

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

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

January 23, 2003

I. Call to Order

Co-Chair Frank Colonna called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Co-Chair Frank Colonna, Long Beach; Co-Chair Samuel Peña, Maywood; Melanie Andrews, Compton; Keith McCarthy, Downey; Jessica Maes, Huntington Park; Gene Daniels, Paramount; William Davis, Vernon; Thomas Warren, Port of Los Angeles; Sharas Bangalore, Caltrans; Ernest Morales, MTA; Alan Bowser, SCAG.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: George Cole, Bell; Daniel Crespo, Bell Gardens; Hugo Argumedo, Commerce; Frank Gurule, Cudahy; Fernando Pedroza, Lynwood; Xochilt Ruvalcaba, South Gate; Jim Dear, Carson; John Calhoun, Port of Long Beach.

ALSO PRESENT: Helene Ansel, Office of Assemblymember Alan Lowenthal; Bill Pagett, I-710 Technical Advisory Committee Chair and City Engineer of Bell Gardens, Cudahy, Maywood, and Paramount; Jinny Park, MTA; Pat Proano, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works; Anthony Cevallos, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works; Jeannine Critie, Office of Long Beach Vice Mayor Frank Colonna; Lon Maddox, City of Long Beach Traffic Manager; Fernando Mendoza, City of Commerce Administrative Analyst; Kevin Wilson, City Vernon Director of Community Development; Carlos Alvarado, Bell City Engineer; Richard Powers, GCCOG Executive Director; Jack Joseph, GCCOG Deputy Executive Director; Deborah Chankin, GCCOG; David Levinsohn, Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas; Steven Yoshizumi, PBQD; Michael Fischer, Cambridge Systematics Inc.; Sylvia Novoa, Consensus Planning Group; Julia Brown, CPG; Andrea Rodriguez, CPG; Nazan Armenian, CPG; Bahram Fazeli, Communities for a Better Environment; Deborah Schoch, Los Angeles Times.

II. Roll Call

Formal roll call of the OPC members was taken. Other participants and audience members offered self-introductions.

III. Pledge of Allegiance

Member Warren led the pledge of allegiance.

IV. Amendments to the Agenda

There were no amendments to the agenda.

V. Public Comments

There were no public comments at this time.

VI. Consent Calendar

A. Minutes of the Meeting of June 27, 2002.

The minutes of the OPC meeting of June 27, 2002 were not available. It was the consensus of the Committee to defer approval of the minutes to the next OPC meeting.

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

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

Member Bowser encouraged that, in addition to the regular posting places, websites be used to post the OPC agendas. Co-Chair Colonna requested that staff report back at the next meeting regarding use of the Internet to post agendas.

VII. Reports

A. Overview of Study Status

David Levinsohn, PBQD, reviewed the study process and reported that the study was in the alternatives evaluation phase. He briefly discussed the current activities of the team (assessing mobility and environmental benefits and impacts; researching engineering issues and potential project costs; and evaluating financing options) and the future decision points approaching for the OPC (selection of a Locally Preferred Strategy and priority projects).

B. Update on Build Alternative Evolution

Steven Yoshizumi, PBQD, described the changes that the alternatives have undergone during the six-month period since the OPC last met. He started by saying that the design concepts were developed to greater detail with certain background assumptions:

- Meet the Intent of the OPC-Approved Alternative Definition
- Maintain Federal and State Design Standards
- Minimize Right-of-Way/Land Use Impacts

He next reviewed the mainline concept and the various components included in each of the alternatives, highlighting specific aspects of each alternative.

Alternatives A and B had not changed significantly since the June 27, 2002 OPC meeting.

Changes in Alternative C included the following components:

- Collector-Distributor Road
- Truck Bypass Lanes
- Truck Inspection Facility
- Truck-Only Ramps
- Terminal Island Freeway Extension

The Collector-Distributor Road system and the Truck-Only Ramps were fleshed out in more detail. The Truck Bypass Lanes had changed some due to the close proximity of the 91/710 interchange and the 105/710 interchange. Instead of separate bypass lane facilities, a single bypass facility was developed around both interchanges starting south of SR-91 and terminating north of I-105. The Truck Inspection Facility was also altered a bit so that it was located on the

northbound bypass facility. The Terminal Island Freeway Extension had changed quite a bit in response to comments received from both FHWA and the City of Long Beach. Rather than connecting the Terminal Island Freeway Extension to I-405 near Alameda Street, approximately one mile west of I-710, the Terminal Island Freeway Extension was re-routed along the Southern California Edison property to connect with I-710 north of I-405. Access to I-405 would be achieved via local access ramps at Wardlow Road and Santa Fe Road.

Changes in Alternative D included the following issues:

- Number of HOV lanes
- Elevated vs. At-Grade
- Southern Terminus

The number of HOV lanes changed because of the difficulty in transitioning two HOV lanes at both the north and south ends of the project. Because the number of HOV lanes was reduced from two to one in each direction at both the north and south ends, those locations that only had one HOV lane in each direction were developed at grade, while the locations that only two HOV lanes in each direction remained largely elevated (except for ingress/egress locations) to reduce right-of-way impacts. The Southern Terminus was also modified, again largely because of the difficulty of terminating the HOV lane, and also because of the complexity of the number of closely spaced interchanges between Ocean Boulevard and Pacific Coast Highway – five in a 2.4-kilometer (1.5-mile) section.

Changes in Alternative E included the following areas:

- Truckway Alignment Relative to the Mainline
- Truckway/Autoway Configuration at the South End

Previously, the Truckway had been envisioned as being located primarily elevated in the median of the freeway. In response to public, Caltrans, and CHP comment, the Truckway was relocated so that it was not elevated in the median of the freeway, but was located either on one side of the freeway or the other, or split so that there were lanes on both sides of the freeway, and at times those lanes were either elevated or at-grade.

At the south end of the project, Alternative E had previously been conceived with the Truckway extending as far south as Anaheim Street. To reduce right-of-way impacts and construction related impacts, the concept was modified to include an Autoway that would run from the Shoemaker Bridge to north of Willow Street. This four-lane facility would carry autos to/from the downtown/entertainment

area. The Truckway would begin north of Willow Street and extend north the rest of the length of the corridor.

The alternatives also propose different concepts for the I-5/I-710 interchange. Alternative C proposes leaving the existing interchange as it is, and adding a new northbound I-710 to northbound I-5 connector on the right side – all trucks would be prohibited from the existing left side connector and directed to use the new right side connector. Alternative D proposes replacing the existing interchange with all new right-side connectors designed to current design standards, plus the addition of two new connectors – from northbound I-710 to southbound I-5 and from northbound I-5 to southbound I-710. Alternative E also proposes to replace all of the existing connectors, plus it incorporates the same two new movements via a viaduct over Atlantic Boulevard. This four-lane facility would connect the two freeways, but have no access to or from the local streets.

C. Analyses of TDM Strategies

Michael Fischer, Cambridge Systematics, presented some analysis of existing and anticipated port operations and the benefits, impacts, and challenges that some proposed elements of Alternative B might have.

Mr. Fischer described the travel conditions during the West Coast Ports Lockout in October, 2002. I-710 experienced improved flow. There was no truck traffic going to/from the ports, and limited auto traffic. This raised the question of what could be done to improve I-710 operations through demand management measures at the ports. With this question in mind, Cambridge Systematics attempted to assess the impact of 24/7 operation at the ports in lieu of adding lane capacity on I-710.

Currently the container terminals operate in three gate shifts:

- Day shift – 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM
- Evening shift – 5:00 PM to 2:00 AM
- “Hoot” shift – 2:00 AM to 8:00 AM

Presently most gates are only open on weekdays with 80 percent of the traffic during the day shift, 20 percent during the night shift, and negligible operations during the “hoot” shift.

Port truck trips are expected to more than double by 2025. Since gate capacity is determined by the number of truck processing lanes, the rate at which each truck is processed and the total hours of gate operations, the terminals would

have to increase operations in any or all of these areas to accommodate the anticipated growth.

However, the yard or the berth is what restricts throughput capacity, not the gate size, so the terminal operators are motivated to minimize the gate area, not expand it. Further, while other ports have shorter truck processing times (most notably in Asia), there are labor laws in this country that effectively limit the processing rate. These two conditions point to extending the gate hours in order to accommodate the anticipated growth.

The Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach Transportation Management Plan (POLA/LB TMP) assumes 24/7 operations by 2025. The following operational plan from the POLA/LB TMP is assumed in the I-710 Major Corridor Study No Build and TSM/TDM alternatives:

- 60% traffic – day shift
- 20% traffic - evening shift
- 20% traffic – “hoot” shift
- Up to 15% of weekly traffic in weekend

Cambridge Systematics’ analysis looked at two other operational plans: closing the gates during the AM and PM peaks shifting traffic to the off peak periods, and a more level loading during the day and night shifts.

Closing the gates during the peak periods might reduce truck traffic on I-710 during the peak periods, but it has operational inefficiencies related to the fact that this operational strategy would result in a six-hour shift between the peaks. Again labor laws make such an operational strategy challenging and not cost-effective.

Mr. Fischer said that the analysis focused on the level loading strategy:

- 50% traffic – day shift
- 40% traffic - evening shift
- 10% traffic – “hoot” shift

In the AM peak period in the southbound direction, although congestion (measured by V/C ratio) was reduced by up to 10 to 15 percent, the V/C ratios were still greater than 1 indicating congestion. And the changes in congestion are considerably less than the expected results for the build alternatives.

To achieve this kind of a traffic distribution, it is likely that a trucker appointment system would have to be implemented to match the 50/40/10 distribution profile. Further, some of the traffic would have to be specifically targeted to shift to the off-peak hours. And potentially some sort of value pricing system for peak hour operation might help to induce the shift out of the peak period.

Even with these assumptions, the challenge of implementing this type of operation is large. It would require coordination between terminal operators, truckers and shippers. It may increase the cost of doing business for some or all parts of the supply chain. As such, it may hamper the competitive position of the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. And there are potentially other community impacts, like the noise impact of increased night-time operation in suburban/residential areas, and the possible need to change local regulatory codes.

D. Update on Public Involvement

Sylvia Novoa, Consensus Planning Group (CPG), provided the OPC with an update of the recent public outreach efforts. In the current stage of public and community outreach, over 1,500 community groups were contacted and offered a project briefing. Among those that accepted, the different groups and organizations had different issues, but common to most of them was a concern for safety. The community groups also voice an awareness of the potential for impacts.

In meetings with city staffs, the cities seemed to be focusing on the impacts to their individual jurisdictions more than overall corridor impacts. And it was clear that at this point there was no overwhelming consensus for a particular alternative.

E. Next Steps

David Levinsohn, PBQD, concluded the reports by saying that the next steps in the study include the TAC receiving and discussing the technical evaluation information that the study team is developing for each alternative (and each component), and for continued and increased public outreach to provide additional information to the OPC in approximately three to four months.

It was moved by Member McCarthy, seconded by Member Daniels, to receive and file the reports from the project consultants. The motion was approved unanimously.

Co-Chair Colonna requested that the revised Final Set of Alternatives be distributed before the next meeting of the OPC.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 7:45 p.m.