

# 6<sup>th</sup> Street Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #5 Meeting Minutes

---

**Meeting:** with CAC Members:

Sergio Rangel, Business Owner  
Jim Bickley, Spilo World Wide  
Michelle Mowery, LA DOT Bicycle Program Coordinator  
Mike Buhler, LA Conservancy  
Jesse Leon, Office of Council Member Jose Huizar  
Kevin Break, Break Photography  
Laurie Perlwin, Boyle Heights Resident  
Victoria Torres, Boyle Heights Neighborhood Council Member  
Teresa Marquez, Boyle Heights Homeowner and Resident Association  
Nat Gorman, Cal Fiber  
Magnus Walker, Serious Clothing

**Meeting Date:** 11/8/2007 6:00 p.m. – 7:30p.m.

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

**Attendance:** Team:

Yoga Chandran, CH2M Hill  
Wally Stokes, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering  
Jim Wu, 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 Kochoon, Parsons  
Steve Thoman, David Evans and Associates, Inc.  
Cameron Millard, Caltrans

---

## **Introduction:**

The CAC # 5 meeting was held with 11 attendants of the 27 invited individuals. The objective of CAC #5 meeting was to present the outcome of the alternative alignment screening and the bridge type screening activities for the Replacement Alternative, which were conducted subsequent to the last CAC meeting. All members received in advance a copy of the CAC #4 meeting minutes and the alternative alignment and bridge type screening exercise results. Jeff Bingham facilitated the meeting. Steve Thoman, bridge engineer discussed the process followed for selecting five bridge types for further evaluation and Walter Quesada, roadway engineer, presented and described the process for selecting alternative alignments. All invited members were given a copy of the agenda, CAC #4 meeting minutes, CAC #5 Power Point presentation and copy of the alternative alignment and bridge type screening exercise results. All members were encouraged to ask questions at all times during the meeting.

## **Meeting Summary:**

The meeting began at 6:00 p.m. Jeff Bingham welcomed the CAC members and introduced the project team. The CAC members were then asked to introduce themselves. Jeff. Bingham proceeded to explain the goals for the night. He asked the CAC members to review the meeting minutes of CAC #4 meeting that took place on August 28 at the Boyle Heights Youth Technology Center.

Steve Thoman then proceeded to present in detail the process for bridge screening which considered input from CAC members during CAC #4 meeting, and a workshop with the bridge Peer Group and PDT arranged subsequently.

# 6<sup>th</sup> Street Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #5 Meeting Minutes

Steve walked the group through each step the team employed to arrive at the final five selected bridge types for further evaluation in the environmental review process. The five bridge type concepts for the Replacement Alternative included:

1. Main Span Replication
2. Concrete Box Girder with Steel Tied Arch Pedestrian Way over the River
3. Steel Half-Through Arch with Concrete Box Girder Approaches
4. Extradosed Concrete Box Girder with Dual Pylons
5. Extradosed Concrete Box Girder with Single Pylons

In addition to the bridge types presentation, Steve also provided information on potential treatment of ASR and the applicability of these treatments to the viaduct, the information of which has been inquired by the CAC members during the previous meetings. Steve discussed the effectiveness of Lithium treatment and the carbon fiber reinforcement methods to contain ASR. Steve concluded that these methods will not provide long term solution to the issue related to ASR and seismic behavior.

Walt Quesada similarly explained the various alignments considered by the PDT under the Replacement Alternative. He described the criteria used for the evaluation of these alignments. Walt presented the CAC members with a spreadsheet that summarized the alternative alignments considered, alternative description, evaluation criteria, score, rank, and the selected alignments to be carried forward for detailed analysis. The selected alignment alternatives included:

1. No Action,
2. Retrofit Alternative 5, using steel casing around the existing columns,
3. Replacement Alternative 2- Alignment 2,
4. Replacement Alternative 5- Alignment 5,
5. Replacement Alternative 10- Alignment 10.

Walt further showed the CAC members the alignment maps. He answered a lot of questions asked by the CAC members related to the potential impacts to various properties under each alternative considered.

Jeff Bingham summarized the meetings stating that the environmental technical studies are well underway. Jeff further mentioned that the future CAC meetings will be arranged to tour the project site and to present the preliminary results of the various environmental technical studies.

After the presentation, the CAC members were given an opportunity to ask questions related to alignment and bridge screening activities..

The CAC members were informed that the PDT was going to coordinate the date for a CAC member site visit for mid-late January 2008. CAC members expressed interest in participating in the site visit. The date for CAC #6 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:

- Do all the bridge designs have the same alignment?

# 6<sup>th</sup> Street Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #5 Meeting Minutes

- How many properties located on the Westside will the City take with alignment 10?
- What was the outcome of the screening process of the bridge types and alignments?
- Why did the 5 Alternatives chosen by the City team scored less than the rest of the alternatives available?
- How were the 5 alternatives chosen ranked?
- Given the limited penetration of lithium in the concrete, has it ever been effective to solve the ASR problem in other structures?
- Does the FHWA recognize the use of lithium as an effective method to treat ASR?
- Has the FHWA report dismissed lithium as an alternative solution?
- Isn't Caltrans using carbon fiber successfully for seismic retrofitting of bridges?
- Is the FHWA report on lithium treatment available for review?
- Roughly when will the City start taking property by eminent domain?
- Will this project work in conjunction with the LA River Master Plan?
- An elevator would not be a good idea for the bridge; this would give too much privacy for illegal activities.
- What happens to the businesses between Mateo and 6<sup>th</sup> St. on the Westside if the new alignments require that space?
- Can we get copies of the alignment renderings size 11x17?
- A DWP expert should be part of the January site visit.
- What does the City do with the NOP Comments submitted?

## Next CAC Meeting:

Next CAC meeting was not tentatively scheduled.

## Action Items:

- Send meeting minutes to CAC members
- Set Date for Site Visit
- Provide CAC members with copies of alignment renderings