

MEETING NOTES

PASADENA CITIZENS' ADVISORY COUNCIL

www.pasadenacac.org

Tuesday, August 22, 2023

Revive! Church

The 300th meeting of the Pasadena Citizens' Advisory Council (PCAC) was held on Tuesday, August 22, 2023, at the Revive Church, 1062 Fairmont Parkway. The PCAC was joined by the Galena Park-Jacinto City Community-Industry Partnership to participate in the TxDOT presentation about the SH 225 and I-610 East Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) Study. The agenda was accepted as proposed. The meeting notes from April 25, 2023, were approved without change.

ATTENDEES *italicized*

PCAC Members

Andrew Aleman, City of Pasadena OEM
Jed Aplaca, City of Pasadena Parks and Rec.
Ruth Askine
Diane Barnes, CTHS
Hal Burke, City of Pasadena
Neighborhood Network
Raul Camarillo, Harris Co. Pct. 2
Emilio Carmona
Azell Carter, City of Pasadena OEM
Monica De La Portilla
Tammy De Los Santos, City of Pasadena Parks and Rec.
Tish Eubanks, City of Pasadena
Albert Gonzales
Rick Guerrero, Pasadena Economic Development Corp.
Mike Jackson
Chad Carson, Economic Alliance Houston Port Region
Luz Locke
Loretta McCarthy
Lupita Monreal, City of Pasadena
Neighborhood Network
Ellis Orozco
Ernesto Paredes

Margie Pena, Baker Ripley
Brenda Pritchard, City of Pasadena
Neighborhood Network
Dominick Rezza
Giovanna Searcy
Richard Sims
Sue Sims
Joe Valdivia
Christian Rocha, Chamber of Commerce
Cristina Womack, Chamber of Commerce
Jack Womack

Support

Diane Sheridan, Facilitator
Emily Morris, Secretary

Observers or Resources

Jerri Anderson, Community Awareness Services
Kaylyn Atanacio, Entech
Vanessa Ayala Medina
Chris Baecke, Harris Co. Pollution Control
Bianca Carrizal, State Rep. Mary Ann Perez
Skylar Casey, HCA SE

Juan Flores, Air Alliance Houston
Fred Floyd, Jr., Bob's Truck Care
Renee Ford, HCA SE
Roger Gonzales, Entech
Jen Hadayia, Air Alliance
Bambi Hall, TxDOT
Ninfa Herrera
Diamond Pham, Air Alliance
Rae Sterkel
Lindsay Swanagan, HCA SE
Sue Theiss, TxDOT
Pat Van Houte, Pasadena City Council
David Wade, HCOHSEM
Jackson Wagner, HCA SE
Wahida Wakil, Entech

CAC Plant Members

Afton Chemical, Hari Sundaram rep by Maryam Shekari,
Air Products, Brian Farhadi
Albemarle, Lisa Fruge rep by Kevin Paul, Paul Hernandez
BASF, Abe Ahmed
Chevron Pasadena Refinery, Joe Ebert, Jennifer Silva, Nathan Kangas

Chevron Phillips, Andy Woods rep by William Rutherford
Enterprise Products, Karla Arriaga, Ethyl, Hari Sundaram rep by Maryam Shekari
Evonik, Nathan Locklar, Donovan Phelan
Gulf Coast Authority, Denise Ehrlich
INEOS Phenol, Mike Meyer, Pedro Hernandez
Intercontinental Terminals Co., Robert Surguy rep by Gary Sterkel
Kinder Morgan Pasadena Terminal, Robert Hammons, Scott Eady, Marlin Collins
KM Export Terminal, Mike Dugger, Scott Eady
LyondellBasell Refinery, Clint Titzman, Lauren Gonzales
Next Wave Energy, Shane Presley rep by Ken Livengood, David Muscat
OxyChem, Eric Delgado
Sekisui, Jeff Thompson, Scott Stephens

TXDOT SH 225 AND I-610 EAST PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL LINKAGES (PEL) STUDY

Two handouts posted in Member section of www.pasadenacac.org

Representatives of the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) delivered a presentation that detailed conceptual alternatives for expansion of SH 225 and I-610 East. Attendees then were offered multiple ways to provide input to TxDOT. During the presentation, representatives encouraged attendees to complete an online survey about the proposals and offer their comments. The survey can be found at <https://www.menti.com/al84dnxrcm7h/0>.

Attendees also were offered a Stakeholder Comment Form to complete and submit that night or by mail or email. **All comments must be postmarked or emailed by 9-5-23** to be considered in this phase of the PEL. Small group discussion input on the yellow worksheets also will be submitted to TxDOT.

- **Representing the project** were Bambi Hall and Sue Theiss, from TxDOT; Kaylyn Atanacio, Wahida Wakil, and Roger Gonzalez from Entech; and Jerri Anderson from Community Awareness Services. Sue Theiss introduced the topic, and Roger Gonzales delivered the presentation.
- **PEL study:** Gonzalez began the presentation by explaining that a PEL study is a preliminary examination of many workable options for the roadway expansions of SH 225 and I-610 East, which will be medium- and long-term projects. Gonzalez explained that the study falls under the jurisdiction of the National Environmental Policy Act and will be carried out by TxDOT. A PEL study contributes to high-level decision-making while promoting “efficiency and cost-effective solutions” and including stakeholders in the process.
- **Public engagement timeline:** Gonzalez said the PEL Study Public and Stakeholder Engagement Activities began in 2020 and would conclude by the end of 2023. As an example of why improvements need to be made to these corridors, Gonzalez mentioned that increasing ship sizes have prompted incidents of ships hitting the 610 bridge. He said increasing the height of the bridge would be considered as part of the infrastructure improvements. Gonzalez also said adding electronic message boards are an option as well.
- **A Purpose and Need statement** provides a basis for future roadway expansion, taking into consideration existing conditions and public input to develop viable alternatives.
- **5 needs were identified:** Enhanced safety, multimodal movement of people, efficient movement of freight and maritime cargo, enhanced emergency evacuation, and upgrading of aging infrastructure.
- **Why are they needed?** Studies have shown increases in vehicular accidents, congested roadways, emergency events requiring evacuation, and aging infrastructure; 52% increase in population by 2045; and insufficient mass-transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.
- **SH 225 and I-610 East PEL Study Progress:** Public meeting #2 in October 2023 with PEL study findings slated for late 2023.
- **What is a Conceptual Alternative?** A conceptual alternative includes **primary** alternatives,

which serve the corridor-wide purpose and need, and **supplemental** alternatives, which meet localized transportation needs.

- **Supplemental Alternatives** can be combined with any primary alternative, which include connectivity, multimodal transportation, frontage roads, and main lanes.
- The TxDOT PEL study includes **7 alternatives**. Each alternative provides a detailed infrastructure plan and considers the following criteria: How many of the 5 Needs were met, benefits of the plan, and deficiencies of the plan. The first plan considered is to do nothing, which offers no benefits and meets none of the current and future needs, while the next 7 alternatives include such options as elevated roadways, truck lanes, expanded lanes, and new lanes.
- **How to stay engaged in the public input process:** A survey is found at this link <https://www.menti.com/al84dnxrcm7h/0>, and the “SH 225 & I-610 East PEL Study Page” is found at this link <https://www.txdot.gov/projects/projects-studies/houston/sh225-i610-east-study.html>.
- **Two handouts from TxDOT summarize** the presentation: “SH 225 and I-610 East PEL Study Primary Conceptual Alternatives” and “SH 225 and I-610 East Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) Study.” The handouts can be found in the Member section of www.pasadenacac.org.

Q&A

Q: Some of the ships have hit the bridge? Are there no guidelines for the size of ships?

A: Yes, but that’s a Port of Houston question because their terminals are on the other side of the bridge. Boats ride lower [in the water] when full and ride higher when they’re empty, and that’s part of the problem.

Q: Would dredging be an option?

A: Dredging is not being considered by TxDOT - infrastructure needs to be improved anyway, so it stands to reason to raise the elevation during this improvement.

Q: Can we choose a combo in the alternatives? Or have an alternative that combines some of the other alternatives?

A: Yes, we are exploring adding a travel lane with an elevated structure.

Q (A question was asked about the elevated structure in the managed-lane concept in Primary Alternative 4): Is that similar to an HOV lane?

A: Yes

Q: Would people be required to go through the elevated lanes, and would there be a charge?

A: They would not be required, but it depends on what we would be using those lanes for. We’re hoping to reduce truck traffic.

Q: There is a need for the public to understand the risks of elevated lanes in general and understand safety barriers. We have a lot of hazardous materials going through these corridors, and elevated lanes become an issue of concern.

A: We are proposing a variety of options with elevated managed lanes, and we can convert general-use lanes to truck lanes – there are multiple options.

Q: Can you explain two things on the Managed lanes? Can you talk about how this is physically managed and how would travelers move through these areas?

A: If you are familiar with I-10 West, these are Managed lines. There are signs that go up when it’s open, and

when it's closed, and what type of vehicles can use it. It also tells us what kinds of vehicles are used at what time of the day. When you look at Managed lanes, it's about trying to get them through the most efficient way. "Managed" means that there had to be a decision made, and from this hour to this hour, we see trucks that need to go from here to there, so we are going to manage this traffic from this time frame for these vehicles. So "Managed" doesn't mean toll; it means we are going to figure out the best use for this real estate to make sure people get through the most efficient way possible.

Q: Does "managed" mean there are fees?

A: "Managed" just means it could limit what type of vehicles use it at a particular time of the day. The goal is to move people efficiently. It could mean fees.

Q: Nothing has been said about costs yet. What will the costs be and how much weight will that have in the design that you choose?

A: We are going through the cost process to evaluate the cost. With evaluations – environmental impact, flow of traffic – this will be a high-level cost estimate; TxDOT is not doing the design. There will be right-of-way (ROW) impacts, pipelines may have to be moved, or utilities – these are costly. This will be in the report.

Q: What is multimodal?

A: So multimodal would mean anything other than cars. We would have other modes of transportation, and transit is something we would consider or bicycle lanes.

Q: What are "primary" and "secondary"?

A: Primary is the basic reconstruction, and supplementary would include the bike lanes or sidewalks.

Q: Are PEL studies performed for all TxDOT projects?

A: They are done for long-corridor projects. The study looks at the corridor and discerns the needs and history of the corridor: Does it need to widen lanes or shoulders, add traffic barriers or sidewalks and bike paths nearby, does it need shared-use paths? The study examines a variety of ideas and helps decide which agency should build what – county, city, another agency, etc. The final results identify the best way to get vehicles through the corridor. Do intersections need to change? Add detention ponds? Make signal changes? Smaller projects can get done quicker.

Q: What is the timeline on all of these plans?

A: This study is going to be wrapped up by the end of the year. The next phase will be the schematic and environmental phase. This could take as long as three to five years because of the environmental process and because of the type of corridor that it's in. For example, with 610, there's a lot of coordination and a lot of environmental issues that need to be addressed. After we get the schematic approval, this will go to design, and this can take two to three years, or possibly four, depending on the complexity of the channel. A full project runs from 10 to 15 years from beginning to construction and includes funding. We also have identified short-term projects, and these can be done quickly. The district is looking at doing the 610 bridge and has started the schematic design of the bridge.

Q: After 9 to 10 a.m., the trucks start leaving the port, and Clinton Drive is like a parking lot for trucks. Is there any plan to put an exit on 610 as an alternative to them using Clinton Drive?

A: This is very early in the planning stage. If you know of an issue, provide that input on the survey. This is the time to provide input.

Small Group Discussion

Responses were provided by 29 people who identified themselves as taking part in PCAC, 12 people who take part GP-JC, and 6 people who participate in both groups.

What transportation changes would you like to see on the SH 225 and I-610E corridor?

- Finish what they already started.
- Direct connectors from 225 to Beltway 8 (2).
- Relieve clutter at 610 to 225, and 225 to 8.
- Less traffic, reduced congestion, and increased safety (2).
- Separation of pedestrian and commercial traffic.
- Improve intersections.
- Separate freight from traffic and provide public transportation.
- Commuter rail – invest in public transit.
- Lane expansions.
- Designated lanes for trucks (2).
- Dedicated entrance/exit ramps for elevated truck/HOV lanes.
- To alleviate the truck congestion on Clinton Drive in Galena Park, is it possible to add an exit/entrance ramp before Clinton Drive. It looks like an 18-wheeler parking lot in Galena Park. That way, trucks can enter the freeway from the Port.
- Very concerned about elevating trucks that high and a truck having an accident with flammables.
- Explanation of safety on elevated lanes.

What would you consider to be immediate (0-2 years) needs for SH 225 and I-610E corridor?

- Finish existing project.
- Improve signage to suggest alternative routes or estimated arrival times.
- More bus options from different areas, not just downtown.
- Exit improvements.
- Managed lanes for trucks.
- Lane expansions.
- Dedicated 225 to Beltway 8N on/off ramp.
- Beltway 8/225 flyover.
- Beltway and 225 flyover connectors not impacted.
- 610/225 interchange flyover.
- Plans to include all 8 connectors.

Do you have any concerns about the information that was presented by TxDOT today?

- How much is the cost? (2)
- Who is paying? (2)
- Funding mechanism for options.
- Managed lane expectations and regulations, and potential expense to users.
- If they go with an expansion project, how many people would it impact?
- Elevated lanes are expensive – if you put money into elevated lanes, what other area loses funding?
- Elevated lane only when needed to avoid taking property.
- Would like to see a combination of supplemental alternatives.
- Timelines too long.

- Alternatives presented are never going to happen because of petro industry in TX.
- Go ahead and get started.
- Scheduled completion and city growth.

Input on any other topics?

- How will increased traffic and industry affect noise in the area and neighborhoods?
- When are they going to start working on Beltway 8 bridge again? It needs to be completed.
- Keep bike trails at parks, not on freeways.
- Pave KMET way.

HOST PLANTS INTRODUCTION

There were two host plants because of the combined PCAC and GP-JC CIP meeting.

LyondellBasell Houston Refinery

Clint Titzman, Technical Assurance Manager, said LyondellBasell has been operating since 1918 and takes the worst crude and turns it into the best gasoline products. LyondellBasell’s Houston Refinery has a rated capacity of 268,000 barrels per day of crude oil, which is processed into reformulated gasoline and ultra-low-sulfur diesel, as well as other high-value products such as jet fuel, aromatics, lubricants, and petroleum coke. The slide also indicated the company’s commitment to the community.

Q: Isn’t LyondellBasell going out of business?

A: We are shutting down at the end of 2024 and looking at options. We have some assets that we could convert into plastics recycling. Options could include mechanical recycling and chemical/advanced recycling. Advanced recycling is turning plastics back into raw material. When the runtime of the refinery was extended, it was to give us time to explore such options.

Q: Aren’t you part of the project in Kingwood?

A: Yes, we’re part of a pilot project for advanced recycling. This is the Houston recycling collaborative.

Chevron Pasadena Refinery

Jennifer Silva, Corporate Affairs Manager, said Chevron Pasadena Refinery dates back to the early days of exploration and refining in SE Texas and manufactures fuels and petroleum feedstocks. In operation since 1919, the facility now employs about 350 workers and has a daily refining capacity of 110,000 barrels of oil. Silva said the company has a strong commitment to the community and strives to create social and economic value wherever it operates. Chevron’s Light Tight Oil (LTO) Project, expected to be completed in 2024, will update the refinery, increasing crude capacity, diversifying production output, and lowering overall permitted emissions.

PLANT UPDATES

Kinder Morgan Pasadena Terminal: Environmental Health and Safety Director Scott Eady reported a fire that occurred at the Pasadena Terminal on Witter Street on July 9, 2023. The written Plant Update Summary describes the event and the associated emissions. There were ongoing communications with regulatory agencies and local offices of emergency management during and after the incident, to which Kinder Morgan’s Gulf Region emergency response personnel responded. This is an active investigation and debriefings are not complete at this time. Once they are, PCAC will receive an updated report.

Plant Update Summary was mailed to attendees shortly before the meeting and mailed to all members the day afterward. Direct questions to Diane Sheridan facilitator, dbsfacilitator@gmail.com, 281-326-5253 or raise questions at the next meeting. The tally below corrects errors when the updates were compiled and mailed.

In a Nutshell:

- Updates were received from all 18 plants
- **7 of 18** had reportable environmental incidents
- **3 of 18** had OSHA recordable injuries
- **10 of 18** had neither environmental nor safety incidents

11 plants had no environmental incidents:

- | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Afton Chemicals | 5. Enterprise Products | 9. Intercontinental Terminals |
| 2. Air Products | 6. Ethyl | 10. Kinder Morgan Export Terminal |
| 3. Albemarle | 7. Evonik | 11. Next Wave Energy Partners |
| 4. BASF | 8. Gulf Coast Authority | |

15 plants had no safety incidents:

- | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Afton Chemicals | 7. Evonik | 12. Kinder Morgan Liquids Terminal |
| 2. Air Products | 8. Gulf Coast Authority | 13. Next Wave Energy Partners |
| 3. Albemarle | 9. INEOS Phenol | 14. Oxy Vinyls |
| 4. Chevron Pasadena Refinery | 10. Intercontinental Terminals | 15. Sekisui |
| 5. Enterprise Products | 11. Kinder Morgan Export Terminal | |
| 6. Ethyl | | |

FUTURE PCAC MEETINGS

Dinner available at 5:30 pm. Meetings are from 6:00 – 7:30 p.m. unless otherwise indicated.

Tuesday, Sept. 26, 2023 – Overview of Recycling in PCAC Plants

We will have brief round-robin reports from several plants on what they do and have planned. Then the PCAC will have the opportunity to decide whether to follow up to learn more.

- **Oct. 24:** We will invite a UH professor to introduce us to carbon capture technology as he has done for two other CACs.
- **Nov. 28:** Annual Report on Emissions from PCAC Plants.

DATES FOR 2023 ----- All 4th Tuesdays

Tues., Feb. 28
Tues., Mar. 28
Tues., Apr. 25

Tues., May 23
No June or July meetings
Tues., Aug. 22
Tues., Sept. 26

Tues., Oct. 24
Tues., Nov. 28
No December meeting