

I-405 Improvement Project



Stakeholder Working Group
August 23, 2012



Public Comment Period

May 18 to July 17, 2012

- Postcard Mailings (15,537)
- Newspaper Advertisements
- Community Banners / Posters
- Large Employer Outreach
- E-blasts
- Website
- Stakeholder Briefings (30)
 - Corridor businesses
 - Local, state, federal elected officials
 - Civic and community organizations
 - Labor, OCBC, SCAG and other regional groups

Public Comment

Public Hearing Attendance

Costa Mesa	235
Westminster	200
Rossmore	190
Fountain Valley	180

TOTAL: 805

Comments

Emails	650
Public Hearing Comments	75
Letters	483
Court Reporter Comments	8

TOTAL: 1,216

Key Issues

- Fairview Bridge replacement (Costa Mesa)
- Noise/visual impacts with SR-73 connector (Costa Mesa)
- Business relocations (Fountain Valley)
- Parking impacts (Westminster)
- Almond Avenue soundwall reconstruction (Seal Beach)
- Orange / Los Angeles border area traffic impacts (Seal Beach and Long Beach)
- Air quality impacts (Seal Beach)
- Soundwall heights
- Perceptions of tolling and high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) 2+ conversion
- Funding questions

City of Costa Mesa

Issues:

- Opposition to Fairview bridge replacement
- Impacts associated with SR-73 connector in Alternative (Alt) 3

Recommended Approach:

- Truncate Alt 3 – Begin/end Express Lanes north of Fairview Ave.
 - Avoids reconstruction of Fairview Bridge
 - Eliminates SR-73 direct connector and associated impacts

City of Fountain Valley

Issue: Braided ramps between Magnolia and Warner Avenues requires up to 4 business relocations (Alts 1, 2, 3)

Recommended Approach:

- Use a collector/distributor configuration
 - Eliminates need for business relocations
 - May require non-standard design exceptions

City of Westminster

Issue: Business parking impacts (Alts 1, 2, 3)

Sears: 20 spaces

El Torito: 35 spaces

Recommended Approach:

- Designs refined to eliminate parking impacts to Sears
- Designs modified to reduce impacts to El Torito parking from 35 to 3 spaces (can be mitigated)
 - Requires non-standard lane width on city street (Westminster)

City of Seal Beach

Issue: Replacement of Almond Avenue soundwall (Alts 2, 3)

Under existing plans:

- Alt 1 - No impact to wall
- Alts 2, 3 - Requires replacement of a portion of the wall

Recommended Approach:

- For Alt 2 – Cannot avoid relocating soundwall
- For Alt 3 - Pursue operational and/or design variations to avoid soundwall relocation

City of Seal Beach

Issue: Perception project worsens air quality (Alts 1, 2, 3)

Recommended Approach:

- Share information about air quality impacts / benefits:
 - No-build has the worst impact
 - Alt 2 and Alt 3 are best for air quality
 - Alt 1 delivers only half the air quality benefit of Alt 2 or Alt 3

City of Seal Beach / Rossmoor

Issue: Perceived bottleneck at Los Angeles county line
(Alts 1, 2, 3)

Recommended Approach:

- Conduct additional traffic analysis
- Review lane drop locations for optimization

City of Long Beach

Issue: DEIR/DEIS does not consider traffic impacts in Los Angeles County

Recommended Approach:

- Perform additional traffic analysis
 - Review impacts in Los Angeles County
- Continue and increase coordination efforts with Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority and City of Long Beach

Soundwalls

Issue: Soundwall heights and locations (throughout corridor)

Recommended Approach:

- Maximize soundwall heights where possible
- Use non state and federal funds to augment soundwall program and work to address community issues

Feedback on Alt 3

Issues:

- Perceptions of tolling
- Perceived take-away when converting from HOV2+ to HOV3+ occupancy
- Cost of transponder

Recommended Approach:

- Study policy options including part-time opportunities for HOV2+
- Explore HOV exclusive account with no monthly fees (similar to 91 Express Lanes)



Feedback on Alt 3 (cont'd)

Issue: Perception Measure M2 paying for toll road

Recommended Approach:

- Incremental cost of toll lanes paid for by toll revenue
- Provide additional information about Alt 1, 2, 3 sources and uses of revenues



Funding the Alternatives

	ALT 1	ALT 2	ALT 3
M2 Project Promise 1 regular lane each direction \$1.3 Billion*	\$1.3 B	\$1.3 B	\$1.3 B
Above and Beyond M2 Added lanes beyond M2 promise	None	+1 Regular Lane Each Direction	+1 Express/Toll Lane Each Direction
Additional Cost	\$0	\$100 million	\$400 million
Funding Source		Traditional Transportation Funds**	Tolls/ User Fees***
Total Cost	\$1.3 B	\$1.4 B	\$1.7B

* Measure M2 project funding assumes a combination of M2 funds, leveraged funds, and project savings

**Funding shortfall – additional federal, state and/or local transportation funds are needed (unidentified)

***Tolls finance construction, operations and maintenance of the express/toll lanes

Feedback on Alt 3 (cont'd)

Issue: Questions about potential uses of net toll revenues

Recommended Approach:

- Provide information about Streets and Highways Code - 143 (j)(1):

....any excess toll or user fee revenue under a lease agreement with a regional transportation agency may be paid to the regional transportation agency for use in improving public transportation in and near the project boundaries...

Upcoming Analysis & Policy Discussions

Alternative 1

- Assess Design-Build (D-B) opportunities
- Analyze schedule & cost implications without D-B

Alternative 2

- Assess D-B opportunities
- Analyze schedule & cost implications without D-B
- Explore funding and potential project tradeoffs

Alternative 3 (Modified)

- Modify Alt 3 to address public input*
- Revise traffic and revenue projections
- Analyze HOV2+ toll policy options

* May require additional environmental review

Next Steps

- Regional Planning and Highways September 17, 2012
- Board of Directors LPA* September 24, 2012
- Project Development Team PA** Fall 2012

* LPA = Locally Preferred Alternative

** PA = Preferred Alternative

