I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee
Thursday January 29, 2015
6:30 PM
Progress Park
15500 Downey Avenue
Paramount, CA

AGENDA

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

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

A. AGENDA ITEM: at this time the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and

B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee agenda; and

C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL – BY SELF INTRODUCTIONS

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
IV. 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. 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 I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee.

   A. Approve Minutes for the Meeting of July 31, 2014, of the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION:

   A MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM.

VIII. ELECTION OF CO-CHAIR FROM THE SOUTHERN SECTOR

IX. REPORTS

   A. Report I-710 EIR/EIS Update

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

   B. I-710 Early Action Programming

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

   C. CA-7 Workshops Status Report

   SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF
X. MATTERS FROM THE I-710 EIR/EIS PROJECT COMMITTEE

XI. MATTERS FROM THE CHAIR

XII. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 8:00 p.m. unless the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee meeting scheduled for Thursday, April 30, 2015, 6:30 PM.

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.
VII. CONSENT CALENDAR

Item A

Approval of Minutes
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
I-710 CORRIDOR EIR/EIS PROJECT COMMITTEE

A Meeting Held at Progress Park
15500 Downey Ave.
Paramount, CA
July 31, 2014

I. Call to Order

Co-Chairman Hurtado called the meeting to order at 6:39 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Roll Call was taken by self-introductions:

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Gil Hurtado, City of South Gate, Co-Chair; Nestor Enrique Valencia, City of Bell; Pedro Aceituno, City of Bell Gardens; Denise Robles, City of Commerce; Diane Oliva, City of Cudahy; Roberto Uranga, City of Long Beach; Sal Alatorre, City of Lynwood; Oscar Magana, City of Maywood; Gene Daniels, City of Paramount; Larry Forester, City of Signal Hill; William Davis, City of Vernon; Patrick V. DeChellis, County of Los Angeles; Doug Drummond, Port of Long Beach; Lilia Leon, I-5 JPA; Ron Kosinski, Caltrans; Diane DuBois, MTA; Mike Jones, SCAG; Judy Mitchell, SBCCOG (ex officio).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Jim Dear, City of Carson; Willie Jones, City of Compton; Luis Marquez, City of Downey; Rosa E. Perez, City of Huntington Park; David Labatique, Port of Los Angeles; Barbara Messina, SGVCOG; Mark Sedlacek, LADWP (ex officio); Tom Taber, Southern California Edison (ex officio).

ALSO PRESENT: Cory Allen, Office of Senator Ricardo Lara; Niki Tennant, District Director, Office of Assemblymember Bonnie Lowenthal; Sarah M. Withers, City Manager, City of Lynwood; Emilio M. Murga, Director of Public Works, City of Lynwood; Elias Saikaly, City of Lynwood; Maria L. Viera, City of Lynwood; Johnny Ford, Assistant City Manager, City of Compton; Art Cervantes, Director of Public Works, City of South Gate; Hazel Haynes, City of Long Beach; Ali Cayir, Engineer, City of Commerce; Nancy Pe, Project Management, Caltrans; Jennifer Taira, Caltrans; Allison Morrow, Caltrans; Ernesto Chaves, Transportation Planning Manager, Metro; Peter Greenwald, Senior Policy Advisor, South Coast AQMD; William C. Pagett, Chair, I-710 Technical Advisory Committee; Richard D. Jones, General Counsel, GCCCOG; Ivy Tsai, Deputy
III. **Pledge of Allegiance**

Member Leon 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. **Matters from Staff**

Gateway Cities COG General Counsel Richard D. Jones explained the procedures by which the activities of the Project Committee result in a recommendation to Caltrans, which has final authority for matters relating to I-710.

VII. **Consent Calendar**

It was moved by Member Forester, seconded by Member Daniels, to approve the minutes of the meeting of January 30, 2014. The motion was approved unanimously, with members Leon and Uranga abstaining.

VIII. **Reports**

A. **Appointees to the I-710 Corridor Advisory Committee**

Esmeralda Garcia, MIG, presented a report recommending the following appointments to fill vacancies on the Corridor Advisory Committee: Jose Bojorquez (99¢ Only Stores); Pablo Camacho (Teamsters Local 848); Chris Shimoda (California Trucking Association); and Marianne Venieris (Cal State Long Beach Center for International Trade and Transportation).

It was moved by Member Forester, seconded by Member DuBois, to approve the recommended appointments to the Corridor Advisory Committee. The motion was approved unanimously.
B. Recommended Alternatives to Be Included for Evaluation in the I-710 EIR/EIS

Dave Levinsohn, URS, gave a PowerPoint presentation which summarized the alternatives recommended to be included in the Re-circulated Draft EIR/EIS. He reviewed the work completed since the January meeting of the Project Committee, including: context sensitive design improvements; updated traffic forecasts; and an air quality status update.

Mr. Levinsohn introduced the new set of preliminary build alternatives as alternatives 5C and 7. The features of Alternative 5C include air quality measures, widening of I-710 to include additional general purpose lanes, modernization of the freeway's geometrics, arterial system improvements, TSM/TDM and ITS measures, and focused improvements.

Alternative 7 was described as including air quality measures, a zero/near zero emission freight corridor, modernization of the freeway’s geometrics, arterial system improvements, TSM/TDM and ITS measures, and focused improvements. The freeway alignment and structures would be designed to allow post-2035 general purpose lane additions, but they would not be included in the RDEIR/RDEIS.

Mr. Levinsohn reviewed the geometric concept plans for the two build alternatives with the Project Committee. He said more current and detailed information on right-of-way constraints has led to a better informed design.

Esmeralda Garcia, MIG, reviewed the community participation process that had occurred. She said they continued to work with the local advisory committees, Corridor Advisory Committee, and community groups to further refine the two preliminary, revised alternatives and their geometric plans. She reported that the Corridor Advisory Committee had recommended that Community Alternative 7 be included as a distinct alternative in the RDEIR/RDEIS.

Mr. Levinsohn reviewed the main sections of Community Alternative 7, which had been recommended by the Corridor Advisory Committee as an addition to the other build alternatives and highlighted the key differences with alternatives 5C and 7. In summary, CA-7 maintains the current configuration of general purpose lanes, includes an aggressive strategy to improve public transit via rail and bus, includes a separate 4 lane elevated freight corridor, proposes a public/private partnership for operating a mandated zero emission freight corridor, and includes river improvements along with bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
Allison Morrow, Caltrans, referred the Project Committee to the May 22, 2014, letter from Caltrans which outlined the practical, legal, technical, and jurisdictional rational for why certain elements of CA-7 fall outside the purview of the I-710 project level EIR/EIS. She pointed out that the Los Angeles River is not under the jurisdiction of Caltrans and, thus, improvements to the river cannot be included in the EIR. She referred the Project Committee to the Governor’s veto message regarding SB 811, which would have mandated that CA-7 be included in the EIR. In his message the Governor said that “statutorily requiring the project environmental impact report to consider specified mitigation measures that exceed the project’s scope is a precedent I don’t wish to establish”.

Bill Pagett, I-710 Technical Advisory Committee Chair, said the recommendation of the Technical Advisory Committee was to include alternatives 5C and 7, as well as all elements of CA-7 that are legally and jurisdictionally implementable and meet the Purpose and Need of the I-710 EIR/EIS. He said the TAC recommended that Metro and the Gateway Cities COG be directed to coordinate with appropriate outside agencies to develop a “Comprehensive I-710 Corridor Program” to initially focus on the remaining elements of CA-7.

Mr. Levinsohn then reviewed the “next steps” of the process leading up to the release of the RDEIR/RDEIS and, ultimately, the selection of a locally preferred alternative, completion of a final EIR/EIS, and Project Approval/Record of Decision.

Co-Chairman Hurtado opened the discussion for public comments.

Joan Greenwood, Long Beach, spoke in support of including CA-7 in the RDEIR. She said overriding economic considerations could be used under CEQA to include CA-7 in the EIR.
Augustine Perez, Commerce, said he supported CA-7.

Iris Verduzco, Communities for a Better Environment, spoke in support of CA-7.

Angelo Logan, East Yards Communities for Environmental Justice, spoke in favor of including CA-7 in its entirety, along with alternatives 5C and 7, in the EIR. He said he was not saying that it must be picked as the ultimately chosen alternative, but that it should be studied in the EIR.

Monica Parilla said she had been coming to these meetings for nine years and urged the Project Committee to think of the community.
Mary Duenas, Lynwood, referred the Project Committee to letters of support for CA-7 from Lynwood councilmember Solalche and Alatorre.

Mark Lopez, East Yards Communities for Environmental Justice, said the Project Committee had voted a year and a half ago to include CA-7 in its entirety and that it should move forward with CA-7.

David Sanchez, Huntington Park, said there should be a reduction of the number of ships coming into the Long Beach harbor and that we should be looking at alternative ports. This is how we fight pollution, he said.

Olga Moedano, Communities for a Better Environment, said CA-7 should be the choice.

Ricardo Gastelum, Communities for a Better Environment, said he had been following these meetings since 2005 and that he hoped the Project Committee would support what the community needs, namely CA-7.

Maria Reyes, Long Beach, said it is important to include CA-7 because it will benefit us and the Los Angeles River. She said there are very few parks in West Long Beach.

Carolina Cabrera, Communities for a Better Environment, said she supported CA-7 because there is a long history of freeway projects that damage the community.
Irene Garcia, Lynwood, said she supported the zero emission freight corridor and that CA-7 is needed for our health.

Peter Greenwald, South Coast Air Quality Management District, urged inclusion of the SCAQMD proposals that were described in a letter he presented the Project Committee. He said the major points were: 1) the freight corridor should be designed in such a way that encourages maximum usage; and 2) the freight corridor should provide for access to the warehouses in Carson and Compton. He said the District does not want the project design to foreclose other alternative technologies.

Maguie Goday, Lynwood, said to think of having a better environment for us all. She said CA-7 is needed to keep our rivers clean.

Lynwood City Manager Sarah Magana Withers submitted a letter in support of CA-7 and urged the Project Committee to support CA-7.

Ramya Sivasubramanian, Natural Resources Defense Counsel, submitted a matrix prepared by the Coalition for Environmental Health and Justice (CEHAJ) and spoke in support of CA-7.
Ben Polk, Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles, said he would like Caltrans to study a targeted hiring strategy.

Bill Magavern, Coalition for Clean Air, said the only way to address all of our clean air policy goals is to include CA-7 in its entirety.

Laura Baker, CEHAJ, said she supported including CA-7 in its entirety, as well as the recommendations made by the SCAQMD.

Maurice Weiner, Long Beach, said he is concerned about particles that would be released by the I-710 project.

Marina Pando, Commerce, spoke in favor of CA-7. She said she didn’t think it was fair for Caltrans to remove families from their homes; they must look for other alternatives.

Julius and Czarina Calacsan, West Long Beach, said they are part of CEHAJ and asked the Project Committee to think about those living next to I-710. They said there is a need to improve pollution, which is why they support CA-7.

Nancy Maravilla said she supported CA-7, especially improved public transit.

Linda Kamora-Kay, West Long Beach, said trucks on I-710 have been affecting her asthma and that she supports CA-7.

Cory Allen, Office of Senator Ricardo Lara, said he is a strong supporter of CA-7. He said it is okay to set a precedent to advance the environment of our community.

Nancy Martinez and Gabby Cervantez said we must clean up the air and the pollutants that affect our health.

Taylor Thomas, West Long Beach, said he has asthma and that his health did not improve until he moved away from I-710. He said zero emission technology would help address this issue.

Robert Gonzalez, East Yards Communities for Environmental Justice, spoke in favor of CA-7.

Alexses Cabrera, Youth for Environmental Justice, said she supported CA-7 in its entirety.

Veronica Lopez, Huntington Park, said she supported CA-7 in its entirety.
Maria Socorro, Huntington Park, said she supported CA-7 in its entirety.

Guillermo Merin, Maywood, said he doesn’t feel that people are listened to.

Maria E. Arreola, Huntington Park, asked for support of CA-7.

Rosa Esquivel, South Gate, said she wants support for CA-7 in its entirety.

Jose Luis Silva, Communities for a Better Environment, said he supports CA-7. He asked the Project Committee to think of our families in the long term.

Fernando Solis, Communities for a Better Environment, said the community wants CA-7.

Robert Cabrales, Communities for a Better Environment, said the representatives of the community have put a lot of time into this project. He asked if they were wasting their time if Caltrans can do what it wants. He said he respectfully asks the Project Committee to support CA-7 in its entirety.

There being no one else wishing to speak, Co-Chairman Hurtado closed the public comment period.

Member Daniels said we have been hearing about asthma, but improving air quality has been the number one goal of the Project Committee all along.

It was moved by Member Uranga, seconded by Member Valencia, to include Community Alternative 7 in its entirety, along with alternatives 5C and 7, in the RDEIR/RDEIS.

It was moved by Member Alatorre, seconded by Member Magana, to amend the motion by including the SCAQMD and TAC recommendations as part of the motion. This amendment was accepted by members Uranga and Valencia.

Member Forester said that CA-7 cannot legally be included in the EIR without those limitations expressed by Caltrans in its letter.

Member Magana said he urged his colleagues to include CA-7 and to set the precedent.

Member Forester said he cannot vote to include CA-7 in its entirety because of the illegality.
Member Valencia said we can send a message to Sacramento that this is what the community wants.

Member Alatorre said Lynwood was cut in half when I-105 was opened. He said Sacramento didn’t care about community issues. He said CA-7 will protect the residents of the area.

Member DeChellis said something is missing in this dialogue and moved that Metro continue to work with the County and the entire corridor to study the level of service so that it doesn’t stay a level F. He said otherwise this could end up dumping all of the traffic into East Los Angeles. The motion was seconded by Member Oliva.

The motion failed by show of hands.

Member DuBois said we spent $31 million on the original EIR and that Measure R allows $590 million for I-710. She said, if we keep studying, that is all we will have and if we keep adding things, it will go on forever.

Member Drummond said 20 more years of studying will be 20 more years of asthma.

Member Oliva said she agreed with Member Magana that we should set a precedent.

Member Kosinski said this is a very complex issue regarding the Los Angeles River and flooding. He said if we move forward with this project there will be mitigation measures that could lead to river improvements.

There being no further discussion, the amended motion was approved by the following vote:

AYES Members Valencia, Aceituno, Robles, Oliva, Uranga, Alatorre, Magana, and Leon, and Co-Chairman Hurtado.

NOES: Members Daniels, Forester, Davis, DeChellis, Drummond, and DuBois.

ABSTAIN: Members Kosinski and Mike Jones.

ABSENT: Members Dear, Willie Jones, Marquez, Perez, Labatique, and Messina.
C. I-710 Early Action Projects

Bill Pagett, Chair of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, presented a report summarizing the recommendation of the TAC that the Project Committee request that the MTA Board move $200 million in early action projects funding forward to the first decade of funding, $60 million of which would be transferred from freeway projects to non-freeway projects, $40 million to come from non-freeway funding in the second decade, and $100 million in “out year” freeway improvement funding, the latter of which would be used to fund sound walls and other freeway projects.

It was moved by Member DuBois, seconded by Member Drummond, to approve the TAC recommendation. The motion was approved unanimously.

Ernesto Chaves, MTA, explained the semi-annual process that the MTA Board of Directors uses to approve changes to the Measure R funding plan.

Mr. Chaves introduced Tom Choe of System Metrics, who had been selected by the MTA Board to serve as the consultant Program Manager for the Measure R funded early action projects.

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

D. I-710 Aesthetics Master Plan Presentation

Jennifer Taira, Caltrans, gave a PowerPoint presentation which summarized the process for developing an overall aesthetics plan for the I-710 freeway corridor. She reviewed the meetings that had occurred and discussed the development of the corridor aesthetic theme and design guidelines agreed to by the Aesthetics Committee, which is made up of representatives from all of the cities through which the freeway traverses as well as the County for the unincorporated areas. Design guidelines include a unifying theme, the integration of roadway aesthetic treatments, and enhancement of natural and human environments.

Ms. Taira presented several visual examples of aesthetic treatments that could be incorporated into the project, including options for the design of sound walls.

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

E. COG Engineer’s Report
Yvette Kirrin, consultant engineer to the Gateway Cities Council of Governments, gave a brief presentation on the activities to date regarding the development of the Gateway Cities Strategic Transportation Plan. She said she and the consultant team led by Cambridge Systematics would be continuing to work with cities to include their planned projects in the Strategic Transportation Plan and to maintain consistency.

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

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

Member Forester announced that this would be his last meeting as a member of the Project Committee because, as a civil engineer, he cannot abide by the recommendation to include Community Alternative 7 in its entirety in the RDEIR/RDEIS.

X. Matters from the Chair

There were no matters from the Chair.

XI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 10:00 p.m.
VIII. REPORTS
ITEM C
CA-7 Workshops Status Report
TO: I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG

BY: MTA Staff/710 Project Team

SUBJECT: CA 7 Workshops Status Report

Background

The owner operator of the I-710 Freeway is the State of California represented by the Department of Transportation (Caltrans). As owner operator, Caltrans has the designated “Lead Agency” status under CEQA (California Environmental Law) and has delegated authority from FHWA (Federal Highways) to act as “Lead Agency” under NEPA (Federal Environmental Law). Caltrans has the ultimate authority over the project including designation of the Locally Preferred Alternative (the project).

Over the past six years, Caltrans, LA Metro, the Gateway Cities COG, Ports of Los Angeles/Long Beach, the I-5 JPA and SCAG have been working on project environmental clearance through a comprehensive community participation framework that has resulted in over 300 public meetings. The environmental document was circulated for public review in draft form in 2012. In the same year SCAG released the 2012 SCAG RTP, changes in growth forecasts and economic downturn lead to a decision to revise the environmental documents utilizing the new forecasts and recirculate new drafts in the Spring of 2016.

In 2012, various community organizations and law interest groups formed the Coalition for Environmental Health and Justice (CEHAJ) and developed an alternative called Community Alternative -7 (CA-7), which was submitted as a comment to the Draft EIR/EIS recirculated in 2012. CEHAJ through various different avenues requested it be submitted for inclusion into the environmental process as a discreet alternative for analysis.

The I-710 Project Team spent significant time reviewing CA-7 and comparing it project components for alternatives currently under environment review. On May 22, 2014, and again on July 11, 2014 (Attachment A), Caltrans sent letters to CEHAJ memorializing its position: that CA-7 in its entirety would not be analyzed in the environmental document, as Caltrans does not have the jurisdictional authority to implement various elements of CA-7. Both letters also noted that the majority of the items in CA-7 were either already contained within the project alternatives or might reasonably become mitigations to the recognized impacts from the project.

In July of 2014, the Community Advisory Committee sent a recommendation to the I-710 Project Committee to include CA-7 in the environmental documents in its entirety. The I-710 Project Committee took a vote to recommend that the environmental documents include CA-7 along with Alternatives 5C and 7.
CA-7 Workshops

At the request of California State Transportation Agency (Cal-STA), Caltrans Metro and the Gateway Cities Council of Governments (GCCOG) held a series of workshops to generate additional dialog and a better understanding of CA-7; Three workshops took place on the following dates: December 11, December 17, and January 16. The goal of the workshops was to better understand the scope and components of CA-7 through questions, discussions and dialog. Below is a summary of the three meetings (Attachment B).

The workshops also provided an opportunity to gain clarification on elements of Alternatives 5C, 7, and CA-7 that remained unclear, and to determine if additional elements of CA-7 could be included in the RDEIR/SDEIS. During the first workshop, members of the CEHAJ provided an overview of CA-7. The group also discussed specific components of the proposed geometric designs for Alternatives 5C and 7 and how they differ from CA-7. Members of the CEHAJ reiterated that the coalition’s CA-7 proposes no right of way impacts. There was an agreement of disagreement on the right of way impacts caused by the Project's safety improvements.

The second workshop focused on the scope of CA-7. After discussing the scope and reach of the proposed CA-7 elements (freight corridor, transit bicycle and pedestrian improvements, Los Angeles River, community enhancements and construction mitigation) it became clear that there are two different buckets, one are project elements and the other are program elements. The group came to an agreement that the I-710 Corridor Project was only addressing one aspect of an overall vision for the corridor. CA-7 includes proposed improvements to the proposed I-710 Corridor Project (highway) project as well as others that are part of a larger program.

The third workshop focused on sharing information on potential funding mechanisms for the project, especially since there currently is no source of funding to construct a project. Also during the last workshop, the agencies proposed an approach that would ensure the study of CA-7 elements in both the I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS and a Gateway Cities led corridor-wide initiative (Attachment C). The Gateway Cities Council of Governments committed to providing the necessary leadership to undertake a CA-7 Livability Initiative. CEHAJ requested an additional workshop to respond to this plan, which the Project Team agreed to.

In summary, the workshops served as an interactive fact finding session between CEHAJ and agency representatives.

Next Steps

As part of the last workshop, agency staff presented the attached Implementation Plan for CA-7 as a possible path forward. CEHAJ requested an additional workshop to respond to
this plan, which the Project Team agreed to. The Project Team will continue working with CEHAJ on the proposed path forward.

No action is being requested today. Staff will report on the continued discussions with CEHAJ at the next Project Committee meeting.
May 22, 2014

Mr. Adrian Martinez  
Staff Attorney  
Earthjustice, Counsel for Coalition for Environmental Health and Justice (CEHAJ)  
50 California St., Ste. 500  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Subject:    I-710 Corridor Project – Response to Letter of April 17, 2014

Dear Mr. Martinez:

Thank you for your letter of April 17, 2014, regarding the offer of assistance in clarifying the complex disputes regarding the environmental review of the I-710 Corridor Project. Your letter offers perspectives on the Governor’s veto of Senate Bill 811 (SB 811) and its relevance to the environmental review of the I-710 Corridor Project, and expresses concerns regarding Caltrans fulfilling its role as the lead agency under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Caltrans and its agency partners on the I-710 Corridor Project welcome your invitation to engage in a constructive dialogue with CEHAJ to ensure that the I-710 Corridor Project is developed in a manner sensitive to the concerns of the Corridor communities and stakeholders.

Perspectives on SB 811

We believe the Governor’s message of October 11, 2013, to the Members of the California State Senate regarding SB 811 makes two points very clear. First, by stating that “statutorily requiring the project environmental impact report to consider specified mitigation measures that exceed the project’s scope is a precedent I don’t wish to establish,”, the Governor made it very clear that mitigation measures should be based on the actual impacts of the project. We are following through with the Governor’s statement in the CEQA/NEPA process to ensure that any proposed mitigation measures are tied to project impacts and that the alternatives, as proposed, do include those project features that are directly tied to addressing the defined purpose and need of the project. Your letter notes that Community Alternative 7 (CA-7) proposed by CEHAJ includes elements that should not be considered mitigation, but as features of the project alternatives themselves. As discussed later in this letter, almost all of the elements of CA-7 are proposed for inclusion in the revised alternatives to be studied in the Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report/Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (RDEIR/SDEIS) for the project.

“Caltrans improves mobility across California”
The second key point in the Governor’s message is his statement, “Caltrans is instructed to work with the author and local stakeholders on identifying mitigation measures within the scope of CEQA that ensure the I-710 project benefits motorists, goods movement, the community, and the environment.” We believe we are following this direction from the Governor, and we are committed to continuing a constructive dialogue on the I-710 Corridor Project with CEHAJ and other community stakeholders. As you know, members of my staff and I have met with various CEHAJ representatives both individually and in group meetings multiple times since CA-7 was first proposed in 2012. Those meetings have been beneficial to Caltrans in helping us better understand the different elements of CA-7, and we hope they have been beneficial to representatives of CEHAJ in understanding the limitations that Caltrans has in addressing certain elements of CA-7. Please be advised that I will shortly request another meeting with CEHAJ representatives to continue this dialogue.

**Caltrans’ Responsibilities under NEPA**

Caltrans takes its role under the Memorandum of Understanding with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to implement NEPA very seriously. Many of the technical analyses (such as the Health Risk Assessment, environmental justice analysis, and inclusion of public health considerations for all environmental topics) included in the I-710 Corridor Project environmental process go above and beyond Caltrans’ standard procedures for environmental review. Your letter cites the provisions of Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice, as well as U.S. Department of Transportation and FHWA Orders to implement Executive Order 12898. Your letter also restates many of the environmental justice concerns raised by CEHAJ in its comment letter of September 28, 2012 on the I-710 Corridor Project Draft EIR/EIS. Again, Caltrans is fully committed to fulfilling its responsibilities under NEPA to comply with Executive Order 12898, as well as addressing the comments received on the I-710 Corridor Project Draft EIR/EIS. Specifically, as has already been shared with CEHAJ representatives in previous meetings (most recently on March 17, 2014, at a meeting with representatives from the East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice), the design of the I-710 build alternatives have been revised to avoid and minimize impacts to important community facilities such as the Long Beach Multi-Service Center, Bell Shelters, and Shelter Partnerships.

**Inclusion of CA-7 in the RDEIR/SDEIS**

In the closing paragraph of your letter, you ask for a response to the question that has been previously asked, and that is whether CA-7 will be analyzed in its entirety in the RDEIR/SDEIS. As Caltrans’ staff has consistently stated in previous meetings with CEHAJ representatives, there are elements included in CA-7 that are simply not within Caltrans’ jurisdiction to implement as the owner-operator of I-710 and as the Lead Agency under CEQA and NEPA (e.g., “restoration of the natural river functions” as stated in CA-7 Element 5 – River Improvements). Therefore, we will not be analyzing CA-7 in its entirety in the RDEIR/SDEIS. However, Caltrans has worked with our agency partners and project consultants to incorporate most elements of CA-7 in both of the alternatives proposed for analysis in the RDEIR/SDEIS. For example, proposed Alternative 7 includes a zero emission/near zero emission freight corridor as proposed in CA-7 Element 3 (Committed Zero Emission Freight Corridor), but with no additional general purpose lanes as proposed in CA-7.

“Caltrans improves mobility across California”
Element 1 (No Widening of General Purpose Lanes). In addition, both proposed Alternatives 5C and 7 include the construction of specific bikeway and river trail linkages along the Los Angeles River as proposed in CA-7 Element 6 (Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Element). Proposed Alternatives 5C and 7 also include programmatic components such as a Community Health Benefits grant program as proposed in CA-7 Element 7 (Community Benefits and Enhancements). A detailed table comparing the elements of proposed Alternatives 5C and 7 to the elements of CA-7 is attached for your reference.

In conclusion, I want to thank you again for sharing CEHAJ’s perspectives and concerns. We look forward to continuing to work together with CEHAJ and other community groups to ensure that the I-710 Corridor Project benefits the community and the environment.

Very truly yours,

RONALD KOSINSKI
Deputy District Director, Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation, District 7

Attachment: I-710 Corridor Project Alternative Comparisons Matrix

cc: Maya Golden-Krasner, Communities for a Better Environment
    Susanne Browne, Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles
    Ramya Sivasubramanian, Natural Resources Defense Council
    Angelo Logan, East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice
    Patricia Ochoa, Coalition for Clean Air
    Carrie Bowen, Caltrans District 7
    Frank Quon, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
    Richard Powers, Gateway Cities Council of Governments

“Caltrans improves mobility across California”
July 11, 2014

Community Advisory Committee Members
via e-mail

Subject: Follow-up to June 19 CAC discussion on Community Alternative 7

Dear CAC Members,

During the June 19, 2014 Community Advisory Committee meeting the Committee discussed specific elements of Community Alternative 7 that Caltrans is not studying in the RDEIR/SDEIS. In response to four main points that members of the Committee discussed at length, Caltrans has prepared this letter. I expect that this will help in clarifying the reasoning behind some of the elements that differ between Community Alternative 7 and the proposed Alternative 7. There appear to be four main issues of contention regarding elements of Community Alternative 7 that are not “fully included” within the proposed Alternative 7.

Aggressive transit improvement strategy. Section CA7.2 of the CEHAJ CA7 Community Alternative proposal advocates for “an aggressive strategy to improve public transportation via bus and rail in the I-710 corridor”, including considerations for “building additional light rail capacity or expanding bus routes and service”. Additionally, section CCA7.2 (Free Public Transit program) of Appendix 1 of the proposal calls for Caltrans, by way of Metro, to “provide free rides on the Metro Blue Line and make additional Metro Bus Lines free when the I-710 will be closed for demolition and construction work.”

Transit improvements are the domain of Metro, rather than Caltrans. As a component of the I-710 Corridor Project, Metro is proposing significant light rail and bus transit increases in the corridor as part of the I-710 Corridor Project. This commitment was originally made in Chapter 2 of the June 2012 Draft EIR/EIS and will be re-affirmed in the Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS.

This commitment was made in spite of technical analyses that show that these proposed increases in transit service have very limited effect on addressing key elements of purpose and need. Within the I-710 corridor, even with higher transit shares of person-travel than most of Los Angeles County, it would require a 20-25% increase in transit services to reduce auto trips by one to two percent. It is the belief of the project sponsors, however, that this investment in increased transit services, along with other proposed project trip reduction strategies such as transit demand management and active transportation, will have a measurable benefit on corridor mobility. That is why these elements have been included in all of the build alternatives since early in this environmental study.
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The project team has previously studied the potential for transit usage in the corridor (Final Report, Technical Memorandum – Multimodal Review, March 2009; available on Metro’s website) and, for example, found that decreasing the Blue Line’s headways to the greatest extent feasible (approximately 5 minutes in peak hours) while still operating under system restrictions, would result in a boarding increase of approximately 8 percent. Assuming every new boarding is a single-occupant driver, this increase in Blue Line ridership would decrease study area auto trips by less than one-half percent (approximately 3,350 auto trips).

With regard to the free transit program proposed during construction, the project team will consider options such as transit vouchers or other measures similar to what is currently being implemented on the I-5 reconstruction project.

**Revitalization and restoration of the Los Angeles River.** Section CA7.5 of the CEHAJ proposal discusses river improvements, specifically “restoration of the natural river functions, including recreational trails, restored wetlands, continuous fish migration corridors, and native landscaping.” A follow-up document provided by CEHAJ in summer 2013 titled “Draft: The Coalition for Environmental Health and Justice (CEHAJ) LA River Improvements of Community Alternative 7 (CA7)” set forth guidelines for design elements and enhancements of river-centric connections.

Improvements to the Los Angeles River are solely the domain of the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE). If any of the proposed project alternatives would impact the River, those impacts will be quantified and appropriate mitigation measures will be proposed that would contribute to the revitalization and restoration of the River. The appropriate level of funding for the mitigation will be negotiated with USACOE. Per the Executive Office’s Council on Environmental Quality, “Memorandum for Heads of Federal Departments and Agencies: Appropriate Use of Mitigation and Monitoring and Clarifying the Appropriate Use of Mitigated Findings of No Significant Impact” (dated January 14, 2011, accessed at [http://ceq.hss.doc.gov/current_developments/docs/Mitigation_and_Monitoring_Guidance_14Jan2011.pdf](http://ceq.hss.doc.gov/current_developments/docs/Mitigation_and_Monitoring_Guidance_14Jan2011.pdf)), “Agencies should not commit to mitigation, however, unless they have sufficient legal authorities and expect there will be necessary resources available to perform or ensure the performance of the mitigation.” Similarly, per the Federal Highway Administration’s Environmental Review Toolkit section on NEPA and Transportation Decisionmaking: Mitigation of Environment Impacts ([http://environment.fhwa.dot.gov/projdev/tdmmitig2.asp](http://environment.fhwa.dot.gov/projdev/tdmmitig2.asp)), “FHWA’s mitigation policy states: Measures necessary to mitigate adverse impacts will be incorporated into the action and are eligible for Federal funding when the Administration determines that: 1. The impacts for which the mitigation are proposed actually result from the Administration action; and 2. The proposed mitigation represents a reasonable public expenditure after considering the impacts of the action and the benefits of the proposed mitigation measures. In making this determination, the Administration will consider, among other factors, the extent to which the proposed measures would assist in complying with a Federal statute, Executive Order, or Administration regulation or policy.”

CEQA grants public agencies the authority to mitigate in section 15041 of the CEQA guidelines. “(a) A lead agency for a project has authority to require feasible changes in any or all activities involved in the project in order to substantially lessen or avoid significant effects on the
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environment, consistent with applicable constitutional requirements such as the “nexus” and “rough proportionality” standards established by case law”.

River enhancements as a proposed project feature are inappropriate uses of federal, state, and local transportation dollars from which Metro and Caltrans projects are funded. Recently, USACOE recommended approval of a comprehensive, stand-alone proposal (Los Angeles River Ecosystem Restoration Alternative 20) to restore habitat, widen the river, create wetlands and provide access points and bike trails for an 11-mile stretch of the river north of downtown Los Angeles, at a cost of approximately $1 billion to be shared between federal, state and city sources. Caltrans commends this decision by USACOE and looks forward to the development of a restoration project south of downtown.

**Targeted hiring measures to environmental justice populations.** Section CCA7.5 of Appendix 1 to the CEHAIJ proposal discusses Community Benefits. Specifically, “Targeted workers means an individual whose primary place of residence is within an Economically Disadvantaged Area or an Extremely Economically Disadvantaged Area in the United States, or a Disadvantaged Worker...a minimum of 40% of all hours of Project Work shall be performed by Targeted Workers, with priority given to residents of Extremely Economically Disadvantaged Areas.”

The Caltrans Office of Business and Economic Opportunity (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/bep/) is dedicated to increasing the participation of small businesses, disadvantaged business enterprises, and disabled veteran business enterprises in both State and Federal contracting and procurement. Caltrans is acutely aware of and committed to having parity in all projects. Caltrans identifies underrepresented groups in contracting on federally funded highway projects through data from the U.S. Department of Labor, U.S. Census, and the Federal-Aid Highway Construction Contractors Annual EEO Reports for California. Caltrans utilizes this information to increase the pool of qualified minorities, women, and disadvantaged persons in the highway construction industry. The On-The-Job Training/Supportive Services (OJT/SS) Program is the vessel Caltrans utilizes pursuant to Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Title 23, Part 230, Subpart A. The OJT/SS program’s purpose is to increase the participation and competencies of Equal Employment Opportunity groups that have been significantly underrepresented, to fulfill highway construction workforce needs. The goal of the OJT/SS program is to provide skills training for transportation workers that will lead to permanent journey-level careers in the highway construction industry. Caltrans solicits qualified contractors to submit proposals to conduct skilled trades training programs to increase competencies for inclusion in enhanced training programs. By increasing competencies, participants are prepared for inclusion into a U.S. Department of Labor recognized apprentice program. CFR, Title 23, §230.111 provides direction to Caltrans on determining which Federal-aid highway construction contracts shall include the “Training Provisions” and the minimum number of trainees to be specified therein after giving appropriate consideration to the guidelines set forth in §230.111(c). Caltrans feels that these ongoing training programs are the most effective way to support economically disadvantaged workers and prepare them for careers in the highway construction industry.

Additionally, Caltrans realizes the importance of ensuring the benefits of construction jobs are seen by the local communities impacted by such projects, especially when such communities are
economically disadvantaged. However, state and federal statutes prevent Caltrans from mandating location-based hiring on any contracts using state or federal funds (see 23 United States Code (USC) 112; 23 CFR 635.117(b)). Additionally, Proposition 209 precludes the State from implementing race- and gender-conscious programs related to non-federally-funded contracts. Currently, Metro is actively pursuing legislation that would allow transportation agencies "to prioritize hiring local residents for highway and transit projects" (http://bass.house.gov/press-release/rep-bass-introduces-legislation-benefit-local-workers).

Comprehensive pedestrian and bicycle element. Section CA7.6 of the CEHAJ proposal calls for Caltrans to, among other things, "support through planning and implementation grants all communities in the corridor study area in drafting and adopting pedestrian and bicycle master plans that reflect local conditions and priorities, and that facilitate regional connectivity." Caltrans is also called to "connect the communities on either side of the I-710 with a series of pedestrian- and bicycle- only bridges or lids every ¼ to ½ mile, especially where there is a particularly long gap between existing street crossings."

While the planning and implementation of pedestrian and bicycle master plans are not an eligible use of project related funds, Caltrans currently offers three different transportation planning grant programs for the upcoming fiscal year (FY) 2014-2015: Partnership Planning for Sustainable Transportation, Transit Planning for Sustainable Communities, and Transit Planning for Rural Communities. Additionally, it is anticipated that the Environmental Justice and Community-Based Transportation Planning grants will return for the FY 2015-16 grant cycle. All corridor communities are encouraged to apply for this grant funding. Forty applications statewide, totaling $5.3 million in funding, were selected for funding in FY 2014-15.

Constructing bridges over the I-710 at an interval of every ¼ mile for the length of the project (approximately 20 miles) would represent an additional 40 structures that would be built in close proximity to, and potentially impacting, homes and neighborhoods. At an individual cost of $2-3 million the full array of pedestrian and bike-only bridges would add $40 to 60 million to the total project cost. When the project team made the decision to revise and recirculate the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (DEIR/DEIS), it pledged to incorporate more flexibility into the new alternatives with regards to the future funding landscape and availability thereof. This additional cost to fund 40 new overcrossings does not appear feasible at this time, but as noted in the next section, several new structures are proposed to provide critical bicycle/pedestrian linkages within the I-710 Corridor.

In closing, I would like to remind you of the steps Caltrans and the project team is taking to ensure that the community’s voice is being heard. The following elements of Community Alternative 7 are being incorporated into Alternative 7, which is being proposed for inclusion in the RDEIR/SDEIS.

Under Alternative 7, there would be no widening of general purpose lanes, and modernization of existing interchanges is being designed to minimize right-of-way impacts to the fullest extent possible. It is not physically possible to modernize the design of existing interchanges and improve traffic safety with no impacts to adjacent properties. The proposed freight corridor in Alternative 7
would be restricted to use by zero and near zero-emission trucks, and Alternative 7 also proposes additional programmatic air quality improvement strategies.

The feasibility of a Public/Private Partnership (PPP) to design, operate and maintain the proposed improvements to I-710 will be studied and discussed in the RDEIR/SDEIS.

Significant increases in both light rail and bus transit services within the corridor are being proposed, as described in more detail above.

Stormwater treatment and Best Management Practices are an integral part of every Caltrans project, in line with the stringent requirements of our 2012 Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit.

The design of pedestrian and bicyclist infrastructure is being guided by Caltrans’ Complete Streets Implementation, which provides for “a transportation facility that is planned, designed, operated, and maintained to provide safe mobility for all users, including bicyclists, pedestrians, transit vehicles, truckers, and motorists, appropriate to the function and context of the facility” (Complete Streets Implementation Action Plan, 2010). Additionally, a Class I bikeway between LARIO and the LA River bike path will be provided.

During the project development process, the project team has worked to ensure any impacts to community facilities and services, as well as residential, commercial, and industrial buildings and facilities, will be minimized to the fullest extent possible. The project team has also proposed a Community Health Grants program be funded as an element of the proposed build alternatives, modeled after the Port of Long Beach’s Port Mitigation Grant Programs. Further specific mitigation measures will be identified and disclosed in the RDEIR/SDEIS, but only after impact determination is complete.

I expect that this will help in clarifying some of the questions raised by committee members regarding the some of the elements proposed by the authors of CA 7. We look forward to further providing additional information during the CAC Workshop scheduled for July 17. We appreciate your ongoing involvement and commitment to the process.

Very truly yours,

RONALD KOSINSKI
Deputy District Director, Division of Environmental Planning
California Department of Transportation, District 7

cc: CEHAJ
CA-7 Workshop #1
December 11, 2014
10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.
Caltrans District 7 Headquarters
100 S Main St., Los Angeles, CA
Conference Room 03.026

AGENDA

10:00 a.m.  I. Welcome

10:05 a.m.  II. Review Agenda, Meeting Objectives and Desired Outcomes

10:20 a.m.  III. Brief Overview CA-7 –

10:30 a.m.  IV. Listening Session by Topic Area
- Freeway Design
- Freight Corridor
- Transit

11:45 a.m.  Working Lunch

11:55 a.m.  V. Confirm areas of mutual agreement

12:45 p.m.  VI. Confirm agenda topics for Workshop #2

1:00 p.m.  Adjournment

Daniel Jacofano, Mark Lopez, Gary Sidhu
Daniel Jacofano (MIG) and Working Group Members
CEHAJ Representative
Daniel Jacofano (MIG) and Working Group Members
Facilitated Discussion Daniel Jacofano (MIG)
Daniel Jacofano (MIG) and Working Group Members
CA-7 Workshop #2
December 17, 2014
9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.
Caltrans District 7 Headquarters
100 S Main St., Los Angeles, CA
Conference Room 03.026

AGENDA

9:00 a.m.  I. Welcome
Daniel Iacofano,

9:05 a.m.  II. Review Agenda and Previous Meeting Recap
Daniel Iacofano
(MIG)

10:30 a.m. III. Understanding the Scope of CA-7
Daniel Iacofano
(MIG) and
Working Group
Members
- Freeway Design – Follow up items
- Freight Corridor
- Transit
- Bicycle/Pedestrian
- LA River
- Community Enhancement
- Construction Mitigation

11:15 a.m. Working Lunch

11:55 a.m. IV. Confirm areas of mutual agreement
Facilitated
Discussion
Daniel Iacofano
(MIG)

12:45 p.m. V. Confirm agenda topics for Workshop #3
Daniel Iacofano
(MIG) and
Working Group
Members

1:00 p.m.  Adjournment
CA-7 Workshop #3  
January 16, 2015  
10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.  
Caltrans District 7 Headquarters  
100 S Main St., Los Angeles, CA  
Conference Room 1.040B

AGENDA

10:00 a.m.  I. Welcome

10:05 a.m.  II. Review Agenda and Previous Meeting Recap

10:10 a.m.  III. Topic Area Discussion
- Funding Implementation  
             (Including P3)

11:30 a.m.  Working Lunch

11:45 a.m.  IV. Potential Steps for Moving Forward

1:30 p.m.   V. Confirm Areas of Agreement

2:00 p.m.   Adjournment
ATTACHMENT C
How do we effectively pursue implementation of Community Alternative 7?

A) Through I-710 Corridor Project – these elements are in Alternatives 5C and 7:

1. No additional general purpose capacity (Alternative 7 only)
2. Avoidance of community facility direct impacts (e.g. Bell Shelter, Long Beach Multi-Service Center)
3. Improvements to existing river access from major arterials (within the project footprint)
4. Adequate and safe bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure (within the Project Footprint)
5. Bicycle/Pedestrian Connection (Class I) between the County of LA Bike Path and the Los Angeles-Rio Hondo “LARIO” Trail, adjacent to Imperial Highway
6. Bicycle/Pedestrian Connection (Class II) between the LARIO Trail and the Compton Creek River Path via Del Amo Boulevard
7. Two Parkway Bridges/Crossings (at Imperial Hwy and another one TBD)
8. Evaluation of PPP delivery options
9. Tree planting and streetscape enhancement within the 710 Project Footprint
10. Substantial transit operational improvements
11. I-710 freeway ramp metering and related ITS/TSM operational improvements
12. I-710 ZE/NZE Truck Technology Deployment Program (separate handout)
13. I-710 Community Health and Benefit Program (separate handout)

B) Through I-710 Corridor Project - these elements could be incorporated as mitigations to identified impacts once the analysis is completed

1. Construction equipment AQ mitigation and construction traffic mitigation
2. Limited Free Public Transit program and/or enhanced service during construction periods that require freeway closure(s)
3. Air filtration systems for significantly impacted sensitive receptors properties
4. Funding of I-710 air pollution mitigation program
5. Funding of I-710 noise mitigation program
6. Near freeway soundproofing before construction for significantly impacted properties
7. Additional community benefits
8. Job Programs (e.g. work experience, minority business enterprise, women business enterprise and small business utilization and retention) - commitment levels to be determined after environmental phase.

C) Through a “CA-7 Livability Initiative” - working with regional partners and responsible jurisdictions:

1. Aggressive strategy to improve transportation via rail and bus in the I-710 Corridor, including considerations for building additional light rail capacity or expanding bus routes and service.
2. LA River Improvements: enhanced system of park networks that will create greenbelts and open space connections; recreational trails, restored wetlands, and native landscaping; multi-benefit green treatment trains; removing impermeable surfaces elsewhere
3. Comprehensive Pedestrian/Bicycle Program: connection and enhancement of the growing bike path networks along Compton Creek, Rio Honda, and the Los Angeles River; planning and implementation grants for communities in the corridor study area for drafting and adopting pedestrian and bicycle master plans; connect the communities on either side of the I-710 with a series of pedestrian- and bicycle-only bridges or lids every ½ to ⅔ mile, establish a dense network of bicycle-friendly neighborhood routes, also known as “bike boulevards”; utilize existing underused railroad and utility rights-of-way to construct separated pedestrian/bicycle paths; stripe bicycle lanes and install sufficient bicycle parking racks at industrial and commercial facilities; provide walking and cycling connections to passenger rail stations – Metro and Metrolink – and to bus stops
4. Working collaboratively with the local jurisdictions; define and implement a Complete Streets Program, including “road diets,” on principal arterial and collector streets throughout the corridor study area, prioritizing those that currently cross the I-710 freeway and LA River
5. Comprehensive Community Benefits Program: maintenance and upgrades at existing corridor parks as well as additional sports and recreation facilities and programs; pedestrian and streetscape improvements to facilitate students’ safe routes to school; near freeway air filtration; more public art into existing park facilities, neighborhoods, gateways, and corridor transportation facilities.
6. Health Study