

**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 EI-

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.