6th Street Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project
Presentation to the American Institute of Architects Los Angeles Chapter

---

Meeting: with AIA Urban Design Committee Members **Meeting Date:** 04/23/2008 7:00 p.m. – 10:00p.m.

Jennifer Gill, Consultant
Amber Hawkes, Urban Designer
Melani Smith, Melendrez
Tony Chacon, Melendrez
Scott Baker, Melendrez
Deborah Kahen, City Of LA Planner
Mike Buhler, Los Angeles Conservancy
Julia Stewart, City of Los Angeles Planner
Brian Bartholomew, Architect
John Chase, Urban Designer

Meeting Location: AIA Urban Design Office
3780 Wilshire Blvd Suite 800
Los Angeles, CA 90010

* Two attendees did not sign in.

Attendance: Team:

Jim Wu, LABOE
Glenda Silva, DSO
Jeff Bingham, Parsons
Anne Kochaon, Parsons
Steve Thoman, David Evans and Associates, Inc.
John Koo, LABOE
Don MacDonald, MacDonald Architects

Meeting Summary:

The AIA meeting was held with 12 attendants. The objective of the meeting was to give AIA members a historical background of LA River Bridges and update on the City's current bridge program, which includes the 6th St Viaduct Improvement project. The project development team made a presentation outlining the current 6th St Viaduct - seismic, geometric and material deficiencies and explaining the Alkali Silica Reaction (ASR) that is affecting the entire concrete structure.

Steve Thoman, bridge engineer, facilitated the meeting along with the help of Jeff Bingham who spoke about the history of the Los Angeles bridges, and John Koo who described the Bridge Improvement Project for the City of Los Angeles. Mr. Thoman explained the various design constraints and alignment screening results for each of the alternatives under consideration for the project. Mr. Bingham gave a summary of all the activities that have taken place for the project over the last year and half. The Community Advisory Committee process and involvement was explained in detail during the presentation. Dan Macdonald, bridge architect, explained and described in depth all of the design concepts that were and are being considered if the 6th St Viaduct is replaced.

All meeting attendees were encouraged to ask questions at all times during the presentation.

6th Street Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project
Presentation to the American Institute of Architects Los Angeles Chapter

Questions and Comments:

Questions, comments, and input raised by the AIA members during the presentation are summarized below:

- What will happen to the communities along the length of the bridge?
- What is the City's approach for such long viaduct regarding the urban context?
- Has the City discussed development opportunities for the Eastside portion under the bridge?
- Is the cost of land acquisition included in the estimate cost of replacing the bridge?
- Is there a great difference in cost between the three alternatives that the team is proposing?
- Is the median being proposed for safety reasons?
- Is the median safer than a barrier or an emergency lane?
- Will the additional lanes serve as emergency lanes?
- Is the median more desirable than a curb because of current safety standards?
- What is the current posted speed on the bridge?
- Is the new bridge design wider than the existing bridge?
- The city is going to spend too much money to widen the bridge; money should be used to make other types of improvements to the structure.
- Is widening the bridge a priority?
- Add the LA Curb link to the project website.
- Do you need to have a sidewalk on both sides of the bridge?
- Can the bridge have a sidewalk on only one side?
- What type of community outreach has the City conducted for this project?
- What is the feedback received?
- What is the estimated life of the bridge?
- What is the estimated life of all the bridges in the city?
- If the current bridge cannot be saved, is it cost effective to fix current bridge or replacing it with a new one?
- If the city is considering spending money on this bridge, is it cost effective to preserve current bridge design?
- How many years of additional bridge life will a retrofit give you?
- What is the extent of wrapping the columns in steel and how does this work?
- Can the - iconic span of the bridge be preserved?
- What is the current condition of the steel arches?
- Architecturally speaking can the arches be saved?
- What is the present structural integrity of the arches?

- If the arches would be in perfect condition, would they be useful?
- Can the city reuse the arches by adaptive use?
- Relocate the arches to the new structure to celebrate the new and old elements of the bridge?
- Does the availability of funding affect the feasibility of alternatives and improvements?
- Is the cost of retrofit cheaper?
- Does the bridge have a safety record?
- How many accidents have occurred on the bridge?
- Do not replicate the bridge, identify certain current qualities and use them for new opportunities for the new structure.
- Historic elements should be preserved.
- We need to consider how much we are really willing to invest in preserving the current look of the bridge.
- Bureau of Engineering should consider all combinations of alternatives for the new design.
- If the new bridge design keeps some of the older elements, this will limit new design opportunities.
- Median is a waste of money.
- Who is going to gain from keeping current designs for new structure?
- What is the value of this bridge compared to other bridges in the city?
- How sick is the bridge?
- What made the bridge historical?
- Where did the bad aggregate come from?
- Is this bridge very different from other bridges?
- Which other bridge has the ASR problem?
- Can the city calculate how much more will the aggregate and material expand under its current condition?
- Is the Los Angeles Conservancy only concerned about the steel arches or the entire bridge?
- Conservancy should only focus on the iconic span of the bridge?
- Bridge does not have any really beautiful features.
- Make an extraordinary and creative design for the 21st Century.
- New bridge design should create new opportunities for the future.

Action Items:

No action items.