



## Long Beach-East Los Angeles Corridor Mobility Investment Plan

### Community Leadership Committee (CLC) Meeting #20 Summary (Virtual)

October 10, 2023



## Attendees

### Project Team

Ray Sosa, Deputy Chief Planning & Development Officer, Metro  
 Michael Cano, Executive Officer of Countywide Planning & Development, Metro  
 Lilian De Loza-Gutierrez, Director, Community Relations, Metro  
 Akiko Yamagami, Transportation Manager of Countrywide Planning & Development, Metro  
 Jessica Medina, Manager, Equity and Race, Metro  
 Lucy Delgadillo, Project Manager, Highway Programs, Metro  
 Jeff Newman, Transportation Planner, Caltrans District 7  
 Amber Hawkes, Co-Director, HERE LA  
 Shannon Davis, Co-Director, HERE LA  
 Sofia Gulaid, Urban Designer HERE LA  
 Jon Overman, Cambridge Systematics  
 Lilia Scott, Cambridge Systematics  
 Robert Cáliz, Cal Strategic Management  
 Dave Levinsohn, Vice President, AECOM  
 Aryeh Cohen, Planner, AECOM  
 Erika Morales, Facilitator, Morales and Morales  
 Julia Lester, Principal, Ramboll  
 Susan DeSantis, Senior Project Manager, Arellano Associates  
 Melissa Holguin, Senior Project Manager, Arellano Associates  
 Laura Herrera, Project Manager, Arellano Associates  
 Nora Casillas, Deputy Project Manager, Arellano Associates  
 Trey Grogan, Project Coordinator, Arellano Associates  
 Eric Davidian, Project Coordinator, Arellano Associates  
 Leticia Bustamante, Assistant Project Coordinator, Arellano Associates

### CLC Members

	Name	Jurisdiction	In Attendance 10/10 (25 members)
1	Luis Mesa	Bell	Y
2	Natalie Rubio	Bell Gardens	Y
3	Emmanuel Godinez	Boyle Heights	
4	Fa'alagilagi (Langi) Meni-Siliga	Carson	Y
5	Alfonso Garate	Commerce	Y
6	Phyllis Ollison	Compton	Y
7	Irma Lopez	Cudahy	Y
8	Miyuki Gomez	East LA	Y
9	Guadalupe Arellano	East LA	Y
10	Kathleen Barajas	East LA	Y
11	Sinetta Farley	East/Rancho Dominguez	Y
12	Jose Rodolfo Vallejo	Huntington Park	Y
13	Dan Wamba	Lakewood	Y
14	Marcos Lopez	Long Beach	
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	Y
20	Andres Duarte	Montebello	Y
21	Esmeralda Hernandez	South Gate	Y
22	Viridiana (Viri) Preciado Cervantes	Walnut Park	Y
23	Tiesha Davis	San Pedro	Y
24	Manuel Arellano	Wilmington	Y
25	Dora Douglas	Vernon	Y
26	Susan Adams	At Large / En general	Y
27	Kevin Shin	At Large / En general	Y
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 Tuesday, October 10, 2023, from 5 – 7:30pm. The intent of this meeting was to: (1) Give an overview of where the project is and where it is going; (2) Present Draft Evaluation Findings; and (3) Discuss the draft evaluation in small groups.

### **Meeting Summary**

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

- Co-facilitators Shannon Davis and Amber Hawkes welcomed attendees and provided an overview of the agenda, along with an introduction to the project team, and conducted the CLC roll call. There were 25 CLC members in attendance and 8 members of the public.

#### **➤ Agenda Item #1: September Meeting Recap**

- The co-facilitators provided a high-level overview of the September Combined CLC and Task Force Meeting, which included:
  - Modifications to the project, including schedule changes, a revised approach to presenting information based on community feedback, and new added concern criterion.
  - Clarifications regarding the process, including how prioritization will take place and how prioritized projects are linked to available funding.
  - Discussions of key questions and concerns raised by the CLC and Task Force

- An overview of how projects were identified and how Special Corridor Programs were developed to address gaps identified by stakeholders.
- The meeting facilitators then provided an overview of the Zero Emission Work Group Meeting.
- There was no public comment for this agenda item.

➤ **Agenda Item #2: Overview of Where We Are and Where We Are Going**

- Co-facilitators Shannon Davis and Amber Hawkes introduced the topic of schedule and next steps, which includes project progress, schedule modifications, and critical path items. The goal was to provide CLC members with a clear understanding of the next few months, which will bring the project to its conclusion.
  - The project is currently at the *Evaluating & Refining Projects & Programs* stage.
    - This includes evaluating projects, tiering projects, and prioritizing projects and informing the next stage, which will be: *Creating an Investment & Policy Strategy for Implementation*.
  - The Special Meeting Schedule over the next three months includes:
    - Projects and programs will be organized into tiers for prioritization and presentation in November.
    - In November, the CLC will also have a test for Consensus.
    - There will be two meetings in November (16th and 30th) and no meeting in December, before resuming in January (date TBD).
    - The Investment Plan document has begun to be drafted and an update on the progress will be presented to the Metro Board in November.
    - The complete Draft Investment Plan will be presented to the Metro Board, Task Force, CLC, and LB-ELA communities in January 2024.
  - The Project Tiering / Prioritization Process key takeaways include:
    - Tier 1A projects will be prioritized for initial funding recommendations, but not all projects in this tier will receive funding in the initial recommendations.
    - Tier 2A projects/programs ready to implement can be “packaged” (bundled into a grouping or a comprehensive Program that covers multiple goals, projects and/or geographies) with other 2A projects or 1A projects for initial funding recommendations.
    - Tier 1B projects (may need to be refined or made more ready to be eligible for funding) will be put in a Modal Program for further refinement.
    - Tier 2B projects (not ready to be advanced toward implementation but could be eligible for planning funding and further refined) will be organized into Modal Programs as well.
    - Project Tiering determines where projects land (1A, 1B, 2A, or 2B).
    - Project Prioritization helps pick top projects within Tier 1A for initial funding recommendations or within 2A for “packaging” for initial funding recommendations.
    - Modal Programs will be initiated following the approval of the plan for the six main modes.

- **General CLC Questions and Comments on Agenda Item 2**
  - For prioritizing and tiering, is one more important than the other or are they basically even?
    - The full list of all the projects will go into the tiering. Project prioritization will only happen for the Tier 1A projects.
  - When considering the tiering of the projects, is there any weighting aside from the weighting already considered in the evaluation?
    - The technical team explained that the weighting is in progress/to be determined.
- **Public Comment**
  - Sorry to back track, but I noticed some CLC positions were still vacant, will they be filled?
    - The Project Team made concerted efforts to fill vacant seats with multiple rounds of reopening the application. However, at this point of the project schedule, there was a decision made to close the application process and not seek new members.

➤ **Agenda Item #3: Evaluation Draft Findings**

- Co-facilitators Davis and Hawkes emphasized that the Draft Evaluation Findings are the first piece of the puzzle, and that “Readiness” will also be considered as the Tiered Project List is generated. This is an important frame to use when reviewing the draft findings. In other words, just because a project rises to the top in the evaluation, it doesn’t necessarily mean that the project will have a high readiness.
- Key takeaways from the Draft Evaluation were then reviewed, including takeaways regarding projects that scored the highest in each mode and what they have in common, along with takeaways regarding project concerns. Example takeaways include:
  - Active Transportation Category: High scoring projects/programs include corridor-wide programs and those that serve both bikes and pedestrians.
  - Arterial Category: High scoring arterial projects and programs are those that serve multiple modes (supporting bike/ped or transit travel) and address safety, along with mobility.
  - Freeway Category: High scoring projects include interchange projects that also include bike/ped accommodations and corridor-wide programs that address multiple goal areas.
  - Goods Movement Category: High scoring freight projects and programs include those that address air quality/emissions as well as those that are multimodal.
  - Transit Category: High scoring transit projects and programs include those that offer new service as well as frequent and reliable service.
  - Projects that score well (high benefits) tend to: be regionally significant; Respond to multiple goals instead of just one; or sometimes also have more concerns.
  - Not all concerns are the same. Some can be mitigated, others cannot or are more difficult to mitigate.
- Meeting facilitators reminded the group of the goals and principles that informed the evaluation process. Then, they provided an orientation to the materials CLC members have

received and how they are organized including how to navigate the spreadsheets. This “tutorial” is available.

○ **General CLC Questions and Comments on Agenda Item 3**

- I am impressed with the tools as a decent way of supporting prioritization going into the tier process.
- Is the project team tracking the geographic distribution of projects all around the corridor?
  - All the projects will be mapped in the data dashboard, but we have not calculated the impact geographically in terms of where projects are located. The projects aren’t equally distributed, which shows the importance of the community programs that can help to fill in the gaps.
  - Michael Cano, LA Metro, noted that geography is important while it is also important to consider multimodal aspects and alignment with goals/principles.
  - Lack of funding is also a barrier for realizing projects. Metro is trying to figure out where there are deficiencies to make sure that the funding approved for the corridor supports the needs of the corridor. The Metro Board will be tracking the investments and dollar amounts.
- Will the Dashboard have public access?
  - Yes.
- Can you clarify: the table we received doesn’t account for project readiness and it’s entirely possible for some projects to score well according to these metrics but not be considered due to lack of readiness, right?
  - Yes.
- I live in West Long Beach; will any projects be taking place there? It is always forgotten.
  - The technical team will look at the project list to see if there are any other projects in that location, which we can do during the group discussions. In addition, make sure to look at the corridor-wide and “multiple-jurisdiction” projects.
- With the analysis going on, will that push things back further from the deadline or will the deadline remain the same?
  - The deadline will remain the same as discussed earlier in the meeting.
- Who is part of reviewing the analysis that will come next? Is CLC?
  - Yes, the CLC will participate in this in November, January and February, along with the Task Force. The CLC will review the Draft Investment Plan and continue discussions after the Metro Board presentation.

○ **Public Comment**

- Alright, so my question is just what the link is to see the scoresheet with the plus and minus signs that we can click to see the underlying scoring. The public document that was shared is not showing that for me, and either I just have the wrong link or it's not functioning as intended. I'll put my hand down now.
  - You may need to download the spreadsheet and click to unprotect the spreadsheet. There should not be a password to unprotect the workbook.

➤ **Agenda Item #4: Discussion Groups**

- The meeting group split into four discussion groups, primarily based on neighboring geographies along the corridor including:
  - Spanish Language Group (All communities)
  - North Corridor Group (Bell, Bell Gardens, Boyle Heights, Commerce, Cudahy, East LA, Huntington Park, Maywood, Montebello, Vernon, Walnut Park)
  - Central Corridor Group (Bellflower, Compton, East Rancho Dominguez, Lakewood, Lynwood, South Gate)
  - South Corridor Group (Carson, Long Beach, San Pedro, Signal Hill, Wilmington)
- The groups referenced the evaluation results and discussed preliminary comments, concerns, or questions.
- **Spanish Language Group Q&A**

➤ Comment/Question	
1	I want to pause. Someone asked if the projects that are not relevant are going to be eliminated, and we will keep only the practical ones. Is that accurate? Will projects be deleted?
2	I believe projects that are the most practical need to be adopted. The Metro Staff need to visit and tour these areas affected by these projects.
3	My concern is regarding the 103 Highway through Long Beach. This space is ugly and of high concern since there are schools there.
4	In the past meeting, we spoke about how those projects that aren't ready yet and how they could return. Is that the case?
5	Are there projects for West Long Beach?
6	I won't believe it until I see it. In Long Beach it is super dangerous to ride a bicycle. Let's not forget there are two freeway exits in that location. It is very dangerous.
7	My general question is what involvement do the adjacent cities to the 710 have? How will they contribute? Will they? It is my understanding that cities are another avenue to get funds.

○ **North Corridor Group Q&A**

➤ Comment/Question	
1	I actually have a question about what Amber shared about community projects - something about them being considered along the lines of equity or something. Do you mind going over that info again?
2	I also have concerns about anything zero emissions in here because I worry about the use of hydrogen and I'm not sure if the detrimental impacts of hydrogen are considered.
3	I would like to be part of the ZET group, as I drive an electric vehicle for work and commute on the 710 daily.
4	Can you demonstrate how to sort by the highest scoring to lowest?
5	I can't maneuver the tabs so that they are side by side with benefits and concerns. I can't imagine how those with hard copies will flip back and forth.
6	I think to do some contrasting is beneficial when looking at something that's highly rated. It's good to see how the concern factors correlate to benefits.
7	There was a slide up earlier in the presentation that discussed how equity was incorporated into the Community Programs, can we revisit that?
8	I don't see any projects that benefit the East LA area.
9	The ZET Program project description is a lot of money. The project description should be clear and considered. There is too much traffic congestion in this area. Thinking long-term: where is

	the area/location? What will be displaced? Would we put charging stations over a park? This needs much more information and clarity because it is the highest rated.
--	--

○ **Central Corridor Group Q&A**

➤ Comment/Question	
1	What are the abbreviations at the top of the sheet?
2	As far as scoring, were the professionals on the project team in their particular field such as "Air Quality" the experts pulled in to qualify the scoring and ensure the accuracy of the scores?
3	In terms of the Task Force, were there any stakeholders there that are transportation professionals that helped craft these scores?
4	It appears that the programs are concepts while projects are actual infrastructure ideas that will have a higher chance to be implemented, is this true?
5	Are we just conducting the scoring now or will there be analysis of these scores being done coincidentally?
6	What is the best suggestion to help digest and go through all the scores to make sure I know how to properly analyze this document?
7	How long do we have to analyze and digest all this information?

○ **South Corridor Group Q&A**

➤ Comment/Question	
1	Carson had one project in there with 4 concerns. I want to make sure the Carson project made it through and got funding. The project has benefits but it also has concerns; is this an issue?
2	On a broad level I understand the criteria. I want to make sure the investments being made will be beneficial in the long term and keep away from further freeway expansion that has larger detrimental effects. Investments need to create communities that are people-oriented rather than car-oriented.
3	Why wasn't it printed on legal paper? Did you run out of that size paper? It's more challenging for me to digest. I'm referring to what was mailed to me. I know we're trying to save trees. The ledger size made it easier for me to write notes.
4	How will "Equity" benefit the community. How will equity be distributed so there is more revenue to the city and there is less debt.  How will equity be disbursed in the city? When the construction starts to move how will equity be considered, in particular relating to the jobs that will be created?  In the beginning we also talked about housing and health access and sustainability. How can we ensure the success of projects in the long term, instead of just be a flash in the pan?
5	Can we look at the Goods Movement projects, Freeway Projects, and Active Transportation?
6	I want to know if it's movements of project or movements of something else but it's completely different than I thought it was going to be. But it's a good different, so thank you.
7	(Freeway projects) Can we scroll up and see what the highest scoring freeway projects are?
8	(Community Programs) Since you mentioned the community, is there a project or program that stresses the importance of using community members for the jobs that will be created?

➤ **Agenda Item #5: Group Report Out**

- The discussion groups then reported out the key takeaways from their discussions:
  - **Robert Cáliz (Spanish Language Group Facilitator)** noted that they discussed projects that are not immediately ready but will need to provide a path forward

on how these projects can move forward to implementation at a later date. There was concern that this process would be used to eliminate projects. Staff emphasized that the evaluation process is not designed to eliminate projects. Rather, what we are aiming to do is to provide a process on what a project sponsor would need to do to move the project forward to project readiness and qualify for funding from the Investment Plan. The group then showed how to use the evaluation criteria results on a couple of projects to understand the process.

- **Erika Morales (North Group Facilitator):** The group spent time discussing how to use the spreadsheet (most people were using the hard copies), then they discussed scoring concerns vs benefits, scoring by mode, and the benefits and concerns around ZET project LB-ELA\_0004: Long Beach-East Los Angeles Corridor Clean Truck Program, for example.
- **Shannon Davis (Central Group Facilitator):** The group spent time talking about how the spreadsheet is organized, looked at different ways to organize the data, and discussed different ways to review at the spreadsheet (e.g. jurisdiction, projects you’ve been tracking throughout), and how/when to provide feedback.
- **Amber Hawkes (South Group Facilitator):** The group noted that the projects prioritized are forward-looking. They looked at Freeway and Goods Movement projects to see what ranked high/low. The initial feeling of some of the group members was that scoring seemed accurate and reflected the goals of the project. The group also had a discussion about equity, relating to geographic distribution and whether economic programs/job creation programs would be spread equally.

➤ **Closing Remarks**

- Meeting facilitators described the progress on two federal grant applications and one state grant application, which were recently submitted on behalf of the project.
- The meeting closed with a word of thanks and a reminder of upcoming meetings:
  - Task Force Meeting: October 23
  - CLC Meetings: November 16 and November 30
- **There was no public comment for this agenda item.**

➤ **CLC Comment for Closing Remarks**

- CLC members noted that they appreciated the Spanish language group with Robert Cálix to further understand the content.

➤ **Meeting 17 Q&A (Chat)**

Comment/Question	
1	The information is being shared too quickly
2	I did not receive the packet. Can you place a copy in the chat?
3	Personally, I am digesting what has been shared up to this point this evening.
4	When considering the tiering of the projects, is there any weighting aside from the weighting already considered in the evaluation?
5	Sorry to back track, but I noticed some CLC positions were still vacant, will they be filled?
6	The LB-ELA Multimodal Corridor Plan Draft Eval Results document that was mailed to us is not filtered/ordered from highest scoring to lowest scoring, right?

7	I am impressed with the tools as a decent way of supporting prioritization going into the tier process
8	Has there been an analysis done on how the projects are distributed across the region geographically? What about an analysis of the distribution of dollars across the different project/program categories? Distribution of dollars geographically?
9	Will the Dashboard have public access?
10	Can I clarify: the table we received doesn't account for project readiness and it's entirely possible for some projects to score well according to these metrics, but to not be considered due to lack of readiness, right?
11	Alright, so my question is just what the link is to see the scoresheet with the plus and minus signs that we can click to see the underlying scoring. The public document that was shared is not showing that for me, and either I just have the wrong link or it's not functioning as intended. I'll put my hand down now.
12	My usual question -- are there any projects for the 103 Freeway in Long Beach?