



East Los Angeles LAC Meeting #4

April 15, 2009
6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.
Our Lady of Lourdes
3772 East 3rd Street Los Angeles

MEETING SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

On Wednesday, April 15, 2009, the community of East Los Angeles held their fourth Local Advisory Committee (LAC) meeting at Our Lady of Lourdes Catholic Church. The purpose of the meeting was to provide an update on the Corridor Project EIR/EIS; discuss the I-5/I-710 interchange; review the alternatives and screening methodologies; present the recommendation that the TAC proposes to give to the Project Committee on April 30 regarding which alternatives to study in the EIR/EIS; and to get the LAC's feedback on the TAC's proposed recommendation.

Present at the meeting were LAC members Thomas Delgado, Martha Hernandez, Diana Tarango, Gustavo Camacho, and Clara Solis. LAC members were joined by Phil Doudar from the LA County Department of Public Works. In attendance from the Project Team were Devon Cichoski (Metro), Rob McCann (LSA), Jack Waldron (URS), and Jesse Froehlich (MIG). Members of the Caltrans I-5 Project Team also attended, including Garrett Damrath, Jason Roach, and Asadour Terterian.

PROJECT UPDATE

Gustavo Camacho, East Los Angeles LAC co-Chair, opened the meeting and thanked all for their attendance. He then gave the floor to Jack Waldron of URS who gave a brief project update. Mr. Waldron explained that over the last year, the Project Team has been conducting screening-level studies of alternatives, and has been presenting the results of this screening to the LACs and Subject Working Groups (SWGs) over the last month. The TAC will be making a recommendation to the Project Committee on April 30 as to which alternatives should be further studied in the EIR/EIS.



In parallel to the screening of alternatives, traffic modeling is also underway. This traffic modeling, which is based on 2035 projections, will inform the geometrics and the air quality modeling in the Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment (AQ/HRA).

SUBJECT WORKING GROUP REPORT

Devon Cichoski of Metro gave an update on the most recent SWG activities, and encouraged the East LA LAC to participate actively in these working groups. She noted that while the Environmental SWG would be making recommendations to the CAC the following evening, the Community Design SWG and Transportation SWG have not made any recommendations to date. The CSWG and TSWG discussions have focused on community design enhancements and zero tailpipe emission alternative goods movement technologies, respectively.

Ms. Cichoski asked Clara Solis, East LA appointee to the ESWG to give a report-back from that group's recent meetings. Ms. Solis expressed concern that there didn't seem to be much community representation at the ESWG meetings, and that the group's discussions had become highly technical. She expressed that until the most recent presentation to the ESWG, there had been a lack of clarity as to how health would be addressed in studies outside of the AQ/HRA. Ms. Solis expressed interest in inviting Dr. Paul Simon of LA County Public Health to give his presentation—which he had given to the ESWG on April 13— to the East LA LAC.

I-5/I-710 INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. Camacho gave a synopsis of a letter the East LA LAC had drafted to Caltrans, outlining concerns with the most recent geometrics presented for the I-5/I-710 interchange improvement, including:

- Commercial property impacts on Telegraph—an important commercial corridor in East Los Angeles
- A request to reconsider closing Atlantic/Eastern and preserve access to that area
- A request to reconsider the impacts to the local elementary school
- Concern with the elimination of Dennison, which creates cul-de-sacs and raises concerns with public safety and connectivity

A dialogue ensued between the LAC and Caltrans staff in attendance. The East LA LAC requested that the highway design, including lane width and shoulder width, be modified to save businesses. Asadour Terterian noted that such measures would require approval from the FHWA. Mr. Camacho urged Caltrans to begin the process to seek approval, noting that the purpose of the LAC's letter was to ensure that Caltrans begins the necessary processes to address the East Los Angeles community's concerns. He also suggested they consider realigning the I-5 towards the park in Commerce in order to save businesses on Telegraph. Mr. Terterian stated that Caltrans could likely study such an option within a few months. Garrett Damrath noted that there are specific federal criteria (Section 4f) that must be adhered to in considering impacts to parks.

Regarding Dennison and the creation of cul-de-sacs, the LAC feels cul-de-sacs are undesirable. Phil Doudar of LA County DPW stated that the County's design standards specify that dead-end streets not exceed 700 feet. Mr. Damrath noted that the tradeoff in the case of Dennison might be more loss of homes. Mr. Terterian reminded the group that the geometrics assume worst case scenarios, and it is possible that modeling will show fewer lanes are required. Mr. Terterian also encouraged an iterative design process, noting that the comment period is ongoing, and the ultimate highway design will be the result of multiple rounds of feedback between the communities and the Project Team.

I-710 ALTERNATIVES SCREENING

As the group transitioned to a discussion of alternatives, screening, and recommendations, Mr. Waldron clarified that the alternatives the group was about to discuss apply to the I-710 corridor, and not to the I-5/I-710 interchange.

Rob McCann of LSA referred the LAC to PowerPoint handouts and the Alternatives Screening Fact Sheet, which outline the current six alternatives. Mr. McCann emphasized that the current set of alternatives was developed to reassess the LPS, and that each alternative includes and builds on the elements of the preceding alternative. Mr. McCann also noted that the criteria used to screen the alternatives were designed to address the project Purpose and Need.

Mr. McCann then went on to review the alternatives and screening results with the group, engaging in discussion throughout the presentation. Points, questions and clarifications that arose during the group discussion on Alternatives Screening included:

- How does Alternative 3 compare to Alternatives 5 and 6 in terms of right-of-way (ROW) impact?
 - Alternative 3 has less ROW impact than 5 and 6. Alternative 6 has the largest ROW footprint.
- What kind of traffic modeling has been done on Alternatives 6a and 6b?
 - For initial screening, the Project Team used the SCAG model calibrated to traffic counts from 120 monitoring points, and then applied growth factors. For further screening they will employ more detailed modeling approaches to be applied by Cambridge Systematics.
- What is the approach for Zero Emission Trucks given recent legislation?
 - There is an industry outreach process underway to initiate the process for getting the necessary component technologies (which all exist as part of other systems) and putting them together in the proposed form for the proposed use. The strategic approach is to demonstrate the market opportunity that this new technology presents.

Mr. McCann then reviewed the TAC's proposed recommendation to study Alternatives 1, 5a, 6a, and 6b in the EIR/EIS. Ms. Solis asked for an explanation as to why Alternative 3 had not been included, noting that apart from mobility measures, it seemed

to perform well against the screening criteria. It was explained that on its own, Alternative 3 does not meet the project Purpose and Need. Alternative 6b was developed to incorporate zero emission alternative goods movement technologies into the LPS. Other than the advanced goods movement technologies, there is nothing in Alternative 3 that is not included in the other alternatives.

The group expressed general agreement with the TAC's proposed recommendation.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.