When you turn on a faucet or flip a light switch, do you keep your fingers crossed because you are not sure of the outcome, or do you even give it a second thought? Most people would answer this question by pointing to the latter rather than the former. One of the more remarkable aspects of infrastructure is how little we think about it. Hardly anyone grasps that infrastructure is to a society what the circulatory system is to a human body: a series of vital, interwoven transmission belts for moving not just things but also people, services and ideas.

In fact, not too long ago when you mentioned the word infrastructure in a conversation with a non-engineer, you either got a blank stare or like the Spelling bee, the listener asked you to spell it and use it in a sentence! Well, the good news is that “Infrastructure” has slowly but surely seeped into our national lexicon and you even hear leading politicians talk about needed infrastructure investments. The bad news is there is still not enough funding to even maintain what we have got, let alone invest in new infrastructure. The current recession has obviously made matters worse.

Historically, recessions tend to trigger a drop in tax revenue and an increased demand for government services, which stresses government budgets. The current recession is no different, but this time, declines in municipal tax revenues have been more severe. This is due to prolonged period of high unemployment, and a sluggish economic recovery. Another factor that is contributing to the current sharp decline in tax revenue is the shrinking of the property tax base because of high rate of property foreclosures and continuing falling home prices. Stable home prices provide stable tax revenue, which is used to fund many critical city and county services, such as the local police force, fire department, public education, and infrastructure projects. The fall in property values that began in the recent recession, and that continues in many markets across California today, is slowing down. However its impacts are still amplifying the budget crises in local cities and counties across California.

Well, that is cheerful information! Should we fold up our tents and wait for the economy to get better and hope for more infrastructure funding at that time? or should we mobilize behind a unified message and become individual “Infrastructure Champions” advocating for a cause that directly impacts our careers, and communities’ well being, as well as, in our case, California’s economic health? California in some respects is a microcosm of our nation. We are a culturally diverse, and rapidly growing State. As such, our infrastructure is beginning to show its age. With 38 million residents, California is the most populated state in the country and its economy ranks as the world’s eighth largest economy. This trend is expected to continue into the foreseeable future. over the next 20 years, California is expected to grow at a rapid pace. Based on some estimates our State will add an additional 10 million residents over the next 20 years, putting California’s population at a staggering 48 million people. These days, Californians are noticing infrastructure more than usual, and at least some are trying to think about it—because it’s failing, sometimes with disturbing consequences. This is precisely the reason that ASCE Region 9 (California) decided to examine the state of our infrastructure by producing a report card in 2006 and then updating it again in 2012.

As the Co-Chair of the 2006 and 2012 California Infrastructure Report Cards, (www.ascecareportcard.org), I had the honor and privilege of unveiling both State-Wide Infrastructure Report Cards at the Capitol in Sacramento. The most recent one took place continued on page 3
The history of Los Angeles area development can be seen as the crowning achievement of man’s ability to tame the environment and transform a once dry and arid environment with a population of only 310,000 in 1910 to a booming megalopolis that is home to over 18 million people today. Looking back upon the past century, the Los Angeles region reflects the vision of early urban planners of a land of interconnected system of freeways, streets and roads dependent upon the automobile as the primary source of transportation. However, despite the construction of one of the most significant freeway systems in the country with some freeways spanning up to six lanes in one direction, the region’s transportation system, a hallmark of this urban environment, is continually plagued with traffic congestion, air pollution and passenger frustration. The dependence on automobile traffic and the effects of rapid population growth over the past century have created an urbanized and sprawling region that some may feel is far less than what many may have hoped for.

Starting in the 70’s urban planners began rethinking the policies of previous decades and enacted general plans that encouraged mixed-use developments in both urban and outlying areas. Developers and supporting civil engineering started mixing commercial land use with residential spaces. Restoration of existing buildings grew in popularity, replacing the raze-and-renew policy that dominated urban planning in the 1960s and 1970s. Greater emphasis was placed on pedestrian-friendly developments even as they approved continued expansion.

Through the close of the 20th century and moving into the 21st century, new concepts of sustainability, low impact development, smart growth, and integrated sustainable infrastructure arose in community planning and design. Civil engineering practices are now embracing these strategies in the L.A. region with new rating systems for sustainability and green design. These practices are anticipated to significantly affect how we grow over the next century.

History of L.A. Urban Development

With the construction of the Los Angeles Aqueduct, also celebrating its 2013 Centennial as a major civil engineering achievement, the city was transformed with four times as much water as it required and lured the growth of many neighboring communities. During the spectacular growth of the 1910s and 1920s, the Pacific Electric Red Car trolley lines were the axis of urbanization in Los Angeles, however, they gradually become unprofitable and increasingly unattractive compared to automobiles which were rapidly growing in popularity. As automobiles became cheaper and began to fill the region’s roads in the 1920s, electric Pacific Electric trolleys lost ridership largely due to the congested roads often causing accidents that made service unreliable. Cities abandoned some well-established public transport system in favor of the automobile. Southern California embraced the car and the freeway. It had ample space to expand, and many developers eager to profit from expansion.

Over time, Los Angeles became a city built around the automobile, with all the social, health and political problems that this dependence produces. The urban spread of Los Angeles became a notable feature of the town, and the pace of the growth accelerated in the first decades of the 20th century. Initially, the expansions of life from the cities outward helped middle-class families improve the quality of their lives. Fresh air, space and access to nature used to be reserved for the elite. With a car, citizens could live in uncrowded conditions yet still be able to work in urban centers. Veterans returning from service in World War II bought homes in rapidly developed suburbs. Prior to the expansion boom, adequate and affordable housing was rare. Isolation from the fabric of urban life led some to question the middle-class values of the 1950s and early 1960s. Increased sprawl in the 1980s further increased residents’ reliance on cars. Going to the market or even reaching public transportation meant driving. Cities and states further widened roads and highways to accommodate the increased traffic. Pedestrian traffic on busy thoroughfares became unpleasant and dangerous. People living farther from urban centers spent more and more time commuting, a trend that unfortunately continues in the 21st century.

What Dreams We Had

In reviewing the path chosen by early leaders in how the Los Angeles would grow, it is important to note that there were several early engineering and planning attempts to redirect the growing automobile dependent society in a perhaps more societal sustainable pattern. Some of the more creative ideas that would perhaps have changed the face of urban growth and promoted more sustainable approaches were the consideration of rapid transit systems. In 1954, various monorail proposals were being considered by L.A. One proposal arose that many urban planners of today wonder “what if”. In 1960, about a year after Walt Disney’s demonstration model monorail at Disneyland, the Alweg Monorail Company proposed to finance and construct a rapid transit monorail system 43 miles in length, serving the San Fernando Valley, the Wilshire corridor, the San Bernardino corridor and downtown Los Angeles. The Alweg offer was a turnkey proposal in which they forecasts, developed and completed and operating system. The budget for the initial monorail network, including rolling stock, was estimated to be $187.5 million. Continued on page 8.
on February 29, 2012 to a standing room only crowd of ordinary citizens, engineers, officials, and journalists. ASCE has over 14,000 members in both public and private sectors throughout California. The support for this report card was founded in the engineering profession represented by not only ASCE, but organizations such as American Public Works Association (APWA), University of California Irvine’s Civil & Environmental Engineering Affiliates (UCI CEE), American Council of Consulting Engineers (ACEC), and others, to name a few. The California Infrastructure Report Card effort involved about 100 volunteers from both the Public and The Private sectors who combed through volumes of data, developed reports, recommended public policy positions, and calculated funding needs for eight infrastructure categories over five months and countless number of hours, to get to the finish line. So, how did California do and how did our grades change from 2006?

The good news is that the overall GPA improved slightly from “C-” to a “C”. Still, this is not a report card that one would be proud showing off to others. The slight improvements in grades could be attributable to existing projects in the “pipeline” as well as an infusion of money from the passage of the 2006 infrastructure ballot initiatives, worth about $42B, and the effects of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009; better known as ARRA. Now, don’t get me wrong, those are all good things, but when we look at the $650B need over 10 years versus the $42B one time infrastructure bonds, we know we have a long way to go, and we should not ease up on our efforts, just yet. It is the old adage of “Pay me now or Pay me later”. Consider the fact that the needed infrastructure investment in California has increased from $37 billion annually in the 2006 Infrastructure Report Card to $65 billion annually in this year’s Infrastructure Report Card in just six years. Infrastructure components do not remain static and deteriorate over time so as engineers we are always playing a catch-up game even to maintain the infrastructure we have. The message is; our infrastructure is deteriorating very rapidly and the days of getting by with just maintenance, are gone.

In the past five decades, our capital investment has plummeted precipitously. In the 1950s and 60s, California spent 20 cents of every dollar on capital projects. By the 1980s, that figure dropped to less than five cents on the dollar. Current estimates put infrastructure investment at around a penny on the dollar. This is despite ever-increasing demands presented by population growth and economic development. Much of the state’s public infrastructure was designed and built to serve a population half the size of California’s 38 million residents today and we face an ever growing population in years to come.

So what can we do about this? The California Infrastructure Report Card has outlined several public policy options in the Citizen’s Guide. These include the “Self-Help” model which has been very successful here in California, especially Southern California. Virtually every county South of Ventura County has a “1/2 cent sales tax” in place with the funds going directly to road and transportation projects for that specific county. “Pay As You Go” is another model that we believe its time has come and needs to be applied to more infrastructure elements than just Toll Roads. If you think about it, there are many businesses around us that charge a premium for delivering a premium service. For example, UPS, the cable companies, and pest control companies all charge extra if you want to reduce their standard 4-6 hour waiting block to a 1-2 hour window. It has also become accepted industry practice by most airlines to charge extra for each piece of luggage you want to check in. America’s power, water and transportation infrastructures have long been correctly regarded as marvels of the modern age. More important, perhaps, is that in a nation proud of private initiative and responsibility, and of government both small and Federal, infrastructure has long forced us to adapt our ideology to necessity. Adapting our approach to areas where people are willing to pay for infrastructure renewal is an important step in shifting that paradigm.

Next, the term Public Private Partnership or PPP has been thrown around a lot but under-utilized in my opinion. PPP or P3s have mostly been discussed in the context of a private entity funding the construction of a public infrastructure upfront in exchange for a revenue stream from the public entity over a fixed period of time. There are innovative partnerships and solutions that can be formulated in this area that can save cash strapped cities and counties a lot of upfront monies, as well as time and effort.

Finally, we need to get to know our infrastructure. We can’t have an infrastructure rehabilitation/renewal strategy if we don’t have a road map showing us what those needs are. Having little or no knowledge about the condition of our infrastructure will guarantees its failure in the not so distant of a future. This is one case that Ignorance is definitely not bliss. Consider if you will that the ratio of emergency repairs to non-emergency repairs could be 5:1. This means that $65 billion we have identified, could mean $325 billion annually if there are a lot of infrastructure failures that have to be funded on an emergency basis. You know that we can’t afford $65 billion now so we really can’t afford to wait and let it become $325 billion annually.

One thing is for certain, we are living on borrowed time when it comes to our infrastructure and if we don’t undertake a major and comprehensive rehabilitation soon, we will leave very little infrastructure to our grandchildren. So how do we move forward? Well the answer is straightforward, but it does take a bit of work and perseverance to implement. I would summarize it in three steps; 1) Discovery (develop an accurate picture of your infrastructure by producing your local report card), 2) Message (get to know infrastructure demands your public has and is willing to support) and 3) Advocacy (combine the results of your findings and take that message to the public and public officials).

You see, it all starts and ends with US. As Civil Engineers we can be our own best representatives and cheerleaders to deliver the message of need for infrastructure funding to the general public and politicians. So, get involved, and get ready to start preaching the gospel of infrastructure renewal to your friends, neighbors, and your countrymen. You will be amazed at the tremendous impact you will have.

I am very interested in your thoughts and feedback, please send your comments and questions to yemrani@hfinc.com
September saw the end of the first year of this two-year session. The Governor had until October 12 to sign or veto legislation. Some of the following pieces of legislation may not have been signed.

**Signed Bills of Interest**

**AB 14** (Lowenthal) (Support) will require the Transportation Agency to prepare a state freight plan with specified elements to govern the immediate and long-range planning activities and capital investments of the state with respect to the movement of freight. The bill requires the agency to establish a freight advisory committee with various responsibilities in that regard. The initial state freight plan would be submitted to the Legislature, the Governor, and certain state agencies by December 31, 2014, and updated every 5 years thereafter.

**AB 528** (Lowenthal) will revise the items required to be included in the State Rail Plan and the business plan. The bill would require the State Rail Plan to be submitted to the California Transportation Commission for advice 6 months prior to submitting the final State Rail Plan to the Transportation Agency for approval, and, on or before March 1, 2017, would require the approved State Rail Plan to be submitted to the Legislature, the Governor, and other specified entities. The bill would require the state rail plan to be updated, at a minimum, every 5 years.

**AB 811** (Lowenthal) Current law authorizes the Attorney General, a district attorney, or the state or a local agency that issued a permit to excavate to bring an action for the enforcement of a civil penalty against an operator or excavator who negligently or knowingly and willfully violates the requirements of these and related provisions.

**AB 811** will require statewide information provided by operators and excavators regarding facility events to be compiled and made available in an annual report by regional notification centers and posted on the Internet Web sites of those regional notification centers.

**AB 1259** (Olsen) enacts conforming changes as a follow-up to **SB 1278** (Wolk, 2012) and **AB 1965** (Pan, 2012), which revised the flood hazard planning and development requirements for cities and counties located in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley.

**SB 4** (Pavley) defines the terms well stimulation treatment, hydraulic fracturing, and hydraulic fracturing fluid. The bill requires the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency, on or before January 1, 2015, to cause to be conducted, and completed, an independent scientific study on well stimulation treatments, including acid well stimulation and hydraulic fracturing treatments. The bill requires an owner or operator of a well to record and include all data on acid treatments and well stimulation treatments.

Signing the bill, Governor Brown issued the following statement: To the Members of the California State Senate: “I am signing Senate Bill 4, which establishes strong environmental protections and transparency requirements for hydraulic fracturing and other well stimulation operations. I am also directing the Department of Conservation, when implementing the bill, to develop an efficient permitting program for well stimulation activities that groups permits together based on factors such as known geologic conditions and environmental impacts, while providing for more particularized review in other situations when necessary. The bill needs some clarifying amendments and I will work with the author in making those changes next year. Sincerely, Edmund G. Brown Jr.”

**SB 135** (Padilla) will require the Office of Emergency Services, in collaboration with various entities, including the United States Geological Survey, to develop a comprehensive statewide earthquake early warning system in California through a public-private partnership and would require the system to include certain features, including the installation of field sensors. The bill will require the office to develop an approval mechanism to review compliance with earthquake early warning standards as they are developed.

**SB 425** (DeSaulnier) (Support) will allow a public agency, principally tasked with administering, planning, developing, and operating a public works project, to establish a specified peer review group, as defined, and would require the administering agency, if a peer review group is established, to draft a charter, published on the agency's Internet Web site, related to the duties of the peer review group.

**Recent Reports**

CA Budget Project has released its report, “Uneven Progress: What the Economic Recovery Has Meant for California’s Workers,” finds that the state “has added nearly 770,000 jobs since early 2010,” but 34 out of CA’s 58 counties still have unemployment rates in double digits.

The Legislative Analyst's Office has released the following review: Review of the proposed memorandum of understanding for Bargaining Unit 9, represented by the Professional Engineers in California Government.

Yale School of Forestry & Environmental Studies has released a survey, “Climate Change in the Californian Mind,” finds 79 percent of Californians believe global warming is happening and 11 percent believe it is not, also that 58 percent believe that if global warming is happening, it is “mostly due to human activities.”

Public Policy Institute of CA has released its report, “Parcel Taxes for Education in California,” outlines proposal to lower threshold for passing school parcel taxes in local elections from two-thirds to 55%, finds reform “would probably allow far more parcel taxes to pass,” but there is “no evidence that it would expand their use beyond the sort of wealthy Bay Area school districts that already have them.”

Next 10 releases “Cleantech Investment: A Decade of CA’s Evolving Portfolio” finds corporate investors are “growing players California’s cleantech sector” while “traditional venture capitalists” continue playing “pivotal role.”

continued on page 5
Environment California Research & Policy Center has released its report, “Will Solar Power Have a Home in California,” finds “net energy metering is a vital part of a healthy residential solar energy market.”

Appointments
By Governor. As chief deputy director at the CA Department of Water Resources: Laura King Moon, 53, Woodland, Democrat, project manager for the Bay Delta Conservation Plan.

To CA Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank Board of Directors: Peter Luchetti, 57, Sausalito, decline-to-state, founder and managing partner at Table Rock Capital.

By Speaker of Assembly. To CA Coastal Commission: Greg Cox, 65, Chula Vista, Republican, chair of the San Diego County Board of Supervisors. Fills vacancy left when a previous commissioner’s term expired. Cox’s term expires May 2017. Compensation: $50 per meeting, $12.50 per hour in preparation for meetings not to exceed eight hours per meeting, plus actual and necessary expenses. As alternate to Mr. Cox on the CA Coastal Commission: Olga Diaz, 37, Escondido, Democrat, deputy mayor of Escondido. Pleasure term. Compensation: same as above for meetings she attends in Cox’s place.

New Governor Perspective

by Oscar Serrano, P.E., M. ASCE, ASCE Region 9 Sacramento Section Governor

I am very excited to be writing this article as the new ASCE Region 9 Governor for the Sacramento Section. First of all, I would like to thank the outgoing Governors: Fareed Pittalwala, Camilla Saviz and Brent Seimer, for all of their hard work over the past three years. The new incoming Governors: Kwame Agyare (San Francisco Section Governor), Gregg Fiegel (Governor At-Large) and I, have big shoes to fill.

Over the next three years I will strive to provide great leadership and support to the Sacramento Section, Region 9 and the Region 9 Board. Throughout my career I have been an active ASCE participant and served in many capacities including YMF President and Sacramento Section President. In my previous positions as an ASCE officer I have participated in legislative activities including the Washington D.C. Fly-in and legislative activities in Sacramento. I have participated in WRYMC and WSBL so I am familiar with the message that ASCE is promoting.

Part of what I enjoy about ASCE is giving back to the community and also to the students. I’ve judged and volunteered at Mid-Pac competitions, helped on scholarship committees, individual and project award committees, participated in several resume workshops, helped with the annual golf tournament benefiting the Make-A-Wish foundation, and many other activities.

As Governor, I don’t see my role changing much from what I had been previously doing; it will simply be expanding to a larger audience. As governor I will act as a liaison between the Sacramento Section and Region 9 and bring forward any issues that arise. In my previous role as President of the Sacramento Section I actively represented the section on the Region 9 Board which provided me with an introduction to the experience required and the issues that will be dealt with throughout my term including legislative activities, project and individual awards, infrastructure report cards, etc.

I think my experience with ASCE will be a valuable asset to the ASCE Region 9 Board and I look forward to working with all of the ASCE members within Region 9.
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After consideration, the County Board of Supervisors voted against the project. This decision to reject the attractive offer was deemed likely based on political pressures from General Motors and Standard Oil Company, strong advocates for continuing the automobile dependence. Even the great writer science fiction author, Ray Bradbury, could not overturn the decision serving as one of strongest advocate for an L.A. monorail. He stated “A single transit line will not answer our problems; we must lay plans for a series of transportation systems that would allow us to move freely, once more, within our city. The answer to all this is the monorail.” Bradbury believed that monorails were ideal for our lovely climate stating “(leave the subways to terribly-weathered New York, et al) and we could build ten for the cost of one subway line.”

Regional Land Use Planning
In October 28, 1965, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) was formed when local elected officials from 56 cities and five counties first convened to begin growth projections and regional planning for Southern California's future. Today SCAG is the largest regional planning organization in the nation. Based on the 2010 US Census, with more than 18 million residents, the region has more population than any state in the nation with the exceptions of California, Texas and New York.

One of the most significant planning documents developed by SCAG is the Compass Blueprint. Compass Blueprint looks at these important relationships and makes the case that land use and transportation planning decisions should be made in careful coordination with each other. Compass Blueprint is a new way to look at how Southern California grows. Since 2000, SCAG has worked actively with the people and institutions of Southern California to create a dynamic regional growth vision based on these four principles: 1) Mobility - Getting where we want to go, 2) Livability - Creating positive communities, 3) Prosperity - Long-term health for the region and 4) Sustainability - Ensuring that today's decisions do not compromise future generations. The Compass Blueprint informs the development of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy, assisting local government planning efforts.

Energy Efficiency and Sustainable Community Design
SCAG has also taken a lead role in encouraging green building and community design. Greenhouse gas emissions from buildings are substantial. New buildings can be constructed using passive solar building design, low- or zero-energy building techniques, using renewable heat sources. Existing buildings can be made more efficient through the use of insulation, high-efficiency appliances (particularly hot water heaters and furnaces), double- or triple-glazed windows, external window shades, and building orientation and siting. While a number of “green building” rating systems have been developed, the most well-known is the LEED system, developed by the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) promotes sustainability in how buildings and now “green neighborhood” are designed, built, and operated.

Another concept that has taken hold in recent years is sustainable urban infrastructure. It is an infrastructure that facilitates a place or region's progress towards the goal of sustainable living. A sustainable design can lead to the development of sustainable communities by ensuring that infrastructural knowledge makes improvements that do not deplete natural resources. This is accomplished through sustainable infrastructure strategies for watershed master-planning, integrated storm water management, reclaiming urban spaces, and green streets programs. The approach also embraces the role of creative thinking and collaborative team-building play in developing the complex solutions needed to affect sustainability. Many civil engineering firms throughout the Los Angeles region are moving forward with this new approach.

The Next Century
For the next 100 years, greater pressures will be upon the development community and the supporting civil engineering community to assure that ‘sustainable’ urban city features are utilized such as: compact, efficient land use; less automobile use, better access; efficient resource use; less pollution and waste; the restoration of natural systems; good housing and living environments; a healthy social ecology; a sustainable economy; community participation and involvement; and preservation of local culture and wisdom.

“Sustainability” has also been embraced by ASCE society as a desirable need for civil engineering projects and helped establish the Institute of Sustainability Infrastructure (ISI) in 2012 which administers a sustainability rating system called Envision™ to aid project teams, owners, agencies and the public to describe elements of sustainable projects and how projects can be delivered that are more efficient and effective solutions.

For the LA region, one can anticipate that future urban development and the associated supporting infrastructure needed to support the current quality of life standards will be a continuing challenge particularly as the LA region’s population continues to increase with all its associated demands on resources. Regardless, it will be the civil engineers who play a key role in the design and implementation of the L.A. regions development and infrastructure and will play an important role in how we grow and adapt to sustainability practices that help ensure a quality of life for us and for future generations to come.
Congratulations To All 2013 Awardees: ASCE Los Angeles Section Awards Luncheon And Officer Installation

INDIVIDUAL AWARDS

Outstanding Civil Engineer in Government
Daniel R. Ferons – Winner

Outstanding Civil Engineer in Private Sector
Steve N. Foellmi – Winner

Outstanding Younger Civil Engineer
Valerie G. Huff – Winner
Adrienne Fedrick – Honorable Mention

Outstanding Faculty Advisor
Rupa Purasinghe – Winner

Outstanding Practitioner Advisor
Carolyn Berg – Winner

Outstanding Civil Engineer in Legislative Activities
Phillip Davies – Winner

Outstanding Civil Engineer in Community Service
Mina Azarnia – Winner

Lifetime Achievement in Civil Engineering
Thomas M. Morgan – Winner

Excellence in Journalism
Thomas Curwen, Los Angeles Times – Winner

Carl Blum Award
Heren Molina – Winner

President’s Award
Jay Higgins – Winner

PROJECT AWARDS

Outstanding Private Sector Civil Engineering Project
Metro Orange Line Extension – Winner
Alton Parkway Extension – Honorable Mention
El Estero Wastewater Treatment Plant – Honorable Mention

Outstanding Sustainability Project
Newport Beach Learning Center – Winner
Rancho Cucamonga Public Works Service Center – Honorable Mention

Outstanding Architectural Engineering Project
USC John McKay Center – Winner

Outstanding Government Civil Engineering Project
Echo Park Lake Rehabilitation Project – Winner
Van Buren Bridges Project – Honorable Mention
New Secondary Activated Sludge Facility 2 at Plant No. 1 – Honorable Mention
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