Corridor Advisory Committee Meeting #28

May 17, 2012
6:00-8:30 p.m.
Progress Park
15500 Downey Blvd., Paramount

MEETING SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION
On May 17, 2012 the Corridor Advisory Committee met at Progress Park. Representatives from the project team in attendance included: Frank Quon (Metro), Adrian Alvarez (Metro), Ernesto Chaves (Metro), Lucy Olmos (Metro), Danielle Valentino (Metro), Jerry Wood (Gateway Cities Council of Governments), Rob McCann (LSA), Julia Lester (Environ), Elizabeth Mahoney (URS), Esmeralda Garcia (MIG), Luz Reyes-Martin (MIG) and Jeff Wilson (The Robert Group).

CAC members in attendance were:

Eileen Aparicio, City of Paramount LAC
Louie Diaz, Teamsters Local 848
Angelo Logan, East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice
Pat Long, City of Long Beach, District 9
Mark Stanley, Rivers and Mountains Conservancy
Harold Tseklenis, CAC Appointee
Joan Greenwood, Long Beach, District 7
Robert Cabrales, Huntington Park LAC

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.

There were no comments or questions from CAC members.

PUBLIC COMMENT
There were no public comments from members of the public.

**BRIEF PROJECT UPDATES**

*Engineering Status Update*

CAC members had the following comments and questions:

- Angelo Logan asked for clarification on the resolution process for right-of-way (ROW) issues amongst key resource agencies like Southern California Edison and the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP).
  - Frank Quon of Metro responded that all agencies are in coordination with Metro regarding impacts and alternatives. The design team has been working closely with those agencies with a high level of cooperation.

- Mr. Logan asked if Caltrans could use eminent domain to secure ROW from Southern California Edison and/or LADWP.
  - Mr. Quon of Metro responded that the agency does have that power, but the interest is not to exercise eminent domain.

*Environmental Status Update*

CAC members had the following comments and questions:

- Robert Cabrales asked for clarification on the participation of the CAC following the release of the Draft EIR/EIS.
  - Rob McCann (LSA) responded that the intent is for the CAC to continue meeting. The next regular meeting is scheduled for June 21st. If the Draft EIR/EIS is not out for public review at that point, the project team will be close to setting a firm release date.

- Mr. Logan asked for clarification on the release date of the Draft EIR/EIS.
  - Mr. McCann responded that the project team is working hard to release the document before the end of June, but he is unable to guarantee an exact date.

- Mr. Cabrales asked where to get information regarding Early Action Projects (Early Action Projects).
  - Mr. McCann responded that Jerry Wood would cover this subject in the TAC Update.

*Community Participation Status Update*

There were no comments or questions from CAC members

*Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Update*
Jerry Wood of the Gateway Cities Council of Governments provided an update on the TAC meeting held May 16, 2012. Mr. Wood reported that the TAC received a very similar presentation along with new details on Early Action Projects. Only two have so far been identified: the Firestone Boulevard onramp in the City of South Gate and extensive sound wall construction, since many locations in the project corridor suffer from high noise levels. A study is underway to assess the feasibility of constructing some of these sound walls early and won’t be completed until later this year. The TAC has begun the process of considering other Early Action Projects, but no new decisions have been made or will be made for several months.

Mr. Quon added that Metro has taken a report to the MTA Board of Directors which identified funding targets for the highway project and other types of improvements that would facilitate Early Action Projects. The Board identified both the Firestone Boulevard onramp and sound walls as Early Action Projects. As Metro works with the COG to identify additional projects within the agency’s funding plan, Metro will take these to the Board for consideration.

CAC members had the following comments and questions:

- Mr. Cabrales asked if Measure R allocated $590 million for Early Action Projects.
  - Mr. Quon responded that Measure R allocated $590 million to the I-710 project as well as Early Action Projects.

- Mr. Logan asked if there is a long list of potential Early Action Projects already identified.
  - Mr. Wood responded that the TAC will be nominating some additional projects, but will likely wait until the release of the Draft EIR/EIS. There is currently no comprehensive list of projects.

- Mr. Logan asked if there is a system in place to track and prioritize Early Action Projects based on specific criteria.
  - Mr. Wood responded that these criteria are currently under development and will be reviewed at the next TAC meeting.

- Mr. Logan asked if the public would be able to provide input.
  - Mr. Wood responded that once the guidelines are developed, TAC members can return to their LACs and their communities to discuss the criteria. The communities can then work with that TAC member to nominate Early Action Projects.

FOLLOW-UP ITEMS

Ms. Garcia reviewed follow-up items from the previous CAC meeting. There were no questions or comments on the previous meeting summary. She reminded the group to forward any edits or comments to MIG by the end of the day Monday for incorporation into the final meeting summary.
At the last meeting the group requested a statement from the project team concerning the absence of quiet pavement in front of the Thunderbird Villa mobile home park in South Gate.

- Mr. Wood and Mr. Quon addressed the issue of the quiet pavement in front of Thunderbird Villa. Caltrans is resolving a construction staging issue and the new pavement should be down in the next couple of weeks.

The project team also had a follow up item related to the methodology for analyzing emissions from arterials. Ms. Garcia introduced Julia Lester, the consultant conducting the AQ/HRA analysis, Ms. Lester provided the same presentation to the Project Committee at their last meeting in March 2012. Before Ms. Lester’s presentation, Ms. Garcia reminded the group that at the CAC April meeting the committee was provided with a written response from Ms. Lester regarding the same topic and the committee requested further clarification. Ms. Lester proceeded to present the clarifying information.

CAC members had the following questions:

- Ms. Greenwood asked if the analysis included an estimate of the ambient air concentrations in micrograms per cubic meter.
  
  o Ms. Lester responded that her results will produce the change in micrograms per cubic meter. The ambient data is going to be the result of all the emissions within the basin and only the traffic emissions are being modeled, particularly along the I-710. The data shows the changes between the different alternatives, but the overall air quality in the region is not just the emissions from the project.

- Ms. Greenwood noted the distinction of using measured concentrations of air toxins in an Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) site analysis versus the modeling and emissions-based calculation methodology required under CEQA. She wanted to know why the OEHHA method was not being used in the I-710 EIR/EIS.
  
  o Ms. Lester responded that the AQ/HRA guidance the team is using is the one approved by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), which incorporates the OEEHHA approach and toxicity values. It is a multi-pathway analysis.

  o Mr. Wood encouraged the CAC to get involved with the ongoing Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) effort for all of the Gateway Cities.

- Mr. Cabrales asked for clarification on the results contained within the AQ/HRA versus those of the Health Impact Assessment (HIA) and if those results were compared to each other.
  
  o Ms. Lester responded that an HIA air analysis takes the results of the AQ/HRA and then does further assessments. In that sense, they are parallel to one another. This is the reason the project team has noted that about 85% of what is in an HIA is already found in the Draft EIR/EIS. There is also a discussion of health in each section of the Draft EIR/EIS that was included as result of the strong health concerns expressed by the I-710 corridor communities.
Mr. Cabrales asked if there were any results obtained for Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM) in the years between the 2008 baseline and 2035.

- Ms. Lester responded that the team does not have the detailed traffic information for those interim years to assess that. However, she noted that regional air quality plans have overall projections for interim years and they show DPM emissions dropping the greatest amount in the next few years.
- Mr. Wood also responded that this question has come up frequently in the AQAP process and, as a result, they are trying to ascertain some estimates for the interim years.

Mr. Logan asked for clarification on what traffic information was used for the Health Risk Assessment (HRA).

- Ms. Lester responded affirmatively that the 2008 baseline and 2035 scenarios (including no-build) were used.

Mr. Logan asked for clarification on why the team cannot take the emissions data on the arterials and input it into the AERMOD to obtain health risk information.

- Ms. Lester responded that the issue was not whether you could input the emissions data into the AERMOD, but rather that it would not lead to meaningful results. Emission changes on arterials due to project design are already subject to uncertainties because of uncertainties inherent in the traffic model and emissions models. Changes in emissions, and the location of those changes, are more uncertain further from the I-710. Dispersion modeling of those emissions would compound those uncertainties and give misleading information on incremental risk changes among the alternatives. In addition, Ms. Lester noted that FHWA has also looked into this issue and have also concluded that there is not enough confidence in the results that would be obtained through this method.

Mr. Cabrales asked when the HIA would be released.

- Mr. Wood responded that the HIA and all other I-710 related AQAP products would be made available to the public when the Draft EIR/EIS is released.

The following was a question from a member of the public:

- Jocelyn Vivar of East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice asked for clarification on Ms. Lester’s slide on entrained emissions. She wanted to know what was meant by the implication that the impacts are overestimated.

  - Ms. Lester responded that the use of the current model overestimates the entrained road dust on the roadway because it increases with vehicle miles traveled (VMT); this is the same as assuming that there is an infinite source of dust on the roadways available to be kicked up by vehicle traffic. For the South Coast Air Basin, what has been found is that there is a finite source of dust on the roadways and the entrained road dust in future years should only increase with increased roadway length. However, the HRA includes results using both of these methods: with entrained road dust remaining constant and with it...
Ms. Vivar had a follow up question to ask if this logic would hold true even with the introduction of a freight corridor. Would this be considered adding “length” to the corridor versus adding lanes?

- Ms. Lester responded that if a freeway is widened, the soil eroding onto the shoulder, a primary source of silt, remains the same, as explained by CARB and SCAQMD in recent presentations. The addition of the freight corridor does not add length to the I-710 or add other erosion sources, but width. As such, the amount of silt remains the same.

At the last CAC meeting, Mr. Logan also requested a discussion on the CAC’s role during the public comment period following release of the Draft EIR/EIS. In response to this request, Ms. Garcia presented a Draft Outreach Program Summary that maps out the activities and roles for each of the I-710 committees from now until the Final EIR/EIS. This draft document highlights the major roles of the CAC in the upcoming stages of the project. The following were questions and comments from the committee:

- Mr. Cabrales asked for clarification on how the upcoming LAC meetings would be scheduled.
  - Ms. Garcia responded that the outreach team would be contacting each of the LACs to schedule update meetings.

- Ms. Long asked if the project team would be coordinating with the Long Beach Oversight Committee to schedule a meeting of that group.
  - Ms. Garcia responded that the project team has been in contact with the new staff member in Long Beach that coordinates with the Oversight Committee.

- Ms. Aparicio asked for clarification on translation services provided at the Public Hearings.
  - Ms. Garcia responded that there would be Spanish simultaneous translation provided at the Public Hearings. In Long Beach, Khmer translation would be available in addition to Spanish. This is consistent with what was provided at the Scoping meetings. Ms. Garcia also noted that the Executive Summary would be translated into Spanish, with 4 other language translations provided in as requested. Those additional languages are Vietnamese, Tagalog, Korean, and Khmer.

- Mr. Logan recommended that he would like the ability for formal comments to be submitted at the CAC Study Sessions. He added that those comments could be compiled as a result of the CAC conversation at the Study Sessions. Mr. Logan suggested that official comment from the committee would be similar to the committee’s comments on mitigation measures.
Mr. McCann responded that comments and input the committee has on mitigation measures are valuable input, but not necessarily comments that would need to be documented as official comments on the Draft EIR/EIS. However, any member of the CAC can provide official comment as representatives of their respective community groups or organizations. Comments that are captured on a wallgraphic are not considered official comment. All official comments would need to be submitted in the appropriate format.

Ms. Aparicio responded that she did not think the CAC study sessions would necessarily be the most appropriate format for submitting official comments. She questioned how we would synthesize the comments of a larger group, rather than each member submitting their comments separately.

Ms. Greenwood added that she thought the Study Sessions should remain as such. The Study Sessions would be a good opportunity for everyone to obtain information on the project in preparation for providing official comment. If the meetings are identified as Study Sessions, you could have better attendance from those who want information and may not be informed enough to provide official comment.

Mr. Diaz noted that he did not think we needed to change the role of the committee at this point. He added that the CAC should maintain their role and not deviate from that. If there is a consensus from the group on an item of great priority/concern to the group, then the committee will be able to move that forward. This is a process that has worked in the past and there should be no change.

Ms. Long added that she would also prefer having Study Sessions where she could encourage her community members to attend and become informed. She did not feel that she could represent them and/or make an official comment on their behalf.

Mr. Stanley added that he was not in favor of formal comments being taken during the Study Sessions, which would include formal comments from public attendees. However, he did think the CAC should be able to provide comments or make recommendations as a committee.

The Committee recommended (5-2) to maintain the Study Sessions as originally proposed. The Study Sessions would not be a meeting where formal public comment would be taken. However, the CAC would still have the ability to make recommendations and/or comments as a body.

- Mr. Logan asked if the role of the CAC during the Alternatives Review milestone of the project could state that the committee would work towards selecting a preferred alternative.
  - Ms. Aparicio agreed.
  - Ms. Garcia responded affirmatively.
• Mr. Cabrales noted that he would like more information and/or a more thorough recap of the actions taken at the TAC meetings.
  
  o Ms. Garcia noted that any recommendations made at the TAC meeting are brought forward to the CAC, but there were none from this month’s TAC meeting. She also noted that Mr. Pagett usually provides a summary of the TAC meetings, but was unable to attend the CAC meeting this month.
  
  o Mr. Diaz added that he found it helpful to receive the email notice for the TAC meetings and has attended a few to keep himself informed of the actions of that committee.

• Mr. Cabrales asked if there would be a summary provided in the Draft EIR/EIS of all of the comments and issues that have arisen in the throughout the corridor in all the years that this project has been going on.
  
  o Mr. McCann responded that the Draft EIR/EIS includes a chapter on comments and coordination. The document includes issues that were brought up during scoping, which also reflect a lot of issues and concerns that were brought up during the Major Corridor Study.

• Mr. Cabrales asked where the HIA would be made available to the public and how would the public be informed of its availability.
  
  o Adrian Alvarez of Metro responded that the HIA would be posted to the COG website and hard copies would be available at the COG offices.

• Mr. Logan asked where electronic and hard copies would be available of the Draft EIR/EIS.
  
  o Mr. McCann responded that the Draft EIR/EIS would be posted to the Caltrans website and hard copies would be available at 7 locations: Metro offices, Gateway Cities COG offices, Caltrans offices, and 4 libraries along the Corridor. In addition, CDs with the electronic version of the Draft EIR/EIS would be available at all other corridor libraries. These copies all include the technical studies.

The following was a question from a member of the public:

• Jocelyn Vivar asked if a link could be provided on the webpage with the Draft EIR/EIS to the HIA.
  
  o Mr. Alvarez noted that the AQAP products would be posted to the Gateway Cities COG website, but they would communicate the question to the COG and follow up with the CAC at their next meeting.
  
  o Ms. Aparicio agreed that it would be helpful to have a link to the HIA available on the same page where the Draft EIR/EIS documents are posted.

• Mr. Logan commented that the HIA was something that was initiated within the I-710 Corridor Project process, but was taken on by the Gateway Cities COG because of the
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- Mr. Quon responded that the HIA is part of the AQAP process, which is led by the COG. It was intended to be a separate and distinct process from the I-710 Project.

- Mr. Greenwood commented that the HIA conducted by the Gateway Cities COG is a policy document that deals not only with impacts along the I-710, but also in the whole gateway cities region. She commented that she thinks the public often thinks that the HIA will tell them about impacts to their individual health, and it does not do that. She added this was another reason for having study sessions to inform the public on what these studies actually tell you.

INTRODUCTION OF DRAFT EIR/EIS CHAPTERS

Mr. McCann of LSA presented a PowerPoint presentation that provided an overview of the Draft EIR/EIS, including the content of specific chapters within the document.

The following were comments and questions from the committee:

- Mr. Cabrales asked if there was an approximation on the size of the document.
  - Mr. McCann responded that the Draft EIR/EIS was roughly the size of 2 5-inch binders, or about 2,000 pages.

SUMMARY AND NEXT STEPS

Ms. Garcia recapped key points from the meeting. The following were follow up items from the meeting:

- The project team will follow up with the Gateway Cities Council of Governments on having a link to the HIA added where the Draft EIR/EIS document will be posted. The team will provide an update at the next CAC meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.