Corridor Advisory Committee Meeting #26

March 22, 2012
6:00-8:30 p.m.
Progress Park
15500 Downey Blvd., Paramount

MEETING SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

On March 22, 2012 the Corridor Advisory Committee met at Progress Park. Representatives from the project team in attendance included: Ernesto Chaves (Metro), Lucy Olmos (Metro), Danielle Valentino (Metro), Jack Joseph (Gateway Cities Council of Governments), Garrett Damrath (Caltrans), Elizabeth Mahoney (URS), Esmeralda Garcia (MIG), Luz Reyes-Martin (MIG) and Jeff Wilson (The Robert Group).

CAC members in attendance were:

Craig Carter, Long Beach, District 8
Joan Greenwood, Long Beach, District 5
Angelo Logan, East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice
Pat Long, City of Long Beach, District 9
Harold Tseklenis, CAC Appointee

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 members had the following questions and comments:

- Angelo Logan expressed concern regarding the consistency of the public participation process. He reminded Ms. Garcia that at the last CAC meeting he had requested a review of the AQ/HRA to be placed on the agenda for further discussion and input from
the CAC on extending the AQ/HRA analysis to include emission analysis on the arterials.

- Ms. García pointed out to Mr. Logan that this agenda item would be addressed under follow up items, in addition to the request from the CAC to add the HIA to the agenda.

PUBLIC COMMENT
The were no public comments.

BRIEF PROJECT UPDATES

Engineering Status Update
CAC members had the following questions and comments:

- Harold Tseklenis asked if there was a schedule for the public hearings.
  - Ms. Mahoney responded that the team was working on putting together a schedule.
- Joan Greenwood suggested that the team ensure that facilities for the public hearings are large enough to accommodate a significantly large public attendance.

Environmental Status Update
CAC members had the following questions and comments:

- Mr. Logan asked for clarification on comments the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) made regarding conformity with Air Quality Management District (AQMD) methodology for modeling entrained road dust.
  - Ernesto Chaves (Metro) responded that the EPA proposed method for assessing entrained dust is different than the South Coast AQMD methodology. However, the I-710 DEIR/EIS includes both methodologies in the Air Quality Health Risk analysis.

Community Participation Status Update
CAC members had the following questions and comments:

- Mr. Logan recommended that between now and the release of the Draft EIS/EIS the CAC should have the opportunity to provide input on how the information and collaterals for the outreach process are presented.
  - Ms. Garcia responded that this was good feedback and the project team would be working on how to develop collaterals and other materials in preparation for the release of the DEIR/EIS. She emphasized that this type of input from the
CAC would be consistent with its role on the project. Furthermore, the CAC members could be an important part of the outreach by informing others of the upcoming release of the DEIR/EIS.

- Mr. Logan commented that the CAC should consider putting together a consensus document that includes comments from the CAC on the EIR. This document could then be forwarded to the Project Committee (PC).
  - Ms. Garcia commented that a consensus document from the CAC to the Project Committee would be a good method to transmit the Committee’s recommendation on a preferred alternative. She asked the other CAC committee members if they agreed with this recommendation. She added that this was something that could be further discussed with the larger CAC group at a subsequent meeting, but would still be noted as a recommendation.
- Mr. Tseklenis commented that he thought the CAC should receive the Executive Summary of the Draft EIR/EIS as soon as possible so they can begin to review it.
  - Ernesto Chaves of Metro agreed and noted that the team would make that available in a timely manner after the release of the DEIR/EIS.

FOLLOW-UP ITEMS

Ms. Garcia reminded the group that at this time the project team would update the CAC on the two items raised during the agenda overview. The first was related to the discussion on the AQ/HRA analysis. Ms. Garcia asked Mr. Chaves to provide an update on the analysis to the groups.

Mr. Chaves explained to the group that, in fact, arterial analysis is included in the AQ/HRA. Mr. Chaves suggested that Julia Lester, the consultant conducting the AQ/HRA analysis, submit a formal response addressing that issue.

- Angelo Logan expressed concern regarding the consistency of the public participation process. He reminded the group that at the last CAC meeting he had requested a review of the AQ/HRA to be placed on the agenda for further discussion and input from the CAC. He further emphasized that this should be a formal recommendation from the CAC to the Project Committee (PC) at their next meeting. The fact that the CAC was not scheduled to meet prior to the March PC meeting demonstrated inconsistency in the public process. The CAC should have a forum to come together and review information that is going before the PC.
• Ms. Garcia responded that the process for sharing information has been consistent and there is no information that has not been shared with the CAC that is going before the PC.

• Mr. Logan commented that he would like to make a formal recommendation to the Project Committee, for them to take up at their next meeting, to expand the analysis on the AQ/HRA to include emissions on the arterials.

• Mr. Chaves responded that Ms. Lester could include her formal response as part of that recommendation and she would be attendance at the Project Committee meeting to address any questions. The Project Committee will be meeting on March 29, 2012.

Ms. Garcia polled the other committee members to see if there was consensus on the proposed recommendation to the Project Committee. Mr. Tseklenis needed some more time to provide his position. The other three members in attendance were in agreement.

• Mr. Logan further commented that other issues (such as the extension of the zero emission benefits) were being studied, so there should be some discussion about the additional analysis he is suggesting.

• Mr. Logan also added that he had an interest in obtaining additional details on the AQ/HRA and that request had been made to the project team. He mentioned that he had not received a response on his request.
  o Mr. Chaves responded that he was not aware of a request and after inquiring with Mr. Logan learned the request was made to Ms. Lester directly. Mr. Chaves would follow up with Mr. Logan on that request and advised him that any future communication should be made directly with Metro to facilitate any follow up or requests. Mr. Chaves also emphasized that the details of the technical studies would be available in the DEIR/EIS when it is released to the public.

**Health Impact Assessment (HIA) Update**

The second follow up item was an update on the HIA. Ms. García asked Jack Joseph from the Gateway Cities Council of Governments to provide an update to the CAC. Mr. Joseph noted that the HIA will be sent to the National Academy of Sciences for Peer Review. When that review is completed. The document will also be sent to Caltrans for their review and to determine if it will be included in the environmental document for the I-710 Corridor Project. He also noted that the HIA would be made available to the public.

CAC members had the following questions:

• Mr. Logan asked when the Peer Review would be completed?
  o Mr. Joseph responded that the process typically takes several months.

• Mr. Logan noted that it did not sound like the peer review would be completed in time for the release of the DEIR/EIS.
• Mr. Logan asked if the HIA had been provided to Caltrans and also asked for information on the timing of Caltrans’ review of the document.
  o Mr. Chaves and Mr. Joseph noted that they would get back to the group with more information on that.

SUMMARY AND NEXT STEPS
Ms. Garcia recapped key points from the meeting. The following were points for follow-up and recommendations by the group.

Recommendation to the Project Committee
• The committee recommended that there be an expansion of the analysis in the AQ/HRA to include emissions on the arterials. This is a recommendation that should be taken to the Project Committee at their next meeting.

CAC Recommendations
• It was recommended that the CAC discuss the role of the committee in providing comments and input on outreach prior to the release of the DEIR/EIS.
• It was recommended that the CAC discuss developing a consensus document with comments and recommendations on the EIR/EIS Alternatives. This document would then be presented to the Project Committee.

Follow-Up Items
• The project team will coordinate with Julia Lester on providing a formal response regarding the modeling on the arterials.
• The project team will report back to the committee with more information on the timing and schedule for Caltrans to receive the HIA for review.

Committee Member Cross added that he would like clarification on potential sound wall locations along the I-710 in Long Beach, specifically around Del Amo Blvd.
  • The project team responded that they would report back to the committee on this request.

ADJOURNMENT
The meeting was adjourned at 7:24 p.m.