



Community Leadership Committee (CLC) Meeting #15 Summary

May 18, 2023

Table of Contents

Community Leadership Committee (CLC) Meeting #15 Summary Report

Appendix A: Evaluation Criteria: Long Beach-East Los Angeles Corridor Mobility Investment Plan



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
 Erik Davidian, Assistant Project Coordinator, Arellano Associates
 Allison Crook, Assistant Project Coordinator, Arellano Associates
 Robert Cáliz, Cal Strategic Management
 Dave Levinsohn, Vice President, AECOM
 Aryeh Cohen, Planner, 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 5/18 (19 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)	
9	Kathleen Barajas	East Los Angeles (unincorporated)	Y
10	Miyuki Gomez	East Los Angeles (unincorporated)	
11	Sinetta Farley	East/Rancho Dominguez (unincorporated)	Y
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	
18	Aide Castro	Lynwood	Y
19	Jamila Cervantes	Maywood	Y
20	Andres Duarte	Montebello	
21	Esmeralda Hernandez	South Gate	
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	
26	Susan Adams	At Large/Compton	
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 Meeting #15 for the *Long Beach – East LA Corridor Mobility Investment Plan* was held on Thursday, May 18, 2023. The intent of this meeting was to: (1) provide recaps from the Task Force and Working Group meetings; (2) hear about the approved Evaluation Criteria and discuss next steps for the project; (3) discuss health-related goals and Evaluation Criteria, as well as how health concerns have been folded into the project; (4) discuss the next CLC meeting, planned as an in-person (and virtual hybrid) interactive session where the CLC will help inform how the project team assigns “Community Input Consideration Flags” to the projects and programs on the list.

Meeting Summary

➤ Introductions, Welcome, Roll Call, 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.
- Co-facilitator, Amber Hawkes, stated that if members find that the team is speaking too quickly, they can let the team know in the chat, raise their hand, or make motions in their video to indicate that speakers should slow down.

➤ Agenda Item #1: Zero Emission Truck, Equity, and Task Force Meeting Recap

- Co-facilitator, Amber Hawkes, shared updates from the ZET Working Group Meeting, where members:
 - Participated in an informal test for consensus on the LACI Community Charging project. Several members of the ZET supported this project and asked additional questions of the project team.
 - Learned about a federal discretionary grant opportunity to advance charging and fueling infrastructure.
 - Received a presentation on workforce development and local hire on ZET projects.
- The Equity Working Group members:

- Discussed health issues and how this project analyzes health impacts.
- Discussed the challenges of evaluating direct health impacts and how other measures are used to examine the potential health benefits of future projects.
- Emphasized the importance of ensuring evaluation captures cumulative benefits of projects that improve health.
- At Task Force Meetings #20 & #20.5, members:
 - Heard updates regarding Working Group and CLC meetings.
 - Discussed how health is incorporated into the evaluation criteria and expressed a desire to see additional health outcomes.
 - Heard from the technical team who clarified that all stakeholders could contribute to “Community Consideration Flags.”
 - Voted to move forward with the Evaluation Criteria (62% yes, 33% no, 5% abstained).

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

- The project timeline and next steps were shown. We are currently “Evaluating Projects and Programs.”
- The next steps of the project include:
 - Screening projects
 - Developing a refined Project List
 - Prioritizing projects
 - Preparing the *Draft Investment Plan*
- The team defined an “Investment Plan” as a multi-page planning document that provides a vision to address impacts through multi-modal solutions. Within the plan, there will be a list of projects/programs with top performers identified, funding sources, and high-level implementation strategies.
- The technical team showed pages of an *example* Draft Corridor Plan that was completed for the I-405 Corridor. While this Plan had different goals, many of the components within the plan help provide examples of what the LB-ELA Investment Plan may contain. Sample pages included:
 - Cover
 - Table of Contents
 - Demographic Analysis
 - Description of Stakeholders & Process
 - Description of Goals & Evaluation Criteria
 - Project List
- The technical team updated the CLC about changes to the Evaluation Criteria. These changes included:
 - Notations were added to the health-related evaluation criteria to clarify how health is addressed. (*See Appendix A*)
 - Safety: SF7 criteria was changed from “Preserves/rehabilitates existing infrastructure” to “Improves/rehabilitates existing infrastructure”.
 - Environment: EN4 criteria added "water capture" to this evaluation criterion.

- Sustainability Guiding Principles: Edited text for clarity, but no content changes were made.
- A note was added to the list of concerns: "During the evaluation process for specific projects, if there are found to be negative impacts that are not captured by these concerns, the project team will add new categories of concerns or document the impacts in some other way."
- CLC Comments
 - A CLC member asked for a specific example of what this means: "During the evaluation process for specific projects, if there are found to be negative impacts that are not captured by these concerns, the project team will add new categories of concerns or document the impacts in some other way."
 - *Response: For example, a project that improves lighting on a roadway that causes inadvertent light pollution within a community might be taken note of, if it occurs as a result of project implementation.*
 - A CLC member asked if it is a problem that the 405 Investment Plan example had different definitions of multi-modal.
 - *Response: Metro replied that this does not appear to be a problem, and that we will use the definition that was developed as part of this project.*
- Public Comment
 - Comment made about health criteria
 - Would like to see low birth rates added to the analysis.
 - Concerned about the heart attack categories and use of CalEnviroScreen 4.0 as the data layer. For example, in the census tract where she grew up, there are only 2,700 people and other census tracts are larger. Because this information is from 2015-2017, only 12 people are showing up per thousand within that time frame. This might not be an accurate reflection of what is happening in some of the census tracts.

➤ **Agenda Item #3: Health Criteria**

- The CLC heard about how health has been considered in the project thus far.
- Health considerations are folded into Project Goals (the Community category) as well as the Sustainability Guiding Principle (direct references to health are included in each of those locations).
- Health outcomes were studied by the technical team using the CalEnviroScreen and the Healthy Places Index, to look at Asthma and Cardiovascular Disease.
- Health Impacts were also studied by the technical team, through an analysis of air pollution (PM 2.5 and Diesel Particulate Matter).
- The technical team also reviewed existing health-related studies. The initial review included:
 - I-710 Health Impact Assessment Final Draft Report (2011)
 - Gateway Cities Air Quality Action Plan Draft Final Report (2013)
 - Lower LA River Revitalization Plan (2018)
 - Metro Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP) (2019)
 - "Beyond the Freeway" 710 Livability Initiative (2019)
 - "Congestion Pricing for Climate, Capacity or Communities?" (2019)
 - Southeast LA Community Emissions Reduction Plan (2020)

- CEHAJ Statement Regarding I-710 Corridor Expansion Project (2020)
- AB617: Snapshot Report (2021)
- Southeast LA AB617 Community Steering Committee Meeting Summary (2021)
- Improving Environmental Justice and Mobility in Southeast Los Angeles (2021)
- Race, Class, and the Production of and Exposure to Vehicular Pollution in Los Angeles (2021)
- The technical team also discussed health as a topic with the CLC, Task Force, and other community members during the process, where topics like the following were brought up:
 - High asthma rates
 - Lack of consistent and well-maintained tree canopy
 - Inequitable access to parks
 - The location of schools, recreational facilities, and community spaces adjacent to freeways and high-volume roadways
- The project is using the Social Determinants of Health (SDOH, from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention) as a way to understand which evaluation criteria can be used to identify positive and negative impacts to community health in the corridor.
- The SDOH link economic and social factors with health outcomes.
- Health benefits are also embedded into various Evaluation Criteria including the following:
 - CH1: Reduce Emissions
 - CH3: Mode Shift
 - CH5: Park Access
 - SF1, SF2, SF4, SF6: Traffic Safety
 - EN 6: Cooling /Heat Reduction
 - OP1, OP4, OP5, OP6, OP7: Access to Amenities
 - CON4: Potential for Traffic Diversion/Emission Shifting
 - CON5: Potential for New Hot Spots, Congestion, AQ, Bike/Ped Safety
 - CON7: Potential for Vehicular Use Increases
- Several Frequently Asked Questions were reviewed, including:
 - Question: Why are we using other criteria as proxies for health? Why not just include health outcomes as separate evaluation criteria?
 - *Response: Because so many factors contribute to health outcomes, it is much more challenging to quantify how a transportation project will directly impact health outcomes. We are following USDOT and CDC definitions of health.*
 - Question: Is it possible to measure health benefits or negative impacts directly?
 - *Response: Our evaluation is designed to measure the outcomes that support our desired (health-related) community results. This is why we have used peer reviewed research (approved by health organizations like the CDC and WHO) to link health outcomes to broader social, environmental and economic factors.*
 - Question: Can we perform a Health Impact Assessment?
 - *Response: A Health Impact Assessment (HIA) requires a high level of project specificity and extensive data. Our investment plan is a collection of potential projects and programs, most of which are a long way off from the level of project detail needed for a HIA.*

- Question: How can we ensure that Health concerns are being addressed as projects move forward?
 - *Response: The Evaluation Criteria are intended to identify, review, and screen projects with high potential to increase pollution in the corridor. Any projects that move toward implementation will eventually be subject to environmental review, with more detailed analyses as part of their individual processes. The Project Team can provide ongoing information/data on health in the LB-ELA Corridor area and provide health-focused implementation guidance with input from the Task Force and community members.*
- Question: How is health being incorporated into the project beyond the evaluation phase?
 - *Response: In addition to a potential Health Equity Dashboard, the project team plans to:*
 - *Continue holding health-focused meetings at CLC, Equity Working Group, and Task Force.*
 - *Develop health-focused project design/implementation guidelines in collaboration with Task Force, Equity Working Group, and CLC members to include as an Appendix to the Investment Plan.*
 - *Identify opportunities to collaborate with other departments, agencies, and organizations who are working on evaluating and improving health equity in the project area.*
- Question: Can the plan improve the quality of healthcare clinics and providers in the LB-ELA corridor?
 - *Response: While our plan can't change how specific health clinics operate, it can help people travel to their preferred healthcare providers more easily. This is something we measure using evaluation criteria OP6: Access to Quality of Life Amenities (grocery stores, healthcare services, schools).*
- Question: Noise Reduction is noted as qualitative. Perhaps you can think about quantifying noise as a concern as well.
 - *Response: No detailed noise modeling and evaluation will be performed as part of the evaluation criteria (either positively or negatively). "EN7: The Potential for Noise Reduction" is essentially qualitative, that may be informed by available quantitative information such as "linear feet of soundwall added" to help characterize the extent of the benefit.*
- CLC Comments
 - CLC members noted that they would like to see more studies that reflect the health impacts in the West Long Beach area. (2x)
 - A CLC member noted that a lot of the studies that were shown in the analysis are outdated.
 - The technical team noted that the studies listed showcase a picture of the type of studies that have been done over time along the corridor.
 - A CLC member asked who will be helping to identify opportunities to collaborate with other departments, agencies, and organizations who are working on an evaluating and improving health equity in the project area? As there are several people already involved with this project who are in the health-related field, are these people already in the planning process for this project? Can they come to in-person meetings?

- *Yes, there are Task Force members from CEHAJ, including East Yard Communities, CBE, and LBACA (Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma) who have been working on this project.*
 - *The technical team will reach out to LA Department of Public Health and the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment to be a part of future discussions.*
 - *In-person meetings will be discussed at a later time during the presentation.*
- A CLC member asked a question regarding evaluation of air quality: will there be monitoring of air quality over time as a part of the evaluation criteria?
 - Monitoring over time will not occur as part of the Implementation Plan, however there is extensive air quality monitoring that is being done by the South Coast Air Quality Management District and others, including air roadway monitoring. The technical team can gather information about that and send out if desired. A link was added to the chat with information relating to the South Coast Air Quality Management District monitoring.
- A CLC member asked, for evaluation of bike lanes, will protected bike lanes vs non-protected bike lanes be considered in the evaluation (e.g., will higher-quality facilities be weighted/considered to be safer)?
 - *Yes, the type of bike facility proposed will factor heavily in the rating of a project.*
- A CLC member stated they were concerned about asthma, and wondered what data was used to determine asthma rates.
 - *CalEnviroScreen was described in the presentation, which shows hospitalizations per 10,000 residents, so the data is broad. However, in the Evaluation Criteria, the team is measuring particulate matter 2.5, which is shown to have high impact on asthma rates.*
- A CLC member stated they were concerned about the monitoring of noise impacts. How would this be solved? Barriers on freeways?
 - *Yes, sound barriers are an example of how noise impacts could be mitigated.*
- A CLC member noted that they were most interested in the health aspects of the projects and how they can address cardiovascular health as well as mental health.
- A CLC member noted that large air purifiers should be installed near freeways to clean air.
- A CLC member noted that in-person tours would be helpful for everyone working on the project.
 - The team noted that there will be future in-person tours that will be mentioned later during the presentation.
- A CLC member noted that in-person meetings would be great in the future.
 - The team noted that there will be future in-person team meetings
- Public Comment
 - A member of the public representing LBACA brought up that they are a part of CEHAJ and a part of the conversations relating to health. She noted that CEHAJ did not vote in favor of the Evaluation Criteria as it was presented.

➤ **Agenda Item #4: Next Steps (Community Input Consideration)**

- The CLC got a sneak-peek at what is planned for the June CLC meeting.
- The June CLC meeting will be held in person on June 22, 5-7pm, at Horchateria Rio Luna (15950 Paramount Boulevard, Paramount, CA 90723)
- The meeting will have a “remote attendance” option.
- The goal of the June meeting will be for the CLC to show the technical team which projects should receive Community Input Consideration Flags.
- CLC members will place red, orange, and green dots on projects to indicate:
 - Red: I have a major concern about this project
 - Orange: I have a question/suggestion about this project
 - Green: I really like this project
- Community Input Consideration Flags help capture concerns or support, from Task Force/CLC/Working Group and public and community input, that aren’t captured by performance metrics.
- The presenters reminded the CLC that currently there are over 200 projects and programs in the Initial List, some of which are more advanced than others.
- CLC Comments
 - Will the meeting be at 5pm next month? *Yes*
 - Can we bring snacks? *Dinner and churros will be provided.*
 - I am glad the session will be in person.
 - Regarding the LA River project, I support this project. It will help with stormwater runoff. This project will help our communities and future generations.
- Public Comment
 - *No public comments made*

➤ **Agenda Item #5: Closing Remarks**

- Corridor tours will be held in late June.
- There are two dates, which CLC members can attend (the same tour route will be offered on both dates):
 - June 24, Saturday, 8:30am-2pm
 - June 28, Wednesday, 8:30am-2pm
- The purpose of the Corridor Tour is to provide an opportunity to view planned improvements as well as built examples of things that are being considered for the LB-ELA Corridor Plan.
- Next Task Force Meeting #21: Monday, June 12 from 5-7pm.
- Next CLC Meeting #16: Thursday, June 22 from 5-7pm (in person).
- Next ZET Working Group Meeting: May 23, 1-3pm.
- Next Equity Working Group Meeting: June 29, 5-7pm.

~~Draft~~ Evaluation Criteria – Long Beach-East Los Angeles Corridor Mobility Investment Plan

Categories	Evaluation Performance Metrics	Type
Air Quality Benefits	AQ1: Reduce Emissions (NOx, PM2.5)	Quantitative
	AQ2: Facilitates clean technologies & lower emissions vehicles	Qualitative
	AQ3: Mode Shift to cleaner modes	Quantitative
Community Benefits (including Health)	CH1*: Reduce Emissions (Health Effects metrics: Diesel Particulate Matter, PM2.5)	Quantitative
	CH2*: Reduce exposure at receptors (HVAC/HEPA, near-roadway vegetation)	Qualitative
	CH3*: Mode Shift to active transportation, transit	Quantitative
	CH4: Improve the User Experience (may be different metrics for different modes)	Qualitative/Quantitative
	CH5*: Bike/Ped Access to parks, recreational areas, or open spaces	Qualitative
Mobility Benefits	MB1: Ridership	Quantitative
	MB2: Speeds / Travel Times (people, goods)	Quantitative
	MB3: Reduce Congestion (hours of delay for people & goods)	Quantitative
	MB4: Modal Accessibility (by zone)	Quantitative
	MB5: Reliability (transit, roadway, goods movement)	Quantitative
	MB6: Gap Closures	Quantitative
	MB7: Increase in travel options	Qualitative
Safety Benefits	SF1*: Protections for Bike / Users (bike class)	Qualitative
	SF2*: Traffic Protections (bike/ped)	Qualitative
	SF3: Personal Security	Qualitative
	SF4*: Includes Safety Features	Qualitative
	SF5: Reducing conflict points (vehicle safety)	Qualitative
	SF6*: Traffic Calming Features	Qualitative
	SF7: Improves / rehabilitates existing infrastructure	Qualitative
Environment Benefits	EN1: Improved Environment from Mode Shifts	Qualitative
	EN2: GHG Reduction Potential	Qualitative/Quantitative
	EN3: Protects natural habitat (Greening Features)	Qualitative
	EN4: Water Quality, Water Capture, Drainage, and Flood Management features	Qualitative
	EN5: Reducing energy use	Qualitative
	EN6*: Reduce Heat Island Effect; Provide Cooling Features for Users	Qualitative
	EN7: Potential for Noise Reduction	Qualitative/
	EN8: Supports transportation efficient land use principles	Qualitative

Categories	Evaluation Performance Metrics	Type
Opportunity/Prosperity Benefits	OP1*: Access to jobs	Quantitative
	OP2: Accessibility (improving mobility challenges for all ages and abilities)	Qualitative
	OP3: Increases Regional Competitiveness	Qualitative
	OP4*: Work Force Development	Qualitative
	OP5*: Potential Targeted Hire, New Construction Jobs	Qualitative
	OP6*: Access to QoL amenities (grocery stores, healthcare services, schools)	Quantitative
	OP7*: Access to open space, recreation and parks, LA river, etc.	Quantitative
Equity	AQ1: Reduce Emissions (NOx, PM2.5)	Quantitative – EFC
	AQ3: Mode Shift to cleaner modes	Quantitative – EFC
	CH1: Reduce Emissions (Health Effects metrics: Diesel Particulate Matter, PM2.5)	Quantitative – EFC
	EQ-CH2: Reduces exposure to air pollution in communities facing high pollution burden and asthma rates	Qualitative – EQ
	CH3: Mode Shift to active transportation, transit	Quantitative – EFC
	EQ-CH5: Increases access to high quality recreational facilities in areas lacking active transportation infrastructure and parks	Qualitative – EQ
	MB1: Ridership	Quantitative – EFC
	MB2: Speeds / Travel Times (people, goods)	Quantitative – EFC
	MB3: Reduce Congestion (hours of delay for people & goods)	Quantitative – EFC
	MB4: Modal Accessibility (by zone)	Quantitative – EFC
	MB5: Reliability (Transit, Roadway, Goods Movement)	Quantitative – EFC
	MB6: Gap Closures	Quantitative – EFC
	EQ-MB7: Increases reliable and accessible transportation options for those who cannot or prefer not to drive	Qualitative – EQ
	EQ-SF1: Improves physical safety for people, walking, biking, and rolling	Qualitative – EQ
	EQ-SF3: Improves perceptions of personal security for people walking, biking, rolling, and taking transit	Qualitative – EQ
	EQ-EN3: Contributes to remediation of environmental damage or loss of natural features	Qualitative – EQ
	EQ-EN6: Includes urban greening and cooling for areas of low tree canopy and high heat island burden	Qualitative – EQ
	EN7: Potential for Noise Reduction	Quantitative – EFC
OP1: Access to jobs	Quantitative – EFC	

Categories	Evaluation Performance Metrics	Type
	OP6: Access to Quality-of-Life amenities (grocery stores, healthcare services, schools)	Quantitative – EFC
	OP7: Access to open space, recreation and parks, LA river, etc.	Quantitative – EFC
	EQ-OP8: Increases quantity and quality of employment opportunities for underemployed and low-income workforce	Qualitative – EQ
	EQ-OP9: Reduces housing or transportation costs for low-income households	Qualitative – EQ
	EQ-OP10: Reduces residential or commercial displacement risk	Qualitative – EQ
Sustainability	SA1*: Provides infrastructure, services, and/or technology to r Reduces reliance on polluting and energy-intensive modes of travel and goods movement	Qualitative
	SA2*: Provides infrastructure to P promotes physical activity and health through active transportation and recreation	Qualitative
	SA3*: Improves climate resilience through mitigation of flooding and extreme heat impacts Improves climate resilience through infrastructure that mitigates the impacts of flooding and increased heat	Qualitative
	SA4*: Supports job creation in, and workforce transitions to green technology and infrastructure sectors	Qualitative/Quantitative
	SA5*: Improves cargo efficiencies to minimize trip volumes and emissions from goods movement activity	Qualitative/Quantitative
Concerns**	Potential for Displacements	Qualitative
	Potential for Physical Impacts (ROW)	Qualitative
	Potential for Increased Commute Times	Quantitative/Qualitative
	*Potential for Traffic Diversion / Emission Shifting	Quantitative
	*Potential for New Hot Spots (Congestion, AQ, Ped/Bike Safety)	Quantitative/Qualitative
	Potential Construction Impacts	Qualitative
	*Potential for VMT Increases	Quantitative

*Criteria being used as a proxy for health outcomes

** During the evaluation process for specific projects, if there are found to be negative impacts that are not captured by these concerns, the project team will consider adding new categories of concerns or documenting the impacts in some other way.

Project Considerations

Flags	Community Input Considerations (Flags)	Qualitative
	Equity Considerations (Flags)	Qualitative