

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
I-710 OVERSIGHT POLICY COMMITTEE**

**A Meeting Held at Progress Park
15500 Downey Avenue
Paramount, CA**

February 28, 2002

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Hector De La Torre, South Gate; Co-Chair Frank Colonna, Long Beach; Co-Chair Samuel Pena, Maywood; Hugo Argumedo, Commerce; Keith McCarthy, Downey; Arturo Reyes, Lynwood; Gene Daniels, Paramount; William Davis, Vernon; John Calhoun, Port of Long Beach; Steve Novotny, Caltrans; Joan Wood, MTA; Zahi Faranesh, SCAG.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: George Cole, Bell; Daniel Crespo, Bell Gardens; Eric Perrodin, Compton; Frank Gurule, Cudahy; Jessica Maes, Huntington Park.

ALSO PRESENT: Betty Karnette, State Senator, 27th District; Helene Ansel, Office of Assembly Member Alan Lowenthal; Ken Jenkins, Office of Senator Betty Karnette; William C. Pagett, TAC Chairman and City Engineer of Bell Gardens, Cudahy, Maywood, and Paramount; Robert Messinger, GCCOG General Counsel; Richard Powers, GCCOG Executive Director; Jack Joseph, GCCOG Deputy Executive Director; Karin Hodin, MTA; Gerald Miller, Long Beach Assistant City Manager; Fernando Mendoza, City of Commerce Administrative Analyst; Reginald Tabor, City of Compton Administrative Assistant; Don Dey, City of Long Beach Traffic Engineer; Jeanine Critie, Office of Long Beach Councilmember Frank Colonna; Carlos Alvarado, City Engineer, City of Bell; Kevin Wilson, City of Vernon Director of Community Development; Dave Levinsohn, Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas; Julie Rush, PBQD; J.D. Douglas, PBQD; Steven Yoshizumi, PBQD; Michael Fischer, Cambridge Systematics, Inc; Bruce Chow, Kaku Associates; Sylvia Novoa, Consensus Planning Group; Alisa Kwun, CPG.

I. Call to Order

Chair Hector de la Torre called the meeting of the I-710 Oversight Policy Committee to order at 5:15 p.m.

II. Pledge of Allegiance

Member Keith McCarthy led the pledge of allegiance.

III. Roll Call

Roll was taken through self-introductions.

IV. Amendments to the Agenda

There were no amendments to the agenda.

V. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

VI. Consent Calendar

It was moved by Co-Chair Colonna, seconded by Member Daniels, to approve the minutes of the December 13, 2001 meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

VII. Reports

A. I-710 Study Update

David Levinsohn of PBQD presented an update of the status of the I-710 Major Corridor Study. Mr. Levinsohn presented the flow chart of the I-710 MCS study process and indicated that the study was now at the milestone of adopting the Initial Set of Alternatives. This step follows the adoption of the Purpose and Need Statement, which the OPC adopted at their December 13, 2001 meeting. This will approve the Initial Set of 12 candidate alternatives that the Study Team will then take through both a technical screening process as well as a public outreach process. This will lead to the next major study milestone, the adoption of the Final Set of alternatives, scheduled for June 2002.

Mr. Levinsohn reminded the OPC of the Purpose and Need Statement, which the OPC adopted at their meeting of December 13, 2001. It consists of 11 problem statements and objectives, however the top three, which are interrelated can be summarized as: the high and increasing volume of heavy duty trucks on I-710 and surrounding corridor roadways; the insufficient level of traffic safety on I-710; and the lack of roadway capacity which causes both recurring and non-recurring traffic congestion. Mr. Levinsohn pointed out that the alternatives proposed for further study should address at least these three, interrelated problems and

issues. Mr. Levinsohn then gave an overview of the principles of alternatives development. The alternatives should:

- Address Various Aspects of Purpose and Need
- Cover a Range of Investment Levels
- Should Include the Locally Preferred Strategy (LPS)
- However, Should Also Have a Reasonable Chance of Becoming the LPS
- Should Include All Reasonable Modes
- Number of Alternatives Should be Manageable
- Alternatives Should be Conceptual in Scope
- Should Be Significantly Different from Each Other

Mr. Levinsohn pointed out that an Initial Set of 12 alternatives has been developed which address the study Purpose and Need and meet the principles described above. They were developed through a series of technical workshops involving both the consultant team and members of the TAC and the sponsoring transportation agencies. They were formally adopted by the TAC at their meeting on February 20, 2002 and include one No Build Alternative, one Transportation Systems Management/Transportation Demand Management (TSM/TDM) Alternative and ten build alternatives. The ten build alternatives are grouped according to their level of benefit, cost and impact (low, medium, high) and the mode they are primarily designed to serve (general purpose traffic, high occupancy vehicles (HOV), trucks, or goods movement). Mr. Levinsohn indicated that each alternative has transportation elements that work together to form its design concept and scope. These elements include:

- Interchanges
- Meet Design Standards
- Adding Lanes
- Arterials
- Freeway
- TDM/TSM; Transit; ITS
- Special Features (e.g., Truck Bypass Lanes, Dual Roadway)
- Elevated
- At-Grade

Mr. Levinsohn then went on to describe each of the alternatives in the proposed Initial Set. The No Build Alternative is comprised of the facilities and services expected to be in place in the Study Area by the planning horizon year of 2025 and includes the rehabilitation work Caltrans has begun along the I-710. Mr. Levinsohn referred the TAC to the details in their handout for the full description of the No Build. Mr. Levinsohn then began to discuss the ten build alternatives, saying that he would come back to the TSM/TDM description after the build alternatives.

Alternative 3, the Low General Purpose Alternative, is comprised of a network of arterial street improvements, plus the redesign of two interchanges along I-710: Imperial Blvd. and Florence Ave. and the partial reconstruction of the I-710/I-5 interchange. Its primary purpose is to improve traffic flow and safety for all vehicle types.

Alternative 4, the Low Truck Alternative, has the purpose of improving safety and managing the flow of heavy duty trucks. Its principal components include an extended collector/distributor lane system between Atlantic/Bandini and the I-710/I-5 interchange, improvements to those heavy truck volume arterials connecting to I-710, a truck inspection facility and major improvements to the I-710/I-405 interchange.

Alternative 5, the Medium HOV Alternative, has the purpose of improving travel time and attractiveness of HOVs to increase the person carrying capacity of I-710. Its major component is the addition of an HOV (carpool) lane in each direction along the entire length of I-710 and major improvements to the I-710/I-5 interchange.

Alternative 6, the Medium General Purpose Alternative, has the purpose of improving safety and eliminating bottlenecks for all types of traffic. Its principal components are the addition of one general purpose traffic lane in each direction between the Shoemaker Bridge and I-405 and between Imperial Blvd. and Atlantic/Bandini interchanges, the addition of collector-distributor lanes, the redesign and reconstruction of the I-405, SR-91 and I-5 interchanges, the improvement of 10 other interchanges and the addition of a new interchange at Slauson Ave.

Alternative 7, the Medium Truck Alternative, has the purpose of improving safety, reliability, and access to I-710 primarily for heavy duty trucks. Its principal components are the addition of truck bypass lanes around the I-405, SR-91 and I-105 interchanges, truck only on/off ramps at high truck volume interchanges, and the redesign and reconstruction of the I-405, SR-91 and I-5 interchanges.

Alternative 8, the High General Purpose Alternative, has the purpose of improving safety and capacity to address high traffic volumes along all of I-710. Its principal components include the addition of two general purpose lanes in each direction between the Shoemaker Bridge and I-405 and between Imperial Blvd. and Atlantic/Bandini interchanges, and the addition of one general purpose lane in each direction for the remainder of I-710. Also included are the redesign and reconstruction of the I-405, SR-91 and I-5 interchanges, the improvement of 10 other interchanges and the addition of a new interchange at Slauson Ave.

Alternative 9, the High Truck Alternative, has the purpose of increasing capacity for growing heavy duty truck demand, improving reliability, and reducing points of conflict between cars and trucks. Its principal components are the addition of new truck only lanes between the Shoemaker Bridge and SR-60, and the redesign and reconstruction of the I-405, SR-91 and I-5 interchanges. The truck lanes would have entry/exit ramps about every 3-4 miles apart.

Alternative 10, the High Goods Movement Alternative, has the purpose of addressing the high demand for goods movement on a system-wide basis throughout the Study Area. Its principal components are a new dual roadway facility between the Shoemaker Bridge and SR-60 to separate auto and truck traffic, similar to the northern section of the New Jersey Turnpike. The auto only lanes would have entry/exit locations spaced about every 3-4 miles. This alternative also includes to extensions to the Terminal Island Freeway, one extending the terminus from Willow St. to I-405 and the other a new viaduct connector between SR-47 and Alameda Street. This alternative also includes the redesign and reconstruction of the I-405, SR-91 and I-5 interchanges and the improvement of 10 other interchanges. Finally, this alternative includes capacity enhancements to major north/south arterials near I-710.

Alternative 11, the High HOV Alternative, has the purpose of improving travel time and attractiveness of HOVs to increase the person carrying capacity of I-710 as well as safety improvements. It includes the addition of four elevated carpool lanes, two in each direction, above the median of I-710 from the Shoemaker Bridge to SR-60, with entry/exit locations spaced about every 3-4 miles. It also includes the redesign and reconstruction of the I-405, SR-91 and I-5 interchanges, including the addition of carpool connector ramps.

Alternative 12, the High General Purpose/HOV Alternative, has the purpose of improving safety, increasing capacity to address high general purpose traffic and providing travel time saving for HOVs. It includes the addition of one mixed flow lane and one general purpose lane in each direction from the Shoemaker Bridge to SR-60. It also includes the redesign and reconstruction of the I-405, SR-91 and I-5 interchanges along with redesign and improvement to 10 other interchanges.

Mr. Levinsohn then presented the TSM/TDM alternative, which has the purpose of improving goods movement, auto and transit travel and reducing environmental impacts. It is a federally required alternative, of relatively low cost, which attempts to address purpose and need through management and operational improvements to the transportation system. Its major components include ramp meters, high mast illumination at freeway/freeway interchanges, ramp termini improvements, peak period parking restrictions on major parallel arterials, empty container management programs, extended truck emission reduction programs, and extended hours for truck pick up and delivery. It also

includes public transit improvements of additional MTA Blue and Green Line feeder shuttle buses, and enhanced community transit services. Finally it includes Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) improvements including smart traffic signals, variable message signs and highway advisory radio.

Mr. Levinsohn summarized that each alternative emphasizes a different trip purpose and mode, that the alternatives include a range of investment and impact levels and that the elements in the No Build and TSM/TDM Alternatives are included in all build alternatives. He then asked the OPC if we are missing an alternative that has a reasonable chance of becoming the Locally Preferred Strategy. He continued to summarize by pointing out that the next step would be to perform a screening analysis of the Initial Set of Alternatives to estimate their benefits, impacts and costs in order to inform the TAC and OPC in their decision as to which five alternatives are the best and should continue to be studied in more detail to become the LPS. Mr. Levinsohn pointed out the Final Set of five alternatives will include the No Build and TSM/TDM and three build alternatives which could be a combination of elements of the 10 alternatives in the Initial Set.

Finally, Mr. Levinsohn presented photos of examples of some of the unique or uncommon features of the Initial Set, including truck bypass lanes, collector/distributor lanes, the dual roadway concept, and direct HOV connector ramps.

Member Argumedo left the meeting at 6:15 p.m.

B. Recommendation from the Technical Advisory Committee

Bill Pagett, TAC Chair, confirmed that the Initial Set presented to the OPC by Mr. Levinsohn in his report was endorsed and approved by the full TAC at their previous meeting.

C. Discussion/Approval of the Initial Set of the Initial Set of Alternatives

OPC Chair Hector de la Torre opened discussion and comment on the proposed Initial Set of Alternatives as recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee.

Co-Chair Frank Colonna said that he felt that there was a missing mode that should be considered and that is high speed passenger rail. He feels that the study should look even beyond its 20 year planning horizon to longer term improvements, and that if major improvements are to be considered for I-710, it would be shortsighted not to think of improvements that could increase the person carrying capacity of the corridor. He suggested a high speed rail link between downtown Long Beach and downtown Los Angeles. Mr. Colonna recognizes that the MTA Blue Line provides such a passenger rail linkage, but he is thinking of a much higher speed technology on exclusive guideway, which

might be maglev technology or more conventional steel wheel on steel rail technology.

Mr. Levinsohn replied that the study scope limited the initial set to no more than 12 alternatives and if the OPC desired to include high speed rail, one of the proposed build alternatives would have to be dropped from further consideration. He suggested that if it was the desire of the OPC to include a high speed rail alternative, then it could be substituted for the High General Purpose/High HOV Alternative as the elements of that alternative were included in other alternatives and they could be evaluated during screening as components of the other alternatives.

After additional discussion, it was moved by Member McCarthy, seconded by Member Reyes, to approve the initial set of twelve alternatives, but substituting a high-speed rail line for the HOV lanes in Alternative 12.

ROLL CALL

AYES: Chair De La Torre, Co-Chair Colonna, Co-Chair Pena, Member McCarthy, Member Reyes, Member Daniels, Member Davis, Member Calhoun, Member Novotny, Member Wood, Member Faranesh.

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Member Argumedo, Member Cole, Member Crespo, Member Gurule, Member Perrodin, Member Maes.

VIII. Matters from the I-710 Oversight Policy Committee

Chair De La Torre said that he would like to meet again for a status report in April.

IX. Matters from Staff

Mr. Powers reported that the Gateway Cities Council of Governments had retained the firm of Nossaman Guthner Knox & Elliott to examine potential financing concepts for the project.

X. Adjournment

Minutes
I-710 Oversight Policy Committee
February 28, 2002
Page 8 of 8

It was moved by Co-Chair Colonna, seconded by Member Daniels, to adjourn. The motion was approved unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 6:40 p.m.