



# Long Beach-East LA Mobility Corridor Investment Plan Community Leadership Committee (CLC) Meeting #23 Summary

*December 14, 2023 | Held Virtually*



**Attendees**

**Project Team**

- Michael Cano, Executive Officer, Metro
- Lilian De Loza Gutierrez, Community Relations Director, Metro
- KeAndra Cylear-Dodds, Executive Officer, Equity and Race, Metro
- Jessica Medina, Manager, Equity and Race, Metro
- Lucy Delgadillo, Project Manager, Highway Programs, Metro
- Amber Hawkes, Co-Director, HERE
- Shannon Davis, Co-Director, HERE
- Sofia Gulaid, Urban Designer HERE
- Melissa Holguin, Senior Project Manager, Arellano Associates
- Susan DeSantis, Senior Project Manager, Arellano Associates
- Laura Herrera, Deputy Project Manager, Arellano Associates
- Trey Grogan, Project Coordinator, Arellano Associates
- Parker Wojciechowski, Assistant Project Coordinator, Arellano Associates
- Robert Cáliz, Cal Strategic Management
- Dave Levinsohn, AECOM
- Aryeh Cohen, AECOM
- Alice Tyree, Caltrans

Julia Lester, Ramboll

- Ernesto Morales, North Star Alliances
- Chris Degroof, North Star Alliances

**CLC Members**

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

	Name	Jurisdiction	In Attendance Dec 14
18	Aide Castro	Lynwood	Yes
19	Jamila Cervantes	Maywood	
20	Andres Duarte	Montebello	Yes
21	Esmeralda Hernandez	South Gate	
22	Viridiana (Viri) Preciado Cervantes	Walnut Park	Yes
23	Tiesha Davis	San Pedro	
24	Manuel Arellano	Wilmington	Yes
25	Dora Douglas	Vernon	
26	Kevin Shin	At Large / En general	Yes
27	Open / Abierto	At Large / En general	
28	Open / Abierto	Bellflower	
29	Open / Abierto	Downey	
30	Open / Abierto	Paramount	
31	Open / Abierto	Signal Hill	

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.

This month’s Community Leadership Committee Meeting for the *Long Beach – East LA Corridor Mobility Investment Plan* was held on Thursday, December 14, 2023, from 5 – 7:00pm. The meeting aimed to:

- (1) Recap Previous Meetings
- (2) Confirm the CLC’s Desired Approach to the New Vacancy in the Coordinating Committee
- (3) Discuss the Funding and Implementation Strategy
- (4) Provide a Community Engagement Update
- (5) Lay Out the Next Steps for Plan Review & Adoption in the Near Year

### **Meeting #23 Summary (December 14<sup>th</sup>)**

- **Introductions, Welcome, Agenda Review, Meeting Objectives**
  - Host Laura Herrera welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed meeting logistics.
  - Co-facilitators Shannon Davis and Amber Hawkes welcomed attendees, reminded everyone of the project team and conducted the CLC roll call. There were 18 CLC members in attendance.
  - Co-facilitators then outlined the agenda for the meeting.
- **Agenda Item #1: Previous Meetings Recap**
  - Co-facilitators Amber and Shannon reviewed the timeline and explained that the draft Investment Plan will be released in the new year. Public participation for the Draft Plan review starts in January.

- Co-facilitators reviewed what we heard in the November meetings, including:
  - CLC reached Consensus on the Draft Tiering Results presented (16 “I support”, 2 “I can live with”).
  - Key comments on the Draft Tiering Results received in November and December such as:
    - Finding a way to treat Community Programs as special priorities with a different implementation trajectory.
    - Suggestion to clarify the Community Outreach Strategy and to engage CBOs (community based organizations) early and often.
    - Request for maps that show the geographic locations of Tier 1 projects.
      - Co-facilitator, Amber mentioned that the forthcoming dashboard will map the projects in this way and that sample maps were provided in the recent Task Force meeting.
    - Comments about finding Tier A and B labels confusing.
    - Request to clarify how the “flags” will be used.
    - Request to confirm NEPA/CEQA processes for Freeway Improvements.
- Amber then reviewed the comments from the December 11<sup>th</sup> Task Force Meeting #27 including:
  - Complete Streets projects potentially having a negative impact on traffic.
  - Suggesting we use a different threshold for each mode (type of project).
  - Asking how community feedback informs prioritization.
  - Requesting certain projects to be moved to Tier 1 and Tier 2.
    - Amber discussed that the technical team will not change projects from tiers based on one person’s request and that any edits made with supporting data will be shown (expected in January 2024).
- Shannon reviewed the Proposed Tiering Framework, specifically the improvements proposed by the technical team to address the comment about the confusion between the labels for Tiers A and B.
  - The proposed update from the technical team clarifies that Tier "A" does not always signify priority.
    - TIER 1 – Good alignment with corridor vision, goals, and guiding principles
    - TIER 2 – Partial alignment with corridor vision, goals, and guiding principles
- **CLC Questions and Comments**
  - A CLC member asked if this will change any of the projects in the current Tiers and if will they move up or down in the tiering.
    - Shannon mentioned that this new framing will not change where projects fall in Tier 1 or Tier 2.
    - Jessica Medina, LA Metro, said that some members of the technical team are not here today, but that a few projects may go up and down during the process based on additional data and information received, but that any changes to the projects will be shown.

- A CLC member asked if anything is happening on the Randolph Bike & Pedestrian Project (LB-ELA 0066). There are some residents that are asking about that project and whether it is happening.
    - Amber followed up on this with “The Randolph project is in Tier 2, however please remember that the Tier is not completely indicative of priority or funding. For example, the Randolph project is a good candidate for funding because it ranks highly in Metro's Active Transportation Strategic Plan.”
- **Agenda Item #2: Coordinating Committee Update**
  - Amber explained that we are asking the CLC to nominate and confirm a new member for the Coordinating Committee (CC) due to a recent vacancy.
  - Facilitator Laura gave a refresher on what the Coordinating Committee does and mentioned that one of the two CLC Coordinating committee members, Viri, resigned on 12/11 due to scheduling conflicts. She took a moment to thank Viri for her service for almost two years.
    - Viri explained that she is resigning due to work scheduling conflicts and wanting to put 100% effort on behalf of the CLC, but is now not able to, because of her scheduling conflicts. She expressed her appreciation for the opportunity to contribute to the CC.
    - Robert Calix thanked Viri for her participation and how much she contributed throughout her time on the CC and how he was thankful to Viri for representing the youth voice, even while finishing up her college education.
  - Laura brought up a nomination for the vacancy, CLC member Phyllis Ollison.
    - Phyllis mentioned that she would like to learn more about the position, thanked the team for the nomination, and expressed her happiness with being considered.
    - CLC member, Sinetta Farley, congratulated Phyllis on her nomination and mentioned that she is glad to have her represent the community too.
    - The CLC voted for Phyllis to represent the CLC on the CC and Phyllis thanked the CLC for their vote.
  - **Public Comment: No comments**
- **Agenda Item #3: Funding and Implementation Strategy**
  - Co-facilitator, Amber reviewed the progress made by the technical team to identify methods for funding and implementation.
  - She then reviewed the overall funding pathways for the different Tiers.
  - Then, Shannon described potential implementation pathways identified for example Community Programs.
  - Shannon also reminded the CLC that Metro will create an opportunity to give technical assistance to agencies and jurisdictions with development of projects, if they are in need of this.
  - Amber reviewed the considerations that will go into Funding Prioritization and Implementation.

- She reminded the CLC that the plan is multimodal and mentioned that there is not a specific allocation of funding per mode that is set yet.
- Projects and programs from each of the six modes will be recommended for funding, and recommended projects will often serve multiple modes.
- Metro does not anticipate fully funding projects, rather funding will need to be leveraged from multiple sources.
- Total Measures R/M funding is only enough to fund a small amount of the overall need.
- Funding potential and political agency support are two key factors related to funding and implementation.
- Shannon then reviewed some strategies for Funding, including Project Phasing (phasing a project over time) and Project Packaging (creating synergies between complementary projects and bundling them together).
- Shannon explained that there are different sources of funding (including varying grant sources) for different modes.
- She explained the idea of project refinement (i.e., modal programs used to refine and further develop lower-scoring and less-ready projects).
- Co-facilitators Shannon and Amber then reviewed Concerns and Flags and how they will be used.
  - Amber reminded the CLC that the one type of Concern that was used in project scoring was an “Outcome” concern.
  - “Design” and “Construction” Concerns did not factor into the scoring, but may be used during Prioritization to influence the priority of a project.
  - Shannon reminded the CLC that an “Equity Flag” is raised when a project has 5 or more Concerns and at least 1/3 of the project area is located within an Equity Focus Community (EFC).
  - A Community Input Consideration Flag is raised when multiple community members express concern about that particular project.
  - Projects that receive Equity and/or Community Input Considerations Flags (which are meant to follow a project for its full life), may be de-prioritized.
  - Metro will recommend in the Investment Plan what sorts of actions can be taken to address the issues.
  - The co-facilitators showed a draft funding timeline that depicted different steps where funding would be needed for each type of project and listed potential grant funding sources that are being considered.
- **CLC Questions and Comments**
  - A CLC member asked if Metro would fully fund a small project, if the cost was not too significant.
    - Yes, Metro could consider that.
  - A CLC member asked if funding will be taken from private investors, or if the plan is only considering public sources of funding.
    - The focus of the Investment Plan is on public funding.
  - A CLC member asked for the facilitators to provide more detail on the differences between the Equity and Community Input Consideration Flags.

- Equity Flags are included for projects that have 5 or more Concerns and that are located in an Equity Focus Community (EFC). Community Input Consideration Flags were taken from feedback from the community, including the flagging activity that the CLC did in a previous in-person meeting.
  - Jessica Medina, from LA Metro, mentioned that Community Input Consideration Flags can also be positive, for example if there was a lot of support from the community.
  - A CLC member mentioned that yesterday he went to a committee meeting and heard the testimony of a woman who lives adjacent to the 710 Freeway. She mentioned that cars and trucks on the Freeway spread a polluting dust. He would like to invite the woman to share this story with the CLC.
    - Other CLC members agreed.
    - Amber reminded CLC members that reducing negative environmental impacts like pollution is a key goal of the project.
  - A CLC member asked if the flagging exercise was part of the tiering or separate.
    - Jessica mentioned that the Flags are separate from the tiering exercise (done afterward) but are related.
  - A CLC member asked if pollution refers to air or car pollution?
    - The technical team confirmed that it is referring to both.
- **Public Comment: No comments**

- **Agenda Item #3: Community Engagement Update**

- Edgar Guttierrez from the Engagement Team described the Community Engagement Plan and the activities that are already taking place. He went over the TF, CLC, and Small Group activities. A CBO roundtable was held in November and the Story Map (online) has been updated to make the community familiar with the effort and help them know how to get involved when the Draft Investment Plan is released in the new year.
- Edgar also mentioned that the team is trying to make the engagement as inclusive as possible, since there is a large geographic study area. Both virtual and in-person engagement will be offered, and they plan to do pop ups at places where people already go.
- Edgar said that there will be over 40 activities, not including the viewing opportunities for the online engagement.
- Edgar described the notification planned, including traditional tactics (flyers, posters, door-to-door) and online tactics (social media, website, etc.)
- The team has reached out to over 100 CBOs. As of now, they have 28 CBOs involved specifically, which are all headquartered in, or serve, Equity Focus Communities (EFCs) in the area.
- Overall CBO partner responsibilities including participating in roundtable meetings and providing recommendations for strengthening and/or supporting suggested methods, as well as conducting outreach.
- There are two types of activities: notification activities (e.g. social media activities, banners, phone and text outreach) and engagement activities, which are more involved

(e.g. staffing information booths and pop-ups at local community events, hosting a venue for people to watch the virtual meeting, etc.).

○ **CLC Comments & Questions:**

- A CLC member asked if the team has considered ELA Civic Center.
- A CLC member asked if the Compton meeting is being held at East Rancho Dominguez Park and if City Hall has been contacted in each city.
- A CLC member asked if there will be a grand opening for community engagement or for the project.
  - There is no celebration or grand opening planned at this stage.
- A CLC member said that she has a contact in Compton that she would like to share with the outreach team.

○ **Public Comment: No comments**

● **Closing Remarks**

*Co-facilitators Amber and Shannon closed the meeting with a reminder about the next CLC Meeting on January 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2024. The facilitators gave a huge thank you to the CLC members for their continued participation and many CLC members wished the other members and the team happy holidays and a great new year.*

***Congratulations CLC members on a great year,  
and thank you for all your hard work,  
as we move toward the Draft Implementation Plan!  
We will see you in 2024.***