as Goods Movement industry grows
  - Need to be careful and protect ancillary and support services
  - Important to ensure compatible land uses are not precluded—preserve long term effectiveness
- Given projected growth and the preference for moving containers on trains, rail capacity will need to be expanded
  - If move all local containers on trains, will need more track in the LA basin
  - BNSF to provide information on economic benefits of triple tracking and comparing the mix of local and long distance trains
  - Need to also keep commuter trains in mind as freight rail grows—they are also competing for rail space
- POLB—timing of on dock rail expansion
  - 4-5 years for terminals to be permitted and built
- Need to identify for each project how much is assumed for mitigation

Submitted: November 18, 2005  
 Kirk Marckwald, Co-Chair, Infrastructure Work Group