



Long Beach-East Los Angeles Corridor Mobility Investment Plan

**Community Leadership Committee (CLC)
Meetings #13 & 13.5 Summary**

March 23 and 27, 2023



Attendees

Project Team

Michael Cano, Countywide Planning and Development Executive Officer, Metro
 KeAndra Cylear-Dodds, Equity and Race Executive Officer, Metro
 Lilian De Loza-Gutierrez, Community Relations Director, Metro
 Jessica Medina, Equity and Race Manager, Metro
 Erika Morales, Partner, Morales + Morales, Inc
 Amber Hawkes, Co-Director, Here LA
 Shannon Davis, Co-Director, Here LA
 Serena Powell, Fellow, Here LA
 Melissa Holguin, Senior Project Manager, Arellano Associates
 Susan DeSantis, Senior Project Manager, Arellano Associates
 Laura Herrera, Project Manager, Arellano Associates
 Samantha Sosa, Project Coordinator, Arellano Associates
 Adrian Farran, Project Coordinator, Arellano Associates
 Trey Grogan, Project Coordinator, Arellano Associates
 Robert Cálix, Cal Strategic Management
 Julie Rush, Senior Manager Transportation Planning, AECOM
 Julie Lester, Ramboll
 Keir Opie, Cambridge Systematics
 Alice Tyree, Caltrans District 7

Commented [SP1]: I added Julia and Krit, is there anyone else I'm missing

CLC Members

	Name	Jurisdiction	In Attendance 3/23 (23 Members)
1	Luis Mesa	Bell	Y
2	Natalie Rubio	Bell Gardens	Y
3	Emmanuel Godinez	Boyle Heights	Y
4	Fa'alagilagi (Langi) Meni-Siliga	Carson	Y
5	Alfonso Garate	Commerce	Y
6	Phyllis Ollison	Compton	Y
7	Irma Lopez	Cudahy	Y
8	Guadalupe Arellano	East Los Angeles (unincorporated)	Y
9	Kathleen Barajas	East Los Angeles (unincorporated)	Y
10	Miyuki Gomez	East Los Angeles (unincorporated)	Y
11	Sinetta Farley	East/Rancho Dominguez (unincorporated)	
12	Jose Rodolfo Vallejo	Huntington Park	Y
13	Dan Wamba	Lakewood	Y
14	Marcos Lopez	Long Beach	Y
15	Maria Reyes	Long Beach	Y
16	Marlene Sanchez	Long Beach	Y
17	Elizabeth Zamarripa	Lynwood	Y

18	Aide Castro	Lynwood	Y
19	Jamila Cervantes	Maywood	
20	Andres Duarte	Montebello	
21	Esmeralda Hernandez	South Gate	Y
22	Viridiana (Viri) Preciado Cervantes	Walnut Park (unincorporated)	Y
23	Tiesha Davis	Wilmington/San Pedro (San Pedro)	Y
24	Manuel Arellano	Wilmington/San Pedro (Wilmington)	Y
25	Dora Douglas	Vernon	
26	Susan Adams	At Large/Compton	Y
27	Kevin Shin	At Large	Y

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) and Caltrans District 7 initiated the Long Beach-East Los Angeles Task Force (LB-ELA Task Force) to develop a community-supported, regionally significant, multimodal approach to addressing major mobility, safety, air quality, and equity needs for moving people and goods through the LB-ELA Corridor between the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach and State Route 60. The Community Leadership Committee for the project will inform the Task Force, coordinate with other decision-making bodies, and help move the project forward.

Community Leadership Committee Meetings #13 & 13.5 for the *Long Beach – East LA Corridor Mobility Investment Plan* were held on Thursday, March 23, 2023 and Monday, March 27, 2023. The intent of this meeting was to: (1) Provide a Task Force Meeting recap (2) Discuss Draft Evaluation Criteria (3) Introduce the LACI Project.

Meeting Summary – Meeting #13

- **Introductions, Welcome, Agenda Review, Meeting Objectives**
 - Co-facilitator, Amber Hawkes, welcomed attendees and provided an overview of the agenda, along with an introduction to the project team.
- **Agenda Item #1: Task Force Recap & Related Update**
 - Co-facilitator, Erika Morales, discussed the Task Force’s recent meeting. The Task Force confirmed Irma Lopez as CLC member, discussed evaluating and refining projects and programs, and were presented modeling and evaluation tools.
 - Erika Morales provided information on the upcoming corridor tours and asked the CLC to complete a survey to help pick preferred dates, before the end of the meeting.
 - CLC Comments and Questions
 - When will we know the solidified dates? Some of us have to take off work.
 - Laura Herrera responded that a decision will be made tomorrow and announced early next week.
 - Public Comment
 - None
- **Agenda Item #2: Evaluation Criteria**

- Co-facilitator, Shannon Davis, described that the goal of the evaluation criteria is to identify public realm improvements that satisfy the project’s vision and goals. Some projects will receive Metro funding while others will be funded through various other sources.
- Co-facilitator, Amber Hawkes, reiterated that the evaluation criteria help create a “summary of findings” for each project, so the technical team and the community can better understand how well each project satisfies the project’s vision and goals.
- The three phases of the evaluation include: run models and evaluate projects (Spring 2023); screen projects (Summer 2023); refine the list and prioritize projects (Fall 2023).
- For each criterion, each project will receive either: N/A, no benefit, low benefit, medium benefit, and high benefit. Not all projects can be scored for all evaluation criteria. Projects can be evaluated independently or as a bundle.
- There are four components of the evaluation: goal-related criteria, equity-related criteria, sustainability-related criteria, and community concerns criteria. Equity criteria can be found in each of the 6 goal areas.
- There are 24 equity related criteria, represented with an "EQ" on the slides.
- Equity criteria look at how well projects serve Equity Focus Communities (EFCs).
- KeAndra Cylear-Dodds, LA Metro, explained that an EFC is defined by three characteristics: low-income households, BIPOC/Non-white households, and households without access to a vehicle. “Very high need” indicates areas above the 80th percentile and “high need” is above the 60th percentile.
- The five criteria for sustainability include: air quality and energy, community (physical activity and public health), climate resiliency, workforce and green technologies, and goods movement activities.
- Community Concern evaluation criteria represent concerns raised over the project, including, but not limited to: displacement, direct physical impact to nearby communities, increased commute times, traffic diversion, new safety hot spots, construction impacts, and increasing “vehicle miles traveled.”
- There are 64 evaluation criteria.
- Evaluation findings will show summary findings to help us better understand the projects.
- Not all projects on the list will make it to the Investment Plan.
- Committees will review findings from the evaluation process.
- Comments and Questions
 - Can we be specific on using the word truck/freight truck/or cargo truck? Freight is a system which includes rail, trucks, and other forms of delivery and distribution.
 - Who flags projects?
 - The technical team flags projects based on community input and equity inputs.
 - Is funding being considered as we go through the process or is funding not to be considered as we make selections?
 - Funding will likely come into consideration during the prioritization phase.
 - To become familiar with the 64 projects, would we receive them in advance?
 - There are 64 evaluation criteria. There aren’t any new projects.
 - Is there research that supports that EFCs impact specific projects? Have the criteria for this been used in the past and if so were? Have projects in the EFCs made an impact on communities?

Commented [JM2]: Is this edit accurate? May need to double check with Julie

Commented [CK3R2]: Agreed. I think this is mixing the concerns criteria with the Community input flags.

Commented [SL4R2]: These are the evaluation criteria that were listed under the community concerns. The community concerns evaluation criteria is specific, whereas the Community input flags were more broad.

- These criteria reflect my community's needs. (2x)
- Environment criteria, Discussion
 - Thumbs up (4x)
- Community benefits criteria, Discussion
 - Yes, these represent my community's concerns.
 - How do we evaluate two separate projects that are also connected? How do we see if projects impact each other?
 - This is why we have so many criteria to understand all the different components at play.
 - What are "community receptors"?
 - Receptors are where people gather, e.g. schools, homes, senior centers, etc.
- Safety criteria, Discussion
 - Lighting is very important, would it fit into any of these categories?
 - If project includes lighting it would get a bump in the safety category.
 - Can the lighting be solar, please?
- Opportunity/prosperity criteria, Discussion
 - How do we measure or know if a project will cause displacement?
 - This will be mostly a qualitative measure.
 - Equity shouldn't be a temporary thing; everyone should permanently benefit from the projects.
 - We should not only reduce residential displacement but protect everyone who lives in the area.
 - Make sure we keep in mind how projects impact businesses.
- Public Comment
 - Under what category will distribution of parcels for companies that are transitioning from gas to zero emission be categorized?

Meeting 13.5

Attendees

Project Team

- Michael Cano, Countywide Planning and Development Executive Officer, Metro
- KeAndra Cylear-Dodds, Equity and Race Executive Officer, Metro
- Lilian De Loza-Gutierrez, Community Relations Director, Metro
- Jessica Medina, Equity and Race Manager, Metro
- Erika Morales, Partner, Morales + Morales, Inc
- Amber Hawkes, Co-Director, Here LA
- Shannon Davis, Co-Director, Here LA
- Serena Powell, Fellow, Here LA
- Melissa Holguin, Senior Project Manager, Arellano Associates
- Susan DeSantis, Senior Project Manager, Arellano Associates
- Laura Herrera, Project Manager, Arellano Associates
- Samantha Sosa, Project Coordinator, Arellano Associates
- Adrian Farran, Project Coordinator, Arellano Associates
- Trey Grogan, Project Coordinator, Arellano Associates
- Robert Cálix, Cal Strategic Management
- Julie Rush, Senior Manager Transportation Planning, AECOM
- Alice Tyree, Caltrans District 7
- Julie Lester, Ramboll
- Keir Opie, Cambridge Systematics
- Jack Symington, Los Angeles Cleantech Incubator (LACI)

Commented [JM6]: Please add Jack Symington to this list

CLC Members

	Name	Jurisdiction	In Attendance 3/27 (21 Members)
1	Luis Mesa	Bell	Y
2	Natalie Rubio	Bell Gardens	Y
3	Emmanuel Godinez	Boyle Heights	Y
4	Fa'alagilagi (Langi) Meni-Siliga	Carson	Y
5	Alfonso Garate	Commerce	Y
6	Phyllis Ollison	Compton	Y
7	Irma Lopez	Cudahy	Y
8	Guadalupe Arellano	East Los Angeles (unincorporated)	Y
9	Kathleen Barajas	East Los Angeles (unincorporated)	Y
10	Miyuki Gomez	East Los Angeles (unincorporated)	
11	Sinetta Farley	East/Rancho Dominguez (unincorporated)	
12	Jose Rodolfo Vallejo	Huntington Park	
13	Dan Wamba	Lakewood	Y
14	Marcos Lopez	Long Beach	Y

Commented [SP7]: IRMA PRESENT

15	Maria Reyes	Long Beach	Y
16	Marlene Sanchez	Long Beach	Y
17	Elizabeth Zamarripa	Lynwood	Y
18	Aide Castro	Lynwood	Y
19	Jamila Cervantes	Maywood	
20	Andres Duarte	Montebello	
21	Esmeralda Hernandez	South Gate	y
22	Viridiana (Viri) Preciado Cervantes	Walnut Park (unincorporated)	Y
23	Tiesha Davis	Wilmington/San Pedro (San Pedro)	Y
24	Manuel Arellano	Wilmington/San Pedro (Wilmington)	
25	Dora Douglas	Vernon	Y
26	Susan Adams	At Large/Compton	Y
27	Kevin Shin	At Large	Y

Meeting Summary – Meeting #13.5

➤ **Introductions, Welcome, Agenda Review, Meeting Objectives**

- Co-facilitator, Shannon Davis welcomed attendees and provided an overview of the agenda, along with an introduction to the project team.

➤ **Agenda Item #1: Evaluation Criteria**

- Shannon Davis and co-facilitator, Amber Hawkes, reiterated the timeline, goals of the evaluation, and a concept of “flags” for additional considerations.
- Types of flags include: “equity flag” and “community input consideration flag”.
- Equity flags indicate if a project receives a low equity score.
- Community input consideration flags capture concerns from the Task Force/CLC/Working group input, which aren’t captured by other evaluation criteria.
- Comments and Questions
 - I have a question regarding the flag concept, in simple terms, what is it specifically?
 - It is a reminder to look back and address issues as the project is developed.
 - How are we going to get community input on the flags?
 - If there are multiple comments, then the project will be flagged. The goal would be to address the issue. If it doesn’t get addressed, the flag stays with it until it gets addressed.
 - Some projects are the same but the only thing that may change is the community. If it's flagged in one city, will it be flagged across each city? Is it one flag per instance or across the board?
 - It depends on the project. If the project is in two different communities but has a major negative impact, it will be flagged in both communities.
 - So, if a project is flagged, that doesn’t necessarily mean that the project is being rejected?
 - Correct. It might come into play during the prioritization phase but does not reject the project at this preliminary phase because it is important to

Commented [SP8]: https://arellanoassociates.sharepoint.com/:x:/r/sites/Metro710TaskForce/_layouts/15/Doc.aspx?sourcedoc=%7BF1117FEB-9F8C-4227-8C20-07BE9E886DF5%7D&file=CLC%20%2313.5%20-%20Q%26A%20Log.xlsx&action=default&mobileredirect=true&cid=b8d6d321-9cc3-4f09-a207-2deab6d13bf0

make sure we do our due diligence and learn as much as we can about the projects.

- If there is more than one flag, something has to be stopped. If a project is flagged will everyone get notified? And how many times does a project have to get flagged before it catches someone's attention?
 - Flags happen on a project-by-project basis. The output, including the flags, will be provided to the community.
- When I hear that a project being flagged will not be eliminated, it makes me feel that being part of CLC is simply a dog and pony show. What is the point of getting our input if it won't make a difference to put a stop to a project that doesn't meet the criteria this group set forth? I can understand that not every flag is a deal breaker. But as of now, I have not heard that any of our concerns not being addressed will stop a project from moving forward.
 - There are some projects that have certain negative impacts, which will not be able to move forward. The metrics will weed out projects later on.
- Can we have a list that shows what criteria or flags will stop a project? It feels like there is some discretion that allows a project to move forward.
 - There is a short list of things that would make a project not go through because they violate Metro policies and goals. Some projects we just need more time to analyze. This is why we are working through this evaluation criteria, to help us set thresholds.
- We should eliminate as much ambiguity and discretion as possible.
- These flags are valuable, as it is the community who needs to give their input on what affects them.
- Will there be a limit to how many flags a project could get?
 - A project can only receive just one of each type of flag.
 - The flag will follow the project until it's addressed and will not fall off until then.
- If a project is flagged several times, it should not stay.
- Knowing the flag will follow the project until it is addressed, is helpful.
- Public Comments
 - Flags give projects extra attention. I know pollution is a criterion but from what I've heard air/noise pollution is one of the biggest community concerns. I am not sure how the public will participate.
 - Air pollution is heavily integrated into the evaluation criteria and if there's a heavy community concern about air pollution it can become a community flag.
- CLC Round Robin Comments
 - If a project has a flag, we should just move on and remove it. There are enough projects that won't have a flag that would just allow us to move on.
 - Are we going to struggle to use this in a meaningful way because it is so extensive (i.e. too many criteria)?
 - No issues or concerns with criteria at all. They are fine.
 - I'd like to emphasize the importance of education.
 - I agree to the criteria, but there are a lot of them.

- If a project gets a flag, would it continue and take up space? I don't want to focus or spend time on the ones that are flagged.
- How are we going to change the climate? How would one project have an effect on climate change? In order to change air quality wouldn't we have to close everything that pollutes the air?
- I am okay with what is being presented but I wish we could incorporate budget concerns. When looking at a project with flags we could focus on projects that are ready to go.
- One thing that worries me is how these criteria will be applied to projects. For instance, are you looking for projects that satisfy the most criteria overall or are you looking for projects that satisfy fewer criteria the best? Other than that, I agree with the criteria.
- We need to keep prioritizing safety.
- I agree with the previous comments about providing project funding information.
- I agree with the comments on the environment and education, sharing and collaboration.
- More emphasis should be put on projects with multimodal benefits, including safety.
- The criteria make sense to me.
- The criteria are surface level. I'd like them to be quantifiable. They should build on each other and not stand alone. We need to understand the long term effects, have statistics on impact, and budget information.
- Projects should have a lasting impact on the community.
- Are baselines being set at this point, so that when these projects are implemented, we can have something to compare it to?
 - Yes, the baseline is now.
- Funding is an important thing to consider.
- The evaluation criteria are thorough. Will any projects be flagged automatically.
 - The flags can happen through a variety of sources (CLC and others) and the project team will apply the flags, based on input.
- Public Comment
 - I am not understanding how criteria is going to be used. Will a project be ranked lower if it can't check all the boxes?
 - The scores are summary not additive.

➤ **Agenda Item #2: LACI (Los Angeles Cleantech Incubator) Project**

- Jack Symington, (LACI), introduced the project in a request to receive funding support for a zero-emissions truck charging station.
- Jack Symington discussed that the project is a \$15 million truck charging station. The project matches Metro's goals, will occur on publicly held land, and provide public benefit. The proposed sites are 1519 E 1 St and 816 N Lansing Ave, Wilmington CA 90744.
- Requesting CLC Feedback on the proposed project and request for \$3 million support from Metro's Long Beach – East LA Corridor Zero Emissions funds.
- In a community focus group, the key points made by the community were to make the project an anchor facility down by the ports and placed away from residential areas.

Commented [JM9]: Can Susan DeSantis or Michael confirm this is what the request was for?

- Comments and Questions
 - What are the deployment phases?
 - The project is approximately 6 months out from RFP (request for proposal) and 2-3 years for construction.
 - Would the site be open to the public?
 - Yes, to Class A truck drivers and possibly Class 6 truck drivers. Not open to passenger cars.
 - Would it be geared towards trucking community from start to finish?
 - Yes.
- Public Comments
 - No comments.

➤ **Closing Remarks**

- Corridor Tour Dates:
 - Northern Segment – Wednesday, April 26, 8:30am-2pm and
 - Southern Segment – Thursday, May 11, 8:30am-2pm
- Next Task Force Meeting Monday, April 10, 5-7pm
- Task Force & CLC “Evaluation Framework” Lunch and Learn Monday, April 17, 12-1:30pm
- Next CLC Meeting #14 Thursday, April 20, 5-7pm
- Next Working Group meetings, Equity on Thursday, March 30, 5-7pm, and Zero-Emission Truck on Tuesday, April 18, 1-3pm