Meeting: with CAC Members: Meeting Date: 03/29/07 5:30 p.m. –

7:30p.m.

Miguel Miranda, Boyle Heights Chamber of Commerce

Magnus Walker, Business Owner

Location: Benjamin Franklin Library

2200 E 1st St. Los Angeles, CA

Jay Platt, LA Conservancy

Arturo Herrera, Boyle Heights Resident Homeowner Association Edgar Garcia, Department of City Planning Office of Historic Resources

Ross Valencia Boyle Heights Resident Homeowner Association,

Terry Collier, LA Marathon, Michelle Mowery, Bicycle LADOT, Carol Armstrong, LA River Revitalization

John Saslow, Arts District Police officer Kristian Werner, Arts District Lead Officer

Geoffrey Smith, LA Film,

Elizabeth Blaney, Union De Vecinos,

Rebecca Delgado, Boyle Heights Historical Society,

Tara Devine, Central City East Association,

Ingrid Rodas, LA Marathon,

Teresa Marquez, President of the Boyle Heights Resident Homeowner Association

Guests: Mr. John Linville

Attendance: Team:

Wally Stokes, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering Jim Wu, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering

Tony Torres, DSO Glenda Silva, DSO Dick Chan, Moffatt & Nichol Grace David, LABOE Jeff Bingham, Parsons Anne Kochaon, Parsons Bearj Sarkis, LADOT

#### Introduction:

The first introductory CAC meeting was held with 18 of the 27 individuals who were invited to participate in developing the scope of the project. The meeting started with a quick introduction with the City's project development (PDT) team and invited CAC members. Participants stated their name, affiliation and area of interest with the project. All invited members were given an area of interest sheet asking them to check off their area of interest concerning the project. Tony Torres of DSO facilitated the meeting along with Jeff Bingham of Parsons, who made the power point presentation. All members were encouraged to ask questions at all times during the meeting. After the power point presentation Mr. Torres and Mr. Bingham explained the roles and responsibilities of the CAC. The meeting ended with a questions and discussion session.

#### Meeting Minutes:

#### Group Procedures:

The meeting was opened at 6:00 p.m. by Mr. Tony Torres. Mr. Torres introduced the team members and invited CAC members to introduce themselves. Mr. Torres then gave a 5-minute introductory presentation regarding the purpose of the CAC with initial emphasis on participating in the development of scope for the project. Mr. Jeff Bingham proceeded with a 20-minute power point presentation, which consisted of the project overview with current bridge condition and environmental process. All CAC members were encouraged to ask questions or make

comments during presentation. Mr. Bingham answered all questions and responded to all comments during and after the presentation. Mr. Wally Stokes of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering and Mr. Dick Chan of Moffatt and Nichol also answered questions during the presentation.

After the presentation Mr. Torres explained that the level of participation and commitment expected from the CAC members was at least once a month for about 1 hour and half. All CAC members present agreed to the commitment of attending meetings once a month at Benjamin Franklin Library. He also explained that the number of meetings scheduled for the CAC has yet to be determined and, as a starting point will be set to 3 meetings. Future meetings will be scheduled according to need. Mr. Torres then proceeded to explain that the roles and responsibilities of CAC members would be to provide opinions, advice, guidance and suggestions on areas concerning the scope of the project. All CAC member ideas and suggestions will be woven into the team's project development process.

Mr. Bingham then proceeded to include that all CAC members will be the most important vehicle to disseminate information back into their communities regarding the project. He also explained that the CAC members do not have veto power nor will they vote on suggestions that are presented.

The meeting concluded with the goal for the next CAC meeting was to develop the purpose and need of the project. Mr. Wally Stokes then proceeded to suggest that at the next meeting we should talk about the homeless encampment issues under the bridge. Every CAC member agreed to set the next meeting date for April 26 5:30 p.m. at Benjamin Franklin Library. Meeting has been changed to May 10<sup>th</sup> 5:30 p.m. at the Boyle Heights Technology Center 1600 E 4<sup>th</sup> St. Los Angeles 90023.

Meeting ended at 7:30 p.m.

### **Questions Asked**

- ➤ How long will bridge be out of service?
- Is 4 years the maximum of time that bridge will be out of service?
- ➤ Who will decide the final design of the bridge?
- ➤ What percentage of design is allocated for art? 11%
- If proposition money is set up for the project, will every improvement or plan discussed for the bridge a possibility?
- Can you present similar case studies or field review of work done on bridges like the Broadway -Pasadena Bridge?
- Under what conditions or standards is the bridge currently in?
- ➤ How is the useful life of a bridge calculated?
- If the baseline replacement cost is higher, how much is the cost expected to rise?
- How much more will it cost to build a state of the Art bridge and not just a baseline bridge?
- Will the new bridge have ASR problem?
- ➤ Is there another mitigation/ treatment for the ASR problem?
- Did any of the Los Angeles Bridges suffer damage during past earthquakes?
- How can you sell us the replacement solution if more funding is needed?
- > Is replacing the bridge a done deal?
- ➤ Will EIR include expansion of bridge and new alignment?
- > Will decorative elements remain?
- ➤ Will project work in conjunction with the LA River Revitalization plan?
- ➤ How will we attract movie industry to Los Angeles after new bridge is built?
- ➤ What are the mitigation measures that will in be play for the businesses in Boyle Heights and Downtown that will be impacted by this project?
- ➤ Where will additional funds come from if project cost goes up?
- > Before the creation of the CAC what was your vehicle to engage the community?

No bicycle lane on the sidewalk.

### **Comments**

- Carol Armstrong of the LA River Revitalization plan explained that the plan is not set in stone and that the plan is a vision that enables many changes in areas of open space. All the green areas in the plan do not mean that this is their only designation. The green areas just emphasize that those open areas exist and that they can be used for many other visions.
- ➤ Teresa Marquez, President of the Boyle Heights Homeowner Residents Association stated that she would like to see a new bridge be constructed right next to the current bridge. She was also concerned about the structural integrity of the new bridge and how past earthquake activity has proven her theory true that new bridges are not necessarily safer than older structures. She also requested two meetings, one for the Boyle Heights Quadrant 3 and the Boyle Heights Homeowner Residents Association.
- Build structure-enclosing bridge.
- ➤ Michelle Mowery of the Bicycle Advisory Committee explained that the City is currently reviewing the bike path plan for the entire city and the 6<sup>th</sup> St Bridge is not on the current bike path because of current bridge road deficiencies. She added that replacement of the bridge gives opportunity for new bridge to be included in bike plan.
- Kristian Werner, Lead officer for the Arts District introduced CAC members to the homeless encampments issue under the bridge. He hopes this project will help with the management of the encampments and is eager to see this through an environmental design. Officer Werner is particularly concerned with the illicit criminal activities that are taking place under the bridge because of the homeless who have such encampments.
- > CAC would like to see project consider traffic, pedestrian and bike needs.

#### **Data Collected from Area of Interest Sheets:**

This is a summary of the information collected from the 11 interest forms that CAC members filled out. 7 out 11 CAC members responded that design is the desired area of most interest at 63% of the vote. 6 out 11 CAC members responded that a historical aspect was the next desired area of interest at 54% of the vote. 5 out of 11 CAC members responded that aesthetics is a desired area of interest at 45% of the vote. 3 out of 11 CAC members responded that Cultural Sensitivity, Community events and traffic are areas of interest at 27% of the vote. 2 out of 11 CAC members responded that Other and Recreational areas are of interest at 18% of the vote. Only 1 out of 11 CAC members responded that Mitigation Measures is a desired area of interest at 9% of the vote. In the Other category as an area of interest, members included non-motorized transportation, crime reduction and improvement of quality of life through environmental designs.

Design 63% Historical Aspects 54% Aesthetics 45% Cultural Sensitivity 27% Community Events 27% Traffic 27% Other 18% Recreational 18% Mitigation Measures 9%

### Action Items:

- Send out meeting minutes
- Case studies or field review of similar construction projects
- Set up next CAC meeting
- Schedule meeting requests