

**Subject:** West Valley Community Advisory Group (WV CAG) Meeting #9  
I-10 and I-15 Corridor Projects, County of San Bernardino  
**Date:** June 15, 2015 at 6 p.m.  
**Location:** Central Park Community Center, Rancho Cucamonga, CA  
**Participants:** 10 CAG members were in attendance

<b>WV CAG Meeting Attendees</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Tressy Capps	Fontana Resident, Community Activist
Phillip Cothran	State Farm Insurance Agent
Valerie Henry (East Valley)	Devore Rural Protection Association
Johnnie Long	Retired
Danny Marquez	San Bernardino Veterans Advisory Board
Tony Martinez	Instructor at UCR and Chaffey College
Loree Masonis	Home health aide
Linda Sargent	CEO consulting business
Matthew Slowik	Retired, Fontana Unified School District, Fontana Rotary Club
Rich Stewart	Assistant Chief, CHP
<b>WV CAG Members Not in Attendance</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Dr. Kenneth Alpern	Transit Coalition
Lina Chu	Asian Real Estate Association of America
Michael Douglas	Developed for Douglas Co.
Laura Gama	Disneyland employee
Tim Gerdes	Director of Operations
Lynda Gonzalez	M.A.S. Auto and Truck
Dennis Gutierrez	Inland Empire Hispanic Leadership Council
John Husing	Economist
Beth Kranda	Valley Transportation Services
Michael Krouse	Ontario Visitors and Convention Bureau
Roy Mabry	Association of Black Correctional Workers
Oswaldo Maysonet	211 Access and Mobility Coordinator
Penny Newman	Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice (CCA EJ)
Christine Pham	Victoria Gardens
Monique Reza	City of Fontana, Department of Engineering
Faiz Shah	Islamic Center
Marie Shahani	Fontana Community Senior Center
Luis Vaquera	Fontana Unified School District

William Waddingham	Rotolo Chevrolet
<b>San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) and Consultants</b>	
Garry Cohoe	Director of Project Delivery – SANBAG
Carrie Gilbreth	Public Outreach – Westbound Communications
Robert Chevez	Public Outreach – Westbound Communications
Eileen Hards	Public Outreach – Westbound Communications
Esmeralda Garcia	Public Outreach – MIG
<b>Members of the Public</b>	
None	

Ms. Carrie Gilbreth called the meeting to order at 6:13 p.m.

**I. Welcome and Introductions**

Ms. Gilbreth with Westbound Communications welcomed all to the meeting.

The agenda was distributed and then reviewed. Self-introductions took place among all attendees.

*Project Summary Binder* – The “I-10/I-15 Corridor Projects: Project Summary Binder” dated June 3, 2015 was handed out to each CAG member for background information. It was noted that this binder was distributed to SANBAG Board Members.

**II. Recommitment of CAG Membership**

Ms. Gilbreth provided attendees with an overview of the CAG roles and responsibilities and stated a key activity is for CAG members to reach out to their network of organizations and communities to share information about the project and also receive feedback/input. Additionally, Ms. Gilbreth asked CAG members to encourage friends and colleagues to join any of the three CAGs in the various geographic areas.

*Attendance of CAG Meetings* – Ms. Gilbreth discussed the importance of CAG member attendance at CAG meetings. As part of the commitment, CAG members who miss more than two unexcused meetings would be replaced.

*Media Inquiries* – Ms. Gilbreth discussed media inquiries with attendees. CAG members were reminded that they could absolutely state their personal opinions about the project, but that they must be clear they are not a voice for SANBAG. Media inquiries about SANBAG and specifics of the project should be directed to the SANBAG public information team.

*Questions/Comments* – The following questions/comments were made by attendees during this part of the agenda:

- Mr. Phillip Cothran asked if the options/alternatives had been revised or if studies had been thrown out. Mr. Garry Cohoe responded that the environmental and technical studies are being done and the options/alternatives are going to continue to remain the same.

- Mr. Cohoe proceeded to review the timeline of project milestones. Mr. Cohoe informed the group that a SANBAG Board decision on the I-10 Corridor could be made in the early part of 2016 on what recommendation will be made to Caltrans. Mr. Cohoe also informed the group that the final environmental document with potential approval will be made in late 2017. Study results will be brought to the next CAG meeting and are available for review.
- A discussion began regarding the CAG's purpose. Ms. Gilbreth stated that CAG members serve as liaisons that take information back to organizations and community members to help make them aware of the project and their voice for choice. At this time, CAG members requested more handouts to give to the public.
- CAG members collectively agreed that there is a perception that SANBAG has already made up their mind about options and wants the CAG to "sell" toll lanes because the financial plan handed out in the project summary does not include HOV lanes. Traditional funding pays for the HOV lanes, but CAG members requested the exact numbers. Mr. Cohoe reaffirmed that there are still three alternatives for I-10 and two alternatives for I-15. Mr. Cohoe also stated SANBAG's vote regarding the I-10 locally preferred alternative of express lanes resulted in: 23 yes votes and 4 no votes. It is important to note that while the SANBAG Board has identified a locally preferred alternative, that action alone does not mean the final alternative has been determined. There is a need/opportunity for the public to continue to provide input on the various alternatives under consideration.
- CAG members agreed that there is a difficulty with the public's perception of CAGs and the relationship to SANBAG. Some CAG members felt they were perceived to have the same locally preferred alternative opinion as the SANBAG Board and they were getting backlash from some members of their communities. Some members were worried the CAG can't effectively communicate neutrality to the public about the project.
- Mr. Cothran stated he would like to be convinced his role as a CAG member is valuable. Mr. Cothran believed the CAGs were only established to meet the legal requirements of public outreach. Mr. Cohoe responded that this is not the case. Legally, there is a requirement to circulate the environmental document and have a public hearing. Mr. Cohoe said the CAGs were a part of a larger recommendation from the SANBAG Board to have the public more involved throughout the project development process so that comments/concerns would be heard and addressed by the technical team.
- Ms. Johnnie Long said she believed they have failed the public because it seemed the public does not know their function.
- CAG members would like to see the public get more involved with the project as people are not showing up to community meetings. Ms. Gilbreth and Mr. Cohoe explained that ongoing communication is important to getting the public to become aware of the projects and understand what is happening. They agreed that only telling people once

about the project is not good enough and that CAG members play an important role in continuing to create awareness about the project with their respective organizations.

- CAG members requested substantive information they could start reviewing to better understand the alternatives. The Project Summary Binder distributed at this meeting is a good place for initial information. Technical studies being prepared for the environmental document can be made available for review. (Follow-up: Caltrans will not allow the distribution of the environmental studies to the CAG members until the environmental document is released to the public. A summary of the environmental studies findings will be provided at the next CAG meeting)
- A discussion began on the meaning of the term “locally preferred alternative.” Given a public perception that toll lanes were the preferred choice, there was an agreement that clarity needed to be achieved on all levels about what the various choices were on the I-10 and I-15 projects.

### **III. Educational Materials**

Brochure – Ms. Gilbreth distributed brochures and fact sheets to CAG members and explained that the brochure is a handout with a simplified explanation of the project. It was meant as a conversation starter to make the public aware about the project.

The brochure was intended to address the following questions about the I-10 and I-15 corridors: What is the challenge? Where are we going to be? And what are our options?

Questions/Comments – The following questions/comments were made by attendees during this part of the agenda:

- CAG members suggested clarification on what “Express Lanes” means in the brochure – i.e. toll lanes. Ms. Tressy Capps stated the collateral does not include the word “toll lanes” and that it was confusing.
- A discussion began about how the toll lanes would be managed, if selected. Mr. Cohoe noted that two entities could be maintaining the different lanes. SANBAG could potentially maintain only the toll lanes while Caltrans would maintain the General Purpose Lanes. He explained that these are decisions that have not been made at this point.
- Another discussion followed regarding the uses for the residual revenue collected from the toll lanes. Mr. Cohoe stated that this decision has not been made yet. This would ultimately be a SANBAG Board decision.

Fact Sheets – Ms. Gilbreth explained that the fact sheets were a more detailed version of the brochure. CAG members reiterated the need for more clarity on the various options under consideration and not just express lane options.

Website – Ms. Gilbreth informed CAG members that a project specific website had been developed and asked members that in the interest of their time, if the website was something they would prefer to look at on their own and provide input via phone or email. They agreed to

view the website individually. Ms. Gilbreth explained the website would incorporate a town hall forum that will also encourage feedback online via email, helpline, briefings, etc.

#### **IV. Briefing Brainstorm**

As a result of other agenda items being discussed in depth, CAG members agreed to provide ideas for increasing outreach via phone or email to Ms. Gilbreth.

#### **V. Meeting Summary and Next Steps**

Ms. Gilbreth thanked attendees for their discussion about the role of CAG members and input on the collateral materials. Feedback will be reviewed by the project team and incorporated where applicable. Updated materials will be made available on the project website. A notice will be sent to CAG members informing them of the available materials. This is expected to take place in July 2015.

The next CAG meetings are expected to take place in the fall, ahead of the environmental document review and comment period that is anticipated in the November timeframe. There will be increased communication with CAG members prior to the next meeting to identify new opportunities for briefings and provide collateral materials for CAG member outreach efforts.

**Ms. Gilbreth adjourned the meeting at 8:17 p.m.**

#### ***Additional Information:***

##### **Project Material Distributed**

- Meeting Agenda
- I-10/I-15 Corridor Projects: Project Summary Binder dated June 3, 2015
- I-10/I-15 Corridor Projects Brochure (English)
- I-10 Corridor Project Fact Sheet (English)
- I-15 Corridor Project Fact Sheet (English)



CORRIDOR PROJECTS

? LEIR VS EIS

CEQA NEPA

- COMPREHENSIVE -  
AVOID REDUCE & MITIGATE IMPACTS

→ PROVIDE  
ONGOING  
CLARITY

? EIS - POSSI - NMD

MINIMAL/NO IMPACTS

→ PROVIDE  
TECHNICAL DATA  
FROM TECH STUDIES  
PRIOR TO ENV RELEASE

? WILL SUBCOMMITTEE  
STAY IN PLACE FOR  
PROJECT DURATION?

CAGS MAY HAVE  
DIFFERENT  
INPUT ON PREF ALT.

? IS CHARGE TO REPORT  
TO BOARD?  
PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS

? WHAT IS CAG'S ROLE?  
PROVIDE  
MEANINGFUL  
INPUT INTO  
ALTS !!

? ARE ALL OPTIONS STILL  
ON THE TABLE

"PUBLIC PERCEPTION  
ALT HAS BEEN  
SELECTED"

? WHEN WILL FINAL DECISION  
BE MADE?

→ CHANGE PERCEPTION

→ CAGS  
SHOULD MAKE  
RECOMMENDATION  
TO BOARD

→ CLARIFY  
CAGS ROLE  
W MAKING  
RECOMMENDATIONS  
CLARIFY EXPECTATIONS

FOLLOW UP:

1 SANBAG EXPLORE  
CAGS RECOMMENDATION  
FROM CAG IN PROVIDING  
FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS  
TO BOARD

2 CAG FEEDBACK  
ON BRIEFINGS  
VIA EMAIL

3 TECH STUDIES  
SUMMARIES OF FINDINGS  
TO CAGS

4 MEETING LOOK AHEAD

? WHAT IS ROLE  
OF CAGS WITH  
PROVIDING FEEDBACK  
IF PREF ALT HAS  
BEEN DETERMINED  
IS CHARGE  
COMPLETE?

? WILL  
MAINTENANCE  
FOR EXPRESS  
LANES BE PRIORITIZED  
OVER G.P. LANES?  
SANBAG WILL  
BE RESPONSIBLE

? WHO COLLECTS TOLL?  
SANBAG  
FEES PAY FOR  
OP/MGT/MAINT  
BONDS

? HOW WILL OVERALL  
MOBILITY BE  
IMPROVED  
-TRUCK TRAFFIC