

GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Environmental Committee

AGENDA

Wednesday, April 17, 2013
6:00 - 8:30 p.m. Meeting

Gateway Cities Council of Governments
16401 Paramount Boulevard, 2nd Floor Conference Room
Paramount, California

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 Environmental Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The Environmental 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 Environmental Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the Environmental Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at this time the Environmental 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 Environmental 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. 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 - Three minutes for each speaker.

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Minutes of the January 25, 2012 meeting of the Environmental Committee
- B. Minutes of the January 30, 2013 meeting of the Environmental Committee

VII. REPORTS

5 Min. A. AQAP Status and Schedule Update - Oral Report by ICF

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

5 Min. B. AQAP Participation Framework Committee Reports - Oral Report by Arellano Associates

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

C. New Air Quality Improvement Measures – Report on Development, analysis and quantification of impact of additional and new measures – Oral Report by ICF

120 Min. SUGGESTED ACTION: ADJOURN MEETING TO CONVENE WORKSHOP WITH ROUNDTABLES

D. COG Engineer's Report - Oral Report by Jerry Wood

10 Min. SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO HEAR REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

VIII. MEETING SCHEDULE REVIEW

IX. COMMENTS FROM ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITTEE CHAIR AND MEMBERS

X. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 8:30 p.m. unless the Environmental Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regularly scheduled Environmental Committee 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.

**CONSENT CALENDAR
ITEM A
APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS Environmental Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, January 25, 2012

6:00 - 8:30 p.m. Meeting

**Gateway Cities Council of Governments
16401 Paramount Boulevard, 2nd Floor Conference Room
Paramount, California**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Bill DeWitt called the meeting to order at 7:07 PM.

II. ROLL CALL – BY SELF INTRODUCTIONS

Roll call was taken by self-introduction.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Bill DeWitt – City of South Gate; Steve Lefever – Planning Directors Committee Representative (City of South Gate); Elizabeth Warren – FuturePorts; Michael Jordan and Nelson Kerr – representing Ron Arias, City of Long Beach Health and Human Services Department; Adrian Martinez– Natural Resources Defense Council; TL Garrett - Pacific Marine Shipping Association; Angelo Logan – AQAP Advisory Roundtable Liaison (East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice); Luis Cabrales – AQAP Advisory Roundtable Liaison (Coalition for Clean Air); David Libatique - Port of Los Angeles Commissioner; Daniel Ojeda – AQAP Technical Roundtable Liaison (City of Lynwood).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT

Jorge Rifa – City Managers Committee Liaison (City of Commerce); Ruben Arceo – I-5 JPA Representative (City of La Mirada); Angie Castro – representing Supervisor Gloria Molina; and Karly Katona, Representing Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas; Steve Forster (City of La Mirada; Judith Mitchell – South Coast Air Quality Management District Board; Douglas Drummond and Thomas Fields – Port of Long Beach Commissioners.

OTHERS PRESENT: Joan Greenwood – AQAP Advisory Roundtable Representative (West Long Beach Neighborhood Representative); Harold Tseklenis – AQAP Advisory Roundtable Representative (Downey Community Representative); Jessica Tovar – AQAP Advisory Roundtable Representative (Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma); Jill Griffiths – AQAP Technical Roundtable Representative (City of Long Beach); Jerry Wood – GCCOG

Staff; Karen Heit – GCCOG Staff; Scott Broten, ICF International; Susan DeSantis – Arellano Associates; Maria Yanez-Forgash – Arellano Associates; Katie Burnside – Arellano Associates.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Steve Lefever led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA

There were no amendments to the agenda.

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

There were no additions to the meeting minutes of the October 26, 2011 meeting of the Environmental Committee. Member Daniel Ojeda made a motion to receive and file the report. Member TL Garrett seconded the motion to no objection.

VII. REPORTS

A. AQAP Status and Schedule Update – Oral Report by ICF

Overall Status, Schedule and 101 Handout Review

Scott Broten presented a Status and Schedule Update on the AQAP. He reviewed the components of the AQAP and identified those that are part of the I-710 EIR/EIS and those that are part of the GCCOG AQAP process. He presented an assessment of the work completed to date on each task and the scheduled completion dates for the tasks still in process. He also discussed the development of the Toolkit that will be a product of the various tasks that are part of the AQAP including the completion of the Compendium Update and Early Actions. The Toolkit will be a set of measures, policies, projects that can be implemented to improve air quality in the Gateway Cities COG subregion. He also presented the AQAP meeting schedule for 2012 and noted the topics that each of those public meetings and webinars would be covering. Scott briefly mentioned that the list of Early Actions has been completed and will be released in early February.

B. AQAP Participation Framework Committees Reports – Oral Report by Arellano Associates.

Susan DeSantis presented an overview of the Participation Framework and updated the Committee on its current status. She reported on the HIA Technical Working Group and Roundtable meetings that took place between October and November 2011, which focused on reviewing the draft findings and recommendations of the I-710 Health Impact Assessment (HIA) work product. She also reported that the Transportation Committee (TC) and the Gateway Cities Council of Governments (GCCOG) Board approved the Environmental Committee's recommendation for a Peer Review of the HIA document. The

GCCOB Board also requested staff to provide an update to the TC at their January 2012 meeting on how to proceed with the peer review. She reviewed some of the comments, suggestions and concerns that were raised by the Working Groups and Roundtables and noted that there was universal support for the Peer Review. She then indicated that per the TC's action all comments received during the various meetings on the HIA, meeting summaries and any documents used during the HIA process would be provided to the Peer Review Panel. The TC also agreed that at the conclusion of the Peer Review, the final HIA work product document and the Peer Review Report would be submitted directly to Caltrans. She paused to allow for questions

Member TL Garret requested clarification on what documentation and in what format those documents were provided to the I-710 Project Work Group? Additionally, he asked what documentation will be provided to the Peer Review Committee as the Peer Review Process moves forward. J. Wood responded that both the I-710 Project Work Group has been provided with a variety of reports including Roadway Modeling, Construction Staging, final HIA Work Product, comment letters, etc. He further noted that all reports and documents provided to the I-710 Project Work Group will be made available for the Peer Review.

Next Susan DeSantis requested that Mr. Wood provide a brief update on the status of the I-710 EIR/EIS release for public comment, and how the proposed Peer Review schedule would fit within that overall schedule. Mr. Wood indicated that the EIR/EIS report will be released on April 1 and that the current review period is for 60 days. Caltrans is still considering whether or not to extend the review period beyond the 60 days; they will make that determination within one month.

Member Angelo Logan expressed concern that the peer review will not be completed in time to be submitted to Caltrans. He further noted that if the HIA is not included as part of the EIR/EIS, then the public can't comment during the comment period. Mr. Wood recognized the challenges with the schedule and noted that the HIA could still be included as a comment to the EIR/EIS and thus would be part of the final EIR/EIS. Member Karen Heit also added that it is important to keep in mind that the I-710 Project Committee can only make recommendations to Caltrans on what to include in the EIR/EIS, but it cannot force the lead agency do anything. Thus far Caltrans has been open to reviewing the HIA Work Produce, but has not made any decision on whether or not to include any of the HIA in the EIR/EIS. Member Angelo Logan requested that the EC come back to the schedule/timing discussion following the Peer Review Presentation. Ms. DeSantis noted that current discussion with the National Research Council (NRC) staff suggest that a preliminary Peer Review document may be available before the comment period closes. She also indicated that per NRC staff, the current schedule is ambitious and while it may be possible to tighten it in certain areas the most time consuming task is convening of the Peer Review Panel, which is a task that is time-consuming, and cannot be expedited.

Member Adrian Martinez requested clarification on the action taken by the I-710 Project Committee. It is his understanding that the I-710 Project Committee approved the inclusion of the HIA in the EIR/EIS, not the Peer Review Report. He also expressed concern over the Peer Review Process delaying consideration of the inclusion of the HIA in the draft EIR/EIS and argued that the best place for the document to be included is in the draft stage. Ms. DeSantis noted that the recommendation to move forward with a Peer Review was made by the Environmental Committee and subsequently approved by the Transportation Committee that the HIA was not adequate for inclusion without a Peer Review.

Member TL Garret requested clarification on whether the COG Board would take action on the HIA at the conclusion of the Peer Review Process. Ms. DeSantis stated that there would be no Board action at that time. She noted that the TC and GCCOG Board approved motions in November 2011 stating that at the conclusion of the Peer Review Process, the HIA, Peer Review Report and all Comments received during the participation process were to be submitted directly to Caltrans. This action modified the language approved by this EC Committee at its November meeting. Ms. Heit read the exact language in the November 2nd TC meeting.

C. I-710 HIA Work Product Peer Review – Oral Report by Karen Heit

Ms. DeSantis called the Environmental Committee Member's attention to the Peer Review Process handouts. She pointed out that the currently the HIA Peer Review is in the "study definition" stage, which focuses on the questions that will guide the Peer Review Process. She also indicated that the presentation would include the nine study questions approved by the NAS Governing Board and noted that input from the Environmental Committee on these questions is welcomed. Ms. DeSantis also indicated that the selection of the Peer Review Panel is a key step in the Peer Review Process. She highlighted the importance of selecting a panel that does not result in any conflicts of interest, that is balanced and has the expertise needed to evaluate the HIA document. Ms. DeSantis then reviewed the preliminary schedule based on initiating the Peer Review in February. She did note that the funds for the Peer Review have not been secured.

Next, Ms. DeSantis began review of the nine questions approved by the NAS Governing Board that would guide the Peer Review Process. Member Angelo Logan requested clarification on what documentation would be available to the Peer Review Panel. Ms. DeSantis responded that all documents generated by all of the HIA TWG, Roundtables, Environmental Committee, as well as any formal and informal comments submitted would be made available to the panel. Member Logan also wanted to ensure that NAS was provided with the purpose and need of the HIA.

Member Nelson Kerr asked if the Peer Review Panel has been selected and if they have experience in HIA's. Ms. DeSantis indicated that we do not know who the panel members will be at this time; however she reviewed the qualifications of the NAS staff that would be assigned to the Peer Review

Member Luis Cabrales requested clarification on whether or not the Environmental Committee can change the questions. Ms. DeSantis clarified that the EC can make recommendations to revise the language, however the nine questions were approved by the NAS Governing Board and they are under no obligation to change the questions.

Member Angelo Logan requested clarification on the source of the nine questions. Ms. DeSantis indicated the nine questions were crafted and approved by the NAS Staff. She also indicated that NAS staff were provided with the questions drafted by the Gateway Cities staff and reviewed by the Environmental Committee, and then subsequently by the Transportation Committee prior to submission to NAS.

Member Adrian Martinez indicated that Question 2 needed to be more specific. He thought it was too broad as currently stated.

Member T.L. Garrett made a general comment on all nine questions. He indicated that the questions should be used within the scope of the I-710 project and the effects of the project. This is important because some of the recommendations were made for items that went beyond the I-710 project.

Next, Ms. DeSantis reviewed questions six to nine and paused for questions and comments. No questions or comments were made by Environmental Committee Members. Chairman DeWitt asked if there were any comments on the process.

Member Adrian Martinez asked the cost of the Peer Review process. Ms. Heit indicated that a contract has not been secured with NAS; therefore she is not at liberty to discuss cost details. As soon as a contract is secured the cost will be made public record.

Member Angelo Logan asked to revisit the Peer Review timing issue that he raised during the previous presentation. He recommended that the issue of the Peer Review timing be brought up to the TC and to the I-710 Project Committee as it relates to the timing of the I-710 EIS/EIR. Mr. Wood indicated that Caltrans has not made a decision on the length of the comment period.

Member Nelson Kerr requested clarification on the source of funds for the Peer Review. He also noted that if the funding is not secured soon the Peer Review schedule will likely be impacted. Ms. DeSantis responded that staff is currently looking at funding sources, including foundations.

Member T.L. Garrett noted an opportunity with the release of the I-710 EIR/EIS overlapping with the Peer Review and wanted to know if it is useful to have the EIR/EIS inform the Peer Review process – the HIA's value added. Ms. Heit responded that NAS indicated that in order to make the value judgment they would have to review the EIR/EIS and that process could be very timely but cost prohibitive.

Chairman DeWitt asked for Public Comments. Jill Griffiths, City of Long Beach noted that the Environmental Committee Members seem to have different levels of familiarity with the preparation of the Draft EIR. She noted that the decision to include the HIA or any other document in the EIR is not an arbitrary decision, the crating and preparation of the EIR is very specific and only supporting technical studies should be included that are used in the preparation of the text and conclusions in the Draft EIR. She also noted that if the HIA is not quoted or used in the EIR to make decisions then it should not be included. Mr. Wood responded that Human Impact Partners (HIP) had access to technical studies and Caltrans is currently reviewing the HIA to see if it should be included.

Finally, Ms. DeSantis reviewed the Peer Review Committee required expertise and invited EC members to make recommendations on potential members.

Angelo Logan noted that jobs and the economics was one of the big questions that came up and asked where that topic fits in the expertise required. M. DeSantis agreed and suggested making a recommendation to add this area of expertise.

Member Luis Cabrales asked if the experts were going to be selected nation-wide. Ms. DeSantis indicated that they would be selected based on a nation-wide search.

D. COG Engineer's Report– Oral Report by Jerry Wood

This item will be discussed at the next meeting

VIII. MEETING SCHEDULE REVIEW

Chairman DeWitt confirmed that the next meeting of the Environmental Committee will be determined at a later date.

IX. COMMENTS FROM ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITTEE CHAIR OR MEMBERS

X. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 PM.