DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

Corridor Advisory Committee

January 21, 2009
6:00-9:00 p.m.
Progress Park
15500 Downey Avenue, Paramount

INTRODUCTION

On January 21, 2009 the 710 Corridor Advisory Committee met. Representatives from the project team included: Esmeralda Garcia (MIG) Pat McLaughlin (MIG), Jerry Wood (Gateway Cities COG), Devon Cichoski (Metro), Adrian Alvarez (Metro), Ernest Chaves (Metro), Jack Waldron (URS), Dave Levinsohn (URS), Rob McCann (LSA), Arcelia Arce (The Robert Group) and Julia Lester (ENVIRON).

Introductions and Agenda Overview

Esmeralda Garcia opened meeting with a round of introductions and a review of the agenda.

Review Meeting #1 Summary

A general review was given of the summary of meeting #1. The CAC requested that a category for recommendations be added to the summary.

Project Update

Mr. Jack Waldron was introduced to give a project update. Mr. Waldron discussed the progress made since the last CAC meeting. Alternatives have been further developed but no new alternatives have been identified. He stated that the process for screening alternatives was being developed and would be reviewed with the CAC at the next month's meeting. After the set of screened alternatives is approved by the Project Committee, a draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (DEIR/EIS) will be developed. This particular phase will take a year and a half and the DEIR/EIS is expected to be issued in summer 2010.

Ms. Garcia then gave an update on the status of the Local Advisory Committees (LACs) and the Subject Working Groups (SWGs). LACs have been meeting and the SWGs held their first meetings this month. The LACs have been asked to share their visions of the corridor and how it can function beyond being just a goods movement corridor, and enhance communities in the future.

One representative from each SWG will bring back the results of the discussion to the LACs to continue the dialogue at the local level. Ms. Garcia then asked the CAC members to share their thoughts on SWG meetings recently held. One highlight from the Transportation SWG mentioned by a CAC member was that the electric truck option seemed promising. There was some concern regarding the level of attendance at the Transportation Working Group meeting. The group suggested that CAC members be informed about agendas for upcoming SWG meetings so that if a topic is scheduled that they are interested in, they can participate in the discussion.

A Project Committee (PC) meeting is scheduled for January 29, 2009. The following meeting will be scheduled for April 30, 2009. The PC will be asked to adopt a goods movement scenario and then advise on the selection of alternatives to go forward into the DEIR/DEIS, including alternative technology considerations.

Overview of Technical Studies

Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Update
Ms. Lester was introduced to give an Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment update, including a discussion of protocols. The protocols outline what we are trying to do. Ms Lester likened them to a "cookbook" for the Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment study. The purpose of the protocols is to ensure transparency in the process and facilitate a consensus on the technical approach. This document will have extensive technical appendices.

The topics that will be covered include how we will project emissions, including dispersion modeling. The federal and state conformity regulations require that a hot spot analysis be completed at key intersections and interchanges. Ms. Lester indicated that this was the first freeway project where a health risk assessment based on full dispersion modeling is a planned element of the project. Typically, a mobile air source toxics analysis is done rather than such a health risk assessment.

Ms. Lester indicated that there were lessons learned from the SR 47 Project and related comments. Similar to the SR47 Project, ENVIRON is recommending that EPA's approved air dispersion model, AERMOD, be used. Indeed, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has offered a Beta version of an upgraded version of AERMOD that should model typical roadway sources more accurately. The air agencies and other members of the Agency Air Technical Working Group (AATWG) are still commenting on the recommended model choices.

With regards to the Health Risk Assessment, ENVIRON will be doing emission quantification of mobile source air toxics. For freeway projects there are typically six priority mobile air toxics that are the main drivers of health risk. The team is currently discussing whether the six priority mobile air toxics are sufficient or whether additional air toxics should be considered.

Other analysis to be included:

- Project construction emission impacts

- Greenhouse gases
- Cumulative impacts

Other analyses under discussion include:

- PM mortality issues- qualitative impacts
- Ultrafine particulates less than 0.1 microns

Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment Protocol Outreach and Next Steps:

- The Agency Air Technical Working Group (or AATWG) met in December
- The Environmental Subject Working Group will discuss Protocol elements at the next meeting (held January 22nd)
- The Corridor Advisory Committee will be updated as the draft Protocol is revised based on AATWG comments
- The draft Protocol will be given to the Corridor Advisory Committee and Environmental Subject Working Group for review

The following issues were raised and discussed between CAC members and Ms. Lester:

- Technical adjustments will be made to the emission modeling if new greenhouse gas regulations warrant it.
- GCCOG is preparing a list of other related projects and studies for consideration in the cumulative impacts assessment in the EIR/EIS.
- Distinctions between a health impact assessment and a health risk assessment need to be considered.
- For greenhouse gases, although quantifying “life cycle” greenhouse gas emissions have been suggested by some, the study team’s recommendation is not to include them based on current interim guidance, assessment of current methodologies, and lack of detailed, reliable data on this issue.
- The CAC would like to include a broad range of ages, young and old, included in the age range being analyzed in the Health Risk Assessment.
- The issue of expanded monitoring in local communities was raised. It was clarified that the regulatory dispersion models do not require this type of monitoring. It was also clarified that the Air Quality / Health Risk Assessment is not a forecast of local ambient air quality and health risks, but a tool to assess the Project’s (and project alternatives’) incremental impacts. Local monitoring programs may be considered as a separate element of the Project or its mitigation, but it is not a requirement of the Air Quality / Health Risk Assessment.

Railroad Goods Movement Study

Mr. Levinsohn gave an update on the railroad goods movement study. Port cargo scenarios were reviewed, three were presented.

- High cargo demand forecast, high on-dock rail capacity, no new near-dock rail facilities

- High cargo demand forecast, high on-dock rail capacity, both ICTF and SCIG constructed/expanded
- Low cargo demand forecast, low on-dock rail capacity, no new near dock rail facilities

Mr. Levinsohn explained that studies have indicated that freight railroads are nearing capacity in the LA Basin and on-dock expansion would be likely. Implementation of Scenario 2 will be a great challenge. On-dock and near-dock expansion still does not meet international and domestic intermodal needs. There is a high concern with how to address railroad capacity issues as well as how these capacity issues impact other components of goods movement.

Issues raised by CAC members included:
- Railroads need to solve the problems that they are causing and address grade separation needs.
- We need to deal with bottlenecks (mostly in the Inland Empire) and what to do at the "end" of the Alameda Corridor.

Alternative Goods Movement Technology Study
Mr. Levinsohn presented an overview of the study. He explained that the purpose of the study is to:
- Support EIR/EIS evaluation
- Identify potential alignments
- Define attributes of a generalized alternative technology application
- Provide technology-neutral definition of requirements

Background was then given on the potential technologies being studied. Mr. Levinsohn's presentation also touched on potential terminal interfaces for each type of technology including:
- Magnetic Levitation
- Exclusive Contract Guideway
- Electric/Battery Powered Trucks

The CAC members had comments and suggestions in the following areas:
- Consider using electric trucks as an "internal shuttle" to the trains and guideway
- Add for consideration in the assumptions:
    - Exclusive use of the guideway by electric trucks or a fee for non-electric vehicle use
    - Plug-in or recharge facilities
    - Public-Private partnerships for maglev
- Provide cost breakdown of electric truck guideway vs. regular truckway
- Consider operational issues associated with electric/battery powered trucks

Multimodal Review Overview
Mr. Levinsohn explained that the purpose of this review was to assess the ability of other modes in the I-710 corridor to reduce auto and truck traffic on I-710. CAC observations and comments were:
- Include methods for relieving traffic on arterial streets as well.

- Consider improved bike access as an enhancement to transit (rail) use in the corridor.
- There should be more transit options beyond the usual.

.

Initial Feasibility Analysis (IFA) Results
Mr. Levinsohn explained the purpose of the Initial Feasibility Analysis (IFA):

- Assess feasibility of meeting mobility goals of Need and Purpose under different port cargo growth scenarios
- Assess feasibility of meeting mobility goals with TSM/TDM/Transit
- Assess feasibility of meeting mobility goals with Maximum Rail Share and Alternative Goods Movement Technology

The project team reviewed the criteria for selecting a port cargo volume scenario:

- Includes reasonable assumptions about future demand based on economic analysis
- Incorporates improvements that are funded/programmed or based on sound commercial interests (private investment)
- Is not biased to justify higher levels of infrastructure investment
- Has reasonable probability of developing a project to mitigate impacts
- Is consistent with a conforming Regional Transportationn Plan
- If two scenarios have similar capacity requirements, select the scenario with higher impact levels
- The primary metric used is equivalent lane requirements for I-710

The CAC members expressed concerns regarding relieving commuter traffic; providing an alternative for commuters would free up lanes for cargo including the use of freeway express buses. The CAC inquired as to whether a review will be completed on the potential traffic impacts associated with the completion of the northern portion of the I-710. In addition, there was a concern that the study cargo forecast be a policy decision that needs to be completed.

Comment [dml1]: Not sure what policy decision that needs to be completed means?

Introduction to Screening Methodology
Rob McCann reviewed the screening methodology, stating that the purpose of the screening is to identify the alternatives to be analyzed in detail in the DEIR/EIS. There are six alternatives that will be analyzed:

1. No Build
2. Transportation Systems Management/Transportation Demand Management/Transit
3. Enhanced Goods Movement by rail and/or Advanced Technology
4. Arterial & I-710 congestion relief improvements
5. Ten Lane Facility
6. Alternative 5 with addition of Freight Movement Corridor

The six alternatives will be screened according to the following 10 key goals:

- Improve air quality and public health
- Improve traffic safety

- Minimize design deficiencies
- Address projected traffic volumes
- Address projected corridor growth
- Minimize Right of Way impacts
- Minimize Section 4(f) impacts
- Reduce energy consumption
- Ensure environmental justice
- Promote cost effectiveness

The CAC inquired as to whether enhanced goods movement by rail was similar to traditional rail and what the capacity might be. Support was expressed for the concept behind Alternative 3 – enhancing goods movement through advanced technology. In addition, the CAC requested that cost effectiveness of public health benefits be incorporated into the screening methodology.

Comment [t2]: What was the answer?

Comment [dml3]: Enhanced goods movement by rail supports the 43 million TEU cargo forecast scenario

The LACs and the TAC will be reviewing the screening methodology at their upcoming meetings.

Comments and feedback will be requested.

Additional Business
The CAC appointed Mr. Malcolm Carson by simple majority to sit on the committee.

Next Steps
The next CAC is tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, February 18, 2009. There was a request that the next agenda include a discussion of health impacts beyond air quality – such as the impacts of noise and light pollution.

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.