



## **I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee**

*Thursday, January 25, 2018*

*6:30 PM*

**Progress Park**

**15500 Downey Avenue**

**Paramount, CA**

### **AGENDA**

**STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 16401 PARAMOUNT BOULEVARD, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.**

**FOR YOUR INFORMATION:** The I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee at the following times:

- A. **AGENDA ITEM:** at this time the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. **NON-AGENDA ITEMS:** during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee agenda; and
- C. **PUBLIC HEARINGS:** at the time for public hearings.

**Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.**

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL – BY SELF INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**IV. ELECTION OF A CO-CHAIR FROM THE NORTH SECTOR**

**V. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).

**VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS** - Three minutes for each speaker.

**VII. MATTERS FROM STAFF**

**VIII. CONSENT CALENDAR:** All items under the Consent Calendar may be enacted by one motion. Any item may be removed from the Consent Calendar and acted upon separately by the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee.

- A. Approve Minutes for the Meeting of January 31, 2017, of the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION:

A MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM.

**IX. REPORTS**

- 50 Min A. I-710 EIR/EIS Project Updates and Recommendations
- Summary of Public Comments – Presentation by Metro
  - Project Alternatives Evaluation and Project Team Recommendation – Presentation by Metro
  - I-710 TAC Recommendation – Report by Bill Pagett, TAC Chair
  - I-710 CAC Recommendation – Report by MIG

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

- 10 Min B. Current I-710 Early Action Project Update Including
1. Cash Flow/Invoicing Status – Oral Report by Metro

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

- 5 Min C. Update on I-710 Livability Initiative – Oral Report by COG Staff

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

D. COG Engineers Report – Oral Report by COG Staff

5 Min

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

**X. MATTERS FROM THE I-710 EIR/EIS PROJECT COMMITTEE**

**XI. MATTERS FROM THE CHAIR**

**XII. ADJOURNMENT**

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 8:00 p.m. unless the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee meeting scheduled for Thursday, March 29, 2018, 6:30 PM.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

**VIII. CONSENT CALENDAR**  
**Item A**  
**Approval of Minutes**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE  
I-710 CORRIDOR EIR/EIS PROJECT COMMITTEE  
A Meeting Held at Clearwater Building  
16401 Paramount Blvd.  
Paramount, CA 90723**

January 31, 2017

**I. Call to order**

Co-chair Gil Hurtado called the meeting called to order at 6:41 pm

**II. Roll Call**

Roll Call was taken by self-introductions.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Pedro Aceituno, City of Bell Gardens; Hugo Argumedo, City of Commerce; Blanca Pacheco, City of Downey; Marilyn Sanabria, City of Huntington Park; Lena Gonzalez, City of Long Beach, Co-Chair; Gene Daniels, City of Paramount; Lori Y. Woods, City of Signal Hill; Gil Hurtado, City of South Gate, Co-Chair; Herlinda Chico, County of Los Angeles; Doug Drummond, Port of Long Beach; Lilia Leon, I-5 JPA; John Vassiliades, Caltrans; Alison Lindor, SCAG; Judy Mitchell, South Bay Cities Council of Governments (ex officio).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Ana Maria Quintana, City of Bell; Albert Robles, City of Carson; Janna Zurita, City of Compton; Baru Sanchez, City of Cudahy; Sal Alatorre, City of Lynwood; Representative from the City of Maywood; Leticia Lopez, City of Vernon; David Libatique, Port of Los Angeles; Robert Garcia, MTA; Barbara Messina, San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments; Steve Boyles, City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (ex officio); Don Johnson, Southern California Edison (ex officio).

ALSO PRESENT: Cory Allen, Chief of Staff, Office of Long Beach Councilmember Lena Gonzalez; Maria Slaughter, Director of Public Works, City of Carson; Ernesto Chaves, Project Manager, MTA; Julia Brown, Metro Community Relations Manager; Kekoa Anderson, Gateway Cities COG Engineer; Karen Heit, Gateway Cities COG Transportation Analyst; Steve Lantz, South Bay Cities COG Transportation Director; Shannon Willits, AECOM; Esmeralda Garcia, MIG; Julia Lester, Environ.

**III. Pledge of Allegiance**

Co-Chair Gil Hurtado led the Pledge of Allegiance

#### **IV. Amendments to the Agenda**

There were no amendments to the agenda.

#### **V. Public Comments**

There were no general public comments.

#### **VI. Matters from Staff**

There were no matters from staff.

#### **VII. Consent Calendar**

The Consent Calendar was approved by acclamation.

#### **VIII. Reports**

##### **A. I-719 EIR/EIS Project Updates**

##### **1. Project status Reports by AECOM//LSA/MIG**

Shannon Willits – AECOM provided the project status report including an overview of the public outreach with cities on the alternatives and their impact on the environment. He indicated that almost all of the technical studies have been turned over to Caltrans where they are being reviewed by District 7 staff before they are reviewed by Caltrans Headquarters in Sacramento. Esmerelda Garcia, MIG, reviewed the local advisory, corridor committee meetings and the issues that have come up including study sessions on the alternatives. She emphasized that the team was available for additional meetings if the cities should so desire. Willits went over the project definition, the three alternatives and project needs. There are three alternatives; No-Build, Alternatives 5C and 7. He went on to review the common elements to both build alternatives:

- Maximum goods movement by rail
- TSM/TDM/ITS Improvements
- Transit improvements
- Active Transportation Improvements
- I-710 Zero/Near Zero Emissions (ZE/NZE) Truck Deployment Program
- I-710 Health & Benefit Program

##### **2. Overview of Proposed Alternatives – AECOM/LSA/MIG**

Willits continued to review the design elements of the 19-mile corridor and the projects and improvements that are common to both.

The ability to handle capacity is different in the two alternatives; he reviewed the addition of auxiliary lanes with Alt. 5C and the use of the Freight Corridor to handle truck freight capacity for Alt. 7. Alt. 7 is also defined by its limited ingress and egress.

Willits went on to describe the improvements for each of the alternatives through a concept drawing of the same three cross sections of the freeway, pointed out the design differences. Each of the sections posed different challenges for facilities owned and operated by Southern California Edison and the United States Army Corp of Engineers. Each alternative has its unique property, construction and utility relocation challenges.

### 3. Overview of Proposed Alternatives – MTA

Willits turned the presentation over to Ernesto Chaves, MTA Project Manager. Chaves reviewed the project timing and the comments that were submitted during the first draft of the EIR/EIS, Chaves announced that the plan was to circulate the environmental document by the summer of 2017. He discussed that the next phase after the completion of the environmental will be the development of a construction phasing plan that is dependent upon funding availability. While the SDEIR/SDEIS is being circulated, the funding partners are planning to work through the identification of a preferred alternative and phasing plan. He reviewed the public process that would conclude in a recommendation coming up from the local committees to the Project Committee to the I-710 Executive Committee, to the MTA Board and ultimately Caltrans and the state. He discussed the need for more frequent Project Committee meetings for the coming year and as many individual briefings that are needed. He reviewed the project calendar and indicated that the funding issue will arise in June of this year.

Co-Chair Gil Hurtado called for public comment on the reports.

#### **Public Comment:**

Amanda Lopez wants to see MTA Board Motion 22.1(Motion 22.1) implemented in full. She wanted to make sure the active transportation elements are implemented

Maria Lopez – Long Beach resident living in an impacted area. She lives within the project area and has attended meetings. She would like to see improvements to services in the community. She reported an issue with an alley in Long Beach that had not been resolved.

Maria Reyes – Resident of West Long Beach. She heard that the project will protect public health. She indicated that nothing had been done to improve the health of the community.

She felt that removing homes and businesses was not improving the community. She didn't want to be forced to move and face higher rents and lease rates. She did not want to see the Long Beach multi-purpose center located away from where people need it.

Sylvia Betancourt – Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma (LBACA). She wants to see no displacement. She is particularly concerned that there be no displacement in the Commerce community. She is concerned about the number of trucks and the high rate of asthma in children. She supports the use of zero emission trucks. She wants to see Motion 22.1 implemented completely and was concerned that it wasn't.

Priscilla Sanchez – Passed out a paper with three informational graphs. She said she heard the ZE was not being considered and went on to discuss the usage and benefit of

ZE vehicles.

Amanda Meza – Made a brief presentation on the distributed graph and the government support of ZE technology versus the continuance of reliance on fossil fuels.

Maria Hernandez – Huntington Park resident urged the Project Committee to support the use of ZE technology; she explained the third graph and discussed the dependency on oil.

Itzel Martinez – Huntington Park wants Caltrans to consider the use of ZE vehicles and wanted to make sure that seniors were accommodated

Martha Romo – Indicated that no one in her Huntington Park community knows about the project. She gets information from attending Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma meetings (LABACA).

Yemili Perez – Both she and her daughter have asthma. She wants to see the study of ZE vehicles. She lives in Wilmington and is personally impacted by the pollution.

Sarah Rivera – Communities for a Better Environment (CBE). She was encouraging the project to not impact the homeless shelters. She resides in the Bell shelter. She encouraged that the project design not take homes.

Miquel Ortega – East Yards Communities for Environmental Justice (EYCEJ) – spoke in support of no residential displacement. The Bandini and Bristol areas are going to lose homes. He does not want to see housing removed. The removal of homes would impact him personally. EYCEJ presented an option that would not remove homes.

Mark Lopez – EYCEJ, spoke about the anniversary of the Project Committee directing Caltrans to study Community Alternative-7 (CA-7). Lopez brought up Trump trying to find a middle ground for pushing the economy. He is concerned that Trump's priorities become the goals of this project. He indicated that Caltrans has not listened to the community and the communities deserve better.

Hugo Lujan – EYCEJ Organizer. He updates members of the community. He wants to push CA-7 and gain the maximum beneficial community impact. He asserted that the issue is Caltrans is an obstacle to making CA-7 a reality and implementing Motion 22.1.

Jesus Escot – EYCEJ – Bellflower resident. It is important for Caltrans to comply with Motion 22.1 and improve the LA River Bikeway. The project fails without improving the Bike lanes.

Jose Lara – EY spoke in support of improvements in the LA River, more lights and green space

Gabriel Guerrero - South Gate resident/Communities for a Better Environment (CBE) – is concerned about people that will be displaced and where they will go. He wants to see Motion 22.1 studied and implemented. He indicated that ZE vehicles are needed to reduce pollution.

Susanne Browne – Legal Aid Foundation – Called attention to the letter and the chart that were distributed. She is concerned that Motion 22.1 was not implemented. She brought up displacement potential for the Long Beach Multi-Service Center and the Bell shelter as well as the use of ZE funds.

Heather Kryczka– National Resources Defense Council – Caltrans has failed to implement Motion 22.1. Caltrans has violated the Motion with not eliminating displacements. She was not sure if Caltrans had failed to comply with other aspects of the Motion. She urged the Project Committee to request full compliance with Motion 22.1.



Chair Hurtado discussed the location of his residence to the I-710 freeway and the LA River. He indicated that the other elected officials around the table were also residents of impacted communities. He stressed that the issues were personal to him and the other Project Committee members and thanked the speakers for their positive attitudes and comments.

4. Metro Board Motion 22.1 Update – MTA

Ernesto Chaves reviewed the history of Motion 22.1 and how it has been incorporated in the work. He reviewed a chart that inserted Motion 22.1 in the environmental review process. Most of the items are relevant to Alt. 7. He reviewed the items that have not been incorporated but will be part of follow-on activities as they are not specific to environmental review. He talked about the independent bicycle routes that are underway as a discrete effort. He went on to focus on three items of the many Motion 22.1 components (highlighted in yellow). Avoiding property takes has been done but will require intensive briefings to be clear. The ZE option, LA River and additional crossing/replacements of crossings would be examined in depth tonight. Chaves called on Shannon Willits to review the Motion 22.1 bicycle elements and the additional freeway crossings. He reviewed the protocol used to determine where additional crossings were possible and would meet the ½ mile gap. He gave examples of where crossing didn't make sense. He reviewed the following three locations that are common to both and two that are possible with 5C. He discussed the size and bulk of the crossings and the potential impact they may have to communities. There are some limited ROW impacts associated with the construction of the crossings. David Levinsohn - AECOM discussed the impacts to the LA River Bike path, including lighting ingress/egress improvements and landscaping. He addressed design elements for bikeway path bike repair stations. LED solar powered lighting and additional access points. Levinsohn gave examples of potential improvements.

A Motion to receive and file the reports was made and approved

**B. I-710 Measure Funding Criteria**

No Report was given

**C. Metro Updates**

1. Measure M

Ernesto Chaves passed out the Measure M Expenditure Plan indicating that the administrative guidelines for expenditures had not been determined. He reviewed the Measure M allocation for the I-710 project allocations. He also discussed the timing for the funding coming forward for distribution.

A Motion to receive and file the report was made and approved

2. Zero Emission Truck Initiatives/Grants

Julia Lester, Environ Consultant, spoke next on the air quality work. She said that ZE and NZE were being considered and that the study was technology neutral. She talked about the status of existing ZE and NZE vehicles and how rapidly viable vehicle alternatives were

becoming available. She stated that the analysis of ZE was underway and would be presented to the CAC and TAC next month. She went on to explain that Alt. 5C has NZE and ZE trucks where Alt. 7 has two options ZE and NZE.

#### **D. SR-91/I-605/I-405 & I-710 Project Study Report (PSR) Development Study**

Ernesto Chaves discussed where the two project programs overlap. He discussed the SR-91/I-605/I-405 project status and reviewed the project limits. He discussed the major design elements and a broad brush for the potential costs. He reviewed the potential for \$5 million worth of localized improvements to arterial streets that would further ease freeway congestion.

A Motion to receive and file the report was made and approved.

#### **E. I-710 Early Action Projects Update**

##### **1. I-710 Soundwall Plans**

The Early Action Projects consists of soundwalls to be located in various locations along the I-710. Chaves discussed placing soundwalls where they would benefit the community and not be torn down to accommodate either build alternative. There are three packages that are in the design phase. He also talked about the aesthetic treatments that are being prepared for some existing walls that will remain in place. He showed a slide with the pilaster design for the project. He reviewed the soundwall construction schedule and the work to be done.

A question was asked about the permanence of the walls and compatibility with the rest of the project elements.

#### **F. Updates on I-710 Livability Initiative**

Kekoa Anderson, Gateway Cities Council of Governments (GCCOG) Consulting Engineer, launched a presentation of the I-710 Livability Plan (I-710 LP). He reviewed those elements that are part of the I-710 LP and how it is complimentary with the GCCOG Strategic Transportation Plan (STP) as well as the I-710 community vision. The LP has not started so Anderson reviewed the anticipated process and how the I-710 LP project activities will roll out. He reviewed the STP plans for the different modes and how they will help build the I-170 LP. He emphasized the focus on safety and the issues with truck traffic, and safety pedestrians and bikes.

He went on to talk about the need for park space and how the freeway project can assist with the development of open space utilizing remnant freeway parcels. A comment was made that the presentation concerning the I-710 LP should have been presented earlier in the course of the meeting when most of the interested public was still in attendance. Anderson commented that the presentation has been given all over the I-710 communities and there was and will be opportunities to hear it again.

A Motion to receive and file the report was made and approved.

### **G. COG Engineers Report**

Anderson went on to give the COG Engineers report. He reviewed the TAC meetings and the LA River working group and the upcoming meetings that will provide planning and potential funding for improvements as suggested in Motion 22.1. Anderson reviewed the status of the corridor masterplan and the arterial work that is developing. He discussed the benefit of multi-jurisdiction urban forestry impacts and the potential for the impact on GHG benefit from larger projects consisting of multiple jurisdictions. He indicated that Gateway subregion was due for urban forestry project funds. He brought up the potential for bio-swales and other storm run-off projects. He talked about the enhanced potential based upon the work the COG has done through the STP process. He reviewed in detail some of the components for the arterial improvements. He discussed the success of Gateway Cities in receiving water quality funds by combining the various elements that clean run-off water. He went over the Long Beach MUST Project which treats run-off and provides community benefit. Co-Chair Lena Gonzalez thanked Anderson for working on the Long Beach plans and for working closely with the communities.

A Motion was made and approved to receive and file the report.

### **IX. Matters from the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee**

There were no matters from the Project Committee.

### **X. Matters from the Chair**

Co-Chair Gil Hurtado announced that this was his last meeting and thanked the PC for all their hard work and expressed a desire to attend a future groundbreaking.

### **XI. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 8:45 p.m.