

6th Street Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project

Public Scoping Meeting # 1 and 2

Meeting Minutes

Attendants:

Meeting Date: 08/14/2007 2:00 p.m. – 4:00p.m.
and 6:00pm-8:00pm

Agency Meeting at 2:00pm -4:00 pm

Ted Masigat, Corps of Engineers
Sonia Campos, Office of the Speaker Fabian Nunez
Tami Podesta, Caltrans
Gabe Brooks
Ana Scott, Downtown News
Ron Kosinski, Caltrans
Hector Elizalde, Office of Lucille Robal-Allard

Location: Artshare Los Angeles
801 E 4th Place Los Angeles, 90013

Public Scoping Meeting at 6:00 pm- 8:00pm

Jim Bickley, Spilo World Wide
Kevin Break, Kevin Break Photography
Erick Nathan
Yuval Bar- Zemer
John Buhler, LA Conservancy
Marcello Vavala, LA Conservancy

Team:

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
Grace David, LABOE
Jeffrey Bingham, Parsons
Anne Kochoon, Parsons
Carlos Montes, Caltrans
Cameron Millard, Caltrans

Meeting Summary:

The project development team and the City of Los Angeles hosted two scoping meetings on August 14, 2007 at Artshare Los Angeles to provide the opportunity for the agency staff and general public to provide input and comments on the Notice of Preparation and Initial study for the 6th St Viaduct Improvement Project released on July 23, 2007. The first meeting was held at 2:00 p.m. to accommodate the public agency staff that will be involved with or have an interest on the project. The second meeting was held at 6:00 p.m. was held to accommodate the residents, business and property owners on the Westside of the Los Angeles River. During the first half of the meeting, the attendants were first allowed to view the project area maps and the project alternatives under study, and to ask questions directly to the project team members. On the second half of the meeting, the project team presented the attendants with the power point presentation which contained the information about the project background, the purpose and need of the project, the public involvement process, the project status, the environmental process, and the overall project schedule. At the end of the presentation, the attendants were allowed to ask questions to the project team members. Both meetings lasted two hours each.

6th Street Viaduct Seismic Improvement Project

Public Scoping Meeting # 1 and 2

Meeting Minutes

Questions and Comments:

Agency Meeting:

- When did the recent epoxy patching occur on the bridge?
- Did the Bridge sustain damages during the Northridge Quake?
- Why is it called a viaduct?
- Is there a reason why this bridge in particular is the only one with the ASR problem?
- Why is the County not involved?

Public Meeting:

- Where did the First St Bridge concrete come from?
- If bridge is replaced will it have additional lanes?
- Do historical bridges need to meet AASHTO (American Association of State Highway and Transportation officials) standards?
- How significant are 11,000 vehicles going across the bridge daily?
- What kind of impact will closing the bridge have, relative to 1st St and 4th St. bridges?
- Can we increase the Gold Line use?
- If the bridge is taken out of service without fixing the ASR problem, does the probability of collapse still exist and damage the structures under the bridge?
- What is the specific date for the end of the comment period?
- Where can we find the minutes to all of the meetings?
- What is the length of the entire bridge compared to project span?
- Will hybrid alternatives of retrofit and replacement be considered?
- Three columns lead to bridge span, can we shift load to the center column while leaving the historic footprint?
- Can the exterior columns be replaced?
- Are there other concerns with the concrete that we should know about?
- If you retain only the span over the river, can you still remove the ASR concrete?
- Are any of the retrofit alternatives feasible even if they do not stop the ASR damage?
- You have presented the project with the engineer approach versus what the public thinks and this was not a good approach.
- Determine public goals first then figure out what is the best approach.
- How aggressive are we with the ideas of a well preserved retrofit?
- How far is the City willing to test new technologies for project?
- Can you stop the water from seeping through the structure to stop the ASR problem?
- Disappointed with lack of community presence but know that the community supports keeping the bridge as-is?