



Long Beach-East Los Angeles Corridor Mobility Investment Plan

Community Leadership Committee (CLC) Meetings #21 and #22 Summary

November 16 and 30, 2023 | Held Virtually



Attendees

Attendees

Project Team

- Michael Cano, 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
- 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
- Adrian Farran, Project Coordinator, Arellano Associates
- Trey Grogan, Project Coordinator, Arellano Associates
- Jon Overman, Cambridge Systematics
- Lilia Scott, Cambridge Systematics
- Robert Cáliz, Cal Strategic Management
- Dave Levinsohn, AECOM
- Aryeh Cohen, AECOM
- Alice Tyree – Caltrans

CLC Members AA PLEASE ADD ATTENDANCE

	Name	Jurisdiction	In Attendance Nov 16	In Attendance Nov 30
1	Luis Mesa	Bell	Yes	Yes
2	Natalie Rubio	Bell Gardens	Yes	Yes
3	Emmanuel Godinez	Boyle Heights	Yes	
4	Langi Meni-Siliga	Carson	Yes	Yes
5	Alfonso Garate	Commerce		Yes
6	Phyllis Ollison	Compton	Yes	Yes
7	Irma Lopez	Cudahy	Yes	Yes
8	Miyuki Gomez	East LA	Yes	
9	Guadalupe Arellano	East LA		
10	Kathleen Barajas	East LA	Yes	Yes
11	Sinetta Farley	East/Rancho Dominguez	Yes	Yes
12	Jose Rodolfo Vallejo	Huntington Park	Yes	Yes
13	Dan Wamba	Lakewood	Yes	
14	Marcos Lopez	Long Beach	Yes	Yes
15	Maria Reyes	Long Beach	Yes	Yes
16	Marlene Sanchez	Long Beach	Yes	Yes
17	Elizabeth Zamarripa	Lynwood	Yes	Yes
18	Aide Castro	Lynwood	Yes	Yes
19	Jamila Cervantes	Maywood		
20	Andres Duarte	Montebello		Yes

21	Esmeralda Hernandez	South Gate	Yes	Yes
22	Viridiana (Viri) Preciado Cervantes	Walnut Park	Yes	
23	Tiesha Davis	San Pedro	Yes	Yes
24	Manuel Arellano	Wilmington	Yes	
25	Dora Douglas	Vernon	Yes	
26	Susan Adams	At Large / En general		Yes
27	Kevin Shin	At Large / En general	Yes	Yes
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 Meetings for the *Long Beach – East LA Corridor Mobility Investment Plan* were held on Thursday, November 16, and Thursday, November 30, 2023 from 5:00 – 7:00pm. The meetings aimed to:

- (1) Recap Previous Meetings
- (2) Discuss Draft Tiering Results and Test for Consensus
- (3) Test for Consensus on Results
- (4) Review Freeway Improvements

The CLC had two meetings to go over the Draft Tiering Results in November. In the first meeting, the CLC saw the draft results. In the second meeting, the CLC had more time to delve deeper into comments and take a Test for Consensus.

Meeting #21 Summary (November 16)

- **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 22 CLC members in attendance.
 - Co-facilitators then reviewed the meeting agenda.
- **Agenda Item #1: Previous Meetings Recap**
 - Co-facilitators presented Task Force Meeting #25 recap information from October 23, which focused on reviewing the Draft Evaluation Results. In addition, some of the comments received from the CLC in the Meeting #20 (October 10) were reviewed.
 - The schedule was presented, along with a Look Ahead for the next few months.
 - Key points from past meetings were covered, including:

- Funding available. There is \$693m of Metro Measure funds available to be leveraged for the overall need (i.e. project list). The projects and programs on the list include more than \$6 billion of potential costs.
 - CLC question: How do we determine how much funding projects will receive?
 - Costs vary by project type. Part of the allocation process will look at how much the project costs and what sorts of leveraging (of local funds, for example) is possible, which will then help determine how much funding from Measure R and Measure M will be allocated.
- Tiers. Projects and programs on the list have been split into tiers, which represent different levels of “scoring” and “readiness.” Projects not selected for the first batch of Metro investment will be further refined within “Modal Programs.”
- Transparency. All changes will be shown in a redlined version of the evaluation results and reasons for any changes will be shared.
- Concerns. Concerns are incorporated into tiering based on the concern “stage of development.” Outcome concerns are less mitigatable and therefore influencing tiering. Design and construction concerns are more mitigatable and therefore do not influence tiering, but may impact funding priorities for Tier 1A.
- Equity. Equity has been folded into all phases of the project, from start to finish. Some examples include: folding equity into the Guiding Principles and Goals, multi-lingual outreach, and application of the Equity Planning and Evaluation Tool (EPET).
- Executive Management Committee Update
 - The Committee met before the CLC meeting today. They heard about our project’s process. The Board is excited about the project and is looking for the CLC and TF to deliver the draft plan in the new year. This was a “receive and file” committee meeting, so no specific action was taken.
- **CLC Questions and Comments**
 - Because funding is limited, will the projects need to look for additional funding?
 - Yes, funding will need to be leveraged to fully cover project costs.
 - Schedules and budgets usually are larger than originally intended. Will cushions be assumed to protect against these issues?
 - Each project cost estimate includes a contingency for unforeseen circumstances and delays.
 - Will the recent I-10 problems impact our work relating to what we are trying to accomplish (ranking and priorities, etc.) and funding availability?
 - We have a set-aside already from Measures R and M, so this amount will not change, but it does impact leverage and what grants are available. Overtime there is a lot of competition for funding. The Mayor of LA is advocating for specific funding relating to the I-10, so ideally that would not impact our project in regard to funding.
 - Emergencies are typically dealt with quickly. The 710 Plan has a long timeframe, so this emergency does not affect the analysis done to date.
- **Public Comment: No comments**

- **Agenda Item #2: Draft Tiering Results**

- Shannon Davis opened the agenda item by reminding the CLC about the difference between the four tiers. We will be focusing today on Tier 1 projects and programs.
- Tier 1 and Tier 2 are based on the evaluation results, including scoring from the outcome concerns. The top 40% of all projects within each mode are placed in Tier 1.
- The benefit score multiplied by the benefit score reduction creates the draft ranking score.
- Tier A and Tier B were defined as being based on the “readiness.” Different modes and programs have different readiness thresholds to determine what is “short” versus “long” term. Projects that are already funded or under construction were removed.
- The CLC then reviewed the draft results for each category by mode, along with preliminary feedback about the list. Up to 10 Tier 1A and 1B examples were included for each category. The project ID, name, draft ranking score, and draft tier were included.
- Community Programs were reviewed because they may have a different pathway to implementation, compared to the other programs and projects on the list. All community programs have advanced into Tier 1 because of their importance to the community.
- Removed projects were displayed, including 6 projects that were either already under construction or fully funded.
- Finally, the Test for Consensus was introduced, and co-facilitators mentioned that the goal was to come to consensus in the second November meeting. Draft Test for Consensus Statement: “I support moving forward with the LB-ELA tiering results.”
- **CLC Questions and Comments (including responses from the “round-robin” where each CLC member was asked to speak).**
 - CLC concern was expressed about the reduction percentages for project concerns.
 - Similarly, the idea was brought up that perhaps the intensity of the concern or the cost related to each concern should factor into the calculation of scoring reduction.
 - There is a lot of work already underway on Artesia, why is that project still on the list?
 - The full 19 miles of that project is not fully funded, which is why the project should remain on the list.
 - I think the team did a good job narrowing it down; this was a challenging task. I am happy with how this has progressed.
 - I am OK with the results and do not have any questions currently.
 - I am fine with the results and do not have any questions.
 - I feel good about the results.
 - I am good with the results and have no concerns currently.
 - I am Ok with this and glad to see the results address most of our concerns, but I’d like more time to digest the results.
 - I can go along with the majority of the CLC.
 - The methodology creates a logical basis for the tiering. I’d like to continue looking at the list.
 - I am satisfied, but I’d like to know more about the weighting of the concerns.
 - I would like more clarity about some of the projects, especially about their development.
 - I don’t have any comments but would like to review this all again before deciding one way or another.

- No concerns or questions; I feel comfortable. I'd like to continue to hear other CLC feedback.
- I'd like more details about the concerns.
- I would like to go along with what others are saying.
- No comment currently.
- What I've heard largely makes sense.
- I have no problems with this content currently.
- I am not in agreement with the concern percentages.
- Street lighting is important for safety.
- **Public Comment: one comment**
 - Is the tiered list living? How do we make sure that some of the 1B projects might become more of a priority when they become more "ready"?

Co-facilitators Amber and Shannon, along with Jessica Medina from LA Metro closed the Meeting #21 with a reminder regarding CLC Meeting #22 at the end of the month. Read below for the summary of Meeting #22.

Meeting #22 Summary (November 30)

- **Introductions, Welcome, Agenda Review, Meeting Objectives**
 - Host Laura Herrera welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the meeting logistics.
 - Co-facilitators Shannon Davis and Amber Hawkes welcomed attendees, reminded everyone of the project team members. Shannon noted that this will be Susan Adams' last meeting and thanked her for her time and dedication to the CLC. Shannon then conducted the CLC roll call. There were 19 CLC members in attendance.
 - Co-facilitators reviewed the meeting agenda.
- **Agenda Item #1: Previous Meetings Recap**
 - Co-facilitator Amber reviewed where we are in the project schedule and the look ahead for the next three months.
 - The team has added a meeting on December 14th, 2023 for a discussion on funding and project prioritization.
 - Shannon provided a high-level overview of the previous CLC and Task Force Meetings, which included:
 - Noted that some CLC members were happy with the tiering results.
 - Some members had a desire to have more time to review the tiering results.
 - Some CLC members wanted to better understand the thresholds for the "Benefit Score Reduction" and suggested to adjust this calculation to better account for projects with more concerns.
 - The meeting facilitators provided an overview of recent Small Group Meetings including Air Quality, Local Jurisdictions, CEHAJ, Freight and Transportation.
 - The meeting facilitators reminded the CLC about key points regarding funding from past meetings.

- \$693 million of Metro Measure funds available but the project list exceeds this cost.
- All community programs have been promoted to Tier 1 priority.
- **CLC Comments/Questions on Agenda Item #1 :**
 - A CLC member asked to hear again about the funding sources and amounts.
 - Shannon reiterated that funding includes \$193 million from Measure R (Fiscal Year 2023), \$250 million from Measure M (FY2026), and an additional \$250 million from Measure M (Fiscal Year 2032).
 - A CLC member asked about the dollar amount of funding available for LB-ELA Corridor and when it will be available.
 - Shannon mentioned that this number represents LA Metro funding only and doesn't include grants. Funds are realized in the fiscal years 2026 and 2032 through the respective measures. As a result, there will be no access to the funds until those specific fiscal years.
 - A CLC member asked about CLC alternates and if they could be identified.
 - Amber responded that this was useful feedback for the future, however at this time new CLC members will not be brought into the process.
 - A CLC member asked if there is a timeframe to begin projects related to Measure R (2023) and if we will lose any funding.
 - Jessica Medina from LA Metro mentioned that the fiscal funding runs from July – June, but that Measure R funding is already solidified.
 - A CLC member asked if any CLC members with habitual absences could be replaced.
 - Amber and Laura confirmed that they instituted a policy for people who miss more than 3 meetings. There have been 3 times where CLC members were replaced because they were absent repeatedly.
 - It's concerning that we haven't secured additional funds to support all our projects. Ensuring we address the needs and carry out all planned initiatives for our communities is crucial.
 - The CLC should treat stormwater management and retention projects with greater importance, for example the LA River.
 - A CLC member asked in the chat: "Quick clarification question: the funding available from the various tax measures, are the amounts mentioned specifically for the LB-ELA Corridor or for all projects across the region?"
 - Jessica responded that these are specific to the corridor.
- **Public Comment: No comments**

- **Agenda Item #2: Draft Evaluation Results**

- Key aspects of the Draft Tiering Results include:
 - Difference between Tier 1 and Tier 2, including that 40% of projects within each mode have been categorized into Tier 1
 - How scoring is calculated
- Any changes made to the scoring will be shared with the CLC members.
- Two themes came up through comments by CLC members during the last meeting:
 - Comment 1: Reduction percentages for the outcome concerns seemed off.
 - The technical team shared three scenarios to respond to this comment:

- Scenario 1: Keeping tiering the same
 - Scenario 2: Create even thresholds for benefit score reduction
 - Creating even thresholds didn't make a lot of changes to the tiering.
 - Scenario 3: Increased benefit score reduction for projects with more concerns
 - More projects were moved between Tier 1 and Tier 2
- **CLC Discussion on Comment 1:**
 - I have seen so many accidents and people run over that Mirador these days in Long Beach and other areas in LA. With so many streets with construction work makes me think that these projects must comply with safe measures and strategies during their construction and also when the project is finished that are used daily.
 - The numbers in Scenario 2 do not make that much of a difference. The CLC member appreciated the different scenarios, but felt that projects with several concerns (9, 10, etc.) should be removed/no longer considered.
 - Amber asked if flagging could come in play here.
 - Aryeh Cohen from AECOM and the technical team mentioned that projects with the highest benefit often have the highest concerns because they span many cities, require larger infrastructure changes, etc.
 - Can we see the scenario comparisons again?
 - Could we have yellow flags in addition to red flags? Is that something that could be talked about or implemented?
 - Aryeh mentioned that the flags are coming from community members and are not related to the evaluation process.
 - Can you re-explain the scenario tables?
 - Amber explained that there are 10 possible outcome concerns, and Aryeh mentioned that a project can have a high score in one area but a high concern in that area.
- **Comment 2: Need more information about Community Programs**
 - Amber and Shannon mentioned that all Community Programs advanced into Tier 1.
 - Aryeh mentioned that Community Programs aren't "competing" with the other projects.
 - Amber explained that the Community Programs have a specific path forward. As a part of the investment plan, Metro will identify sponsors for these programs and this will be discussed in more detail at the Equity Working Group meeting on December 4th.
- **CLC Discussion on Comment 2:**
 - Can these slides be shared around? The results are very complicated as presented.
 - Three CLC members shared that they were good with the tiering.

- Appreciate the time spent on this. In light of how limited the changes were after tweaking the benefit reduction, I would be comfortable taking a test for consensus.

- **Agenda Item #3: Test for Consensus**

- Co-facilitators Amber and Shannon led the Test For Consensus based on the statement “I support moving forward with the LB-ELA tiering results” and went through the list of CLC members one by one to test consensus.
- 16 CLC members supported the results, and 2 members could live with the results. Some members were absent. AA TO CONFIRM

- **Agenda Item #4: Freeway Improvements**

- Amber and Shannon reviewed Freeway Improvement projects, including more detail about the types of projects included in the Project List.
- What is included:
 - Mainline safety and operational improvements
 - Interchanges
 - Overcrossings
 - Technology
- Not Included:
 - Widening
 - Full freeway to freeway interchanges
 - General purpose lanes
 - Projects with major displacement
- Amber and Shannon reviewed the definition of Mainline, Interchange Safety Improvements, Overcrossing Safety Improvements, technology improvements, and related projects.
- Amber and Shannon outlined the path forward for all Freeway projects. They shared a diagram that outlined the process from the Final Corridor Mobility Investment Plan until Project Completion.

- **CLC Comments/Questions on Agenda Item #4**

- A CLC member had a question about congestion pricing and needed clarification on what that project entails.
 - Aryeh said that this potential project is being studied outside of this process and a lot of concerns have been raised both within the technical team’s analysis and in general.
 - Lilian De Loza Gutierrez from LA Metro mentioned that they are also using congestion pricing on express lanes, but the CLC member mentioned that the project references tolling rather than express lanes. Jon Overman from Cambridge Systematics mentioned that congestion pricing is essentially more intricate tolling, but it can vary which lanes (express lanes or all lanes).
 - A CLC member mentioned that it would be an issue if people had to pay per use of the 710. The 710 is for community. There is no other straight way to get from East LA to Long Beach. There is no alternative. If one is trying to get to Shoreline Village or the Port, there is no alternative. That is an equity issue, and she has a problem with that.

- Michael Cano from LA Metro mentioned that it is just a concept at the moment. It would need a lot of time to develop.
- Would EVs be charged a fee?
- There are no service roads. In Dallas, every car needs a toll tag to use the freeway.
- Oregon is studying congestion pricing.
- Jessica mentioned that this project is also doing an equity analysis and that their office is meeting with them to discuss the equity impacts.
- Would there be displacement of residents in order to acquire private property?
 - Jessica said that purchasing private property would include some displacement but we do not know that will happen at this stage. They do have a board directive that we want to minimize displacement so we can share more about that in the next meeting.
 - A CLC member added a comment about the importance of providing assistance for individuals if they are displaced.
 - Lilian agreed that anyone displaced would receive market value compensation.
- A CLC member wanted to review Step 1 of the Freeway Project Path.
- A CLC member asked about the availability of governmental subsidies for individuals looking to purchase zero-emission or electric trucks.
- A CLC member emphasized her concern about the issue of displacement and clarified that she does not support it.
- A CLC member recommended that the CLC hold a Christmas meeting where CLC members and people of the community can come together.

Co-facilitators Amber and Shannon closed the meeting with a reminder regarding the CLC Meeting #23 on December 14, and encouraged CLC members to attend the Equity Working Group meeting on December 4.