

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>PAGE</u>
<b>ES EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>S-1</b>
S.1 Study Overview .....	S-1
S.2 Study Background .....	S-7
S.3 I-710 Corridor Study Area .....	S-9
S.4 Purpose and Need .....	S-9
S.5 Alternatives Considered .....	S-14
S.6 Alternatives Evaluation .....	S-20
S.7 Development of a Hybrid Strategy .....	S-30
S.8 Tier 2 Community Advisory Committee Recommendations .....	S-38
S.9 Technical Advisory Committee Recommendations .....	S-41
S.10 I-710 Oversight Policy Committee Actions .....	S-44
S.11 MTA Board Action .....	S-45
S.12 Issues for Further Consideration .....	S-45
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
1.1 Study Background .....	1-1
1.2 I-710 Corridor Study Area .....	1-3
1.3 Project Organization .....	1-3
1.4 Study Process .....	1-6
<b>2.0 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT .....</b>	<b>2-1</b>
2.1 Public Involvement Framework .....	2-1
2.2 Initial Scoping Phase .....	2-3
2.2.1 Agency Stakeholder Interviews .....	2-3
2.2.2 Community Roundtables .....	2-3
2.2.3 Motorist Questionnaires .....	2-4
2.2.4 Public Open Houses .....	2-4
2.2.5 Public Information Materials .....	2-4
2.3 Initial Set of Alternatives Screening Phase .....	2-4
2.3.1 Elected Official/City Staff Briefings .....	2-5
2.3.2 Stakeholder Briefings .....	2-5
2.3.3 Community Presentations .....	2-6
2.3.4 Roundtable Discussions .....	2-6
2.3.5 Public Information Materials .....	2-7
2.4 Final Set of Alternatives Evaluation Phase .....	2-7
2.4.1 Elected Official Briefings .....	2-7
2.4.2 Community Group Briefings .....	2-8
2.4.3 Targeted Outreach Efforts .....	2-9
2.4.4 Environmental Groups Outreach Efforts .....	2-10
2.4.5 Roundtables .....	2-11
2.4.6 Open Houses .....	2-11
2.4.7 Impacted Community Meetings .....	2-12
2.4.8 Public Information Materials .....	2-12

2.5 Development of Locally Preferred Strategy Phase ..... 2-13

2.5.1 Community Advisory Committees ..... 2-14

2.5.2 Tier 1 - Community Level CAC ..... 2-14

2.5.3 Tier 2 – Corridor Level CAC..... 2-15

**3.0 PURPOSE AND NEED ..... 3-1**

3.1 Existing and Future Conditions ..... 3-1

3.1.1 Projected Growth..... 3-1

3.1.2 Projected Traffic Volumes..... 3-3

3.1.3 Design Deficiencies..... 3-4

3.1.4 Safety..... 3-8

3.1.5 Air Quality and Public Health..... 3-11

3.2 Need for Action ..... 3-13

3.3 Guiding Principles ..... 3-17

**4.0 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED ..... 4-1**

4.1 Alternatives Development ..... 4-1

4.1.1 Sources for Potential Transportation Improvements ..... 4-1

4.1.2 Approach to Alternatives Development..... 4-3

4.2 Initial Set of Alternatives ..... 4-5

4.3 Alternatives Screening ..... 4-17

4.3.1 Approach / Screening Criteria..... 4-17

4.3.2 Screening Analysis ..... 4-18

4.3.3 Community Input on the Initial Set of Alternatives ..... 4-27

4.4 Technical Advisory Committee Recommendation ..... 4-30

4.5 Final Set of Alternatives ..... 4-34

**5.0 ALTERNATIVE REFINEMENT AND EVALUATION ..... 5-1**

5.1 Design Concepts ..... 5-1

5.1.1 Alternative C ..... 5-1

5.1.2 Alternative D ..... 5-3

5.1.3 Alternative E..... 5-4

5.1.4 I-710/I-5 Interchange Concepts ..... 5-5

5.2 Transportation System Performance ..... 5-6

5.2.1 I-710 Facility Performance..... 5-6

5.2.2 Study Area Transportation Facility Performance ..... 5-14

5.3 Right of Way Impact Analysis..... 5-18

5.4 Environmental Analysis ..... 5-23

5.4.1 Aesthetics and Visual Quality ..... 5-24

5.4.2 Traffic and Circulation ..... 5-28

5.4.3 Air Quality ..... 5-35

5.4.4 Agriculture ..... 5-42

5.4.5 Biological Resources..... 5-43

5.4.6 Cultural Resources ..... 5-45

5.4.7 Geology, Seismicity, and Soils ..... 5-47

5.4.8 Hazardous Materials..... 5-48

5.4.9 Hydrology, Water Quality, and Floodplains..... 5-52

5.4.10 Noise ..... 5-57

5.5 Costs ..... 5-64

5.6 Public and Community Input ..... 5-67  
5.6.1 Public and Community Outreach Opportunities ..... 5-67  
5.6.2 Public and Community Feedback ..... 5-68

**6.0 DEVELOPMENT OF A HYBRID STRATEGY ..... 6-1**  
6.1 Revised Study Direction ..... 6-1  
6.2 Community Engagement ..... 6-2  
6.3 Hybrid Design Concept ..... 6-4  
6.4 Right-of-Way Impact Analysis ..... 6-15  
6.5 Cost and Financial Analysis of the Hybrid Strategy ..... 6-18  
6.5.1 Draft Hybrid Design Concept Cost Estimate ..... 6-18  
6.5.2 Financial Analysis ..... 6-20

**7.0 TIER 2 CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 7-1**  
7.1 Tier 2 Committee Activities ..... 7-1  
7.2 Tier 2 Committee Summary Recommendations ..... 7-1

**8.0 TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 8-1**  
8.1 TAC Review Activities ..... 8-1  
8.2 TAC Recommendations ..... 8-2

**9.0 SELECTION OF A PREFERRED STRATEGY ..... 9-1**  
9.1 Decision Making Process ..... 9-1  
9.2 Additional Oversight Policy Committee Action ..... 9-2  
9.2.1 I-710 Locally Preferred Strategy ..... 9-2  
9.2.2 Additional Oversight Policy Committee Actions ..... 9-7  
9.3 MTA Board Action ..... 9-7  
9.4 RSTIS Peer Review Group ..... 9-8

**10.0 ISSUES FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION ..... 10-1**  
10.1 Air Quality Action Plan ..... 10-1  
10.2 Public Involvement Plan for EIS/EIR ..... 10-1  
10.3 Mini-Corridor Study ..... 10-2  
10.4 Freeway Design Issues ..... 10-2  
10.5 Definition of Arterial Street Improvements ..... 10-3  
10.6 Determination of Truck Inspection Facility(ies) ..... 10-3  
10.7 Phasing of Improvements ..... 10-3  
10.8 Technology, Construction and Noise Impacts ..... 10-4  
10.9 Project Funding ..... 10-4

**LIST OF TABLES**

<b><u>TABLE</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
Table S-1	I-710 Mainline Lane Configurations.....S-22
Table S-2	I-710 Average Daily Traffic Volumes (in Passenger Car Equivalent units) .....S-23
Table S-3	I-710 Average Daily Heavy Duty Truck Volumes .....S-24
Table S-4	Estimated No. of Structures Removed, Draft Hybrid Design Concept .....S-35
Table S-5	Acreage Impacts by Land Use Type, Draft Hybrid Design Concept .....S-36
Table S-6	Comparison of Capital Cost Estimates (2004 Dollars, in Millions) .....S-38
Table S-7	Tier 2 CAC Summary Recommendations.....S-39
Table S-8	Summary TAC Recommendations – Hybrid Strategy .....S-43
Table 2.5-1	Tier II Community Advisory Committee Membership .....2-17
Table 3.1-1	Freeway-to-Freeway Interchanges – Key Design Concerns .....3-6
Table 3.2-1	I-710 Corridor Problem Statements .....3-14
Table 4.1-1	Stakeholder Suggestions for Transportation Improvements .....4-1
Table 4.1-2	Build Alternatives Grouped by Levels of Investment .....4-4
Table 4.3-1	Summary of Capital Costs (in millions).....4-24
Table 4.3-2	Alternatives Screening Evaluation Matrix .....4-26
Table 4.4-1	TAC Recommendations for Mainline Concepts .....4-32
Table 4.4-2	TAC Recommendations for Transportation Elements .....4-33
Table 5.2-1	I-710 Mainline Lane Configurations.....5-7
Table 5.4-1	Alternative C – Visual Impact Assessment.....5-25
Table 5.4-2	Alternative D – Visual Impact Assessment.....5-26
Table 5.4-3	Alternative E – Visual Impact Assessment .....5-27
Table 5.4-4	I-710 Average Daily Traffic Volumes (in PCEs), Year 2025.....5-29
Table 5.4-5	I-710 Average Daily Heavy Duty Truck Volumes, Year 2025 .....5-30
Table 5.4-6	I-710 Volume/Capacity Estimates – AM Peak Period, Year 2025 .....5-32
Table 5.4-7	I-710 Volume/Capacity Estimates – Midday Time Period, Year 2025 .....5-33
Table 5.4-8	Sensitive Species Federal and State Ranking .....5-43
Table 5.4-9	Potential Impacts to Cultural Resources .....5-45
Table 5.4-10	Alternative C – Estimated No. of Hazardous Materials Sites Impacted .....5-49
Table 5.4-11	Alternative D – Estimated No. of Hazardous Materials Sites Impacted .....5-50
Table 5.4-12	Alternative E – Estimated No. of Hazardous Materials Sites Impacted.....5-51
Table 5.4-13	Alternative C – Water Resources Impact Assessment.....5-55
Table 5.4-14	Alternative D – Water Resources Impact Assessment.....5-56
Table 5.4-15	Alternative E – Water Resources Impact Assessment .....5-57
Table 5.4-16	Alternative C – Noise Impact Assessment .....5-59
Table 5.4-17	Alternative D – Noise Impact Assessment .....5-61
Table 5.4-18	Alternative E – Noise Impact Assessment.....5-63
Table 6.4-1	Structure Impacts by Land Use Type by City (Hybrid Design Concept).....6-16
Table 6.4-2	Acreage Impacts by Land Use Type by City (Hybrid Design Concept).....6-17

<b><u>TABLE</u></b>		<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
Table 6.5-1	Comparison of I-710 Alternatives Cost Estimates .....	6-19
Table 6.5-2	Projected Net Proceeds from Container Fee .....	6-23
Table 6.5-3	Container Fee Bond Assumptions.....	6-23
Table 6.5-4	Interest Rate Assumptions .....	6-24
Table 6.5-5	Funds Available for I-710 Corridor Improvements .....	6-24
Table 8.2-1	Summary TAC Recommendations – Hybrid Strategy .....	8-3

**LIST OF FIGURES**

<b><u>FIGURE</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
Figure S-1	Map of Hybrid Design Concept .....S-5
Figure S-2	I-710 Corridor Guiding Principles.....S-8
Figure S-3	I-710 Corridor Study Area .....S-10
Figure S-4	I-710 Corridor Problem Statements.....S-12
Figure S-5	I-710 Average Travel Speeds – PM Peak Period .....S-25
Figure S-6	Delay Reductions (Vehicle Hours, Person Hours Saved) .....S-26
Figure S-7	Annual Accident Reductions.....S-27
Figure S-8	Right-of-Way Impact Analysis .....S-28
Figure S-9	Capital Cost Estimates (Year 2003 Dollars) .....S-29
Figure S-10	Acreage Impacts by Land Use Type .....S-37
Figure S-11	Map of Hybrid Design Concept .....S-45
Figure 1.1-1	Project Location Map ..... 1-2
Figure 1.2-1	I-710 Corridor Study Area ..... 1-4
Figure 1.3-1	I-710 Study Organization Chart..... 1-6
Figure 1.4-1	I-710 Study Flow Chart..... 1-7
Figure 2.1-1	I-710 MCS Outreach Process Flow Chart .....2-2
Figure 3.1-1	Population Density (1998, 2025) .....3-1
Figure 3.1-2	Employment Density (1998, 2025).....3-2
Figure 3.1-3	Port Cargo and Truck Forecasts .....3-3
Figure 3.1-4	I-710 Projected Traffic .....3-4
Figure 3.1-6	Correlation between Traffic Volumes and Accidents .....3-9
Figure 3.1-5	High Accident Locations.....3-10
Figure 3.1-7	Sources of Carcinogenic Risk (Toxic Air Contaminants) .....3-12
Figure 3.1-8	Estimated Carcinogenic Risk (All Sources).....3-12
Figure 4.2-1	Initial Alternatives 3 & 4 .....4-7
Figure 4.2-2	Initial Alternatives 5 & 6 .....4-9
Figure 4.2-3	Initial Alternatives 7 & 8 .....4-11
Figure 4.2-4	Initial Alternatives 9 & 10 .....4-13
Figure 4.2-5	Initial Alternatives 11 & 12 .....4-15
Figure 4.3-1	Volume / Capacity Ratios on I-710 in the AM Peak Period .....4-19
Figure 4.3-2	Travel Time Savings (Minutes) .....4-20
Figure 4.3-3	Estimated Delay Reduction (Thousands of Hours) .....4-21
Figure 4.3-4	Estimated Accident Reduction.....4-22
Figure 4.3-5	Estimated Land Use Impacts.....4-23
Figure 4.3-6	Average Cost per Mile .....4-25
Figure 4.5-1	Alternative C .....4-38
Figure 4.5-2	Alternative D .....4-40
Figure 4.5-3	Alternative E .....4-42

<b><u>FIGURE</u></b>		<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
Figure 5.2-1	I-710 PM Peak Period, Northbound, Volume/Capacity Ratios .....	5-8
Figure 5.2-2	I-710 PM Peak Period, Northbound, Speeds by Segment.....	5-9
Figure 5.2-3	I-710 PM Peak Period, Northbound, Average Travel Speeds.....	5-10
Figure 5.2-4	Projected Volume / Capacity Ratios on I-710 Special Use Lanes .....	5-11
Figure 5.2-5	Forecast Truck Utilization of I-710 Truck Lanes .....	5-12
Figure 5.2-6	Forecast Change in Truck Traffic on I-710 GP Lanes .....	5-13
Figure 5.2-7	Forecast Change in Vehicle Miles Traveled.....	5-14
Figure 5.2-8	Daily Reductions (Person Hours Saved / Vehicle Hours Saved) .....	5-15
Figure 5.2-9	Annual Accident Reductions.....	5-16
Figure 5.2-10	Time Savings due to Reduction in Accidents - Travel Time Reliability .....	5-18
Figure 5.3-1	Total Right of Way Comparison.....	5-19
Figure 5.3-2	Mainline vs. Total Right-of-Way Comparison .....	5-20
Figure 5.3-3	Right-of-Way Comparison by Component .....	5-21
Figure 5.3-4	Right-of-Way Impacts by City .....	5-22
Figure 5.3-5	Right-of-Way Impacts by City (Excluding Utility Right-of-Way) .....	5-22
Figure 5.4-1	I-710 DPM Concentrations (between Willow Street and I-405).....	5-39
Figure 5.4-2	I-710 DPM Concentrations (between Rosecrans and Alondra).....	5-39
Figure 5.4-3	Estimated Percentage Change in Regional Emissions .....	5-41
Figure 5.4-4	Estimated Percentage Change in I-710 Study Area Emissions .....	5-42
Figure 5.5-1	Total Cost Comparison.....	5-65
Figure 5.5-2	Mainline vs. Total Cost Comparison.....	5-65
Figure 5.5-3	Construction vs. Right-of-Way Cost Comparison.....	5-66
Figure 5.5-4	Component Cost Comparison.....	5-67
Figure 6.3-1	Draft Hybrid Design Concept.....	6-7
Figure 6.3-2	Typical Section (between PCH and Anaheim St.).....	6-8
Figure 6.3-3	Typical Section (between PCH and Willow St.).....	6-9
Figure 6.3-4	Typical Section (north of Del Amo).....	6-10
Figure 6.3-5	Typical Section (Alondra to Rosecrans Ave.).....	6-11
Figure 6.3-6	Typical Section (South of Imperial Highway) .....	6-12
Figure 6.3-7	Typical Section (Imperial Hwy to Firestone Blvd.).....	6-13
Figure 6.3-8	Typical Section (Firestone Blvd. to Florence Ave.) .....	6-14
Figure 6.4-1	Acreage Impacts by Land Use Type by Alternative .....	6-18
Figure 6.5-5	Truck Value of Time Distribution.....	6-27
Figure 6.5-6	Tolls and Truck Lane Usage .....	6-28
Figure 9.2-1	I-710 MCS Hybrid Design Concept .....	9-4

## **LIST OF APPENDICES**

### **APPENDIX A**

List of Consultant Firms

### **APPENDIX B**

I-710 Oversight Policy Committee Membership, Meeting Agendas, Meeting Minutes

### **APPENDIX C**

I-710 Technical Advisory Committee Membership, Meeting Agendas, Meeting Minutes

### **APPENDIX D**

I-710 Major Corridor Study Fact Sheets

### **APPENDIX E**

*Community Report*, Moore Iacofano, Goltsman, Inc., (January 2005)  
"Long Beach City Council I-710 Oversight Committee, Summary of Outreach," City of Long Beach, (September 2004)

### **APPENDIX F**

*August 2001 Issues Analysis Report*, Consensus Planning Group, Inc., (August 2001)

### **APPENDIX G**

*Initial Set of Alternatives*, Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc., (March 2002)

### **APPENDIX H**

"I-710 Major Corridor Study Screening Methodology," Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc., (March 2002)  
"Description of Screening Measures," Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc., (May 2002)

### **APPENDIX I**

Detail – ROW Analysis, Screening of Alternatives, Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc., (May 2002)

### **APPENDIX J**

Detail – Capital Cost Estimates, Screening of Alternatives, Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc., (May 2002)

### **APPENDIX K**

"TSM/TDM Alternative – Description of Goods Movement Strategies," Cambridge Systematics, Inc., (September 2002)

**APPENDIX L**

“Conceptual Plans for Alternatives C, D, and E,” Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc., (January 2003), provided under separate cover.

**APPENDIX M**

*I-710 Major Corridor Study Final Set of Alternatives*, Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc., (Revised January 2003)

**APPENDIX N**

*A Comparison of Alternatives with Respect to Localized Diesel Particulate Matter Concentrations*, Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc., (May 2003)

*I-710 Major Corridor Study – IDAS Parameters, Rates, Technical Memorandum*, Cambridge Systematics, Inc., (February 2003)

**APPENDIX O**

Detail – Estimated ROW Impacts by Element by Land Use Category (Alternatives C, D, E);  
Detail – Estimated ROW Impacts by City, Total / Exclusive of Utility ROW (Alternatives C, D, E);  
Detail – Estimated Capital Cost by Cost Category (Alternatives C, D, E); Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc., (March 2003)

**APPENDIX P**

*I-710 Major Corridor Study “Hybrid” Alternative (Locally Preferred Strategy) Technical Report*, Gateway Cities Council of Governments, (April 2004)

**APPENDIX Q**

Detail – Financial Analysis, Hybrid Design Concept, Cambridge Systematics, Inc., (June, 2004)

**APPENDIX R**

I-710 Tier 2 Community Advisory Committee Meeting Agendas, Meeting Minutes

**APPENDIX S**

*Major Opportunity/Strategy Recommendations and Conditions*, Tier 2 Community Advisory Committee, (August 2004)

**APPENDIX T**

“Recommendations for Consideration in Adoption of I-710 Locally Preferred Strategy,” I-710 Technical Advisory Committee, (September 2004)

**APPENDIX U**

“I-710 Oversight Policy Committee Adopted Locally Preferred Strategy, Executive Summary, November 18, 2004,” Gateway Cities Council of Governments, (January 2005)

**APPENDIX V**

“I-710 Corridor Study, Caltrans and FHWA Report on Locally Preferred Strategy,” Caltrans, (September 2004)