

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

**I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
A Meeting Held at the Long Beach Energy Department
2400 East Spring Street
Long Beach, CA
April 15, 2003**

- I. Chair Pagett called the meeting to order at 1:50 p.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair William Pagett, Bell Gardens, Maywood, Paramount; Anthony La, Downey; Carlos Alvarado, Bell, Cudahy; Robert Zarrilli, Commerce; Joseph Lim, Compton; Patrick Fu, Huntington Park; Lon Maddox, Long Beach; Yadi Farhadi, Lynwood; Joe Comstock, South Gate; Kevin Wilson, Vernon; Victor Rollinger, Carson; Maged El-Rabaa, County of Los Angeles; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach; Kanya Dorland, Port of Los Angeles; Sharas Bangalore, Caltrans; Ernest Morales, MTA; Al Bowser, SCAG; Lt. William Murphy, CHP; Carol Gomez, AQMD.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Sandra Balmir, FHWA/FTA.

OTHERS PRESENT: Helene Ansel, Assemblyman Alan Lowenthal's office; Sara Skinner, Councilmember Tonia Reyes-Uranga's office, Long Beach; Jeannine Critie, Vice Mayor Frank Colonna's office, Long Beach; Anthony R. Ybarra, City of Bell Gardens; Mohammad Mostahkami, City of South Gate; Sumire Gant, City of Long Beach; Scott Mangum, City of Long Beach Planning; Jolene Hayes, Port of Long Beach; Sue Lai, Port of Los Angeles; Raymond Maekawa, MTA; Linda Taira, Caltrans, Corridor Studies; John Zeigler, Auto Club of Southern California; Duane Kenagy, ACET; John Doherty, ACTA; Bobby Cochran, Rivers and Mountains Conservancy; Eric Donald, private citizen; James Sturm, private citizen, Long Beach; James Filipan, Stevens Steak House, Commerce; Linda Ivers, private citizen, Long Beach; Bry Myown, private citizen, Long Beach; Manuel Avila, Jr., private citizen, Huntington Park; David San Jose, Coolidge Triangle Association, Long Beach; Dan Pressburg, private citizen, Long Beach; Deborah Schoch, Los Angeles Times; Robin Urevich, KPCC Radio; Doris Chan, PBQD; Dave Levinsohn, PBQD; Steven Yoshizumi, PBQD; Julie Rush, PBQD; Lee Ward, Meyer, Mohaddes Associates; Sylvia Novoa, CPG; Andrea Rodriguez, CPG; Paul Taylor, Kaku Associates; Richard Powers, Gateway Cities COG; Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities COG; Deborah Chankin, Gateway Cities COG; Don Camph, Gateway Cities COG.

- II. Roll was taken through self-introductions and a sign-in sheet was circulated.
- III. Bill Pagett, TAC Chair, led the pledge of allegiance.

Minutes
I-710 Technical Advisory Committee
April 15, 2003
Page 2 of 15

- IV. There were no amendments to the agenda.
- V. There were no public comments at this time.
- VI. Consent Calendar:

Approval of the TAC minutes for April 2 and April 9 was continued to the next meeting.

VII. Reports:

A. Study Overview

Dave Levinsohn (PBQD) reminded the TAC that this was the fourth of a series of meetings intended to provide the TAC members with the technical information they need to make their Locally Preferred Strategy (LPS) recommendation to the Oversight Policy Committee (OPC).

B. Report on Economics (Tolling of Truck Facility)

Michael Fischer, Cambridge Systematics, presented results of the toll analysis for the truck lanes in Alternative E. Mr. Fischer pointed out the following key features of the approach to toll analysis:

- The analysis is based on a tradeoff between travel time savings on the truck lanes vs. the cost of the tolls. Thus, the analysis relies on travel time data derived from the sub-area focus model and data on value of time collected in a stated preference survey by researchers at UC Berkeley.
- The value of time data recognizes that different types of trucks have different values of time. This is represented by a probability distribution in the data. In modeling tolls, CS divided trucks into 2 weight classes and five value-of-time categories and assigned each to the network in the model using different values of time for each vehicle class.
- Tolls are represented as an equivalent travel time impact. This affects route choice in the model.

Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach, asked Mr. Fischer to elaborate on the truck classes and how the value of time is different between them. Mr. Fischer said that they used a randomly selected sample of California registered trucks, and extracted only the Southern California data. The data was collected by interviewing fleet managers who can make routing decisions. Cambridge Systematics also looked at port only trucks, but the sample was too small to make reliable assumptions. A logistics curve was fitted to

Minutes
I-710 Technical Advisory Committee
April 15, 2003
Page 3 of 15

the value of time data. The trucks were split into five value-of-time categories for each of two weight ranges, greater than 33,000 pounds, and 8,500 to 33,000 pounds. Kerry asked if the value of time was based on actual costs. Michael said that the source of the data was opinion surveys.

Kanya Dorland, Port of Los Angeles, asked if capital costs and the net revenue of the tolls had been calculated. Mr. Fischer answered that the level of detail she was asking about had not been analyzed yet.

Mr. Fischer next presented some of the key assumptions in the analysis. Based on the data, mean value of time was assumed to be \$30/hour and median value of time was assumed to be \$18/hour, reflecting a distribution skewed to the lower values of time but with some trucks having very high value of time. He noted that Cambridge Systematics believes that these assumptions and the methodology used provide a lower bound estimate of the potential of tolls for the following reason:

- The value of reliability benefits are not factored into route choice due to the methodology.
- The data represent “average” California trucks. The value of time for trucks serving the port may be higher.
- The study did not evaluate the benefits of allowing longer combination vehicles to operate on the toll lanes. This might be possible for select origin-destination pairs (such as for delivery to and from the intermodal yards).
- Speed estimates from the model are critical and are difficult to validate. Even small changes in the assumed difference in speeds between the mainline and the truck lanes can have significant impacts on the results of the analysis.

Using a hypothetical trip from the port, Michael showed the impact of different assumptions about the value of time and speeds on the mainline. This information was used subsequently to conduct a sensitivity analysis of the results. One point that was clear from the example, however, is that for the very short trips that characterize truck operations on I-710, the impact of saving time on I-710 itself may be small for trucks relative to the amount of time they spend waiting for pick up and delivery during other parts of their work day.

Mr. Fischer next showed data on truck lane utilization rates for two scenarios, a \$0.07/mile toll and a \$0.15/mile toll. The maximum revenue toll is expected to be somewhere between these two values. At \$0.07/mile, truck lane utilization averages around 60 percent of all trucks whereas at \$0.15/mile this drops to around 35 percent. There is not a big difference between peak period utilization rates and daily utilization rates because of the relatively constant congestion levels throughout the day and the

high mid-day truck volumes. In a sensitivity analysis, Cambridge Systematics compared utilization rates for a \$0.15/mile toll assuming that actual value of time is twice that assumed in the base case model runs. Utilization rates were approximately equivalent to the base case \$0.07/mile toll. In the base case of \$0.07/mile, annual revenue in 2003 dollars was estimated at \$6.1 million. Maximum revenue for the base case is probably closer to \$8 million annually. Cambridge Systematics ran sensitivity cases with higher (double) value of time and assuming that speeds on the mainline are 5-8 mph lower than the model predicts. In the best case, annual revenues might be as high as \$25-\$30 million. The increased value of time figures might be a way of taking into account the value of travel time reliability, for example.

Kerry Cartwright asked if a model run had been done for the tolling scenario. Mr. Fischer said that a model run had been done, and that a separate model run had been done for double value of time but not for different speeds – a pivot/sensitivity analysis had been done for speeds.

Kerry Cartwright commented that assessing the impact of speed/reliability is crucial to the tolling analysis, because a V/C ratio above 0.95 represents unstable flow – vehicle flow rates decline from 2200/lane/hr to 1600/lane/hr. Also, travel time reliability is important. It is possible to underestimate toll revenues if speeds are over estimated. Mr. Fischer agreed and said that was why Cambridge Systematics did the sensitivity analysis.

Kerry Cartwright recommended that Michael Fischer make this presentation in front of the California Trucking Association, and concurred with Kanya Dorland that he would like to see an estimation of capital and O&M costs to collect tolls. The study team agreed to provide that data to the TAC.

Al Bowser, SCAG, asked if there would be enough time savings associated with the tolled truck facility to facilitate additional trips or turns. Michael indicated that very little of the trucks' total trip time is spent on I-710. Because much of their trip time is spent elsewhere – at gates, etc. – it is unlikely that the time savings on I-710 would be enough to make another turn.

C. Report on Regional Air Quality Impacts

Mr. Fischer continued by discussing the regional air quality impacts of the proposed alternatives. Changes in emissions relative to the future no-build condition were presented for each of the alternatives. On a regional basis, changes in emissions are very small for all alternatives (for most pollutants, the reductions are less than 0.3 percent). On a regional basis, all criteria pollutants show declines despite small VMT increases. Emissions changes for the study area are also very small (in this case less than 2 percent change). However, for the study area, emissions for all criteria pollutants except PM10 show slight increases. This is due to the fact that study area

Minutes
I-710 Technical Advisory Committee
April 15, 2003
Page 5 of 15

VMT increases significantly for all of the alternatives relative to the no-build. In the case of several pollutants, emissions begin to increase as speeds improve past a certain point. For this reason there are very noticeable increases in NOx emissions. This affect is greatest for Alternative E, as trucks (a major mobile source of NOx) experience the greatest speed improvement. However, in all of the alternatives, PM10 emissions decrease due to improved speeds.

Deborah Chankin, Gateway Cities COG asked Mr. Fischer to explain the graphic – the previous charts had shown each alternative as a different color. He explained that in this chart the different emissions were shown in different colors and they were grouped by alternative, so the TAC members should compare bars of the same color to see which alternative had the greatest impact. David Levinsohn, PBQD, noted that the regional impact was a reduction of less than 0.4 percent and the change in the study area emissions ranged from a reduction of less than 2 percent to an increase of less than 2 percent depending on the emission and the alternative.

Kerry Cartwright asked what the forecast year was for the data presented. Michael Fischer said that these were 2025 forecasts and that they assumed both 2025 traffic volumes and the prescribed changes in the federal emission standards. Kerry also asked if the regional analysis covered the entire SCAG region, and asked what was encompassed within the study area. Mr. Fischer said that the regional analysis did cover the entire SCAG region, and that the study area for this analysis was bounded by the ocean on the south, I-110 on the west, SR-60 on the north and I-605 on the east.

Al Bowser asked if this analysis correlated to the Direct Traffic Impact Model (DTIM) that SACG uses. Mr. Fischer indicated that Cambridge Systematics did not use DTIM. Deborah Chankin asked what DTIM was. Al Bowser said it is the model SCAG uses to assess air quality impacts. He suggested that using DTIM would cast the results within a construct that SCAG and AQMD understands. David Levinsohn asked if this is something that SCAG would do once a Locally Preferred Strategy was selected and incorporated into the Regional Transportation Plan. Al Bowser said that SCAG would do that kind of analysis at that time.

A private citizen in the audience asked if the analysis takes into account accidents involving trucks as that kind of accident takes longer to clear and results in more congestion. Michael Fischer said that the model assumes an average condition, which, in the case of I-710, means 5 total accidents per day, without specifying what types of vehicles are involved in those accidents. The same gentleman asked if jersey barriers were assumed, because he felt that straight faced barriers were more effective in truck-involved accidents. David Levinsohn said that the type of barrier to use was too detailed to address at this level of study.

Julie Rush (PBQD) presented updated information on diesel particulate matter (DPM) for two locations near I-710, (1) between Willow Road and I-405, and (2) between

Minutes
I-710 Technical Advisory Committee
April 15, 2003
Page 6 of 15

Alondra and Rosecrans. At the last TAC meeting (April 9, 2003), the study team noted that the heavy duty truck volumes were double counted for one time period for the Willow to I-405 location for one of the alternatives, which could affect the emissions results. Consequently, all the traffic numbers were verified and the air quality models were rerun for both locations to determine if it affected the emissions levels. The study team also corrected for the truck distribution pattern within the general purpose lanes for all of the alternatives. In the State of California, trucks are relegated to the two right-hand lanes (e.g., closer to sensitive receptors).

At the Willow to I-405 site, the emissions results changed for Alternative E only; the other alternatives remained about the same. At the Alondra to Rosecrans site, the emissions levels for Alternative C changed slightly. Alternative C performed more similarly to Alternative E at distances close to the freeway. At these two locations, all of the alternatives performed better than the No Build Alternative.

Julie Rush explained that the revised emission results on diesel particulates did not change the key conclusions of the analysis that were presented at the April 9th TAC meeting:

- improvements in vehicle speeds reduces DPM emissions
- trucks in lanes close to sensitive receptors increases concentrations
- elevated lanes are better than at-grade lanes due to increased dispersion, however, this effect diminishes the further you get from the freeway
- more trucks means higher emissions levels

Of all the factors, changes in speeds seem to have the greatest influence on diesel particulate concentrations at these two locations.

David San Jose asked if this data was saying that there would be more or less pollution. As a resident, and because of his involvement in youth organizations, he said he was concerned about the health of the community. He felt that if there were additional truck lanes, and three times the number of truck and double the number of cars that there are today, there could be little benefit from any proposal. He also indicated that he had understood that the Alameda Corridor was supposed to include four lanes for trucks double decked, but this was not done.

D. Additional Evaluation of Alternatives (Terminal Island Freeway and Slauson Avenue)

Paul Taylor, Kaku Associates, described some additional information about the Terminal Island Freeway and the Slauson Avenue interchange that was requested by the TAC at the previous meeting.

Minutes

I-710 Technical Advisory Committee

April 15, 2003

Page 7 of 15

Data had been previously presented to illustrate the impacts/benefits of the Terminal Island Freeway Extension and the Alameda Truckway Connector. The additional data showed that the Terminal Island Freeway Extension resulted in a decrease of approximately 40,000 passenger car equivalents (PCEs) on I-710 south of I-405, whereas the Alameda Truckway Connector showed no significant change on I-710 in the same section. However, the Alameda Truckway Connector did show a decrease in traffic (approximately 24,000 PCEs relative to the No Build) on the Terminal Island Freeway just south of Willow Street. It also resulted in an increase in traffic on Alameda Street (approximately 40,000 PCEs relative to the No Build).

With respect to the Slauson Avenue interchange, Mr. Taylor had previously presented data (at the April 9th TAC meeting) that showed that the ramp volumes at Atlantic Boulevard (north of Slauson Avenue) and Florence Avenue (south of Slauson Avenue) were essentially unchanged by the implementation of a new interchange at Slauson Avenue. Additional analysis revealed that traffic on I-710 north of the Slauson Avenue interchange increased by 22 percent relative to the No Build, and traffic on Garfield Avenue north of Slauson Avenue (which roughly parallels I-710), decreased by 41 percent.

Carol Gomez, AQMD, asked what the planning horizon year was for the data that Paul Taylor presented. He told her the planning horizon year for this data and all the forecast data in the study was 2025.

E. Question and Answers/Discussion

Prior to the Question and Answer/Discussion period, Sylvia Novoa (CPG) made a presentation regarding public outreach during the study and specifically the recent public outreach for the Open House meetings.

Sylvia Novoa said that the goal of the public outreach plan was to develop an integrated outreach process that involves and informs all interested stakeholders in the I-710 corridor. She said that the audiences that have been targeted include:

- Affected residents
- Community groups and organizations
- Business owners and groups
- Trucking and transportation interest
- Major destinations
- 710 commuters
- Agencies
- Environmental groups
- Schools
- Churches

Minutes
I-710 Technical Advisory Committee
April 15, 2003
Page 8 of 15

Ms. Novoa indicated that council members and/or city officials were contacted early in the study in each city for names of individuals and organizations they felt should be involved in the I-710 outreach program. Community organizations were contacted for recommendations of other individuals and organizations to involve. City websites, rosters, information guides, newsletters were researched for additional community resources. The outreach was tailored to specific community needs. Instead of expecting people to come to meetings, the outreach went to the people where they were. Over 220 meetings were held with community groups through various mechanisms. Presentations were made, roundtable discussions and open houses were held, and certain individuals received one-on-one briefings.

Additionally, fact sheets, questionnaires, and comments sheets were provided at these meetings and to those who requested them. The Gateway Cities COG web site and city web sites have links to the study and a bilingual hotline was set up and advertised for this study.

The information on the impacts of the alternatives has the greatest public interest, so the outreach plan spells out the highest level of outreach in this period. In the past three weeks council members of impacted cities were briefed, two press briefings were held, and six roundtables were held on April 10 and 11, 2003.

In the next few weeks impacted community meetings will be held in Commerce, East Los Angeles, Bell Gardens, and Long Beach. The study team is also hosting Open Houses in Long Beach, Bell Gardens and East Los Angeles on April 28, 29, 30, 2003.

To ensure the community knows about the Open Houses 54,000 letters are being sent to impacted communities residents in East Los Angeles, Commerce, Bell Gardens and Long Beach. Long Beach will also receive notices in water bills, via a cable TV crawler, and a sign on an electric message board at the I-710 and I-405 interchange.

A private citizen in the audience suggested that the outreach plan should consider billboards on I-710 to reach the people who drive on the freeway regularly.

Linda Ivers, private citizen, Long Beach, said that she and some of her friends have had a lot of problems with the web site, and that the outreach form doesn't work. Further, up-to-date information is not posted on the web site. She also asked if the right-of-way impact aerials would be posted on the web site. Deborah Chankin said that things are being posted on the web site based on requests from the public, and that the Gateway Cities COG is working to provide the images on the web site. Linda Ivers asked how long the right-of-way impact aerials had been available. Bill Pagett said that the cities have had them for two weeks and that they are still digesting the information.

Minutes
I-710 Technical Advisory Committee
April 15, 2003
Page 9 of 15

A private citizen in the audience stated that the TAC should decide what they are trying to do. He suggested that creating a canal between the ports and the rail yards would reduce the truck trips on I-710. Or that moving the warehouses nearer to the ports would do the same thing. He said that in England, instead of destroying London, they moved the port traffic to the Essex marshes. He said that in Manchester they have a ship canal, and suggested that containers could be carried overhead through maglev technology. He felt that the study has too narrow in its focus and scope. Bill Pagett said that some of the suggestions that were made were not the charge of this committee.

The next segment of the meeting, as planned, was for the TAC members to ask questions of the study team regarding some specific aspects of the alternatives, particularly specific design features and right-of-way impacts.

Kanya Dorland, POLA, asked the study team to explain the Anaheim/PCH braid. She asked why this takes so much right-of-way.

The study team responded that the northbound on-ramp traffic from Anaheim Street goes over the northbound off-ramp traffic to Pacific Coast Highway. This concept takes right of way to accommodate the loop ramps. It could not be tighter in this type of configuration because of design speed and sight distance requirements.

Bill Pagett, TAC Chair, asked if there would be access to parcels between the southbound frontage road and the southbound on-ramps at Pacific Coast Highway and Anaheim Street.

The study team responded that in this concept, based on Caltrans typical right-of-way policy, they would not be included.

Bill Pagett asked where are the truck ramps at Pacific Coast Highway?

The study team responded that there is a loop on-ramp in the southeast quadrant and an off-ramp in the northwest quadrant. Both are dedicated to trucks only.

Kerry Cartwright, POLB, asked if the interchange concepts at Pacific Coast Highway and Anaheim Street in Alternatives C and E are different? If so, why? He said the POLB believes that a diamond configuration could work at both Pacific Coast Highway and Anaheim Street.

The study team responded that they are different, to give the TAC options of different types of improvements – each has advantages and disadvantages.

Lon Maddox, Long Beach, said that the City supports a combination of C and E south of I-405 and is wondering if it would be possible to provide access to Willow Street or

Minutes
I-710 Technical Advisory Committee
April 15, 2003
Page 10 of 15

Pacific Coast Highway from the autoway in Alternative E. The POLB suggested that the model output could indicate where that access would best be located. The City also thinks that there needs to be more improvements from Anaheim Street to south of Ocean Boulevard. Further, Long Beach favors the truck inspection facility to be moved south of I-405.

The study team responded that providing access from the autoway to Willow Street or Pacific Coast Highway would require some modification of the existing access because there are already ramps at both of those streets. And allowing for the inspection facility south of I-405 would likely require elimination of some access and/or acquisition of residential/commercial property.

Kanya Dorland, POLA, asked what movements are possible from the proposed Terminal Island Freeway extension? Could you access I-405?

The study team responded that you could not access I-405 directly. Access from the Terminal Island Freeway extension would go to/from I-710 north of I-405. However, the proposed ramps at Wardlow would allow traffic movements between I-405 and the Terminal Island Freeway extension via the existing interchange at Santa Fe Avenue. A previous concept had included an interchange on I-405 approximately one mile west of the I-405/I-710 interchange, but early consultation with FHWA indicated that because this would violate one of their standards they would not allow two freeway-to-freeway interchanges so closely spaced. So the concept was revised to the current plan based on suggestions from both FHWA and Long Beach. This revision eliminated a large interchange and reduced the number of acquisitions.

Victor Rollinger, Carson, said that the City of Carson is against the Alameda Truckway Connector and any effort that would be made to upgrade Alameda Street with more lanes or freeway-like design because it would split the City in half. Such projects would change the character of the corridor and would isolate people from and rest of city and they will suffer from more impacts. The City feels that more attention needs to be paid to the potential impacts that these proposals would have on Carson. Carson favors the Terminal Island Freeway extension and suggested that they would not support the Alameda Truckway Connector. Kerry Cartwright, POLB, stated that the POLB would have to see an analysis at the intersection of Ocean Boulevard and the Terminal Island Freeway because they are currently pursuing an improvement to that interchange and would want to know the impact of either Terminal Island Freeway proposal on traffic volumes at the interchange.

Joe Lim, Compton, asked how many truck trips would be diverted to Alameda Street by the proposed Alameda Truckway Connector? Compton is also concerned about the impact to their city as traffic on Alameda Street increases.

Minutes
I-710 Technical Advisory Committee
April 15, 2003
Page 11 of 15

The study team responded that traffic volumes on Alameda Street north of the connector would increase by about 40,000 passenger car equivalents (PCEs).

Kerry Cartwright, POLB, asked how do you account for the delay caused by the queuing at the truck inspection facility? How does it actually work? And how is it designed?

The study team responded that a time delay factor is introduced for that link in the traffic model. The model is not able to do much else at this level of precision. Lt. William Murphy, CHP, said that at other inspection stations, they signal trucks to go into the station until it is full and then close the station until they can clear it sufficiently. Then they reopen it. They weigh in motion all trucks that go through the station, but only inspect those that have expired stickers or are suspected of needing some inspection. The inspection station is located on the northbound truck bypass facility. It is designed such that truck traffic would exit the northbound I-710 and drive through the weigh in motion area. Any trucks that needed to be inspected would be flagged over to the side for inspection.

Ernest Morales, MTA, asked if the inspection station could be combined with the Exclusive Truck Facility in Alternative E, and would it fit within the utility right-of-way?

The study team responded that it probably could, but there would need to be more analysis to be sure.

Joe Lim, Compton, asked why is the Alondra interchange modified in Alternative D and why are there so many lanes on Alondra at that interchange? One of the properties in that interchange is currently vacant, but it is in plan check right now for near-term development.

The study team responded that because of the widening of I-710 caused by the mainline improvements, the interchange needed to be reconfigured. Alternative D includes mostly diamond interchanges, which by their design require left turn movements from the street onto the freeway. These left turn movements would require left turn lanes which add to the number of lanes required on this street.

Joe Lim, Compton, asked, with regard to alternative E, what is happening on the southbound side? At what height is the Truckway?

The study team responded that the truck lanes would go over Alondra and over SR-91. They would be at approximately the same height as the existing southbound I-710 to eastbound SR-91 flyover connector.

Victor Rollinger, Carson, asked how effective would sound walls be on the proposed elevated Truckway in Alternative E?

Minutes
I-710 Technical Advisory Committee
April 15, 2003
Page 12 of 15

The study team responded that to block the source of the noise, the exhaust pipe, the walls would have to be at least 12 feet high.

Victor Rollinger, Carson, asked whether a lower wall would block the tire noise, which (at speed) is a greater source of noise?

The study team responded that a shorter wall would block some tire/road noise.

Deborah Chankin, Gateway Cities COG asked that the study team explain the differences between the concepts for the SR-91 interchange improvements in Alternatives D and E.

The study team responded that Alternative D includes a very extensive amount of reconstruction to eliminate a number of design deficiencies. As such it also has a commensurately high amount of right-of-way impact. Alternative E addresses many, but not all of the design deficiencies and has a lower level of right-of-way impact. Additionally, Alternative E has fully directional truck ramps in this interchange.

Kerry Cartwright, POLB, asked if all of the truck ramps are necessary and cost effective. Does the traffic forecast support the need for all of those ramps?

The study team said that they would check the forecasted traffic volumes and report back to the TAC.

Lon Maddox, City of Long Beach, said that the City opposes the level of impact that is currently shown for this interchange reconstruction and wants to know if it could be minimized.

The study team responded that if fewer improvements are made, the impact could be reduced.

Al Bowser, SCAG, asked what design speed was assumed? If the design speed were reduced, then the design standards would allow a tighter design.

The study team responded 65 miles (110 kilometers) per hour.

Bill Pagett, TAC Chair, asked the project study team to explain the profile of the Truckway between SR-91 and Imperial Highway.

The study team responded that the Truckway would go over SR-91, over Alondra Boulevard, over Rosecrans Boulevard and under I-105, then over Imperial Highway.

Minutes
I-710 Technical Advisory Committee
April 15, 2003
Page 13 of 15

Joe Comstock, South Gate said that currently there is little access to residential and utility uses between the river and the freeway. He asked if the proposed improvements to I-710 would help or hinder that situation?

The study team responded that, as part of this project, the existing undercrossing could be improved, and/or an additional overcrossing could be provided at Southern Avenue allowing a second access point for those land uses.

Kanya Dorland, POLA, asked why not show all impacts to one side of I-710?

The study team responded that the alternatives assumed concentric widening because it is less disruptive to traffic during construction. The main purpose of the concept development at this stage is to show the relative differences between the alternatives to provide the TAC and OPC a chance to compare them and make trade-offs. Future design may or may not favor non-concentric widening.

Bill Pagett, TAC Chair, asked would use of vertical walls instead of slopes eliminate some right-of-way acquisition?

The project team responded that walls could reduce the amount of right-of-way acquisition, but they are not standard practice in all locations. At some locations walls could make economic sense. In other places they may not. It is a decision that the State would make later in the process – a more conservative assumption was used at this stage of project development.

Bill Pagett, TAC Chair, asked the team to explain the profile of the HOV lanes (Alternative D) and the Truckway (Alternative E) in the Bell Gardens area. The public would like to see the use of vertical walls to reduce the right-of-way impacts. Or could the Truckway be placed in the median in this area to reduce right-of-way impacts?

The study team responded that the HOV lanes would be elevated over Florence Avenue. The Truckway would be at-grade from north of Firestone Boulevard to south of Florence Avenue and then go over Florence Avenue. Where the Truckway is at-grade, there would be no need for a wall. So far, an effort was made to not locate the Truckway elevated over the median in response to public input and Caltrans/CHP concerns. However, that could change based on direction from the TAC and the OPC.

Kevin Wilson, Vernon, asked where is the truck access to the intermodal yards in Alternatives C and E?

The study team responded that, in Alternative C, there are truck ramps at Washington Boulevard. In Alternative E, there are truck ramps at Washington Boulevard and connecting to the Atlantic Boulevard viaduct.

Minutes
I-710 Technical Advisory Committee
April 15, 2003
Page 14 of 15

Robert Zarrilli, Commerce, asked why don't the truck ramps connect directly to the rail yards?

The study team responded that there are greater right-of-way impacts, and operational issues to address to get the northbound trucks (on the east side) to the yards (on the west side). It could be done, but the impacts would be greater.

Kevin Wilson, Vernon, asked could you use the old Ford property at the corner of Atlantic Boulevard and Sheila Street to construct a direct ramp to the rail yards? The rail companies are not opposed to direct connectors.

The study team responded that it was possible, but it would have to be studied further.

Robert Zarrilli, Commerce, asked could you set up a meeting to talk to the rail companies about this?

The study team responded that they would contact them and invite staff from Commerce, Vernon, Bell and the County of Los Angeles to this meeting.

Robert Zarrilli, Commerce, stated that at this point it appears that the City of Commerce is opposed to Alternatives C, D, and E because of the level of right-of-way impacts.

Kevin Wilson, Vernon, said that the City of Vernon would favor realigning the northbound off-ramp to Bandini Boulevard to line up with their proposed alignment for 26th street. That could open some land for development. The City would also favor the northbound off-ramp on a viaduct over Bandini Boulevard connecting with northbound Atlantic Boulevard to provide a more direct path for trucks going to Sheila Street.

The study team responded that current state policy prohibits aligning a ramp with a street opposite the ramp terminal. It would require a design exception. State policy may or may not allow for private development between the ramps, Atlantic Boulevard and Bandini Boulevard. A viaduct over Bandini Boulevard might provide more direct access to Sheila Street, but would eliminate access at Bandini Boulevard.

A private citizen in the audience asked about what is happening at the Firestone Boulevard interchange. Half the interchange was modified, but the other half was not. When will that be completed? Joe Comstock, City of South Gate, said that the City is pursuing the northbound ramp modifications and that they will be completed within the next few years.

IX. Adjournment

Bill Pagett, TAC Chair suggested holding the next TAC meeting on May 1, 2003, following the open houses, so that the TAC could get a preliminary briefing on the

Minutes
I-710 Technical Advisory Committee
April 15, 2003
Page 15 of 15

results of that part of the public outreach. It was the consensus of the TAC to meet again on May 1.

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 4:30 p.m.