

## FINAL SCREENING OF ALTERNATIVES BRIEFING PACKAGE

### 1.0 Introduction

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) is conducting a public meeting for the Final Screening of Alternatives for the Restoration of Historic Streetcar Service in Downtown Los Angeles (Project) Alternatives Analysis (AA). The AA is being completed in partnership with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), City of Los Angeles (City) and the Community Redevelopment Agency of Los Angeles (CRA/LA). The purpose of the Project is to restore historic streetcar service to downtown Los Angeles. The Project Study Area (PSA), shown in Figure 1.

Metro welcomes and encourages your participation in the Project. A public meeting regarding the Final Screening of Alternatives will be held on the following date:

When: Thursday, November 3, 2011

Time: 5:30p.m. to 7:00p.m.

Where: Caltrans, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Conference Room, 100 S Main St, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Comments may be submitted at the meeting; sent via e-mail to [streetcarservice@metro.net](mailto:streetcarservice@metro.net); provided via voicemail at (213) 922-3000; or mailed to Metro c/o Laura Cornejo, One Gateway Plaza, 99-22-2, Los Angeles, CA, 90012.

For more information on the Project, please visit [www.metro.net/streetcar](http://www.metro.net/streetcar).

### 2.0 Final Screening Alternatives

The final screening considers the alternatives that advanced from initial screening. The initial screening divided the corridor into segments to reduce the number of potential combinations that needed to be evaluated and allowed the evaluation to focus on the specific opportunities and constraints within each district. Therefore, the alternatives that advanced from initial screening were recommended by segment (Segments A, B, and C). The alternatives advanced from initial screening are shown in Figure 2 and described below:

- Segment A: Advance A4, A6, and A7
- Segment B: Advance B1 and B2
- Segment C: Advance C1 and C3

Figure 1: Project Study Area (PSA)





## 2.1 Changes to Alternatives Prior to Final Screening

The following changes were made to alternatives prior to final screening.

- A4/B3: A modification was made to the A4 alternative to address the 14 percent slope on Grand Avenue between 5<sup>th</sup> Street and 4<sup>th</sup> Street. The revised A4 alternative uses an elevated bridge structure for the streetcar between 6<sup>th</sup> Street and 4<sup>th</sup> Street. The revised A4 alternative requires a new B3 alternative on Grand Avenue between 9<sup>th</sup> Street and 5<sup>th</sup> Street.
- C1: A modification was made to the C1 alternative to eliminate the at-grade crossing of the Metro Blue/Expo Line on Pico Boulevard. The C1 alternative was removed from consideration and replaced with the C2 alternative, which uses Hope Street and 11<sup>th</sup> Street to bypass the at-grade crossing.
- B4: A new B4 alternative was added that uses Figueroa Street between 9<sup>th</sup> Street and 7<sup>th</sup> Street, and 7<sup>th</sup> Street between Figueroa Street and Hill Street. The B4 alternative was added in response to public and stakeholder requests during initial screening to add an alternative that more directly serves the Financial Core as well as the 7<sup>th</sup> Street/Metro Center Station.

The revised alternatives by segment are described below:

- Segment A: Advance A4 (revised), A6, and A7
- Segment B: Advance B1, B3 (replaces B2), and B4 (new)
- Segment C: Advance C2 (replaces C1) and C3

## 2.2 Combined Alternatives for Final Screening

The alternatives in each segment recommended during initial screening are combined into seven alternatives for final screening as shown in Figure 3 and described below:

- Alternative 1: A4/B3/C1
- Alternative 2: A4/B3/C3
- Alternative 3: A6/B1/C1
- Alternative 4: A6/B1/C3
- Alternative 5: A7/B1/C1
- Alternative 6: A7/B1/C3
- Alternative 7: A6/B4/C3



### 3.0 Final Screening Results

The following table summarizes the results of the final screening for each alternative. Table 1 shows the estimates for ridership, capital cost, operation and maintenance (O&M) cost, and cost per user calculated for each alternative.

**Table 1: Ridership and Cost Results**

Alternative	Ridership		Capital Cost	Annual O&M Cost	Cost per User
	Daily Boardings	Boardings Per Mile			
1	9,090	2,370	\$115,499,000	\$5,318,000	\$1.28
2	7,390	2,230	\$107,807,000	\$5,318,000	\$1.52
3	9,880	2,300	\$119,053,000	\$6,148,000	\$1.28
4	8,180	2,160	\$106,367,000	\$5,318,000	\$1.36
5	11,190	2,170	\$137,895,000	\$7,442,000	\$1.34
6	9,500	2,040	\$130,438,000	\$6,916,000	\$1.48
7	8,390	2,210	\$106,761,000	\$5,318,000	\$1.33

Note: Cost per User = (Annualized Capital Cost + Annualized O&M Cost) / Boardings

Table 2 summarizes the results of the final screening using the final screening criteria. The alternatives are rated High (1), Medium (2), or Low (3) for each criteria, with High (1) meaning optimal performance and Low (3) indicating sub-standard performance. All of the criteria are weighted equally for the final screening.

**Table 2: Final Screening Results**

Criteria	Alternative							Summary
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Ridership	1	3	1	3	2	1	1	– Alternatives 1, 3, 6, and 7 have the highest combined average of daily boardings and boardings per mile
Capital Costs	2	2	2	1	3	3	1	– Alternative 4 (\$106.4 million) and Alternative 7 (\$106.8 million) have the lowest capital cost
O&M Costs	1	1	2	1	3	3	1	– Alternatives 1, 2, 4, and 7 (\$5.3 million) have the lowest O&M cost
Cost/Benefit	1	3	1	1	1	3	1	– Alternatives 1 and 3 (\$1.28) have the lowest cost per user, followed by Alternative 7 (\$1.33), Alternative 5 (\$1.34), and Alternative 4 (\$1.36)
Destinations	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	– Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7 serve Bunker Hill, while Alternatives 5 and 6 serve Union Station
Circulation	3	3	2	1	3	3	1	– Alternatives 1 and 2 cannot serve stops on Grand Ave between 3 <sup>rd</sup> St and 6 <sup>th</sup> St because of elevated bridge structure – Alternatives 5 and 6 cross US 101 freeway on-ramp/off-ramps
Design	3	3	2	1	3	3	1	– Alternatives 1 and 2 require an elevated bridge structure on Grand Ave – Alternatives 1 and 2 require modification of the Grand Ave bridge deck – Alternatives 5 and 6 require modification of the Main St and Los Angeles St bridge decks over US 101
Environmental	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	– Alternatives 1 and 2 have the most potential environmental issues because of elevated bridge structure on Grand Ave
Economic Development	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	– Alternatives 1, 3, and 5 (Pico Blvd) have more economic development potential than Alternatives 2, 4, 6, and 7 (11 <sup>th</sup> St).
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>11</b>	

High (1) = Optimal Performance, Medium (2) = Moderate Performance, and Low (3) = Substandard Performance.

#### 4.0 Next Steps

A community update meeting will be held on November 3, 2011 from 5:30 to 7:00pm at Caltrans building located at 100 S. Main St, Los Angeles, California. Metro will share the results of the final screening process and provide an opportunity for questions and comment.

It is anticipated that the Alternatives Analysis will result in a locally preferred alternative to be recommended to the Metro Board late winter 2012.