



## Corridor Advisory Committee Meeting #5

April 16, 2009  
6:00 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.  
Progress Park  
15500 Downey Ave, Paramount

# DRAFT REVISED MEETING SUMMARY

---

## INTRODUCTION

I-710 Corridor Advisory Committee members convened for their fifth meeting on Thursday, April 16, 2009.

Members of the Project team present included: Ernest Morales (Metro), Lynda Bybee (Metro), Susan Gilmore (Metro), Devon Cichoski (Metro), Ron Kosinski (Caltrans), Garrett Damrath (Caltrans), Jerry Wood (Gateway Cities COG), Jack Waldron (URS), Rob McCann (LSA), Jayna Goodman (LSA), Shannon Willits (URS) Pat McLaughlin (MIG) and Esmeralda Garcia (MIG) and Arcelia Arce (The Robert Group).

Members of the Corridor Advisory Committee present included:  
Glenna Amos, South Gate LAC  
Eileen Aparicio, City of Paramount LAC  
Hamid Bahadori, Auto Club of Southern California  
Gustavo Camacho, East Los Angeles LAC  
Malcolm Carson, Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles  
Craig Carter, City of Long Beach Council District 8 Appointee  
John Cross, City of Long Beach Council District 7 Appointee  
Clifford Dunbar, CAC Appointee  
Bob Eula, CAC Appointee/City of Commerce LAC  
Belinda Faustinos, Rivers and Mountains Conservancy  
Robert Hildebrand, City of Long Beach District 1 Appointee  
Allen Hose, CAC Appointee  
Angelo Logan, East Yards Communities  
Pat Long, City of Long Beach Council District 9 Appointee  
Dr. Joe Magaddino, California State University Long Beach



Metro



Bill Pagett, TAC Chair  
Ray Park, City of Carson LAC  
Patty Senecal, California Trucking Association  
Mario Sotelo, City of Commerce LAC  
Harold Tseklenis, CAC Appointee

### ***Introductions and Agenda Overview***

Pat McLaughlin opened the meeting with a round of self-introductions and reviewed the meeting agenda which included: update on project schedule and progress of the Subject Working Groups, review on the input on the Geometric Plans by the LACs and TAC, overview of the screened alternatives and review of the recommendations on the AQ/HRA.

### ***Public Comment***

There were no public comments.

### ***Review of Meeting #4 Summary***

Ms. McLaughlin gave a recap of Meeting #4. The committee had previously requested that further detail be provided on the Environmental Justice analysis process. Ms. Nancy Pfeffer, Project Team Environmental Justice consultant, had provided additional information on the definition, measures and process for considering on-freeway and off-freeway analysis. Ms. McLaughlin indicated that, at the previous meeting, the CAC had also requested that discussion of the Alternatives and Screening Process be continued at the next meeting to allow for additional time for review of materials and consideration of potential Committee directions. The Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment was introduced at Meeting 4. Due to time considerations, the report on geometrics had been deferred to Meeting 5. She also indicated that, as requested by the CAC, for this and subsequent meetings public comment had been moved to the beginning of the meeting.

## **PROJECT UPDATE**

Mr. Jack Waldron gave a brief update on the progress of the project. He indicated that the screening process had been completed for the alternatives and that, after review by the TAC and tonight's CAC, the Project Committee would select a narrowed-down range of alternatives to be carried into the environmental review process. In conjunction with preliminary engineering, a traffic analysis will be completed between now and mid-July. Mr. Waldron indicated that a traffic operations analyses will feed into development of more detailed roadway layouts by the Geometrics team and will also be useful in the environmental assessment.

### ***Subject Working Groups***

Ms. McLaughlin asked members of the CAC who had participated in the Subject Working Groups to share insights, observations and findings of these groups. Mario Sotelo mentioned that the Community Design and Economics group had not met since the last CAC meeting but that the group had been impressed with the presentation on potential enhancements to and designs for features such as soundwalls. Bob Eula reported that the Transportation Subject Working Group had heard presentations on and discussed alternative technologies in some detail. He indicated that it had been the conclusion of members of the TSWG group that

maglev had too many problems because of issues such as loading and unloading and that a system of electrical trucks was preferred.

Angelo Logan reported on behalf of the Environmental Subject Working Group (ESWG). He said that the group was very active and diverse, with fifteen participants at the last meeting. Mr. Logan noted that of the fifteen participants only four were officially appointed to the group. He reviewed a handout presenting the ESWG's findings and recommendations on the EIR/EIS, the Air Quality/Health Risk Assessments Draft Protocol and the overall process:

#### *EIR/EIS*

- The EIR/EIS needs to go beyond the traditional process and include Health Impact Assessment (HIA) factors.
- Analysis of criteria pollutants should be based on stationary sources in addition to mobile sources.
- Calculate and report construction AQ/HRA impacts in the AQ/HRA and EIR/EIS. Some members also stated that "worst-case" operations/construction AQ/HRA impacts be calculated and reported if specific staging and phasing could not be determined at the time of analysis.

#### *AQ/HRA Review Draft Protocol*

- Provide specifics of how new 8-hour Reference Exposure Levels (RELs) will be treated in the AQ/HRA if current modeling techniques don't reflect updates to the RELs.
- Report baseline isopleths and projected isopleths in addition to the differential isopleths that are currently emphasized in the protocol.

#### *Process*

- Significance thresholds should be defined and communicated prior to the AQ/HRA and other analyses. For example, the South Coast Air Quality Management District has established numeric significance thresholds for criteria pollutant emissions and concentrations, as well as health indicators such as cancer risk.
- Some members believe that Caltrans should have a process and forum for decision-maker education and public input to the process for defining significance thresholds.
- Present a timeline for public input to the AQ/HRA; especially regarding criteria still up for determination; as well as to the EIR/EIS, and other benchmark studies related to the I-710 Corridor Project.

#### *Other*

- The ESWG requests an opportunity to make a presentation to the CAC and the Project Committee concerning the need for a comprehensive health analysis.

The CAC agreed that the suggested presentation on the need for a comprehensive health impact analysis would be beneficial for the CAC to hear at their next meeting.

### **Geometric Plans**

Local Advisory Committee (LAC) representatives and the TAC representative were then asked to provide a brief synopsis of their groups' findings and observations on the geometric plans that had been presented to the individual committees as part of the review process. These were as follows:

**East Los Angeles** -- Gustavo Camacho reported that the concerns of the East Los Angeles LAC centered largely on potential impacts of the I-5 and I-710 projects together. He indicated that proposed plans for I-5 would have major impacts to business and residential communities along that corridor. There was particular concern with proposed I-5 improvements wiping out commercial uses along Telegraph Road, leading to loss of jobs. There was also concern with blockage of fire and safety access and school access along Telegraph. He indicated that all three alternatives that had been presented so far for Telegraph Road had impact and that the LAC had developed proposed changes to the I-5 concept and would continue to advise the I-5 team.

**Carson** -- Ray Park from the City of Carson LAC stated that the Carson LAC had expressed concerns with safety along Del Amo Boulevard and that the geometric concepts had addressed those issues and major changes have been incorporated. He indicated that the LAC and the Project Team had explored the potential of providing additional parking for the Blue Line station using excess property created by the proposed realignment of the off-ramp. He also indicated that there was concern with LA River access, including trails and safety for bicyclists.

**Commerce** -- Mario Sotelo, reporting on behalf of the City of Commerce LAC, supported by LAC members Bob Eula and Angelo Logan, indicated that their LAC strongly recommends that dedicated truck lanes need to go directly into the railyards. There is concern among Commerce LAC members about potential impact on Bristow Park and also regarding right-of-way requirements where I-5 connects to I-710. Residential takes in this area are a particular concern. He indicated that the community is open to double decking as a way of avoiding impacts. There is also concern with potential impact of Slauson off-ramp improvements on local streets. Angelo Logan indicated concern with bringing geometric plans to the Project Committee without the LACs having received a formal response back from the Project Team. Mr. Logan asked that a formal response be provided to the LACs.

**South Gate** -- Glenna Amos, representing South Gate LAC, reported that the South Gate LAC is concerned with traffic flow, specifically impacts on local streets and public facilities, including those in the adjacent community of Downey. She also said that the South Gate LAC believes that the Miller off-ramp, specifically, is inappropriate because of impacts on local streets. Firestone Boulevard and Stuart and Grey streets are also concerns. The former is problematic because it is currently heavily impacted by traffic and the latter is heavily populated by residential and school uses, presenting safety and traffic issues for that street if current geometric plans move forward.

**Long Beach** -- John Cross indicated concerns about the Willow and Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) interchanges, especially any potential impacts on residential properties. He indicated interest in getting more specific information on these impacts.

**TAC** -- Bill Padgett, TAC representative, said that minor changes requested by TAC had been incorporated and documented and had been addressed. He stated that they expected that other comments would be addressed during engineering refinement. Angelo Logan expressed concern that LAC comments also be considered and incorporated into the TAC recommendations.

When asked about next steps for considering LAC and TAC comments, Jack Waldron stated that options for the geometrics would be explored reflecting input and comments received. He said that the team will be working with the communities throughout the rest of the process to explore options and address concerns.

### **ALTERNATIVES SCREENING**

Ms. McLaughlin then introduced Dave Levinsohn of URS who gave a brief overview of the alternatives being considered, the screening process and the results of the screening of alternatives. He stated that the project team was initially charged with reviewing the initial six alternatives derived from the Locally Preferred Strategy (LPS) approved at the conclusion of the Major Corridor Study. Since then, there have been major new findings regarding the potential of certain alternative technologies for zero emissions container transport. The alternatives that were studied are as follows:

- Alternative 1: No Build
- Alternative 2: Transportation Systems Management
- Alternative 3: Enhanced Goods Movement by rail and/or Advanced Technology
- Alternative 4: Arterial & I-710 congestion relief improvements
- Alternative 5A: Widen 710 to 10 GP Lanes
- Alternative 5B: Widen 710 to 8 GP + 2 HOV Lanes
- Alternatives 6: Alternative 5A with the addition of a Freight Movement Corridor

Mr. Levinsohn also reviewed the screening criteria used to evaluate the alternatives. These included:

- Air Quality
- Mobility
- Traffic Safety
- Right of Way Impacts
- Environmental Impacts
- Cost

### ***Mobility Findings***

The first screening criterion presented was Mobility. Mr. Levinsohn reviewed the mobility screening results with the Committee. The findings suggest that there is substantial need for new capacity in the corridor. Only Alternative 6 provides sufficient capacity to reduce peak period I-710 volume and capacity ratios (V/C) below 1.0. Reduction in Alternative 6 total screenline V/C suggests potential for significant positive impacts on arterials as compared to

other alternatives. The four screenline locations were set up at Pacific Coast Highway, Del Amo Blvd., Rosecrans and Atlantic /Bandini. The findings results at Screenline 1 (PCH) suggest Alternative 6 may have more capacity south of I-405 (14 lanes) on I-710 than needed. Only alternative 6 had average end-to-end speed on I-710 general purpose lanes higher than 35 mph. The top performing alternatives, in order of performance, included Alternative 6, Alternative 5A and Alternative 5B.

Members of the CAC were concerned regarding plans to limit corridor lanes in the southern portion of the corridor. Most of the traffic in the corridor is generated at the harbor. Traffic bleeds out onto the different north-south corridors. If lanes are reduced, the traffic will move onto arterial streets. Mr. Levinsohn responded that while most of the traffic at the southern end is due to port traffic, at each interchange along the corridor you pick up more vehicular traffic. By the time you reach the I-5 freeway the traffic is substantially heavier. The CAC noted that trucks are now beginning to use other freeways as well such as the SR-91 freeway, therefore should not reduce the number of lanes in consideration. Mr. Levinsohn indicated that the project team was only considering reducing the number of auto lanes not truck lanes. In addition, the southern section would still see an increase in lanes over the No Build.

### ***Air Quality Findings***

All 2035 alternatives may show emission decreases compared to 2008 baseline due to pending federal regulations reducing allowable diesel engine emission levels. Compared to the 2035 No Build Alternative, Alternative 3 shows greatest reductions in NOx and Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM) as a result of approximately 22,400 daily truck trips that could be eliminated by an automated fixed guideway version of a clean energy powered container transport technology in that alternative. Alternatives 5A, 5B, and 6 show appreciable reductions in NOx with slight increased in DPM.

### ***Traffic Safety Findings***

Studies have shown a number of existing physical design deficiencies. Proposed design improvements and reduction in volume of heavy duty trucks should substantially reduce accident rates. Alternative 6 has the lowest percentage of heavy duty trucks on general purpose lanes as it separates cars and trucks. This proportion can be reduced further through the inclusion of alternative technology. Alternative 6 plus Alternative 3 are best for traffic safety but Alternatives 5A and 5B also provide safety benefits.

### ***Right of Way Screening Findings***

All alternatives are consistent with the project objective of minimizing Right-of-Way (ROW) impacts; mobility and traffic safety benefits are trade-offs to residential impacts; Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 have a substantially greater impact to regional transmission facilities provided by the utilities; Alternatives 1, 2 and 4 have the least impacts.

### ***Environmental Impact Screening Findings***

These screening measures include: ROW impacts on waters of the United States; ROW impacts on Section 4f (park land, open space) properties; and environmental justice assessment. The results indicated that there would only be one ROW impact on a Section 4(f) property -- Cesar Chavez Park. While a piece of the park land would need to be taken, the

geometric design frees up additional land, producing a net increase in park land for Cesar Chavez Park. The environmental justice assessment was performed using demographic data; it could not distinguish meaningfully between alternatives at the screening level of analysis and did not account for potential benefits as a result of project implementation at the screening level. Alternative 6 had the highest impact to the waters of the United States but may be the only practicable alternative as it is the only alternative that fully meets the mobility element of the Purpose and Need of the project.

### **Capital Cost Screening Findings**

Alternatives 3 and 6 have the highest capital cost, however they also provide the greatest benefits. The committee wanted to know how operational costs would be factored in.

#### **Summary:**

- Alternative 6 (updated Hybrid LPS) is the only one to meet Mobility element of Purpose and Need
- Alternative 6 is the best performer on Traffic Safety
- Alternative 6 reduces NOx but slightly increases freeway daytime DPM compared to No Build
- Alternative 6 impacts (affected properties, waters of the US, cost) are highest compared to other alternatives
- Alternative 3 (Alternative Technology) has highest capital cost followed by Alternative 6

The screening recommendations are drawn from the initial set of alternatives. The project is required to carry Alternative 1 (No Build) forward under CEQA/NEPA. Alternative 1 represents the Future (2035) Baseline. “No Build” also consists of planned and committed projects such as: Enhanced Goods Movement by Rail; the Clean Trucks Program; Expanded Night Gate Operations at the Ports; the I-710 Pavement Rehabilitation Project; Added Lanes to I-5 between the Orange County Line and I-605; and Traffic Signal Coordination Projects on key arterials throughout the I-710 Corridor Study Area.

Alternative 5A is the second alternative that is being recommended for further study. This alternative has less impact than Alternative 6 and provides measurable benefits. It also provides a basis for comparison of the benefits, cost and impacts of the freight corridor in Alternative 6. The project team can also reevaluate and adjust the number of general purpose lanes based upon refined traffic forecasting.

Alternative 6 is being split into two separate Alternatives: 6A and 6B and are both consistent with the Major Corridor Study Locally Preferred Strategy. Alternative 6A includes the 10 general purpose lanes, plus 4 freight movements lanes (conventional trucks); and assumes a mix of conventionally powered trucks per new air quality regulations would use the freight corridor. The project team would also be able to reevaluate and adjust the number of general purpose lanes based upon refined traffic forecasting.

Alternative 6B differs from 6A in that the freight movement lane is built for use by zero emission trucks rather than conventional trucks. Zero emission trucks may be internally (battery) or externally (overhead catenary wire) powered. The freight corridor will follow the

highway design alignment and loading standards, and be designed to allow for possible future conversion to a fixed guideway zero emission system. The project team will be able to reevaluate and adjust the number of general purpose lanes based upon refined traffic forecasting.

Alternatives 2 (TSM/TDM/Transit) and 4 (Arterial Highway/Freeway Congestion Relief) are not being recommended as stand-alone alternatives because they do not provide adequate improvements by themselves to address the purpose and need for the project. They will however be included as part of the recommendations in Alternatives 5A, 6A and 6B. Alternative 3 (Goods Movement Enhancement by Rail and/or Advanced Technology) also does not provide adequate improvements by itself to address the purpose and need for the project. Goods Movement Enhancement by Rail is included in all screened alternative beginning with Alternative 1. The advanced technology component of Alternative 3 will be included as part of recommended screened Alternative 6B.

Alternative 5B (Widen I-710 to 8 General Purpose and 2 HOV Lanes) also does not provide adequate improvements by itself and results in lower mobility performance and yet has the same costs and impacts as its counterpart, Alternative 5A.

### ***CAC Questions and Comments***

Individual questions and comments related to the alternatives and screening were:

- There is information that there is a net out-migration of population in California. How can the percentage of traffic increase expected in 2035 be anticipated?
  - The models are based upon regionally adopted SCAG demographic forecasts, which predict long-term population increase in the five county SCAG region. However, new information always becomes available.
- Were there environmental improvement or impact differences between Alternatives 5b and 5a?
  - There were imperceptible differences at the screening level.
- HOV lanes should be considered as part of Alternative 6 assuming it moves forward as one of the alternatives. This could further encourage transit use and reduce the need for additional lanes for widening.
- There could be flexibility in the number of lanes that will actually be built – if the economy is down and port import/exports decline, it may be advisable to reduce the number of lanes to six to eight rather than ten.
- Route 22 may be a model of future HOV lane design in southern California – it is designed as a flexible HOV, without double yellow lines, making transition in and out easier.
- The project should be monitoring AB 32 requirements.

- Railroads could move cargo on maglev if they wanted to do it. The project should have them figure out how to do this.

Specific opinions expressed by participants on the alternatives were:

- The Carson LAC would like to see Alternative 6 included in the screened alternatives and thought that it was the best in meeting the overall purpose and need of the project.
- South Gate LAC agreed with the presentation on recommended alternatives for further screening and believes that Alternative 6b is a feasible option. Electric trucks rather than maglev are the preferred advanced technology.

### **CAC FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

After discussion, Ms. McLaughlin asked the CAC for their reaction to – including agreement or disagreement with – the TAC recommendation, which was to carry forward Alternatives 1, 5a, 5b and 6b into the EIR/EIS process.

The CAC concurred with the TAC recommendation, with the caveat that comments made by the TAC and LACs be addressed. The CAC added to this recommendation that future comments also be considered. An additional recommendation proposed by Angelo Logan, that the Project Team prepare and present a schedule giving specifics on findings and issues related to refining the geometrics and preparing the draft EIR/EIS (including the Health Risk Assessment) to the CAC for their consideration so that the CAC can be part of the discussion dialogue prior to reports being finalized. The CAC recorded this recommendation.

#### ***Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment***

Rob McCann introduced the topic of the Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment. He reviewed the recommendations of items to be included in the protocols and those that were considered but were not recommended for further inclusion. Bill Padgett indicated that the Technical Advisory Committee (which included the Southern California Air Quality Management District (AQMD)) had acted unanimously to approve the recommendation on the protocols.

CAC members expressed hesitation to move forward with a recommendation. There was little disagreement regarding what was included in the protocol, however, there was concern regarding certain data that would not be considered. The CAC felt that to reach consensus, they would need to be presented with rationale for excluding these items. This was perceived as especially important because of the understanding that once protocol was recommended and analysis begun, the protocol would be frozen as it stands, with no further opportunity to add to the requirements unless there was a change in regulation or law. For this reason, the CAC was uncomfortable moving forward with a recommendation until they felt all necessary aspects were included in the protocol.

Additional comments and questions by the CAC were:

- Angelo Logan mentioned that the Environmental Subject Working Group had also expressed concern that the protocols do not consider emissions from construction and also with the concept of “freezing” protocols and “unfreezing” them only if new regulations or requirements are issued by state or federal government.
  - There is analysis of construction emissions over an 18-mile corridor for the various alternatives, as well as minimization strategies. However, without knowing how construction phasing would occur, which is determined by funding, there is no way to do an accurate construction emission analysis.
- Why have certain recommended points of consideration by the EPA and the AQMD been dismissed? In the summary, many of these are described as not being possible to do. Why would this then be recommended by federal experts?
  - Certain aspects of consideration from the EPA and AQMD were integrated. Those excluded were done so because they were considered prohibitive for various reasons. Additionally, Caltrans would like to see significant funding directed toward meaningful mitigation measures, not just analysis.
- Caltrans says that the proposed AQ/HRA goes much further than what is typically seen. Even if this is an unprecedented amount of analysis, the nature of this project demands as rigorous a process as possible, especially given how quickly standards change over time.
- Why don't the protocols address all of the concerns identified by Tier 2 as part of the Major Corridor Study?
  - The Tier 2 report identified a range of ideas and strategies to address air quality in the corridor. The AQ/HRA and the protocols are designed to assess air quality and health risk related specifically to the I-710 corridor project. Other health- and air quality-related topics will be addressed through the Gateway Cities COG's Air Quality Action Plan and other ongoing initiatives in the corridor and region.
- Why isn't AQMD asking for similar requirements for other District 7 projects?
  - AQMD had asked that certain additional studies be considered during the I-710 Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment process because of the unique nature of the I-710 corridor and study approach. They have asked for similar considerations from District 7 on the I-405, SR 47, and other large transportation projects.
- Who makes the final governmental decisions at the Federal level regarding the EIR?
  - Typically, the Federal Highway Administration and the Environmental Protection Agency would make the decision at the Federal level, which would then be dictated to the State. Because of California's push, in some cases, for environmental standards that are more stringent than what is seen at Federal level, this top-down process has and will continue to prompt questions.

- Does giving our consensus to move forward with the Alternatives imply that we are fully satisfied with the all of the Alternatives?
  - No. The Project Team is fully aware that questions and concerns exist for all of the Alternatives and the geometrics. However, all of these Alternatives were created with the LPS as a starting point, and are the best options given what we know so far. Once we receive traffic, noise, air and community impacts data from the analysis, we will use this, along with comments, as the basis for further refinement. The discovery of a historic site, for instance, could completely change assumptions regarding alignment. Also, the CAC can, as the TAC did, add caveats to the recommendation to move forward. All of this will be conveyed to the Project Committee.
- Gustavo Camacho of the East LA LAC expressed concern about the impacts of the I-5 geometrics proposed for Alternative 5a on the East LA community.
  - The Interstate 5 project and process is not a part of the I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS scope
  - The CAC urged that the I-5 project should incorporate findings and input received in the I-710 process
- In the future, the Project team will try to ensure that members of all committees receive agendas and other materials from all meetings that take place to keep everyone apprised to project progress. There is a possibility of using a feature on Metro's website that allows users to upload documents and sends out alerts when new documents are posted. Metro will be in contact regarding how to access and use this feature.
- What is legal relationship between the I-710 EIR/EIS and the Air Quality Action Plan?
  - There is no legal relationship. The EIR/EIS includes the elements required by State and Federal regulations. In addition, it includes the Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment, which is unique to this project. The Air Quality Action Plan is a voluntary study and assessment being undertaken by the Gateway Cities COG as a follow-up to area-wide concerns raised through the Tier 2 process and in the Gateway Cities as a whole. However, the two studies and analyses will be coordinated and discussed with the CAC as they progress.
- Angelo Logan commented on the gap between the ESWG, the TAC, the CAC and the PC in terms of communications flow and information dissemination.
- The CAC noted the importance, given the horizon year of 2035, of getting youth input and involvement in the process.

After further discussion, the CAC requested that more information be provided on issues raised at the ESWG and by the CAC on items not recommended for analysis in the AQ/HRA protocols. The observation was that time is needed to allow for further CAC participation in review of the protocols and information provided. The CAC recommended that any action on the AQ/HRA be tabled until the next meeting.

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.