



I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

Thursday, May 31, 2018

6:30 PM

**Gateway Cities COG Office 2nd Floor Conference Room
16401 Paramount Boulevard
Paramount, CA**

AGENDA – MEETING IS CANCELLED

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 January 25, 2018, of the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION:

A MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM.

VIII. REPORTS

50 Min A. I-710 EIR/EIS Project Updates – Presentation by Metro

- Recap of Board Action Including Motions
- Description of Alternative 5C
- Approach to Initial Stage Program (or Early Action Program)
- Timeline & Next Steps

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

10 Min B. Current I-710 Early Action Project Update Including

- Cash Flow/Invoicing Status – Oral Report by Metro

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

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

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

5 Min D. COG Engineers Report – Oral Report by COG Staff

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

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

X. MATTERS FROM THE CHAIR

XI. 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, August 30, 2018, 6:30 PM.

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

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
January 25, 2018**

I. Call to Order

Member Al Austin called the meeting to order at 6:38 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Roll Call was taken by self-introductions:

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Ana Maria Quintana, City of Bell; Pedro Aceituno, City of Bell Gardens; Hugo Argumedo, City of Commerce; Marilyn Sanabria, City of Huntington Park; Al Austin, City of Long Beach, Sal Alatorre, City of Lynwood; Carlos Alvarez, City of Maywood; Tom Hansen, City of Paramount; Lori Y. Woods, City of Signal Hill; Maria Davila, City of South Gate; Melissa Ybarra, City of Vernon; Javier Hernandez, County of Los Angeles; Bonnie Lowenthal, Port of Long Beach; David Libatique, Port of Los Angeles; John Soria, I-5 JPA; Ron Kosinski, Caltrans; Sharon Weissman, MTA; Alison Linder, SCAG; Judith Mitchell, South Bay Cities COG (ex officio); Donald Johnson, Southern California Edison (ex officio).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Cedric L. Hicks, City of Carson; Janna Zurita, City of Compton; Baru Sanchez, City of Cudahy; Blanca Pacheco, City of Downey; Barbara Messina, San Gabriel Valley COG; Steve Broyles, LADWP (ex officio).

ALSO PRESENT: Bill Pagett, City Engineer, City of Paramount and Chair, I-710 Technical Advisory Committee; Ernesto Chaves, Transportation Planning Manager, MTA; John Vassiliades, I-710 Project Manager, Caltrans; Julie Rush, AECOM; Julia Lester, Ramboll Environ; Esmeralda Garcia, MIG; Ivy Tsai, Deputy General Counsel, GCCOG; Nancy Pfeffer, Executive Director, GCCOG; Jack Joseph, Deputy Executive Director, GCCOG; Karen Heit, Transportation Analyst, GCCOG.

III. Pledge of Allegiance

Member Austin led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. Election of a Co-Chair from the North Sector

Member Austin announced that nominations were in order for the position of Co-Chair from the North Sector of the I-710 project area replacing Gil Hurtado, who has retired from office. The GCCOG Deputy Executive Director pointed out that the North Sector included cities located north of Rosecrans Avenue.

Member Hugo Argumedo offered his own nomination to serve as Co-Chair. It was moved by Member Hernandez, seconded by Member Alvarez, to elect Member Argumedo as the Co-Chair from the North Sector. The motion was approved unanimously.

V. Amendments to the Agenda

There were no amendments to the agenda.

VI. Public Comments

Member Austin asked if there were any speakers wishing to address the Project Committee regarding matters that were not on the agenda. There were no speakers.

VII. Matters from Staff

There were no matters from staff.

VIII. Consent Calendar

It was moved by Member Hernandez, seconded by Member Weissman, to approve the minutes of the meeting of January 21, 2017. The motion was approved unanimously, with seven abstentions.

IX. Reports

A. I-710 EIR/EIS Project Updates and Recommendations

Ernesto Chaves, MTA, gave a PowerPoint presentation which summarized the evaluation results leading to a preferred alternative for the I-710 project. He reviewed the timeline of the Recirculated Draft Environmental Document, which was released for public review and comment on July 21, 2017, for a 90-day period. During that period, three public hearings and two community briefings were conducted. He said the process resulted in nearly 2,500 individual public comments. He summarized the key issues and concerns, including preference for full zero emissions technologies; avoidance of right-of-way impacts; concerns about peak-hour parking restrictions and ramp and street closures during construction; the need for more bicycle and pedestrian connections to the Los Angeles River Trail; environmental and air quality

concerns; the need to include local hire provisions in construction; and the need to fully utilize freight rail and the Alameda corridor.

Julie Rush, AECOM, reviewed the technical findings of the project development team. She summarized the key points of the two build alternatives. She described Alternative 5C as intending to modernize, add capacity, and improve traffic operation and safety on I-710. She said three design options would reduce impact to the BNSF Hobart Rail Yard without community impacts; direct an aerial connector from Pacific Coast Highway to Shoemaker Bridge in Long Beach without community impacts; and make mainline and I-710/SR-60 interchange improvements that would have some property impacts. She said Alternative 7 would add a grade separated “clean emission” freight corridor and modernize the freeway. Two design options would reduce the impact to the BNSF Hobart Rail Yard with some community impacts and would make mainline and I-710/SR-60 interchange improvements with some resultant property impacts. The estimated total cost of Alternative 5C is \$6 billion, and the estimated total cost of Alternative 7 is \$10 billion.

Ms. Rush presented a side by side comparison of Alternative 5C and Alternative 7 with regard to twelve evaluation factors: air quality; air quality cost benefit; project cost/affordability; constructability; right-of-way impacts; mobility benefits; congestion relief; travel times; safety benefits; impacts on parks and open space; environmental justice impacts; and visual impacts. The comparison showed Alternative 5C to perform better in more of these categories. The constructability dilemma regarding Alternative 7 is that the freight corridor cannot be built in segments that can be utilized but must be constructed completely first. To accomplish this, I-710 must be rebuilt first to make way for the freight corridor. The total amount of funding that is reasonably foreseeable does not make Alternative 7 a practical alternative.

Ms. Rush reviewed the air quality benefits resulting from the zero and near-zero emission trucks that would be deployed under either alternative. She pointed out that the major air quality benefits come from the trucks, as well as cleaner port operations and regional/state regulations, rather than from the freeway infrastructure. The maximum benefit to air quality would be achieved by beginning with a mix of zero emission and near-zero emission trucks in the near term. Over time the transition to zero emission trucks would take place as technologies become commercially available and as unit prices drop.

Mr. Chaves said the preferred alternative would include features that improve air quality and mobility within the I-710 study area: zero and near-zero emission trucks; an I-710 community and health benefit program; intelligent transportation systems and advanced technologies; a congestion relief

program for intersections and local arterials; transit improvements; and bicycle and pedestrian facilities and connections. He said the preferred alternative would also eliminate peak period parking restrictions on arterials and the design options in East Los Angeles that would result in the greater right-of-way impacts.

Bill Pagett, Chair of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, presented the TAC's recommendation to select Alternative 5C as the preferred alternative, with the note that Metro will work with the cities regarding viable Alternative 5C design refinements, and to maximize the air quality benefits, including the I-710 zero and near-zero emission truck program.

Esmeralda Garcia, MIG, presented the report from the Corridor Advisory Committee. She said the CAC was asked to make a recommendation concerning the preferred alternative and that it was explained to the CAC that it is not governed by the Brown Act and, as an advisory group, does not need to reach a unanimous consensus. During this meeting the discussion among committee members was followed by a show of hands for two separate recommendations. The first motion concerned Motion 22.1. There was a motion that no recommendation be made until all elements of Motion 22.1 are complied with. Ms. Garcia said, based on a show of hands, six members agreed with this motion, five did not agree. A second motion was made to recommend Alternative 5C as the preferred alternative. Based on a show of hands, five CAC members agreed with this motion, five did not agree, and one abstained.

Member Mitchell asked how displacement of residents is handled. Member Kosinski responded that, generally speaking, both renters and homeowners are provided substantial relocation benefits, although people who have lived for many years in a location aren't happy no matter the amount of money.

Member Davila asked about the local hiring program. Mr. Chaves responded that the intent is to have a local hiring program, but that the details remain to be worked out.

Member Alatorre asked how Caltrans would control the types of trucks used in construction so that they are clean vehicles. He said he also wondered how Alternative 5C would handle the trucks from the ports. Julia Lester, Ramboll Environ, responded that pursuant to MTA Board Motion 22.1 the project team had analyzed the maximum availability of clean equipment. Member Kosinski added that the road would be open during construction so that the freight trucks from the port would be able to use the corridor. He said much construction would be done at night.

Member Alatorre said he is concerned about the pollution that will occur during construction. He said prevailing wages should be part of the construction contract.

Co-Chairman Argumedo thanked staff for all the work and attendance at a large number of meetings. However, he said, Commerce will be suffering 50% of the residential relocation and 30% of the business relocation. He said he wants assurances in writing that Commerce residents who are relocated would be able to remain in Commerce.

There being no further discussion among the Committee, the item was opened for public comment.

Angelo Logan, CEHAJ, said this particular EIR doesn't do justice. He said it falls short in the analysis of both alternatives and that lots of areas had not been analyzed.

Suzanne Brown, Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles, said before a project is chosen there should be a mandatory zero emission corridor, no residential relocation, and an adopted local hiring policy.

Hector Negrete, East Yards Communities for Environmental Justice, said in this housing crisis we can't afford to lose more housing. He asked that no alternative be considered; instead follow Motion 22.1.

Isabel Alvarenga, Communities for a Better Environment, said she opposed using taxpayer dollars for this project, which is killing us.

Kenneth Jones, East Yards Communities for Environmental Justice, asked that their plan be considered.

Felicitas Ramos, East Yards Communities for Environmental Justice, said this project is causing suffering to her and all affected residents. She said she has been a Commerce resident for 43 years and doesn't want her house to be demolished.

Herendira Razcon, Long Beach, said she is an asthma sufferer who lives near the port. She asked that their health be considered and to support zero emissions.

Eddie Torres, Jr., East Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, asked that voting on the alternative be deferred in order to get more information.

Richard Hernandez, Commerce, said he didn't believe there has been a study on displacement. He said there should only be zero emission trucks and that there should be targeted hiring.

Clara Solis, East Los Angeles Local Advisory Committee, said the impacts of both alternatives are very bad for East Los Angeles. She said it is premature to pick an alternative.

Gerald Cerda said he prefers the project be put on hold until all issues are addressed.

Jessica Prieto, East Yards Communities for Environmental Justice, said she wants no displacement; expanding freeways just adds congestion and pollution.

Angel Banuelos, Communities for a Better Environment, said they have asthma and the expansion of the freeway would cause more asthma. They said the EIR should include Motion 22.1.

Ernesto Gonzalez, Commerce, said expanding freeways will not help; they just disrupt communities.

Christopher Enriquez, Communities for a Better Environment, said it is irresponsible to even consider displacement. He said expansion of the freeway would get rid of the Salvation Army.

Lena Ruvalcaba, Communities for a Better Environment, said expansion of the freeway will get rid of the homeless shelter.

Jan Garcia, Huntington Park, said there is no full commitment to zero emissions.

Kimberly Castro, Communities for a Better Environment, said these projects don't benefit the community.

Christian Guzman, Wilmington, said the Committee members should lobby their own government to change over to zero emission vehicles.

Beatriz Carrillo, Communities for a Better Environment, said she opposes the expansion of I-710. She said there must be a way to find zero emissions in the corridor.

Sylvia Betancourt, Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma, said she wants to prioritize health, but that is not part of the conversation. She said Motion 22.1 needs to be part of the project.

Sara Rivera, Communities for a Better Environment, said she is a resident of the Bell Shelter and doesn't want the shelter to be taken away.

Maria Garcia, Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma, said the health of the community is more important than freeways. She asked for support for zero emissions and Motion 22.1.

Alicia Rivera, Communities for a Better Environment, said Motion 22.1 is important to be considered.

Miguel Dominguez, East Yards Communities for Environmental Justice, said health conditions in the area are very negative.

Miguel Dominquez, Jr., East Los Angeles, said Caltrans needs to inform people better; so many people don't know about the project.

No one else wishing to speak, Member Austin closed the public comments.

Member Quintana said that without understanding the impacts on our health we are going to make a decision that could have impacts in Bell. She said we should push back a decision.

Member Alvarez said he would like to see reconsideration of alternatives 6A, 6B, and 6C, to allow for a Slauson Avenue interchange.

Member Woods said this project has been involved with community outreach for 15 years, with significant progress over the years.

It was moved by Member Woods, seconded by Member Lowenthal, to approve the recommendation of the Technical Advisory Committee.

It was moved by Member Soria, seconded by Member Sanabria, as a substitute motion, to receive and file the report. The substitute motion was approved, with Member Woods and Member Lowenthal opposed.

B. Current I-710 Early Action Project Update Including Cash Flow/Invoicing Status

There was no report on this item.

C. Update on I-710 Livability Initiative

There was no report on this item.

D. COG Engineers Report

There was no report on this item.

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

There were no matters from Committee members.

XI. Matters from the Chair

There were no matters from the Chair.

XII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 9:28 p.m.

VIII. REPORTS
Item C
Update on I-710 Livability Initiative –
Report by COG Staff