



Long Beach-East Los Angeles Corridor Mobility Investment Plan

Community Leadership Committee (CLC) Meeting #14 Summary

April 20, 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
 Amber Hawkes, Co-Director, Here LA
 Shannon Davis, Co-Director, Here LA
 Serena Powell, Fellow, Here LA
 Susan DeSantis, Senior Project Manager, Arellano Associates
 Laura Herrera, Project Manager, Arellano Associates
 Adrian Farran, Project Coordinator, Arellano Associates
 Trey Grogan, Project Coordinator, Arellano Associates
 Eric Davidian, Assistant Project Coordinator, Arellano Associates
 Allison Crook, Assistant Project Coordinator, Arellano Associates
 Robert Cáliz, Cal Strategic Management
 Dave Levinsohn, Vice President, AECOM
 Julie Rush, Senior Manager Transportation Planning, AECOM
 Julie Lester, Ramboll
 Jon Overman, Cambridge Systematics
 Alice Tyree, Caltrans District 7
 Paul Marquez, Caltrans Deputy District Director of Planning

CLC Members

	Name	Jurisdiction	In Attendance 4/20 (22 Members)
1	Luis Mesa	Bell	X
2	Natalie Rubio	Bell Gardens	X
3	Emmanuel Godinez	Boyle Heights	X
4	Fa'alagilagi (Langi) Meni-Siliga	Carson	X
5	Alfonso Garate	Commerce	X
6	Phyllis Ollison	Compton	X
7	Irma Lopez	Cudahy	X
8	Guadalupe Arellano	East Los Angeles (unincorporated)	X
9	Kathleen Barajas	East Los Angeles (unincorporated)	X
10	Miyuki Gomez	East Los Angeles (unincorporated)	X
11	Sinetta Farley	East/Rancho Dominguez (unincorporated)	X
12	Jose Rodolfo Vallejo	Huntington Park	X
13	Dan Wamba	Lakewood	X
14	Marcos Lopez	Long Beach	X
15	Maria Reyes	Long Beach	X

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

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 Meeting #14 for the *Long Beach – East LA Corridor Mobility Investment Plan* was held on Thursday, April 20, 2023. The intent of this meeting was to: (1) provide a Task Force meeting recap and (2) gauge consensus about and vote on the evaluation criteria.

Meeting Summary

- **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: Task Force Recap, Working Group, and Corridor Tour Recap**
 - Co-facilitator, Amber Hawkes, discussed the Task Force’s recent meeting. The Task Force reviewed the draft evaluation criteria, discussed the process and project removal, and expressed some concerns about the evaluation criteria (e.g. they are too complex). The Task Force heard about the CLC's March meetings. The Task Force, Committees, and Working Groups will have an opportunity to review evaluation findings and any projects recommended to be removed.
 - Amber Hawkes discussed the March Equity Working Group meeting, where participants discussed the Equity Planning and Evaluation Tool (EPET) and addressed concerns from a recent letter from Coalition for Environmental Health and Justice (CEHAJ) members regarding the application of the EPET to the LB-ELA Corridor Plan process. On behalf of the Zero Emission Truck Working Group, the EWG was asked to consider the Los Angeles Cleantech Incubator's (LACI) request to provide \$3 million for a Zero Emission Truck Charging Facility from the Metro Board’s overall commitment of \$50M in seed funding. Lastly, EWG Members participated in a poll regarding preferences for a workshop on the Community History section of the EPET.

- Shannon Davis notified the CLC that the Corridor Tour will be rescheduled to maximize participation. The project team will send out a new poll to members soon.
- KeAndra Cylear-Dodds, LA Metro, summarized the results of the Caltrans tour from Tuesday April 18, 2023, sharing that the tour included key stakeholders and State representatives who walked the corridor while discussing challenges and impacts from the 710 Freeway.
- CLC Comments and Questions
 - I do not see projects that benefit health in a large capacity (e.g. mitigation and asthma) and would like to see projects and additional programs directly associated with health.
- Public Comment
 - Comment #1: The first member of the public voiced concern about the lack of projects in East LA and stated that there is an uneven distribution of projects across the 710 Corridor. Public comments have not been included in items being considered for funding and public comments should be noted and taken into consideration.
 - Comment #2: The second member of the public asked to clarify if the project team was suggesting that the CLC is happy with the projects on the project list. The commenter reminded the team that both the community and CLC members have expressed concerns about the lack of projects related to the LA River, for example. Additionally, they stated that it is hard to understand where the projects are geographically, without a visual tool.
 - Amber Hawkes clarified that earlier she was referring to the CLC generally being happy with the evaluation criteria and not the project list.

➤ **Agenda Item #2: Evaluation Criteria**

- Amber Hawkes stated that the goal of this agenda item is to move toward consensus regarding the evaluation criteria (not the project list) and then to consider a vote on the evaluation criteria. The next steps after the evaluation phase are to screen and create a refined project list, prioritize projects, and then prepare the draft investment plan.
- Shannon Davis reviewed the project principles and project goals. She reiterated that today's vote is for the evaluation criteria and not the project list. She reminded the CLC that the final product of this effort is the development of an Investment Plan. Some projects would be Metro-funded and/or implemented, while others would be funded by other sources and implemented by cities and other entities.
- Amber Hawkes reviewed the equity and sustainability guiding principles and the evaluation criteria categories.
- Key Questions
 - Key Question 1: What does the evaluation show? What will it be used for?
 - The evaluation will show findings based on information we know about the projects. This will help describe the pros and cons of the projects themselves.
 - Key Question 2: Will all projects on the list make it to the Investment Plan?
 - No. Projects can be removed as a result of the evaluation.

- Key Question 3: If the community opposes a project and there are real concerns about it, why should that project move forward?
 - During the evaluation process, these concerns will be discussed, and the project could be removed if it does not align or cannot be made to align with Metro policy, including the project’s Vision, Goals, and Guiding Principles. In other words, some projects will not make it into the Draft Investment Plan.
- Key Question 4: Will the community be able to review projects that may be removed?
 - Yes, committees and the Task Force will review the evaluation findings and any projects that are recommended to be removed.
- Key Question 5: How and when is prioritization happening?
 - Prioritization happens as a subsequent, separate step and is slated for Fall 2023.
- Key Question 6: Why aren't there specific thresholds that are used to tell us why a project is in or out?
 - The majority of the projects are in the early planning stages and lack the definition that is needed to fairly apply absolute, quantitative thresholds with any assurance. During the evaluation step, potential benefits and impacts will be discussed with the committees. Some projects may perform well for some goals and yet poorly for others. The trade-offs need to be understood and discussed. One of the objectives of the evaluation step is to learn why a project may be performing poorly and if it can be improved or enhanced during subsequent stages of project development.
- Key Question 7: Why can’t the evaluation criteria be more quantitative?
 - Many of the projects and programs are not sufficiently developed or lack specific descriptions to allow for a fair quantitative comparison. This is why we have several different types of measures, including qualitative measures, that help assess potential benefits. Because we are looking at a multimodal system of projects and we need to achieve multiple goals, we are applying a “multiple measures” approach.
- Amber Hawkes reviewed the project concerns and 5 sustainability criteria, which are also part of the evaluation criteria. She reiterated that several of the equity criteria are embedded through many of the evaluation criteria.
- CLC Comments and Questions
 - I expected to receive a copy of the evaluation criteria.
 - The project team stated that all of the evaluation criteria were included in the CLC presentation that was sent out prior to the meeting and also contained within the presentation sent out for CLC meetings #13 and #13.5.
 - The evaluation criteria are well intended and general enough to support the evaluation process.
 - Will new projects be added if others are omitted?
 - There are several programs included in the Initial List that are specifically included to allow for additional projects to be identified, developed, and

implemented under the Investment Plan, once it is put in place. The Investment Plan is intended to be a living document that will help guide future investments in the Corridor for many years to come.

- Can you please define “programs”?
 - Programs are highlighted in blue in the current list of Projects and Projects. Rather than representing one specific capital project, programs provide a mechanism in which projects can continue to be identified and developed, all with a common goal. An example includes a community health program that would allow cities to develop and identify community health projects, with a supporting funding source attached.
 - One way to think about it is to think of programs as a "basket of projects."
- How do we move forward with projects without plans attached to them?
 - Some projects/programs are in their early planning strategies. For example, the Gateway Cities COG has developed master plans for some of the Complete Street corridors. In this case, different cities may need to work together to develop more detailed, design plans for each street segment that falls into their jurisdiction.
- The facilitators are going too fast, making translation difficult for the interpreters.
 - The facilitators will continue to try and speak slowly and leave time for interpretation.
- When we talk about health, what specifically are we talking about? The projects don't explicitly say how they will improve health or how they will function.
 - Health is incorporated in the evaluation criteria in a number of ways. We look at recent health studies such as those used by the South Coast Air Quality Management District to evaluate air quality and toxic emissions (pollutants) to evaluate health impacts. There are a number of evaluation criteria that relate to health.
 - We consider health in terms of medical conditions (asthma), access/connectivity (bicycling, walking, access to parks), and safety from collisions, for example.
- There is no way to translate everything that's being said. We talk too quickly in English and we need to move slower. A lot of the words used in this project are hard to translate into Spanish.
- Noise pollution is a big issue in East LA; how can we address this?
 - Evaluation criteria EN7 (potential for noise reduction) addresses noise pollution.
- It's great that EN7 is an evaluation criterion but there is not a clear project dedicated to noise pollution in the project list. We need to repair past harms.
 - There is a project on the list that raises sound walls on freeways (Project 0137).
- It would help to receive paper copies of this information so we can put pen to paper.
- Shouldn't funding be a factor for evaluating these projects?
 - Funding has not been attached to any of the projects at this time.

- Once the project team applies the evaluation criteria, they will provide a summary of responses so it's more digestible.
- I have concerns about understanding how the criteria works and I don't understand the process for the flags. I agree with past comments about health concerns, as well.
 - After evaluation criteria, all groups will meet to review summary. Then we will move on to prioritization stage.
- We have too many projects and we don't concentrate on one. Why don't we focus on one project then move to another?
 - The focus of this conversation is the evaluation criteria and not the project list. There will be a prioritization phase later.
- I would like to abstain. I think all the criteria are important and want them to all be applied to the projects.

○ **Test for Consensus on Evaluation Criteria – Results**

	Number	Percentage
I Support	7	29%
I Have Concerns	9	38%
I Can Live With	4	17%
I Will Stand Aside	2	8%
Total	24	83%

- A CLC member then motioned for vote, which was seconded.
- **Vote on Evaluation Criteria: “Do You Support the Evaluation Criteria?” - Results**

	Number	Percentage
Yes	15	83%
No	3	17%
Total	18	100%

- The motion to approve the evaluation criteria passed.
- Public Comments
 - Comment #1: The project team is not doing a good job of outreach. I didn't receive an invite to this meeting and had to ask for it. It's not fair that the public can't see the chat. If we can't see the chat then we can't understand the entire conversation. Also, I'd like to mention connectivity was not mentioned as a criterion in filling bike path gaps. It's not the same as reconnecting communities. Lastly, we need to include cancer hotspots, which was a big concern of the EPA and also one of the communities of East Los Angeles when the alternative five were chosen.
 - Comment #2: We should have separate meetings for English and Spanish. There seems to be a lot of confusion that needs some attention.

➤ **Closing Remarks**

- Next Task Force Meeting #20 Monday, May 1 from 5-7pm.
- Next Task Force Meeting #20.5 Monday, May 8 from 5-7pm.
- Next CLC Meeting #15 Thursday, May 18 from 5-7pm