

APPENDIX C

I-170 Technical Advisory Committee Membership, Meeting Agendas, Meeting Minutes

I-710 Technical Advisory Committee Membership

Bill Pagett, **Chair, City of Maywood and City of Paramount**

Desi Alvarez, **Vice-Chair, City of Downey**

Carlos Alvarado, **Bell and Cudahy**

John Oropeza, **City of Bell Gardens**

Victor Rollinger, **City of Carson**

Robert Quintero and Bob Zarrilli, **City of Commerce**

Agustus Ajawara, **City of Compton**

Patrick Fu, **City of Huntington Park**

Ed Shikada and Sumire Gant, **City of Long Beach**

Joe Wang and Yadi Fahardi, **City of Lynwood**

Ed Miño and Mohammad Mostahkami, **City of South Gate**

Maged El-Rabaa, **County of Los Angeles**

Kevin Wilson, **City of Vernon**

Kerry Cartwright, **Port of Long Beach**

Kanya Dorland, **Port of Los Angeles**

Allan Bowser, **SCAG**

Steve Novotny and Sharas Bangalore, **CalTrans**

Ernest Morales, **MTA**

Sandra Balmir, **FHWA & FTA**

Kathryn Higgins, **AQMD**

I-170 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Agendas and Minutes

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Wednesday, March 14, 2001
2:30 p. m. Meeting*

*Progress Park Plaza
(Map attached)
15500 Downey Avenue
Paramount, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 103, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

VI. REPORTS

- A. Introduce Consultant Team (Levinsohn)
 - 1. Study Overview
 - a. Technical (Levinsohn)
 - b. Community Outreach (Novoa)
 - 2. Early Study Activities (Levinsohn, Taylor, Novoa)
 - a. Technical (Taylor)
 - b. Community Involvement (Novoa)
 - 3. Proposed Study Boundaries (Taylor)
 - 4. Questions & Answers (Levinsohn moderator, study team members (agency and consultant))

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT

- B. Review I-710 Stakeholders, City and Agency Contacts

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT

- C. Review of Scope of Work

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT

- D. Review of Time Schedule

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT

- E. Set Date and Time for Future Meetings

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT

VII. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 4:00 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting scheduled for (not yet determined).

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR
Item A
Approval of Minutes

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**15500 Downey Avenue
Paramount, CA**

March 14, 2001

Chair De La Torre called the meeting to order at p.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Hector De La Torre, South Gate; Co-Chair Frank Colonna, Long Beach; Co-Chair Ricardo Sanchez, Lynwood; Hugo Argumedo, Commerce; Keith McCarthy, Downey; Gene Daniels, Paramount; John R. Calhoun, Port of Long Beach; Steve Novotny, Caltrans; Ray Maekawa, MTA; Zahi Faranesh, SCAG.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Co-Chair Margarita Ruvalcaba, Maywood; George Cole, Bell; Pedro Aceituno, Bell Gardens; Marcine Shaw, Compton; Tom Jackson, Huntington Park; William Davis, Vernon.

ALSO PRESENT: Cudahy Vice Mayor Frank Gurule; South Gate Vice Mayor Bill De Witt; Gilbert Canizales, representing State Senator Betty Karnette; Helene Ansel, representing Assemblyman Alan Lowenthal; Bell City Engineer Carlos Alvarado; Commerce Administrative Analyst Fernando Mendoza; Cudahy City Clerk Larry Galvan; Joan Wood, MTA; Karin Hodin, MTA; Al Bowser, SCAG; GWCCOG Executive Director Richard Powers; GWCCOG General Counsel Robert Messinger; Don Camph, GWCCOG staff; Jack Joseph, GWCCOG staff; Vickey Gurule.

Roll was taken through self-introductions.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned by consensus at p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Powers, Secretary

VII. REPORTS
ITEM A

TO: I-710 Technical Advisory Committee

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director

SUBJECT:

Background

Issues

Overview of Issues

Recommended Action

VII. REPORTS
ITEM B

**VII. REPORTS
ITEM C**

TO: I-710 Technical Advisory Committee

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director

SUBJECT:

Background

Issue

Recommended Action

**VII. REPORTS
ITEM D**

TO: I-710 Technical Advisory Committee

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director

SUBJECT:

Background

Recommended Action

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE A Meeting Held at Progress Park Plaza 15500 Downey Avenue Paramount, CA March 14, 2001

Chair Pagett called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair William Pagett, Bell Gardens, Cudahy, Hawaiian Gardens, Maywood, Paramount; Carlos Alvarado, Bell; Robert Quintero, Commerce; Augustus Ajawara, Compton; Wes Lind, Huntington Park, Ed Norris, Long Beach; Joseph Wang, Lynwood; Mohammad Mostahkami, South Gate; Kevin Wilson, Vernon; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach;; Calvin Aubrey, CHP; Sandra Balmir FHWA/FTA; Steve Novotny, Caltrans; Linda Taira, Caltrans; Richard Powers, GCCOG; Jack Joseph, GCCOG; Joan Wood, MTA; Al Bowser, SCAG.

OTHERS PRESENT: Sumire Gant, Long Beach; Ed Gingas, CHP; Doug Granger, CHP; Dennis Martinez, CHP; Todd Sturges, CHP; Joe Vizcarra, CHP; Linda Taira, Caltrans

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Desi Alvarez, Downey; Patrick Fu, Huntington Park.

Roll was taken through self-introductions.

There were no amendments to the agenda.

There were no public comments.

Richard Powers (GCCOG) described the project background the role of the Oversight Policy Committee (OPC), and the role of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

The consultant delivered a presentation on the I-710 Major Corridor Study.

A. Introduction of Study Team

Dave Levinsohn, Parsons Brinckerhoff's Project Manager, introduced the consultant team that would be working on the I-710 Major Corridor Study and briefly described the role that each team member would play. The I-710 Major Corridor Study involves transportation planning, travel demand forecasting and traffic analysis, environmental studies, goods movement/financial assessment, and conceptual engineering, combined with an extensive community outreach program.

MTA is managing the consultant's contract, however, the consultant team will also be working in close cooperation with Caltrans, SCAG, and the Gateway Cities COG. The project will have a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) made up of representatives of participating agencies, including the public works directors of each of the I-710 Corridor Cities and the Port of Long Beach. This group will provide technical input and will make recommendations. At key milestones in the study, presentations and recommendations will be made to the Oversight Policy Committee (OPC) for project decision-making. The OPC will also provide the policy direction for the study.

1. Study Overview

a) Technical

Dave Levinsohn outlined some of the possible transportation improvements that could result from the study and described the basic steps necessary to take a major transportation project from the initial planning stages through to construction. The project development process can be quite lengthy and is dependent upon the type of the transportation improvement, the implementing agency, and the nature of approvals that will ultimately be required. For example, adding lanes to the I-710 freeway would require a much more involved state/federal process compared to a local roadway project that might be accomplished under a shorter timeframe.

Dave Levinsohn then summarized the major work tasks included in the consultant's scope of work and described the key decisions that will be asked of the TAC and OPC for the I-710 Major Corridor Study. The overall objective of the I-710 study is to identify a program of transportation projects and improvements called a locally preferred alternative for the full corridor. From the locally preferred alternative, specific projects will be identified and documentation prepared so that these projects can become eligible for funding and can thus be advanced into the project development pipeline.

Leading to the selection of a locally preferred alternative are major milestones in the study that will require the TAC's and OPC's consideration and, ideally, a consensus agreement at each decision point. It is important

that these interim decisions “stick” so that the project can keep moving. Key decision points for the I-710 study are:

- *Purpose and Need:* Agreement on the transportation problems, priorities, and what should be addressed in the I-710 corridor study area.
- *Initial Alternatives:* The range of 8-10 transportation solutions that have a reasonable chance of becoming the locally preferred alternative.
- *Screened Alternatives:* Only the three “best” transportation alternatives that should be carried forward for further technical study (mobility benefits, environmental impacts, costs).
- *Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA):* The best overall transportation solution for the full corridor.
- *Project Study Reports (PSRs):* A short list of specific projects that should and can be advanced immediately into the project development pipeline and result in programming decisions which include their incorporation into the STIP.

Accompanying the technical work for the I-710 study is the community outreach program.

b) Community Outreach

Sylvia Novoa, Consensus Planning, summarized some of the objectives of the community outreach program. The consultant team wants to avoid a situation where we reach the end of the study and then suddenly hear from community stakeholders who were never informed of the project. Sylvia also explained that not only was it important to inform the communities about the project, but also to find out what people in the communities think should be done in the I-710 corridor study area so that they are actually part of the process. For this reason, many of the work activities in the community outreach program will involve gathering public input from different groups as the study progresses and presenting that information to the TAC and OPC for their consideration.

Sylvia Novoa also introduced the other subconsultants that would be working on the community outreach program for the I-710 study. Adler Public Affairs will assist with media relations and elected officials outreach. Jacki Bacharach & Associates will assist with agency coordination and elected officials outreach.

2. Early Study Activities

a) Technical

Paul Taylor, Kaku Associates, is leading the transportation planning and travel analysis work effort on behalf of the consultant team. Paul reported that they are now in the data collection stage of the project such as gathering and analyzing information from previous studies in addition to establishing the geographic information systems (GIS) databases. The consultant team will work in partnership with SCAG to produce the travel demand forecasts for the study. The first modeling meetings with SCAG and Port of Long Beach have already taken place. Another early task will be defining and setting the geographic limits for the I-710 corridor study area. This item will be discussed later in this meeting agenda. In addition, the consultant team will be contacting the public works directors of each of the cities to collect information on: traffic, transportation needs, and local transportation projects.

Sylvia Novoa outlined some of the methods that the consultant team will be using early in the project to collect public input. An important first step is the development of a public outreach plan that will serve as a blueprint for who will be contacted, how, and when. Examples include: interviews, community presentations/workshops, public meetings, newsletters, surveys and focus groups. The consultant team recognizes that each community is different and that different approaches will be necessary in order to truly be effective. The initial set of contacts will occur with the OPC members themselves. An example of the kinds of questions that they will be asked is provided in the folder. These interviews will also allow the OPC members to become more informed of the status of the project so that they are prepared when contacted by members of their community.

Questions and Answers/Input from those present on this Agenda item:

- Kerry Cartwright (Port of Long Beach): Would like to see certain key constituents contacted as part of the study (trucking companies, distributors, warehousing groups) as they may have some type of role with regard to financing. What is Jacki Bacharach's role and would this be one of her functions for the study? Port of Long Beach has a network of contacts that they can provide to the consultant team.
- Richard Powers (GCCOG): TAC members will be asked how would the individual cities like to be contacted. Recognize that each City is different. Just giving everyone a "heads up" that they (and people in their city) will be hearing from the consultant.
- Robert Quintero (Commerce) : Please cc the public works department (i.e., TAC member) on correspondence going to the policy people within the City.
- What about intermodal facilities (i.e., major truck attractors)? How will the study capture these and other types of truck activity centers?

- Bill Pagett (Chair): Study on truck impacted intersections should have some of this data. Suggest you obtain a copy of this study.

Paul Taylor responded that based on some of the information included in the Port's travel demand model, there may be a way to identify and isolate these types of facilities in the logistics chain of truck movements.

- Kerry Cartwright (PoLB): In the Ports traffic model we have OD and survey data, where we can isolate truck patterns, but not all of the transfer locations. Suggest contacting members of the industry.
- Robert Quintero (Commerce) : Will you be considering an option to widen I-710? And if so, how will that tie into planning for the I-5 facility? For example, there is a community located near the I-710/I-5 interchange that looks as though they will be impacted. For your public outreach, you should identify and attempt to contact property owners likely to be affected.
- Augustus Ajawara (Compton) : Would like to see the study address areas within the cities (e.g., six warehouses) that attract large numbers of trucks.
- Kevin Wilson (Vernon): knows of intermodal facility with high amounts of freight traffic (truck and rail) would like to see the study address improvements necessary to address/facilitate these movements.
- Bill Pagett (Chair): It is in the consultant's scope of work to study rail access issues and truck access on and off the freeway. The movement of empty containers is another issue.
- Kerry Cartwright (PoLB): The movement of empty containers is accounted for in a spreadsheet model as part of the Port's modeling effort. Note that a study addressing the issue of containers is currently underway.

Paul Taylor responded that intermodal and rail yards will essentially be treated as special, focus areas for the study. The consultant team will also be conducting interviews with all of the individual cities to try to understand their traffic problems. For example, problems on city streets, traffic relationships to the freeway, and intermodal facilities.

- Dennis Martinez (CHP): Aware of a ramp improvement project (I-5/Firestone Blvd.) that is already underway. Wonders if it will be included in the I-710 study?

Paul Taylor responded that yes, the consultant team is aware of this project, Kaku performed this traffic work, and it will be included as background to the I-710 study. The consultant team is also aware of the Statewide Integrated

Traffic Records System (SWITRS) accident database. The study will utilize three sources of accident data: (1) data collected by the localities, (2) Caltrans data base, and (3) SWITRS.

- Richard Powers (GCCOG): CHP are included as members of the TAC at the specific request of members on the OPC.
- Todd Sturges (CHP): The I-710 to I-5 interchange causes accidents daily. There are operational problems with close proximity of the off-ramps, but we know that the cities don't want to lose the off-ramps. It is a difficult problem.

Paul Taylor responded that there may be something we can do in situations such as these by adding an auxiliary lane. But that also has impacts such as right of way or environmental impacts that the cities don't want either. All these must be taken into consideration.

- Robert Quintero (Commerce) : How are you going to address bottlenecks (downstream) created by widening I-710?
- Bill Pagett (Chair): We don't want to involve the City of Los Angeles. This project terminates at SR-60 because we want to stay as far away from the I-710 project to the north (Pasadena) as possible.
- Augustus Ajawara (Compton): How does the Alameda Corridor affect the I-710 study?

Paul Taylor responded that at some point, probably at our next meeting, we will need to discuss what is included in the 2025 alternative (i.e., the No Build Alternative). The Alameda Corridor is already under construction and for modeling purposes almost all elements of this project are assumed to be in place and thus will be part of the background condition.

- Kerry Cartwright (PoLB): There is a misperception with regard to the ability of the Alameda Corridor to reduce truck traffic. Truck traffic is expected to increase dramatically. The Alameda Corridor helps offset these truck increases, but we show that there still will be many more trucks on I-710 in 2020. Port data shows about 35,000 (ADT) coming out of the Port today. By the year 2020, the number of trucks increases to about 85,000 – 90,000 per day, and that number already takes into the account the offset provided by the Alameda Corridor.

The Alameda Corridor was proposed, essentially, to enable the Ports to grow.

- Kerry Cartwright (PoLB): Actually, the Alameda Corridor is mitigation to the projected increase in trains (i.e., associated with increases in goods) to corridor cross traffic.

- Mohammad Mostahkami (South Gate): We have an interchange project, cloverleaf, where we have finished Phase I and are starting work on Phase II. At this stage we are thinking about how to find funds for Phase III. We like the idea of the interviews and are looking forward to this. We would like to invite our planning staff in addition to our public works people. We know what is going on with regard to our city streets, but our planners know what is happening on the development side. For community outreach, it is important to talk to the businesses. Should ask them about their truck movements.
- Augustus Ajawara (Compton) : Suggest that we include the ACTA. Concerned about railroad traffic through the city, potential for truck diversion, etc. Also concerned with usage of the bypass track (currently being used for the Alameda corridor).
- Richard Powers (GCCOG): For the TAC, we want to be inclusive and so added members are welcome. However, not sure if added members should have voting privileges though.
- Kerry Cartwright (PoLB): Bypass track is only temporary and will no longer be in place once construction is completed for the Alameda Corridor. Port data largely captures the port traffic. For information on local truck movements, you would need to contact ACTA.
- Richard Powers (GCCOG): Based on previous discussions, there is recognition among the policymakers that we cannot build our way out of congestion. We anticipate at least one alternative that includes TDM components. Another issue is air quality and level of health risk associated with vehicular emissions in the I-710 Corridor.
- Kerry Cartwright (PoLB): In the Port study, we considered three TDM scenarios, where we spread port (and truck operations) across different time periods/different hours.

3. Proposed Study Boundaries

Paul Taylor introduced proposed corridor study area, outlined in blue on a map graphic. The goal is to identify the I-710 area of influence (e.g., where traffic spills over).

- Richard Powers (GCCOG): The boundaries for the corridor study area were discussed before and deferred to now because we couldn't come to a resolution. If the corridor area gets too large, then you run the risk of diluting the core of what you are after. Some thoughts for discussion... The I-5 Corridor Study already covers much of the City of Commerce. Another question: Is the Port of Los Angeles really under our sphere of influence?

Generally, we also wanted to avoid the City of Los Angeles and the cities in the San Gabriel Valley. This creates jurisdictional difficulties, complicates our funding arrangements, and impacts our ability to reach consensus.

- Linda Taira (Caltrans) : In drafting the scope, two corridor study areas were envisioned. A broader one for modeling that captured the major traffic patterns for analysis and a narrower study area, close to I-710, where the physical improvements would occur.

Data collection and reporting of travel results was discussed among TAC members and consultant team. The I-710 study will not be analyzing intersections throughout the study area. However, study will analyze the freeway interchanges and some ramp intersections may be included as part of this analysis.

TAC members suggested changes to Kaku's proposed Study Area boundaries. The TAC then voted on the revised, expanded study area for general analysis and a narrower focus area around the I-710 for improvement alternatives. Motion passed. The approved Study Area Boundaries for general analysis are as follows:

South Boundary

- Along the Ports of Long Beach and LA from SR-110 to Cherry Avenue

East Boundary:

- Cherry Avenue from Ocean Boulevard to Pacific Coast Highway (PCH)
- PCH from Cherry Avenue to Lakewood Boulevard
- Lakewood Boulevard from PCH to I-5 Freeway.
- I-5 Freeway from Lakewood Boulevard to Paramount Boulevard.
- Paramount Boulevard from I-5 Freeway to Telegraph Road
- Telegraph Road from Paramount Boulevard to Garfield Avenue
- Garfield Avenue from Telegraph Road to SR-60 Freeway.

West Boundary:

- SR-110 Freeway from End of SR-110 Freeway to Lomita Boulevard
- Lomita Boulevard from SR-110 Freeway to Wilmington Avenue
- Wilmington Avenue from Lomita Boulevard to Victoria Street
- Victoria Street from Wilmington Avenue to S. Central Avenue
- S. Central/N. Central Avenue from Victoria Street to El Segundo Boulevard
- El Segundo Boulevard from N. Central Avenue to Alameda Street
- Alameda Street from El Segundo Boulevard to I-10 Freeway.

North Boundary

- I-10 from Alameda Street to I-5

- I-60 from I-5 to Garfield Ave.
- Augustus Ajawara (Compton): Do projections show that the Alameda Corridor will fill up? Concerned that train traffic will shift back to existing rail lines within the cities.
- Kerry Cartwright (PoLB): Our data shows that Alameda Corridor can handle the increased rail traffic. No concern at this point that there will be spillover.
- Bill Pagett (Chair): Suggest that each TAC member identify which members within their respective jurisdictions should be added to the overall contact list for the study (for Consensus Planning Group). Ask that the TAC members make the first contact within the City. At the next meeting, the consultant will then bring back a full contact list.
- Bill Pagett (Chair): When will the TAC see a full copy of the scope of work?

MTA PM (Joan Wood): For now, the study overview should suffice. We are still working on some of the details of the work plan, so we won't be handing out a copy of the scope of work yet.

- Bill Pagett (Chair): The time schedule shows a two-year study. Personally, I don't see it being done any sooner than that. Does the consultant have any comments on this?

Dave Levinsohn responded that the Consultant Team can get back to the TAC on this. They are planning on discussing schedule issues with MTA in the next few weeks.

It was voted and decided that the TAC will meet monthly, on the 2nd Wednesday of every month, from 1:30 to 3:30 p.m. The consultant will only attend every other month or those meetings where Study decisions need to be made.

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

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Wednesday, April 11, 2001
1:30 p. m. Meeting*

*Progress Park Plaza
15500 Downey Avenue
Paramount, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 103, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Minutes of the Meeting of March 14, 2001

VII. REPORTS

- A. Discussion Regarding Policies and Procedures for I-710 TAC Meetings (Pagett)
 - 1. Sign-in Sheets for TAC Members and Public
 - 2. Seating of Voting and Non-voting Attendees
 - 3. Determination of Number of Members Needed for a Quorum
 - 4. Responsibility for Minutes of Meetings
 - 5. Responsibility for Developing Agenda
- B. Report on the Interface of the I-710 and I-5 Projects (Ralph Webb)
- C. Report from Caltrans on Scheduled Repairs to the I-710 Freeway (Novotny)
- D. Discussion of Pending Issues in Each Corridor City
- E. Identification of Contact Persons for Each Agency

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 3:30 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting scheduled for May 9, 2001.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE A Meeting Held at Progress Park Plaza 15500 Downey Avenue Paramount, CA April 11, 2001

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair William Pagett, Bell Gardens, Cudahy, Maywood, Paramount; Carlos Alvarado, Bell; Robert Quintero, Commerce; Augustus Ajawara, Compton; Wes Lind, Huntington Park; Ed Norris, Long Beach; Ed Mino, South Gate; Kevin Wilson, Vernon; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach; Sandra Balmir, FHWA/FTA; Joe Vizcarra, CHP; Al Bowser, SCAG; Steve Novotny, Caltrans; Joan Wood, MTA.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Vice Chair Desi Alvarez, Downey; Joe Wang, Lynwood.

OTHERS PRESENT: Karin Hodin, MTA; Richard Powers, Gateway Cities COG; Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities COG; Sumi Gant, City of Long Beach; Louis Rubenstein, Port of Long Beach; Linda Taira, Caltrans Corridor Studies; Kristin Wilson, Caltrans Corridor Studies; Dave Levinsohn, PBQD; Julie Rush, PBQD; Paul Taylor, Kaku Associates; Sylvia Novoa, Consensus Planning Group.

Roll was taken through self-introductions.

There were no amendments to the agenda.

There were no public comments.

Consent Calendar:

It was moved by Robert Quintero, seconded by Al Bowser, to approve the minutes of the meeting of March 14, 2001. The motion was approved unanimously.

Reports:

A. Discussion Regarding Polices and Procedures for I-710 TAC Meetings

Chairman Pagett recommended the use of sign-in sheets to be signed by all TAC members and members of the public attending meetings of the TAC. He recommended the use of nameplates for the TAC members so that voting members of the TAC could be distinguished from non-voting members of the audience. It was the consensus of the TAC to approve the recommendations of the Chair.

It was the consensus of the TAC that a quorum of the TAC would be a majority of 11 of the 20 agencies represented on the TAC. The Chair asked COG staff to prepare a list of the members to be used at meetings for purposes of determining a quorum.

Dave Levinsohn [PBQD] said that his team would prepare draft minutes for any TAC meetings for which they prepare the agenda materials. The Chair requested that Gateway Cities COG staff prepare the minutes for any meetings that are not done by the project consultant.

It was agreed that Joan Wood, MTA Project Manager, Richard Powers, COG Executive Director, or Dave Levinsohn, PBQD Project Team Leader should receive any items for the agenda. The COG would prepare the agenda and send notices relative to the meetings and determine the submittal deadline for items to be included on the agenda.

B. Report on the Interface of the I-710 and I-5 Projects

This item was deferred until June, when the I-5 Corridor Executive Director would be able to attend.

C. Report from Caltrans on Scheduled Repairs to the I-710 Freeway

Steve Novotny distributed and discussed a list of currently scheduled Caltrans rehabilitation projects on the I-710 Freeway in the project study area. He said he would bring back to the May or June meeting a maintenance status report.

D. Discussion of Pending Issues in Each Corridor City

Dave Levinsohn reported that meetings are ongoing with each city to discuss issues relating to the I-710 corridor. He said that Kaku Associates was responsible for dealing with technical issues, and that Consensus Planning Group was organizing public outreach meetings.

Chairman Pagett requested that the Highway Patrol report on safety issues to the TAC and the Oversight Policy Committee.

E. Identification of Contact Persons for Each Agency

It was the consensus of the TAC to identify themselves as the appropriate contacts for TAC meetings.

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 3:30 p.m.

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Wednesday, May 9, 2001
1:30 p. m. Meeting*

*Progress Park Plaza
15500 Downey Avenue
Paramount, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 103, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. **CALL TO ORDER**
- II. **ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. **AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Minutes of the Meeting of April 11, 2001

VII. REPORTS

- A. Public Outreach Plan (Consensus Planning Group)
- B. Summary of Stakeholder Interviews and Discussion (Consensus Planning Group)
- C. Preview of Informal VA Roundtables (Consensus Planning Group)
- D. Discussion of Data Needs (Kaku Associates)
- E. Study Schedule (Parsons Brinckerhoff)
- F. Upcoming Scoping Meetings (Parsons Brinckerhoff)
- G. Update from CHP on Truck Safety Inspections

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 3:30 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting scheduled for May 9, 2001.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE A Meeting Held at Progress Park Plaza 15500 Downey Avenue Paramount, CA May 9, 2001

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair William Pagett, Bell Gardens, Cudahy, Hawaiian Gardens, Maywood, Paramount; Carlos Alvarado, Bell; Robert Quintero, Commerce; Patrick Fu, City of Huntington Park; Kevin Wilson, Vernon; Sumire Grant, City of Long Beach; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach; Doug Granger, CHP; Linda Taira, Caltrans; Karin Hodin, MTA.

OTHERS PRESENT: Bob Zarrilli, Commerce; Richard Powers, Gateway Cities COG; Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities COG.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Roll was taken through self-introductions.

There were no amendments to the agenda.

There were no public comments.

A. Public Outreach Plan

Sylvia Novoa, consultant, Consensus Planning Group, provided an overview of the Public Outreach Plan that has been developed for the I-710 Major Corridor Study. Sylvia distributed a flow chart that described the community outreach tasks for each major phase within the study: Informal Value Analysis/Purpose and Need, Scoping, Screened Alternatives, Environmental Document, and Locally Preferred Alternative. The consultant will use several different methods to try to reach people throughout the study including: individual interviews and briefings; roundtable discussion groups; questionnaires; public workshops and community presentations. Near the conclusion of each major study phase, public input will be summarized and analyzed in an issues analysis report.

The consultant team has completed several interviews with members of the OPC, city staff, elected officials, public agencies, and other representatives of major stakeholder groups within the corridor (e.g., trucking interests, auto club, community groups). The consultant has also drafted a questionnaire to be distributed at locations where users of I-710 are known to frequent to obtain the typical commuter's opinion on the problems and conditions on I-710. Several of the cities have agreed to help make contacts with major employers, community centers, and other organizations to help distribute and collect the questionnaires. In addition, the Gateway Cities COG has agreed to host a project website that will provide general public information on the I-710 Study and will also collect feedback from the public on selected topics. The website will also have links to MTA, SCAG, and the I-5 project so that the public can access information about transportation issues that relate to the I-710 Study.

Additional contacts for individual interviews were suggested by some of the TAC members. These included interviewing some of the steamship companies (Port of Long Beach) and the Mayor of Long Beach (Gateway City COG). In addition, the consultant will contact J. Winter to obtain a list of names of the individuals on the Port's intermodal committee.

B. Summary of Stakeholder Interviews

Sylvia Novoa distributed a handout that summarized the key issues and problems on I-710 as expressed by all those participating in the individual interviews. Whereas a great deal of feedback was received from all of the interviews, the summary focuses on those issues where general agreement was heard among the stakeholders. These included:

- Problems with truck traffic on I-710
- Need for additional ramps or interchanges on I-710 (e.g., Slauson Ave.)
- Need for design improvements to existing interchanges on I-710 (e.g., Florence Ave. interchange, I-5 interchange)
- Need for landscaping, better signage, and soundwalls on I-710
- Problems with left-lane egress locations on I-710
- Congestion on major arterials (both parallel arterials and arterials that connect with I-710)
- Need for strategies to shift trucks to off-peak hours
- New development that will potentially change traffic patterns in the Corridor

The TAC members made no comments on the summary analysis of problems and transportation needs from the stakeholders. There was general concurrence among the committee members that the proposed list effectively captured the key issues in the corridor.

C. Upcoming Round Table Discussions

Sylvia Novoa outlined the preparation activities, proposed format, and invitation list for the upcoming Round Table discussions. The roundtables will be taking place over a two-day timeframe on May 15 and 16 at a centralized location in the Corridor (South Gate). The agenda calls for three meetings each day and participants will be grouped according to their roles and interests. For example, all elected officials will be grouped together, public agency representatives, trucking interests, major employers, residents and community groups, and so on. The purpose is to generate discussion within each group on the transportation problems and needs in the Corridor as well as potential solutions so the participants can hear each other's thoughts and ideas. The consultants will record and summarize what each group said.

The consultant has already sent out invitations to the roundtables and will also be following up with reminder calls to encourage attendance. Kerry Cartwright suggested that the Port of Long Beach board members should also be invited to the session for the elected officials. He will forward an invitation to those board members. Sumire Grant, City of Long Beach, expressed the concern that it will be difficult to get residents and businesses leaders to attend if the meetings are not held in a location nearby. The consultant acknowledged that this is likely to be a problem, but also that it was an important part of the roundtables to encourage people from different geographic locations in the corridor to talk to each other about mutual interests and problems. There will be additional opportunities (public workshops and community presentations) held in different locations throughout the corridor to gather public input during project scoping and at key phases in the study process.

Dick Powers, Gateway Cities COG, noted that they may need to add the City of Carson to the OPC due to its proximity to the I-710 Corridor even though they are not officially part of the Gateway Cities COG.

D. Data Needs

Paul Taylor, consultant, Kaku Assoc., provided a status report on the technical information that has been collected to date and described some of the data needs that are still outstanding. The most critical item, by far, is the model data that is expected from SCAG and the Port of Long Beach. The loaded networks and trip tables are necessary to model both existing and future traffic conditions in the I-710 corridor study area. If this model information is not received by mid-May, then there will be a direct impact on the project schedule for the I-710 Study.

In addition, the consultant team is collecting traffic counts from Caltrans and the cities within the study area along I-710, related freeways, and the major arterials where this information is available. Paul displayed a map that showed where this traffic information has been collected. The purpose of this count information is to enable the consultant to validate the corridor-specific subarea model that will be developed by the project team. Where necessary the consultant will conduct traffic counts at selected locations to help validate the model across major screenlines in the corridor study area. Paul said that the consultant team still needs any existing traffic count information that is available from the local jurisdictions. 1996 traffic data is okay as the consultant can adjust the data to reflect the model's base year.

Kerry Cartwright (Port of Long Beach) stated that the models that were used to develop the Ports' transportation master plan will be made available to the I-710 project team by the May deadline, however, the Ports' future year is 2020. The I-710 consultant will have to factor the data up to year 2025 themselves. He will provide the factors that will enable them to do this. Kerry then asked about the types of truck class categories that would be reported by the I-710 consultant. In response, Paul said the consultant envisions using a truck class scheme similar to that used by SCAG.

Richard Powers asked about the e-modal study. In response, Kerry Cartwright noted that the e-modal study information is already included in the Ports' model data, but that the e-modal study and the empty container study would be good background information for the consultant.

E. Study Schedule/Tier 1 versus PEAR Environmental Approach

David Levinsohn, consultant, PB, distributed two schedules for the study. Dave explained that two different schedules are shown to illustrate what the timeline would be for project depending upon what type of environmental process was selected for the project. The initial decision points and milestones are the same for both schedules (purpose and need; develop alternatives; and screening of alternatives). The intent is to select an environmental process that will result in the shortest project development timeframe leading to the implementation of transportation improvements. The project team will not know what the best environmental approach is for the I-710 Major Corridor Study until more is known about the alternatives to be developed later in the study. Until an environmental approach is selected, the consultant will pursue a public review process that will satisfy the federal and state regulatory requirements of both a Tier 1 EIR/EIS and a PEAR environmental document.

Dave described the first major decision point that was coming up in the middle of August and stressed the importance of obtaining the model data from SCAG and the Ports in time for the OPC to adopt a Purpose and Need

Statement for the project by August 15, 2001. The study team will also need to hold public scoping meetings during the last week of June 2001 to ensure that public input on the scope of the study as well as their opinions on the purpose and need for transportation improvements are taken into account and presented to the TAC members (July 2001) and OPC members (August 2001) for their consideration.

The project team will develop up to ten alternatives, including the No Build and the Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Alternatives by this September. The TSM Alternative mostly consists of operational improvements such as added bus service or improved traffic signals and is designed to derive the greatest transportation benefit from the existing infrastructure. By the end of the year (December 2001), the consultant will screen these down to no more than five alternatives (1 No Build, 1 TSM, and 3 build alternatives). Depending upon the environmental approach selected, the study team will seek consensus on a preferred alternative by September 2002 (PEAR) or May 2003 (Tier 1 EIR/EIS).

Dick Powers (Gateway Cities COG) mentioned that they would like to obtain as much information as possible on the preferred alternative by April 2003 so that they can begin their lobbying efforts on proposed transportation projects for the next transportation authorization bill.

The TAC members discussed the relative advantages and disadvantages of a PEAR environmental approach compared to a Tier 1 environmental approach. Linda Taira (Caltrans) indicated that Caltrans environmental staff would look more favorably on a PEAR approach for this type of study given the level of environmental effort required to initiate PSR studies and to seek funding, which is one of the primary objectives of the I-710 Major Corridor Study. She also said that the initial rationale for a Tier 1 approach was to provide the ability to acquire right of way at the conclusion of the study. However, she now does not anticipate the funding being available in that time frame to acquire right of way. No matter which environmental approach is selected, it is still important to obtain public input and to engage environmental resource agencies such as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers during the study.

F. Upcoming Scoping Meetings

The public scoping meetings will likely be held the last week in June 2001. TAC members will receive more information as to the specific times, dates, and places in early June.

G. Report from CHP/Truck Safety Inspections and Enforcement

Doug Granger (California Highway Patrol) presented a verbal report on their truck inspection procedures, describing random stops, annual inspections, and paperwork checks. I-710 has no enforcement area where vehicles and/or trucks can be pulled over safely.

The California Highway Patrol (CHP) works cooperatively with Caltrans to locate and site truck enforcement facilities. The CHP would prefer to locate a truck inspection facility on I-710, south of I-405. However, the facility would require a great deal of space (4 lanes, plus 1 lane for acceleration), which would be difficult to achieve.

The issue of poor equipment and lack of maintenance was discussed in addition to the public's perception that the trucks are just not safe. According to the CHP's experience, the two biggest issues with truck safety are that the truck drivers need to get more sleep and they need to slow down. It is not a mechanical problem with the trucks. The I-710 freeway was never designed to handle the high volumes of truck and auto traffic that it experiences today. The CHP is also constrained by lack of personnel. They have the same number of officers as they did in 1973.

8. Other Business

The TAC was asked to consider changing the monthly meeting date and time. The current date and time was still best for all members present, so it was recommended that this issue needed to be revisited once the Chair received suggestions on alternative dates and times from the missing TAC members.

The next OPC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 24th. The OPC will meet on the fourth Thursday every other month.

It was suggested that Ralph Webb of the I-5 JPA be contacted to give a presentation about I-5 as it relates to I-710. It was noted that members of the I-5 JPA are welcome to attend the I-710 TAC meetings. The Chair asked Robert Quintero (Commerce) if he would be willing to serve as the liaison between the two studies and he agreed to do so.

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

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Wednesday, June 13, 2001
1:30 p. m. Meeting*

*Progress Park Plaza
15500 Downey Avenue
Paramount, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 103, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Minutes of the Meeting of May 9, 2001

VII. REPORTS

- A. Report on Oversight Policy Committee Decision to Use a PEAR (Preliminary Environmental Assessment Report) in lieu of a Tier 1 EIS
- B. Project Update (Joan Wood, MTA Project Manager)
- C. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the Dates of Future Meetings

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 3:30 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE A Meeting Held at Progress Park Plaza 15500 Downey Avenue Paramount, CA June 13, 2001

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair William Pagett, Bell Gardens, Cudahy, Maywood, Paramount, Bob Zirrilli, Commerce; Patrick Fu, City of Huntington Park; Sumire Gant, Long Beach; Joe Wang, Lynwood; Ed Mino, South Gate; Louis Rubenstein, Port of Long Beach; Joan Wood, MTA; Steve Novotny, Caltrans; Calvin Aubrey, California Highway Patrol.

OTHER PRESENT: Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities COG; Kristin Wilson, Caltrans; Karin Hodin and Michelle Smith, MTA; Doug Granger, CHP; Eugene Kao, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works; John Zeigler, Automobile Club of Southern California; Dave Levinsohn, Project Consultant

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Cities of Bell, Compton, Downey, and Vernon; SCAG; FHWA.

Roll was taken through self introductions.

Chair Pagett led the Pledge of Allegiance.

There were no amendments to the agenda.

There were no public comments.

It was moved by Member Fu, seconded by Member Mino, to approve the minutes for the meeting of May 9, 2001. The motion was approved unanimously.

Joan Wood, MTA Project Manager, reported that the Oversight Policy Committee had voted to use a PEAR (Preliminary Environmental Assessment Report) in lieu of a Tier 1 EIS for the I-710 Major Corridor Study.

Joan Wood announced a series of public workshops that would be held in late June to received comments regarding the Major Corridor Study.

Chair Pagett advised the Committee that its regular meeting date conflicted with that of the County task force on water quality, which prevented some members to be able to attend both meetings. He proposed that the regular meeting date be changed to the third Wednesday of each month, provided that there were no

I-710 TAC Minutes

June 13, 2001

Page 2 of 2

other conflicts for Committee members. After discussion, it was moved by Member Gant, seconded by Member Mino, to move the regular meeting date of the I-710 TAC to the third Wednesday of each month. The motion was approved unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned by consensus at 2:10 p.m.

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Wednesday, July 18, 2001
1:30 p. m. Meeting*

*Progress Park Plaza
15500 Downey Avenue
Paramount, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 103, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Minutes of the Meeting of June 13, 2001

VII. REPORTS

- A. Report from the Port of Long Beach Regarding TMP Study results (Kerry Cartwright)
- B. I-710 Project Update (Joan Wood, MTA Project Manager)

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 3:30 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A Meeting Held at Progress Park Plaza

15500 Downey Avenue

Paramount, CA

July 18, 2001

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice Chair Desi Alvarez, Downey; Steve Steinbrecher, Bell Gardens, Cudahy, Maywood, Paramount; Bob Zarrilli, Commerce; Patrick Fu, City of Huntington Park; Sumire Gant, Long Beach; Ed Mino, South Gate; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach; Joan Wood, MTA; Steve Novotny, Caltrans; Sandra Balmir, FHWA/FTA.

OTHERS PRESENT: Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities COG; Kristin Wilson, Caltrans; Karin Hodin, MTA; Louis Rubenstein, Port of Long Beach; Doug Granger, CHP; James Chou and Patrick Smith, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works; Dave Levinsohn, Project Consultant.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Cities of Bell, Compton, Lynwood, and Vernon; SCAG.

Roll was taken through self-introductions.

Vice Chair Alvarez led the Pledge of Allegiance.

There were no amendments to the agenda.

Sandra Balmir asked for the reasons that the PEAR environmental review process was chosen. Joan Wood and Dave Levinsohn responded that they will provide her with the background information.

It was moved by Member Wood, seconded by Member Zarrilli, to approve the minutes of the meeting of June 13, 2001. The motion was approved unanimously.

Kerry Cartwright presented a report on the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles' TMP study results. Activity at the ports currently affects 500,000 regional jobs. The study forecasted that by 2020 there would be 36.1 million twenty foot equivalent units would pass through the ports, compared to the current figure of 9.5 million. The study recommends expanding the 710 freeway

from 6 to 8 to 10 lanes or adding two truck lanes. It also recommends that 60% of the units be handled outside of the day shift, in order to reduce the impact of the increased activity at the ports on the flow of traffic.

Joan Wood announced that the Purpose and Need report would be the key item at the next TAC meeting.

Steve Novotny announced that Caltrans would be hosting a bus tour of the I-710 on August 29, and reported on an Office of Traffic Safety funded study that would focus on temporary safety improvements to the I-710.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned by consensus at 2:40 p.m.

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Wednesday, August 15, 2001
1:30 p. m. Meeting*

*Progress Park Plaza
15500 Downey Avenue
Paramount, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 103, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Minutes of the Meeting of July 18, 2001

VII. REPORTS

- A. Presentation of Purpose and Need Elements (Consultant Team)
 - 1. Socio-Demographics
 - 2. Engineering/Operational Deficiencies
 - 3. Transit
 - 4. Environmental Issues
- B. Status and Update of Traffic Forecasts (Consultant Team)
- C. Public Outreach Issues Analysis
- D. Study Schedule Update (Consultant Team)

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 3:30 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE A Meeting Held at Progress Park Plaza 15500 Downey Avenue Paramount, CA August 15, 2001

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Bill Pagett, Bell Gardens, Cudahy, Maywood, Paramount; Vice Chair Desi Alvarez, Downey; Kevin Wilson, Vernon; Ed Mino, South Gate; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach; Al Bowser, SCAG; Doug Granger, CHP; Rob Lund, CHP; Sumire Gant, Long Beach; Robert Quintero, Commerce; Bob Zarrilli, Commerce; Steve Novotny, Caltrans; Joan Wood, MTA; Patrick Fu, Huntington Park;

OTHERS PRESENT: Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities COG; Karin Hodin, MTA; Eugene Kao, Los Angeles County DPW; James Chon, Los Angeles County DPW; Linda Taira, Caltrans; Mary Lou Echternach, Assemblymember Lowenthal's Office; Dave Levinsohn, Project Consultant Team; Julie Rush, Project Consultant Team; Kip Field, Project Consultant Team; Karen Savage, Project Consultant Team; Paul Taylor, Project Consultant Team; Alisa Kwun, Project Consultant Team

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Cities of Bell, Compton, and Lynwood

Roll was taken through self-introductions.

Jack Joseph led the Pledge of Allegiance.

The agenda was amended at the request of the project consultant team to present Item B. prior to Item A.

Member Cartwright requested a correction to the minutes from the meeting of July 18, 2001 to say that he presented a report on the Port of Long Beach's *and Port of Los Angeles'* TMP study. It was moved by Member Wilson and seconded by Vice Chair Alvarez to approve the minutes of the meeting of July 18, 2001 as amended. The motion was approved unanimously.

Joan Wood requested clarification from the CHP regarding the date and time of the I-710 Safety Grant Bus Tour. It was clarified that the tour is on August 30th at 8:30 a.m. leaving from the CHP East Los Angeles Area Office in Monterey Park.

Dave Levinsohn presented an update on the status of traffic forecasts for the study. He said that the consultant team had detected counter-intuitive results in the SCAG forecasts for years 2010 and 2025, in that future peak period, peak direction traffic volumes are forecast to be less than year 1997. The consultant team also observed that forecast employment in 39 traffic analysis zones in or near the study area had been

I-710 TAC Minutes

August 15, 2001

Page 2 of 3

forecast to zero in the future, totaling 106,000 jobs. The consultant team had met with the SCAG traffic forecasting staff, who acknowledged that there are errors in the forecasts provided by SCAG and that they need to correct the employment forecasts and re-run the forecasts. This will take them at least two weeks.

Since future traffic volumes are a key input to study purpose and need, the completion of this study milestone will be delayed at least one month while the consultant team waits for corrected SCAG forecasts and then spends the time necessary to process and analyze the forecast results.

Members of the consultant team presented elements of the purpose and need for corridor improvements. These elements presented were socio-demographics (J. Rush), engineering/operational deficiencies (K. Field), transit issues (K. Savage), and environmental issues (J. Rush).

Socio-Demographics/Land Use. Characteristics such as population, employment, and land use shape travel choices and trip making in the I-710 Corridor Study Area. Two key data sources were used to identify the demographic characteristics of the I-710 travel corridor: (1) SCAG's socio-economic and land use data, and (2) 1990 Census. SCAG is currently in the process of revising their employment projects for 2010 and 2025, thus the information presented is draft and may be updated. Demographics presentation covered items such as: population density and projected growth; employment classifications and project employment growth; age and household size; ethnic populations; average household income; car ownership; and land use. Demographic characteristics within the I-710 Study Area were compared with LA County as a whole to identify key trends.

Engineering/Operational Deficiencies. A summary of the physical constraints and design deficiencies of the existing I-710 facility was presented. A number of the current operational problems are related to the deficiencies of the existing design to accommodate the overall growth in traffic and specific growth in truck traffic over the last 40+ years. Specific design features of the local street and freeway to freeway interchanges such as non-standard interchange spacing, clover-leaf ramps, non-standard ramp geometry and left-egress for major traffic movements were discussed. Other design features related to the I-710 Mainline freeway such as inadequate weaving distances, narrow or non-existent shoulders, and narrow lanes were also discussed.

Transit Issues. The presentation covered five main topics: (1) a summary of the 18 transit service providers in the study area; (2) a summary of the transit service concept and characteristics of the services provided in the study area; (3) a summary of the evaluation of MTA routes (from the SABRE study); (4) a summary of transit rider characteristics; and (5) identification of transit related issues for passengers and for operators. Public transit is an important issue in this study area due to the relatively high proportion of the study area population that is "transit dependent." There is a relatively high proportion of low-income households in the study area; a high proportion of households without private automobiles (or only one vehicle/household); and a high proportion of minority households.

Transit issues for passengers in the study area include: frequent need to transfer between routes due to the grid system which does not serve some origin-destination pairs directly; inadequate coverage in some portions of the study area; difficulty in

I-710 TAC Minutes

August 15, 2001

Page 3 of 3

getting between communities due to the intra-community focus of local transit service providers; overcrowding on some transit routes; and delays and slow travel times on transit due to congestion on streets and highways. Transit issues for operators in the study area include: difficulties in achieving productivity and cost-effectiveness goals for a variety of reasons; institutional barriers to regional transit system integration; limited funds, especially for operations; limitations/restrictions on the use of funds from different sources; and the impacts of roadway congestion on operating effectiveness and costs.

Environmental Issues. Seven environmental factors have been identified that are unique to the I-710 Corridor and that should be considered when developing the purpose and need for transportation improvements as well as alternatives development and screening. The seven environmental factors are: (1) air quality; (2) environmental justice; (3) community cohesion; (4) potential for displacements/relocation; (5) floodplain and water quality; (6) aesthetics/visual impacts; and (7) noise. The air quality discussion included need to maintain regional conformity and the presence of diesel particulates/air toxins in the I-710 Study Area. There are a large number of minority and low-income groups living in the I-710 Study Area. The Executive Order on environmental justice requires that federal agencies consider and address disproportionately high adverse environmental effects of proposed projects on these minority and low-income populations. Land uses directly adjacent to I-710 were reviewed and issues associated with possible right-of-way impacts (encroachment on the LA River Channel; residents, parks, schools) were highlighted. Potential landscaping (visual) and noise issues were also raised and discussed.

Alisa Kwun of Consensus Planning Group provided a summary of the Issues Analysis based upon the public outreach conducted to date in the study. The summary of issues and suggestions reinforced the perception that high truck volume is a major problem in this Corridor and alternatives need to be explored to alleviate the congestion it is believed to cause. Other major issues reported from outreach efforts included access to interchanges, cloverleaf ramps, and arterial traffic. Suggestions for improvement included the addition of separate truck lanes or other general purpose lanes, construction of Slauson Avenue on/off ramps, an I-5 south and other right lane interchanges, and twenty four hour port operation. The summary of comments were based on what was heard at the stakeholder Interviews, Roundtables, Open Houses and the 256 Questionnaires that have been received.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned by consensus at 3:30 p.m.

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Wednesday, November 21, 2001
1:30 p.m. Meeting*

*Gateway Cities COG Offices
7300 Alondra Blvd., Suite 201
Paramount, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 201, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Minutes of the Meeting of August 15, 2001

VII. REPORTS

- A. Project Status Report (Consultant Team)
- B. Existing and Future Conditions (Consultant Team)
 - 1. I-710 Safety Issues
 - 2. Preliminary Traffic Forecasts
 - 3. Goods Movement
 - a. Trucks
 - b. Freight Rail
- C. No Build Alternative (Consultant Team)
- D. Next Steps (Consultant Team)

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 3:30 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE A Meeting Held at Gateway Cities COG Offices 7300 Alondra Blvd., Suite 201 Paramount, CA November 21, 2001

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair William Pagett, Bell Gardens, Cudahy, Maywood, Paramount; Carlos Alvarado, Bell; Don Dey, Long Beach; Joseph Wang, Lynwood; Mohammad Mostahkami, South Gate; Kevin Wilson, Vernon; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach; Patrick Fu, Huntington Park; Sandra Balmir FHWA/FTA; Steve Novotny, Caltrans; Joan Wood, MTA; Al Bowser, SCAG.

OTHERS PRESENT: Sumire Gant, Long Beach; Pai-Kang Wang, Port of Long Beach; Doug Granger, CHP; Patrick Smith, Los Angeles County; Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities COG; Dave Levinsohn, PBQD; Paul Taylor, Kaku; Julie Rush, PBQD; Bruce Chow, Kaku.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Vice Chair Desi Alvarez, Downey; Robert Quintero, Commerce; Augustus Ajawara, Compton.

Roll was taken through self-introductions.

Chairman Pagett led the pledge of allegiance.

There were no amendments to the agenda.

There were no public comments.

It was moved by Member Wang, seconded by Member Bowser, to approve the minutes of the meeting of August 15, 2001. The motion was approved unanimously.

Reports:

A. Project Status

Dave Levinsohn (PB), consultant, described the steps that the project team has taken since the August 21st, 2001 TAC Meeting. There has been a four month

delay to the project schedule attributable to counter-intuitive travel demand forecasts and problems with the socio-economic data in the I-710 Study Area in the 2001 RTP model. Travel demand data is necessary to understand the future performance of the transportation system in order to develop the purpose and need statement for the study.

In late September 2001, SCAG and MTA agreed that the I-710 project team would use MTA's long range model as the primary basis for the travel demand forecasts for the initial milestones of the I-710 Major Corridor Study, while SCAG continued work on correcting socio-economic forecast data and analyzing the outputs of the RTP model. The consultant team, with assistance from MTA's modeling staff, started work in early October 2001 to extract travel demand forecast data from MTA's model sets, integrate these vehicle trips with information on heavy duty truck forecasts from both SCAG and the Port of Long Beach, and analyze future travel patterns and conditions for the I-710 Corridor. Preliminary travel demand results were produced in early November and will be presented to the TAC today at this meeting.

The project schedule has been reset and the next project milestone will occur on December 13th, 2001, when the OPC is scheduled to approve the Purpose and Need Statement. The TAC will meet on December 12th to provide their recommendation on Purpose and Need. The executive summary of the proposed Purpose and Need Statement will be distributed to the TAC members via e-mail one week prior to the December TAC meeting.

B. Existing and Future Conditions

At the August 2001 TAC Meeting, the consultant team presented findings on: demographics, physical constraints and operational deficiencies, transit, environmental issues in the I-710 Corridor as well as public input from the scoping activities conducted for the project. At today's TAC meeting (November 21, 2001), the consultant team will present the second half of the technical analysis of existing and future conditions in the I-710 Study Area and will cover: safety, travel demand forecasting, and goods movement.

1. Safety

Julie Rush (PB) presented analysis of three years accident data drawn from Caltran's database of reported accidents that showed the numbers and locations of accidents along I-710. Accident patterns indicate that accidents tend to occur at or near the interchanges on the mainlines of I-710, with just south of I-405 and just south of I-5 being the two worst locations. Three factors that contribute to these safety problems were discussed: design deficiencies, traffic volumes, and the mix of the vehicles using I-710. The negative effects that accidents have on the transportation system were also discussed.

2. Preliminary Traffic Forecasts

Paul Taylor (Kaku) provided a brief overview of the methods used to predict existing and future year travel conditions in the I-710 Corridor Study Area based on the model results from MTA's regional forecast model, SCAG's 2001 Heavy Duty Truck forecasts, and the Port of Long Beach's Transportation Master Plan projections. These travel results are preliminary and will be used to identify the Purpose and Need for the project as well as Alternatives Development and Screening for the I-710 Study. Travel demand projections for the I-710 Study will be revisited for Alternatives Evaluation, once SCAG has finished reviewing the 2001 RTP model and once the consultant develops a subarea model for the I-710 Study Area. Kerry Cartwright (POLB) stated that the 2025 forecasts for the Ports' traffic analysis zones that were provided to the I-710 consultant team were draft and will also need to be revisited based upon confirmation on their assumptions for goods movement in 2025 compared to 2020.

The consultant presented the transportation system performance information for the I-710 Study area, including: travel time results; traffic forecasts for both autos and trucks; traffic growth; levels of service (LOS); congestion/travel delay; and transit mode share. Traffic congestion in the I-710 Study Area is already a problem and is projected to get worse by 2025. According to future year estimates, levels of service on I-710 during the peak hours will be poor (LOS F) in both directions along much of the freeway.

3. Goods Movement

Dave Levinsohn (PB) provided an overview of the goods movement issues in the I-710 Study Area that were developed by Mike Fischer (CSI). The role that freight plays in the economic profile of the region; major intermodal travel movements and trip patterns in the I-710 Study Area; mode share; and the importance of transportation system performance in the supply chain were discussed. The costs of congestion and trip unreliability attributable to poor transportation system performance affect three major portions of the region's economy: (1) trucking, (2) manufacturing/national distribution, and (3) wholesale/local distribution. Al Bowser (SCAG) asked if trip reliability was included in the evaluation measures to be used in the I-710 Study during alternatives evaluation. The consultant responded that trip reliability would be considered in the development and evaluation of transportation alternatives. The affect of non-recurrent congestion on trip reliability and potential solutions such as advanced warning systems and intelligent transportation systems (ITS) was also discussed.

C. No Build Alternative

The consultant initiated discussion with the TAC members on the criteria that should be employed to identify what types of future transportation projects should

be included in the 2025 transportation system baseline that comprises the No Build Alternative for the I-710 Study. The rule of thumb is “funded and committed” transportation projects and/or projects that have obtained formal environmental approval. In the I-710 Study Area, SCAG’s future baseline as shown in the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan model networks is generally consistent with this principle, however, there are a few projects that warrant additional consideration because of their potential influence on traffic in the I-710 Corridor. These include: (1) I-710 Gap Closure Project, north of I-10; and (2) I-5 Widening Project, between SR-91 and I-710.

A decision does not have to be made at this TAC meeting, but it is important to open the dialogue on the No Build Alternative prior to the development of the subarea model for the I-710 Study. It was suggested that the “funded and committed” guideline should be employed for the I-710 Study, which indicates that the HOV Interim Project on I-5 would be the best assumption. The consultant will consult with SCAG to obtain additional information on the I-710 Gap Closure Project. The consultant will then make a recommendation for the No Build Alternative to present to the TAC.

D. Next Steps

The next TAC meeting is scheduled to occur on Wednesday, December 12th, 2001. The consultant will present the Purpose and Need Statement for the I-710 Study for TAC review and recommendations. A 5-page draft copy will be provided to the TAC via e-mail approximately one week prior to this meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Wednesday, December 12, 2001
1:30 p.m. Meeting*

*Gateway Cities COG Offices
7300 Alondra Blvd., Suite 201
Paramount, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 201, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Minutes of the Meeting of November 21, 2001

VII. REPORTS

- A. Consultant Presentation of Purpose and Need for the I-710 Major Corridor Study
- B. TAC Discussion/Recommendations of Purpose and Need
- C. No Build Alternative Update (Consultant Team)
- D. Next Steps (Consultant Team)

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 3:30 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE A Meeting Held at Gateway Cities COG Offices 7300 Alondra Blvd., Suite 201 Paramount, CA December 12, 2001

Chair Pagett called the meeting to order at 1:38 p.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair William Pagett, Bell Gardens, Cudahy, Maywood, Paramount; Vice Chair Desi Alvarez, Downey; Robert Quintero, Commerce; Patrick Fu, Huntington Park; Don Dey, Long Beach; Kevin Wilson, Vernon; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach; Sandra Balmir FHWA/FTA; Linda Taira, Caltrans; Joan Wood, MTA; Al Bowser, SCAG.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Carlos Alvarado, Bell; Augustus Ajawara, Compton; Joe Wang, Lynwood; Ed Mino, South Gate.

OTHERS PRESENT: Sumire Gant, Long Beach; Karin Hodin and Michele Smith, MTA; Kristin Wilson, Caltrans; Richard Powers and Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities COG; Dave Levinsohn and Julie Rush, PBQD; Mike Fischer, CSI; Julie Rush, PBQD.

Roll was taken through self-introductions.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Kevin Wilson.

There were no amendments to the agenda.

There were no public comments.

Consent Calendar:

It was moved by Robert Quintero, seconded by Kevin Wilson, to approve the minutes from the November 21, 2001 Meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

Reports:

A. Consultant Presentation of Purpose and Need for I-710 MIS

Dave Levinsohn (PBQD), consultant, provided a brief overview of the Purpose and Need Statement. He said that a draft of the Purpose and Need Statement was distributed to both the TAC and the OPC membership on December 6, 2001. He recommended that the TAC achieve TAC consensus on a recommended Purpose and Need Statement today in order to present it to the OPC for their approval tomorrow, December 13, 2001.

The Purpose and Need Statement is drawn from both the technical analysis produced by the study team and public input that has been received to date. Many of the conclusions included in the Purpose and Need Statement tie back to issues and technical findings that were presented to the TAC membership during the August 2001 and November 2001 TAC meetings, specifically: physical constraints and operational deficiencies; demographics; transit; environmental issues; safety; traffic and travel demand; and goods movement. As part of the Purpose and Need Statement, study goals and objectives have been established for each of the identified problem issue areas.

B. TAC Discussion/Recommendations of Purpose and Need

During the discussion, the following changes were requested and agreed to by the TAC membership for the Purpose and Need Statement:

- Expand the discussion in the Project Need Section that currently focuses on high traffic volumes, trucks, safety, design deficiencies, and goods movement to encompass some of the other issues included in the list of problem statements such as congestion on parallel arterials, air quality / diesel particulates, environmental justice, access to transit, and aesthetics.
- Highlight the anticipated increase in truck growth and high truck percentages on I-710.
- Indicate how the severity of the accident rate on I-710 compares to other freeways in the Greater Los Angeles Area.
- The problem statements should not be prioritized or listed in priority order.
- An additional study objective, "Improve Person and Freight Travel Times" should be added to (A) Recurrent Traffic Congestion.
- An additional study objective, "Improve Predictability of Travel Time" should be added to (B) Non-Recurrent Traffic Congestion.
- The study objective "Reduce Non-Recurring Congestion on I-710" should be expanded to include major arterials affected by non-recurring congestion.
- Under (D) Goods Movement, the study objective entitled "Improve Travel Times to Major Truck Destinations" should be reworded to say "Improve Travel Times to Major Freight Destinations."

- Under (D) Goods Movement, add the following study objective: "Improve the Efficiencies of Goods Movement."
- Under (E) Design Deficiencies, add the need to consider missing interchanges in the description of the problem statement.
- Change the label of problem statement (F) Right of Way Impacts to "Land Use Constraints"
- Combine problem statement (H) Ease of Implementation/Construction with problem statement (G) Cost-Effectiveness.
- Under (I) Air Quality, change the wording of study objective to read "Minimize On-Road Mobile Source Emissions..." rather than "Reduce On-Road Mobile Source Emissions..."
- Under (K) Aesthetics/Noise, add some wording that addresses the need to consider design improvements.
- Under (L) Transit, add a study objective that addresses the need to "Improve Access to Transit."

It was moved by Robert Quintero, seconded by Joan Wood, to approve the Purpose and Need Statement as amended. The motion was approved unanimously. Dave Levinsohn reported that the Purpose and Need Statement will be revised and redistributed to the OPC membership at the December 13, 2001 OPC meeting.

C. No Build Alternative

Julie Rush (PBQD) provided a brief update and redistributed the current description of the No Build Alternative that was revised in response to TAC recommendations from the last TAC meeting.

D. Next Steps

Dave Levinsohn reported that the OPC is scheduled to adopt the Purpose and Need Statement on December 13, 2001. Unless the OPC makes major changes in the Purpose and Need Statement, alternatives development will occur in January and February of 2002. It is anticipated that the next TAC meeting on the Initial Set of Alternatives will occur in either in January or February 2002.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Wednesday, January 30, 2002
1:30 p.m. Meeting*

*Gateway Cities COG Offices
7300 Alondra Blvd., Suite 201
Paramount, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 201, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Minutes of the Meeting of December 12, 2001

VII. REPORTS

- A. Status Report on the I-710 Major Corridor Study
- B. Purpose and Need/Study Goals and Objectives
- C. Framework for Alternatives Development
- D. Initial Set of Alternatives
- E. Questions and Answers/Discussion
- F. Next Steps

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 3:30 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE A Meeting Held at Gateway Cities COG Offices 7300 Alondra Blvd., Suite 201 Paramount, CA January 30, 2002

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair William Pagett, Bell Gardens, Cudahy, Maywood, Paramount; Carlos Alvarado, Bell; Robert Quintero, Commerce; Ed Shikada, Long Beach; Ed Mino, South Gate; Woody Natshara, Vernon; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach; Steve Novotny, Caltrans; Joan Wood, MTA; Al Bowser, SCAG.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Augustus Ajawara, Compton; Desi Alvarez, Downey; Patrick Fu, Huntington Park; Joe Wang, Lynwood; Sandra Balmir, Federal Highway Administration.

OTHERS PRESENT: Don Dey, City of Long Beach; Pai-Kang Wang, Port of Long Beach; Joe Vizcarra, Paul De Paola, and Doug Granger, California Highway Patrol; John Zeigler, Automobile Club of Southern California; Linda Taira, Caltrans; Yvonne Tseng, MTA; Patrick Smith, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works; Richard Powers and Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities Council of Governments; Dave Levinsohn and Julie Rush, PBQD; Bruce Chow, Kaku Associates; Dike Ahanotu, CSI; Don Camph, CGCOG Transportation Advisor.

Roll was taken through self-introductions.

The consent calendar on the agenda was amended to defer approval of the December 12, 2001 minutes. The minutes will be made available and approved at the next TAC meeting.

There were no public comments.

Reports:

A. Project Status

Dave Levinsohn (PBQD), consultant, described the major activities that have occurred since the December 12, 2001 TAC Meeting. The project is on the

schedule that was established last August. The Oversight Policy Committee met on December 13, 2001 and approved the Purpose and Need Statement for the I-710 Study as recommended by the TAC with one small change. On January 9th and 10th, 2002, the project team conducted a two-day workshop to develop a list of preliminary concepts for the initial set of alternatives that will be presented and discussed with the TAC today.

B. Purpose and Need/Study Goals and Objectives

Dave Levinsohn distributed the Final Purpose and Need Statement as adopted by the OPC on December 13, 2001. The OPC approved the version recommended by the TAC with one minor revision – that the discussion of the transit element of the Purpose and Need Statement be expanded to address the discretionary transit rider. The consultant also distributed a two-page summary version of the Purpose and Need Statement that just listed the problem statements and the goals and objectives for the I-710 Study. This list was instrumental to the development of the preliminary transportation alternatives.

C. Framework for Alternatives Development

Dave Levinsohn described the process used to develop the initial set of transportation alternatives. At this stage, the alternatives are still preliminary. This TAC meeting will serve as a working session to add to and/or reshape the preliminary alternatives. The objective is to establish a list of between eight and ten build alternatives, including both a No Build and TSM alternative, for a total of ten to twelve transportation alternatives for the initial set.

It is important to incorporate the full spectrum of transportation options that meet the purpose and need for improvements in the I-710 corridor, but only those that have a reasonable chance of becoming the preferred alternative. The build alternatives are structured according to three levels of capital investment: (1) low, (2) medium, and (3) high. The build alternatives also consist of a design concept and scope that emphasize different trip types or purposes: (a) general purpose trips; (b) truck trips; (c) HOV; and (d) goods movement.

During alternatives development, it is also important to understand and acknowledge the physical and operational transportation improvements that are already taking place in the I-710 Corridor by 2025. This is especially true of planning and development activities that are already occurring with regard to: bus transit, light rail, signal coordination projects on major arterials, intelligent transportation systems, truck impacted intersections, and goods movement programs. By definition, these improvements are included in the No Build Alternative and thus represent the starting point for the development of other transportation alternatives.

D. Initial Set of Alternatives

Dave Levinsohn provided an overview of the ten transportation alternatives that have been developed to date with the assistance of Caltrans, SCAG, MTA, POLB, and the TAC Chair during a two-day workshop conducted in mid-January. During the last two weeks, the consultant team has further refined these concepts for presentation to the TAC. The ten alternatives are:

- Alternative 1 – No Build Alternative
- Alternative 2 – 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

In addition, Caltrans has suggested that an elevated HOV facility concept be added to the initial list (i.e., High HOV Alternative).

E. Questions & Answers/Discussion

During the work session on the initial set of alternatives, the following issues were raised and discussed among the TAC membership:

- Add widening of Florence Blvd., I-710 to Eastern, arterial improvements (Alts. 3, 4).
- Add widening of Firestone Blvd., Garfield to Atlantic, arterial improvements (Alts, 3, 4)
- Change southern limit of Santa Fe Ave. from PCH to Wardlow, arterial improvements (Alt. 3)
- Avoid or mitigate impacts to on-street parking, arterial improvements (Alts 3, 4, 10)
- Enhance discussion of access management to include consolidation and/or elimination of commercial driveways, smaller residential streets, and provision of off-street parking; arterial improvements (Alt. 3)
- Question on high truck volumes and operational capacity of truck scale/inspection facility (Alt. 4)
- Move location of truck scale/inspection facility north of I-405 and retain Willow Street interchange (Alt. 4)
- Define operating and occupancy assumptions for proposed HOV lanes (Alt. 5)
- Question on geometric and operational feasibility of direct truck ramps (Alt. 7)

- Question on the maximum allowable number of mixed flow lanes that should be considered for I-710 (Alt. 8)
- Expand the profile assumption for elevated truckway facility to allow for consideration of other profile options such as depressed truckway facility or barrier-separated, at-grade truck lanes in addition to the elevated option (Alt. 9)
- Clarify assumptions and description of land use strategies, goods movement improvements (Alt. 10). Need to be sensitive to potential labor issues and institutional barriers.
- Add a new alternative that includes an elevated HOV facility.
- Consider adding more direct HOV connectors to the HOV alternatives.
- Add a new alternative that includes both HOV and additional mixed flow lanes.
- Question on how the alternatives will be screened once they are identified.

F. Next Steps

Descriptions of the initial set of alternatives will be developed based on today's discussion and distributed to the TAC prior to the next TAC meeting, which is scheduled for February 20, 2002. We will seek a consensus recommendation from the TAC on the initial set of alternatives at the February TAC meeting. Shortly thereafter, an OPC meeting will be scheduled in late February or early March in order to adopt the initial set of alternatives.

Between March and May, the project team will conduct alternatives screening to develop the technical evaluative information needed to identify the most promising transportation alternatives or best combination of transportation elements to carry forward for further study. The next major milestone, selection of a final set of alternatives, is scheduled to occur in June 2002.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Wednesday, February 20, 2002
1:30 p.m. Meeting*

*Gateway Cities COG Offices
7300 Alondra Blvd., Suite 201
Paramount, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 201, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Minutes of the Meetings of December 12, 2001 and January 30, 2002

VII. REPORTS

- A. Presentation of Revised Initial Set of Alternatives
- B. Discussion and Adoption of Initial Set
- C. Overview of Alternatives Screening Process

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 3:30 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE A Meeting Held at Gateway Cities COG Offices 7300 Alondra Blvd., Suite 201 Paramount, CA February 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; Robert Quintero, Commerce; Augustus Ajawara, Compton; Patrick Fu, Huntington Park; Don Dey, Long Beach; Ed Mino, South Gate; Sherwood Natsuhara, Vernon; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach; Steve Novotny, Caltrans; Joan Wood, MTA; Al Bowser, SCAG; Calvin Aubrey, CHP.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Carlos Alvarado, Bell; Joe Wang, Lynwood; Sandra Balmir, FHWA/FTA.

OTHERS PRESENT: Frances Lee and Kristin Wilson, Caltrans; Karin Hodin, MTA; Paul De Paola and Doug Granger, CHP; John Zeigler, Automobile Club of Southern California; Pat Smith, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works; Barbara Beck, SCAQMD; Jack Joseph and Deborah Chankin, Gateway Cities COG; Dave Levinsohn, Julie Rush, and Steven Yoshizumi, Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade and Douglas; Paul Taylor and Bruce Chow, Kaku Associates; Michael Fischer, Cambridge Systematics.

Roll was taken through self-introductions.

There were no amendments to the agenda.

Augustus Ajawara led the Pledge of Allegiance.

There were no amendments to the agenda.

There were no public comments.

**I-710 Technical Advisory Committee
Minutes of the Meeting of February 20, 2002
Page 2 of 4**

Consent Calendar:

It was moved by Robert Quintero, seconded by Joan Wood, to receive and file the minutes of the meetings of December 12, 2001, and January 30, 2002. The motion was approved unanimously.

Reports:

A. Presentation of the Revised Initial Set of Alternatives

Dave Levinsohn (PBQD), consultant, presented the Initial Set of Alternatives that had been revised as a result of January 30, 2002, TAC Workshop. Handouts of the Initial Set of Alternatives were mailed to the TAC members a week before the meeting. There are now twelve alternatives. These are:

- Alternative 1 – No Build Alternative
- Alternative 2 – 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 General Purpose/High HOV Alternative

After discussions among the TAC members, it was the consensus for the TAC to make the following adjustments to the preliminary set of transportation alternatives:

- Add widening of Florence Blvd., I-710 to Eastern, to the arterial improvements (Alts. 3, 4).
- Eliminate Santa Fe Ave. from the arterial improvements (Alt. 3)
- Add language regarding the need to avoid or mitigate impacts to on-street parking to the arterial improvements (Alts 3, 4, 10)
- Enhance discussion of access management to include consolidation and/or elimination of commercial driveways, smaller residential streets, and provision of off-street parking; arterial improvements (Alt. 3)
- Move location of truck scale/inspection facility north of I-405 and retain the Willow Street interchange (Alt. 4)
- Defined operating and occupancy assumptions for proposed HOV lanes (Alt. 5, 11,12)

**I-710 Technical Advisory Committee
Minutes of the Meeting of February 20, 2002**

Page 3 of 4

- Expand the description of the profile assumption for elevated truckway facility to allow for consideration of other profile options such as barrier-separated, at-grade truck lanes in addition to the elevated option (Alt. 9)
- Clarify assumptions and description of land use strategies, goods movement improvements (Alt. 2, 10).
- Add a new alternative that includes an elevated HOV facility (Alt. 11).
- Add more direct HOV connectors to the High HOV Alternative (Alt. 11).
- Add a new alternative that includes both HOV and additional mixed flow lanes.

B. Discussion and Adoption of the Initial Set of Alternatives

Dave Levinsohn initiated discussion of the Initial Set of Alternatives. He said that the TAC must reach a consensus recommendation on the Initial Set today so that the alternatives can be revised and mailed out to the Oversight Policy Committee prior to their meeting, which is scheduled for February 28, 2002.

After several questions on the initial set of alternatives and how they would be screened, along with discussion on some of the elements of the various alternatives, the TAC agreed to an initial set of twelve alternatives, with the following modifications:

- goods movement strategy on extended gate hours would be amended to include all entities in the supply chain (Alt. 2)
- extend the HOV lane/facility further south from PCH to the split at 7th Street (Alts, 5, 11, 12)
- modify the exclusive truck facility to show a 6-lane cross section between 7th Street and SR-91 rather than an a 4-lane cross section. Between SR-91 and SR-60, the cross-section remains 4 lanes. (Alt. 9)
- modify the exclusive HOV facility to show a four-lane cross section rather than a two-lane cross section (Alt. 11)

During the discussion, the consultant team explained that just because certain elements are included in more than one alternative that does not necessarily mean that those specific improvements have a greater chance of passing the screening process.

Desi Alvarez and Steve Novotny left the meeting at 3:10 p.m.

It was moved by Don Dey, seconded by Joan Wood, to include the extension of the Terminal Island Freeway to the State Route 91 Freeway in one of the alternatives. The motion failed by the following roll call vote:

I-710 Technical Advisory Committee
Minutes of the Meeting of February 20, 2002
Page 4 of 4

AYES: Bowser, Cartwright, Dey, Pagett (for Paramount), and Wood.

NOES: Ajawara, Aubrey, Fu, Mino, Natsuhara, Pagett (for Bell Gardens, Cudahy, and Maywood), and Quintero.

ABSENT: Alvarado, Alvarez, Balmir, Novotny, and Wang.

Sherwood Natsuhara left the meeting at 3:35 p.m.

It was moved by Al Bowser, seconded by Joan Wood, to approve the initial set of twelve alternatives as amended. The motion was approved unanimously.

Given that the timeframe between the TAC meeting and the upcoming OPC meeting was very short (approximately one week), TAC members were requested to meet with their OPC representatives to brief them individually on the initial set of alternatives before February 28, 2002.

C. Overview of the Screening Process

Julie Rush, PBQD, distributed a handout that outlined the technical screening process that would be utilized over the next two or three months to narrow the twelve alternatives down to five. There was insufficient time left at the TAC meeting to fully discuss the proposed screening methodology, but some of the key issues and activities were highlighted for the TAC members to consider once they had more time to review the handout, after the TAC meeting. It was the consensus of the TAC that the screening process will be discussed in more detail at the next TAC meeting, scheduled for March 20, 2002.

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 4:02 p.m.

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Wednesday, March 20, 2002
1:30 p.m. Meeting*

*Gateway Cities COG Offices
7300 Alondra Blvd., Suite 201
Paramount, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 201, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The

I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

I-710 TAC Agenda

March 20, 2002

Page 2 of 2

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Minutes of the Meeting of February 20, 2002

VII. REPORTS

A. Report on OPC Adopted Initial Set of Alternatives

B. Overview of Alternatives Screening Process

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 3:30 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

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.

**SPECIAL JOINT MEETING
I-710 OVERSIGHT POLICY COMMITTEE
I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

*Wednesday, April 10, 2002
5:00 p. m. Meeting*

*Progress Park Plaza
15500 Downey Avenue
Paramount, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 103, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Oversight Policy Committee/Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Oversight Policy Committee/Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Oversight Policy Committee/Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Oversight Policy Committee/Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEMS: at the time the I-710 Oversight Policy Committee/Technical Advisory Committee consider the agenda item OR during Public Comments; and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments; comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Oversight Policy Committee/Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- III. ROLL CALL**

**I-710 Oversight Policy Committee
I-710 Technical Advisory Committee
April 10, 2002 Special Joint Meeting**

IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

VI. REPORTS

A. I-710 Outreach Plan

B. Discussion Regarding the Initial Set of Twelve Alternatives

C. Overview of Alternatives Screening Process

VII. MATTERS FROM THE I-710 OVERSIGHT POLICY COMMITTEE/TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

VIII. MATTERS FROM STAFF

X. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 7:30 p.m. unless the I-710 Oversight Policy Committee or Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

**MINUTES OF THE
SPECIAL JOINT MEETING
I-710 OVERSIGHT POLICY COMMITTEE
I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

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

April 10, 2002

OPC COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Hector De La Torre, South Gate; Co-Chair Frank Colonna, Long Beach; Co-Chair Samuel Pena, Maywood; Keith McCarthy, Downey; Gene Daniels, Paramount; John Calhoun, Port of Long Beach; Steve Novotny, Caltrans; Joan Wood, MTA.

OPC COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: George Cole, Bell; Daniel Crespo, Bell Gardens; Hugo Argumedo, Commerce; Eric Perrodin, Compton; Frank Gurule, Cudahy; Jessica Maes, Huntington Park; Arturo Reyes, Lynwood; William Davis, Vernon; Zahi Faranesh, SCAG.

TAC COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Bill Pagett, Bell Gardens, Cudahy, Maywood, and Paramount; Don Dey, Long Beach; Kevin Wilson, Vernon; Kerry Cartwright, POLB; Al Bowser, SCAG; Steve Novotny, Caltrans; Joan Wood, MTA; Lt. Paul De Paola, CHP

TAC COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Vice Chair Desi Alvarez, Downey; Carlos Alvarado, Bell; Robert Quintero, Commerce; Augustus Ajawara, Compton; Patrick Fu, Huntington Park; Joe Wang, Lynwood; Ed Mino, South Gate; Sandra Balmir, FHWA/FTA.

ALSO PRESENT: Karin Hodin, MTA; Gerald Miller, Long Beach Assistant City Manager; Richard Powers, GCCOG Executive Director; Jack Joseph, GCCOG Deputy Executive Director; David Levinsohn, Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas; Julie Rush, PBQD; Steven Yoshizumi, PBQD; Paul Taylor, Kaku Associates; Alisa Kwun, Consensus Planning Group; Sylvia Novoa, CPG.

I. Call to Order

Chair Hector de la Torre called the joint meeting of the I-710 Oversight Policy Committee and I-710 Technical Advisory Committee to order at 5:20 p.m.

II. Pledge of Allegiance

OPC Chair Hector de la Torre led the pledge of allegiance.

III. Roll Call

Roll was taken through self-introductions. There not being present a quorum of the I-710 Oversight Policy Committee, the members in attendance convened as a committee of the whole. A quorum of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee was present.

IV. Amendments to the Agenda

There were no amendments to the agenda.

V. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

VI. Reports

A. I-710 Outreach Plan

Sylvia Novoa of Consensus Planning Group provided the OPC/TAC an overview of the I-710 Major Corridor Study outreach plan for the alternatives screening phase of the study. Ms. Novoa reminded the committees of the previous phase of outreach, where public and stakeholder input was solicited on the problems and issues in the corridor and suggested improvements to address those problems. This input helped lead to the Purpose and Need Statement and the Initial Set of Alternatives.

Ms. Novoa indicated that the current phase of outreach is designed to solicit input on the Initial Set of Alternatives, what the public likes and dislikes about them and why. The outreach is designed to reach multiple audiences among the general public and stakeholders. The outreach methods will include the following:

- Press Release / Media Briefing
- Stakeholder Meetings / Briefings
- Community Presentations
- Roundtables
- Website / Telephone Hot Line

B. Discussion Regarding Initial Set of Twelve Alternatives

David Levinsohn, PBQD reviewed the background on the development of the initial set of 12 alternatives as presented at the February 28, 2002 OPC meeting. He also presented a description of the 12 alternatives, as discussed at the February 28, 2002 OPC meeting. The only change from the presentation at the February 28th OPC meeting was the further definition of the OPC-adopted Alternative 12, High Rail, which proposes a high speed rail line between downtown Long Beach and downtown Los Angeles. Co-Chair Colonna thanked the project team for bring forward the recommended addition of the high-speed rail alternative. The proposed rail line follows an alignment along I-710 from Long Beach to a Union Pacific Railroad alignment between Imperial Highway and Firestone Blvd., where it follows the UPRR alignment into Union Station in Los Angeles.

Mr. Levinsohn also presented photos which illustrated examples to the committees of the various features of the proposed alternatives, including collector-distributor lanes, truck bypass lanes, dual use lanes, elevated carpool lanes, carpool connector lanes and high speed rail.

C. Overview of Alternatives Screening Process

Julie Rush, PBQD, presented an overview of the alternatives screening process. The purpose of the screening process is to produce evaluative information needed to narrow the range of alternatives. Technical information being developed will address benefits, costs and impacts of the alternatives. The focus will be on evaluation criteria that clearly distinguish among alternatives or specific features of the alternatives. The focus of the screening process will be on the key issues and major differences among the alternatives. Results will be produced at a "sketch planning" level of detail, including both quantitative and qualitative results. These results will be order of magnitude, but will be refined in the next phase of analysis. The screening methods will treat the alternatives equally, and assess the performance of the alternatives with respect to the adopted Purpose and Need.

Travel benefits to be produced during screening will include traffic and transit ridership, shifts in travel demand by mode, facility and time of day, travel time, levels of service and changes in safety. Environmental impacts during screening will be based upon sketch plans of the alternatives using accepted design standards and experience from other, similar projects. This will allow the development of an approximate "footprint" of the right of way requirements for each alternative, by major land use type for each alternative. Environmental justice issues and noise and visual impacts will be qualitatively assessed.

Cost estimates during screening will be order of magnitude costs based upon the sketch level design of the alternatives and unit costs from other projects. They will include right of way cost estimates and contingencies based upon the very conceptual level of engineering design. Ms. Rush pointed out that the cost estimates would change as alternatives evolve and more details become known in subsequent study phases. Other issues to be assessed during screening will include feasibility/constructability issues, regional transportation system connectivity, and risks associated with unproven applications and design features.

In summary, technical screening represents a preliminary round of analysis that will be able to identify the key trade-offs among alternatives. Along with public input, it will provide information that will allow the TAC and OPC to identify the final set of five alternatives, from the initial set of 12 alternatives.

VII. Matters from the I-710 Oversight Policy Committee/Technical Advisory Committee

Steve Novotny of Caltrans announced that he has been promoted to the North County Office Chief position and will be leaving the OPC and TAC. Caltrans has not named his successor yet, which will probably require one or two months.

VIII. Matters from Staff

There were none.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 7:15 p.m.

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Wednesday, May 15, 2002
1:30 p.m. Meeting*

*Gateway Cities COG Offices
7300 Alondra Blvd., Suite 201
Paramount, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 201, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

I-710 TAC Agenda

May 15, 2002

Page 2 of 2

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Minutes of the Meetings of February 20, 2002, and March 20, 2002.

VII. REPORTS

A. Study Status

B. Part One of Alternatives Screening Results

C. Upcoming TAC and OPC Meetings

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 3:30 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE A Meeting Held at Gateway Cities COG Offices 7300 Alondra Blvd., Suite 201 Paramount, CA May 15, 2002

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair William Pagett, Bell Gardens, Cudahy, Maywood, Paramount; Don Dey, Long Beach; Ricardo Pacheco, South Gate; Sherwood Natsuhara, Vernon; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach; Steve Novotny, Caltrans; Karin Hodin, MTA; Paul de Paola, CHP.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Carlos Alvarado, Bell; Bob Zarrilli, Commerce; Augustus Ajawara, Compton; Desi Alvarez, Downey; Patrick Fu, Huntington Park; Joe Wang, Lynwood; Al Bowser, SCAG; Sandra Balmir, FHWA/FTA.

OTHERS PRESENT: Mohammad Mostahkami, South Gate; Louis Rubenstein, Port of Long Beach; Kanya Dorland, Port of Los Angeles; Steve Finnegan, Auto Club of Southern California; Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities COG; Deborah Chankin, Gateway Cities COG; Sharas Bangalore, Caltrans; Hamid Toossi, Caltrans; Linda Taira, Caltrans; Cathy Manzo, MTA; Dave Levinsohn, PBQD; Paul Taylor, Kaku Associates; Mike Fischer, CSI; Steven Yoshizumi, PBQD; Julie Rush, PBQD.

Roll was taken through self-introductions.

Chairman Pagett led the Pledge of Allegiance.

There were no amendments to the agenda.

There were no public comments.

Consent Calendar:

Consultant staff announced that the minutes for the meeting of March 20, 2002, were not ready to be approved. It was moved by Don Dey, seconded by William Pagett, to approve the minutes of the meeting of February 20, 2002, and to defer

action on the minutes of March 20, 2002, until next meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

Reports:

A. Study Status

Dave Levinsohn [PBQD] provided a status report on the I-710 Study. Starting at today's meeting (May 15, 2002), the TAC will be meeting weekly to review the technical information that has been produced on alternatives screening. The objective of screening is to narrow the initial list of twelve alternatives down to five alternatives (i.e., No Build, TSM, and three build alternatives). At this TAC meeting the project team will present the design concepts for the initial build alternatives as well as technical screening information on estimated right-of-way impacts, travel demand shifts (percentage change by mode), and relative change in volume/capacity ratios for I-710 under each of the twelve alternatives. At the next TAC meeting (May 22, 2002), the project team will present screening information on: traffic volumes, travel benefits, capital costs, and environmental issues. The study is still on track for a TAC recommendation for a final set of alternatives at the end of February for consideration by the I-710 Oversight Policy Committee in mid-March.

B. Technical Screening Results (Part I)

Dave Levinsohn provided a summary overview of the 12 Initial Alternatives, maps of which were posted on the walls of the meeting room. Julie Rush (PBQD) provided a summary review of the technical screening activities, focusing the TAC on the order of magnitude differences of the measures among the alternatives.

1. Right of Way Impacts

Julie Rush distributed a bar chart and table which summarized estimated land use impacts for each of the build alternatives (3-12). The land use impacts are divided into seven categories: commercial/industrial land, residential, power/utility corridor, railroad, undeveloped, water/LA River, and 4(f)/community resource. These impacts were assessed by categorizing potential right-of-way requirements overlaid on aerial photography of the I-710 corridor, and are very approximate. Potential right-of-way impacts were also tabulated by alternative by city so as to allow for a comparison among the 10 build alternatives. The tabulations show that alternatives 7 and 9 generate the most right of way impacts, with over 300 acres each, while alternative 3 generates the least impacts, with less than 15 acres.

2. Travel Demand Forecasts

Dave Levinsohn distributed a table entitled "Summary of Travel Demand Changes" and presented a chart of the volume/capacity ratios on the mixed flow lanes of I-710 for each alternative. The table presents the changes in average daily traffic and a.m. peak period traffic in 2025 created by each of the alternatives. Changes in ADT on the mainline lanes are insignificant except for the following alternatives: alternative 5 (medium HOV), where 50% of carpool vehicles are forecast to shift to the carpool lanes; alternative 9 (high truck), where 44-88% of trucks are forecast to shift to the truck lanes in the no toll scenario; alternative 10 (high goods movement), where 34-63% of the drive alone and carpool vehicles are forecast to shift to the special use lanes and some trucks would shift to the Terminal Island Freeway and new near dock rail yard; alternative 11 (high HOV), where 60% of carpool vehicles are forecast to shift to the HOV lanes; and alternative 12 (high rail), where 25% of the rail passengers are forecast to shift from auto use. Similar effects are forecast for each of the alternatives in the a.m. peak period. However, in the a.m. peak period, it is also forecast that due to the assumed truck demand management strategies, a 10-30% decrease in heavy duty truck volumes on I-710 would be forecast, which is equivalent to a 4-12% decrease in total vehicle volumes on I-710.

Dave Levinsohn then discussed the volume/capacity ration chart, which displays the V/C ratio on each segment of I-710 from the north end of the corridor to the south end. It shows that alternatives 8, 9, and 10 reduce the V/C ratio, a measure of traffic congestion, the greatest amount along the I-710.

C. Upcoming TAC and OPC Meetings

The next TAC meeting will be next week, May 22, 2002. At this meeting, part two of the technical results, related to travel benefits, cost estimates and environmental issues will be presented. The subsequent TAC meeting will then be May 29, 2002, where the TAC will begin to deliberate their recommendation for the Final Set of alternatives.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 4:00 p.m.

SPECIAL I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Wednesday, May 22, 2002
1:30 p.m. Meeting*

*Gateway Cities COG Offices
7300 Alondra Blvd., Suite 201
Paramount, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 201, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

I-710 TAC Agenda

May 22, 2002

Page 2 of 2

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Minutes of the Meetings of March 20, 2002, and May 15, 2002

VII. REPORTS

A. Study Status

B. Technical Screening Results

1. Travel Benefits

2. Cost Estimates

3. Environmental Issues

C. Upcoming TAC and OPC Meetings

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 3:30 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE A Meeting Held at Gateway Cities COG Offices 7300 Alondra Blvd., Suite 201 Paramount, CA May 22, 2002

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair William Pagett, Bell Gardens, Cudahy, Maywood, Paramount; Carlos Alvarado, Bell; Robert Zarrilli, Commerce (by telephone); Patrick Fu, Huntington Park; Don Dey, Long Beach; Mohammad Mostahkami, South Gate; Kevin Wilson, Vernon; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach; Sharas Bangalore, Caltrans; Joan Wood, MTA; Joe Vizcarra, CHP.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Augustus Ajawara, Compton; Desi Alvarez, Downey; Joe Wang, Lynwood; Al Bowser, SCAG; Sandra Balmir, FHWA/FTA.

OTHERS PRESENT: Louis Rubenstein, Port of Long Beach; Karin Hodin, MTA; Paul de Paola, CHP; Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities COG; Sue Lai, Port of Los Angeles; Kanya Dorland, Port of Los Angeles; John Ziegler, Auto Club of Southern California; Deborah Chankin, Gateway Cities COG; Hamid Toossi, Caltrans; Frances Lee, Caltrans; Cathy Manzo, MTA; Dave Levinsohn, PBQD Steven Yoshizumi, PBQD; Julie Rush, PBQD Paul Taylor, Kaku Associates; Jacki Bacharach, Bacharach & Associates.

Roll was taken through self-introductions.

Chairman Pagett led the Pledge of Allegiance.

There were no amendments to the agenda.

There were no public comments.

Consent Calendar:

It was the consensus of the TAC to defer approval of the TAC minutes for March 20, 2002, and May 15, 2002, until the next meeting.

Reports:

A. Study Status

Dave Levinsohn [PBQD] provided a status report on the I-710 Study. Starting on May 15, 2002, the TAC has been meeting weekly to review the technical information that has been produced on alternatives screening. The objective of screening is to narrow the initial list of twelve alternatives down to five alternatives (i.e., No Build, TSM, and three build alternatives). At the last TAC meeting (May 15, 2002), the project team presented the design concepts for the initial build alternatives as well as technical screening information on estimated right-of-way impacts, travel demand shifts (percentage change by mode), and relative change in volume/capacity ratios for I-710 under each of the twelve alternatives. At this TAC meeting, the project team will present screening information on: traffic volumes, travel benefits, capital costs, and environmental issues. The study is still on track for a TAC recommendation for a final set of alternatives at the end of February for consideration by the I-710 Oversight Policy Committee in mid-March.

B. Technical Screening Results (Part II)

1. Travel Benefits

Dave Levinsohn distributed a table that shows a side by side comparison of traffic volumes for nineteen links of I-710 mainlines during the a.m. peak for the Year 2025. For each alternative, the table shows drive-alone vehicles, carpool vehicles (2+), heavy-duty trucks, and total vehicles (autos and trucks) on I-710. Alternative 2 shows a small decrease in heavy duty truck volumes during the peak hours, which is largely attributable to more of a shift to 24-7 operations due to the incentives/disincentives policy assumptions associated with extended gate hours of operation. [Note: by definition Alternative 2 carries through all of the build alternatives.] Alternative 5 shows that slightly more than half of the 2+ vehicles would use the proposed carpool lane, whereas Alternative 11 shows about two thirds of the 2+ vehicles on I-710 would use the proposed HOV facility. Alternative 9 shows that most of the heavy duty trucks would use the proposed truck facility, but that this number drops significantly if tolls are proposed. Alternative 10 would induce the greatest amount of vehicle shift out of I-710 existing mixed flow lanes (and into the special purpose lanes) compared to all the other alternatives. Alternative 12 would only see a slight decrease in mixed flow vehicle traffic on I-710 compared to the No Build Alternative.

It was requested that additional description be provided on the goods movement strategies associated with Alternative 2, especially extended gate hours, so that TAC members and policy members understand why there is a noticeable shift in volumes (truck) by time of day.

In order to characterize the benefits associated with the arterial improvements proposed in Alternatives 2, 3, 4, 7 and 10, Paul Taylor [Kaku] distributed a table that showed volume/capacity ratios at four east-west screenlines that capture north-south movement in the a.m. peak period for the Year 2025 at various locations in the corridor: (1) north of PCH; (2) south of SR-91; (3) north of I-105; and (4) north of I-5. One north-south screenline, near I-710, captured east-west arterial traffic movement in the I-710 study area. As can be expected, the full grid of arterials proposed under Alternative 3 performed the best for the vehicles using the arterial system under this measure. Alternative 10 was next best, particularly when the mainline facility of I-710 was included in the calculation. Alternative 4 and 7 were about the same with regard to east-west movement within the I-710 study area.

Julie Rush [PBQD] distributed a series of bar graphs that showed the performance of the initial set of alternatives for the future year (Year 2025) during the a.m. peak period. For purposes of comparison, the mixed flow lanes in the southbound direction of I-710 were examined. The bar graphs covered the following performance measures:

Travel time (minutes): The model predicts that by the Year 2025, it will take a motorist about 34 minutes to travel from SR-60 to Anaheim Street on I-710 in the southbound direction in the a.m. peak period. Under free flow speeds (65 mph), the same trip is predicted to take only 15 minutes. Alternative 2 improves travel times to about 27 minutes (mostly due to shifting some trucks out of the a.m. peak period). Alternatives 8, 9, and 10 perform the best against this measure with predicted travel times of 16.8 minutes, 17.7 minutes, and 16.7 minutes respectively.

Hours of Recurrent Delay: This measure is intended to show the effects of the reduction in traffic congestion attributable to each alternative during the morning rush hours as measured in improved hours of delay (annualized). Recurrent delay refers to the amount of delay experienced by motorists that occurs on I-710 every day, typically during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Alternatives 8, 9, and 10 perform the best with respect to this measure. Alternatives 5, 6, and 11 are next best.

Hours of Non-Recurrent Delay: This performance indicator measures the change in non-recurrent delay (24-hour day, annualized) or delay that occurs due to unpredictable events such as traffic accidents, vehicle breakdowns, or bad weather. For goods movement, as well as, for commuters and employers, predictability and trip reliability is just as important as avoiding morning and afternoon rush hour traffic. Alternative 8 performs the best as it reduces the hours of non-recurrent delay the most. And, Alternatives 6, 9, and 10 perform next best. All lanes (not just mixed flow lanes) are included in this calculation. This measure correlates with reductions in predicted number of accidents/accident rates.

Accidents: This measure predicts and compares the number of accidents (annualized) that would occur on I-710's southbound lanes under each alternative. All of the alternatives, including Alternative 2, would result in an improvement over the No Build condition. Alternative 8 performs the best and is the only alternative that is predicted to result in an accident rate (number of accidents per million vehicle miles) of less than 1.50.

Because these numbers are potentially confusing, the TAC members requested that the travel benefit measures (delay, accidents, travel times) for Alternatives 2 – 12 all be shown "as compared to the No Build Alternative" (e.g., the higher the bar, the better). The project team agreed to re-format the bar charts for the TAC and for future presentations.

2. Cost Estimates

Steven Yoshizumi [PBQD] distributed capital cost estimates for the build alternatives, Alternatives 3 – 12. These costs are preliminary and will likely change as the study progresses and as the design concepts continue to evolve. Right-of-way costs have been included and are based on the right-of-way estimates (by acre) that were produced and presented to the TAC on March 15, 2002. Estimated capital costs range from \$689 million (Alternative 3) to as much as \$3.5 billion (Alternative 12). In keeping with planning-level cost estimates, costs are rounded to the nearest hundred thousand. Sheets that provide a breakdown of each alternative by major transportation element are also provided. These elements include items such as: mainline facility and local interchange improvements, freeway-to-freeway interchange improvements, collector-distributor lanes, truck inspection facility, truck ramps, truck bypass lanes, arterial improvements, and right-of-way.

The cost estimates include "add on" costs such as design, construction management, and administration as well as liberal contingency (approximately 50%), consistent with a "sketch-level" cost estimate. Relocation of existing electrical transmission towers (e.g., Southern California Edison, Dept. of Water and Power) was also included in the preliminary cost estimates.

3. Environmental Issues

A qualitative assessment was performed on the initial set of alternatives for four key environmental issues: visual, noise, environmental justice, and community cohesion. The alternatives were compared against each other based upon their described physical and operational characteristics. The rankings are subjective and are intended to illustrate relative differences among the alternations. A score of 0 means no impact and a score of 10 means worst case, when comparing the alternatives side by side.

Visual: Alternative 9 would perform the worst (score = 10) against this measure, due to the large amount of aerial freeway structures associated with an elevated truckway facility. Alternative 11 would be next worse (score = 9) because of the elevated HOV facility and direct freeway-to-freeway HOV connectors. Alternatives 10 and 7 are next (score = 8) because of the proposed width of Alternative 10 and because of the exclusive truck ramps (flyovers) and truck bypass facilities proposed under Alternative 7.

Noise: The noise assessment was based on the following factors: geographic proximity of sensitive receptors; new structures; relative roadway widths; ambient conditions; and proposed modes/vehicle mix. In terms of noise from vehicles, cars are the quietest, medium trucks/buses/light rail are about the same, heavy trucks are noisier, and heavy rail, such as high speed rail, tends to be the noisiest. Using this assessment, Alternative 9 performs the worst (score = 10), then Alternative 11 (score = 9), and then Alternative 10 (score = 8).

Environmental Justice: The measure used for environmental justice was an assessment of the potential for disproportionate right-of-way impact. This examined where the physical aspects of an alternative would have increased impacts upon the minority and low-income residents living near I-710. Other factors where right-of-way impacts would affect these populations are the loss of commercial/industrial properties that may represent employment/or shopping areas, and the loss of community resources such as parks or schools. Alternative 7 performs the worst (score = 10) due to its high level (e.g., acres) of right-of-way impacts attributable to the exclusive truck ramps and bypass lanes. Alternative 10 is next worse (score = 9) due to the magnitude of widening that would be involved to the mainlines and number of interchanges affected. Alternative 8 (score = 8) is next for similar reasons.

Community Cohesion: This provides an assessment of the impacts related to acquisition of property and the creation of a permanent dividing element through a "cohesive community." Of great concern is a viaduct proposed along Atlantic Avenue between I-710 and I-5 that is included as a freeway-to-freeway design element for the reconstruction of the I-5/I-710 interchange in Alternatives 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11. Consequently, all of these alternatives fare poorly (score of 8 or higher) with regard to this measure.

C. Upcoming TAC and OPC Meetings

The next TAC meeting will be next week, May 29, 2002. At this meeting, the technical results presented to the TAC earlier on May 15th and 22nd will be summarized and discussed and the results of the public outreach obtained to date will be presented. This meeting is pivotal as the TAC will be asked to form their recommendation for a final set of alternatives for consideration by the OPC. The goal will be to identify a design concept and scope for three build

Minutes I-710 Technical Advisory Committee

May 22, 2002

Page 6 of 6

alternatives that could potentially be made up from a "mix and match" of the best elements of the initial set of alternatives.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 4:00 p.m.

SPECIAL I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Wednesday, May 29, 2002
8:30 a.m. Meeting*

*Gateway Cities COG Offices
7300 Alondra Blvd., Suite 201
Paramount, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 201, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Minutes of the Meetings of March 20, 2002, May 15, 2002, and May 22, 2002

VII. REPORTS

- A. I-710 Study Status Report
- B. Summary of Public Input/Community Outreach Activities
- C. Overview of Technical Results
- D. Framework for Screening
- E. TAC Recommendation for the Final Set of Alternatives
- F. Next Steps

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 10:30 a.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE A Meeting Held at Gateway Cities COG Offices 7300 Alondra Blvd., Suite 201 Paramount, CA May 29, 2002

Chair Pagett called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair William Pagett, Bell Gardens, Cudahy, Maywood, Paramount; Carlos Alvarado, Bell; Augustus Ajawara, Compton; Wes Lind, Huntington Park; Don Dey, Long Beach; Mohammad Mostahkami, South Gate; Kevin Wilson, Vernon; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach; Al Bowser, SCAG; Steve Novotny, Caltrans; Joan Wood, MTA; Joe Vizcarra, CHP.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Cities of Commerce, Downey, and Lynwood; FHWA.

OTHERS PRESENT: Sharas Bangalore, Caltrans; Karin Hodin, MTA; Richard Powers, Gateway Cities Council of Governments; Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities Council of Governments; Dave Levinsohn, PBQD; Sue Lai, Port of LA; Kanya Dorland, Port of LA; Sylvia Novoa, CPG; Alisa Kwun, CPG; Michelle Smith, MTA; John Zeigler, Auto Club of So. Cal.; Julie Rush, PBQD; Jacki Bacharach, Bacharach & Associates; Paul Taylor, Kaku Associates; Hamid Toossi, Caltrans; Cathy Manzo, MTA; Karen Hedlund, Nossaman, Guthner, Knox & Elliott; Kristin Wilson, Caltrans; JD Douglas, PBQD; Steven Yoshizumi, PBQD; Barbara Beck, AQMD; Michael Turner, MTA; Louis Rubenstein, Port of LB.

Roll was taken through self-introductions.

There were no amendments to the agenda.

There were no public comments.

Consent Calendar:

Approval of the TAC minutes for March 20, 2002, May 15, 2002, and May 22, 2002 will be deferred until the next TAC meeting.

Reports:

A. I-710 Study Status Report

Dave Levinsohn (PBQD) described the overall purpose of this TAC meeting, which is to develop a technical recommendation for which of the initial set of alternatives should be included in the final set of five alternatives for further study. The TAC recommendation will then be forwarded to the OPC membership for their consideration and approval. In order to meet the overall project schedule, the goal is to complete the screening milestone by next month: June 2002. Upon selection of the final set of alternatives, the consultant team will spend the next several months defining and evaluating these alternatives in greater detail.

We would like to get through the new material as quickly as possible, so that the bulk of the meeting can be devoted to discussing the relative merits of the initial alternatives and formulating a TAC recommendation.

TAC members should have already received materials that summarize the screening technical results as these were e-mailed or faxed to the members late on Friday, May 26th. Information on community input received to date as well as responses to additional data requests were sent out to the TAC members on Tuesday (May 28th). Extra copies of these handouts for this May 29th TAC meeting, plus all of the detailed information on technical screening that has been distributed to the TAC members on May 15th and May 22nd, are located on the conference table. Extra copies of the screening methodology, the initial set of alternatives, and the purpose and need statement are also provided. An index for all of these handout materials is also included for reference purposes.

B. Summary of Public Input/Community Outreach Activities

Sylvia Novoa (CPG) provided an overview of the public comments that have been received to date on the initial set of alternatives. No clear favorite has arisen from the pack, however, the public/stakeholders consistently favor those measures and improvements that seek to separate cars and trucks on I-710. In addition, certain design elements are preferred by a majority of the participants. These include: Slauson, the freeway-to-freeway interchange improvements; truck inspection facility; improvements that shift truck traffic away from I-710 and towards the Terminal Island Freeway; and measures for shifting truck traffic to off-peak hours.

On the other hand, some elements received a less than favorable public response. These features were: tolling options; trucks on elevated lanes; HOV lanes and rail. There was also concern expressed about those improvements that would result in a high amount of ROW takes.

Community meetings, briefings, and presentations are also scheduled to occur during the month of June, particularly the first two weeks. In order to be included in the summary document presented to the OPC prior to their approval of the final set of alternatives, members of the public have been urged to get their written comments in by the first week of June. The project team will continue to hold meetings that have been scheduled, even if these meetings take place after the OPC's approval of the final set. In this case, the study team will adjust the content of the presentations. The community outreach program is on-going. For example, a great deal of outreach will occur after the final set has been selected in order to build consensus for a locally preferred strategy.

C. Overview of Technical Results

An evaluation table has been developed for the initial set of alternatives that compares the key results of the twelve alternatives, side by side. Twenty-two performance measures are shown and are grouped into the following general categories: mobility; safety; environment; cost; and constructability. Dave Levinsohn reviewed each of the measures; described how they were derived; and highlighted the alternatives that performed the best under each measure.

In summary, the benefits associated with each of the alternatives are located in the top half of the evaluation table, while costs and impacts are located in the bottom half. The consultant team highlighted the alternatives that achieved the best performance rating (one of the top three) for each measure. In general, the build alternatives with the greatest benefits are: Alternatives 8, 9, and 10. The build alternatives with the lowest impacts and costs (i.e., best) are Alternatives 3 and 4.

In most cases, the evaluation table contains information that the TAC has already seen before as these screening findings were presented at either the May 15th or the May 22nd TAC meeting. These measures include: shifts in travel demand; vehicle hours of delay; estimated accidents; ROW impacts; capital costs; and environmental assessment. In other cases, the results have been displayed in a different manner, per the request of the TAC (e.g., travel benefits for each alternative as compared to the No Build Alternative).

Two measures were added since the last TAC meeting to provide a more complete picture of the relative trade-offs among the alternatives and to supplement the quantitative screening results: (1) qualitative safety assessment and (2) qualitative assessment of the ease of construction. Steven Yoshizumi (PBQD) described the rationale used for both the safety and constructability assessment as well as the ratings assigned to each alternative. Technical memos that detail the findings for the two measures were e-mailed to the TAC members, the previous Friday (5/26).

Qualitative Safety Assessment: Evaluates each of the alternatives based on their unique design and operational features. This measure was intended to supplement the accident estimates, which are almost exclusively based on anticipated changes in volume/capacity ratios realized by the alternatives on a link by link basis. In general, the TAC agreed with the findings of the qualitative assessment, however, some members felt that two alternatives that contained design features that explicitly separated truck and auto movements (Alternatives 7 and 9) should have received better marks.

Ease of Construction: Evaluates the physical feasibility of each of the alternatives based on the relative difficulty of construction; maintenance of traffic issues; construction impacts; and potential fatal flaws. All of the alternatives were found to be physically feasible, with the possible exception of Alternative 7, which would be extremely difficult to implement as currently described. This assessment assumed that no further ROW would be required for construction (e.g., construction easements) and that construction could take place within the ROW envelope previously identified in the ROW impact quantitative assessment.

D. Framework for Screening

Julie Rush (PBQD) outlined the process that will be used for the TAC discussion of the initial set of alternatives, ideally leading towards a TAC recommendation for the final set of alternatives. The strategy is to break the decision down into manageable components, focusing on the “big picture” decisions first and then addressing the smaller features last. The first step will be to identify the “design concepts and scope” for each the three different build alternatives. A “design concept and scope” can be the same as one of the initial set of alternatives or a variation. The second step will be to adjust each of the final three alternatives to encompass the best design features that should be carried forward for further analysis and that best complement each alternative. Certain design features (e.g., arterials) can be viewed independently from the mainline “design concept and scope” decisions. In addition, it is advisable to devote most of the TAC’s time and discussion on major topics of concern and less time on the areas where there is clear or near majority agreement on the alternatives that either should be dropped or carried forward into the final set.

Reminders for Alternatives Screening:

Alternatives 1 and 2 will automatically be carried forward into the Final Set. Therefore, it is anticipated that most of the discussion will focus on which three of the ten build alternatives should be carried forward. The proposed improvements described in Alternative 2 are also included in Alternatives 3 -12.

Only those alternatives that have the best chance of becoming the locally preferred strategy (i.e., best meet purpose and need) compared to the other alternatives should be carried forward. An alternative should not be selected in

order to “study it more,” if there is a reasonable likelihood that it will ultimately be discarded in favor of another alternative.

The final set of alternatives should be fundamentally different from each other, in order to provide decision-makers with distinct trade-offs at the conclusion of alternatives evaluation. If a specific design element is included in more than one alternative, that does not mean it has any greater chance of being selected for the locally preferred strategy compared to other design options.

The final set of alternatives can be a combination of the best elements of the initial set of alternatives (i.e., mix and match). However, the primary objective of the screening decision-point is to narrow the range of alternatives by dropping the least competitive options in favor of the most competitive alternatives.

E. TAC Discussion/Recommendation for the Final Set of Alternatives

A straw vote was conducted to find out where the areas of agreement and disagreement for the best three “design concept and scopes.” Much of the discussion centered on: whether an HOV lane option should be carried forward; operational concerns with having trucks elevated over existing I-710 mixed flow lanes; the desire to do all that is possible to address traffic congestion in the I-710 corridor; and the advisability of carrying forward a “medium” option such as Alternative 6 to provide a lower cost, lower ROW impact alternative. Of the initial set of ten build alternatives, Alternatives 6, 8, 9, 10 and 11 received the greatest support for the final set. A great deal of the remaining discussion was spent trying to bring forward the best elements of some of the other alternatives into Alternatives 6, 8, and 9.

Discussion was also initiated on specific design improvements such as the proposed connectors for the Terminal Island Freeway listed in Alternative 10. The group felt that there was a high likelihood that these improvements would move forward on a path independent of the I-710 Study, but that it was advisable to keep them in for the time being. Since the two connectors served similar, and perhaps competing functions, it was suggested that these improvements not be paired together in the same alternative.

Meeting time ran out before the TAC was able to achieve consensus on a recommendation for a final set of alternatives. It was moved and seconded that the TAC reconvene next Wednesday afternoon, June 5th, at 1:30 p.m.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

SPECIAL I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Wednesday, June 5, 2002
1:00 p.m. Meeting*

*Gateway Cities COG Offices
7300 Alondra Blvd., Suite 201
Paramount, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 201, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

I-710 TAC Agenda

June 5, 2002

Page 2 of 2

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Minutes of the Meetings of March 20, 2002, May 15, 2002, May 22, 2002, and May 29, 2002

VII. REPORTS

- A. TAC Recommendation for the Final Set of Alternatives
- B. Next Steps

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 10:30 a.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE A Meeting Held at Gateway Cities COG Offices 7300 Alondra Blvd., Suite 201 Paramount, CA June 5, 2002

Chair Pagett called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair William Pagett, Bell Gardens, Cudahy, Maywood, Paramount; Carlos Alvarado, Bell; William McConnell, Commerce; Augustus Ajawara, Compton; Patrick Fu, Huntington Park; Don Dey, Long Beach; Mohammad Mostahkami, South Gate; Kevin Wilson, Vernon; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach; Al Bowser, SCAG; Sharas Bangalore, Caltrans; Joan Wood, MTA; Joe Vizcarra, CHP.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Desi Alvarez, Downey; Joe Wang, Lynwood; Sandra Balmir, FHWA/FTA.

OTHERS PRESENT: Bob Zarrilli, Commerce; Karin Hodin, MTA; Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities COG. Louis Rubenstein, Port of Long Beach; Kanya Dorland, Port of Los Angeles; Pat Smith, LACDPW; Maged El-Rabaa, LACDPW; Paul De Paola, CHP; John Zeigler, Auto Club of Southern California; Dave Levinsohn, PBQD; Julie Rush, PBQD; Paul Taylor, Kaku Associates; Steven Yoshizumi, PBQD; Marie Marston, Metropointe Engineers.

Roll was taken through self-introductions.

There were no amendments to the agenda.

There were no public comments.

Consent Calendar:

The consultant staff announced that the TAC minutes for March 20, 2002, May 15, 2002, May 22, 2002, and May 29, 2002, were not ready for adoption. It was the consensus of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee to defer action on the aforementioned minutes until the next TAC meeting.

Reports:

A. TAC Recommendation for the Final Set of Alternatives

Julie Rush (PBQD) led a discussion among TAC members, continued from the May 29th TAC meeting, to develop a consensus on the three build alternatives to recommend for the Final Set of Alternatives. The results of the May 29th straw vote of the TAC, showing each member's top three alternatives, were presented. There was a spread of votes among the Initial Set of alternatives, with Alternatives 6, 8, 9, 10 and 11 garnering the most votes.

The TAC members were then asked to indicate which of these they thought might become their Locally Preferred Strategy at the conclusion of the Study, and these preferences were annotated on the straw vote tabulation. From this exercise, it was revealed that the I-710 mainline design concepts and scope from Alternative 6 (Medium General Purpose) and Alternative 9 (High Truck) had significant consensus support from the TAC. However, there was still a wide range of opinion for which mainline design concept should become the third build alternative in the Final Set.

After additional discussion among the TAC members present, it was the consensus of the TAC that the third build alternative be created by combining the mainline design concept and scope of Alternative 8 (High General Purpose) with Alternative 11 (High HOV). The Final Set adopted set included the following I-710 mainline design concepts and scopes:

1. No Build
2. TSM/TDM
3. Medium General Purpose/Medium Truck (Alternative 6)
4. High Truck (Alternative 9)
5. High General Purpose/High HOV (Alternatives 8 and 11)

Once the TAC reached consensus on the I-710 mainline design concepts and scopes for the Final Set of Alternatives, the next discussion focused on the completion of each alternative's full design concept and scope. The consultant team provided the TAC with a handout (see attached) which organized the remaining design elements into proposed packages. The discussion began to assess which design elements should be packaged with each of the three mainline design concepts. The TAC indicated that the following design elements were to be eliminated from further consideration in the Final Set:

- Goods Movement Strategies
- Truck-Only ITS
- Most of the direct HOV connectors
- Most of the direct truck ramps

- Partial redesign of I-5/I-710 interchange

Meeting time ran out before the TAC was able to complete consideration of a recommendation for the packaging of other improvements with the mainline design concepts and scopes to create the Final Set of Alternatives. It was the consensus of the TAC that the TAC reconvene next Wednesday afternoon, June 12th, at 3:00 p.m., to complete the development of the recommended Final Set of Alternatives. The consultant team was directed to develop proposed packaging of design elements with the final set of three build alternatives and to present them to the TAC at the June 12th meeting.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 4:00 p.m.

SPECIAL I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Wednesday, June 12, 2002
3:00 p.m. Meeting*

*Gateway Cities COG Offices
7300 Alondra Blvd., Suite 201
Paramount, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 201, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

I-710 TAC Agenda

June 12, 2002

Page 2 of 2

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Minutes of the Meetings of March 20, 2002, May 15, 2002, May 22, 2002, May 29, 2002, and June 5, 2002.

VII. REPORTS

- A. TAC Recommendation of the Final Set of Alternatives
- B. Next Steps

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 4:30 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE A Meeting Held at Gateway Cities COG Offices 7300 Alondra Blvd., Suite 201 Paramount, CA June 12, 2002

Chair Pagett called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair William Pagett, Bell Gardens, Cudahy, Maywood, Paramount; Vice Chair Desi Alvarez, Downey; Carlos Alvarado, Bell; William McConnell, Commerce; Augustus Ajawara, Compton; Patrick Fu, Huntington Park; Don Dey, Long Beach; Mohammad Mostahkami, South Gate; Kevin Wilson, Vernon; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach; Sharas Bangalore, Caltrans; Sharas Bangalore, Caltrans; Karin Hodin, MTA; Joe Vizcarra, CHP

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Joe Wang, Lynwood; Alan Bowser, SCAG; Sandra Balmir, FHWA/FTA.

OTHERS PRESENT: Bob Zarrilli, Commerce; Louis Rubenstein, Port of Long Beach; Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities COG. Kanya Dorland, Port of Los Angeles; Sue Lai, Port of Los Angeles; Kristin Wilson, Caltrans; Maged El-Rabaa, LACDPW John Zeigler, Auto Club of Southern California; Dave Levinsohn, PBQD; Julie Rush, PBQD; Steven Yoshizumi, PBQD.

Roll was taken through self-introductions.

There were no amendments to the agenda.

There were no public comments.

Consent Calendar:

The consultant staff announced that the minutes for the meetings of March 20, 2002, May 15, 2002, May 22, 2002, and June 5, 2002 were not ready for approval. It was moved by Karin Hodin, seconded by Kevin Wilson, to approve the minutes of May 29, 2002, and to defer action on the aforementioned minutes until the next meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

Reports:

A. TAC Recommendation for the Final Set of Alternatives

Julie Rush (PBQD) led a discussion among TAC members, continued from the June 5th TAC meeting, to complete the packaging of the three build alternatives and to finalize the TAC recommendation of the Final Set of Alternatives. The consultant team presented their recommendation of the packages of design elements to be added to each of the three build alternative mainline design concepts adopted at the June 5th TAC meeting (see attachment). After a brief discussion, it was the consensus of the TAC to approve the consultant team recommendation of the packaging of the build alternatives. The Final Set is comprised of five alternatives:

- A. No Build
- B. TSM/TDM
- C. Medium General Purpose/Medium Truck
- D. High General Purpose/High HOV
- E. High Truck

The TAC recommended Final Set of Alternatives is shown in the attached exhibit.

Upon approval of the Recommended Final Set, Chair Pagett requested that the TAC members brief their respective Oversight Policy Committee (OPC) members prior to the OPC meeting scheduled for June 27, 2002, at which the OPC will consider the TAC recommendation. Dave Levinsohn offered the attendance of consultant team staff members at any of these briefings, if requested by the TAC member.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 4:00 p.m.

SPECIAL I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Wednesday, October 16, 2002
1:30 p.m. Meeting*

*Gateway Cities COG Offices
7300 Alondra Blvd., Suite 201
Paramount, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 201, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Minutes of the Meetings of March 20, 2002, May 15, 2002, May 22, 2002, June 5, 2002, and June 12, 2002.

VII. REPORTS

- A. Update on Alternatives Design Concepts
- B. Update on Sub-area Model
- C. Update on Public Outreach
- D. Overview of Alternatives Evaluation Process
- E. Discussion Regarding the I-710 Project's Place in the MTA's Short Range Transportation Plan

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 3:30 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE A Meeting Held at Gateway Cities COG Offices 7300 Alondra Blvd., Suite 201 Paramount, CA OCTOBER 16, 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; Carlos Alvarado, Bell; Robert Zarrilli, Commerce (by telephone); Augustus Ajawara, Compton; Patrick Fu, Huntington Park; Lon Maddox, Long Beach; Mohammad Mostahkami, South Gate; Kevin Wilson, Vernon; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach; Sharas Bangalore, Caltrans; Joan Wood, MTA; Joe Vizcarra, CHP.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Desi Alvarez, Downey; Joe Wang, Lynwood; Al Bowser, SCAG; Sandra Balmir, FHWA/FTA.

OTHERS PRESENT: Sumi Gant, Long Beach; Linda Timmons, Compton; Wes Lind, Huntington Park; Louis Rubenstein, Port of Long Beach; Karin Hodin, MTA; Paul de Paola, CHP; Bill Murphy, CHP; Sue Lai, Port of Los Angeles; Kanya Dorland, Port of Los Angeles; Maged El-Rabaa, LACDPW; Victor Rollinger, Carson; John Ziegler, Auto Club of Southern California; Deborah Chankin, Gateway Cities COG; Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities COG; Hamid Toossi, Caltrans; Frances Lee, Caltrans; Raymond Maekawa, MTA; Cathy Manzo, MTA; Warren Whitenlaw, MTA; Stacy Alameida, MTA; David Wang, MTA; Jinny Park, MTA; Andrea Hricko, USC Environmental Health Sciences Center; Dave Levinsohn, PBQD; Steven Yoshizumi, PBQD; Julie Rush, PBQD; Paul Taylor, Kaku Associates; John Muggridge, Kaku Associates; Sean Mohn, Kaku Associates; Tom Choe, Kaku Associates; Jacki Bacharach, Bacharach & Associates; Josh Gertler, Consensus Planning Group; Anthony Crump, Consensus Planning Group; Julia Brown, Consensus Planning Group; Andrea Rodriguez, Consensus Planning Group.

Roll was taken through self-introductions.

Chairman Pagett led the Pledge of Allegiance.

There were no amendments to the agenda.

There were no public comments.

Consent Calendar:

The consultant staff announced that the minutes of March 20, 2002, May 15, 2002, May 22, 2002, June 5, 2002 and June 12, 2002 were not ready for approval. It was the consensus of the TAC to defer approval of the aforementioned TAC minutes until the next TAC meeting.

Reports:

A. Update on Alternatives Design Concepts

Steven Yoshizumi (PBQD), engineering task manager, presented an update on the conceptual design evolution of each of the build alternatives, C, D and E. Steven informed the TAC that the basic design concept of each of the build alternatives has not changed, but details of some elements have changed to some degree. In Alternative C, for instance, the exclusive truck ramp at PCH has evolved into two separate ramps: from southbound I-710 to westbound PCH, an additional, truck-only lane will be added to the existing ramp. For eastbound PCH to northbound I-710, the existing loop ramp will be converted to a truck-only ramp, while cars will be required to make a left turn to the existing westbound to northbound ramp.

Steven also pointed out that the design of improvements to the I-710/I-405 interchange would eliminate the ability of northbound to westbound traffic to exit I-405 at Santa Fe or Alameda.

In Alternative D, traffic operations considerations require the 4 HOV lanes to reduce to 2 HOV lanes between I-5 and SR-60.

In Alternative E, the Truckway concept has been modified south of I-405 such that 4 new elevated lanes would be constructed in the median of I-710 between the Shoemaker Bridge ramps and Willow Street, with the elevated lanes restricted to cars and trucks restricted to the general purpose lanes on the existing freeway. The truckway lanes would begin and end in the vicinity of Willow Street.

B. Update on Sub-area Model

John Muggridge (Kaku) provided an overview of the I-710 subarea travel forecasting model. The model has been developed based upon the SCAG 2001 RTP model and the POLB TMP model. The model is a focused subarea model, which means that the zone and network detail has been increased in the vicinity of I-710 (I-110 to I-605, San Pedro Bay to SR-60) and decreased further away

from the study area. The model estimates drive alone autos, carpools, light heavy, medium heavy and heavy-heavy trucks. The traffic assignment method is a multi-class assignment and the SCAG volume/delay functions have been replaced with BPR functions. The model is currently being validated to 1997 count data across multiple north/south and east/west screenlines within the study area for both the am and pm peak periods. The model will be used to estimate the traffic impacts and benefits of each of the I-710 alternatives.

C. Update on Public Outreach

Anthony Crump (CPG) provided an update on the public outreach task of the project. The current phase of outreach on the Final Set of alternatives has commenced. Letters have been sent by GCCOG to over 70 elected officials in the Study Area notifying them that the current phase of outreach is starting up and offering to brief them on the study. This phase of outreach will be divided into two parts. The first part, between now and January, will focus on providing explanations of the composition of the Final Set of alternatives as adopted by the OPC in June, and requesting feedback on their features. The second phase will begin in February, 2003 and will provide the public and stakeholders with the evaluative information about the alternatives. This phase will continue up to the OPC decision next spring on the selection of the Locally Preferred Strategy (LPS).

D. Overview of Alternatives Evaluation Process

Dave Levinsohn (PBQD) presented a handout that listed the evaluation measures that will be developed for each of the alternatives. He indicated that these measures, while similar to those used during the alternatives screening process, will be developed in more detail. They are closely correlated with the issues in the adopted Purpose and Need Statement of the study. The handout also presented a listing of the major elements of the alternatives for which evaluation information will be developed to facilitate the TAC and OPC to be able to "mix and match" elements of the alternatives to develop the LPS.

Within the TSM alternative, Mr. Levinsohn requested direction from the TAC regarding the assumptions that should be used to define truck trip demand management strategies. The traffic forecasts developed for the previous screening analysis assumed aggressive financial incentives/disincentives would be applied to shift additional port truck trips out of the current peak periods to off-peak, particularly night time periods. After discussion, it was the consensus of the TAC to direct the study team to assume no additional truck demand management strategies in the TSM over the future No Build, due to their controversial and speculative natures. It was consensus of the TAC to explore the issue of truck demand management further at future meetings. Mr. Levinsohn indicated that, if so directed, the consultant team in the future could do

a "sensitivity test" forecast to provide an indication of the amount of peak period traffic benefit that could accrue to a port truck demand management strategy.

E. Discussion Regarding I-710 Project's Place in the MTA's Short Range Transportation Plan

Ray Maekawa (MTA) provided a presentation on the MTA's Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) and its relationship to the congested corridors in Los Angeles County, including the I-710 Corridor. The SRTP is focused on transportation projects that have regional mobility benefit and that can be implemented in the 2003-2009 timeframe. Mr. Maekawa referred to a handout which described the MTA staff's current thinking, in draft form, about possible SRTP projects for the I-710 study area, as well as an information data sheet to define potential corridor "hot spots" and suggested short term improvement projects to address the hot spots. Upon questioning by TAC members, Mr. Maekawa explained that projects nominated for the SRTP are not in the same process as those for the biennial MTA Call for Projects. SRTP data sheets and project proposals need to be submitted to MTA staff by the end of October.

After discussion, the it was the consensus of the TAC to propose the following projects for the SRTP from the I-710 Major Corridor Study, recognizing that the determination of the Locally Preferred Strategy for the I-710 will not be selected until Spring, 2003:

- Gerald Desmond Bridge Replacement
- Arterial Widening for all arterials still under study in Alternatives C, D, and E
- Freeway to freeway interchange improvements at I-710/I-405, I-710/SR-91, and I-710/I-5

The TAC directed Deborah Chankin of GCCOG staff, with assistance of Kerry Cartwright, POLB staff, to develop the draft SRTP submittal and then e-mail it to the TAC members for review and comment. Once comments are received, it will be revised and then submitted to the MTA by GCCOG.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 4:00 p.m.

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Wednesday, January 22, 2003
3:30 p.m. Meeting*

*Progress Park Community Center
15500 Downey Avenue
Paramount, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 201, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

I-710 TAC Agenda

January 22, 2002

Page 2 of 2

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Minutes of the Meetings of March 20, 2002, May 15, 2002, May 22, 2002, June 5, 2002, June 12, 2002, and October 16, 2002.

B. A RESOLUTION OF THE I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE DESIGNATING LOCATIONS FOR POSTING OF AGENDAS AND RESOLUTIONS REQUIRED BY LAW TO BE PUBLISHED OR POSTED

VII. REPORTS

A. Overview of Study Status

B. Update on Build Alternative Evolution

C. Analyses of TDM Strategies

D. Update on Public Involvement

E. Next Steps

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 5:30 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A Meeting Held at Progress Park

15500 Downey Avenue

Paramount, CA

January 22, 2003

Chairman Pagett called the meeting to order at 3:45 p.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair William Pagett, Bell Gardens, Cudahy, Maywood, Paramount; Victor Rollinger, Carson; Bob Zarrilli, Commerce; Joseph Lim, Compton; Patrick Fu, Huntington Park; Lon Maddox, Long Beach; Joe Wang, Lynwood; Mohammad Mostahkami, South Gate; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach; Kanya Dorland, Port of Los Angeles; Fred Alipanah, Caltrans; Ernest Morales, MTA; Craig Klein, CHP.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Carlos Alvarado, Bell; Desi Alvarez, Downey; Kevin Wilson, Vernon; Maged El-Rabaa, County of Los Angeles; Al Bowser, SCAG; Sandra Balmir, FHWA/FTA.

OTHERS PRESENT: Mayor Victor Bello, Bell; Tony Ibarra, Bell Gardens; William McConnell, Commerce; Sumire Gant, Long Beach; Bill Murphy, CHP; Sue Lai, Port of Los Angeles; Ginny Park, MTA; John Zeigler, Auto Club of So. Cal.; Linda Taira, Caltrans; Jolene Hayes, Port of Long Beach; Wendy Wang, City of Los Angeles; Dave Levinsohn, PBQD; Pete Mandia, Alameda Corridor Authority; Duane Kenagy, Alameda Corridor Authority; Sylvia Novoa, CPG; Julia Brown, CPG; Andrea Rodriguez, CPG; Steven Yoshizumi, PBQD; Paul Taylor, Kaku Associates; Michael Fischer, CSI; Richard Powers, Gateway Cities COG; Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities COG; Deborah Chankin, Gateway Cities COG; Don Camph, Gateway Cities COG; Andrea Hricko, USC.

Roll was taken through self-introductions.

Chairman Pagett led the Pledge of Allegiance.

There were no amendments to the agenda.

There were no public comments.

Consent Calendar:

- A. Approval of the TAC minutes for March 20, 2002, May 15, 2002, May 22, 2002, May 29, 2002, June 5, 2002, June 12, 2002 and October 16, 2002.

Chairman Pagett announced that this item would be deferred until the next TAC meeting in order to give members time to review the minutes that were distributed at the meeting.

- B. A RESOLUTION OF THE I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE DESIGNATING LOCATIONS FOR POSTING OF AGENDAS AND RESOLUTIONS REQUIRED BY LAW TO BE PUBLISHED OR POSTED

It was moved by Member Zarrilli, seconded by Member Rollinger, to waive further reading and adopt the resolution. The motion was approved unanimously.

REPORTS:

- A. Overview of Study Status

Dave Levinsohn provided a reminder of the overall study process and pointed out that the study was in the phase of evaluating the final set of five alternatives. Today's meeting will provide the TAC with a description of the three build alternatives and how they have evolved through the conceptual engineering process over the past several months. It will also provide the TAC with a preliminary analysis of the traffic congestion relief effects of a more aggressive, illustrative truck demand management strategy, and an update on community outreach activities and findings since the last TAC meeting.

- B. Update on Build Alternative Evolution

Steven Yoshizumi, Parsons Brinckerhoff I-710 MCS Engineering Task Leader presented the TAC with an overview of how each of the build alternatives, C, D, and E had evolved in design concept and scope since the final set of alternatives was adopted in June, 2002. This evolution was a result of the conceptual engineering work undertaken to refine the alternatives for further evaluation and analysis. The objective of the conceptual design process was to implement the intent of the approved alternatives, while meeting federal and state highway design standards and minimizing right of way impacts.

Steven presented power point slides illustrating key design features of each of the alternatives. For Alternative C, he presented schematics of the design concepts for the collector-distributor lanes between Atlantic/Bandini and I-5, the truck bypass lanes around the I-710/SR-91 interchange, the truck inspection facility, the truck

only ramps at Washington and PCH and the Terminal Island Freeway extension. In response to a question from the TAC, Steven pointed out that the PCH truck ramp would require the widening of the PCH overcrossing of I-710.

For Alternative D, Steven discussed the variation in the number of HOV lanes between one and two additional HOV lanes per direction, the variation in HOV lane profile between at-grade and elevated and the southern terminus of the improvements in Alternative D. In the southern section, from Pacific Coast Highway to I-405, one at-grade HOV lane is provided in each direction. Operationally this works well because the HOV connector from I-405 adds an additional lane north of I-405 which corresponds with the two-lane HOV section (each direction) between I-405 and Slauson Avenue. North of Slauson Avenue, there are a number of closely spaced interchanges, including I-5, and there is a perceived need for access. Because of all of the access points, the volume of HOVs is anticipated to be less than in the central portion of the corridor. So north of Slauson Avenue, up to approximately Olympic Boulevard, one at-grade HOV lane is provided in each direction. The southern terminus of Alternative D was changed such that the improvements end at Pacific Coast Highway. The terminus moved north from the Shoemaker Bridge to avoid the complications of the modifications to access required by the closely spaced interchanges at Pico Avenue, 9th Street, Anaheim Street, and Pacific Coast Highway. In response to a question from the TAC, Steven indicated that the determination of locations of one versus two HOV lanes was determined by a combination of factors including traffic volumes, as well as operational and physical constraints.

For Alternative E, Steven presented three features: the alignment of the truck lanes relative to the I-710 mainline along the Corridor, the "autoway" proposed between the Shoemaker Bridge and I-405 in Long Beach, and the Atlantic Avenue viaduct at the I-5/I-710 interchange. Steven explained how the conceptual design of Alternative E has the truck lanes varying between two lanes on either side of I-710 versus all four lanes on the same side of I-710. Starting at the north end near Whittier Blvd., the truck lanes split into two lanes on either side of I-710 until the vicinity of Atlantic Blvd., where all four lanes shift to the east side of I-710 until south of Imperial Blvd. where the lanes diverge again into two lanes on either side of the freeway and then converge again into four lanes on the east side of I-710 until south of Wardlow Ave. where they diverge into two lanes on either side for a short distance until the southern terminus of the truckway.

Steven then presented the concept of the autoway between the Shoemaker Bridge and north of Willow Street in the southern segment of the I-710. Autos coming across the Shoemaker Bridge from Long Beach would be routed onto a new set of four elevated lanes, two in each direction, above the median of the existing I-710. Trucks coming to or from the ports would use the existing I-710 lanes, thereby separating most of the auto and truck traffic on the southern segment of I-710. The autoway lanes would merge back into the existing I-710 lanes between Willow and Wardlow, just north of the start and end of the proposed truck only lanes.

Steven presented the proposed Atlantic Avenue elevated viaduct, which would provide the currently missing connections of northbound I-710 to southbound I-5 and northbound I-5 to southbound I-710. The viaduct would be elevated above Atlantic Blvd. between the two freeways and carry two lanes of traffic (all vehicle types) in each direction.

Finally, Steven presented the three different concepts among the three build alternatives for the I-710/I-5 interchange and explained the differences among them.

Steven responded to several questions from TAC members clarifying the description of the design concepts of each of the alternatives. A member of the public questioned whether the TAC or OPC had considered innovative methods to move cargo without creating diesel emissions.

C. Analyses of TDM Strategies

Mike Fischer of Cambridge Systematics, Inc. made a presentation about an analysis of a hypothetical scenario to shift more port truck trips out of the am and pm peak periods and what effects this might have on future traffic volumes on I-710. This “what if” analysis was done in response to a prior request of the TAC to examine a scenario as part of the TSM/TDM alternative. CSI’s analysis addresses the question “What is the potential to improve I-710 traffic operations through travel demand management strategies at the port terminals?” Mike explained the current operations at the port terminal gates. Up to three shifts are operated: day shift (8 am – 5 pm), evening shift (5 pm to 2 am) and ‘hoot’ shift (2 am to 8 am). Under present operating conditions, most of the gates are open only on weekdays, with 80% of truck traffic occurring during the day shift and 20% during the evening shift, with few gates open during the hoot shift.

In the planning horizon year of 2025, cargo volumes are forecast to increase to levels such that port terminals will need to increase number of truck lanes at their gates, or increase the truck processing rate or extend the number of hours that the gates are operating. Because of physical and institutional constraints on the terminals, the most likely response will be to increase hours of operation to handle the forecast growth in container volumes. The I-710 major corridor study adopted the assumptions on hours of terminal operations assumed in the Ports Transportation Master Plan study. These assumptions include 60% of truck traffic occurring during the day shift, 20% during the evening shift and 20% during the hoot shift, with up to 15% of container trips on the weekends. The presumption is that these times of day shifts will occur due to market dynamics, neither as a result of explicit policies nor regulations.

CSI studied a scenario where the time of day distribution of truck trips was assumed to be 50% day shift, 40% evening shift, and 10% hoot shift. This scenario

was chosen in order to attempt to minimize the number of truck trips occurring during the am and pm peak traffic periods. CSI found that there could be a 10-15% reduction in congestion, as measured by the volume/capacity ratio on southbound I-710 during the am peak period with the implementation of this 50/40/10 strategy. This still results in congested conditions on I-710 and less than the expected congestion relief benefits of the build alternatives.

Mike presented several candidate mechanisms that could result in truck operations at the port terminals moving to a 50/40/10 time distribution. These could include further implementation of an appointment system for container pickup and delivery, targeting specific cargo to move to off-peak hours, and a value pricing system which would increase container fees for those picked up during peak hours but a discount for those picked up during off-peak hours. Mike enumerated several challenges to implementing a 50/40/10 scenario, including coordinating among terminal operators, truckers, and shippers, and addressing the community impacts of expanding night time truck operations at warehouses.

Mike fielded several questions and comments from TAC members, noting that the congestion analysis was a "static" analysis, which did not account for other vehicles shifting routes to fill up the capacity created on I-710 by the reduction in truck trips at certain times of the day. The POLB member also pointed out that some of the terminals have started to build in appointment incentives at their gates using the emodal internet software scheduling system.

D. Update on Public Involvement

Sylvia Novoa of Consensus Planning Group presented the TAC with an update of public and agency outreach efforts. She summarized the outreach meetings that had been conducted since the previous TAC meeting in October, 2002. Sylvia reported that over 1,500 groups had been contacted to be offered information about the study. She reported that the consistent feedback was a concern about traffic safety and improving it on the I-710. Sylvia reported that as of yet they had not detected a consensus forming for any of the alternatives.

Mohammed Mostahkami asked if he could receive a list of the groups contacted in South Gate. Andrea Hricko, member of the public, offered an opinion that the study still needed to improve its outreach, that her experience working with communities in the corridor was that most residents were still unaware that plans are being studied to widen the freeway. Sylvia noted that CPG and MTA have been consulting with Ms. Hricko to expand the list of community groups to contact. They agreed to exchange contact information.

E. Next Steps

It was the consensus of the Technical Advisory Committee to tentatively schedule for March 12 the first of a series of meetings intended to lead to a consensus on a

recommended locally preferred alternative.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 5:50 p.m.

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Wednesday, March 26, 2003
1:30 p.m. Meeting*

*Paramount Fire Station
15538 Colorado Avenue
Paramount, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 201, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

I-710 TAC Agenda

March 26, 2003

Page 2 of 2

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Minutes of the Meetings of March 20, 2002, May 15, 2002, May 22, 2002, June 5, 2002, June 12, 2002, October 16, 2002, and January 22, 2003.

VII. BUSINESS SESSION

- A. Consideration of the Addition of the South Coast Air Quality Management District to the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee
- B. Establishment of Tentative Meeting Dates and Times

VIII. REPORTS

- A. Study Overview
- B. Right-of-Way Impact Estimates
- C. Cost Estimates
- D. Discussion Regarding Consultant's Technical Reports

IX. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 3:30 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

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 aeriels 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.

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Wednesday, April 2, 2003
1:30 p.m. Meeting*

*Long Beach Energy Department
2400 East Spring Street
Long Beach, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 201, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

I-710 TAC Agenda

April 2, 2003

Page 2 of 2

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Minutes of the Meeting of March 26, 2003

VII. REPORTS

A. Study Overview

B. Preliminary Environmental Analysis Report (PEAR) Explanation

C. Detailed Results

D. Question and Answer Period

IX. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 3:30 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

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 2, 2003

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair William Pagett, Bell Gardens, Maywood, Paramount; Anthony La, Downey; Carlos Alvarado, Bell, Cudahy; Ray Ramirez, Commerce; Joseph Lim, Compton; Patrick Fu, Huntington Park; Lon Maddox, Long Beach; Yadi Farhadi, Lynwood; Mohammad Mostahkami, South Gate; Kevin Wilson, Vernon; Sharas Bangalore, Caltrans; Lt. William Murphy, CHP; Victor Rollinger, Carson; Maged El-Rabaa, County of Los Angeles; Sandra Balmir, FHWA/FTA; Ernest Morales, MTA; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach; Sue Lai, Port of Los Angeles.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Carol Gomez, SCAQMD.

OTHERS PRESENT: Deborah Chankin, Gateway Cities COG; Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities COG; Maura Dwyer, Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma; Raymond Maekawa, MTA; Sumi Gant, City of Long Beach; Andrea Rodriguez, Consensus Planning Group; Jinny Park, MTA; Vin Kumar, Caltrans Goods Movement; Ken Hatai, Caltrans Traffic Investigations; Maged Soliman, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works; Art Krugler, private citizen, Whittier; Harley Martin, CH2M Hill; John Doherty, ACTA; Duane Kenagy, ACET; John Zeigler, Automobile Club of Southern California; Barbara Martenoff, Los Angeles World Airports, LAWA; Patrick Tomcheck, Los Angeles World Airports; Helene Ansel, Assemblyman Alan Lowenthal's office; Bridget Sramek, Assemblyman Alan Lowenthal's office; Mike Sanders, Long Beach Mayor Beverly O'Neill's office; Lee Ward, Meyer, Mohaddes Associates; Jolene Hayes, Port of Long Beach; Anthony R. Ybarra, City of Bell Gardens; Julie Rush, PBQD; Dave Levinsohn, PBQD; Doris Chan, PBQD; Steven Yoshizumi, PBQD; Susan Robbins, PBQD.

- II. Roll was taken through self-introductions and a sign-in sheet was circulated.
- III. Ernest Morales, MTA, 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
April 2, 2003
Page 2 of 9

VI. Consent Calendar:

The TAC minutes for March 26, 2003 had not been distributed prior to the meeting. Approval of the minutes was continued to the next TAC meeting.

VII. Reports:

A. Study Overview

Dave Levinsohn, PBQD, began by reviewing the schedule for presenting data to the TAC. On March 26th, estimates of right-of-way impacts by acre and capital costs were presented. Today, the project team intends to cover environmental issues. Next week, traffic and air quality will be discussed. April 15th and 23rd are set aside for deliberation meetings to obtain consensus on the locally preferred strategy. Note that the meeting that had previously been scheduled for April 16 has been changed to April 15, 2003, at 1:30 p.m. at the Long Beach Energy Department.

Dave also discussed the project development timeline. The question of the likely implementation schedule for the project has been raised on several occasions, so we developed a sample project development timeline. The timeline shows a possible schedule based on a 15-18 mile project and 3 phases. The I-710 Major Corridor Study occurs early in the overall process. Under this timeline the overall project would be finished in about 2021. But there are ways to speed this up – design-build, change phasing.

The TAC Chair commented that the project schedule is ultimately dependant upon funding. Art Krugler, private citizen from Whittier, asked if a cash flow curve had been prepared. Dave replied that a cash flow curve would not be prepared at this level of study.

B. Preliminary Environmental Analysis Report (PEAR) Explanation

Susan Robbins, PBQD, explained the purpose of the PEAR. The PEAR is required by Caltrans. It provides an initial environmental evaluation of alternatives; presents results of the preliminary analysis; identifies environmental constraints that may affect future design efforts; and becomes part of the Project Study Report. In essence, the PEAR is a screening-level of analysis. More thorough environmental review takes place during the environmental phase of project development.

The purposes of the PEAR include to: develop an inventory of environmental resources; identify potentially significant project impacts that could delay or affect the viability of any project alternative; determine additional studies needed to complete environmental clearance; and determine the next type of environmental document needed (e.g., EIR/EIS). It was noted that Section 4(f) of the 1966 U.S. Transportation

Act can impact the project development process. It is important to identify these potential Section 4(f) site impacts, as these have time implications, or could require modifications of alternatives in order to avoid these impacts.

C. Environmental Screening Results

In order to provide comparative information on the proposed alternatives with regard to environmental concerns, an environmental checklist and supporting discussion was prepared. This discussion represents a key section of the PEAR document that is currently under development for submittal to Caltrans for their review. The environmental screening analysis focuses mostly on the build alternatives (e.g., Alternatives C, D, and E).

The following environmental topic areas are summarized and covered in today's presentation:

- Acquisitions/ROW
- Aesthetics/Visual Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology, Water Quality, Floodplains
- Land Use/Planning
- Noise
- Parks/Recreation
- Socioeconomics
- Utilities

Two categories, (1) agriculture, and (2) geology, seismicity, and soils, are not expected to be greatly impacted by the proposed project, therefore these two categories did not warrant a separate discussion. As an overview, any impacts to geology, seismicity, or soils are typically addressed as part of the engineering design phase and through the use of "best management practices." Agricultural uses are analyzed using a Prime, Unique, State, or Local Importance designation. These designations are made according to the soil type and topography. Prime farmland provides the most beneficial combination of both soil type and topography for agriculture. The Local Designation provides the least ideal combination for agricultural uses. Within the I-710 corridor, although there are pockets of existing agricultural uses underneath towers in utility right-of-way, none of the soil types meet the Prime, Unique, State, or Local Importance criteria.

Summary information on the traffic and air quality categories will be presented to members at the next TAC meeting.

Acquisitions and ROW: Properties located within the proposed footprint for each alternative were counted to provide an additional measure for ROW impact, in addition to the ROW analysis by acre that was presented last week. Potential acquisitions were counted off of aerials and any partial take was counted as a full take. At this early stage of study, there was no differentiation between full and partial impacts. Any building that looked like a structure was counted. The data was not field verified. Of the Build Alternatives, Alternative D had the highest number of residential structures and vacant lots acquired. Alternative E acquired the most commercial properties. Alternative D acquired the most railroad properties, Alternative E acquired the most sensitive uses, and Alternative C acquired the most utility structures. Utility towers were not counted for this part of the environmental screening analysis, but are accounted for elsewhere in the cost estimate.

Aesthetics/visual quality: This study examined changes to the existing visual environment. These changes may be tangible or intangible, as well as positive or negative changes. The study team looked at impacts upon visually sensitive land uses (e.g., residential neighborhoods, parks, cultural and public facilities), along the mainline (miles affected), the interchanges (acres affected), and the arterial improvements (miles affected). Alternative C affected the least mainline miles (Alternative D affected the most); Alternative B affected the least interchange acres (Alternative D affected the most). High mast illumination accounts for high impact associated with interchanges in Alternative B. Alternative E affected the least arterial miles (Alternative C affected the most).

Biological resources: Research was conducted to analyze the “potential for conflict” with recorded rare/endangered animals, plants, habitat areas; affected federally protected wetlands; interference with movement of fish or wildlife; and conflicts with policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Three endangered species potentially affected were identified: California orcutt grass, Salt marsh bird’s beak habitat, and the Pacific pocket mouse habitat. Alternative C potentially affects the CA orcutt grass; Alternative D potentially affects salt marsh bird’s beak habitat and the Pacific pocket mouse habitat; and Alternative E potentially affects salt marsh bird’s beak habitat.

Cultural resources: In analyzing cultural resources it is important to be aware of the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. It is a federal mandate to examine how a federal-funded project could affect these resources, both “eligible” and “potentially eligible” sites for listing by the National Register of Historic Places (NHRP). Alternative C potentially affects 2 sites on the NRHP; Alternative D potentially affects 1 NHRP site; and Alternative E does not affect any NHRP sites. Alternative D potentially affects 6 local cultural resources; Alternative C potentially affects 5 local cultural resources; and Alternative E potentially affects 1 local cultural resource. Based on the sources examined, no archaeological or paleontological sites are known to be located in the proposed footprints of the alternatives.

Minutes

I-710 Technical Advisory Committee

April 2, 2003

Page 5 of 9

Maged El-Rabaa, County of Los Angeles, asked where the cultural resources were located. PBQD indicated that the addresses will be listed in the PEAR, but that the two sites were Casa de Parley Johnson (potentially affected by the Florence Ave. arterial improvements) and Lynwood Pacific Electric Highway Depot (potentially affected by improvements to Long Beach Blvd.).

Ray Ramirez, City of Commerce, asked if the Site of the Sleepy Lagoon Murder and Shelley Air Force Base were considered. PBQD replied that the site of the murder was included however the base would have to be verified.

Hazardous materials: Hazardous materials/waste sites were researched along the I-710 corridor. Impacts to hazardous materials/waste sites were counted only if the property would need to be acquired under the proposed alternative. Potential impacts to arterials are included in the results. Alternative C would potentially affect 2,378 hazardous waste sites; Alternative D would potentially affect 1,525 hazardous waste sites; and Alternative E would potentially affect 939 hazardous waste sites.

Hydrology, water quality and floodplains: Impacts to this resource would occur if the hydrology, water quality or floodplains were altered by the proposed alternatives. For example, where pier walls would be constructed or lengthened, the water levels would rise in those areas. Alternative D poses the highest impact to surface waters due to the Terminal Island Freeway component. Alternatives C and E do not directly impact surface waters. For all alternatives, wetlands areas affected include impacts to the Dominguez Gap Spreading Grounds Facility. Alternative C would have the highest potential impact to floodplains and wetlands, followed by Alternative E, then Alternative D.

John Zeigler, Auto Club of Southern California, asked what accounted for the estimated 100-acre impact on the floodplain in Alternative D. PBQD answered that it was the Terminal Island Freeway/Alameda Truckway Connector that crossed over the Dominguez Gap Spreading Grounds facility.

Land use/planning: Any conversion of existing land uses to a transportation use was considered an impact under this environmental indicator. These impacts were measured based on acres of right-of-way acquisition. Alternative C acquires the highest amount of acreage for residential and commercial uses. Alternative D acquires the highest amount of acreage for railroad and sensitive uses. Alternative E acquires the highest amount of acreage for utility uses.

Noise: Eight 24-hour noise measurements were taken to determine the peak one-hour traffic noise period. Then six 15-minute measurements were taken during those peak one-hour periods. Caltrans' noise abatement criteria (NAC) allows for 65 dBA for sensitive receptors and 71 dBA for commercial areas. It is higher in commercial areas

because they are typically not areas where people sleep. All sites where measurements were taken in the study area currently exceed the NAC. Therefore, a qualitative evaluation was undertaken to provide a basis of comparison for the alternatives. Alternative C has moderate to high impact because new areas of sensitive receptors are exposed to noise due to the Terminal Island Freeway component and the C-D system. Alternative D has a moderate impact and would increase the noise in areas already exposed to traffic noise. Alternative E has high impact because it exposes new areas and more residents to noise due to the new truckway element on the east side of the alignment.

Parks and recreation: Parks and recreation areas which are either historic or of local significance can be designated as a Section 4(f) facility, however, not all parks and recreational areas in the I-710 Study Area are designated Section 4(f) facilities. It is important to note that the acquisition process for a 4(f) site can be lengthy and costly as it must be demonstrated that the project has made every effort to avoid or minimize the impacts. The mainline elements for Alternatives C, D, and E all potentially acquire the same 3 parks: Bristow Park in Commerce, Bandini Park in Commerce, and Coolidge Park in Long Beach. Of these three parks, Coolidge Park is a designated 4(f) property, located in the southwest quadrant of the I-710/SR-91 Interchange. Alternative C arterials potentially affect five park and recreation sites (Scherer Park in Long Beach, Cherry Avenue Park in Long Beach, All Souls Cemetery in Long Beach, Forest Lawn Memorial Park in Long Beach, and Darwell Park in Bell Gardens). Alternative D arterials potentially affect four park and recreation sites (Scherer Park in Long Beach, Cherry Avenue Park in Long Beach, All Souls Cemetery in Long Beach, Forest Lawn Memorial Park in Long Beach). Alternative E arterials potentially affect one park and recreation site, Darwell Park in Bell Gardens.

Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach, asked what three parks would be impacted. PBQD said that Bristow Park in Commerce, Bandini Park in Commerce, and Coolidge Park in Long Beach. Of the three, only Coolidge Park is considered a 4(f) resource. There are no 4(f) property takes in the arterial elements of the alternatives. The TAC Chair asked if the arterial analysis assumed property acquisitions to provide for construction of additional lanes along the entire length of the arterials. PBQD indicated that the analysis did assume acquisitions along the entire length of the affected arterials and that this assumption would presumably represent the worst case scenario for impacts on the arterials. The TAC Chair also noted that there is an additional park in Bell Gardens that would be affected by all three alternatives. Julie Rush, PBQD, also indicated that a more detailed discussion of the items on the checklist presented today could be provided to TAC members at the next TAC meeting. Kerry Cartwright asked if maps would be included in that description. PBQD replied that there would be enough description to determine the locations of the named resources, but that maps are not included.

Socioeconomics: PBQD indicated that the number of potentially affected minorities and persons with low income was determined by Census tracts. If a Census tract was directly impacted by or immediately adjacent to any of the proposed improvements, it was assumed to be affected, and the minority or low-income population was tabulated. Alternative C would impact the highest number of people in the study area, followed by Alternative D, then Alternative E. Although the total number of people affected varies by alternative, the percentage of minorities affected is almost identical between the alternatives. The percent ranges between 93 to 94 percent. The number of persons below poverty is identical between the alternatives at five percent.

Kerry Cartwright asked for clarification regarding whether tracts that were adjacent to, but not directly impacted by the proposed improvements were counted. PBQD confirmed that these adjacent tracts were included in the count.

Kevin Wilson, City of Vernon, asked if the data in the detailed discussion would be displayed for the freeway and the arterials separately. PBQD indicated that the data is broken down by components to allow the TAC and the OPC the flexibility to assess the components individually.

Utilities: Utilities would be impacted if any of the alternatives disturbed, crossed or require relocation of water, gas, cable, telephone, sewer, or petroleum lines, drainage channels or flood basins. Specific information regarding these utilities is included in the more detailed discussion of the items on the environmental checklist. Alternatives C, D, and E cross both the LADWP and SCE 220kV lines.

Ray Ramirez indicated that the Public Utilities Commission considers freight lines as utilities and asked if the impact analysis applied the same consideration. Specifically, he noted that there are considerable freight facilities near Slauson Avenue. PBQD clarified that the railroad facilities were not considered utilities, but were assessed in the right-of-way and land use impact sections of the analysis.

Kerry Cartwright asked for clarification with regard to how the impacted power utilities would be handled. PBQD responded that they had met with the power utilities (both Southern California Edison [SCE] and Los Angeles Department of Water and Power [LADWP]), to discuss the potential impacts and how they might be addressed. SCE said it was possible to consolidate their lines onto fewer towers within a narrower envelope on their property, thereby freeing an approximately 100-foot (30-meter) wide corridor for other development. On the other hand, LADWP felt that there were no opportunities to consolidate, however, there was potential to underground their facilities. Undergrounding their facilities would be expensive and difficult, but it is technically possible. Additionally, a freeway facility could not be constructed on top of the power lines even if they were placed underground, because LADWP would still need access to the lines for maintenance and repair. Similarly, Caltrans would not want utility facilities placed longitudinally within State right-of-way for the same reason.

D. Question and Answer Period

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

Ray Ramirez asked if capped and/or abandoned oil wells were assessed. He knew of old wells along Washington Boulevard, Sheila Street, and at Chandler Oil Field. PBQD replied that oil well facilities were not specifically evaluated at this environmental screening level of study.

Deborah Chankin, Gateway Cities COG, asked if the noise analysis assumed the presence of noise abatement walls as part of the alternatives. PBQD explained that the evaluation of the degree of impact was based on development of the concepts without noise abatement walls to provide a worst-case assessment. The level of mitigation (e.g., number and location of proposed soundwalls) would be analyzed and determined in subsequent phases of project development (e.g., environmental and preliminary design phases). With noise abatement walls included as environmental mitigation, the noise impacts associated with the proposed alternatives could be reduced, although there would still be potential for noise impacts.

Kerry Cartwright asked if noise abatement walls were included in the cost estimate. PBQD confirmed that there was a line item in the cost estimate for "Environmental Mitigation," valued at five percent of the construction cost, and that, at this level of study, the cost for noise abatement walls was included in that line item.

Maged El-Rabaa asked if the impact on the housing stock in the corridor had been considered, and if the analysis had determined who would need to be relocated. PBQD replied that in the analysis, structures were counted, but that the project is still conceptual. Studies and reports like the Draft Relocation Impact report (DRIR), that account for this level of detailed impact analysis, are conducted in the environmental documentation phase.

Ray Ramirez indicated that in working on the I-5 improvement project development process, the question of disclosure has already come up. He questioned when in the process real estate brokers would have to disclose home and property impacts to future buyers. Again, PBQD replied that at this time the project is too conceptual to accurately describe specific right-of-way impacts (takes) that may not occur for ten years or more. Not until the environmental documentation phase would that level of detail be reliably determinable. The TAC Chair added that the impacts are dependent on which concept is selected and which additional components are ultimately included in the Locally Preferred Strategy.

Minutes
I-710 Technical Advisory Committee
April 2, 2003
Page 9 of 9

Victor Rollinger, City of Carson, asked why Alternative E resulted in the highest noise impact, and if that assessment had anything to do with the elevated portions of the truck facility. PBQD confirmed that the elevated portions of the truck facility did contribute to the high noise impact assessment, and reminded the TAC that with implementation of mitigation (noise abatement walls) the impact would be lessened, but not necessarily eliminated. In addition, the noise abatement walls would need to lower the noise levels by 5dBA in order to be considered acoustically feasible.

The TAC Chair asked if the TAC and OPC would be presented with a tabulation of the impacts and benefits of the Locally Preferred Strategy once one had been recommended. PBQD replied that because many of the benefits and impacts have been assessed per component, the data could be arrayed that way, unless the Locally Preferred Strategy changes substantially from what has already been evaluated.

IX. Adjournment

Following the Question and Answer period, the TAC Chair reminded the attendees that Traffic Impacts and Benefits as well as Air Quality Impacts would be discussed at the next TAC meeting on April 9, 2003 and that the meeting would be held at Progress Park in Paramount at 1:30 p.m. He also reminded the attendees that Assemblymember Alan Lowenthal was sponsoring a Coastal Community Town Hall Meeting on April 3, 2003 at 6:30 to 8:00 p.m. at the Aquarium of the Pacific and that all were invited to attend. Further, the TAC Chair also mentioned that there would be I-710 Open Houses on April 28, 29, and 30, 2003 at three locations in the corridor.

Victor Rollinger asked when the next OPC meeting would be held. The TAC Chair indicated that the next few meetings in April would all be TAC meetings and that the OPC would not meet until May 2003, after the TAC had decided upon a recommended Locally Preferred Strategy.

John Zeigler asked for confirmation of the time of the TAC meeting on April 15, 2003. The TAC Chair replied that the TAC meeting on April 15th would be held at 1:30 p.m. at the Long Beach Energy Department – the same time and place as today's TAC meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Wednesday, April 9, 2003
1:30 p.m. Meeting*

*Paramount Progress Park
15500 Downey Avenue
Paramount, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 201, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

I-710 TAC Agenda

April 9, 2003

Page 2 of 2

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Minutes of the Meeting of March 26, 2003

VII. REPORTS

A. Study Overview (Project Consultant Team)

B. Traffic Impacts and Benefits (Project Consultant Team)

C. Presentation by Dr. John Peters, Co-Director, Children's Environmental Health Center, Keck School of Medicine of USC

D. Air Quality Analysis (Project Consultant Team)

E. Discussion

IX. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 3:30 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A Meeting Held at Progress Park

15500 Downey Avenue

Paramount, CA

April 9, 2003

- I. Chair Pagett called the meeting to order at 1:40 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; Mohammad Mostahkami, South Gate; Kevin Wilson, Vernon; Victor Rollinger, Carson; Maged El-Rabaa, County of Los Angeles; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach; Sue Lai, Port of Los Angeles; Sharas Bangalore, Caltrans; Ernest Morales, MTA; Al Bowser, SCAG; Sandra Balmir, FHWA/FTA; Lt. William Murphy, CHP; Carol Gomez, AQMD.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: None.

OTHERS PRESENT: Bridget Sramek, Assemblyman Alan Lowenthal's office; Helene Ansel, Assemblyman Alan Lowenthal's office; Mike Sanders, Long Beach Mayor Beverly O'Neill's office; Jolene Hayes, Port of Long Beach; Michael DiBernardo, Port of Los Angeles; Sumire Gant, City of Long Beach; Anthony R. Ybarra, City of Bell Gardens; Maged Soliman, Los Angeles County, Department of Public Works; Ken Hatai, Caltrans Traffic Investigations; Linda Taira, Caltrans, Corridor Studies; Joe Brazile, Caltrans; Raymond Maekawa, MTA; Ed Gingras, CHP; Enrique Arroyo, Rivers and Mountains Conservancy; John Zeigler, Auto Club of Southern California; Dr. John Peters, USC Keck School of Medicine; Andrea Hricko, USC Keck School of Medicine; Corina Ulloa, USC Keck School of Medicine; Duane Kenagy, ACET; John Doherty, ACTA; Robert Cabrales, CBE; Agustin Eichwald, CBE; David L. San Jose, private citizen, Coolidge Triangle Association, Long Beach; Roger Holman, Coolidge Triangle Association, Long Beach; Martha Thuerte, private citizen, Long Beach; Linda Ivers, private citizen, Long Beach; Dan Pressburg, private citizen, Long Beach; John G. Miller, MD, private citizen, San Pedro; Regina Taylor, private citizen, Long Beach; Ray Pok, private citizen, Long Beach; Deborah Schoch, Los Angeles Times; Dave Levinsohn, PBQD; Steven Yoshizumi, PBQD; Susan Robbins, PBQD; Joel Soden, PBQD; Doris Chan, PBQD; Julie Rush, PBQD; Andrea Rodriguez, CPG; Lee Ward, Meyer, Mohaddes Associates; Harley Martin, CH2M Hill; Paul Taylor, Kaku Associates; Michael Fischer, Cambridge Systematics; Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities COG; Deborah Chankin, 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.
- IV. There were no amendments to the agenda.
- V. There were no public comments at this time.
- VI. Consent Calendar:

It was moved by Robert Zarrilli, seconded by Joseph Lim, to approve the TAC minutes for March 26, 2003. The motion was approved unanimously.

VII. Reports:

A. Study Overview

Dave Levinsohn of PBQD presented an overview of the TAC meeting schedule to provide the TAC with the evaluation results of the final set of alternatives. At the March 26 meeting the TAC received information regarding the right of way impacts and costs of the alternatives. At the April 2 meeting the TAC received information on the environmental impacts of the final set of alternatives. At this meeting the TAC will receive information on the travel benefits and impacts of the alternatives, as well as information on the impact of the alternatives on diesel particulate emissions. Chairman Pagett commented that the TAC might need to adjust the schedule of future meetings because of the volume of materials received.

B. Traffic Impacts and Benefits

Michael Fischer, Cambridge Systematics, presented results of the traffic impacts and benefits analysis. The first indicator for which he presented results was volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratios, an indicator of congestion. V/C was calculated using passenger car equivalency (PCE) factors that attribute higher volume impacts to trucks relative to autos based on the size and operational characteristics of the vehicles. Data were presented that compared each of the alternatives by direction for major segments of the corridor during the PM peak period. The presentation focused first on mainline 710 V/C characteristics. While the results vary by location in the corridor, Alternative D generally had the lowest V/C ratios of all the alternatives. This is primarily because it adds the most capacity relative to demand. Alternative E also reduced V/C ratios on the mainline considerably, due to the diversion of trucks from the mainline to the truck-only lanes. However, the relative improvement in mainline conditions in Alternative E as compared to Alternative C was less than the relative improvement in Alternative D as compared to all other alternatives.

Mr. Fischer next presented information about the utilization of the new facilities that were added in several alternatives (truck by-pass lanes in Alternative C, HOV lanes in Alternative D, and truck-only lanes in Alternative E). Data were again presented by direction for the PM peak period. The truck lanes have the highest projected utilization of all of the new facilities, with V/C ratios above 0.8 throughout most of the corridor. Truck by-pass lanes also have high utilization relative to capacity, with V/C ratios slightly above 0.6. HOV utilization is expected to be relatively low throughout the corridor, with V/C ratios in the middle of the corridor only slightly above 0.3.

Mr. Fischer also presented data on projected mainline speeds based on the model output. These data show similar trends to the V/C ratios as speeds are a function of V/C. Mainline speeds for the no-build condition in the PM Peak period are projected to average between 30 and 45 mph for most of the corridor with many segments below 35 mph. Alternative D gives the greatest improvement in travel times with many segments achieving speeds above 50 mph. The results for Alternative E and Alternative C are similar to results reported for the V/C ratios, with most segments achieving speeds of between 40 and 50 mph. It was noted that the improvement of travel times on the mainline for Alternative E will have implications for tolling because trucks may not realize significant enough savings as compared to the mainlines to make paying tolls very attractive (given the option to use either the mixed flow lanes or the truck lanes).

Mr. Fischer showed the percentage of trucks using the truck by-pass lanes in Alternative C and the truck lanes in Alternative E. Truck lane utilization rates were very high, generally between 60 and 80 percent. Truck by-pass lane utilization was somewhat lower due to the fact that only trucks that are moving through an interchange are candidates for using these lanes. Michael also noted that in some segments, truck lane utilization in Alternative E may be dropping because the truck lanes are operating close to V/C of 1 and the travel savings benefits relative to the mainlines may be narrowing.

Paul Taylor of Kaku Assoc. described traffic volume changes from the No Build alternative due to (1) extending the Terminal Island Freeway to I-710/I-405 in Alternative C and (2) connecting the Terminal Island Freeway to Alameda Street and the proposed Alameda Truckway in Alternative D. Kerry Cartwright asked for data to be presented at the next meeting comparing volumes on Alameda Street north of the proposed connector in Alternative D. Victor Rollinger asked for data to be presented at the next TAC meeting showing the volume changes due to the I-710 Truckway in Alternative E.

Mr. Taylor also described traffic forecasts for the proposed Slauson Avenue interchange and volume changes at the Atlantic/Bandini and Florence interchanges due to adding an interchange at Slauson. He said he would have more details regarding arterial volume changes at the next TAC meeting.

Michael Fischer then showed changes in truck average daily traffic (ADT) on the I-710 mainlines for each of the alternatives. The benefits of truck by-pass lanes and truck lanes as a way of separating trucks and autos were clearly evident in this data with significant decreases in truck ADT on the mainlines for these alternatives.

Mr. Fischer next presented data on the changes in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and delay. As expected, VMT increases dramatically on the 710 facilities (including HOV lanes, truck by-pass lanes, and truck lanes) as compared to the no-build condition for any of the alternatives that add capacity, with Alternatives D and E having the greatest increases in VMT. For the study area as a whole (the area bounded by I-110, I-605, SR-60, and the ports), VMT increases were less pronounced but still significant for Alternatives D and E indicating that some traffic is diverting onto study area facilities due to the improved traffic conditions. Alternatives D and E produced the greatest reductions in overall delay (measured both in terms of vehicle hours traveled and person hours traveled). Overall delay reductions were not substantially different for all of the build alternatives at the study area level, with Alternative D having the greatest benefits. For the 710 facilities, Alternatives D and E had greater benefits than Alternative C.

Based on these results, Mr. Fischer presented the following conclusions:

- Alternative D provides the greatest congestion benefits for the 710 mainlines because it adds the most capacity. However, some of this capacity, the HOV lanes, is poorly utilized. If this capacity were eliminated, Alternative E would look much better by comparison.
- Alternative E provides the greatest mobility benefits for trucks. The truck lane performance is better than the mixed flow performance in Alternative D.
- While Alternative E does provide significant mobility benefits, truck utilization pushes V/C ratios high enough that there are slight congestion impacts during peak periods (speeds are reduced below free flow conditions).
- Alternative E shows very high utilization of the truck lanes. Truck by-pass lanes also have high utilization, although not as high as truck lanes. They also have the unintended impact of increasing truck volumes on the mainline in the immediate vicinity of the truck lanes as compared to the no-build condition.
- All of the build alternatives reduce delay substantially despite increased VMT.

Mr. Fischer next presented results of the safety analysis. The following conclusions with respect to safety are relevant:

- Incident management introduced with the ITS options in the TSM alternative (Alternative B) has significant safety benefits.

- The build alternatives produce safety benefits in part by shifting traffic from the arterials to the freeway, where accident rates are lower.
- Alternative D shows the greatest reduction in fatality accidents (although the difference is small) but these shift to less severe accident types.
- Alternative E evaluation does not account for the safety benefits of separating trucks and autos as no data are available. This benefit is expected to be significant.

Victor Rollinger pointed out that the safety analysis probably under represented the safety benefits of separating trucks and autos as is accomplished in Alternative E. Mr. Fischer agreed with that assessment. Mr. Rollinger suggested that the study team acquire accident rate data, if available, from the separate truck lanes on I-5 in San Diego County. He also requested that when the OPC is briefed on safety benefits, that the consultant team point out that the analysis methodology under represents the safety benefits of those alternative features that separate trucks and cars.

Mr. Fischer concluded his presentation with results from the reliability analysis. Reliability is measured as changes in non-recurrent (incident-related) delay. The following conclusions were presented:

- Alternative B shows significant reliability benefits due to the benefits of incident management in reducing incident duration.
- Alternative D has the greatest reliability improvements. This is due to the addition of lanes, which reduces the impact of incidents, and the reduction in overall congestion making it easier to clear incidents faster.
- The reliability benefits of Alternative E are underestimated because they do not take into account the safety benefits of separating trucks and autos. However, there is a reduction in the potential benefits associated with reduced congestion because a two-lane facility (the truck lanes) is less reliable than a three or four lane facility.

C. Presentation by Dr. John Peters, Co-Director, Children's Environmental Health Center, Keck School of Medicine of USC

Dr. Peters began by distributing copies of his PowerPoint slides to the members of the TAC. The presentation was entitled "Health Impacts of Freeway Expansion". Dr. Peters pointed out that vehicle exhaust contains lots of particles and gases, these particles are very small, as small as PM 0.1, which is 0.1 μm . In 1998, California designated diesel exhaust as a toxic air contaminant, based on studies showing increased cancer risk among railroad workers and truck drivers.

Dr. Peters pointed out that forecasts indicate that the number of trucks on I-710 will almost triple over the next 17 years, and that increasing the number of trucks on I-710 will create local and regional air pollution. He presented data that shows that there is a high concentration of black carbon within 100 meters of I-710, and that I-710 has higher concentrations of black carbon (a marker of all components of diesel exhaust) than I-405 at equal distances, presumably due to the greater truck volumes on I-710.

Dr. Peters referred to the SCAQMD MATES II Study, which looked at the risk for cancer causing chemicals in the air. That study identified diesel exhaust as the most important cancer causing constituent in the air, and the study predicted the greatest risk of cancer along those freeways with the most truck traffic. The health effects of exposure to diesel exhaust include more lung cancer, worsened asthma, and other respiratory effects. He presented data that suggests that living within 300 meters of major roadways adversely affect lung function and increases asthma risk. Dr. Peters also referred to a children's health study which analyzed the health of 6,000 children in 12 California communities in six different counties. The study concluded that lung growth in children is lower in those communities near heavily traveled freeways than in those without them. Data also showed negative effects on children who spent more time outdoors in the vicinity of freeways with higher truck volumes, even if that outdoor activity was exercise.

Additional data presented by Dr. Peters indicates that higher concentrations of ozone are associated with an 83% increase in acute respiratory disease sufficient to cause school absences among children.

In summary, Dr. Peters urged the TAC to consider local and regional health impacts in planning for improvements to I-710, as adding pollution to an already polluted air basin is a really bad idea and the plans for I-710 must make certain that air pollution is not increased and that public health is protected.

At the conclusion of Dr. Peters' presentation, Dr. John Miller, a member of the public, requested the opportunity to address the TAC. Chairman Pagett granted Dr. Miller time to address the TAC. Dr. Miller said he is an emergency room physician but also has a personal and professional interest in children's health. He is concerned because of studies he cited from the medical research literature which links illnesses in children to air pollution, particularly mobile source pollution. Dr. Miller urged the TAC to consider the health effects of I-710 improvement plans on the surrounding communities and their children.

D. Air Quality Analysis

Joel Soden of PBQD presented preliminary findings of the forecast of the effects of the Final Set of I-710 alternatives on diesel particulate matter concentrations. Mr. Soden stated that the analysis focused on diesel particulate matter (DPM), which is part of the

exhaust emissions of heavy-duty trucks. The analysis focuses on particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀), and is measured in micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$). It is a local, rather than regional air quality impact and is estimated as a line source (highway) rather than a point source (e.g. power plant). The challenges in performing this analysis are that there is no approved EPA methodology to quantify diesel particulate concentrations, that the physical science of this is still speculative, and that the methods to quantify diesel particulates for transportation projects are still evolving.

Mr. Soden said that the analysis used existing, approved models for line source evaluation of PM₁₀ in order to compare the I-710 alternatives, focusing on the key variables that increase or decrease diesel particulate concentrations. The analysis focused on year 2025, utilizing EMFAC 2002, v2.2 emission factors, CAL3QHCR mobile dispersion program and actual worst case meteorological conditions from the Los Angeles region. The future traffic forecasts came from the I-710 sub-area model developed for the study by Kaku Assoc., which forecasts traffic by vehicle type, including three classes of trucks by four time periods: am peak, midday, pm peak and night time. DPM model inputs include roadway geometry, truck volumes, emission rates and meteorology. Mr. Soden presented a graph which shows that DPM emission rates are forecast to decline significantly by 2025 compared to today's rates, as federal diesel emissions standards are implemented along with new mandates on low sulfur fuel and as older trucks are replaced with newer trucks over time.

Mr. Soden also showed a graph which indicates that DPM emissions in grams/mile decline as vehicle speed increases.

The forecasts of DPM concentrations were performed for two locations along the I-710 Corridor: between Willow St. and I-405 in Long Beach and between Alondra Blvd. and Rosecrans Ave., both on the southbound side of the I-710. These locations were selected because of the higher forecast truck volumes at those locations, residences close to I-710 at those locations, and to capture the design differences among the alternatives. Mr. Soden presented two charts which displayed the analysis results at those locations. The charts displayed DPM concentrations for each I-710 alternative at increasing distances from the centerline of I-710. At the Willow/405 location, the analysis predicts that alternatives C and D would generate lower DPM concentrations than the no build alternative (A) and that Alternative E would produce higher concentrations. (Checking of these results subsequent to this presentation found errors in the analysis of Alternative E, which were corrected and these revised results were presented at the 4/15/03 TAC meeting. See minutes of that meeting for the corrected results). The results for the Alondra/Rosecrans location predict that all of the improvement alternatives (B-E) will generally reduce DPM concentrations compared to the No Build (A).

The lessons learned from this DPM analysis include:

- Higher speeds reduce DPM emissions
- Trucks in lanes close to sensitive uses increases DPM concentrations
- Elevated lanes are better than at-grade lanes due to increased DPM dispersion
- Higher truck volumes generate higher DPM emissions

Mr. Soden concluded by stating that the analysis shows the relative difference among alternatives for DPM concentrations, informs the facility design process, and that the next phase of I-710 study (EIS/EIR) will involve additional analysis of DPM.

Doctors Peters and Miller questioned the assertion in Mr. Soden's comment that the current state-of-the-art on DPM is still speculative and evolving, given the many health studies that they had cited in their previous presentations. Mr. Soden responded by discussing USEPA current position on DPM and the potential health effects of transportation projects.

Al Bowser said that the position taken by the doctors (i.e., that DPM is very harmful to human health) and the results of the air quality analysis (i.e., that the design of the roadway affects localized pollutant concentrations) are not mutually exclusive.

There were several questions regarding the change in emission factors with future analysis years. In response, Mr. Soden explained the variable and assumptions that USEPA and CARB incorporated into their emission factor algorithms. He also discussed the increased emission controls on diesel engines that are mandated and how they are incorporated into the results.

Several speakers were concerned that traffic projections show large increases in traffic along the I-710 corridor by the 2025 analysis year. Mr. Soden stated that emissions caused by these increases would be offset to some extent by lower emission factors from both future emission controls and increases in vehicular speeds.

E. Discussion

Chairman Pagett requested that the proposed TAC meeting schedule for future meetings be adjusted. He said that he feels that the TAC has been given a substantial amount of information on the evaluation of alternatives over the past three meetings and that they need additional time to digest the information and ask questions of the consultant team. He suggested that at the 4/15/03 meeting that the TAC members be prepared to ask questions of the consultant team regarding right of way impacts and design features of the alternatives. He also requested an update for the TAC of the public outreach effort. Dave Levinsohn indicated that the proposed revision in schedule would be fine with the consultant team. He also reminded the Chair that the consultants have two more items to present to the TAC at the April 15 meeting: an analysis of tolling the truck lanes in Alternative E and the presentation of regional air quality impacts of the alternatives.

IX. Adjournment

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

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 4:40 p.m.

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.

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Tuesday, April 15, 2003
1:30 p.m. Meeting*

*Long Beach Energy Department
2400 East Spring Street
Long Beach, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 201, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

I-710 TAC Agenda

April 15, 2003

Page 2 of 2

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Minutes of the Meetings of April 2, and April 9, 2003

VII. REPORTS

A. Study Overview

B. Report on Economics (Cambridge Systematics)

C. Report on Regional Air Quality Impacts (Parsons Brinckerhoff)

D. Additional Evaluation of Alternatives

E. Questions and Answers/Discussion

IX. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 3:30 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Thursday, May 1, 2003
1:30 p.m. Meeting*

*Paramount Progress Park
15500 Downey Avenue
Paramount, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 201, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

I-710 TAC Agenda

May 1, 2003

Page 2 of 2

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Minutes of the Meetings of April 2, April 9, and April 15, 2003

VII. REPORTS

- A. Preliminary Report on Recent Outreach Activities
- B. Consultant Team Responses to Previous TAC Questions
- C. Continued Discussion on Alternatives
- D. Discussion of Future TAC Meetings and Agendas

IX. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 3:30 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
A Meeting Held at Progress Park
15500 Downey Avenue
Paramount, CA
May 1, 2003**

I. Call to Order

Chairman Pagett called the meeting to order at 1:45 p.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair William Pagett, Bell Gardens, Maywood, Paramount; Anthony La, Downey; Luis Ramirez, 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; Sharas Bangalore, Caltrans; Lt. William Murphy, CHP; Sandra Balmir, FHWA/FTA; Ernest Morales, MTA; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach; Kanya Dorland, Port of Los Angeles; Al Bowser, SCAG; Carol Gomez, SCAQMD.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: None.

OTHERS PRESENT: Samara Ashley, Senator Betty Karnette's office; Jeannine Critie, Vice Mayor Frank Colonna's office, Long Beach; Leana Marshall, Councilmember Val Lerch's office, Long Beach; Sara Skinner, Councilmember Tonia Reyes-Uranga's office, Long Beach; Patrick Burkhardt, Councilmember Bonnie Lowenthal's office, Long Beach; Raymond Maekawa, MTA; Anthony R. Ybarra, City of Bell Gardens; Sumire Gant, City of Long Beach; Deborah Chankin, City of Long Beach; Mohammad Mostahkami, City of South Gate; Jolene Hayes, Port of Long Beach; Sue Lai, Port of Los Angeles; Pat Smith, Los Angeles County DPW; Cathie Chavez, San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy; Richard Powers, Gateway Cities COG; Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities COG; Julie Masters, NRDC; Malcolm Carson, Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles; Roger Holman, Coolidge Triangle Homeowners Association, Long Beach; David San Jose, Coolidge Triangle Homeowners Association and Future Generations Youth Center, Long Beach; Noel Park, San Pedro and Peninsula Homeowners Coalition; Art Krugler, resident of Whittier; David Levinsohn, PBQD; Steven Yoshizumi, PBQD; Doris Chan, PBQD; Julie Rush, PBQD; Josh Gertler, Consensus Planning Group; Julia Brown, CPG; Jacki Bacarach, Jacki Bacarach and Associates; Lee Ward, Meyer, Mohaddes Associates.

II. Roll Call

Roll was taken through self-introductions and a sign-in sheet was circulated.

III. Pledge of Allegiance

Bill Pagett, TAC Chair, led the pledge of allegiance.

IV. Amendments to the Agenda

There were no amendments to the agenda.

V. Public Comments

Comments were made by the following individuals/agencies:

Noel Park, President of the San Pedro and Peninsula Homeowners Coalition, spoke as a nearby resident and daily commuter on I-710 (he has a business in Bellflower). He has attended a number of I-710 public meetings, and has spoken out about air quality issues. His organization had supported a maximum build out alternative on I-710. However, they now see this study as facilitating port expansion. Because of the presumed air quality impacts that his neighborhood would experience from expansion of port activity, they now support Alternative A, the No Build alternative. His organization would rather deal with the traffic impacts related to the No Build alternative than the air quality impacts related to port expansion facilitated by the build alternatives. Mr. Park quoted a report provided to the Port Community Advisory Committee that forecast that the volume of cargo coming into the Port of Los Angeles would grow from 10 million twenty-foot equivalent units (TEUs) in 2000 to 47 million TEUs by 2020. He said that he and the San Pedro and Peninsula Homeowners Coalition are willing to work with the stakeholders in this corridor to find a safe and environmentally just solution to the problems on I-710. Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach, responded that the 20-year forecasts prepared by the Port five years ago indicate projections of 24 to 36 million TEUs. But Mr. Park stated that as a member of the Traffic Subcommittee of the Port of Los Angeles Community Advisory Committee, he had been provided a report developed by Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc. that indicated that the 2020 projections were for 47 million TEUs.

Julie Masters, Natural Resources Defense Council, submitted extensive written comments and stated that over 15 community groups agree that the public outreach on this study has been inadequate, that the wording of the outreach materials has been misleading, and that not enough of the outreach materials were translated into Spanish. She said that she also feels that the Preliminary Environmental Assessment Report is insufficient under CEQA and NEPA and that it ratifies the alternatives that have already been selected. Additionally, she said that she feels that the air quality and diesel particulate analysis is insufficient and that it does not address asthma, and that the process is fatally flawed because it assumes that I-710 must be widened. She urged the TAC to suspend the process until:

- A full environmental review of the project's impacts is prepared;
- Alternatives that are health protective are developed and studied;
- Input from affected communities is solicited and considered

David San Jose, Coolidge Triangle Homeowners Association in Long Beach, stated that he felt that the proposals would not enrich the lives of the city's youth. He also questioned how much good would be accomplished by constructing two additional lanes in each direction when truck traffic is expected to triple and car traffic could double. He also stated that the Port is like a cancer and that Long Beach has sacrificed the City for the Port.

Art Krugler, resident of Whittier and licensed mechanical engineer, said that he has been in Southern California since 1956 and has been using the freeways since 1966. He has recently become aware of the study and thinks that it is doing some good work. He said that when he looks at this corridor and all of the issues surrounding it, he sees four pictures:

- Adding four lanes (two in each direction) will be insufficient, that it won't keep pace with the growth.
- The Los Angeles County Flood Control District is trying to reduce water pollution in the Los Angeles River and is considering means to reduce the outflow, but is looking for funding.
- He knows that the Los Angeles River Conservancy is also looking for funding to convert sections of the river into parks and education centers.
- The County needs money.

To set the context of his comments, Mr. Krugler explained that he is a licensed mechanical, chemical, environmental and construction engineer, and that he designed the Long Beach Power Plant that increased output with no additional pollution. He realizes that you cannot put a freeway in the river, but that the Los Angeles River is really just the 28-foot wide, one-foot deep channel in the middle of a very wide concrete flood plain. He stated that you could build ten lanes on the concrete within the flood plain adjacent to the channel.

Malcolm Carson, Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles, stated that he had received calls from people in East Los Angeles and Pico Rivera about the study. He echoed the comments from the NRDC, and stressed the need for more analysis, to open up the process and have meaningful public input. He agreed with NRDC that Port growth should not be assumed, and that the job market has moved from manufacturing to service (that manufacturing jobs are being exported overseas) which has an impact on low income populations. He summarized by saying that the study should be slowed, that there needs to be more study of the impacts, and that the process needs to be opened up.

VI. Consent Calendar

It was moved by Member El-Rabaa, seconded by Member Bowser, to approve the minutes of the meetings of April 2, April 9, and April 15, 2003. The motion was approved unanimously.

VII. Reports

A. Preliminary Report on Recent Outreach Activities

Josh Gertler, Consensus Planning Group (CPG), introduced himself and explained that he was standing in for Sylvia Novoa, who was out on medical leave.

He reminded the TAC of the public outreach topics that had been discussed at the previous TAC meeting:

- The goal of the community outreach program
- Who had been contacted about the I-710 study
- The various outreach methods that had been used to make the community feel comfortable with the process
- Language and cultural sensitivity
- The triggers for community meetings
- The Purpose and Need Statement
- That the Initial Set of 12 alternatives had been discussed with the public
- That there was now a Final Set of 5 alternatives that had been discussed with the public
- Impacts of the five alternatives
- Next phase of outreach meetings
- Impacted Community meetings
- Open Houses

Mr. Gertler summarized what was heard from stakeholders (the public) who attended the Impacted Community Meetings held thus far, and the Open Houses.

To date, there have been three Impacted Community Meetings in Commerce:

- April 22 – Rosewood Park
- April 23 – Bandini Park
- April 24 – Bristow Park

Invitations for all three meetings were sent in English and Spanish to a total of 12,896 people:

- 4,800 addresses received from City of Commerce (every single resident and business)
- 3,000 addresses from Supervisor Gloria Molina's office
- 5,096 address list purchased from mail house targeting East Los Angeles

Minutes

I-710 Technical Advisory Committee

May 1, 2003

Page 5 of 14

A total of 352 residents signed-in at the Commerce Impacted Community meetings.

- Rosewood Park – 86 people (speaker/comment cards – 34)
- Bandini Park – 145 people (speaker/comment cards – 54)
- Bristow Park – 121 people (speaker/comment cards – 62)

A total of 20 Comment Sheets were received from all three meetings.

The following were topics that were raised by the public attendees at these meetings:

- Concern and anxiety about property takes
- Equitable financial compensation
- Desire to stay in the community they love
- Concerns regarding possible park takings
- Confusion with project timeline and process; many people thought their homes would be taken immediately
- Health concerns related to increased truck traffic (including increased cancer risks)
- Frustration regarding notification of project impacts (and the outreach efforts in their community)
- Frustration with existing rail yards
- Frustration with increased port/truck traffic
- Commerce feels that they would bear the majority of the impacts from this project with regards to land takings
- Commerce would lose land to both the I-710 and the I-5 freeway projects; it's already a small community; it's a "model city" and everyone wants to live here
- Anecdote: One woman approached Sylvia and she was angry and relieved – she was angry, scared and fearful because the notice that was sent to her led her to believe that her home would be taken; she was relieved to find that she wouldn't be impacted at all.

In summary, the attendees of the Commerce Impact Community Meetings felt that the I-710 improvements would not be worth the impacts, and that they would either oppose the project altogether or support Alternative A, the No Build alternative.

Other Impacted Community Meetings are (or will be) scheduled in Long Beach, Bell Gardens and East Los Angeles.

The schedule of meetings in Long Beach includes:

- Wednesday, May 7, 2003 – Houghton Park Activity Room
- Monday, May 12, 2003 – Silverado Park Social Hall
- Wednesday, May 21, 2003 – Drake Park Social Hall

Each meeting begins at 7 p.m.

Invitations for all three meetings were sent in English and Spanish to a total of 44,791 people:

- 14,340 addresses received from City of Long Beach (an area bounded by the city boundary on the south and west; Del Amo Boulevard on the north; and Long Beach Boulevard, Wardlow Road, and Magnolia Avenue on the east)
- 30,000 address list purchased from mail house targeting the North Long Beach zip code 90805 (roughly corresponding to Council District 9)
- 451 addresses in the study database created and maintained by CPG, including elected officials, businesses, community and environmental groups and anyone who has ever attending a meeting, submitted a comment or contacted the team for any reason

The meeting in Bell Gardens has not been scheduled yet. The Study Team is working with City staff to coordinate a date and venue. City staff is also helping the Study Team compile the mailing list for the appropriate impacted communities.

The East Los Angeles Impacted Community meeting is also still being coordinated. It is tentatively scheduled for May 15th; and the venue is still pending. Approximately 32,000 invitations will be sent, comprised of the complete list from Supervisor Gloria Molina (25,470 addresses), and the East Los Angeles portion of the list purchased from a mail house targeting those living within ¼ mile of I-710 (approximately 8,000).

During the week of April 28th, there were three Open House Meetings throughout the corridor:

- April 28 – Long Beach
- April 29 – Bell Gardens
- April 30 – East Los Angeles

Invitations for all three meetings were sent in English and Spanish (and Khmer in Long Beach) to a total of 61,020 people:

- 4,800 addresses received from City of Commerce
- 25,470 addresses from Supervisor Gloria Molina's office
- 21,012 addresses purchased from a mail house targeting those living within ¼ mile of I-710, on both sides, in East Los Angeles, Bell Gardens, Long Beach and the Terminal Island Freeway
- 836 addresses purchased from a mail house targeting those living within ¼ mile of the 710 freeway, on both sides, in Carson
- 7,398 addresses purchased from a mail house targeting those living within ¼ mile of the 710 freeway, on both sides, in Compton, South Gate and Lynwood
- 1,504 addresses in the study database created and maintained by CPG, including elected officials, businesses, community and environmental groups and anyone who has ever attending a meeting, submitted a comment or contacted the team for any reason

The three meetings were well attended.

- Long Beach – 406 attended; 85 comments received
- Bell Gardens – 262 attended; 59 comments received
- East Los Angeles – 117 attended; 17 comments received

Similar to the Commerce Impacted Communities Meetings, there were certain themes to the input that came from the public:

- Residents support Alternatives A and B because there are no (or minor) right-of-way takes.
- There are too many trucks on the road.
- Trucks and drivers are the problem, not the freeway.
- People do not support the build alternatives because of the impacts to the area.
- Lots of community members expressed support for separating cars and trucks.

After distilling all of the input received over the last few weeks, and in summary, Mr. Gertler said that the following are the main ideas expressed by the public:

- There continues to be confusion regarding the project timeline.
- There continues to be confusion as to the fact that we are at a conceptual stage that is planning a long-range vision.
- The community is not clear about the respective roles played by the OPC and the TAC and the decision-making process.
- There is a great deal of distrust about exactly when the impacts became known.
- Media reports regarding this project have caused a premature panic regarding the five alternatives.
- Confusion exists regarding goal of this project – improving mobility and safety, not facilitating port growth.

Maged El-Rabaa, County of Los Angeles DPW, requested that the format and mailing list for the East Los Angeles Impacted Community Meeting be approved by Supervisor Molina's office. He also asked if the TAC members had been advised of all of the Impacted Community Meetings. Bill Pagett, TAC Chair, said they had not, but that TAC members could be e-mailed a notice of future meetings.

Ernest Morales, MTA, suggested that the public input could be summarized in four guiding principles:

- Minimize right-of-way impacts
- Minimize pollution and environmental impacts
- Improve safety
- Relieve congestion

Al Bowser, SCAG, commented that the TAC should review these principles with their staff and discuss them with their OPC members, and return at the next TAC meeting

ready to take a position on how to proceed relative to these principles. It was moved by Member Farhadi, seconded by Member Wilson, to agendaize the guiding principles suggested by Member Morales for the next meeting of the TAC. The motion was approved unanimously.

B. Consultant Team Responses to Previous TAC Questions

Steven Yoshizumi, PBQD, provided responses to three technical questions raised by the TAC at previous meetings:

- Demand for SR-91/I-710 Truck Ramps
- Impact on I-110 Truck Traffic
- Right-of-Way Impact Estimates for Modified Truckway Alignment

Mr. Yoshizumi reported that truck volumes are highest on the northbound I-710 to eastbound SR-91 (and reverse) movements, and second highest on the eastbound SR-91 to northbound I-710 (and reverse) movements. The other connectors were forecasted to serve a demand of between 130 and 250 trucks (converted from PCEs) in the peak periods. Kerry Cartwright, POLB, asked that the study team provide a recommendation to the TAC on which ramps should be implemented based on the data presented. Deborah Chankin, City of Long Beach, asked if FHWA has any rules regarding providing fully directional truck ramp connections that would require implementing all of the truck ramps regardless of the demand. Mr. Yoshizumi replied that the preliminary discussions that the study team has had with FHWA geometric reviewers (and the reviewers' subsequent research with staff in California and Washington, D.C.) indicate that there would be no problem with implementing only some of the truck ramps.

Next, Mr. Yoshizumi reported the truck demand (in PCEs) on I-110 between Sepulveda Boulevard and Pacific Coast Highway for Alternatives A, C, D, and E. In Alternative A, daily truck volumes are forecast to be approximately 73,000 PCEs in 2025. Alternative C daily truck volumes are forecast to be approximately 60,000 PCEs in 2025. Alternative D daily truck volumes are forecast to be approximately 62,000 PCEs in 2025. And Alternative E daily truck volumes are forecast to be approximately 65,000 PCEs in 2025. Alternative C seemed to have the greatest impact on truck demand on I-110, probably due to the extension of the Terminal Island Freeway.

Bill Pagett, TAC Chair, asked what truck demand on I-110 would be like if Alternative C did not include the Terminal Island Freeway extension. Mr. Yoshizumi responded that, based on the data (since all three of the build alternatives have some truck facility drawing trucks off of I-710 and I-110), in a scenario similar to Alternative C without the Terminal Island Freeway extension, truck demand on I-110 would likely be similar to Alternative A, No Build. Victor Rollinger, City of Carson, asked what the alternatives do to truck demand on Alameda Street. Mr. Yoshizumi responded that, based on the data provided at the April 15, 2003 TAC meeting, only Alternative D (which includes the

Alameda Truckway Connector) is forecast to result in a significant change in truck demand on Alameda Street, jumping from 33,000 PCEs per day under Alternative A to 71,000 in Alternative D. Mr. Rollinger said that those numbers don't consider the indirect impacts caused by increased truck traffic on Alameda Street, e.g., air quality, and noise.

Mr. Yoshizumi then reported that the study team had been asked to assess the right-of-way impacts in Bell Gardens and a few other adjacent cities if the exclusive Truckway in Alternative E was aligned in the median of I-710 instead of on the east side of I-710. He reported that there would be a very significant change in Bell Gardens (dropping from 35.1 acres to 4.0 acres), a measurable change in Commerce and South Gate (dropping from 32.9 acres to 19.2 acres and 30.6 acres to 12.2 acres, respectively), and a negligible change in Bell (changing from 26.5 acres to 24.0 acres). This data was based on a cursory analysis extending from Rio Hondo to north of Slauson Avenue.

Chairman Pagett asked if the analysis assumed vertical walls instead of slopes. Mr. Yoshizumi said it did. Mr. Pagett then asked if the analysis assumed realigning the centerline of the freeway toward the DWP property. Mr. Yoshizumi said that all analyses assumed concentric widening. Maged El-Rabaa, County of Los Angeles, asked if this analysis presumed modifications to any other components. Mr. Yoshizumi replied that it did not, that it was only an analysis of the exclusive Truckway alignment in a segment of the corridor. Kevin Wilson, City of Vernon, asked if this analysis accounted for full acquisition or partial acquisition of properties. Mr. Yoshizumi clarified that all right-of-way acreage impact analyses have accounted for only the land that would be necessary for the ultimate improvements and that land in excess of the ultimate state right-of-way that would have to be acquired is assumed to be repackaged and sold. The acreages and the cost estimates assume only the impact to and cost of the ultimate state right-of-way. The parcel counts and structure counts provided in the discussion for the environmental checklist were "actual" and accounted for all directly impacted parcels and structures.

Kerry Cartwright, POLB, asked that the study team provide data for the intersection of Ocean Boulevard and the Terminal Island Freeway to see the impacts of the various alternatives. Mr. Yoshizumi indicated that the requested data would be provided at a future TAC meeting.

Member Comstock, South Gate, left the meeting at 2:50 p.m.

C. Continued Discussion on Alternatives

Ray Maekawa, MTA, asked that each jurisdiction identify which components they are in favor of and which they find unacceptable. Chairman Pagett suggested starting at the south end and focusing all comments on the mainline alternatives.

Lon Maddox, City of Long Beach, said that the City generally supports the project, but that property and environmental impacts should be minimized. He then read a letter from Mayor Beverly O'Neill and Acting City Manager Gerald Miller to Acting Director of Public Works Christine Shippey outlining the City's general position.

Joe Lim, City of Compton, said that until his City Council or City Manager provided direction, the City of Compton would have no comment.

Victor Rollinger, City of Carson, indicated that Carson was not ready to take position on the mainline concepts because they had joined the TAC and OPC only recently. Generally speaking, the City would favor alignments that moved widening or elevated structures to the east, away from private property to avoid reducing the privacy of residents of the Dominguez tract. Mr. Rollinger indicated that the City's OPC member would elaborate on the City's position more at a later date.

Yadi Farhadi, City of Lynwood, asked what the Alameda Corridor has done to offset the growth in truck demand on I-710. He thought it was supposed to remove trucks from I-710. Kerry Cartwright, POLB, said that there is a misperception that the Alameda Corridor was going to remove trucks from I-710. The Alameda Corridor will really only offset some of the expected growth in truck demand on I-710. Mr. Farhadi said that Lynwood is opposed to Alternative E and that they would like to see additional study of Alternatives C and D.

The City of South Gate had no representative at the meeting at the time of this discussion.

Bill Pagett, City of Paramount, said that there are no proposed right-of-way impacts in Paramount. From a visual impact perspective Paramount may have concerns with the elevated alternatives.

Anthony La, City of Downey, stated that there are no right-of-way acquisitions within the City, and that the City generally favored the operational concepts in Alternatives C and E because they took traffic off local streets and put it on the freeways. However, the City does have concerns about privacy issues related to elevated lanes.

Luis Ramirez, Cities of Bell and Cudahy, said that his cities had no specific concerns about right-of-way impacts at this time. The City of Bell supports the Slauson Avenue interchange, but has no preference with regard to the mainline concept.

Patrick Fu, City of Huntington Park, said that since the City is the farthest away from I-710, it has no specific concerns about right-of-way impacts at this time. Huntington Park also supports the Slauson Avenue interchange, but has no preference with regard to the mainline concept.

Bill Pagett, City of Bell Gardens, said that Bell Gardens experiences significant right-of-way impacts from all three mainline concepts. Alternative E with the revisions discussed earlier in this TAC meeting reduces the impacts, but there would still be residential acquisitions. The elevated alternatives tend to reduce right-of-way acquisitions, but could result in noise, air quality, visual, and privacy impacts. Mr. Pagett asked that vertical walls be used wherever possible to reduce right-of-way impacts. He said that the City supports the Slauson Avenue interchange, and supports a diamond configuration at Florence Avenue.

Bob Zarrilli, City of Commerce, stated that the City Council had not taken any formal action as of this meeting, but that the issue was on the May 6, 2003 agenda and that the Council might voice opposition to components that require residential, commercial/industrial, and/or park acquisitions. It is possible that the Council would favor Alternative A, although there may be some elements of the other alternatives that could be included if they did not require right-of-way acquisition.

Kevin Wilson, City of Vernon, said that they City is sympathetic to the right-of-way impacts of the neighboring cities. He indicated that the City prefers the collector-distributor road system between Atlantic Boulevard and I-5 over the truck bypass lanes. The City also favors direct truck ramp connections into the two rail yards, and the Slauson Avenue interchange (diamond configuration). Mr. Wilson said that the City of Vernon would like to see a revised I-5/I-710 interchange with direct connectors for the missing moves (as in Alternative D), but is aware of the impacts on Commerce. He also said that the City is in favor of an additional general purpose lane and one additional HOV lane in each direction along with some of the truck-specific components of Alternative C.

Bob Zarrilli, City of Commerce, added that the city staff is generally in favor of the Slauson Avenue interchange and direct truck ramps into the two rail yards, but he again clarified that the City Council had not taken any action on any of the components as of this TAC meeting.

Maged El-Rabaa, County of Los Angeles, said that the County is opposed to right-of-way impacts and generally favors Alternative A. He said that the County is unsure if Alternative B provides enough benefit to justify the cost. Mr. El-Rabaa also said that the concepts for the I-5/I-710 interchange should be reviewed because they result in significant impacts in Los Angeles County without providing any obvious benefits.

Bill Pagett, City of Maywood, said that the City had no specific concerns about right-of-way impacts at this time. The City supports the Slauson Avenue interchange, but has no preference with regard to the mainline concept.

Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach, expressed that the Port felt that the impacts south of Anaheim were unnecessary. He also said that he felt that the alternatives needed to be revisited with respect to the original objectives.

Kanya Dorland, Port of Los Angeles, said that senior management at the Port had not reviewed the project in detail yet and did not have a specific position. She said that the Port is generally supportive of the alternative that improves congestion the most and supports an extension of the Terminal Island Freeway, but has not decided which of the two concepts (in Alternatives C and D) they support most.

Sharas Bangalore, Caltrans, said that the State has no position at this time. He asked what the traffic and right-of-way impacts would be of eliminating some of the truck ramps at the SR-91/I-710 interchange. Would such a move overburden either the city streets or the general-purpose connectors, and would the right-of-way savings make it worth doing?

Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach, asked the same question of the HOV connector. Consultant staff indicated that data could be provided to help clarify the traffic and right-of-way impacts of eliminating these connectors.

Carol Gomez, Southern California Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), said that her agency had no position at this time and that SCAQMD would be meeting with the study team the following week to review the air quality/diesel particulate analysis. She said that SCAQMD might have concerns over using vertical walls to reduce right of way acquisitions, because that might place the closest home within a shorter distance from the freeway, thus having a greater environmental impact.

Sandra Balmir, FHWA/FTA said that her agency has no position on the alternatives, and that they are involved to advise on the process. She suggested that the TAC focus on options that meet state and federal standards first and that the study must show reasons why standards cannot be met prior to evaluating non-standard features.

Al Bowser, SCAG, indicated that his agency had no position on the alternatives, and suggested that there is no need to rush the process. He said that the Adopted 2001 RTP recognizes the need to improve goods movement to/from the ports and that SCAG is looking at the I-10 and SR-60 corridor, as well as the I-15 corridor and the I-5 corridor. Mr. Bowser continued by saying that SCAG is committed to the corridor study process, and that the TAC is the forum for developing a recommendation. He said that it may take a while to develop a solution that can be embraced as a consensus. Mr. Bowser said that SCAG is happy to be a funding partner of this study and that his agency is looking for a real solution to the problems in this corridor.

Richard Powers, Gateway Cities COG Executive Director, said that he agrees that no one should rush to judge the alternatives. He sees that there is a consensus to avoid

residential right-of-way acquisitions if possible and minimize all right-of-way acquisitions. He recognizes that there are severe public health risks already in place in this corridor and that there is the opportunity for this project to help mitigate that. Mr. Powers said that the schedule needs to be relaxed. From his viewpoint there are three issues that need to be addressed:

- congestion, mobility, goods movement
- environmental issues including acquisitions and air quality
- safety/security
-

Mr. Powers said that the schedule needs to be relaxed until everyone is heard and all city interests have been brought to the table.

Ray Maekawa, MTA, said that this discussion has been valuable because it allows all of the cities to hear what their neighbors are thinking about the various options. He said that the Oversight Policy Committee meeting on May 8, 2003, would be an opportunity to get guidance from the elected officials on what direction in which to head, and that it is the responsibility of the TAC members to brief their OPC members.

Mr. Maekawa said that three OPC meetings are currently scheduled (May 8, May 28, and June 25, 2003) and that they would be informational workshops for the OPC. Information will be presented by stakeholders. The 3 meeting topics include:

- goods movement
- public health (air quality)
- safety

Carol Gomez, SCAQMD, said that May 28th may be too soon to have a discussion of air quality issues and would like to have more time to review the air quality/diesel particulates analysis before the OPC workshop on the subject.

Kanya Dorland, Port of Los Angeles, asked if the OPC meetings could be delayed. Mr. Powers said that they are only information meetings, not decision making meetings. Attendance would not be mandatory. Maged El-Rabaa, County of Los Angeles, said that Supervisor Molina would not be available for the May 8, 2003 OPC meeting and suggested that she wanted to assess the input received at the May 15, 2003 East Los Angeles impacted Community meeting prior to the next OPC meeting. Mr. Powers said that he would check with the OPC co-chairs to see if they would reschedule.

Victor Rollinger, City of Carson, said that so far the TAC had only discussed the mainline components and that Carson is particularly concerned about a non-mainline component, the Alameda Truckway Connector. The TAC Chair said that he was hoping to develop some direction for the mainline and that the non-mainline components would be discussed at the next TAC meeting. Mr. Rollinger said that his city views the impacts of the Alameda Truckway Connector as very significant and that it needs to be

discussed in the context of the mainline improvements. Lon Maddox, City of Long Beach, agreed.

The TAC Chair said that at the next meeting, the TAC would review all of the components and asked that the study team create a listing of all the components that are included in all of the alternatives (with reference to which alternative each is currently attached to). He also directed the study team to meet with all of the cities to discuss and understand the individual concerns of the cities and report back at the next TAC meeting.

Deborah Chankin, City of Long Beach, asked if the study team could report on their meetings with SCAQMD and the railroads. Dave Levinsohn said they would. Kevin Wilson and Bill Pagett asked to be included in the meeting with the railroads.

D. Discussion of Future TAC Meetings and Agendas

The next TAC meeting was tentatively set for Wednesday, June 11, 2003 at 1:30 PM, location to be determined.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 4:00 p.m.

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Wednesday, June 11, 2003
1:30 p.m. Meeting*

*Rosewood Park
5600 Harbor Street
Commerce, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 201, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Minutes of the TAC-OPC Joint Meeting of April 10, 2002; and the TAC Meeting of May 1, 2003

VII. REPORTS

- A. Report on the Oversight Policy Committee Meeting of May 28, 2003
- B. Action Regarding Guiding Principles as Adopted by the Oversight Policy Committee
- C. Consultant Team Review of the Elements of Alternatives A and B
- D. Report from the Consultant Team and Discussion Regarding Meetings with the Cities and Other Agencies on the Elements of Alternatives C, D, and E
- E. Next Steps
- F. Next Meeting Date

IX. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 3:30 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
A Meeting Held at Rosewood Park
5600 Harbor Street
Commerce, CA
June 11, 2003**

I. Call to Order

Chair Pagett called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair William Pagett, Bell Gardens, Maywood, Paramount; Anthony La, Downey; Robert Zarrilli, Commerce; Mariano Aguirre, Huntington Park; Lon Maddox, Long Beach; Yadi Farhadi, Lynwood; Mohammad Mostahkami, South Gate; Sharas Bangalore, Caltrans; Captain Craig Klein, CHP; Victor Rollinger, Carson; Maged El-Rabaa, County of Los Angeles; Sandra Balmir, FHWA/FTA; Ernest Morales, MTA; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach; Kanya Dorland, Port of Los Angeles; Al Bowser, SCAG; Carol Gomez, AQMD.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Carlos Alvarado, Bell, Cudahy; Augustus Ajawara, Compton; Kevin Wilson, Vernon.

OTHERS PRESENT: Samara Ashley, Senator Betty Karnette's office, Long Beach; Commerce Councilmember Rosalina G. Lopez; Leana Marshall, Office of Long Beach Councilmember Val Lerch; Sumire Gant, City of Long Beach; Deborah Chankin, City of Long Beach; Joe Comstock, City of South Gate; Sue Lai, Port of Los Angeles; Linda Taira, Caltrans; Ray Maekawa, MTA; Cathy Manzo, MTA; Richard Powers, Gateway Cities COG; Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities COG; Nadine Munguia, East Los Angeles resident; Richard Alonzo, East Los Angeles resident; Bob Eula, Commerce resident; Joe Flores, Commerce resident; Ed Miles, Commerce resident; Paula Flores, Commerce resident; Frank Lopez, Commerce resident; Tina Baca Del Rio, Commerce resident; Navid Moshrael, Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles; D. Malcolm Carson, Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles Dave Levinsohn, PBQD; Steven Yoshizumi, PBQD; Julie Rush, PBQD; Michael Fischer, Cambridge Systematics, Inc.

II. Roll Call

Roll was taken through self-introductions and a sign-in sheet was circulated.

III. Pledge of Allegiance

Bill Pagett, TAC Chair, led the pledge of allegiance.

IV. Amendments to the Agenda

There were no amendments to the agenda.

V. Public Comments

Richard Alonzo said that he had watched the original construction of I-710. During the Port lock-out, there were no trucks on I-710 and there were no problems. He thought that the Alameda Corridor was built to take truck traffic and now it is underutilized. He said that trucks are overweight and are damaging the freeway pavement. He understands that the CHP is trying to address this.

Mr. Alonzo said that I-110 has already been rebuilt and that trucks should be directed to use that instead of I-710. He feels that the problems need to be restudied. Additionally, he feels that notification and communication has been poor. In summary, he said he feels that there will still be a problem if any of the alternatives are built.

Bob Eula suggested that trucks use Bandini Boulevard for access to I-5 as well as the rail yards instead of Atlantic and Washington Boulevards. He suggested that there could be truck ramps into the rail yards, and that no truck traffic should be on Washington Boulevard.

Nadine Munguia suggested that the study needed to begin again and include more community input.

Ed Miles recommended putting the trucks in the riverbed. He said it would not impact housing and that it leads from the ports to the rail yards.

VI. Consent Calendar

It was moved by Member Rollinger, seconded by Member Zarrilli, to approve the minutes for the OPC-TAC joint meeting of April 10, 2002, and the TAC meeting of May 1, 2003. The motion was approved unanimously, with Member El-Rabaa abstaining from the minutes of the April 10 joint meeting.

VII. Reports

A. Report on the Oversight Policy Committee Meeting of May 28, 2003

Richard Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities Council of Governments, reported on the actions of the Oversight Policy Committee (OPC) at their May 28, 2003 meeting. He read the motion that the OPC passed directing the TAC to develop a hybrid alternative starting with Alternative B and adding appropriate elements of the other alternatives. He also read the Guiding Principles that were approved by the OPC. Mr. Powers reported that the OPC had voted to form a Community Advisory Committee(s) and that the OPC asked that the TAC come back to the June 25, 2003, OPC meeting with suggestions as to how the committee(s) might be formatted or structured. He said that the OPC also adopted a calendar for their future meetings which includes two workshops to be held on June 25, 2003 and July 9, 2003.

B. Action Regarding Guiding Principles as Adopted by the Oversight Policy Committee

Bill Pagett, TAC Chair, reminded the group that Member Ernest Morales, MTA, had recommended a set of four guiding principles at the last meeting to help shape the development of the Locally Preferred Strategy. He referred to Richard Powers' presentation and asked if Member Morales wished to move that the TAC adopt the Guiding Principles as amended by the OPC. It was moved by Member Morales, seconded by Member Zarrilli, to adopt the Guiding Principles as adopted by the OPC. The motion was approved unanimously.

C. Consultant Team Review of the Elements of Alternatives A and B

Michael Fischer, Cambridge Systematics, Inc., reviewed the elements of Alternative A, the No Build Alternative, and Alternative B, the Transportation System Management / Transportation Demand Management Alternative.

Mr. Fischer described what the transportation system and demand would be like in the future with respect to the ports, the highways and arterials, and the technology. In the No Build alternative, approximately 50% of the truck activity on the 710 will be associated with port activities. The percentage is higher south of SR-91. Approximately 50% of port container cargoes will be rail intermodal cargo. The fraction of this cargo handled by on-dock rail will increase from approximately 15% today to 30% in 2025 due to improvements at the terminals and connections to the Alameda Corridor. While this will significantly reduce the relative growth in truck traffic on the 710, there will still be significant growth in truck traffic because of the high overall rate of growth in port cargoes and the growth in warehouse, distribution, and manufacturing activities throughout the corridor. In addition, the no-build alternative assumes substantial increase in 24/7 operations at the port as compared to current conditions due to market factors. The no-build alternative includes the adoption of some degree of empty container management that will reduce truck traffic from the port as well as the adoption of the current port ITS program. Both will help manage truck demand at the port.

The no-build alternative also assumes the continued deployment of ITS technologies throughout the corridor per Caltrans and local jurisdiction plans including:

- Upstream adaptive ramp metering at many ramp locations
- Arterial signal coordination/synchronization as called for in the Gateway Cities Forum Tier I Traffic Improvements
- Limited advanced traveler information systems (ATIS)
- Incident management fully deployed but not being operated to full potential

Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach, added that 10-13% of the cargo is being transloaded to smaller containers at various locations around the region and that the Port is looking for ways to reduce truck trips associated with transloaded cargo. He said that the on-dock rail operations and the Alameda Corridor are assumed to be at maximum capacity in the future No Build scenario.

Bill Pagett, TAC Chair, asked if the transloading could be done on-dock (or near dock) to centralize those operations. Kerry Cartwright said that there are too many locations around the region where cargo is transloaded to make consolidation of those operations simple.

Al Bowser, SCAG, asked why there wasn't more ATIS assumed in the No Build alternative. Mr. Fischer clarified that the No Build alternative assumes all of those projects that are planned and funded for implementation before 2025 and that ATIS components are not currently planned and funded in the region. Kerry Cartwright asked if the County had more ATIS projects planned. Maged El-Rabaa, County of Los Angeles, said that there are projects being planned, but that they require additional study.

Michael Fischer described the elements of Alternative B, the Transportation System Management/Transportation Demand Management alternative. The TSM/TDM alternative includes expansion of many of the no-build features to achieve even greater reductions in truck traffic and more effective overall traffic and demand management. At the port, empty container management systems are pushed to the maximum feasible extent, resulting in an 8.5% reduction in overall truck traffic from the port. The current diesel emission reduction program adopted by the Gateway Cities COG is assumed to be expanded to include a program targeted to get drayage trucks serving the port to repower or purchase cleaner burning power units. These trucks include a higher percentage of older, poorly maintained trucks with higher emission rates than the general truck fleet. The program subsidizes the replacement/repowering of these power units.

The base case for the TSM/TDM alternative does not include a greater level of 24/7 operations but a sensitivity analysis will be conducted for a more aggressive program that would be encouraged through incentives/disincentives. Preliminary analysis showed that a feasible strategy could be devised that would improve level of service on I-710, but significant congestion would still remain.

The TSM/TDM alternative also includes expansion of the ITS strategies including:

- Increasing the number of ramps metered and upgrading to centrally controlled operations
- Including changeable message signs at key locations to allow travelers to avoid congested segments and choose alternative routes
- Upgrades to the signal synchronization/coordination program to include centralized controls
- Addition of ATIS components to the arterial system

- Upgrading the incident management system to include full detection, verification, response, and management capabilities

Al Bowser indicated that the elements included in the TSM/TDM alternative seemed to focus mostly on truck operations and cargo movement and that he felt that the alternative needed to include elements that address carpooling and transit in addition to trucks and cargo. Michael Fischer indicated that Traveler Information Services can be used by people to make mode shift decisions, and Bill Pagett reminded that TAC that an HOV facility was still included in the study as a mainline alternative. Al Bowser expressed concern that any improvement in mobility that could be achieved by improvement of truck and cargo movement might be overwhelmed by an influx of non-truck traffic that would erase the benefit of the TSM/TDM alternative if autos and transit were not addressed. Dave Levinsohn, PBQD, reminded the TAC that additional community and feeder bus service and expanded rail service are included in Alternative B. Sandra Balmir, FTA/FHWA, indicated support for park and ride lots. Kerry Cartwright asked if Alternative B accounted for mode shift – Dave Levinsohn said that it does. Kerry Cartwright also asked if there was rapid bus service in the study area. Bill Pagett said that there was on Florence Avenue, and that the cities were working with the various transit providers to develop a better program to increase ridership.

Captain Craig Klein, CHP, expressed his interest in seeing the Truck Inspection Station included as an integrated part of the TSM/TDM alternative. Bill Pagett said that an integrated ITS system and truck land use management strategies should be included in the TSM/TDM alternative.

D. Report from the Consultant Team and Discussion Regarding Meetings with the Cities and Other Agencies on the Elements of Alternatives C, D, and E

Steven Yoshizumi, PBQD, reviewed the meetings that the team had held since the last TAC to discuss the elements of the various alternatives with each of the cities. He began by reviewing with the TAC the actions that they had taken at their last meeting and the actions of the OPC, both of which instructed the study team to pursue development of a hybrid alternative. Since the last TAC meeting, the study team had received input from most of the study area cities and other agencies.

Additionally, the team met with Caltrans to discuss the feasibility of some of the components and the potential for altering some of them to reduce right-of-way impacts. Caltrans was clear that one of their primary concerns is safety, and that there are options with the parameters of the standards to reduce right-of-way acquisitions while maintaining safe operating conditions.

In meeting with the cities, there were a couple of recurring themes:

- Most cities wanted to at least gain the benefits of Alternative B.
- Some were interested in additional capacity enhancements which could include an additional general purpose lane and/or an exclusive truck facility.

There was also interest voiced for several of the non-mainline elements:

- I-405/I-710 Interchange Improvements
- Slauson Interchange
- Truck ramps into the rail yards at the north end
- Truck Inspection Station
- Arterial capacity enhancements:
 - Spot widening, restriping, raised medians, removal of on-street parking or roadway widening
 - Maximum of 6 lanes on arterials
 - Aesthetic improvements

Two specific elements met with mixed reaction – the Terminal Island Freeway Extension and the Alameda Truckway Connector. Some cities were in favor of one or the other, while other cities expressed a strong negative reaction to these elements. Continued study and coordination of these two elements will be necessary.

Bill Pagett raised the issue of the truck ramps at the north end of the study area and the meeting that was held with the railroads. Steven elaborated that there had been a meeting with the UP, the BNSF, and Los Angeles Junction Railroads and that they had provided valuable input into understanding what value there could be in implementing truck ramps that took traffic off of Washington Boulevard in Commerce. That element is one that may move forward in the hybrid.

Kerry Cartwright suggested that reviewing the travel demand forecasting at this point will be critical in determining the value of the various elements for the hybrid. He also suggested that the Alameda Truckway Connector is being pursued by others on a parallel study track.

Victor Rollinger, Carson, said that Carson agreed to arterial enhancements on Alameda Street when the rail corridor was developed, but that creating a de facto freeway out of it would have significant environmental impacts on the Dominguez residential tract. The residents would need to be involved in any decisions that would impact them.

Mohammad Mostahkami, South Gate, asked if any consideration had been given to the proposed Orange Line passenger rail transit system. Bill Pagett said that the Orange Line was still in early study phases and that the technology that might be employed had not been established. He said that the Orange Line is still largely an unknown at this point.

Bill Pagett also raised a point regarding the discussion with Caltrans – that the project as it is shaping up is a 20-year planning project, but it may not be considered an ultimate scenario for this corridor and that this project should keep in mind future planning and the desire to maintain flexibility in implementation of future projects.

E. Next Steps

Dave Levinsohn, PBQD, described the proposed schedule. The study team would finish meeting with the cities and collect their input into the hybrid alternative. At a TAC meeting on June 26, 2003, the team would present the draft hybrid for review and discussion. Either at that meeting or another TAC meeting within two weeks of June 26, 2003, the TAC would recommend the draft hybrid for further study. That recommendation would go to the OPC for their concurrence and approval. After the hybrid was assessed (including conceptual engineering and right-of-way impacts), the team would bring the data back to the TAC and the OPC for their review and final determination of the hybrid alternative.

Victor Rollinger asked how the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) would fit into this schedule and how their input would be used to shape the hybrid. Richard Powers, Gateway Cities COG, suggested that the TAC might rethink the schedule. Maged El-

Rabaa suggested that if there was going to be an effort to improve/increase public input, that it should happen sooner rather than later.

Al Bowser said he didn't think there was a conflict between asking the consultant to develop a hybrid based on the cities recommendations and the guiding principles, and starting the CAC and gathering additional public input.

Kanya Dorland, Port of Los Angeles, suggested having the CAC develop a hybrid and then melding it with the hybrid alternative recommended by the cities.

Ernest Morales, MTA, said that the team should meet with the utilities again to discuss the current state of the alternatives with them and affirm that there is some level of compatibility between the elements of the alternatives and the continued operation of the utilities.

F. Next Meeting Date

It was the consensus of the Technical Advisory Committee to not set a date for the next TAC meeting as the issue of public input to the development of the hybrid alternative was left unresolved.

Bill Pagett reported that the OPC asked that the TAC examine the possibility of holding TAC meetings in the evening to provide greater public input. Victor Rollinger suggested that the TAC meetings were intended for technical discussion and that the OPC meetings are the forum for public input. As such, he felt that the TAC meetings should be held during the day.

Malcolm Carson, Legal Aid Foundation, said that it is important to find an avenue to provide public input to the development of the hybrid.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 3:47 p.m.

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Thursday, February 19, 2003
1:30 p.m. Meeting*

*Room 2, Bateman Hall
11331 Ernestine Avenue
Lynwood, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 201, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Minutes of the Meeting of June 11, 2003

VII. REPORTS

- A. Report from MTA on its Role in the Current Study Phase
- B. Report from Outreach Consultants on Tier 1 Community Advisory Committee Meetings
- C. Report from Gateway Cities COG Engineering Consultant on Community Engineering Consultations
- D. Report from the Chairman on the February 3, 2004, Meeting of the Tier 2 Community Advisory Committee
- E. Next Steps
- F. Next Meeting Date

IX. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 3:30 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENTS TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
A Meeting Held at Bateman Hall, Room 2
11331 Ernestine Avenue
Lynwood, CA
February 19, 2004**

I. Call to Order

Chairman Pagett called the meeting to order at 1:48

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman William Pagett, Maywood, Paramount; Victor Rollinger, Carson; Robert Zarrilli, Commerce; Augustus Ajawara, Compton; Patrick Fu, Huntington Park; Yadi Farhadi, Lynwood; Mohammad Mostahkami, South Gate; Kevin Wilson, Vernon; 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; Kathryn Higgins, AQMD.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Vice Chairman Desi Alvarez, Downey; Carlos Alvarado, Bell, Cudahy; Sumire Gant, Long Beach; Alan Bowser, SCAG; Sandra Balmir, FHWA/FTA; John Oropeza, Bell Gardens.

OTHERS PRESENT: Captain Craig Klein, CHP; Hamid Bahadori, Automobile Club of Southern California; Joe Lim, City of Compton; Joe Wang, City of Lynwood; Susan Gilmore, MTA; Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities COG; Deborah Chankin, Gateway Cities COG; Jerry Wood, Gateway Cities COG; Nadene Bristow, Gateway Cities COG; Esmeralda Garcia, MIG; Angelo Logan, Member Tier 2 Community Advisory Committee.

II. Roll Call

Roll was taken through self-introductions.

III. Pledge of Allegiance

Member Cartwright led the pledge of allegiance.

IV. Amendments to the Agenda

There were no amendments to the agenda.

V. Public Comments

No one wished to speak during public comments.

VI. Consent Calendar

It was moved by Member Zarrilli, seconded by Member El-Rabaa, to approve the minutes of the meeting of June 11, 2003. The motion was approved unanimously.

VII. Reports

A. Report from MTA on its Role in the Current Study Phase

Susan Gilmore, MTA, explained that the I-710 Oversight Policy Committee and the MTA Board of Directors had put forward motions to create two levels of community participation in the I-710 study process: locally based "Tier 1" community advisory committees, and a "Tier 2" Community Advisory Committee, the latter made up of representatives from each of the tier 1 committees, as well as members from numerous stakeholder groups, including environmental, transportation, business, educational, and health interests.

B. Report from Outreach Consultants on Tier 1 Community Advisory Committee Meetings

Susan Gilmore introduced outreach consultant Esmeralda Garcia of MIG, who briefed the TAC on the tier 1 activities that had occurred to date. She distributed a chart which summarized the status of each tier 1 committee's activities.

C. Report from Gateway Cities COG Engineering Consultant on Community Engineering Consultations

Jerry Wood, Gateway Cities COG Engineering Consultant, explained that he had met with virtually all of the cities and other agencies that are part of the I-710 study. He said that the City of Long Beach had conducted a series of community-wide meetings and

that citizens' recommendations are currently being accumulated. He said that by March 18 the City would have a recommended plan for the eight plus miles of freeway in Long Beach. From there the plan will go out for additional community comments.

Mr. Wood said that he had received comments from Long Beach, Commerce, Bell Gardens, South Gate, and Lynwood regarding draft I-710 plans, and that he was expecting to receive comments from Compton and East Los Angeles in the near future. In response to all of these contributions, he will produce a draft "hybrid" plan for improvements to the freeway corridor. He said that he expected that over the next month and a half the process will evolve into a consensus plan.

Member Wilson said that he would like to be involved in discussions regarding the City of Commerce's proposed Bandini Blvd. alternative because of the impact it would have on the City of Vernon. Mr. Wood replied that as soon as he has a better understanding from Commerce as to what they would like to see he would contact the City of Vernon.

D. Report from the Chairman on the February 3, 2004, Meeting of the Tier 2 Community Advisory Committee

Chairman Pagett reported that the first meeting of the Tier 2 Community Advisory Committee was well attended and that a good discussion had occurred. Deborah Chankin, Gateway Cities COG, said that the Committee had set two or three additional meeting dates, with the next meeting to take place on February 26. Member Mostahkami said that it would be a good idea for the tier 1 committees to name alternates to their members on the tier 2 committee. Member Ajawara inquired as to why there was no representation from the Compton Creek Committee on the Tier 2 CAC. Ms. Chankin responded that the Compton Creek Committee had been nominated, but that the Oversight Policy Committee had received a list of over 50 names from which it had to choose 15 for appointment to the tier 2 committee. She said that the Compton Creek Committee could certainly be considered for additional membership by the Tier 2 Community Advisory Committee.

E. Next Steps

Member Morales said that there would be an intense month long period of meetings of the tier 1 and 2 community advisory committees. He said a key meeting would be the February 26 meeting of the Tier 2 Community Advisory Committee.

F. Next Meeting Date

Chairman Pagett suggested that scheduling the next meeting for mid-April would give the community advisory committees time to meet and come up with recommendations and for the City of Long Beach to complete its process. It was the consensus of the Technical Advisory Committee to meet again on April 15 and on April 29 at Bateman Hall, if the facility is available.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 2:38 p.m.

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Thursday, March 25, 2004
1:30 p.m. Meeting*

*Room 2, Bateman Hall
11331 Ernestine Avenue
Lynwood, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 201, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

I-710 TAC Agenda

March 25, 2004

Page 2 of 2

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Minutes of the Meeting of February 19, 2004

VII. REPORTS

A. Tier 2 Community Advisory Committee Update

B. City of Long Beach I-710 Design Update

C. I-710 Corridor Engineering Update

IX. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 3:30 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENTS TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
A Meeting Held at Bateman Hall, Room 2
11331 Ernestine Avenue
Lynwood, CA
March 25, 2004**

I. Call to Order

Chairman Pagett called the meeting to order at 1:40 p.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman William Pagett, Maywood, Paramount; Victor Rollinger, Carson; Robert Zarrilli, Commerce; Esomchi Enenwali, Compton; Anthony La, Downey; Patrick Fu, Huntington Park; Sumire Gant, Long Beach; Mohammad Mostahkami, South Gate; Kevin Wilson, Vernon; Maged El-Rabaa, County of Los Angeles; Kerry Cartwright, Port of Long Beach; Sharas Bangalore, Caltrans; Ernest Morales, MTA; Kathryn Higgins, AQMD.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Carlos Alvarado, Bell, Cudahy; John Oropeza, Bell Gardens; Yadi Farhadi, Lynwood; Kanya Dorland, Port of Los Angeles; Alan Bowser, SCAG; Sandra Balmir, FHWA/FTA.

OTHERS PRESENT: Sergeant D. E. Morrison, CHP; Ray Maekawa, MTA; Susan Gilmore, MTA; Ernesto Chavez, MTA; Richard Powers, Gateway Cities COG; Jack Joseph, Gateway Cities COG; Deborah Chankin, Gateway Cities COG; Jerry Wood, Gateway Cities COG; Nadene Bristow, Gateway Cities COG; Pat McLaughlin, MIG; Rob Olson, Meyer Mohaddes Associates; Julie Rush, PBQD; Angelo Logan, Member, Tier 2 Community Advisory Committee; Malcohm Carson, Member, Tier 2 Community Advisory Committee.

II. Roll Call

Roll was taken through self-introductions.

III. Pledge of Allegiance

Member El-Rabaa led the pledge of allegiance.

IV. Amendments to the Agenda

There were no amendments to the agenda.

V. Public Comments

It was the consensus of the TAC to hear public comments later in the meeting.

VI. Consent Calendar

Chairman Pagett pointed out that one correction was needed to the minutes from the meeting of February 19, 2004, in that they should show that the TAC member from Bell Gardens, John Oropeza, was absent. It was the consensus of the TAC to approve the minutes of the meeting of February 19, 2004 as amended.

VII. Reports

A. Tier 2 Community Advisory Committee Update

Chairman Pagett recapped the recent meetings of the Tier 2 Community Advisory Committee. He said that the committee had heard reports on air quality, use of alternative fuels, pending legislation, and highway safety (including Caltrans' plans for concrete barriers on I-710), as well as a report from Richard Hollingsworth, President of the Gateway Cities Partnership, on jobs and economic development.

Pat McLaughlin, MIG, outreach consultant for the MTA, reported that the next meeting of the Tier 2 Committee would be held on April 1, and would focus on jobs and economic development and some of the design concepts and enhancements. She said that the Tier 1 committees had continued to meet.

B. City of Long Beach I-710 Design Update

Member Sumire Gant reported that hundreds of people had attended community meetings on the 710 in the City of Long Beach. She said that the City had hired Meyer Mohaddes Associates to help the City plan the design of the I-710 segments in Long Beach. She said the community meetings had focused on many of the same issues that the Tier 2 Community Advisory Committee had been discussing. She handed out a map of Long Beach's draft Locally Preferred Strategy for the City's freeway segments.

Jerry Wood, Gateway Cities COG engineering consultant, described details of the Long Beach segment design concepts. He said that the Long Beach City Council's Oversight Policy Committee will get together on April 26, following four public meetings. At that meeting, the Committee is expected to make its recommendation to the Long Beach City Council. The Council would consider approving the plan in May.

Richard Powers, Gateway Cities COG, restated the process for developing a hybrid alternative.

Member Victor Rollinger said that the TAC needs to know the impact on arterial streets caused by the proposed closure of off ramps such as Wardlow Road, even if that information could not to be provided until the environmental impact report phase. Chairman Pagett said that the Major Corridor Study anticipates the need for \$800,000 in arterial improvements during the first phase of construction because that's where the

traffic will be diverted when the mainline construction improvements are being made. Member Kevin Wilson said he had similar concerns regarding the possible closure of the Washington Blvd. off ramp at the northern end of the project.

C. I-710 Corridor Engineering Update

Jerry Wood summarized the concepts favored by cities along the northern portion of the corridor. He said that proposed plans had not yet been processed all the way through the northern communities. He said that a contingency regarding some of the proposed mainline alignment is that meetings will have to be held with the Army Corps of Engineers, the County Flood Control District, the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, and Southern California Edison regarding the use of parts of their easements.

At this point the Chairman opened up the meeting to public comments.

Angelo Logan, Communities for a Better Environment, asked how air quality elements fit into the strategy for the City of Long Beach. Richard Powers responded that rather than put things on a map, there should be a policy statement adopted requiring that known methods of emission reduction be identified.

Malcolm Carson, Legal Aid Foundation, said that before the environmental impact process begins there should be an air quality plan in place. He said the community involvement process was going well and expressed hope that the TAC will accept the concepts coming out of the process. He said that the Port of Oakland had looked into methods of moving containers to rail yards without using trucks. Richard Powers responded that there would be a response to this suggestion at the next meeting.

IX. Adjournment

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Technical Advisory Committee to schedule meetings for April 21 and 28 at the same location as today's meeting. The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 3:20 p.m.

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Thursday, March 25, 2004
1:30 p.m. Meeting*

*Room 2, Bateman Hall
11331 Ernestine Avenue
Lynwood, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 7300 ALONDRA BOULEVARD, SUITE 201, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

I-710 TAC Agenda

March 25, 2004

Page 2 of 2

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Minutes of the Meeting of February 19, 2004

VII. REPORTS

A. Tier 2 Community Advisory Committee Update

B. City of Long Beach I-710 Design Update

C. I-710 Corridor Engineering Update

IX. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 3:30 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENTS TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

I-710 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

*Thursday, September 9, 2004
1:30 p.m. Meeting*

*Room 2, Bateman Hall
11331 Ernestine Avenue
Lynwood, California*

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 16401 PARAMOUNT BLVD., PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at the time the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL - BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Minutes of the Meeting of April 21, 2004

VII. REPORTS

- A. Presentation of Tier 2 Community Advisory Committee's Final Recommendations
- B. Presentation of Caltrans and FHWA Comments on Design
- C. Presentation on Right-of-Way Impacts in the Proposed Hybrid Design
- D. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding a Final Technical Advisory Committee Recommendation to the Oversight Policy Committee
 - 1. Approval of Community Design Hybrid as Described in Technical Memorandum with Any Additions, Exceptions, Concerns, or Recommendations for Further Study
 - 2. Approval of Tier 2 Community Advisory Committee's Final Report with Any Comments, Concerns, or Recommendations for Further Study
 - 3. Recommendation of Additional Construction Elements from Alternatives C, D, and E To Be Carried Forward, if Any
 - 4. Review and Approval of the No-Build Alternative (Alternative A)
 - 5. Review and Approval of the TSM/TDM Alternative (Alternative B)

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 3:30 p.m. unless the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular I-710 Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENTS TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.