Corridor Advisory Committee Meeting #20

June 16, 2011
6:00-8:30 p.m.
Progress Park
15500 Downey Avenue, Paramount

MEETING SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

On June 16, 2011 the I-710 Corridor Advisory Committee met at Progress Park. Representatives from the project funding agencies and consultant team included: Doug Failing (Metro), Frank Quon (Metro), Adrian Alvarez (Metro), Danielle Valentino (Metro), Lucy Olmos (Metro), Ron Kosinski (Caltrans), Jerry Wood (Gateway Cities COG), Rob McCann (LSA), Elaine Carbrey (Gruen and Associates), Esmeralda Garcia (MIG), Luz Reyes-Martin (MIG) and Arcelia Arce (The Robert Group).

CAC members in attendance were:

Carrie Scoville, Harbor Communities
Angelo Logan, East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice
Louie Diaz, Teamsters Local 848
Pat Long, City of Long Beach, District 9
Robert Cabrales, Huntington Park LAC
Chris Mielke, City of Long Beach, District 1
Eileen Aparicio, City of Paramount LAC
Harold Tseklenis, CAC Appointee
Glenna Amos, City of South Gate LAC
Bill Pagett, City of Paramount, TAC Representative
Malcolm Carson, Legal Aid Foundation

INTRODUCTIONS AND AGENDA OVERVIEW

Meeting facilitator Esmeralda Garcia of MIG opened the meeting with a round of self-introductions and a review of the agenda. CAC member Angelo Logan requested that item VIII on be moved up the agenda. Staff indicated that the item could be taken up once Ron Kosinski
of Caltrans had arrived. Doug Failing of Metro, introduced Frank Quon as the new Executive Officer who would be working on the I-710 Corridor Project from Metro. An expert in ITS, project management and construction, Mr. Quon will provide day to day management of the project.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following were public comments made by attendees:

- On behalf of the families that live in Long Beach, Martha Cota requested an extension of the DEIR/DEIS review period. The 45 day review period is unfair to review a lengthy document. Reading 50 pages a day for a non English speaker is difficult. Families have been suffering with air quality impacts for years, therefore a 180 day review period is necessary to review and understand what is being proposed.

- Monica Parilla, representing Long Beach, Paramount and Commerce, agreed with the previous speaker on the extension. Ms. Parilla questioned how many people can review 50 pages a day. She stated it is impossible for someone with various other commitments. For the community that has been involved in the process, it is only fair to have more than 180 days to review the material and provide comments.

- Bertalina Chavak, Huntington Park resident. Ms. Chavak requested that the review period be extended, as the document is lengthy to read. Ms. Chavak further stated that it was important that community input be taken into consideration because the community will be the one that will be most affected by the project.

- Maya Golden Krasner, Attorney for Communities for a Better Environment, stated that CEQA allows the lead agency to provide for additional time for review under unusual circumstances, and stated that this was an unusual circumstance. The purpose of an EIR is to provide meaningful information on environmental consequences of the project. Ms. Golden Krasner stated that this requires allowing people to truly understand what the EIR/EIS is saying. The project could be one of the largest transportation infrastructure projects in the nation, affecting 15 cities and unincorporated areas in Los Angeles adjacent to the corridor. She went on to state that given that the majority of residents affected by the project are non-native English speakers, time is needed for translation of the document. Under CEQA, the public is given 30-45 days for review for an EIR that is traditionally 150-300 pages in length, given that this document will be larger, the public should be given a proportional review period. She stated that the community deserves the opportunity to meaningfully analyze the alternatives and their impacts. Ms. Golden Krasner also provided as an example the Long Beach General Plan had a review period of over 100 days, and stated given that the I-710 project was bigger in scope, a minimum of 180 days should be given for review.

- Iris, resident of South Gate, requested an extension of the review period due to the fact that many community members are not aware of the project nor do they have time to read the document in addition to their full time jobs, caring for their families, the elderly, etc.
DEIR/EIS REVIEW PERIOD DISCUSSION

Ms. Garcia of MIG introduced the DEIR/EIS Review Period Discussion. This was an item that the CAC requested be added to the Agenda for this Meeting. Ms. Garcia opened up the topic for discussion by the CAC.

- CAC member Angelo Logan began the discussion by stating that he raised the question of extending the review period as a way to begin a dialogue with the group. This issue is of great importance to stakeholders and he felt it was important that the CAC present a formal recommendation to the Project Committee.

- CAC member Louie Diaz supported extension of the review period but noted that in his capacity as a union official and as Planning Commissioner for the City of Carson, he often had to read more than 50 pages a day on a number of projects that come before him.

- CAC member Eileen Aparicio inquired whether the Spanish language translation would be released concurrently with the English version of the document.
  - Ms. Garcia responded that there was no requirement to translate the document. As part of the process they would not be providing a Spanish translation of the document.

- CAC member Malcolm Carson agreed with extending the review period to 180 days. He stated that the public will need time to review the document, and experts representing community groups will need time to weigh in.

- CAC member Harold Tseklenis commented that he was surprised that the document would not be published in Spanish. The project has been in motion for about 10 years and many of the stakeholders are not English speakers. To the extent that their input is wanted, and to make it convenient for the stakeholders to understand and provide meaningful comment, the document should be translated.

- CAC Member Robert Cabrales stated that he wanted to remind the CAC that community participation was part of the guiding principles provided for this project by Los Angeles County Supervisor Gloria Molina. In order for the communities along the corridor to engage in this project, extending the review period is one of the things that the CAC needs to keep in mind. He also concurred with the previous comments relating to translation of the document.

- Ms. Aparicio asked whether there were any legal requirements that stated the document needed to be provided in multiple languages.
  - Ron Kosinski of Caltrans, responded that the policy is to ensure that the notices are in a variety of languages but the document itself is not legally required to be in multiple languages. Further, he stated that if every document was translated, it would be a significant cost.

- Mr. Tseklenis stated that he was also concerned that individual parties who translated the document for stakeholders could misinterpret the document.
After discussion Mr. Cabrales made a recommendation to extend the review period for 180 days. The committee concurred.

There was a request from a member of the audience that the Executive Summary be translated into Spanish.

- Mr. Failing of Metro indicated that he would research whether the State Clearinghouse had any requirements or conditions that would prohibit the publishing of multiple language copies of the environmental document, as there is only one official copy that is at the State Clearinghouse. In addition, Mr. Failing would like to obtain a cost estimate for translation and ultimately take it to the Metro Board.

- Mr. Diaz also commented that he wanted to ensure that the English version of the document would supersede any other versions. A Spanish language translation would be provided as a courtesy.

- Ms. Scoville commented that the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach provide Spanish translations often, at least of Executive Summaries. She further stated that it is pretty standard if we want relevant public input and discussion. The goal is to make the document accessible to the public. She suggested that to cut costs, perhaps the translation can be available on a disk rather than printing copies of the document. She agreed that at a minimum the Executive Summary should be provided in Spanish.

- Mr. Logan requested a timeline for a response.
  - Mr. Failing responded that he anticipated providing a response by the next CAC meeting.

FOLLOW UP ITEMS

Ms. Garcia asked the CAC if there were any questions or comments on the Previous Meeting Summary. The CAC had no comments or changes.

BRIEF PROJECT UPDATES

The committee had no comments or questions on the Engineering and Community Participation status updates.

Environmental Status Update

Ms. Garcia introduced Rob McCann of LSA to provide an Environmental status update. Mr. McCann began with an overview of the activities that were completed this month. These activities included updating environmental technical studies (including the air and noise modeling to reflect current design and traffic forecasts), revising and adding key views for visual analysis, updating the parcel list for right of way analysis, updating the Area of Potential Effects map, and updating the cumulative projects list.
Mr. McCann provided an overview of the revised Key View locations for the Visual Impact Study. The objective was not to obtain a viewpoint from every point along the corridor but to select a sampling representative of different neighborhoods and communities throughout the corridor. The Community Design Subject Working Group reviewed the locations last week and did not have comments.

The three month look ahead includes continuation of technical study revisions based upon updated traffic and engineering work on the I-710 mainline and freight corridor and initiation of analysis of arterial intersection improvements and utility relocations. By September the team will begin to present preliminary results to I-710 Committees following I-710 Funding Partner review.

Mr. McCann provided a refresher of the Environmental Process, highlighting for the CAC the parallel CEQA/NEPA process, following similar activities. He also explained that certain details can be covered during the EIR/EIS phase, but many details will be fleshed out during the design phase. The key discussions will occur following the public review process.

CAC members had the following questions:

- Mr. Logan inquired as to what initiated an update to the traffic analysis.
  - Mr. McCann responded that there had been changes to the assumptions such as the carrying capacity of the freight corridor but more details would be provided during the Updated Traffic Forecast presentation later on in the meeting.

- Mr. Logan also inquired about the Environmental Process flow chart, specifically relating to the current step “Analyze Alternatives”; Mr. Logan wanted clarification on who was included in the discussion process for this step in the process.
  - Mr. McCann responded that technical studies reports are reviewed by the Funding Partners and preliminary findings will be shared with the community and I-710 committees once final reports are completed.

- A member of the audience inquired whether the reports and results from studies would be translated for the community.
  - Mr. McCann responded that the presentations had not been translated at previous CAC or other committee meetings. He emphasized that these preliminary results would not be pieces of the EIR but rather continued status updates of preliminary results.

**AQAP UPDATE**

Adrian Alvarez of Metro was introduced to provide an update on the Gateway Cities Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP). Mr. Alvarez provided a review of the participation framework and the
descriptions of the Committees, Roundtables and Technical Working Groups. AQAP tasks underway include the Community Medical Needs Assessment, the Near Roadway Modeling Assessment, updating the Near Term Air Quality Improvements, and preparation of the final compendium update document. The GCCOG has also transmitted a Construction Staging and Phasing concept report and has developed a draft protocol.

In upcoming months, the following items will be presented through the participation framework:

- Compendium Update
- AQ/HRA Protocol
- HIA Scope of Work
- Community Medical Needs Assessment
- Near roadway modeling research
- I-710 Construction Staging and Phasing

CAC members had the following questions:

- Mr. Logan asked whether there was still an opportunity to apply to participate in the roundtables.
  - Mr. Alvarez responded that the AQAP team has established the initial membership of roundtables. The team wanted to create a membership that would be a manageable size and received more names than can be accommodated. However, Mr. Alvarez noted that anyone interested in participating can communicate that to him.

- Mr. Logan encouraged CAC members to investigate the opportunity, the CAC is one of the most informed bodies on the project and this opportunity would be helpful to the overall knowledge of the project.
  - Jerry Wood of Gateway Cities COG indicated that although standards were set for the group membership, he wanted to let the group know that there is no numerical limit to the membership. He encouraged the members to attend the meetings and if they wanted to sit on the roundtable to contact Mr. Alvarez.

**TAC Update**

TAC Representative Bill Pagett was introduced to provide a summary of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) activities since the CAC last met. Mr. Pagett reported that the TAC met on June 15, 2011 and reviewed many of the items that the CAC will review tonight. TAC members had concerns regarding the traffic analysis and the intersection improvements. There will be sub-committee meetings to look at the intersection and arterial improvements that will be needed to address these concerns.

CAC members had the following questions:
Mr. Cabrales inquired what arterials are being looked at in the corridor.
  o Mr. Pagett stated that all arterials in the corridor from Alameda to Lakewood Boulevard and from south of the corridor to north are being looked at. 148 high impacted intersections were looked at and 60 were studied for improvements.

Mr. Cabrales stated that he was interested in seeing whether there was an opportunity to add bicycle friendly pathways along some arterials.
  o Mr. Pagett stated that bicycle trails are handled separately and would have to be looked at as a separate regional project.
  o Mr. Wood responded that as part of these comments, the LA County Bicycle Plan should be reviewed to ensure that project improvements are consistent with the Bicycle Plan. Many of the project improvements will make cycling easier. Early Action Projects may also assist with this.

Mr. Logan inquired how the arterial improvement study related to SB 375.
  o Ms. Garcia responded that components of the I-710 project were included in the GCCOG’s Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) analysis. Information related to arterial improvements was included in the analysis to achieve the goals set by CARB. The next step is to go to SCAG, which is undergoing a similar process. The GCCOG portion of the SCS will be folded into the larger study. Information on the SCS should be available on GCCOG website.
  o Mr. Wood responded that the GCCOG is working to make arterial highways work more efficiently through signal synchronization as well as additional transit in the area. The GCCOG is putting together a transportation strategic plan that will be available next year.

URBAN DESIGN AND AESTHETICS UPDATE

Ms. Garcia introduced this presentation by reminding the group that aesthetics on the freeway was an important issue for the community during the Major Corridor Study. This feedback helped form the scope of the EIR/EIS, which includes studying aesthetic improvements. Gruen Associates is the consultant tasked with addressing this topic. The Community Design Subject Working Group (CSWG) has studied this issue over several meetings and developed draft themes and concepts for the corridor. As a result of this feedback and feedback from other I-710 Committees and the Funding Partners, a report was developed which includes a “toolbox” of aesthetic themes and concepts.

Elaine Carbrey of Gruen Associates gave a brief presentation of this toolbox and highlighted revisions that were made since the last time the CAC received this earlier presentation, about a year ago. The following are some of the comments that were received from the CSWG:
  - Use of drought tolerant native plants and seasonal plants
- Providing greening where possible, including vines on walls and between the freeway and surrounding neighborhoods
- Screen and sound walls and use of designed sound walls to reduce massing
- Strengthening pedestrian connections and enhancing safety
- Energy generation on the corridor, including solar and wind.
- Preservation of existing vistas and integration with the LA River
- Durability as it relates to maintenance and graffiti
- Enhanced lighting, including the use of colored and LED lighting
- Community branding

Feedback that was obtained through Agency feedback mainly centered on maintenance concerns. The project team has refined the aesthetic features included in the toolbox report to minimize options that present a significant maintenance concern. Other maintenance concerns were addressed with minor revisions.

Ms. Garcia summarized the presentation by stating that while this is an EIR process and structures for the project were not currently being designed, the input provided by the community continues to indicate the importance of aesthetics. The toolbox report being prepared by Gruen Associates will inform the Visual Impact Assessment which will be incorporated into the project EIR/EIS and ultimately influence the design of the project. Community participation will continue to be incorporated throughout the process.

The following questions were raised by CAC members:
- Mr. Logan stated that many of the design elements were based on making the project aesthetically pleasing but was interested in learning whether functionality of sound walls will also be assessed.
  - Ms. Cabrey responded that this will be reviewed during the design phase of the project.
  - Mr. Failing added that there has been a lot of research done on sound walls the real focus is on getting the wall the right height. Treatments on walls generally have limited long term benefits.
  - Mr. Wood added that a feasibility study for sound walls would be issued shortly as part of the Early Action Projects.

**UPDATED TRAFFIC FORECASTS**

Ms. Garcia introduced Doug Smith from URS to provide an update on the traffic forecasting results. Mr. Smith stated that they had completed a draft traffic operations report in fall 2010 as well as a draft arterial traffic impact analysis report. With the results from those reports, they began looking at effects due to changes in alternative assumptions. Mr. Smith showed graphs showcasing daily traffic volumes for the corridor during AM and PM peak hours.
The main additional analysis centered on:

- The Alternative 6A model run was recalculated to get new traffic forecasts for 2035 due to the changes that were made in the assumptions to the network, geometrics, and carrying capacity.
- Alternative 6B included an enhanced freight corridor capacity that will be accomplished through technology which would allow tighter platoons and headways to get more trucks on the corridor and off the general purpose lanes.
- Alternative 6C included the Freight Corridor tolling concept with an enhanced corridor carrying capacity. Tolling was modeled only on the freight corridor to see how it would affect the overall traffic projections.

Some findings from the updated forecasts show:

- Alternative 5A carries more traffic and operates at a better level of service than the No Build option.
- Alternative 6A volumes are higher than in 5A. Alternative 6A will improve operations and decrease truck trips on mainline freeway.
- Volumes in Alternative 6B are higher than in 6A. Volumes increased due to the increased mainline I-710 capacity provided in Alternative 5A. Alternative 6B will reduce trucks on mainline and improve overall throughput.
- Alternative 6C volumes were slightly less than 6B due to the toll diversion. Alternative 6C will increase truck volumes in the General Purpose lanes compared to 6A and 6B.
- All Alternative 6 options improve level of service along the corridor over Alternative 5

Next steps include evaluating the tolling alternative further, completing the revised Draft Traffic Operational Analysis, completing the Intersection Traffic Impact Analysis report, developing and reviewing design improvements to accommodate each scenario, and meeting with individual cities that sit on the TAC to review results.

CALSTART OVERVIEW OF KEY FINDINGS

Ms. Garcia introduced Mike Ippoliti, from CALSTART, to summarize the organization’s key findings on commercial availability of zero emission trucks. Mr. Ippoliti began by stating that the key question under review has been whether Zero Emission Trucks can be commercially available if a Zero Emission Freight Corridor becomes available. Their findings showed that trucks can technologically deliver zero emission goods movement on the I-710 Corridor within the timeframe of the project.
Mr. Ippoliti highlighted examples of technologically advanced trucks that are in use today. These included:

- Dual mode hybrids with zero emissions
- The Meritor-Navistar which at an electric drive has a speed up to 48 mph for 20 miles and is currently in prototype.
- Transit buses that are operating in Long Beach and King County Metro that have catenaries that go up when operating in a tunnel.
- Electric/hybrid range extenders such as Artisan-Parker which operates an electric drive system with turbine range extender
- Full battery electric vehicles such as Balqon which has some in use at the Port
- Proterra has an all-electric bus operating with Foothill Transit

Mr. Ippoliti summarized the presentation by stating that Zero Emission Trucks are technically feasible within the timeframe of the project however a number of barriers exist including design factors, cost, infrastructure and that a business case needs to be made to the industry to help make this function as a viable market.

The following questions were asked by CAC members:

- Mr. Cabrales inquired whether vehicle maintenance will be an issue with the new technology.
  - Mr. Ippoliti stated that developing the technology and having the workforce to maintain the vehicles has to be part of the process.
- Mr. Cabrales further inquired about the percentage of these technologies in use in the region or California.
  - Mr. Ippoliti stated that these technologies are in prototype in the tens of vehicles.
  - Mr. Failing added that prototypes exist, but the real issue is developing a business case so that the number can go from tens to thousands of vehicles. CALSTART has approached Metro and Metro is looking at the cost of taking the next step. Metro will work in partnership with AQMD and others to help push forward the business case.
  - Mr. Wood added that the GCCOG is meeting with Long Beach State to develop a workforce plan to train workers to maintain the vehicles.
- Ms. Scoville asked for clarification on what “Pathway” trucks were.
  - Mr. Ippoliti stated that you essentially can’t go from where we are today to having 1000 battery operated trucks. We need a pathway to full zero emission trucks. Mr. Ippoliti used diesel electric hybrid trucks as an example of a truck that does not run on the electric motor at all times, but proves the technology can work. From this, a truck could be built that improves incrementally until full zero emissions are attainable.
SUMMARY AND NEXT STEPS

Ms. Garcia recapped the action items, which included:

1. Researching the precedents for translating Executive Summary of the EIR/EIS into other languages, and will have information at the next CAC meeting.
2. The CAC recommended extending the EIR/EIS review period to 180 days which will be forwarded to the Project Committee.

Ms. Garcia also noted the look-ahead schedule of topics for presentations at upcoming committee meetings.

Mr. Diaz commended the CAC members and the consultants for bringing their diverse backgrounds and knowledge to the process. He noted that there was a wealth of information that was brought to the body at each meeting to help guide and make informed decisions. He also applauded the participation of the community in the process.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:24 p.m.