

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

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

June 27, 2002

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Co-Chair Frank Colonna, Long Beach; Co-Chair Samuel Pena, Maywood; Daniel Crespo, Bell Gardens; Keith McCarthy, Downey; Arturo Reyes, Lynwood; Gene Daniels, Paramount; Xochilt Ruvalcaba, South Gate; John Calhoun, Port of Long Beach; Sharas Bangalore, Caltrans; Raymond Maekawa, MTA; Barry Samston, SCAG;

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: George Cole, Bell; Hugo Argumedo, Commerce; Melanie Andrews, Compton; Frank Gurule, Cudahy; Jessica Maes, Huntington Park; William Davis, Vernon.

ALSO PRESENT: Helene Ansel, Office of Assembly Member Alan Lowenthal; Sharon Weissman, Office of Assembly Member Jenny Oropeza; Hector de la Torre, Councilmember, City of South Gate; Jeannine Critie, Office of Long Beach Councilmember Frank Colonna; William Pagett, I-710 TAC Chairman and City Engineer of Bell Gardens, Cudahy, Maywood, and Paramount; Gerald Miller, Long Beach Assistant City Manager and Gateway Cities City Manager Representative to the OPC; Richard Powers, GCCOG Executive Director; Jack Joseph, GCCOG Deputy Executive Director; Don Camph, GCCOG Transportation Advisor; Joan Wood, MTA I-710 Major Corridor Study Project Manager; Karin Hodin, MTA I-710 Project Coordinator; Cathy Manzo, MTA; Fernando Mendoza, City of Commerce Administrative Analyst; Carlos Alvarado, City of Bell City Engineer; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach; Paul De Paola, California Highway Patrol; John Ziegler, Automobile Club of Southern California; Kanya Dorland, Port of Los Angeles; Victor Rollinger, City of Carson Director of Public Works; Woodrow Natsuhara, City of Vernon City Engineer; Mohammad Mostahkami, City of South Gate Engineering Manager; David Levinsohn, Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas; Julie Rush, PBQD; Sylvia Novoa, Consensus Planning Group; Karen Hedlund, Nossaman Guthner Knox and Elliott.

I. Call to Order

Co- Chair Samuel Pena called the meeting of the I-710 Oversight Policy Committee to order at 6:43 p.m.

II. Pledge of Allegiance

Member Ruvalcaba 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. Election of Chair

Co-Chair Pena announced that the departure of Chairman Hector De La Torre from the Oversight Policy Committee created the need to elect a new chair or co-chairs of the OPC. Member Ruvalcaba nominated Samuel Pena and Frank Colonna to serve as Co-Chairs of the I-710 Oversight Policy Committee. There were no other nominations. It was moved by Co-Chair Pena, seconded by Member Ruvalcaba, to elect Members Pena and Colonna as Co-Chairs of the Oversight Policy Committee. The motion was approved unanimously.

VI. Public Comments

There were no public comments at this time. GCCOG Executive Director Richard Powers explained that both the City of Carson and the Port of Los Angeles had indicated a desire to join the I-710 Oversight Policy Committee. He said that the details are still being worked out, but that representatives from these two jurisdictions were present and would make comments after the presentations. No one else wished to speak.

VII. Consent Calendar

The approval of minutes for the I-710 OPC meeting of February 28, 2002 and the Joint I-710 OPC/I-710 TAC Meeting of April 10, 2002 was deferred to the next OPC meeting.

VIII. Communications

A. It was moved by Member Daniels, seconded by Co-Chair Colonna, to receive and file the letter of June 11, 2002 from Senator Betty Karnette. The motion was approved unanimously.
Member Ruvalcaba left the meeting at 7:07 p.m.

IX. Reports

A. Project Status Report

David Levinsohn of PBQD presented an update of the status of the I-710 Major Corridor Study. He reminded the OPC that three prior study milestones had been completed:

- Project Initiation/Scoping completed in June 2001
- Approval of Purpose and Need completed in December 2001
- Approval of the Initial Set of Alternatives completed in February 2002.

Mr. Levinsohn said that at this meeting the study team is requesting OPC approval of the Final Set of Alternatives, another study milestone. The proposed Final Set is comprised of five alternatives: one No Build, one TSM/TDM and three build alternatives.

B. Overview of the Initial Set of 12 Alternatives

Mr. Levinsohn presented an overview of the approved Initial Set of 12 alternatives, which had been subjected to the technical screening process and public review and comment. He reminded the OPC that the Initial Set were based upon the adopted Purpose and Need Statement, which consists of 11 problem statements, however the top three interrelated problems are: high and increasing volumes of heavy duty trucks; traffic safety; and lack of roadway capacity. The Initial Set of 12 alternatives was developed through a series of workshops to address the Purpose and Need Statement and was approved by both the TAC and OPC in February 2002. They are comprised of one No Build alternative, one TSM/TDM alternative, and 10 build alternatives. The build alternatives are grouped into low, medium and high categories which reflect the relative levels of benefit, impact and cost.

Mr. Levinsohn briefly reviewed each of the Initial Set of Alternatives, showing a slide for each which indicates their principal purpose and a map of their major elements and features. The Initial Set is comprised of:

- Alternative 1 – No Build Alternative
- Alternative 2 – Transportation System Management/Transportation Demand Management (TSM/TDM) Alternative
- Alternative 3 – Low General Purpose Alternative

- Alternative 4 – Low Truck Alternative
- Alternative 5 – Medium HOV Alternative
- Alternative 6 – Medium General Purpose Alternative
- Alternative 7 – Medium Truck Alternative
- Alternative 8 – High General Purpose Alternative
- Alternative 9 – High Truck Alternative
- Alternative 10 – High Goods Movement Alternative
- Alternative 11 – High HOV Alternative
- Alternative 12 – High Rail Alternative

C. Technical Screening

Mr. Levinsohn presented the findings from the technical screening of the alternatives. He pointed out that the purpose of screening is to produce evaluative information needed to narrow the range of alternatives, that screening represents a preliminary round of analysis, and that it identifies the key trade-offs among the alternatives. Along with public input, it provides the framework for identifying the Final Set of Alternatives. The screening process provides technical information addressing the benefits, costs and impacts of the alternatives, focusing on evaluation criteria that clearly distinguish among the alternatives or specific features of the alternatives.

Mr. Levinsohn then began to present the specific technical screening results, starting with mobility benefits. The mobility benefits analyzed include volume/capacity ratio, reduction in peak period delay, reduction in non-recurrent delay, and reduction in estimated accidents.

The first graph illustrated the I-710 Average Volume/Capacity Ratio forecast for the a.m. peak period in the southbound direction in the year 2025. Alternative 1, the future No Build, is forecast to have a V/C ratio over 1.2, which means that traffic demand exceeds the capacity of the freeway by over 20 percent. Among the alternatives, only alternatives 6, 8, 9, and 10 were forecast to reduce the V/C ratio below 1.0, with alternative 9 forecast to generate the lowest (best) value.

The second mobility measure presented was the Reduction in Peak Period Delay. This was the forecast change in the annual hours of traffic delay compared to the No Build alternative in the year 2025 for the I-710 southbound direction in the am peak period. All of the alternatives are forecast to reduce delay compared to the No Build, with delay reductions ranging from approximately 1,000,000 annual hours for Alternative 2 to almost 2,500,000 annual hours for Alternative 10. The alternatives with the largest reductions in delay are alternatives 8, 9, and 10.

The third mobility measure presented was the Reduction in Non-Recurrent Delay. Non-recurrent delay is the estimated time motorists are stuck in traffic congestion caused by accidents and other traffic disruptive incidents along the I-710. Again the measure is the estimated reduction in annual hours of delay compared to the No Build alternative in the year 2025. All alternatives were estimated to reduce annual hours of non-recurrent delay, with the values ranging between 12,000 hours for Alternative 2 and 77,000 hours for Alternative 8. The four "best" alternatives on this measure are Alternatives 6, 8, 9, and 10.

Mr. Levinsohn then presented the estimated Reduction in Annual Accidents on I-710 compared to the future No Build alternative. All alternatives were forecast to reduce accidents compared to the No Build, with values ranging from slightly over 200 fewer accidents per year in Alternative 2 to over 650 fewer accidents per year in Alternative 8. The alternatives with the greatest estimated reduction in accidents are 8, 10, 9 and 6.

The next evaluation measure presented by Mr. Levinsohn was the estimated land use impacts of the alternatives. These were based upon sketch plan designs of the build alternatives and measure the additional land that would be needed outside of existing Caltrans right of way to construct each alternative. The impacts are presented in acres by seven land use categories:

- Commercial/Industrial
- Residential
- Power or Utility Corridor
- Railroad
- Undevelopable Parcels
- Water/Los Angeles River Channel
- Section 4(f) or Similarly Protected Property

Mr. Levinsohn then showed a bar chart with the estimated land use impacts of each build alternative in total acres and by the land use categories above. Total impacts range from less than 25 acres for Alternative 3 to almost 350 acres for Alternative 7. The four alternatives with the largest amount of right of way impacts are 7, 10, 8 and 9. The lowest are alternatives 3, 4, 5 and 12.

Finally, Mr. Levinsohn presented the capital cost estimates for the ten build alternatives. The cost estimates included both construction and right of way costs. Total cost estimates, in year 2002 dollars, range from \$500 million for Alternative 4 to over \$3.5 billion for Alternative 12. The highest cost alternatives are 10, 11, and 12.

D. Public Input

Sylvia Novoa, Consensus Planning Group, presented the summary of public input during alternatives screening, from April through June 2002. She noted that the study team had heard from eighteen community groups throughout the I-710 Study Area. In addition the team had received feedback from over a dozen stakeholder groups comprised of agencies, freight interests, trucking businesses and associations. The team also conducted 13 elected official briefings at all levels of government and hosted roundtable discussions with employers, community groups, agencies and elected officials/city staff.

Ms. Novoa summarized that the major theme from the public was that design elements that separate cars and trucks should be selected. More specifically, she reported that the public input on the most preferred elements of the alternatives is:

- Truck Inspection Facility (south of I-405) – Alt. 4
- Slauson Interchange – Alts. 6, 8
- Interchange improvements (particularly I-405, I-5)
- Extension of Terminal Island Freeway – Alt. 10
- Addition of Connector at SR-47/Alameda – Alt. 10
- Arterial Improvements – Alt. 3
- Change in Port schedules – Alt. 2

Ms. Novoa reported that the least preferred elements of the alternatives include:

- HOV Lanes – Alts. 5, 11
- Rail Alternative – Alt. 12
- Right-Of-Way Acquisitions
- Tolls – Alts. 9, 10
- Trucks on Elevated Facility – Alt. 9

E. I-710 TAC Recommendation for the Final Set of 5 Alternatives

William Pagett, Chair of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, requested that Mr. Levinsohn present the TAC recommendation of the Final Set to the OPC.

Mr. Levinsohn noted that the alternatives have been labeled A – E so as not to confuse their labels with the Initial Set. Alternative A is the No Build Alternative and is identical to Alternative 1 from the Initial Set. It includes transportation facilities and services expected to be in place by the year 2025. Alternative B is the Transportation Systems Management/Transportation Demand Management (TSM/TDM) Alternative, and is identical to Alternative 2 of the Initial Set. There are three build alternatives: C, D, and E.

Alternative C, the Medium General Purpose/Medium Truck Alternative, is similar in design concept and scope to Alternative 6 of the Initial Set. It also includes design features from the following initial alternatives:

- Arterials = Alt. 3
- Truck Inspection Facility = Alt. 4
- Truck Bypass Lanes, Truck Ramps = Alt. 7
- Terminal Island Freeway Extension = Alt. 10

Its purpose is to improve safety and eliminate bottlenecks for all types of traffic and improve safety and manage the flow of heavy duty trucks.

Alternative D, the High General Purpose/High HOV Alternative, is similar in design concept and scope to Alternative 8 plus Alternative 11 of the Initial Set. It also includes design features from Alternative 10, specifically arterial improvements and the connector between the Terminal Island Freeway and Alameda Street. Its purpose is to improve safety and add capacity to address high traffic volumes along all of I-710 and to improve travel time and attractiveness of carpools to increase the person-carrying capacity of the transportation system.

Alternative E, the High Truck Alternative, is similar in design concept and scope to Alternative 9 of the Initial Set. It also includes arterial improvements from Alternative 4 plus the Slauson interchange. Its purpose is to increase capacity for growing heavy duty truck demand, improve reliability, and reduce points of conflict between cars and trucks.

Mr. Levinsohn presented the next milestones in the study, which are the OPC approval of the Final Set of Alternatives, more detailed assessment of the Final Set, selection of the Locally Preferred Strategy comprised of a single alternative (scheduled for Spring 2003), and finally Caltrans required Project Study Reports for the highest priority early action projects of the LPS to be completed by November 2003.

Mr. Pagett reiterated that the presentation reflected the unanimous recommendation of the TAC for the Final Set of Alternatives.

Mr. Levinsohn and Mr. Pagett then opened the floor to questions and comments from the OPC members.

Co-Chair Frank Colonna commented that he wants to achieve the best consensus. He sees the separation of trucks from I-710 traffic as the study's biggest challenge and he believes that the outcome should try to develop the greatest amount of roadway capacity, but that improvements should try to use the parallel utility corridors as much as possible.

Co-Chair Samuel Pena commented that he endorses the TAC recommendation as presented.

Victor Rollinger, Public Works Director for the City of Carson, commented that he had concerns about the proposed connection between the Terminal Island Freeway and the Alameda Corridor. He said he also had a concern about any alternative that would involve right-of-way takes. However, he said that the City of Carson wants to participate with the OPC on the remainder of the study.

Kanya Dorland, staff representative from the Port of Los Angeles, said that the Port endorsed the TAC recommendation.

OPC member Keith McCarthy asked what major elements were left out of the recommended Final Set. Mr. Levinsohn answered that it is important to provide a point of clarification regarding the future rail potential of one of the recommended alternatives. Alternative 12 (high-speed passenger rail) has been dropped as a stand-alone alternative; however, one of the proposed alternatives (i.e. the elevated HOV lanes in Alternative D) would be designed in such a way that it could be converted to support a future rail line.

OPC member John Calhoun asked if a depressed section would still be looked at in the next phase. Mr. Levinsohn answered yes, based on the preliminary information that they had developed so far, the costs of elevating major sections of roadway are about the same as a depressed configuration. However, he said, this issue will be revisited in the conceptual engineering subtask.

Member McCarthy commented that he had heard that the proposed near-dock rail facility was dropped from inclusion in the Final Set. Mr. Levinsohn answered yes; the TAC members felt that the proposed near-dock rail facility was more of a private initiative of the railroads.

Gene Daniels, OPC member from the City of Paramount commented that he endorsed the truck inspection facility and is pleased that it is being carried forward.

OPC member Daniel Crespo from the City of Bell Gardens stated that he would support the following elements:

- aesthetics (study should stress this aspect)
- arterials
- I-5/I-710 interchange
- I-405/I-710 interchange
- HOV lanes (2 lanes with 24-hour operation)
- elevated lanes

He said he does not support the following elements:

- Right of way impacts
- toll option

Victor Rollinger from the City of Carson commented that they are reluctant to dump more trucks onto Alameda Street. He said the City of Carson does not support the Alameda Corridor connector element.

It was moved by Co-Chair Colonna, seconded by Member Daniels, to approve the Final Set of Five Alternatives as recommended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee. The motion was approved by the following roll call vote:
ROLL CALL

AYES: Co-Chair Colonna, Co-Chair Pena, Member Crespo, Member McCarthy, Member Reyes, Member Daniels, Member Calhoun, Member Bangalore, Member Maekawa, Member Samston.

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Member Cole, Member Argumedo, Member Andrews, Member Gurule, Member Maes, Member Ruvalcaba, Member Davis.

X. Matters from the I-710 Oversight Policy Committee

Co-Chair Pena commended South Gate Councilmember Hector De La Torre for his past service as Chair of the Oversight Policy Committee.

XI. Matters from Staff

There were no matters from staff.

XII. Adjournment

It was moved by Co-Chair Colonna to adjourn. There being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 7:53 p.m.