

MEETING SUMMARY

I-880 Corridor System Management Plan (CSMP) CSMP Development Working Group

Wednesday, March 17, 2010
9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
Caltrans District 4

Attendees

ACCMA: Bijan Yarjani
Caltrans: Erik Alm, Katie Benouar, Cesar Pujol, Bob Rosevear
MIG: Lou Hexter, Paul Rosenbloom
MTC: Danielle Stanislaus, Albert Yee
VTA: Casey Emoto, David Kobayashi

I. Welcome and Meeting Objectives

Lou Hexter, MIG, Inc., called the meeting to order and thanked everyone for attending and participating in the 880 CSMP process. Lou reviewed the meeting objectives and agenda for the meeting.

II. Presentation and Discussion of Related Studies

Erik Alm, Bob Rosevear and Cesar Pujol, Caltrans, presented comparison tables of sections 3, 4 and 5 for discussion. The comparison tables include the key source data and metrics from the related study efforts identified at the February 9th I-880 CSMP Development Working Group meeting.

Generally, data is available from the range of reports identified on the 880 map (handout), providing comprehensive coverage of the corridor. However, consistency of the metrics across the ALA and SCL segments is somewhat lacking. Consistency is adequate for existing conditions, however analyses of future conditions use different metrics for different purposes. The available data does provide a snapshot of existing and projected future conditions in the corridor. Caltrans will be drafting sections of the CSMP based on the compiled data that help “tell the story” of the corridor. A key element of this story will be identifying all of the bottleneck locations in the corridor.

Section 3: Existing Conditions

Caltrans will include the Existing Conditions sections from both the CCIT and 880 FPI report within the CSMP as either an appendix or in the main body.. A supporting summary statement will be developed to introduce these sections.

VTA staff expressed comfort with the findings of the 880 FPI report for SCL 880 conditions. Nevertheless, Working Group members suggested field observation as an effective method for verifying the existing conditions. Ensuring the reported bottlenecks are accurate is the most important validation of these existing conditions reports.

Section 4: Future Conditions

There was discussion about what type of future projections to use and if the projections should include the benefits of programmed projects in the RTP, or not. However future conditions are described, assumed improvements as part of the future conditions should be as clearly stated as possible. Focus of this section should be on what problems are expected to develop in future.

Section 5: Recommendations

The group suggested renaming this section “Strategies/ Findings” or “Strategy Evaluation and Recommendations” rather than simply “Recommendations.” Those strategies identified in all of the compiled studies, such as Ramp Metering, would be called out in a separate part of this section. The group also agreed that areas where problems will persist after listed improvements should be identified as outstanding issues or areas of future study.

III. Review of Initial Draft Sections

The group reviewed drafts of Section 1, CSMP Overview, and Section 2, Corridor Description, of the CSMP. Development Team members requested that additional information from existing reports be added to section 2 as well as bike network and SMART corridor maps.

IV. Review and Next Steps

- Bob Rosevear will distribute draft sections 1 and 2 to the Development Working Group for review. Comments should be sent to Bob by March 31st.
- Following Caltrans review of the comments, a decision will be made regarding the need for an additional meeting, tentatively scheduled for 4/27.
- Caltrans will provide drafts of sections 3, 4 and 5 to the Development Working Group for review during April. Caltrans will stagger the release of these drafts to Working Group.
- Caltrans will be compiling a complete draft of the I-880 CSMP for review in early May.
- VTA and ACCMA will provide descriptions of their existing 880 Smart Corridor programs; a summary description should be included in CSMP.