

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

<b>WV CAG Meeting Attendees</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Tressy Capps	Fontana Resident, Community Activist
Susan Cargill (East Valley)	Resident
Michael (Mike) James	Ceramic Tile Contractor
Jonnie Long	Retired
Loree Masonis	Home Health Aide
Linda Sargent	CEO Consulting Business
Marie Shahani	Fontana Community Senior Center
Matthew Slowik	Retired, Fontana Unified School District, Fontana Rotary Club
<b>WV CAG Members Not in Attendance</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Dr. Kenneth Alpern	Transit Coalition
Lina Chu	Asian Real Estate Association of America
Phillip Cothran	State Farm Insurance Agent
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
Danny Marquez	San Bernardino Veterans Advisory Board
Tony Martinez	Instructor at UCR and Chaffey College
Osvaldo 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
Rich Stewart	Assistant Chief, CHP
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 – I-10 & I-15 Corridor Projects – SANBAG
John Meier	Project Director of I-10 & I-15 Corridor Projects – SANBAG
Tim Watkins	Chief of Legislative and Public Affairs – SANBAG
Julie Vandermost Beeman	VCS Environmental/SANBAG Environmental
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>	
Sri Koneru	Parsons
Jannet Loera	Parsons
Christopher Quach	Parsons
Vikrant Sanghai	Parsons
David Speirs	Vice President – Parsons
Christina Taylor	Supervisor Rutherford’s Office
Bowen Yang	Parsons
Jing Yang	Parsons

Ms. Carrie Gilbreth called the meeting to order at 6:23 p.m.

**I. Welcome and Introductions**

Ms. Gilbreth with Westbound Communications welcomed the West Valley CAG members and thanked them for their participation.

Ms. Gilbreth had each CAG member, public outreach team member, and member of the public introduce themselves.

Ms. Gilbreth gave a brief overview of the agenda.

**II. Update and recent Developments**

*Project Updates* – Mr. John Meier noted two major updates: (1) During the July Board of Directors meeting, the SANBAG Board of Directors directed SANBAG staff to move forward with an accelerated Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) process, which would enable SANBAG to potentially secure a major portion of the needed I-10 funding under

the current Department of Transportation (DOT) administration. In support of this accelerated process, the Board of Directors awarded a contract to CDM Smith at the September Board of Directors meeting to develop Investment Grade Traffic and Revenue forecasts for the I-10 and I-15 corridors. (2) During the August meeting, the I-10 and I-15 Corridor Joint Sub-Committee agreed to bring a recommendation to confirm Express Lanes as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) to the November Board of Directors meeting, prior to circulation of the Draft Environmental Document (DED). Confirming the LPA prior to the DED has two primary benefits:

- The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (MAP-21), the federal transportation funding and authorization bill approved in 2012 highly recommends this approach in order to promote a more efficient and effective DED review, allowing the public to focus their evaluation on the LPA during the Public Comment Period.
- Confirming the LPA would support the accelerated TIFIA loan process, which would allow SANBAG to secure up to 33% of the funding for the I-10 corridor, and better positions SANBAG to take advantage of historically low interest rates.

Mr. Tim Watkins discussed Assembly Bill 914, which would give SANBAG the authority to operate toll facilities on the I-10 and I-15 corridors, as well as the statewide tolling bill AB 194, which would give Transportation Agencies across the state the ability to submit projects for tolling approval by the California Transportation Committee (CTC). Mr. Watkins briefly described how the bill moved through the state assembly and senate, and are now advancing to the Governor's office. Approval of these bills will better enable SANBAG to pursue the accelerated Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) loan discussed earlier.

### **III. CAG Charge for November Milestone**

Ms. Gilbreth announced that a CAG report will be developed that will serve as a mechanism for providing the Board with a summary of the CAG efforts and recommended considerations about the I-10 alternatives. The document will be shared with CAG members ahead of time, and they will have a week to give feedback. Ms. Gilbreth also asked for volunteers to speak on behalf of the CAGs at the November SANBAG Board meeting.

### **IV. Summary of Technical Studies/CAG Feedback and Questions**

Ms. Julie Vandermost Beeman was introduced. Ms. Beeman has helped manage environmental studies and reports as a consultant to SANBAG for more than six years. Ms. Beeman oversees the environmental documents produced by Parsons.

Ms. Beeman provided a summary of the: California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)/National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents being prepared for the project. She explained that there were 16 technical studies prepared for the document.

Ms. Beeman presented a PowerPoint overview of the CEQA/NEPA technical studies. She stated that the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is the most detailed report you can prepare for CEQA and the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is highest detailed document for NEPA. All documents disclose project impacts to the public and identify avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures to reduce impacts. The environmental documents analyze each of the three alternatives to the same level.

Ms. Beeman briefly reviewed the alternatives for the I-10 project: 1) No Build, 2) HOV, and 3) Express Lanes.

Ms. Beeman pointed out the extensive studies that were prepared and included in the document. She noted some studies are independent documents and others are summarized directly in the report.

Ms. Beeman explained that the preparation of the EIR/EIS requires Caltrans District 8 Quality Control review, Caltrans Headquarters/legal review, Caltrans District 8 final review, Caltrans District 8 preapproval review and Caltrans District 8 final review and approval to circulate.

Ms. Beeman said once the draft is completed it goes to the public for review. The comment period is scheduled for December 3, 2015 through February 5, 2016. Forty-five days is the legal period, but it is being extended to 60 days because the document is being circulated during the holidays. In January 2016, there will be meetings where the public will be able to ask questions to the project development team, review documents, and provide formal comments to the environmental document. Members of the public will be able to review materials in a variety of ways that includes online, local libraries and at Caltrans and SANBAG offices. Comments received during the public review period will be captured in the final environmental document and will be addressed through written responses.

Ms. Beeman noted there are 142 avoidance minimization and/or mitigation measures identified in the document. The final environmental document will not be considered for final approval until 2017.

Ms. Beeman said the key differences between the build alternatives are primarily related to the eight miles between alternatives two and three (Los Angeles County Line to Haven Avenue), and the addition of an extra lane for alternative three. All impacts from the project can be mitigated to below a level of significance except for air quality. Air in the region is already at a nonattainment level and that this project alone cannot fix this existing issue.

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

- Ms. Long asked if the EIR considered an upcoming construction project in Fontana. Ms. Beeman said that the EIR/EIS must discuss each corridor city's general plan document and analyze the impact of known projects.
- Mr. Slowik said the City (Fontana) may have to do the EIR or the EIS. Ms. Beeman said they typically don't have to conduct a NEPA document for species only. If there is federal funding, then the federal agency would have to do a NEPA document.
- Mr. Slowik suggested drafting a chart that summarizes the final impacts after mitigation. Ms. Beeman responded that the environmental commitment record lists every measurement required. Each section discusses the existing setting, the impacts, and the mitigation matters. Mr. Slowik said that he would like to see an impacts table for all three alternatives and that this is typically discussed in the chapters of an EIR. Ms. Beeman said she would follow up.

- Mr. Slowik noted that it would be helpful for the group to have a summary chart that shows mitigation measures and what happens after mitigation measures are final for all three alternatives. He requested the document as soon as possible. Ms. Beeman reiterated that everything is summarized to the requirements. The technical documents are subject to change after the review process. Ms. Beeman could not provide the table now because the agency is not allowed to release the information prior to the required review process. She stated he can look at the end of each chapter in the technical studies. She noted that reports are written in a certain format to coincide with the law and there is no table that outlines the mitigations in the format Mr. Slowik is referring to.
- Mr. Slowik also asked about the air quality that cannot be mitigated and if in the traffic subject area, every aspect of traffic circulation has been mitigated below a level of significant impact. Ms. Beeman responded that air quality and traffic technical studies have been conducted and the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) marries the two. The analysis shows that we cannot make the air quality or traffic worse. She also added the fact that while the corridor is already within a nonattainment area, air quality would improve because the idling of vehicles would be reduced through a build alternative.
- Mr. Slowik asked if every component in traffic and circulation was mitigated below a level of significance. Mr. Cohoe responded by saying traffic will be reduced through managed lanes and the project will not increase travel times when completed. The project will improve all the arterial streets and intersections will be looked at to see if there are improvements needed. Mr. Slowik clarified that certain segments will still be congested. Ms. Beeman stated that the No Build option would be worse. She also reminded Mr. Slowik that this is only the I-10 document and not the I-15. Ms. Beeman said she could provide CDs of the technical studies for reference.
- Ms. Long asked if the Level F is acceptable based on the no build. Mr. Cohoe noted the traffic studies show the build alternatives would reduce congestion.
- Mr. Slowik asked if the document was meeting EIR requirements. Ms. Beeman confirmed it was.
- Mr. Slowik reiterated the importance of having a summary of impact and mitigation because it is his assumption that not everyone is going to go through each of the technical reports. Mr. Cohoe reminded him it is not SANBAG's document, it belongs to Caltrans and it is not a final draft and will be released to the CAG when Caltrans allows it to be released to the public.
- Ms. Capps asked about restriping the SR-210 and if that was considered to alleviate traffic as an alternative. Mr. Cohoe said Measure I directives included improvements on the I-10, I-15 the I-215 and the I-215 between I-10 and Riverside. Ms. Capps mentioned soft shoulders, but Mr. Cohoe said that it is not just a matter of restriping, but they would have to take out and redesign the shoulder to meet roadway requirements.

- Ms. Capps mentioned statutory entity change and whether it was contemplated. Mr. Cohoe said that the issue pertains to liability protection for the member cities that comprise SANBAG.

#### **V. CAG Input on I-10 Alternatives**

Ms. Gilbreth passed out worksheets that members could use to take notes about the conversation on CAG input re: I-10 alternatives and considerations, and the CAG process as a whole. The notes taken will be incorporated into the CAG report that will be presented to the SANBAG Board in November. Ms. Esmeralda Garcia facilitated the conversation.

Ms. Garcia stated that it is important that all considerations are raised for each of the I-10 alternatives. CAG members were asked to list the three top considerations. CAG members were also advised they could take worksheets home and think of other ideas.

Ms. Garcia said when making phone calls to CAG members, the concerns were equity, mobility and congestion relief for those trying to get to work. She asked everyone to comment respectfully.

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

- Ms. Capps responded that the community engagement was seriously lacking and thought the community hadn't been informed until the end. She noted that calling it a widening project tricks people and they don't really understand what is actually happening with the project. NOTE: The projects are called the I-10 and I-15 Corridor Projects.
- Ms. Sargent said that the public is more engaged than we think. Ms. Sargent said the people who travel to and from Los Angeles are used to Express Lanes. She thinks commuters are informed and the meetings that we have invested time in have started a dialogue. Ms. Slowik and Mr. Mike James agreed.
- Ms. Long followed up by saying that she has spoken at groups and passed out fact sheets and brochures. Some of these places included an open house in Redlands, City Hall, the Mayor's office, the senior center, luncheons, quarterly meetings, Lee and Associates development meetings, a GPAC meeting in Fontana and a Lewis Library function. Ms. Capps commented Fontana was engaged because that's where everyone was active in the project.
- Ms. Sargent mentioned suggested passing out information at Park and Rides in Los Angeles and close to Ontario. She also suggested Metrolink stations and other commuter parking lots.
- Mr. Slowik said that it doesn't matter how much information was shared, but it was the clarity of the information. He does not think SANBAG should talk in technical form. He said simplified labels were important in order for the public to understand what the

project was really about. He believes CAG members will not be able to translate the document to the public without the impacts and mitigation summary table. Mr. Slowik said that summaries he has looked at in other CEQA documents have had the chart. Ms. Beeman requested a copy of the chart he is referring to so they could emulate it for Mr. Slowik if appropriate.

- Ms. Cargill said it is important to talk about the impacts or benefits to local people and not just consider the “rich people riding to Los Angeles.” She does not think the analysis of improvement to General Purpose Lanes is a good enough explanation. Mr. Cohoe said it has been shown through graphs and charts during community briefings. Mr. Cohoe also referenced a survey that included various demographic and socioeconomic groups in the San Diego area showed the acceptance level of the Express Lanes in their area. For people that never use Express Lanes in San Diego, the approval rate is around 77 percent. Ms. Cargill reiterated that SANBAG should consider the fact that the public needs to understand it is an improvement for everyone and not just the rich Los Angeles commuters. They need to know it is helping the community and it is being paid for in the long term.
- Ms. Capps stated that she understood money from toll lanes would not help maintain the General Purpose Lanes. Mr. Cohoe said that has not been decided.
- Ms. Long said there will always be a segment of the public that ignores the outreach until they hear a bulldozer.
- Ms. Capps said the reaction to the toll lanes from people with low incomes has been negative and their responses should be considered.
- Mr. Slowik said it was explained to him that the legislation that governed the Express Lanes did not clearly indicate whether or not the funds would go back to fund projects in the area. Mr. Cohoe said it was a concern at one point, but the legislation just approved shows that excess revenue needs to be put back into improvements along the corridor itself. Mr. Cohoe said legislation makes it clear that it has to be reinvested in addressing transportation needs and it could be a public transit project. Mr. Watkins said the distinction to the point is that relative to this project there has not been an authority established previously, but the legislation will provide this. Mr. John Meier said the precedent is that the money stays in the corridor and the language is that it has to stay in the corridor. Ms. Cargill noted this would be a great piece of information for the public to know.
- Ms. Cargill said she appreciates the responses from SANBAG, but thinks the meeting would run more smoothly if they just bullet point the concerns and have less discussion.
- Ms. Loree Masonis asked Ms. Long her plan for passing out collateral. Ms. Long said she would pass it out at events and then discuss if people wanted to discuss. Ms. Masonis said the small flyer was easier to read and people were more interested in the concise language. Ms. Masonis said the response she got to the toll roads was either that people were used to it from living on the East Coast, or it was a strong opposition to the toll

roads because they don't like the cost. Ms. Long noted that she was not using it as a method to sell something, but as an informative situation.

- Mr. James asked if there would be Express Lanes from Haven Avenue in Ontario to Ford Street in Redlands without any interruptions. Mr. Cohoe said yes. Mr. Cohoe noted that at one time they thought two Express Lanes to Redlands would not be funded, but the funding was extended.
- Mr. James asked if it had been considered to put Direct Access Ramps (DARs) by hospitals. Ms. Sargent asked what they do in Los Angeles. Mr. Cohoe said emergency vehicles could use Express Lanes and not get charged. Mr. Cohoe said DARs were expensive and have to have a high density use. Ms. Cargill said it was a good suggestion considering the issues emergency vehicles had in Devore.
- Ms. Long commented that the worksheet asked for comments to the Board, but noted that the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) had already been decided by the Board. Ms. Beeman said in order to proceed with the document, they needed to have focus and as a result, reduced other alternatives early on before the current three alternatives for the I-10 corridor were selected to continue studying. The ones eliminated were in addition to the current three – 1) No Build, 2) HOV, and 3) Express Lanes.
- Ms. Garcia gave an overview of the types of comments they are looking for in the worksheet document.
- Mr. Slowik asked if they use the no build option and no dollars are spent, could the dollars be spent on other things to improve traffic congestion. Mr. Cohoe said no because voters provided clear direction through the renewal of Measure I.
- Mr. James suggested if they are going to consider a discount for low income, that seniors should get to drive in the Express Lanes for free.

Ms. Garcia shifted the conversation to discuss suggested improvements from the CAG regarding the CAG process.

Questions and Comments- The following questions/comments were made by attendees during the CAG process:

- Ms. Capps suggested the process could be improved if the CAG members were more diversified, meaning that it should not be the same people involved in other committees.
- Ms. Cargill said that the collateral materials should have been reviewed prior to materials being printed. Ms. Gilbreth responded that the purpose of the small runs was to get the information out for the CAG to make edits. Mr. Watkins also mentioned the small runs allowed the team to evaluate how the design and colors would look in print before they went out to the public.

- Mr. Slowik suggested Ms. Beeman contact the County of San Bernardino and look for the impact summary, which will show the chart he had been referring to during the meeting discussion.
- Ms. Cargill asked to be emailed the impact summary specifically for reference.
- Ms. Gilbreth reviewed the timeline for the environmental document moving forward and emphasized the public comment period. She also stated that CAG meetings will not occur again until the beginning of 2016 and the summary of the CAG report will be distributed to them for comment.
- Ms. Capps agreed with Ms. Gilbreth that communication was important. Ms. Capps said that there was a woman in another Redlands meeting that evening that misunderstood and thought toll lanes were a done deal. Ms. Capps said she tried to tell her that that wasn't true and emphasized clarity is important.
- Mr. Slowik said that if CAG members are going to be asked to provide input, then the summary should be provided prior to December so that the CAG members and public can more easily make comments.

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

Ms. Gilbreth thanked all CAG members for their comments and said they would have a week to turn around comments. Comments would be included in the CAG report to the Board in November. Ms. Gilbreth again invited CAG members to provide comments and speak at the Board meeting. The date of the meeting is November 4, 2015. Ms. Gilbreth also noted the members can call to have collateral materials mailed. She then reminded the members that it is important to gain comments during the public comment period.

- Mr. James asked the audience members to comment from what company they were from. Most responded they were from Parsons and are part of the engineering team.

Ms. Gilbreth adjourned meeting at 7:59 p.m.

# CAG I-10 I-15 CORRIDOR PROJECTS WEST VALLEY

SEPTEMBER 15, 2015

? HOW DOES THIS EIR RELATE TO LOCAL CITY EIR (GENERAL PLAN)  
SANBAG EIR CONSIDERS LOCAL EFFORTS & LOCAL PROJECTS CONSIDER OTHER REGIONAL EIRs

? ARE IMPACTS (AFTER MITIGATION) INCLUDED IN DOC - RESULTING IMPACTS CHARTS INCLUDED - FOLLOW UP ON SUMMARY TABLE

EXPRESS LANES

## GOVERNANCE

## DESIGN

## EQUITY

## COMMUNICATION

## COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

CONSTRUCTION

KEEP REVENUE W/IN CORRIDOR

MEDIAN OFF-RAMP

ACCESS - EMERGENCY VEHICLES

COMMUNICATE TO PUBLIC

INVOLVE CAG IN DRAFT DEVELOPMENT  
SUMMARIZE TECHNICAL INFORMATION

SENIORS USE EXPRESS FOR FREE  
REDUCED

COMMUNICATE BENEFITS TO EVERYONE  
- EXPLAIN HOW IT AFFECTS THOSE USING G.P. LANES

- ENSURE PUBLIC IS AWARE  
DIFFERENT GROUPS HAVE BEEN INFORMED  
- COMMUTERS  
- LOCAL RESIDENT

GROUP PRESENTATIONS  
COMMUNITY EVENTS  
PARK & RIDE INFORMATION

CLEAR INFORMATION  
- NO PLANNER SPEAK  
- TRANSLATE TECHNICAL INFORMATION

ACTION ITEMS

BY DEC  
IMPACTS SUMMARY  
SBOC

EMMIL CAGS  
FOLLOW UP  
W/WORKSHEET RESULTS