

6th Street Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #4 Meeting Minutes

Meeting: with CAC Members:

Meeting Date: 08/28/2007 6:00 p.m. – 8:00p.m.

Rogelio Nava, Council District 14
Marc Spilo, Spilo World Wide
Jim Bickley, Spilo World Wide
Ross Valencia, Boyle Heights Homeowner Residents Association
Arturo Herrera, Boyle Heights Homeowner Residents Association
Carol Armstrong, LA River Revitalization
Rosalie Gurrola, Member of the Boyle Heights Neighborhood Council
Marcello Vavala, LA Conservancy
Jesse Leon, Office of Council Member Jose Huizar
Joaquin Castellanos, Boyle Heights Resident
Kevin Break, Break Photography
Shelly Backlar, Friends of the LA River
Laurie Perlowin, Boyle Heights Resident
Maureena Rodela, Kevin Break Photography
Victoria Torres, Boyle Heights Neighborhood Council Member
Tammy Goss, Boyle Heights Neighborhood Council Member
Tara Devine, Central City East Association

Location: The Boyle Heights Youth Technology
Center
1600 E Fourth St. Los Angeles, CA 90033

Attendance: Team:

Jim Wu, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering
Wally Stokes, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering
Tony Torres, DSO
Glenda Silva, DSO
Dick Chan, Moffatt & Nichol
Walter Quesada, Moffatt & Nichol
Jeff Bingham, Parsons
Anne Kochaon, Parsons
Steve Thoman, David Evans and Associates, Inc.
Kent Cordtz, David Evans and Associates, Inc.
Don MacDonald, MacDonald Architects

Introduction:

The CAC#4 meeting was held with 17 attendees of the 27 invited individuals. The objective of CAC #4 was to provide the opportunity for the CAC members to understand the bridge design concept, to view the variety of possible designs if the Replacement Alternative were to proceed, and to share their preference in the design concepts with the project development team (PDT). All members received, in advance, a copy of the CAC #3 meeting minutes and a copy of the bridge type concepts handout to be used at the meeting. The meeting started with a quick introduction with the PDT and invited CAC members. All invited members were given a copy of the agenda, CAC#3 meeting minutes, and copy of the bridge type concepts. Jeff Bingham facilitated the meeting. Steve Thoman, bridge engineer, and Don MacDonald, bridge architect, presented and described the 16 bridge type concepts. All members were encouraged to ask questions at all times during the meeting. Everyone in attendance was given four green sticker dots to choose the bridge types that they would recommend for consideration during the process. The meeting ended with the recommendation exercise.

6th Street Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #4 Meeting Minutes

Meeting Summary:

The meeting began at 6:00 p.m. Mr. Jeff Bingham welcomed the CAC members and introduced the project team. The CAC members were then asked to introduce themselves. Mr. Bingham proceeded to explain the goals for the night. He asked the CAC members to review the meeting minutes of CAC #3 meeting that took place on June 28 at the Boyle Heights Youth Technology Center.

Mr. Thoman and Mr. MacDonald then proceeded to present the bridge concept types being considered for the replacement alternative. The presentation provided an explanation of the concepts and features of all the 16 bridge types that could be constructed to replace the 6th St Viaduct if the Replacement Alternative were to be selected. The rendering of each bridge type under study was displayed in three groups for viewing by the CAC members, including 1. Beam Type Bridges (1B, 2B, and 3B); 2. Arch Type Bridges (Deck Arches [4A, 5A, 6A], Tied Arches [7A, 8A, 9A, 10A], and Through Arches [11A, 12A, 13A]); and 3. Cable Type Bridges (14C, 15C, 16C) as shown in Attachment 1.

After the presentation, the CAC members were given an opportunity to ask questions before moving on to the recommendation exercise. During the recommendation exercise, the CAC members were asked to select on the bridge types of their preferences. Each CAC member was provided four green sticker dots that they could place on the different bridge concept renderings. Members were instructed to place one or more green dots on their preferred concept (s). Results of the CAC members input are provided in Attachment 1.

The CAC members were informed that the goal for the next CAC meeting was to talk about the results of the alternative alignment screening exercise. The date for CAC #5 was yet to be determined.

Meeting ended at 7:30 p.m.

Questions and Comments:

Questions, comments, and input raised by the CAC members at the Q&A session are summarized below:

- What is the percentage of the cost of the steel and concrete that will be used for bridge type concepts?
- Do the cable bridges shown have belvederes similar to the concepts with belvederes?
- Is concept 15C of the cable stayed bridges, a single column or double tower at each bent?
- Does an aesthetic requirement exist for suicide prevention?
- Council District 14 maintains and supports current original design and concepts but understands that safety is most important.
- Are all concepts possible for construction?
- Will the ADA compliant escalators work with the LA River Revitalization Master Plan?
- Elevators would promote undesirable conduct.
- Will alignments change or impact bridge type concepts?
- Can all these bridge type concepts be built on the original alignment to minimize business impacts?
- Is there a possibility that the bridge be constructed on a straight alignment?
- Does alternative 13 Arch type keep the current kink and is there a grade change?
- Do less stringent guidelines exist for turning the current bridge into a pedestrian bridge?
- Would it be safe to turn the current bridge into a pedestrian bridge?
- If the bridge is retrofitted, what is the life expectancy and cost of the bridge?

6th Street Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #4 Meeting Minutes

- Why can't the ASR be completely removed without changing the face of the current structure?
- The retrofit option should be good start to alleviate the public safety issue and minimize business impacts and in a few years start will a long term solution.
- Do traffic load factors play a role in the disintegrating of the structure?
- A cost analysis should be presented of all the bridge type concepts to show how much more expensive it would be to replace versus retrofit.
- Are all safety elements equal among all concepts?
- Speed limit should be 40 mph.
- How will power lines impact pedestrian walkway designs?
- Build pedestrian walkways in center of the structure.

Results of the CAC Screening of Bridge Type Concepts

The voting results by the CAC members are summarized in Attachment 1.

Next CAC Meeting:

Next CAC meeting was not tentatively scheduled.

Action Items:

- Send meeting minutes to CAC members