



710 Task Force

Draft 710 Task Force Governance Structure

Background: The 710 Task Force is a collaborative process led by Metro and Caltrans District 7 to convene a robust and diverse array of approximately 50 community, industry, public and private stakeholders that are impacted by or dependent upon the movement of people and goods through the 710 Corridor, inclusive of local communities adjacent to the I-710 South freeway.

The 710 Task Force was initiated in September 2021 in response to actions taken in May 2021 by the Metro Board and Caltrans to suspend further work on the original I-710 South Corridor Improvements Project that was under environmental review due to concerns over air quality, public health, displacement and environmental impacts on residents living in communities adjacent to the corridor.

The goal of the task force is to re-evaluate the needs of the corridor, develop multi-modal strategies to meet these needs, identify potential projects and programs in the short and long-term based on those strategies, and create a prioritized investment plan. The Task Force is expected to report to the Metro Board and State of California with outcomes by Spring 2022.

Purpose of the 710 Task Force Governance Structure: During the second 710 Task Force meeting, the project team heard several requests to find ways to better incorporate the community into the 710 Task Force process. In response, Metro and Caltrans will provide a general comment opportunity at the beginning of future meetings and add public comment opportunities after each agenda item. Additionally, we propose the creation of a community advisory committee that will advise the task force throughout its process. Furthermore, to foster the leadership of Task Force members and improve the process, we propose the creation of an Executive Steering Committee which would work with Metro and Caltrans to plan meetings and support the community advisory committee and the Task Force. Below you will find more details on a draft governance structure for the Charter and Community Agreements Working Group to discuss.



- **Executive Steering Committee** (5 members)
 - Membership
 - 3 Co-chairs OR a Chair, Vice-Chair, and 2nd Vice Chair of Task Force
 - Members from the Task Force
 - 1 seat should represent each of the following:
 - Community based organizations
 - Cities/Governmental agencies
 - Goods Movement/Transportation Industry/Labor
 - 2 members from the Community Steering Committee



- Role
 - Work with Metro and Caltrans Staff to plan meetings
 - Support Community Advisory Committee and Task Force activities
 - Other tasks as necessary
- Meet 2 weeks before each task force meeting

- **Community Advisory Committee**
 - Role: Advise the 710 Task Force. This will be discussed by the Community Engagement Strategy Working Group, but may include:
 - Reviewing and advising on TF goals, proposals, and recommendations at consensus checkpoints
 - Participate in working groups
 - Helping to ground truth data and findings
 - Advising on community engagement strategy and efforts
 - Meet bi-monthly

- **710 Task Force Members** (50 members)
 - Role:
 - Elect Exec. Committee Members
 - Work with the Community Advisory Committee to incorporate their advice into the task force recommendations
 - Listen to, reflect on, and work to incorporate public comment
 - Develop recommendations on 710 Corridor multimodal strategies, projects, programs, and investment strategy
 - Meet every 4 weeks



- **Workgroups** (20 max for each)
 - Groups
 - Clean Truck Program WG
 - Community Engagement Strategy WG
 - Charter and Community Agreements WG
 - Others as necessary
 - Role
 - Research and analyze specific issues
 - Develop proposals for the Task Force to consider
 - Meet as needed

- **Facilitator and Consultants**
 - Staff
 - Erika Morales, Facilitator
 - Arellano Associates
 - Cambridge Systematics
 - AECOM
 - Role
 - Facilitate and support the Task Force process
 - Support updates on Task Force progress
 - Provide technical analysis, data, maps, and other information as needed to support the Task Force’s work
 - Provide technical writing and administrative support for Task Force activities (e.g., elections, reports, etc.) and documentation
 - Support implementation of Task Force workplan to achieve their objectives

- **Metro and Caltrans Administrative Staff**
 - Metro Staff
 - Jim de la Loza, Chief Planning Officer



- Laurie Lombardi, Senior Executive Officer, Countywide Planning & Development
- KeAndra Cylear Dodds, Executive Officer, Equity and Race
- Michael Cano, Deputy Executive Officer, Countywide Planning & Development
- Ernesto Chaves, Deputy Executive Officer, Countywide Planning & Development
- Mark Dierking, Manager, Community Relations
- Jessica Medina, Manager, Equity and Race
- Caltrans Staff
 - Gloria Roberts, Chief Deputy District Director, District 7
 - Paul Marquez, Deputy Director, Planning
 - Jeffrey Newman, Chief of Staff, District 7
 - Ron Kosinski, Deputy Director, Environmental Planning
- Role
 - Staff manages and administers the 710 Task Force Process
 - Metro Board and Caltrans Leadership will review and determine how to proceed on the 710 Task Force Recommendations



Consensus and Decision-Making Considerations

Background: During the second 710 Task Force meeting, the project team also heard ideas and initial feedback on potential ways to reach consensus in Task Force Meetings. Consensus will be vitally important to ensure the Task Force can progress through the work plan in a manner that ensures the final deliverable reflects the needs of the impacted communities and regional stakeholders. Below, you will find themes from that conversation as well as examples to consider and Draft Consensus and Decision-Making Considerations for the 710 Task Force. While the latter have been drafted by project staff from the themes and examples, the Charter and Community Agreements Working Group is tasked with developing the recommendation that will be considered by the Task Force at Meeting #3.



Themes from Task Force Meeting #2

- **Process**
 - Hearing from as many stakeholders as possible within the Task Force
 - Aiming for at least 70% of the group agreeing
 - Making room to hear from the folks that have the least amount of power
- **Attitudes/Values**
 - Having an open mind about ideas and outcomes and creating space to pose questions that get us to clarifications and figuring out solutions collectively
 - Not sticking to preconceived ideas about what will happen with the 710 Corridor, but being willing to be convinced of different approaches
 - Coming to shared values with respect for differences and balancing competing priorities



Examples to Consider

- **Metro's 710 EIR/EIS**, the precursor to the 710 Task Force. Metro will recap this process during the working group meeting.
- **Seeds for Change**, an organization in the UK that provides technical assistance and capacity building services for collaboration prepared [a helpful short guide to consensus decision-making](#). In preparation for the Charter Working Group Meeting, consider the following:
 - Page 5 – Diagram depicting the process is not linear and may broaden from the point of introducing a question to the point of coming together to a decision.
 - Page 7 – Detailed flowchart of the consensus process, with seven stages and guiding questions and considerations.
- **Metro's Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC)** uses a modified version of the consensus process and provides an example of how the detailed consensus process flowchart can be adapted to fit the needs of a committee. Note that the PSAC process includes a reflection step at the end of each decision-making process. While the PSAC regularly makes recommendations through reports to the Metro Board, the 710 Task Force will only provide one report, with multiple recommendations, at the end of the of the Task Force process.



item two: decision-making models: types of decision-making



for PSAC decisions

generally, we expect this group to adapt the “consensus” and “majority rule” models for major decisions and/or recommendations



17

item two: decision-making models: change the proposal, if needed

modified process



:: step one ::

DISCUSSION
introduce the topic and surface questions and concerns



:: step two ::

PROPOSAL
pitch an intervention, policy, or action



:: step three ::
TEST FOR CONSENSUS
using degrees of agreement



:: step four ::

MODIFICATION
by repeating steps 1-3 if committee members raise concerns



:: step five ::

FINALIZE
by holding a simple majority vote; provide an opportunity for formal dissent



:: step six ::

REFLECT
by discussing how feedback was received by the Metro Board; revisit the committee's strategy, if needed



26



Draft Consensus and Decision-Making Considerations for the 710 Task Force

In preparation for the Working Group meeting, consider the following options that are drafted from the sample materials shared above:

- **Values/Attitudes/Agreements** – What are the values that all Task Force Members are asked to commit to when engaging in the consensus decision-making process?
 - *Cooperation Between Equals* – Seeing all Task Force Members as equals in the process and as sharing power across different communities and stakeholder groups so there is a respectful and trusting atmosphere
 - *Exploration of Differences* – Exploring the different needs and perspectives of as many communities and stakeholders before forming a proposal
 - *Building Common Ground* – Creating space for open discussion and identification of information and ideas to be considered and find commonalities
 - *Identification of Inclusive and Actionable Win-Win Solutions* – Working together to find solutions that everyone actively supports, or at least does not actively oppose, and that can be implemented in the process or integrated into the recommendations for consideration by the Metro Board and Caltrans.

- **710 Task Force Consensus Process** – Which of the following steps make sense to include in our consensus process? Which don't make sense? Do we need any additional steps to facilitate having an inclusive and collaborative process?
 - **Working Groups** – Between Task Force Meetings, Members participate in smaller working groups to research and develop proposals related to a specific topic.
 - *Step 1. Working Group Proposal Development* - A facilitated discussion in working group meetings to clarify the issue, surface questions and concerns, and develop a proposal that aligns with our values and can include:



- *Exploration of Differences* - Opportunity to identify needs and opinions *before* developing alternatives.
 - *Win-Win Ideas and Solutions* – Working Group Members share ideas for solutions that address questions and concerns raised during discussion.
 - *Building Common Ground* – Working Group Members contribute to developing a proposal that combines the most useful ideas and solutions while weeding out some of the options.
- *Step 2. Testing for Consensus* – Summarizing proposal and considerations that will be presented to the Task Force. See considerations below for process and thresholds.
- **Task Force Discussion** – At Task Force Meetings, Members hear report-backs or proposals from Working Groups and collaboratively strengthen any proposals related to the specific topic after hearing public comment.
 - *Step 3. Working Group Presentation* – Working Groups present to the Task Force to initiate the decision-making process in a public meeting.
 - *Step 4. Facilitated Discussion and Public Comment* – A facilitated discussion to clarify the issue and proposal and surface questions and concerns from the Task Force Members and the Public:
 - *Exploration of Differences* – Task Force Members and the Public have an opportunity to identify additional needs and opinions *before* modifying the proposals.
 - *Win-Win Ideas and Solutions* – Task Force Members and the Public have an opportunity to share additional ideas or solutions.
 - *Step 5. Testing for Consensus* – See considerations below for process and thresholds.
 - *Step 6. Modifications* – Repeating any steps above to make the proposal even stronger.



- *Building Common Ground* – Members of the Working Group presenting a proposal lead in combining the most useful ideas and solutions while weeding out some of the options.
- **Task Force Vote**
 - *Step 7. Formalizing a Task Force Decision* – A facilitated vote and discussion about implementation of the decision made by the group:
 - *Voting* – See considerations below for process and thresholds.
 - *Identification of Implementation Actions* – Work out what needs to happen, by when, and by who.
- **Voting Process and Thresholds** – As we advance towards formalizing a decision, what are the thresholds we should reach before advancing into the next step of the process?
 - Testing for Consensus and Formalizing a Working Group, Committee, or Task Force Decision
 - Process/How: Thumbs up / thumbs down, degrees of agreement (e.g. from one to four to show level of support or opposition), other option?
Threshold: Simple majority (50% +1), supermajority (66% or 70%), other option?