

ATTACHMENT D - SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE/CLC COMMENTS ON EVALUATION SCORES



Community Leadership Committee (CLC) Meeting #20 Summary of Comments Received

The October 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 Results; and (3) Discuss the draft evaluation in small groups. There were 25 CLC members in attendance.

The CLC split into four discussion groups after the presentation, which were primarily based on corridor geographies:

- 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 comments and questions received during the meeting relating to the Draft Evaluation Results are listed below.

GENERAL COMMENTS & QUESTIONS	
1	For prioritizing and tiering, is one more important than the other or are they basically even?
2	When considering the tiering of the projects, is there any weighting aside from the weighting already considered in the evaluation?
3	I am impressed with the tools as a decent way of supporting prioritization going into the tier process.
4	Is the project team tracking the geographic distribution of projects all around the corridor?
5	Will the Project Dashboard be publicly accessible?
6	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?
7	I live in West Long Beach; will any projects be taking place there? It is always forgotten.
8	With the analysis going on, will that push things back further from the deadline or will the deadline remain the same?

**ATTACHMENT D - SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE/CLC COMMENTS ON EVALUATION
SCORES**

9	Who is part of reviewing the analysis that will come next? Is the CLC a part of that review?
----------	---

ATTACHMENT D - SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE/CLC COMMENTS ON EVALUATION SCORES

10	The information is being shared too quickly; please slow down.
11	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?
12	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?

SPANISH LANGUAGE GROUP SUMMARY

This group 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 for what a project sponsor would need to do to move the project forward and qualify for funding. The group then discussed how to use the evaluation criteria results on few of projects to understand the process.

1	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 have? How will they contribute? Will they contribute? It is my understanding that cities are another avenue to get funds.

NORTH CORRIDOR GROUP SUMMARY

This group mainly discussed 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.

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" 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.

ATTACHMENT D - SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE/CLC COMMENTS ON EVALUATION SCORES

6	It's good to see how the concern factors correlate to benefits.
7	There was a slide earlier 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 IA 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 SUMMARY

This 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.

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 SUMMARY

This 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.

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 the Draft Evaluation document printed on legal paper? It's more challenging for me to digest. 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?

**ATTACHMENT D - SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE/CLC COMMENTS ON
EVALUATION SCORES**

	In the beginning we also talked about housing, health access, and sustainability. How can we ensure the success of projects in the long term, instead of just being a flash in the pan?
5	Can we look at the Goods Movement projects, Freeway Projects, and Active Transportation?
6	(Freeway projects) Can we scroll up and see what the highest scoring freeway projects are?
7	(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?



Task Force Meeting #25 Summary of Comments Received

The Task Force Meeting for the *Long Beach – East LA Corridor Mobility Investment Plan* was held on Monday, October 23, 2023, from 5 – 7:00pm. The intent of this meeting was to provide a live demonstration and interactive discussion with the Task Force Members on the Draft Evaluation Results and Rubrics for a sampling of projects within each transportation mode. There were 17 Task Force Members and 1 Ex-Officio Member in attendance. 11 Members of the Public were also present.

The comments and questions received during the meeting relating to the Draft Evaluation Results are listed below by category and subcategory.

WRITTEN & VERBAL COMMENTS/QUESTIONS			
NAME AND AFFILIATION	QUESTION/COMMENT	CATEGORY	SUBCATEGORY
Laura Cortez, TF, EYCEJ	I saw small groups are happening with TF members, will CLC members receive an invitation to those group meetings as well. Will it be open to CLC members?	Community Engagement	CLC/Small groups
Kimberly Leefatt, TF, NRDC	Use proxies for health and equity. The proxy connections should be explicitly explained in the report, to the extent it will be used as (1) a basis for tiering, or (2) as a justification for elevating projects that have high concerns score for recommendation.	Tiering	Health & Equity
Natalia Ospina, TF, NRDC	I'm not sure I'm seeing the distinction either (<i>referring to Kimberly Leefatt's comment</i>)	Tiering	Health & Equity
Laura Cortez, TF, EYCEJ	Regarding readiness and evaluation, I am worried about how the results will be weighted or not weighted the same. I want to vocalize the importance of health concerns and I want to see how the metric will truly uplift health.	Tiering	Health

**ATTACHMENT D - SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE/CLC COMMENTS ON
EVALUATION SCORES**

<p>Kerry Cartwright, POIA, TF</p>	<p>(Freeway)- Now that we have received the results of the application of this convoluted, complex evaluation methodology, I am sure that many TF members and agencies are also concerned regarding this process moving forward. I know we are going to have a subsequent discussion with the team for our projects. I have concerns with the layout of the concerns.</p> <p>I can highlight some of my concerns and recommendations for moving forward. For example, regarding clean truck infrastructure LB-ELA 0023. You should be aware about the huge amount of effort on charging infrastructure by the ports, the state, Go Biz, CARB, CTC (SB 671 Report), CEC, LA Metro, Federal Government, and an EPA Program (nationwide \$3 billion for ports) are all working on this endeavor. Its inappropriate to have concerns for charging infrastructure. That needs to be revisited.</p> <p>LB-ELA 0011 SR 47 Navy Way Interchange -this project should be deleted. We're moving forward with that. The state has supported this effort through the Port Infrastructure Program. It's frustrating. This is not appropriate. The program is showing concerns.</p> <p>Same with LB-ELA 0131 Port of LA NMPN Improvement Program. This project also has funding.</p>	<p align="center">Concerns</p>	<p align="center">Projects that have funding support and are moving forward should not have concerns</p>
<p>Kerry Cartwright, POIA, TF</p>	<p>The Terminal Island Rail system project should be removed due to the total support by the state and federal government, this should be taken out.</p>	<p align="center">Concerns</p>	<p align="center">Projects that have funding support and are moving forward should not have concerns</p>
<p>Kimberly Leefatt, TF, NRDC</p>	<p>I feel as if the issues regarding health have not been covered in a way that is meaningful so if we are suggesting the idea of changing the way criteria is being weighted, we should be looking to recategorize all criteria and categories and not specific ones that some TF members are concerned with.</p>	<p align="center">Final Results</p>	<p align="center">Health/ Transparency</p>

**ATTACHMENT D - SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE/CLC COMMENTS ON
EVALUATION SCORES**

**ATTACHMENT D - SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE/CLC COMMENTS ON
EVALUATION SCORES**

Laura Cortez, TF, EYCEJ	It is important to make that clear for everyone though- that there should be no score changing behind closed doors	Final Results	Transparency
Hector De La Torre, GCCOG	These scores are out—anyone can question any changes going forward and why.	Final Results	Transparency
Connell Dunning, EPA, Ex-Officio	Thank you for clarifying that any updates and refinements to scoring will be brought to the Task Force and explained. It makes sense that those familiar with each project have further input to share as the Investment Plan is finalized.	Final Results	Transparency
Connell Dunning, EPA, Ex-Officio	I appreciate additional information describing the stage of development (e.g., Design, Construction, and Outcome)	Concerns	Readiness
Connell Dunning, EPA, Ex-Officio	I would advocate that any offline questions and changes to the list should be made available to all TF members. We shouldn't be negotiating these things offline in silos we should be transparent.	Final Results	Transparency
Natalia Ospina, TF, NRDC	It might be more efficient to explain the goods movement project first and then hear recommendations	Final Results	Transparency
Hector De La Torre, GCCOG	There is no expansion. Caltrans submitted the notice of No Build to Army Corps of Engineers and US EPA about the previous/ended project.	Freeway	Expansion
Natalia Ospina, TF, NRDC	The information Connell/USEPA is asking for should be shared with the full Task Force.	Freeway	5C comparison
Connell Dunning, EPA, Ex-Officio	When will be given a representation of what freeway projects that are in this initial list are different and which ones are the same from the ones that were originally listed in the 710 Alternative 5C? It looks like there are some projects that include auxiliary lanes that are directly connected to interchange improvements that are connected to more auxiliary lanes that are going for many miles. I want to know why these are not combined into one project.	Freeway	5C comparison
Chris Chavez, CCA, TF	I want to see what projects that are listed were once part of the original 5C expansion.	Freeway	5C comparison
Theresa Dau-Ngo, TF, POLB	In general, I'd like to better understand how the proposed projects relate to the I-710 corridor, per the Measures R and M funding programs (proximity to the corridor, eligibility to use Measures R & M funding vs. reliance on other funding sources, which projects will be implemented by Metro vs. others, etc.). That will give a better picture of how any of these projects would move towards implementation.	Funding Strategy	Measure R/M criteria; Roles & Responsibilities

**ATTACHMENT D - SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE/CLC COMMENTS ON
EVALUATION SCORES**

Laura Cortez, TF, EYCEJ	I feel as if some projects will bring harm to the environment will pass through because of the funding and other readiness metrics when in reality those projects may actually bring more harm to the health of the stakeholders of the corridor. I want to uplift the equity metrics to ensure they are weighted in the same regard as other metrics.	Concerns	Readiness
Chris Chavez, CCA, TF	I want to understand what potential emission reductions will be created from these potential projects.	Concerns	Readiness
Natalia Ospina, NRDC, TF	What is the threshold for projects to be placed into Tier 3?	Concerns	Tiering
Laura Cortez, TF, EYCEJ	How will concerns be factored into the final results? Will they be added or are the concerns scores being looked at independently from the overall score?	Concerns	Tiering
Laura Cortez, TF, EYCEJ	So, there will be a score for benefits, a score for concerns and a section to describe the flags for each project?	Concerns	Tiering
Connell Dunning, EPA, Ex-Officio	I am unsure of the stage of development classifications (design, construction, and outcome) as it relates to the concerns. Are these new concerns that were developed?	Concerns	Readiness/ Stages of Development
Kimberly Leefatt, TF, NRDC	Is there a document that will be distributed with an explanation of how the concerns will be compared to the benefits of a project. Is there an assessment being done to compare some concerns that may be mitigated or that will completely negate the benefits of a specific project that is going to be potentially prioritized. I would love to see a document shared to the public that explains the rational used to understand how to view the benefits and concerns together.	Concerns	Readiness/ Stages of Development

**ATTACHMENT D SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE/CLC COMMENTS ON
EVALUATION SCORES**
