GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

SR-91/I-605/I-405
Corridor Cities Committee

AGENDA

Wednesday, February 24, 2021 - 6:00 PM
Gateway Cities Council of Governments

MEETING REMOTE LOCATION:
https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_VvZGcfzuTHCj9JsuUWXggA
Please register in advance for the webinar

OR JOIN BY PHONE:
1.669.900.6833

MEETING NUMBER:
833 1863 9569

After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the webinar.

AGENDA REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE ON THE GATEWAY CITIES COG WEBSITE AT WWW.GATEWAYCOG.ORG.

ON MARCH 4, 2020, GOVERNOR NEWSOM PROCLAIMED A STATE OF EMERGENCY TO EXIST IN CALIFORNIA AS A RESULT OF THE THREAT OF COVID-19. THE GOVERNOR HAS ISSUED EXECUTIVE ORDERS THAT TEMPORARILY SUSPEND REQUIREMENTS OF THE BROWN ACT, INCLUDING ALLOWING PUBLIC AGENCIES TO HOLD PUBLIC MEETINGS VIA TELECONFERENCING AND TO MAKE PUBLIC MEETINGS ACCESSIBLE TELEPHONICALLY OR OTHERWISE ELECTRONICALLY TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: To address the 91/605/405 Corridor Cities Committee on any agenda item or a matter within the 91/605/405 Corridor Cities Committee Purview, please provide written comments by 3:00 p.m., the day of the meeting, via email to info@gatewaycog.org. All written comments timely submitted will be distributed to the 91/605/405 Corridor Cities Committee members and will become part of the official record.
I. CALL TO ORDER – Raymond Dunton (Presiding Officer)

II. ROLL CALL

III. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

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

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS - The limit for each speaker is three minutes unless otherwise specified by the Chair. Please use the "Raise Hand" feature on Zoom to indicate that you wish to make a comment. If you are calling in, please dial *9 to use the "Raise Hand" feature.

   A. Public comments received via e-mail as of January 27, 2021

VI. MATTERS FROM STAFF

VII. 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 Committee.

   A. Approval of Minutes for the meeting of June 26, 2019 of the 91/605/405 Corridor Cities Committee

VIII. REPORT

   10 Min
   A. Metro Highway Program Update on Measure R/M Funding - Report by Ernesto Chaves (Metro).

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

   15 Min
   B. I-605 Corridor Improvement Project– Report by Isidro Panuco (Metro).
      • Presentation on the Project schedule and current project activities.

      SUGGESTED ACTION: STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO SUPPORT A LOCALLY COLLABORATED ALTERNATIVE TO BE INCLUDED INTO THE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT

   10 Min
   C. SR-91 Corridor Aesthetic Master Plan – Report by Kekoa Anderson (GCCOG)
      • Overview of the SR-91 Corridor Aesthetic
      • Link to Download the Master Plan CLICK HERE

      SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MASTER PLAN, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF
IX. COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

X. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 7:00 PM unless the Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN 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.
V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Item A
Public Comments Received Via E-Mail as of January 27, 2021
I am a resident of Los Angeles who is concerned by the freeway expansion. I am writing to oppose the freeway expansion moving forward because not only Metro Los Angeles has conducted zero stakeholder meetings in the community since directed by the Metro Board in October but because in the era of climate change, freeway expansions will worsen our environment.

We are in a climate crisis. California needs to start prioritizing other forms of transportation that gets people out of carbon emitting cars.

Freeway expansions have been proven not to solve the issue of traffic due to induced demand. (Think of induced demand like putting a bookshelf in your living room, once you have a bookshelf you want to fill up the shelves, that is what happens with freeways and cars. The wider you expand the freeway the more cars will fill up the freeway.)

Thank you,
Thurmon Green
Dear Corridor Cities Committee:

I am a resident of the Gateway Cities and I live in Long Beach. I am writing to oppose the freeway expansion project as Metro LA has not only conducted zero stakeholder meetings in the community since directed by the Metro Board in October but will also not solve traffic issues, worsen air quality, harm the environment, demolish a school, and disrupt an entire neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Keith Farwell
I am a resident of Downey and I grew up in the neighborhood that would be directly impacted by the freeway expansion. My family and many childhood friends still live in that neighborhood, many who are not even a five minute walk away from the soundwall and those whose homes would be demolished for a few extra lanes on the freeway.

I am writing this email asking that you reject any plans Metro has put forth until they engage with community stakeholders like my family and friends who live in the houses that would be torn down but haven't heard a single update on the progress of the freeway expansion. Metro has failed to adequately engage with community stakeholders like myself and my family who are homeowners in the neighborhood for decades. This project was introduced when I was a child and they have all but abandoned any communications with community stakeholders like myself despite being directed by the Board of Supervisors back in October to redouble their efforts to outreach to the community to inform us of how the plans have changed since the initial 2007 & 2014 reports.

I also want to know why Metro is doing the bare minimum in preparing these reports that fail to adequately describe detailed freeway alternatives that would produce minimum impacts on the residents. I also want to know why the acknowledgement of induced demand is not in the report. Studies have shown time and time again that if you widen a freeway it will not solve the issue of traffic and instead put more cars on the road increasing carbon emissions that further pollute our urban environment.

The Corridor Cities Committee's Purview should reject any plans that would expand the freeway considering Metro has not adequately engaged with community stakeholders for decades and because the only acceptable amount of homes lost to a freeway expansion is zero.

Sincerely,

Alex Contreras
Freeway Expansion is not the solution

Lois Keller <kellergals@gmail.com>
Mon 1/25/2021 10:36 PM
To:

- Genny Cisneros

I am a resident of Studio City and I’m a climate activist with Climate Reality Los Angeles who is concerned by the freeway expansion. I am writing to oppose the freeway expansion moving forward because not only Metro Los Angeles has conducted zero stakeholder meetings in the community since directed by the Metro Board in October but because in the era of climate change, freeway expansions will worsen our environment.

Sincerely,

--

www.loiskeller.com
Technical Advisory Committee- 605 Freeway Expansion

Alexandria Contreras <alexandria.contreras17@gmail.com>
Mon 1/25/2021 10:31 PM
To:

- Genny Cisneros

I am a resident of Downey and I grew up in the neighborhood that would be directly impacted by the freeway expansion. My family still lives in that neighborhood, not even a three minute walk away from the soundwall. I want to know why Metro has failed to engage with community stakeholders like myself and my family who are homeowners in the neighborhood despite being directed by the Board of Supervisors back in October and since this project was first introduced.

I also want to know why Metro is doing the bare minimum in preparing these reports that fail to adequately describe detailed freeway alternatives that would produce minimum impacts on the residents.

The Technical Advisory Committee should reject any plans that would expand the freeway considering Metro has engaged with zero community stakeholders since October and because the only acceptable amount of homes lost to a freeway expansion is zero.

Sincerely,

Alex Contreras
I am a resident of Long Beach and I am opposed to the expansion of the I-5 freeway. This expansion is unjustified due to the lack of community input and the bulldozing of residences and green space. This will only work to increase pollution and further degenerate our air quality in the region. Freeway Expansion has not been proven to improve travel times and this would be a waste of taxpayer dollars.

Thank You,
David Shelto
Ridha A Hassoun, PharmD <ridha@hassoun.org>
Mon 1/25/2021 10:12 PM

To: Genny Cisneros

To Whom It May Concern,

I am a resident of Downey who is concerned by the freeway expansion. I am writing to oppose the freeway expansion moving forward because not only Metro Los Angeles has conducted zero stakeholder meetings in the community since directed by the Metro Board in October but because in the era of climate change, freeway expansions will worsen our environment. It is appalling to me the lack of outreach Metro has done regarding the freeway expansion, especially as they were directed to do so by the Metro Board in October.

Freeway expansions don't solve traffic issues. As a son of a Caltrans engineer, I have heard of many freeway expansion projects that my parent has work on, only to drive through them and find the same traffic issues these expansions were supposed to solve! Resources towards freeway expansions are not equitable and should be directed towards transit services. Induced demand increases the amount of cars on the road which will increase carbon emissions, and it is often minority communities that have to deal with the effects on their health and environment. This freeway expansion will harm the environment, displace hundreds of families, bulldoze through green space and a school. This would disrupt an entire neighborhood of Downey and not solve the issue of traffic.

I urge the Gateway Cities Council of Governments to speak up on behalf of over 2 million residents and demand better transportation options for its citizens.

Thank you for your time,

---

Ridha A Hassoun, PharmD
Cell - 562 261 6550
Email - ridha@hassoun.org
Website - www.ridhahassoun.com
Hello,

I am a resident of Downey and I'm a young mother who is concerned by the freeway expansion. I am writing to oppose the freeway expansion moving forward because not only Metro Los Angeles has conducted zero stakeholder meetings in the community since directed by the Metro Board in October but because in the era of climate change, freeway expansions will worsen our environment. I am advocating on behalf of the two million residents who live in the Gateway Cities. This freeway expansion is being pushed through with zero engagement with community stakeholders and will further damage the environment in the Gateway Cities region. This freeway expansion will demolish hundreds of homes, tear through an elementary school and a park. A park that I spent most of my childhood in. I won’t be able to share these memories with my son. This is simply unacceptable. Do not allow this freeway expansion to move forward and protect the Gateway Cities.

Sincerely,

Abby Chavez
I am advocating on behalf of the two million residents who live in the Gateway Cities. This freeway expansion is being pushed through with zero engagement with community stakeholders and will further damage the environment in the Gateway Cities region. This freeway expansion will demolish hundreds of homes, tear through an elementary school and a park. This is simply unacceptable. Do not allow this freeway expansion to move forward and protect the Gateway Cities.

Sincerely,
Alex Caron
Stop the Downey freeway expansion

caitlin brady <caitlinbrady@gmail.com>
Mon 1/25/2021 9:20 PM
To:

- Genny Cisneros

Hello,

I am writing to express opposition to the 605 Freeway Expansion. First, freeway expansions don’t actually solve traffic problems, and more often contribute to them. They are harmful to communities and the environment. We need to be putting more resources into public transportation and infrastructure which could actually improve these issues. Why haven’t you engaged community stakeholders in Downey and the surrounding areas yet? Stop pushing harmful projects like this.

Sincerely,
Caitlin Brady
Please DO NOT pass agenda items VII(B) and VII(C).

I am a resident of 90706 in LA County.

This letter is regarding items VII(B) and VII(C) on tomorrow’s agenda [http://www.gatewaycog.org/media/userfiles/subsite_9/files/committees/2021/91-605-405-corridor/Agenda%2091-605-405%20CCC_lan%2027%202421_Final1.pdf]

I am voicing my opposition to both items referenced above.

It is widely known that widening freeways displaces communities of color, destroys generational wealth, and further pollutes our air. It’s absolutely bewildering that we are still widening freeways in 2020 when this data exists.

Freeway widening projects DO NOT help with overall traffic. In fact, they do nothing at all and even worsen our air quality.

To reduce traffic time, alternative forms of transit are needed, such as bus lanes, road diets, and trains. The aforementioned modes of transit actually reduce traffic, not freeway expansions.

This is absolutely a step in the wrong direction on bettering air quality for LA County residents and all climate change efforts cities, counties, states and nations across the world are striving for. It is unconscionable that the option to widen the freeway is under consideration at all.

The report attached to the agenda is intentionally misleading and sparse with regard to the full impact of these improvements: has the demolition of housing been removed from the plan? Has there been any acknowledgment of plans to demolish housing in a HOUSING CRISIS? There has not been sufficient community input and neither these aesthetic studies nor the full plan for freeway widening should be allowed to move forward without alternatives that maintain homes and contribute to efforts to reduce greenhouse gases in our County.
I am requesting that the Corridor Cities Committee does not pass agenda items VII(B) and VII(C).

Sincerely,
Vickie Gordon
LA County resident in 90706
Freeways 91/605/405 Corridor Cities Committee's Purview

Samantha Joanna Guerrero <sam.jg97@gmail.com>
Mon 1/25/2021 8:30 PM

To: Genny Cisneros

Hello,

I live close to Downey, CA by the 5 Freeway entrance. I am asking that you do not approve the Metro's plans to expand as Metro has not done it's due diligence to inform the community, or gather community input. This expansion will negatively effect the residents, cause dither congestion, and displace households.

Please re consider and outreach to the community prior to further development.

Samantha Guerrero
91/605/405 Corridor Cities Committee's Purview

Alfred Twu <firstcultural@gmail.com>
Mon 1/25/2021 8:05 PM
To: Genny Cisneros

Please do not approve the I-5 expansion plans.

Thanks
Alfred
I am a resident of Downey living in the neighborhood that will be directly impacted by the freeway expansion. So far Metro has failed to conduct any community outreach or gathered any community input on these proposed plans. You can't approve these plans without community engagement. Do not expand the freeway & order Metro to hold stakeholder meetings with us! There should be zero freeway expansions occurring during an era of climate change and during a housing crisis. All this would do is displace hundreds of families, destroy green space and a school, and for what?! To create more pollution and traffic? Shame on you if you approve these plans and shame on Metro for trying to bulldoze a Latino community to the ground.

Adriana Contreras
Lucky Darling <luckyadarling@yahoo.com>
Mon 1/25/2021 6:38 PM
To: Genny Cisneros

Do not approve these freeway expansions! Los Angeles does not need more congested freeways, more transit solutions that depend on cars, or more houses being demolished. Los Angeles needs robust public transit that serves the people who live and work here! Freeway expansions in LA have already been proven to succumb to induced demand and hit capacity within a year of construction, we should not be continuing the destruction of working class neighborhoods for ineffective solutions for suburban commuters.

Lucky Darling

Los Angeles, CA
To whom it may concern:

Do not expand the I-5 by bulldozing family homes. There has been zero community engagement from Metro and you have failed to show detailed comparisons for alternative plans.

This would be premature and unfair to those who it would impact most.

Best,
Natasha

--
Natasha Cougoule
University of California, Berkeley
B.A. Economics, May 2018
ncougoule@berkeley.edu | (408) 533-3601
91/605/405 Corridor Cities Committee's Purview

Christina Dunbar-Hester <dunbarhe@usc.edu>
Mon 1/25/2021 6:26 PM
To: Genny Cisneros

Dear Gateway Cog Board,

I write to urge you to oppose the expansion of I-5. Widening this freeway is not an acceptable plan for the region or the people most affected by the plan. Planning is also not including sufficient engagement from the people affected.

Thank you for your attention to this.

Sincerely,

--

Christina Dunbar-Hester, Ph.D.
& less-new book, Low Power to the People, MIT Press

Annenberg School for Communication and Journalism
University of Southern California
office: ANN 414J
e-mail: dunbarhe@usc.edu
mail: 3502 Watt Way, Building 32, Los Angeles/Tovaangar, CA 90089 USA
Do not approve the I-5 freeway expansion plans. There's been zero community engagement from Metro. Freeway expansion directly increases freeway congestion. Induced demand is a one-way ticket to increased traffic, vehicle miles traveled, pollution, and CO2 emissions.

Best regards,

Chloé Pascual
3500 Elm Avenue, Unit 13
Long Beach, CA 90807
Hello,

My name is Vanessa and I am a resident of Paramount, CA. I am also an avid Metro user; I often use the bus and train to travel to work, recreational areas and other places. I am aware that the Corridor Cities Committee is planning on meeting tomorrow to discuss the Corridor Improvement Project. Because there has not been sufficient feedback obtained from community members and Metro has not made enough of an effort to alert nearby residents of their plans, I am urging the committee to not approve freeway expansion plans. While plans allude that there has been stakeholder involvement from local jurisdictions, Caltrans and the Metro Board, it will ultimately be residents that live in the Gateway Cities that will be impacted by these changes. This is especially true for individuals who live very close to the freeways; not only will they have spaces taken away from them to accommodate additional freeway lanes, they will also potentially be exposed to more air pollution and suffer from poor health outcomes. Given that many people who live in the Gateway Cities are systematically oppressed people of color, this will further exacerbate existing environmental racism and health disparities. These changes would benefit mainly more affluent residents who have access to personal transportation and live outside of the Gateway Cities. If this is the case, we must ask ourselves: which people are actually benefiting from this expansion and why hasn’t Metro thought of expanding freeways near other neighborhoods away from Southeast Los Angeles instead?

Again, please consider rejecting Metro’s plans for freeway expansion. Thank you.

Best,

Vanessa Gomez, MPH | vanessaarely@berkeley.edu | MPH ’20, Public Health Nutrition
UC Berkeley School of Public Health
"If You Build It, They Will Come" Freeway Expansions Stimulate More Traffic

Megan Lynch <spidra@gmail.com>
Mon 1/25/2021 4:50 PM

To: Genny Cisneros

It is difficult for me to believe I even have to write such an email. All around us are the signs of climate change. I'm 55 years old and have seen SoCal get hotter, more dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists, seen the air get better for a bit then start to get worse again as the environmental awareness, regulations, and enforcement faded away. The last couple seasons have been full of fires scientists agree were made worse by anthropogenic climate change. And even in January we've had brushfires. - the LAST thing we need right now is transit investment in making things easier for the automobile.

Eminent domain should be something used only for projects that do overwhelming public good. We should reinvest in rail for freight and passenger travel and I expect due to how the old rights-of-way were sold off and built up that we'll be forced to use eminent domain then. But eminent domain-ing low income people out of their homes because people who refuse to make the changes we need to make to stem climate change want to spend less time in the traffic they're creating is unconscionable.

Build accessible (well-ventilated) public transit. Build accessible cycling infrastructure. Don't waste the public's money on more concrete that will not just worsen air quality for Downey residents, but will contribute to disastrous consequences nationally and globally. You have to be brave enough to show the sort of leadership that suits the times the 20th century's excesses have placed us in.

I'm dead set against this disastrous proposal, but as long as you're proposing it, you owe the community proactive education and outreach in the languages of the community (including ASL). You owe them meeting times that busy working people can make. You owe them respectful engagement, including truly listening to them regarding their lives and future.

Sincerely,

Megan Lynch
I oppose the freeway expansion in Downey

Jessica Elaina Eason <jesspatsox@gmail.com>
Mon 1/25/2021 1:10 PM

To: Genny Cisneros

Hello,

I am writing in opposition to the 605 Freeway Expansion.

We all know freeway expansions are harmful to the community and to our environment. Period. And they do not actually alleviate traffic issues. Public transportation infrastructure does.

Can we please invest in our transportation infrastructure? Can greed not be our number one go to?

Why haven’t you engaged stakeholders in Downey and surrounding areas?

**Stop pushing outdated and racist projects like this one.**

Sincerely,
Jessica Eason
Los Angeles
Public Comment for TAC - 605 Freeway Widening

Wesley Reutemann <wesleyreutemann@gmail.com>
Mon 1/25/2021 1:01 PM

To:

- Genny Cisneros

Dear Committee Members and staff,

As you consider the next steps to widen the 605 freeway, I hope you will examine the many overlapping issues at stake:

In 2017 the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research advised agencies that “every percent increase in lane miles results in a 1.03 percent increase in vehicle travel”. This outcome is well-documented and acknowledged in the academic world. It is also increasingly understood by the general public, who have observed firsthand the results of freeway widening after freeway widening across southern California.

Vehicle trips are the main source of air pollution in southern California, one of the most polluted air basins in the United States. The health impacts of such poor air quality are significant, costly, and long-term. High rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, cognitive impairments, some cancers, and even obesity have all been linked to exposure to high levels of air pollution. These impacts are disproportionately felt by more vulnerable members of our community, including children and older adults. In 2020, researchers at Harvard University even discovered that the risk of dying from COVID-19 went up 8% for each increase of 1 μg/m3 of PM 2.5. These preventable health disparities cost the LA County billions in associated healthcare and diminished productivity, every year.

Los Angeles County and California will never meet its climate action goals unless the region reduces how much the average resident drives. Individual and commercial vehicles are responsible for over 50% of all greenhouse gas emissions in the state of California when one accounts for emissions related to the extraction, processing, and distribution of oil. Vehicle electrification alone will not be sufficient to meet adopted climate and air quality goals, according to the CA Air Resources Board. It is critical that future transportation investments help reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita, and help lead our region and state towards a more sustainable economy and future.

California remains in a housing crisis that disproportionately burdens working families, renters, and lower-income residents. As currently proposed the project would result in the net loss of housing. Protecting existing housing, and supporting new affordable housing,
should be a priority for local decision-makers right now, especially in light of a pandemic exacerbated by overcrowded housing stock.

If the goal is to reduce traffic and speed up travel times, there are other, evidence-based ways to do so within the existing highway right-of-way that would be more cost-effective and sustainable. One more lane is not a solution. It is a myopic, 20th century approach that will negatively impact residents across Los Angeles County.

Thank you,

Wes and Kristin Reutimann

Wesley and Kristin Reutimann
Caitlin Lainoff <clainoff@gmail.com>
Mon 1/25/2021 12:48 PM

To: Genny Cisneros

Please stop pushing for outdated and racist projects like the expansion of the 605 Freeway. Freeways cause disproportionate harm to the communities they damage.

Best,
Caitlin
Freeway expansion

Alia Pyatt <aliajpyatt@gmail.com>
Tue 1/26/2021 7:23 AM
To: Genny Cisneros

I am a resident of Downey and am concerned by the freeway expansion. I am writing to oppose the freeway expansion moving forward because not only Metro Los Angeles has conducted zero stakeholder meetings in the community since directed by the Metro Board in October but because in the era of climate change, freeway expansions will worsen our environment.

Sincerely,

Alia Pyatt
Hi there,

I am writing in opposition to the 605 Freeway Expansion. Freeway expansions are harmful to the community and to our environment and don’t actually alleviate traffic issues. Public transportation infrastructure does.

Why haven’t you engaged stakeholders in Downey and surrounding areas? Stops pushing outdated and racist projects like this one.

Sincerely,
Natalie Smyka
Los Angeles
To: Genny Cisneros

Hi there,

I am writing in opposition to the 605 Freeway Expansion. Freeway expansions are harmful to the community and to our environment and don’t actually alleviate traffic issues. Public transportation infrastructure does.

Why haven’t you engaged stakeholders in Downey and surrounding areas? Stop pushing outdated and racist projects like this one.

Thanks,

Jessica Craven
Los Angeles, CA 90065
Technical Advisory Committee-605 Freeway Expansion

jocelyne flores <joccyflores1@gmail.com>
Mon 1/25/2021 11:55 AM

To: Genny Cisneros

I would like Metro to do their job with the community and therefore engage with community stakeholders and the surrounding areas as directed by Metro Board in October.

This freeway expansion will not only environmentally continue to harm the community of Downey and surrounding areas and the resources given towards this expansion should be given to equitable transit services instead.

Best,
Jocelyne Flores
I am writing in opposition to the 605 Freeway Expansion. Freeway expansions are harmful to the community and to our environment and don’t actually alleviate traffic issues. Public transportation infrastructure does.

Why haven’t you engaged stakeholders in Downey and surrounding areas? Stop pushing outdated and racist projects like this one.

Sincerely,
Nicole
605 expansion

Valerie Hurt <vr.hurt@gmail.com>
Mon 1/25/2021 11:32 AM

To: Genny Cisneros

> Hi there,
> 
> I am writing in opposition to the 605 Freeway Expansion. Freeway expansions are harmful to the community and to our environment and don’t actually alleviate traffic issues. Public transportation infrastructure does.
> 
> Why haven’t you engaged stakeholders in Downey and surrounding areas? Stop pushing outdated and racist projects like this one.
Thank you,
Valerie Hurt
LA Resident
Technical Advisory Committee-605 Freeway Expansion

Kate Grodd <kate.grodd@gmail.com>
Mon 1/25/2021 11:29 AM

To: Genny Cisneros

Hello,

I'm writing in opposition to the 605 Freeway Expansion. It would further damage our environment, and we all know that this expansion will not solve traffic issues. Why not use these resources to expand public transportation services instead?

Thank you,
Kate

--
T: 917-532-5046
Email: kate.grodd@gmail.com
Pronouns: she/her/hers

Double check your voter registration: HERE
Register to vote: HERE
Freeway Expansion comment

Elise Kalfayan <elisek@sunroomdesk.com>
Mon 1/25/2021 11:25 AM

To: Genny Cisneros

I am a resident of LA County and opposed to the 605 Freeway Expansion, as well as any local freeway expansion projects at this time! Freeway expansions are harmful to the community and to our environment and don't actually alleviate traffic issues. Public transportation infrastructure does. Transportation dollars should be going to active transportation, multi-modal transportation projects, transit infrastructure, increased route service, as well as full-fare subsidies for public transit.

Stop funding outdated projects. Please look ahead and help us solve our congestion problems, air quality problems, and equity problems through forward-looking transportation plans.

Elise Kalfayan
Glendale, CA
Charles Bennett <charleshbennett89@gmail.com>
Mon 1/25/2021 11:09 AM

To: Genny Cisneros
Cc: happycitycoalition@gmail.com

To Whom It May Concern:

I write on the subject of the proposed I-605/I-5 freeway expansion. I urge that the expansion either be scuttled outright or undergo further study.

I urge the Technical Advisory Committee to follow through on the directions they received in October to engage with community stakeholders.

Also, I believe a freeway expansion is harmful (in a number of different ways) to both the community and the planet, and flies in the face of state and local policies urging fewer cars, not more. The COG needs to allocate more funds to transit and walkability, and fewer funds to antiquated highway projects. Transit and walkability improvements are more effective at resolving traffic issues than highway projects are.

Regards,

Charles H. Bennett, MPP
To: Genny Cisneros

Hi there,

I am writing in opposition to the 605 Freeway Expansion. Freeway expansions are harmful to the community and to our environment and don’t actually alleviate traffic issues. Public transportation infrastructure does.

Why haven’t you engaged stakeholders in Downey and surrounding areas? Stop pushing outdated and racist projects like this one.

Sincerely,
Amelie Cherlin
Los Angeles
Technical Advisory Committee-605 Freeway Expansion

Emily Pham <emilypham36@gmail.com>
Tue 1/26/2021 8:00 AM

To: Genny Cisneros

Hello, my name is Emily Pham, and I am alarmed by Metro Board’s plans to expand the 605 freeway in Downey. Not only are there plans to tear down over 200 homes and drive construction through a park and an elementary school, but there was insufficient engagement with the community regarding the project. These plans to expand the 605 freeway through Downey, a neighborhood with a predominant Latino community, presents itself a glaring environmentally racist injustice. This issue must be rectified by properly collecting community input and determining which projects would properly serve this community, rather than displacing families and worsening air quality in communities already vulnerable to environmental health disparities. What are the current barriers to Metro Board properly holding itself accountable to and engaging with the communities it ought to serve?

Building freeways and displacing communities of color will not improve traffic. Rather than continuing to push for harmful car-centric investments such as this freeway expansion, I encourage you to more closely and empathetically listen to the communities you serve to produce more opportunities for equitable and sustainable forms of public and active transportation.

Sincerely,

--
Emily Pham
University of California, Los Angeles - Class of 2021
B.S. Psychobiology, B.A. Asian American Studies
(626) 646-8119
emilypham36@gmail.com
Hello,

I am advocating on behalf of the two million residents who live in the Gateway Cities. This freeway expansion is being pushed through with zero engagement with community stakeholders and will further damage the environment in the Gateway Cities region. This freeway expansion will demolish hundreds of homes, tear through an elementary school and a park. This is simply unacceptable. Do not allow this freeway expansion to move forward and protect the Gateway Cities.

Thank you,

Griffin
I'm writing to advocate against freeway expansion. Expanding automobile infrastructure is climate denial. It fractures neighborhoods, destroys homes, and encourages further automobile dependency. With the current amount of carbon in our atmosphere any construction built to accommodate automobiles is extremely unethical and endangers the survival of future generations. Please do not allow this freeway expansion to move forward.

Thank you for your time,
Luke Elderkin
I am a resident of Downey and I’m a resident who is concerned by the freeway expansion. I am writing to oppose the freeway expansion moving forward because not only Metro Los Angeles has conducted zero stakeholder meetings in the community since directed by the Metro Board in October but because in the era of climate change, freeway expansions will worsen our environment.

This freeway expansion will harm the environment, displace hundreds of families, bulldoze through green space and a school. This would disrupt an entire neighborhood of Downey and not solve the issue of traffic.

Freeway expansions have been proven not to solve the issue of traffic due to induced demand. (Think of induced demand like putting a bookshelf in your living room, once you have a bookshelf you want to fill up the shelves, that is what happens with freeways and cars. The wider you expand the freeway the more cars will fill up the freeway.)

This is simply unacceptable. Do not allow this freeway expansion to move forward and protect the Gateway Cities.

Sincerely,
Priscilla Zamora
To Whom it May Concern,

I am a Riverside resident advocating on behalf of the two million residents who live in the Gateway Cities. This expansion project prioritizes people like me, who visit and drive on freeways, over the actual residents of the Gateway Cities, as Metro Los Angeles has conducted zero engagement with any of the stakeholder communities who will bear the brunt of negative impacts from this project. This project will demolish hundreds of homes and tear through an elementary school and park.

Nearby communities will bear the brunt of emissions from the enhanced car capacity, but this will harm my quality of life as well. Prevailing winds push pollution generated by cars in LA into the Inland Empire, where air quality is regularly at unhealthy levels. This project moves us further in the wrong direction and will worsen my air quality.

Freeways are fossil fuel infrastructure, and in an era of simultaneous housing and climate crises, we should not be demolishing homes to make room for more cars. Do not allow this freeway expansion to move forward and protect the Gateway Cities.

Sincerely,
Adriana Rizzo
I am a resident of the Gateway cities, and I live in Downey. I am writing this email to advocate for the 2 million residents living in the Gateway cities.

It is shameful that Metro has ignored the pleas of its residents who are in danger of having their homes razed to the ground for a freeway. This freeway expansion project has lacked community outreach and is indicative of how Metro views the residents of Downey, a predominantly latino community. We ask for better community outreach on these plans as there has been none, despite the Metro Board directing Metro staff in October to engage with community stakeholders. Because of the lack of community engagement, this project cannot move forward with approval by the Gateway Cog.

This freeway project will not make our freeways less congested, and it will bring more environmental pollution to our most marginalized communities. Do not move forward with this project.
Hello,

I am advocating on behalf of the two million residents who live in the Gateway Cities and my entire family who live throughout Los Angeles County. This freeway expansion is being pushed through with zero engagement with community stakeholders and will further damage the environment in the Gateway Cities region. This freeway expansion will demolish hundreds of homes, tear through an elementary school and a park. This is simply unacceptable. Do not allow this freeway expansion to move forward. Please protect the Gateway Cities. After decades of destroying communities with freeway construction and widennings and the growing threat of climate change I cannot believe that in the year 2021 we are even considering bulldozing folks' homes to build more fossil fuel infrastructure. This goes against all reason and logic. More capacity induces more people to drive. In a few years time the widened freeway will be clogged again. We need more public transit and more walkable communities, not more freeways razing people's homes.

Thank you,
Jordan Burns
Lifelong California resident
I'm a resident of Agoura Hills but appalled by what's happening to the people of the Gateway Cities.

The lack of outreach from Metro to the community, particularly in Downey, is suspicious given the demographics of the area's residents.

Plus, the freeway expansion 1) will not improve traffic 2) will demolish homes, an elementary school, and a park, and 3) will worsen air quality and encourage car usage to the detriment of the climate.

Grayson Peters
I am a resident of Downey, near the 605. In October, the LA Metro was ordered to hold community stakeholder meetings by the Metro Board, yet it hasn't held a single one. Beyond that, the proposed expansion will take out hundreds of homes and cause even more damage to the environment. Because of this, I oppose the expansion and urge you to do so as well. Those funds would be better utilized improving public transportation, which would actually help alleviate traffic.

Thanks,
Robert Bazz
TeamLeader22@gmail.com
562-746-2090
On Tue, Jan 26, 2021 at 10:31 AM kirk.davis@drrc.com wrote:

I am opposed to the Westbound SR-91 widening construction project file: 07-LA-91 (PM R11.8/R13.2) and request all related agencies support the No Build alternative.

We live across the street or near the proposed project and we are concerned about the effects on the health of my family and community.

The concerns are as follows:

- The CalTrans/Metro initial environmental study says of the project: "In comparison to No Build Alternative year 2024 conditions, the proposed Build Alternative is predicted to increase emissions by approximately three percent for PM2.5, PM10, NOx and ROG with a two percent increase for CO". According to the US EPA: Exposure to such particles can affect both your lungs and your heart. Numerous scientific studies have linked particle pollution exposure to a variety of problems, including:
  - premature death in people with heart or lung disease
  - nonfatal heart attacks
  - irregular heartbeat
  - aggravated asthma
  - decreased lung function
  - increased respiratory symptoms, such as irritation of the airways, coughing or difficulty breathing.
  - People with heart or lung diseases, children, and older adults are the most likely to be affected by particle pollution exposure.
- The area along the 91 freeway already falls in the 90th percentile and above for poor air quality in the state of California.
- The life expectancy of the 90605 community is 2nd shortest, and asthma related hospitalizations for children under 18 is 2nd most of all Long Beach zip codes according to the 2019 LBCHHS Community Health Assessment.
- The notification letter from Caltrans dated December 11, 2020 about the project does not specify the scope of households notified, and no notices were sent in Spanish to a majority Latin-X community, with a 25% English language deficiency. (Also stated in the LBCHHS report).
- The project area is within an underserved community of color, suffering from a myriad of health issues and inequalities related to the environment in which they live.
- The noise and possible exposure to harmful substances during construction will affect my health and well being.

Based on these concerns we urge you to protect the health, safety, and quality of life in my community by supporting the No Build option. We also request further community outreach with Spanish translation and an extension of the time for public comment on the CalTrans/Metro notification letter dated December 11, 2020. Also the website for the study has been down intermittently during the comment period.

Sincerely,
Juan Perez
Alma Vasquez
Eliza Rangel
Rosa Saines
Luz A Mata
Manuel Mata
Guadalupe Sandoval
Celia Quintero
Cesar Garcia
Elisa Gomez

[Signature]
[Handwritten signature]
Hello, my name is Natalie Garcia and I am advocating on behalf of the two million residents who live in the Gateway Cities. This freeway expansion is being pushed through with zero engagement with community stakeholders and will further damage the environment in the Gateway Cities region. This freeway expansion will demolish hundreds of homes, tear through an elementary school and a park. This is simply unacceptable. Do not allow this freeway expansion to move forward and protect the Gateway Cities.

Sincerely,
A concerned citizen
I am advocating on behalf of the two million residents who live in the Gateway Cities. This freeway expansion is being pushed through with zero engagement with community stakeholders and will further damage the environment in the Gateway Cities region. This freeway expansion will demolish hundreds of homes, tear through an elementary school and a park. This is simply unacceptable. Do not allow this freeway expansion to move forward and protect the Gateway Cities.

Thanks
To whom this may concern,

My name is Jafet Diego and I am a longtime resident of Whittier and a community organizer who mobilizes throughout LA including several of the Gateway Cities. I am writing to oppose the freeway expansion project because this project is being pushed through with zero engagement from community stakeholders and the actual community members who will be displaced if this project moves forward. If approved, this freeway expansion will demolish hundreds of homes, tear through an elementary school and a park, and negatively impact the air quality and overall environment of the communities surrounding this freeway. This is simply unacceptable. Our communities have a right to be included and weigh in thoroughly on such an important decision, especially given the demographics of the communities that will be impacted, which are lower income communities of color who are traditionally marginalized and have a lack of access to resources, healthcare, and government. Do not allow this freeway expansion to move forward and protect the Gateway Cities.

Jafet Diego
I am advocating on behalf of the two million residents who live in the Gateway Cities. This freeway expansion is being pushed through with zero engagement with community stakeholders and will further damage the environment in the Gateway Cities region. This freeway expansion will demolish hundreds of homes, tear through an elementary school and a park. This is simply unacceptable. Do not allow this freeway expansion to move forward and protect the Gateway Cities.

Sincerely,
Ibes Garcia
Downey Resident

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone
I am advocating on behalf of the two million residents who live in the Gateway Cities. This freeway expansion is being pushed through with zero engagement with community stakeholders and will further damage the environment in the Gateway Cities region. This freeway expansion will demolish hundreds of homes, tear through an elementary school and a park. This is simply unacceptable. Do not allow this freeway expansion to move forward and protect the Gateway Cities.
I am advocating on behalf of the two million residents who live in the Gateway Cities. This freeway expansion is being pushed through with zero engagement with community stakeholders and will further damage the environment in the Gateway Cities region. This freeway expansion will demolish hundreds of homes, tear through an elementary school and a park. This is simply unacceptable. Do not allow this freeway expansion to move forward and protect the Gateway Cities.

Thank you.
To Whom It May Concern,

I am a resident of the Gateway Cities, Downey specifically. I am writing this email to advocate for the 2 million residents living in the Gateway Cities. This freeway expansion project has lacked community outreach by Metro Los Angeles and this is indicative of how they view Downey residents, a predominantly Latino city, by their treatment of us on the ground. We ask for better community outreach on these plans as there have been none despite Metro Board directing Metro staff in October to engage with community stakeholders. Due to lack of community engagement, this project cannot move forward with approval by the Gateway COG.

This freeway expansion will harm the environment, displace hundreds of families, bulldoze through green space and a school. This would disrupt an entire neighborhood of Downey and not solve the issue of traffic. This proposal must be rejected by the Gateway COG and the Gateway COG must ask for better alternatives.

Freeway expansions have been proven not to solve the issue of traffic due to induced demand. Think of induced demand like putting a bookshelf in your living room, once you have a bookshelf you want to fill up the shelves, that is what happens with freeways and cars. The wider you expand the freeway, the more cars will fill up the freeway. THIS PROPOSAL MUST BE REJECTED by the Gateway COG and the Gateway COG must ask for better alternatives.

Thank you,
Jacquelyn Garcia
Downey Resident
To Whom It May Concern:

I am advocating on behalf of the two million residents who live in the Gateway Cities. This freeway expansion is being pushed through with zero engagement with community stakeholders and will further damage the environment in the Gateway Cities region. This freeway expansion will demolish hundreds of homes, tear through an elementary school and a park. Realistically, this is not a viable solution to reduce traffic, in fact, this will exacerbate the troubling problem Southern California has with traffic and poor air quality. This is simply unacceptable. Do not allow this freeway expansion to move forward and protect the Gateway Cities.

Sincerely,

Judith Peña

--

Judith
Dear Members of Gateway COG,

I'm a California resident, and I'm writing to advocate on behalf of the two million residents who live in the Gateway Cities. The fact that we are even considering freeway expansion projects in 2021 is really embarrassing. This money could be put to so much better use actually providing realistic alternatives for the mobility of the region without buying into the same harmful and inequitable reliance on automobile infrastructure that we've relied on for decades.

The community will suffer because of the proposed lane additions to this corridor and there has not been true community engagement on the effects of this project. And what will the end result of expanding the freeway be? Temporary congestion reductions will be overshadowed by the increased demand, so this is a colossal waste of money. Do not expand the freeway, our state and the climate are depending on it. Invest in real solutions instead.

All the best,
Eamon Johnston
Dear Gateway Cities Council of Governments,

My family has been residents of the Gateway Cities since 1977 and we live in Downey and South Gate. I am writing to oppose the freeway expansion moving forward because Metro Los Angeles has conducted zero stakeholder meetings in the community since directed by the Metro Board in October, and because in the era of climate change, freeway expansions will worsen our environment.

The whole state needs to reduce VMT and greenhouse gas emissions. California needs to build more affordable housing. Our state must make equity and fairness for minority neighborhoods a priority. This projects take us in the wrong direction in all areas.

This freeway expansion project has lacked community outreach by Metro Los Angeles & this is indicative of how they view our predominantly Latino cities. We ask for better community outreach on these plans. There has been none despite the Metro Board directing Metro staff in October to engage with community stakeholders. Due to the lack of community engagement, this project cannot move forward with approval by the Gateway COG.

This freeway expansion will demolish hundreds of homes, tear through an elementary school and a park, will harm the environment. This would disrupt our neighborhood of Downey and not solve the issue of traffic. This is simply unacceptable. Do not allow this freeway expansion to move forward. This proposal must be rejected by the Gateway COG.

Freeway expansions have been proven not to solve the issue of traffic due to induced demand. This proposal must be rejected by the Gateway COG and the Gateway COG must ask for better and investments in our communities.

Thank you,

Alejandro Caro
Caro Family
Lopez family
To whom it may concern,

My name is Thomas Irwin, and I am a resident of East Los Angeles. I am concerned about the freeway expansion project, and the impacts that it will have on the surrounding community. As a region, we need to be focused on how we can expand opportunity through alternative means of transportation, not expand our already polluting freeways. I oppose all plans to expand the freeway under the current proposal.

Thank you for your time and consideration

Thomas Irwin
Cell: 7037726033
To whom it may concern,

My name is Thomas Irwin, and I am a resident of East Los Angeles. I am concerned about the freeway expansion project, and the impacts that it will have on the surrounding community. As a region, we need to be focused on how we can expand opportunity through alternative means of transportation, not expand our already polluting freeways. I oppose all plans to expand the freeway under the current proposal.

Thank you for your time and consideration

--

Thomas Irwin
Cell: 7037726033
I am a resident of Whittier and local nonprofit director who is concerned by the proposed freeway expansion. I write to oppose this expansion moving forward.

Metro Los Angeles has failed to conduct stakeholder meetings in the community despite being directed to do so by the Metro Board in October. Demolishing hundreds of homes, an elementary school, and a park without discussion is abusive to this underrepresented community.

The data shows us that freeway expansions are an ineffective solution for gridlock. Furthermore, in the era of climate change, freeway expansions further harm our environment. It seems we have not explored all our resources here--starting with community input.

Sincerely,

Megan Hobza
To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Ariana Rodriguez and I am resident of Downey.

I am advocating on behalf of the two million residents who live in the Gateway Cities. This freeway expansion is being pushed through with zero engagement with community stakeholders and will further damage the environment in the Gateway Cities region. This freeway expansion will demolish hundreds of homes, tear through an elementary school and a park. This is simply unacceptable. Do not allow this freeway expansion to move forward and protect the Gateway Cities.

Thank you for your time,

Ariana Rodriguez
I am writing this email to advocate for the 2 million residents living in the Gateway Cities. I'm concerned about the freeway expansion. I am writing to oppose the freeway expansion moving forward because not only has Metro Los Angeles conducted zero stakeholder meetings in the community since directed by the Metro Board in October, but because in the era of climate change, freeway expansions will worsen our environment.

In addition, the freeway expansion will destroy more than hundreds of homes, a park, and a school. This is indicative of how they view Downey residents, a predominantly Latino city, by their treatment of us on the ground.

Sincerely,

Nikolas Delgado
I am a resident of Downey and I'm concerned about the freeway expansion. I am writing to oppose the freeway expansion moving forward because not only has Metro Los Angeles conducted zero stakeholder meetings in the community since directed by the Metro Board in October, but because in the era of climate change, freeway expansions will worsen our environment.

In addition, the freeway expansion will destroy more than hundreds of homes, a park, and a school. This is indicative of how they view Downey residents, a predominantly Latino city, by their treatment of us on the ground.

Sincerely,

Robert Castañeda Jr.
He/Him
I am a resident of Downey and I'm concerned about the freeway expansion. I am writing to oppose the freeway expansion moving forward because not only has Metro Los Angeles conducted zero stakeholder meetings in the community since directed by the Metro Board in October, but because in the era of climate change, freeway expansions will worsen our environment.

In addition, the freeway expansion will destroy more than hundreds of homes, a park, and a school. This is indicative of how they view Downey residents, a predominantly Latino city, by their treatment of us on the ground.

Sincerely,

Mary Castañeda
I am a resident of Whittier who is concerned about the freeway expansion. I am writing to oppose the freeway expansion moving forward because not only Metro Los Angeles has conducted zero stakeholder meetings in the community since directed by the Metro Board in October but because in the era of climate change, freeway expansions will worsen our environment. I understand the rationale behind this decision, but we must choose to answer transportation issues in sustainable ways, and ways that do not absolutely devastate lives. Homes, schools, and parks will be destroyed. These are the fabric of our lives. Please do not go through with this plan. Please withhold making a decision on this matter until community members can voice their perspectives and alternative solutions can be researched further.

Sincerely,

Zenaida Huerta
I am a resident of Downey and I'm concerned by the freeway expansion. I am writing to oppose the freeway expansion moving forward because Metro Los Angeles has conducted ZERO stakeholder meetings in the community since directed by the Metro Board in October. Also, in the era of climate change, freeway expansions will worsen our environment and are NOT the solution for traffic congestion.

This freeway expansion will harm the environment, displace hundreds of families, bulldoze through green space and a school. This would disrupt an entire neighborhood of Downey and not solve the issue of traffic.

NO to the 5 and 605 freeway expansion.

Sincerely,
Janet Molinaro
I am horrified that, in 2021, Metro is proposing to demolish homes in order to expand the 605 & 5 freeways. In the midst of our housing crisis & climate crisis, this is exactly the wrong direction to go. Gateway Cities COG should oppose this misguided measure.

Last year, LA Metro wrote a blog post about how they had learned their lesson from the 105 freeway construction demolishing entire neighborhoods. But its proposed course of action to tear down homes & even a school in Downey & neighboring communities suggest otherwise. Hundreds of families risk being displaced in pursuit of "just one more lane" & the always just out of reach traffic fix.

Moreover, expanding freeways is taking our entire state in the wrong direction for meeting our urgent climate goals. The California Air Resources Board has determined that we as a state will not meet our greenhouse gas emission reduction goals without reducing vehicle miles traveled by 25%. Yet adding freeway capacity will have the opposite effect, encouraging more people to get in their cars & drive longer distances, pumping more carbon dioxide into the atmosphere & moving us further down the road to climate catastrophe. Residents across the state are already struggling with worsening wildfires, coastal erosion, and devastating heatwaves; this proposed freeway expansion will make those challenges worse.

Not only that, adding more traffic to the 5 & 605 freeways will worsen local air pollution, linked to a whole host of negative health outcomes: greater vulnerability to respiratory illnesses like COVID-19, higher rates of asthma among children near freeways, worse heart & vascular health, and greater risk of dementia, and new harms discovered on a frequent basis.

For these reasons – destruction of the surrounding neighborhood + displacement of residents, impeding our ability to meet state climate goals, and harming local health through worsened particulate pollution – Gateway Cities COG should reject any expansion of the 5 & 605 freeways. The supposed traffic improvements will prove illusory, but the harms will last for generations.

Aaron Eckhouse
I am a resident of DOWNEY and I’m a mother who is concerned by the freeway expansion. I am writing to oppose the freeway expansion moving forward because not only Metro Los Angeles has conducted zero stakeholder meetings in the community since directed by the Metro Board in October but because in the era of climate change, freeway expansions will worsen our environment.

Sincerely,

Natalie Garcia

Sent from my iPhone
I am a resident of Downey and I'm concerned about the freeway expansion. I am writing to oppose the freeway expansion moving forward because not only has Metro Los Angeles conducted zero stakeholder meetings in the community since directed by the Metro Board in October, but because in the era of climate change, freeway expansions will worsen our environment.

In addition, the freeway expansion will destroy more than hundreds of homes, a park, and a school. This is indicative of how they view Downey residents, a predominantly Latino city, by their treatment of us on the ground.

Sincerely,

Robert Castañeda

Sent from my iPhone
I am a resident of Downey and I'm concerned about the freeway expansion. I am writing to oppose the freeway expansion moving forward because not only has Metro Los Angeles conducted zero stakeholder meetings in the community since directed by the Metro Board in October, but because in the era of climate change, freeway expansions will worsen our environment.

In addition, the freeway expansion will destroy more than hundreds of homes, a park, and a school. This is indicative of how they view Downey residents, a predominantly Latino city, by their treatment of us on the ground.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Castañeda
To whom I may concern:

I am advocating on behalf of the two million residents who live in the Gateway Cities. This freeway expansion is being pushed through with zero engagement with community stakeholders and will further damage the environment in the Gateway Cities region.

This freeway expansion will demolish hundreds of homes, tear through an elementary school and a park. This is simply unacceptable. Prioritize people, their families, and their well-being. Do not allow this freeway expansion to move forward and protect the Gateway Cities.

Sincerely,
Cersy Rotondo
I am OPPOSE TO THIS PROJECT, my family is in opposition.
Comment on Item VII. B - I-605 CIP Report

Dear Chair, Vice-Chair, and committee members,

My name is Jayro Queme and I am a resident of Pico Rivera. I've been following the I-605 CIP since becoming aware of it in late June 2020. Since then, I've been looking for opportunities to find more information and provide comments. I understand that meetings were held in 2016 and 2018 however the project has appeared to have changed since then. A TDM/TSM alternative does not appear in the latest reports. It is my hope that moving forward the COG and Metro work to be more forthcoming with details on the project on a regular basis.

I have concerns with the premise of the project that widening freeways will provide the alleged benefits of easing congestion and enhancing system efficiency. Examples across the country and locally show that this is a dubious claim. In particular, the 405 widening failed to maintain the improvements that were promised. What makes this project any different? How will this project achieve these goals and maintain them?

Furthermore, this project appears to be antithetical to the adopted County's "Our County" sustainability plan. In particular, Goal 8A seeks to achieve "[reducing] vehicle miles traveled by prioritizing alternatives to single occupancy vehicles". Moving forward with a highway widening is immensely irresponsible.

With these concerns shared I hope that your stance on this project is seriously re-assessed.

Respectfully,
Jayro Queme
VII. CONSENT CALENDAR
Item A
Approval of Minutes for
       June 26, 2019
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
SR-91/I-605/I-405 CORRIDOR CITIES COMMITTEE
A Meeting Held at the
Gateway Cities Council of Governments
1st Floor Conference Room
16401 Paramount Blvd., Paramount, CA
June 26, 2019, 5:00pm

I. Call to Order

Chair DuBois called the meeting to order at 5:10 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Roll Call was taken by self-introductions.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Diane DuBois, City of Lakewood Chair; Raymond Dunton, City of Bellflower; Naresh Solanki, City of Cerritos; Sean Ashton, City of Downey; Jesse Alvarado, City of Hawaiian Gardens; Stacy Mungo, City of Long Beach; Leonard Shryock, City of Norwalk; Laurie Guillen, City of Paramount; Fernando Dutra, City of Whittier; Bill Johnson, County of Los Angeles.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Tony Lima, City of Artesia; Janna Zurita, City of Compton; Representative from City of Industry; Representative from City of Pico Rivera; Joe Angel Zamora, City of Santa Fe Springs.

ALSO PRESENT: Ernesto Chaves, Metro; Genny Cisneros, GCCOG Staff, Yvette Kirrin, GCCOG Engineer; Kekoa Anderson, GCCOG Engineer.

III. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Member Ashton.

IV. Amendments to the Agenda

There were no amendments to the agenda.

V. Public Comments

There were no Public Comments.

VI. Matters from Staff
There were no matters from staff.

VII. Consent Calendar

It was moved by Member DuBois, seconded by Member Dunton, to approve the Consent Calendar. The motion was approved unanimously.

VIII. Reports

A. I-605 Hot Spots – Engineering Report

Freeway Hot Spots

Ernesto Chaves, Metro, gave a PowerPoint presentation which updated the Committee on the status of freeway interchange projects. Mr. Chaves reviewed the background for the early action projects program, stating that, to be eligible, projects needed to have independent utility, limited right-of-way impacts, and be able to be completed within five years. He identified independent projects with I-605 interchanges that were analyzed in collaboration with Caltrans.

Non-Freeway or Arterial Intersection Hot Spots

Ernesto Chaves, Metro, gave a PowerPoint presentation which reviewed the arterial hot spots program. He said the initial list of intersection improvements were at 28 locations, for which $39.9 million had been programmed. He said Metro was asked to complete PA/ED for ten intersections and complete PS&E for five intersections.

It was moved by Member Dunton, seconded by Member DuBois, to receive and file the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

B. I-605 Corridor Aesthetic Master Plan

Kekoa Anderson, GCCOG, provided an overview of the I-605 Corridor Aesthetic Master Plan. The corridor master plan unifies and compliments the existing corridor. Project Aesthetics Goals and Objectives are kept at the forefront to create a visually pleasing corridor, ensure visual unity with the corridor, enhance community identity, promote design for safety, functionality, and maintainability.

He reported that the Technical Advisory Committee had approved the I-605 Corridor Aesthetic Master Plan at their last TAC meeting.
Due to the size of the document, it could not be included in the meeting agenda packet, however the full document can be viewed/downloaded from the GCCOG Web Site.

It was moved by Member Mungo, seconded by Member Dunton, to approve I-605 Corridor Aesthetic Master Plan. The motion was approved unanimously.

C. The I-605 “Hot Spots” Measure M Multiyear Subregional Program (MSP)

Yvette Kirrin provided an overview presentation of the I-605 “Hot Spots” Measure M Multiyear Subregional Program (MSP). She provided a handout that detailed the steps taken to create the 91/605/405 Multi Sub-Regional Plan (MSP) for the Measure M funds. The goal was to quantify a project from each jurisdiction to be funded and delivered, consistent with the Measure M guidelines. Most of the jurisdictions completed the GCCOG informational request for projects, and returned a list of projects for review by GCCOG and Metro staff. No projects were provided by the Cities of Compton, Industry, Norwalk and Santa Fe Springs. She noted that the same presentation and recommendation to approve the Measure M MSP work plan (ie. List) was presented to the TAC on May 28, 2019 and the motion was approved unanimously. As far as next steps, she recommended the Measure M MSP work plan (or list of projects) be forwarded to Metro Staff for approval and funding.

It was moved by Member DuBois, seconded by Member Dutra, to approve the proposed MSP workplan. The motion was approved unanimously.

D. Gateway Cities Engineer’s Report

Kekoa Anderson reported that there is an initiative to create an aesthetics committee for the SR-91 corridor similar to the ones established for the I-710 and I-605 Corridors.

The completed master plans to date are for the I-710 Corridor and the I-605 Corridor which both include the interchanges at SR-91. When the two plans were completed, the next step was to look at the east-west connection of SR-91, and how it ties into the aesthetics for the I-710 Corridor and the I-605 Corridor. To the east of the project, I-5, that crosses into Orange County, has another aesthetic theme. To the west of the project, outside of the COG boundaries, another theme is being developed. The goal of the SR-91 Aesthetic Committee is to determine a concept plan for this segment of SR-91 that blends with the individual
perpendicular freeway connections and tie into themes to the east and west.

One of the reasons to initiate the SR-91 Aesthetic Master Plan now is because there are projects that are in progress.

- Westbound 91, which is in Plans, Specifications & Estimate (PS&E) Phase. 65% Submittal is anticipated by December of this year.
- SR-91 (Atlantic to Cherry), which is in Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA&ED) phase
- SR-91 (Central to Acacia), which also is in PA&ED phase.

Aesthetic assumptions for structures need to be defined so that they can be incorporated into the structural analysis for 65% design level. Not having the aesthetics defined early may cause re-work and potential delays to project schedules.

It was moved by Member Guillen, seconded by Member Dutra, to receive and file the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

IX. Comments from Committee Members
Chairman DuBois thanked the Committee for attending the meeting and assuring that there was a quorum.

X. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 5:57 p.m.
VIII. REPORTS

Item B.

I-605 Corridor Improvement Project
REPORT BY ISIDRO PANUCO (METRO)
Project Limits

Improvement Corridors

**I-605:** South of Rosecrans Av to Ramona Bl north of I-10 (16 miles)

**SR-60:** Santa Anita Av to Turnbull Canyon Rd (5.5 miles)

**I-5:** Florence Av to Rio Hondo Channel (3 miles)

**I-10:** Peck Rd to the I-605/I-10 Interchange (2.6 miles)

**I-105:** Studebaker Rd to Bellflower Bl (1.5 miles)
### Project Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Initiated Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS)/Issued Notice of Preparation and Notice of Intent for EIR/EIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Conducted six scoping meetings in Downey, Santa Fe Springs, Norwalk, Industry, South El Monte and Whittier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Added ExpressLanes to the Build Alternatives based on scoping comments from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and consistency with Metro Board Express Lanes Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Conducted three additional community update meetings in Norwalk, Pico Rivera, and Whittier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-20</td>
<td>Held dozens of meetings with local jurisdictions to develop technical studies for the EIR/EIS and refined the proposed project alternatives with local input to address GCCOG and Metro concerns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recent Project Coordination**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept 2020</td>
<td>Letter from the GCCOG requesting delay circulation of 605 EIR/EIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2020</td>
<td>Metro Board approved motion on I-605 EIR/EIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-Dec 2020</td>
<td>6 + meetings with local jurisdictions, GCCOG, I-5 JPA, and Caltrans to develop locally supported design alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March-April 2021</td>
<td>Planned Metro Board updates on project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Locally Supported Design Alternatives

I-605 CIP Purpose and Need

• Ease congestion / improve mobility and operations
• Enhance regional connectivity and system efficiency
• Improve safety and enhance trip experience

Approach

• Re-evaluate, prior 605 studies/reports
• Developed alternative design variations to balance Design Standards (improve operations, safety) and Minimize Impacts (Right of Way, Environmental impacts)
• Alternative design variations were presented to Downey, SFS, GCCOG and I-5 JPA for input and comment
Locally Supported Design Alternatives

Add one General Purpose Lane (GP), HOV, or ExpressLane. Include Aux lanes at select locations, improve on/off ramps and add direct connectors. **ROW Impacts reduced by 5%**

Add one HOV lane and Aux Lanes on I-5 – with no provision for a future second HOV lane. **Revised design alternative will reduce ROW impacts by up to 34%**

Add GP lane eastbound, westbound and Aux Lanes. ROW Impacts account for 3% of total with no proposed changes.

Add HOV or ExpressLane Direct Connectors at 105 and 10 Interchanges. Impacts account for 2% of total with no proposed changes.
Add one HOV lane and Aux Lanes on I-5 – with no provision for a future second HOV lane.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents Options</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Parcels Impacted</th>
<th>Parcel Reductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020 PA/ED Option 1</td>
<td>I-605 to Rio Hondo Channel</td>
<td>Baseline (Full Std Lane/Shoulder + 2 HOV Lanes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A (East Side Widening)</td>
<td>Alt 2 (West Side Widening)</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A (East Side Widening)</td>
<td>Alt 2 (West Side Widening)</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A (East Side Widening)</td>
<td>Design Alt (Full Std Lane/Shoulder + Ramp/Local St Realignment + 1 HOV Lane)</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A (East Side Widening)</td>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Typical Freeway Section
Add one General Purpose Lane (GP), HOV, or ExpressLane. Include Aux lanes at select locations, improve on/off ramps and add direct connectors.

**ALTERNATIVE 1**
No Build (Existing Condition)

**ALTERNATIVE 2**
1 converted ExpressLane (HOT)
1 new General Purpose lane
*Auxiliary lanes added where needed

**ALTERNATIVE 3**
1 converted ExpressLane (HOT)
1 new ExpressLane (HOT)
*Auxiliary lanes added where needed

**ALTERNATIVE 4**
1 new HOV lane
*Auxiliary lanes added where needed

*Auxiliary lanes added between interchanges.
*ExpressLanes also referred to as High-Occupancy Travel (HOT) lanes.
I-605 CIP Project Schedule

DRAFT EIR Circulation – Spring/Summer 2021
FINAL EIR Winter 2022
Design 4-5 Years* 2023 - 2027
Acquisition of Properties 2-3 Years* 2026 - 2027
Construction* 4-5 Years

*Start of future phases after Environmental – and the overall project timeline – is dependent on securing additional funds for the project. Local sales tax revenues which are expected to be available for this Project over the next 30 years (approx. $1 billion) are insufficient to cover the cost of constructing the project. A substantial amount of outside funding/revenue (over $4 billion), beyond Metro’s capacity, is needed to start and complete design/construction of the project.
Next Steps

Future I-605 CIP Activities:

GC, SGV, I-5 JPA & City Concurrence:
Actions of support
Include Local Design Alternatives:
On-going

Report to Metro Board:
January – April 2021

Stakeholder Engagement:
January – Summer 2021

> Regular updates to COG, I-5 JPA and Corridor Cities prior to EIR/EIS circulation.

Isidro Pánuco, Project Manager
Metro
One Gateway Plaza, MS 99-22-9
Los Angeles, CA 90012

metro.net/i-605-CIP

Corridor Improvement Project
Thank You!
VIII. REPORTS
Item C.

SR-91 CORRIDOR AESTHETIC MASTER PLAN
REPORT BY KEKOA ANDERSON (GCCOG)
STATE ROUTE - 91 CORRIDOR AESTHETIC MASTER PLAN
State Route - 91 Corridor Aesthetic Master Plan

November 23, 2020

Aesthetic Committee Members

Municipalities

City of Artesia
City of Bellflower
City of Cerritos
City of Compton
City of Lakewood
City of Long Beach
City of Paramount

Gateway Cities, Council of Governments

Kekoa Anderson

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro)

Ernesto Chaves, LA Metro  Lucy Delgadillo, LA Metro

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

Tin T. Dinh, District 07  Abraham Almaw, DES Bridge Architecture & Aesthetics
George Olguin, District 07  Isaac Tasabia, DES Bridge Architecture & Aesthetics
Glen Levstik, District 07
2.0 SITE ANALYSIS

2.1 Project Site

State Route 91 is a major east-west highway in the southerly central portion of Los Angeles County which is used primarily for international, interstate, interregional and intraregional travel carrying people and goods throughout Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside and San Bernardino counties. SR-91 is also used for commute travel and is a major highway for goods movement in California, providing access to the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. It serves the largest center in the Los Angeles basin for warehousing and transloading located at the southwest quadrant of SR-91 and I-710.

The project area is projected to experience substantial growth for goods movement. Build out of the area, as well as increased shipping traffic from the ports, will generate additional traffic on the freeways and at the SR-91/I-710 system interchange. Widening improvements to the mainline, including local arterial and system interchange improvements, will address existing deficiencies and accommodate projected growth.
2.0 SITE ANALYSIS

2.2 Community Photos
2.0 SITE ANALYSIS

2.3 Existing SR-91 Corridor
2.0 SITE ANALYSIS

2.3 Existing SR-91 Corridor
4.0 STRUCTURAL AESTHETICS

4.1 OVERCROSSINGS

An overcrossing is a structure carrying a county road or a city street over a state highway, and occurs at various locations along the SR-91 Corridor.

Replaced or widened bridges will often be intermixed with existing bridges which have different architectural styles. The overall geometry of replaced or widened structures will be similar to remaining structures to provide visual unity. The “Artesian Theme” will be applied to geometric forms of girders, columns, and abutment walls which responds to the historic and geographic influences of the region.
4.1 OVERCROSSES
4.3 UNDERCROSSEINGS

The “Artesian Theme” will be applied to all undercrossings. The aesthetic treatment consists of integrally colored concrete, fractured fin texture, basalt texture, and project fencing and lighting with black finish.
4.3 UNDERCROSSES

BIRD'S EYE VIEW
4.4 PEDESTRIAN OVERCROSSINGS

The “Artesian Theme” will be applied to all pedestrian overcrossings. The aesthetic treatment consists of integrally colored concrete, fractured fin texture, and project fencing and lighting with black finish.
4.10 LIGHTING

Lighting is an important feature for a bridge structure both in its functionality and appearance. When selecting lighting fixtures, it is important to not only enhance the design of the structure, but also to complement the existing lighting from the surrounding areas. For the SR-91 CMP, a family of lighting fixtures have been proposed that are simple and elegant in design, yet similar to existing lighting along the SR-91 corridor to unify the communities. City to select and negotiate new city street lighting.

Application: Structures and Arterial Street Lighting
Color: Black

Note: All light post components to receive a black powder coated finish

EXISTING COMMUNITY LIGHTING

As shown: Tear Drop with pedestrian luminaire on 30’ pole
Color: Black

PERSPECTIVE VIEW
4.11 RETAINING WALLS

All new retaining walls throughout the SR-91 Corridor will have consistent aesthetic treatment. The textures and patterns will be consistently used on all wall types, whether they are MSE, cast in place, or other wall types. The "Artesian Theme" will be applied to all retaining walls and will be a combination of: integrally colored concrete, fractured fin texture, basalt texture, and a featured horizontal band with heavy sandblast texture.
4.12 SOUND WALLS

Sound walls for the SR-91 corridor shall consist of integrally colored split face block in 2 different colors. Custom pilasters will be placed at regular intervals of 349'-4". The block motif is designed to incorporate placement of the pilaster. Sound wall heights will vary throughout the corridor and all design elements will adjust accordingly. Where appropriate, new sound walls will tie into existing sound walls. All pilasters shall be constructed vertical to profile grade (plumb).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal Size</th>
<th>Texture</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8&quot; x 8&quot; x 16&quot;</td>
<td>SPLIT FACE 2 SIDES</td>
<td>SANDSTONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10&quot; x 8&quot; x 16&quot;</td>
<td>SPLIT FACE 2 SIDES</td>
<td>NATURAL GRAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8&quot; x 8&quot; x 16&quot;</td>
<td>SPLIT FACE 2 SIDES CAP</td>
<td>NATURAL GRAY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TO MATCH ANGELUS BLOCK COLORS

NOTE: ALL DIMENSIONS SHOWN ARE TYPICAL

349'-4" ON CENTER (TYPICAL PILASTER SPACING)
5.10 PLANT PALETTE

**Trees**
- Fern-leaved Catalina Ironwood
- Mexican Sycamore
- California Black Oak

**Shrubs**
- Acacia redolens ‘Desert Carpet’
- Prostrate Acacia
- Asclepis fascicularis
- Narrowleaf Milkweed

**Shrubs**
- Bougainvillea ‘San Diego Red’
- San Diego Red Bougainvillea
- Fremontodendron californicum
- California Flannelbush
- Lantana ‘Spreading Yellow’
- Spreading Yellow Lantana
- ‘Mound San Bruno’ – Coffeeberry
- Plumbago auriculata ‘Imperial Blue’
- Imperial Blue

**Vines**
- Rhus ovata
- Sugar Bush
- ‘Davis Gold’ Toyon
- Distictis buccinatoria
- Red Trumpet Vine

**Ground cover**
- Parthenocissus tricuspidata
- Boston Ivy
- Muhlenbergia rigens
- Deer Grass
5.10 PLANT PALETTE

Bio Swale Plants

- California Meadow Sedge
- Common Rush
- Blue Oat Grass
- Giant Wild Rye