

## **MINUTES OF THE MEETING**

**I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
A Meeting Held at the Paramount Fire House Activity Center  
15538 Colorado Avenue  
Paramount, CA  
March 26, 2003**

- I. Chair Pagett called the meeting to order at 1:40 p.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair William Pagett, Bell Gardens, Cudahy, Maywood, Paramount; Anthony La, Downey; Luis Ramirez, Bell; Robert Zarrilli, Commerce; Joseph Lim, Compton; Patrick Fu, Huntington Park; Lon Maddox, Long Beach; Joe Wang, Lynwood; Mohammad Mostahkami, South Gate; Kevin Wilson, Vernon; Sharas Bangalore, Caltrans; Captain Craig Klein, CHP; Victor Rollinger, Carson; Maged El-Rabaa, County of Los Angeles; Ernest Morales, MTA; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach; Kanya Dorland, Port of Los Angeles.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Sandra Balmir, FHWA/FTA; Al Bowser, SCAG.

OTHERS PRESENT: Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities COG; Hamid Toossi, Caltrans Planning; Daniel M. Dunn, Caltrans Right of Way; Bob Thorpe, Caltrans Railroad Coordinator; Dave Levinsohn, PBQD; Doris Chan, PBQD; Steven Yoshizumi, PBQD; Jolene Hayes, Port of Long Beach; Sylvia Novoa, CPG; Liberty Escovilla, Caltrans Planning; Frances Lee, Caltrans Corridor Studies; Sumi Gant, Long Beach; Robert Cabrales, CBE; Hector Alvarado, Inquilinos de Maywood; Deborah Schoch, Los Angeles, Times; John Doherty, ACTA; Harley Martin, CH2M Hill; Anthony R. Ybarra, Bell Gardens; Gary Hamrick, Meyer, Mohaddes Associates; Lee Ward, Meyer, Mohaddes Associates; Dilara Rodriguez, Caltrans Goods Movement; John Ziegler, Auto Club of Southern California; Deborah Chankin, Gateway Cities COG.

- II. Roll was taken through self-introductions and a sign-in sheet was circulated.
- III. Jack Joseph, Gateway COG led the pledge of allegiance.
- IV. There were no amendments to the agenda.
- V. There were no public comments at this time.

**Minutes**  
**I-710 Technical Advisory Committee**  
**March 26, 2003**  
**Page 2 of 8**

VI. Consent Calendar:

It was moved by Kevin Wilson, seconded by Robert Zarrilli, to approve the TAC minutes for March 20, 2002 , May 15, 2002, May 22, 2002, June 5, 2002, June 12, 2002, October 16, 2002, and January 22, 2003. The motion was approved unanimously.

VII. Business Session:

A. The Technical Advisory Committee discussed adding a representative of the South Coast Air Quality Management District to the committee. It was moved by Robert Zarrilli, seconded by Maged El-Rabaa, to approve the addition of the South Coast AQMD to the TAC. The motion was approved unanimously.

B. The Technical Advisory Committee discussed the meeting schedule for the next four meetings. Representatives from both Ports had conflicts on April 16, 2003. The committee agreed to switch that meeting to April 15, 2003. The following is a list of the dates, times and locations of the remaining four TAC meetings as arrived at by a consensus of the Technical Advisory Committee:

- Wednesday, April 2, 1:30 p.m., City of Long Beach Energy Department, 2400 E. Spring Street
- Wednesday, April 9, 1:30 p.m., Paramount Progress Park, 15500 Downey Ave.
- Tuesday, April 15, 1:30 p.m., Long Beach Energy Dept.
- Wednesday, April 23, 1:30 p.m., Long Beach Energy Dept.

Reports:

A. Study Overview

Dave Levinsohn, PBQD, reviewed the upcoming study activities, including open house meetings in late April, and the Oversight Policy Committee meetings in April and May, 2003.

B. Right-of-Way Impact Estimates

Steven Yoshizumi, PBQD, began by reviewing the alternative descriptions and providing a more detailed account at focused locations in each of the three build alternatives. He also compared the proposed concepts at the I5/I-710 interchange in each of the three build alternatives.

Then Steven discussed the right-of-way impact estimates. He began with a brief discussion of the background and assumptions that went into the estimates: the impacts are conceptual; there will be numerous opportunities between now and construction for the concepts to be refined, and thus the right-of-way impacts modified;

the impacts assumed Caltrans standards for slopes and maintenance; the impact lines indicate final Caltrans right-of-way – full parcels would be acquired with any excess property repackaged and sold.

Next Steven presented the right-of-way impact totals. The data was arrayed by component and by land use category. The components are included in the alternative descriptions, and the land use categories include: Sensitive uses (parks, cemeteries), Commercial/Industrial, Public/Utility Corridor, Residential, Railroad, and Undevelopable Property.

The right-of-way impacts were compared in various ways to illustrate the differences between the alternatives. A comparison of the total right-of-way impacts showed that Alternative E impacted the most acreage. A comparison of the mainline impacts relative to the total impacts showed that the Alternative E mainline concept had the highest proportion of the impacts.

In comparing design options for several of the components the following was made clear: although the improvement concepts are different, the right-of-way impacts for the I-5/I-710 interchange in Alternatives D and E are very similar. The improvements at the SR-91/I-710 interchange require more right-of-way for the concept proposed in Alternative D than in Alternative E. The right-of-way impacts at the I-405/I-710 interchange are somewhat similar between all three alternatives with Alternative D again requiring the most. And the two concepts for extension of the Terminal Island Freeway require approximately the same amount of right-of-way acquisitions.

The total right-of-way and the right-of-way excluding the Public/Utility Corridor impacts was arrayed in a table and discussed. The Public/Utility Corridor category includes such things as the Southern California Edison and Los Angeles Department of Water and Power property. Excluding these acquisitions provides a clearer representation of the impacts to the local communities and businesses. In either case, the number of acres impacted was highest in Long Beach for Alternatives C and D. It was highest in Long Beach in Alternative E if the Public/Utility Corridor impacts are included, and highest in Commerce if the Public/Utility Corridor impacts are excluded.

### C. Cost Estimates

Following some discussion of the right-of-way impacts, Steven discussed the cost estimates. Again, he began with a brief discussion of the background and assumptions that went into the estimates: these are concept level estimates; average unit costs were developed for some quantities (pavement, earthwork, structures); some categories of cost were included on a per mile basis (drainage, traffic handling); and others were based on percentages of construction cost (mobilization, contingency, design). Steven also described that the right-of-way unit costs were developed based on a database search of recent sales in the study area.

Steven presented the alternative cost estimates for Alternatives B through E. The data was arrayed by component category and by project cost, right-of-way cost, and total cost. For Alternative B, the component categories included Mainline improvements, Interchanges and Arterials, Goods Movement, Transit, and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS). For Alternatives C, D and E, the component categories included mainline improvements, Interchanges, the Terminal Island Freeway, TSM/TDM/Transit, and Arterials. Costs for Alternative B were estimated at approximately \$355 million, \$3.2 billion for Alternative C, \$3.6 billion for Alternative D, and \$3.5 billion for Alternative E (2003 dollars).

The costs were compared in various ways to illustrate the differences between the alternatives. A comparison of the total cost showed that Alternative D had the highest total cost. A comparison of the mainline costs relative to the total costs showed that the Alternative E mainline concept had the highest total cost, twice the cost of the Alternative C mainline, and almost twice the cost of the Alternative D mainline.

Right-of-way costs for Alternative B were estimated at \$112 million associated with replacement of on-street parking that would be removed during the peak period. Right-of-way costs for the three build alternatives ranged from approximately \$750 million to approximately \$875 million (2003 dollars).

Steven compared the cost of the design options for several of the components. The costs for the three freeway-to-freeway interchanges, I-5/I-710, SR-91/I-710, and I-405/I-710, vary with the complexity and degree of benefit of the proposed improvements. The extension of the Terminal Island Freeway shows a higher cost than the Alameda connector. And the TSM/TDM/Transit costs are lowest for Alternative C because more of the TSM/TDM/Transit-type of improvements are already included in the mainline, interchange and arterial components of Alternative C than any other alternative, as evidenced by the fact that the arterial costs for Alternative C are considerably higher than those of the other alternatives.

#### D. Discussion

The following is a summary of the discussion that occurred during the Consultant's reports:

##### Right-of-Way

The Port of Long Beach (POLB) indicated that they had not seen the concept for the Anaheim Street braid and wondered where right-of-way would be acquired. PBQD said that the Anaheim Street braid was essentially the same as the Pacific Coast Highway braid, and that right-of-way would be acquired in the northwest and northeast quadrants.

**Minutes**  
**I-710 Technical Advisory Committee**  
**March 26, 2003**  
**Page 5 of 8**

Caltrans Right-of-Way, the Port of Los Angeles (POLA), and the County of Los Angeles asked if the number of impacted residences had been counted or if a general count was available? PBQD stated that the number of impacted structures had been counted off of the aerials. The City of Compton asked when the aerials had been taken. PBQD told them that the aerials were taken in 2000.

Caltrans Right-of-Way asked what the project development schedule was anticipated to be – when the project would be moving to the Project Study Report, Project Report, and Environmental Document phases. The TAC Chair and Gateway COG indicated that the lead agencies would have to secure funding for those phases of project development before any work would proceed and that it could take up to 3 years to secure such funding.

The TAC Chair asked why some cities were not listed in the table. PBQD replied that any city not listed did not have any right-of-way impacts.

The County of Los Angeles asked why the data was shown with the Public/Utility Corridor right-of-way excluded. PBQD answered that the data was shown with the total right-of-way acquisitions, as well as the total less any acquisitions from utilities such as Southern California Edison (SCE) to show the total non-utility right-of-way acquisitions. This data is relevant because it more accurately reflects the amount of impact to residential and business concerns. Where utility corridors are impacted, the utility facilities would be relocated within other parts of the utility corridors in a way that is compatible with the proposed improvements. Those estimated relocations are included in the cost estimates. This difference is material to the Cities of Bell, Long Beach and Los Angeles.

POLB questioned whether the Terminal Island Freeway extension in Alternative C utilized the SCE right-of-way, and whether or not the existing SCE facilities would need to be relocated outside of the existing right-of-way. PBQD replied that for the most part, the Terminal Island Freeway extension was within the SCE right-of-way, there are some locations (near Willow Street, Wardlow Road and I-405) that additional right of way would be required, and that the SCE facilities would be relocated within the existing envelope. POLB expressed the opinion that the ramps on the north side of Willow may not be necessary, thereby reducing the right-of-way impacts.

The TAC Chair clarified an issue for the rest of the committee. Acquisitions of land that is owned/maintained by the County/Flood Control District but which lies within the boundaries of a city is shown as an impact to that city, not an impact to the County. The TAC Chair did not want the committee and specifically the County to be misled by the way the data was arrayed. The County of Los Angeles stated that they have easements throughout the corridor that need to be considered in order to coordinate properly. The County also asked if there would be new structures in the river. PBQD

**Minutes**  
**I-710 Technical Advisory Committee**  
**March 26, 2003**  
**Page 6 of 8**

stated that there would not be facilities running down the length of the river, but that at locations where the freeway (or crossing freeways) crossed the river, there could be new or widened structures with additional columns in the river.

South Gate asked whether acquisitions would be on the east or west side of the freeway. As developers come to the City, the City wants to be able to tell them what is planned for that area. PBQD told the TAC that one copy of the complete set of right-of-way impact aerials would be provided to the TAC members at the end of the meeting.

While several of the cities had specific questions about right-of-way impacts with their jurisdictions, the TAC Chair indicated that a more general discussion would be more beneficial at this time because some cities may have similar concerns. PBQD suggested that a better time to discuss individual city concerns would be during the TAC's upcoming deliberations on a recommendation of a locally preferred strategy.

Cost Estimate

The TAC Chair asked how the parking restriction costs were estimated. PBQD explained that the parking restrictions in Alternative B were assumed for the 74.2 miles of arterials that would be widened in Alternative C. Of the total centerline miles, it was assumed that 12.5% of the parking lost would need to be replaced with off-street lots/structures. The cost to build lots/structures for this number of parking spaces, as well as the cost to buy the land for those lots/structures was included in the estimate. The parking restrictions would be instituted during the peak periods only. POLB asked for a listing of the affected arterials. PBQD stated that the affected arterials in Alternative B coincide with the widened arterials in Alternative C. POLB also asked if these parking restrictions were modeled in the traffic forecasting for Alternative B, and PBQD replied that they were.

Caltrans Right-of-Way observed that there would be substantial railroad involvement and that the costs of their facilities can be very high – a signal box can cost \$1 million. They asked what costs had been included. PBQD replied that costs for relocation had been accounted for, plus a considerable contingency was added.

The County of Los Angeles asked if the railroads had been consulted. PBQD indicated that there had been discussions with the railroads earlier in the project, but none recently. Caltrans Right-of-Way suggested that the committee might consider inviting the railroads to join the TAC. The contact people for each of the railroad entities are as follows:

Richard Gonzalez, Union Pacific  
Bob Brenza, Burlington Northern Santa Fe  
Bill Edward, Los Angeles Junction

**Minutes**  
**I-710 Technical Advisory Committee**  
**March 26, 2003**  
**Page 7 of 8**

Caltrans Right-of-Way asked if costs were included for relocating utilities. PBQD replied that detailed costs were not developed because the extent of existing utilities is unknown, but that a cost for utility relocation was included on a per mile basis. Also, the cost to relocate SCE and DPW towers was included on a per unit basis.

POLA asked why Alternative C, in which only one lane is added at some locations, has a similar mainline improvement cost to Alternative D, in which two to four lanes are added. PBQD pointed out that the Alternative C mainline included the collector-distributor roads and the truck bypasses. \$0.5 billion of the mainline improvement costs in Alternative C are associated with the SR-91/I-105 truck bypass lanes, which are considered part of the mainline.

The TAC Chair asked what the purpose of improving the arterials was, to add capacity during construction or divert the demand from the freeway in the long term. PBQD answered that while the arterial improvements would be used as detours during construction, the additional capacity would remain after the construction was completed and that while the majority of the truck demand would be more likely to use the freeway, there is probably sufficient latent demand in the study area to address any capacity that is provided by the arterial enhancements. The TAC Chair expressed a desire to see permanent improvements in all directions, not just during construction. He does not want the project to increase arterial capacity just during construction, but make the improvements permanent. Temporary capacity enhancements (such as parking restrictions) would just leave the problem for the cities to fix afterward.

POLB asked if the arterial improvements assumed that lanes would be added or if there would be permanent parking restrictions. PBQD replied that for the build alternatives, the arterial enhancements assumed construction of one additional lane in each direction.

The TAC Chair also asked why Alternative E includes the lowest number of arterial miles that would be improved. PBQD stated that because it is anticipated that there would be a significant shift of trucks off the mainline into the dedicated truck lanes, there would be available capacity for autos on the mainline, therefore not requiring as many improvements to the arterials.

The City of Vernon asked if the arterial costs include the cost of bridge widening. While Bridge widenings were not specifically included in the cost, PBQD indicated that costs for widening all segments of the arterials were included and that a substantial contingency was included. POLB asked if the same cost was used for widening arterials throughout the study area. PBQD indicated that it was.

The County of Los Angeles asked how the right-of-way take/cost was estimated. PBQD explained that what is shown in the right-of-way impact aerials is the ultimate Caltrans right-of-way, but that most parcels would likely be full acquisition. Upon completion of

**Minutes**  
**I-710 Technical Advisory Committee**  
**March 26, 2003**  
**Page 8 of 8**

construction, any portions of parcels that would not be used for the highway improvements would be repackage and sold. The Gateway COG asked if the right-of-way cost was offset for the sale of the surplus. PBQD explained that the cost estimate only included the portion of the right-of-way that would be part of Caltrans ultimate right-of-way – that the cost of the surplus was not included in the estimate to begin with.

POLB asked if it would be possible to put the right-of-way impact aerial images on the website. The Gateway COG indicated that the files are too large and would take too long to download to make it practical and useful.

Following the Consultant's reports, Robert Cabrales representing CBE requested the opportunity to address the committee. He read a letter (attached) emphasizing the need to address environmental issues such as air quality and environmental justice in coordination with the advancement and development of this project. The TAC Chair thanked Mr. Cabrales and received a copy of the letter. Mr. Cabrales also suggested that the TAC add a member whose primary focus is the environmental concerns in the corridor. The TAC Chair indicated that he would have to review the guidelines for formation of the TAC before commenting on such a proposal.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.