

I-710 Areas of Concern and Mitigation Strategies

April 11, 2013

Area of Concern / Problem	Potential Mitigation Strategies	Notes
Detection health.	Caltrans to fix the sensors.	Problems may be due to rehabilitation work. Most on and off ramps appear to be equipped.
Congestion on surrounding freeways.	Addressed by coordinated, comprehensive regional travel study / freeway management plan.	Complex problem to solve. I-710, parallel arterials, and surrounding freeways create a "grid." Difficult to determine driver patterns due to multitude of travel options.
Truck traffic volume growing faster than passenger car traffic.	See I-710 Corridor project evaluations (for instance, separating trucks from regular traffic).	I-710 carries more trucks than any other route in California. Future I-710 Corridor Project may help mitigate truck traffic. High volume of truck traffic makes it difficult to replicate an ICM solution on other corridors.
Truck traffic on arterials.	Disallow trucks from using arterials.	Local jurisdictions expressed desire to have minimum truck traffic on their roads. Some arterial traffic unavoidable due to location of warehouses.
Congestion due to the high frequency of accidents.	May be able to reduce the frequency of accidents by altering lane changing/weaving traffic patterns around ramps. Driver education campaign on how to behave around trucks.	Difficulty to alter truck trip patterns due to relative location of port and warehouses/intermodal terminal; need to keep trucks off residential areas.
Inability to meter entering traffic at Atlantic and Washington interchanges (ramp meters have been turned off so that trucks can enter the freeway at higher speeds).	Change in interchange geometry, rerouting truck traffic through alternate freeway entrance/exit points.	Difficulty to alter local truck trip patterns.
Short ramp length at the I-710/I-405 interchange not conducive to ramp meters.	Change in interchange geometry.	Likely to be a very costly solution due to limited right-of-way.
Limited real-time traffic detection along arterials in the central section of the corridor.	Install traffic sensors.	Sensor installation subject to fund availability and desirability from local jurisdictions. Cost will depend on existing infrastructure and sensor type.
Not all cities have the ability to centrally monitor and control traffic signals within their jurisdiction.	Deploy TMC.	May be cost-prohibitive. TMC may be shared with another city.
Cities in the northern part of the corridor may not have the resources to support the deployment and operation of an ICM system.	Needs staff and equipment. Mitigation highly dependent on local/regional politics.	
Lack of available capacity at key intersections.	Signal timing improvements, intersection geometry changes where right-of-way permits, operational changes.	

Area of Concern / Problem	Potential Mitigation Strategies	Notes
High density of traffic signals on surrounding arterials reduces attractiveness of re-routing traffic onto arterials.	Improve signal coordination and/or interconnection; implement inter-jurisdictional signal coordination.	Inter-jurisdictional coordination subject to local politics.
Metro Blue Line is 2 to 4 miles away from freeway and travel is on congested arterials.	Develop coordinated path to relevant stations.	Uncertainty regarding effectiveness of strategy, distance of travel to stations likely not to be appealing to drivers.
Limited parking availability at light rail stations in the corridor – limits mode shift opportunities.	Increase parking capacity. Develop agreements with private parking lot operators.	Effectiveness of mitigation strategy likely linked to providing real-time parking availability information to relevant freeway traffic.