

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE A Meeting Held at Gateway Cities COG Offices 7300 Alondra Blvd., Suite 201 Paramount, CA March 20, 2002

Chair Pagett called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair William Pagett, Bell Gardens, Cudahy, Maywood, Paramount; Vice Chair Desi Alvarez, Downey; Patrick Fu, Huntington Park; Don Dey, Long Beach; Woody Natsuhara, Vernon; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach; Al Bowser, SCAG; Steve Novotny, Caltrans; Karin Hodin, MTA.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Carlos Alvarado, Bell; Robert Quintero, Commerce; Augustus Ajawara, Compton; Joe Wang, Lynwood; Ed Mino, South Gate; Sandra Balmir, FHWA/FTA; Joe Vizcarra, CHP.

OTHERS PRESENT: Yvonne Tseng, MTA; Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities COG; Deborah Chankin, Gateway Cities COG; Louis Rubenstein, Port of Long Beach; Frances Lee, Caltrans Corridor Studies; Kristin Wilson, Caltrans Corridor Studies; Inez Yeung, LA County DWP; James Chon, LA County DWP; Dave Levinsohn, PBQD; Paul Taylor, Kaku Associates; Julie Rush, PBQD.

Roll was taken through self-introductions.

There were no amendments to the agenda.

There were no public comments.

Consent Calendar:

Consultant staff announced that the minutes for the February 20, 2002 meeting were not yet ready and no action was taken.

Reports:

A. Report on OPC Adopted Initial Set of Alternatives

Dave Levinsohn [PBQD] summarized for the TAC members the results of the I-710 Oversight Policy Committee Meeting (OPC) that took place on February 28, 2002. The OPC adopted an initial set of twelve alternatives for further study; however, there were some revisions to the set that was recommended by the I-710 TAC. Mr. Frank Colonna, City of Long Beach and Co-Chair of the I-710 OPC, proposed that a rail alternative be added to the study for further consideration. In order to accommodate the new alternative, it was suggested that Alternative 12 originally proposed by the TAC as a combination added HOV lane and added mixed flow lane be replaced by a rail alternative that utilized the existing I-710 alignment to the greatest extent possible. A key factor behind this suggestion was to take advantage of the SCAG region's development efforts with regard to high-speed rail (e.g., the "Orange Line"), particularly if the I-710 corridor needed to be rebuilt. This proposed change was seconded and adopted by the full OPC. Other concerns and issues raised and discussed by the OPC included elevated truck lanes (visual, noise concerns) and the possibility of depressing the truck lanes (Alt. 9) and placing them "in trench" as well as the need to use existing state right-of-way as much as possible. Consequently the project team will be looking at "best fit" with regard to the horizontal and vertical alignment of Alternative 9 in keeping with its design concept and scope, as well as the other build alternatives.

Dave Levinsohn reviewed the primary features of Alternative 12, High Rail, which has been further developed by the project team as a result of the OPC meeting. In order to help this alternative compete well with the other build alternatives as an alternative mode, it is important that the rail users realize a travel time advantage over the auto. This is one of the chief criticisms of the "Blue Line" Line as it takes about an hour for transit riders to reach downtown LA (7th & Flower) from downtown Long Beach. Better rail travel times mean higher rail speeds and fewer station stops. As proposed, Alternative 12 would be an exclusive, double track rail line linking downtown Long Beach and Union Station in downtown Los Angeles; would utilize the median of I-710 and Union Pacific rail rights-of-way; and would have stations located about every five miles. It would interface with both the existing "Blue Line" (near Del Amo) and the existing "Green Line" (near I-105) and would utilize a system configuration consistent with what is under study for the "Orange line" along the Union Pacific rail right-of-way between Norwalk and downtown Los Angeles.

The TAC members discussed the trade-offs between closer station spacing (1 mile) and thus the need to serve as many communities in the I-710 study area as possible and the need to keep rail travel times competitive. It was decided to keep the general location of the rail stations as proposed.

B. Overview of the Alternatives Screening Process

At the last TAC meeting (February 20, 2002), a memo that described the proposed technical approach for screening the initial set of alternatives was distributed but there was insufficient time remaining for a full discussion. The memo on Screening Methodology has since been updated to provide further background explanation, to address the new rail alternative, and to include additional environmental or qualitative factors.

Julie Rush [PBQD] described the proposed technical screening approach, which will take place over the next several weeks during the months of March, April, and May. The screening effort will focus on developing "order of magnitude" differences among the initial set of alternatives with regard to benefits, costs, and impacts. Both quantitative and qualitative performance measures will be used to characterize the relative performance of the twelve alternatives. Technical screening will consist of the following major activities: (1) estimate right-of-way impacts; (2) estimate capital costs; (3) estimate travel demand; (4) estimate transportation mode shift/facility demand shift due to major capacity improvements; (5) estimate travel benefits; (6) estimate safety benefits; and (7) estimate environmental and other qualitative factors. As the subarea model for I-710 is currently in the process of being developed, the project team will utilize the same travel demand outputs (e.g., from MTA's regional forecast model, SCAG's HDT forecasts, and the Port of LA's model from their Transportation Master Plan effort) that were used to represent existing and future travel conditions in the I-710 Corridor under Task 3.

Key issues discussed by the TAC members included: physical constraints posed by the LA River; I-710 as a goods movement corridor versus an HOV corridor; physical and operational issues associated with an elevated truckway; and the relative merits of setting an upward limit on project cost based on assumed financial feasibility. In general, TAC members were opposed to setting any arbitrary limits on project cost to identify a range of final alternatives and stated that, instead, the screening activities should focus on addressing the demand (and needs) in the I-710 corridor and cost-effectiveness of the relative improvements.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 3:40 p.m.