Chapter 6
Evaluation of Alternatives

6.1 Introduction

This chapter summarizes the capital costs and planned sources of funding for the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 build alternatives. This chapter also includes a comparison of the alternatives analyzed in this Draft EIS/EIR.

This initial analysis will assist the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Metro, city officials, and the general public in understanding and evaluating Metro's financial capacity to construct the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 and to operate and maintain the existing transit system and the proposed extension.

Costs and funding presented in this chapter are in 2010 base year dollars and in Year of Expenditure (YOE) dollars, assumed to be 2035. YOE dollars reflect the financial impact of funds that would need to be expended in the actual year of expenditure and the relative effects of inflation on costs and revenues. Annual and compounded inflation rates and the project implementation schedule are used to project from base year dollars to YOE dollars. This inflation rate is the most current rate used for other projects. For example, in YOE dollars, $1.00 in 2011 is equivalent to $1.03 in 2012, using an inflation rate of 3.0 percent. Year of expenditure cost estimates are derived by multiplying the constant dollar cost estimate for a particular year by the inflation factor calculated for that year. In addition, costs and revenues presented are consistent with Metro's fiscal year, which begins July 1 and runs through June 30.

6.2 Capital Costs and Funding

This section presents the capital cost of the project and the federal, state, and local revenue sources proposed for funding.

6.2.1 Capital Costs

Capital cost estimates for the alternatives were developed based on concept drawings reflecting an approximate ten percent level of engineering completion.

As shown in **Table 6-1**, capital costs for the TSM and build alternatives are presented in 2010 base dollars and in YOE dollars. Costs for the No Build Alternative are not included because no new transit investment in the project area, beyond what is planned for in Metro's 2009 *Long Range Transportation Plan* (LRTP), would be constructed. The capital costs of the alternatives range from approximately $100.1 million ($203.6 million in YOE dollars) for the TSM Alternative to $1.70 billion ($3.29 billion in YOE dollars) for the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative with the Rosemead Boulevard and the I-605/San Gabriel River aerial crossing options. The YOE costs for the TSM Alternative and build alternatives reflect the implementation plan assumed in Metro's LRTP.

Table 6-2 presents the capital costs of the alternatives using FTA's Standard Cost Categories (SCC). FTA requires submission of capital costs in SCC format at key milestones in the project development process. These cost figures are the gross capital expenditures relative to the No Build Alternative. Total capital costs are divided into five major categories. These include:

- General Construction: guideway elements, stations, maintenance yards, sitework, systems, and contingencies;
- Vehicles: vehicle manufacturing and assembly;
- Right-of-Way (ROW): all rights-of-way, land, maintenance yards, and existing improvements;

Table 6-1. Capital Cost Estimates in 2010 and YOE Dollars ($ in Millions)

Alternative	2010 Dollars	YOE Dollars
TSM Alternative	$100.1	$203.6
SR 60 LRT Alternative		
SR 60 LRT Alternative	$1,296.1	$2,549.0
SR 60 LRT Alternative with North Side Design Variation	$1,271.2	$2,499.7
Washington Blvd. LRT Alternative		
Washington Blvd. LRT Alternative	$1,425.25	$2,835.8
Washington Blvd. LRT Alternative with Aerial Crossings Options	$1,661.0	$3,288.8

Source: AECOM, CDM Smith 2013

Table 6-2. Capital Cost Estimates by Alternative (2010 $ in Thousands)

Cost Category	TSM Alternative	SR 60 LRT Alternative		Washington Blvd. LRT Alternative	
		Without North Side Design Variation	With North Side Design Variation	Without Aerial Crossings Options	With Aerial Crossings Options
Construction	$2,500	$781,429	$762,425	$752,202	$767,448
ROW, Land, Maintenance Yards, and Existing Improvements	$4,900	$114,750	$116,375	$218,000	$412,860
Vehicles	$83,633	$66,150	$66,150	$117,600	$117,600
Professional Services	$ -	$215,910	$210,713	$207,875	$212,115
Unallocated Contingency (Construction)	$9,103	$117,824	$115,566	$129,568	$151,002
Total	**$100,136**	**$1,296,062**	**$1,271,229**	**$1,425,245**	**$,1,661,025**

Source: AECOM, CDM Smith 2013.
Notes:
This table lists only the net capital expenditures for each alternative relative to the No Build Alternative.
Capital costs include construction of a maintenance yard for each of the build alternatives.

- Soft Costs: professional engineering and related services. Generally, soft costs are the capital expenditures that are required to complete an operational transit project, but are not spent directly on activities related to brick-and-mortar construction, vehicle and equipment procurement, or land acquisition. Instead, these expenses are incurred for professional services that are necessary to complete the project; and,
- Unallocated Contingency: additional cost included in the estimate that may be used to cover unforeseen costs, inflation, and/or mitigation measures.

As the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Project moves through FTA's major capital project development process the costs and implementation schedule will be further refined.

6.2.2 Capital Funding Sources

Metro's approved 2009 LRTP has established a budget of $2.49 billion for the life of the project, which is the present worth in 2010 dollars, escalated to the year of expenditure. The following combination of federal, state, and local revenue sources could be used to fund the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Project:

- Federal Sources
  - Congestion Management and Air Quality (CMAQ)
  - Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)
  - Other future FTA funding
- State Sources
  - Regional Improvement Program Funds (RIP)
- Local Sources
  - Measure R Sales Tax
  - Local Agency Funds
  - Proposition A
  - Proposition C
- Additional Local, State, and Federal Funding Levels

Measure R is projected to provide $1.271 billion, approximately 50 percent of the capital cost necessary for the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 project. Additional revenues will need to be identified to fully fund the capital costs of the LRT build alternatives. The required additional revenues range from approximately $10 million for the SR 60 LRT Alternative to $60 million for the SR 60 LRT Alternative with the North Side Design Variation; and from $285 million for the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative to $732 million for the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative with Aerial Crossing Options. Metro will also conduct value engineering and potentially refine the locally preferred alternative (LPA) during the Final EIS/EIR process in order to reduce cost. This may include the development of a Minimal Operable Segment (MOS).

Measure R was amended by the Metro Board of Directors in June 2013 to reflect changes to the availability date of Measure R funds for the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 and other projects. This amendment reflected the availability of funds for the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 project prior to 2024, but only if certain conditions are met. The change in Measure R funding availability is conditioned on meeting several threshold tests, including passage of the American Fast Forward Tax Credit Bond program. If these conditions are met and the funds are available, then the Metro Board of Directors can amend or reflect this change in availability in the LRTP. As such, the financial plan contained in the Final EIS/EIR will reflect the Measure R amendment and clearly identify the timeframe in which Measure R funds are available for this project.

In an effort to implement third decade projects, as identified by Measure R, sooner and to advance the issuance of the Final EIS/EIR, thereby reducing costs and providing new services sooner to riders, the Metro Board is pursuing additional funding mechanisms for projects planned for the later years of Measure R. Metro's effort includes the second part of its America Fast Forward legislation, a new

class of Qualified Tax Credit Bonds for Transportation.

A brief description of each funding source is provided in the following sections.

6.2.2.1 Federal Sources

Congestion Management and Air Quality

The CMAQ program is a federal formula grant program for use on projects that contribute to attainment of national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). CMAQ is also programmed for rail and bus operations and can be used for the first three years of operation of individual new rail and bus projects.

CMAQ funds are expected to cover approximately 0.7 percent of the capital costs necessary for the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Project.

Regional Surface Transportation Program

Established by the State of California Statute, the RSTP program funds projects using funds from the Surface Transportation Program in accordance with Section 133 (f) of Title 23 of the United States Code (USC). Of the $320 million apportioned annually, 76 percent is directed to California's eleven urbanized areas with a population greater than 200,000.

6.2.2.2 State Sources

Regional Improvement Program Funds

RIP funding is derived from the State Highway Account and programmed in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Funds in the State Highway Account are comprised of state fuel excise taxes, truck weight fees, and other state transportation revenues as well as California's allocation of federal highway trust funds. Within the STIP, 75 percent of the funding is allocated and programmed by regional transportation planning agencies such as Metro under the RIP. The remaining 25 percent is programmed by the state under the Interregional Improvement Program.

Based on a fund estimate prepared by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the California Transportation Commission develops the annual RIP programming targets for each agency. Metro selects and programs the projects to be funded through its Call for Projects process and the Metro Long and Short Range Transportation Plans. Metro has programmed and re-programmed its STIP projects to conform to the targets, which have been subject to change based on the level of funds available and the extent of borrowing of transit revenues by the state for use in balancing the state budget.

RIP funding would provide approximately $0.5 million dollars towards the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Project capital costs.

6.2.2.3 Local Sources

Measure R Sales Tax

The majority of the project would be funded with Measure R funds, which are collected via a sales tax for the purpose of making transportation investments in the county. Measure R is a half-cent transportation sales tax approved in November 2008 by Los Angeles County voters to meet the transportation needs of Los Angeles County. This is the third half-cent transportation sales tax implemented in Los Angeles County; the others are Proposition A and Proposition C. Collection of the Measure R tax began on July 1, 2009 for public transit purposes (rail expansion, local street improvements, traffic reduction, improved public transportation, and quality of life) for a period of 30 years.

Metro is responsible for administering Measure R revenues. Measure R revenues flow to Metro. The revenues are then allocated in accordance with legally binding allocation rules delineated by Los Angeles County Ordinance #08-01, the Metro Formula Allocation Procedure, and Metro Board of Directors actions. Ordinance #08-01 mandates that 65 percent of Measure R revenues be allocated to rail or bus transit.

Local Agency Funds

The Measure R Expenditure Plan calls for local jurisdictions to provide three percent of total project costs for Measure R transit projects.

Approximately three percent of total project costs of the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Project will be provided from local agency funds.

Proposition A

Proposition A is a half-cent sales tax designated for transportation projects throughout Los Angeles County. Proposition A was approved in 1980 by county voters and was instrumental in the advancement of several projects, including the Metro Blue Line to Long Beach and Metro Red Line to North Hollywood.

Proposition C

Proposition C was also approved by county voters in 1990 as a half-cent sales tax for transportation improvements throughout the county. Revenues from the sales tax are distributed to five different categories, including five percent to rail and bus security; 10 percent to commuter rail, transit centers, and park and ride lots; 25 percent to transit-related improvements to streets and highways; 20 percent as local return; and 40 percent discretionary for capital and operations improvement projects.

6.3 Comparison of Alternatives

This section summarizes the information from the other chapters of this Draft EIS/EIR and highlights important trade-offs between the proposed alternatives. Section 6.3.1 contains a summary of the evaluation methodology used to compare the alternatives. Further information on the cost and ridership estimates used in this analysis is provided in Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered. Detailed discussions of environmental considerations are provided in Chapter 4, Environmental Analysis, Consequences, and Mitigation.

6.3.1 Evaluation Methodology

Metro applied the following objectives for evaluating potential alternatives for the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Project. These objectives reflect Metro's mission to meet public transportation and mobility needs for transit infrastructure while also being a responsible steward of the environment and being considerate of affected agencies and community members when planning a fiscally sound project.

- Serve the large number of transit-dependent and low-income residents in the project area.;
- Increase access to major employment centers, activity centers, and destinations in the project area and Los Angeles County;
- Provide regional transit connectivity with the Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension and Measure R projects; and,
- Provide transit alternatives to alleviate roadway congestion, improve mobility options for enhanced quality of life, and provide a convenient and reliable alternative to the automobile.

These goals draw upon those presented in the Alternatives Analysis Report and an addendum to the report, both completed in 2009. For the purposes of this Draft EIS/EIR, these goals have been updated and refined based on public involvement and further analysis of the proposed alternatives, the project area, and the background transportation system.

In addition to the extent to which each alternative achieves the objectives above, the alternatives were compared based on features and environmental impacts remaining after mitigation.

6.3.2 Evaluation Results

This section examines the proposed TSM Alternative and the two build alternatives, the SR 60 LRT Alternative and the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative, based on the criteria discussed in Section 6.3.1. These criteria were used to compare the alternatives to each other and to the No Build Alternative, which represents year 2035 conditions

without the proposed Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Project. Detailed descriptions of the potential alternatives are provided in Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered. The results of the evaluation are presented in **Table 6-3**. Further discussion of the results is provided in the following sections.

6.3.2.1 Achievement of Project Objectives

As indicated in Table 6-3, the TSM Alternative and build alternatives would serve transit-dependent/low-income populations. However, the LRT build alternatives would provide better service to transit-dependent populations given their shorter travel times compared to the TSM Alternative.

The TSM Alternative and build alternatives would increase access to activity and employment centers. However, the LRT build alternatives would provide better and more reliable access than the TSM Alternative because the LRT build alternatives would not be subject to roadway traffic conditions, and would not require patrons to transfer in order to access the existing Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension.

The LRT build alternatives would be more successful in leveraging transit investments (from the existing Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension and Measure R projects) to provide connections farther east than the No Build and TSM Alternatives. The LRT build alternatives would extend the Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension from the existing Atlantic Station to the east by 6.9 or 9.5 miles, depending on the alternative selected. The LRT build alternatives would be an extension of the Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension and would not require patrons to transfer in order to access the existing Gold Line Eastside Extension. This improved transit connectivity would increase transit ridership, provide an alternative to automobile travel, and increase access to major employment centers, activity centers, and destinations within the project area and the region.

Increased transit ridership would also generate environmental benefits through reduced vehicle trips, reduced roadway congestion, reduced emissions of several air pollutants, and offset of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with automobile travel. Improved accessibility and mobility associated with the alternative would also lead to an increase in employment opportunities for the regional population. Implementation of an LRT system would also make it easier for new developments to integrate alternative transportation into their project designs.

The TSM Alternative is predicted to have the least reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) compared with the LRT build alternatives (see Section 4.8, Climate Change). In addition, the LRT build alternatives would not be subject to roadway traffic conditions, would provide a greater number of new daily linked trips, and would have shorter travel times, as shown in Table 6-3. Therefore, the LRT build alternatives would provide greater increases in mobility, accessibility, and reliability of alternative transportation in the project area compared to the No Build and TSM Alternatives.

6.3.2.2 Land Use Benefits

Opportunities for future development on underutilized parcels, vacant sites, and surface parking lots are present in the vicinity of station locations along both LRT alignments.

The TSM Alternative would not provide new rail service to the project area; rather, it would improve existing bus service. Since bus routes can be changed easily, developers do not readily respond to improvements in bus service compared to investment in rail infrastructure. The TSM Alternative improvements would not be enough to induce development in the project area or act as a catalyst for appropriate economic development.

Table 6-3. Alternatives Evaluation Results

Criteria	No Build Alternative	TSM Alternative	SR 60 LRT Alternative	Washington Blvd. LRT Alternative
Project Objectives				
Enhance service to transit-dependent/low-income populations	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Increase access to activity and employment centers	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Leverage transit investments to provide connections farther east	Low	Low	High	High
Alleviate roadway congestion	No	No	Yes	Yes
Improve mobility options	No	No	Yes	Yes
Provide a convenient/reliable alternative to the automobile	No	No	Yes	Yes
Alternative Features				
New Daily System-wide Linked Trips in 2035	N/A	22,798	28,683	29,575
Average Weekday Daily Boardings	N/A	N/A	16,700	19,900
Travel Time (minutes)	50-60	30-42	13	17.5 to 22
Capital Costs (millions of 2010 $)	None	100.1	1,271 to 1,296	1,425 to 1,661
Alternative Length (miles)	N/A	N/A	6.9	9.5
New Stations	0	0	4	6
Environmental Impacts Remaining After Mitigation (Adverse/Significant?)				
Transportation: Intersection impacts during operation	No	No	No	Yes
Community and Neighborhood Impacts: Changes to the physical character of the existing community; community/resource events	No	No	No	Yes (adverse but not significant)
Visual and Aesthetic Impacts: Visual alteration of the existing community	No	No	No	Yes

Table 6-3. Alternatives Evaluation Results (continued)

Criteria	No Build Alternative	TSM Alternative	SR 60 LRT Alternative	Washington Blvd. LRT Alternative
Cumulative Impacts: Visual and aesthetic impacts	No	No	No	Yes
Cumulative Impacts: Intersection impacts	No	No	No	Yes

Source: CDM Smith 2014.
Note: 'Adverse' refers to the level of effect under NEPA and 'significant' refers to the level of impact of significance per CEQA. Adverse but not significant impacts are perceived as negative are considered 'adverse' under NEPA but do not reach a level of significance under CEQA.

6.3.2.3 Alternative Features

As presented in Table 6-3 and Appendix II, Travel Demand Modeling Technical Memorandum, the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative would attract the highest number of new daily systemwide linked trips in 2035, approximately 29,575 trips. A linked trip is a trip from origin to destination on the transit system. Even if a person must make several transfers during a journey, the trip is counted as one linked trip on the system. Boardings are unlinked trips which occur every time a person boards a transit vehicle.

The SR 60 LRT Alternative would have the shortest travel time compared to the other alternatives, with a travel time of 13 minutes from the existing Eastside Extension Atlantic Station to the Peck Road station, and the lowest capital costs of the two LRT alternatives.

Although the TSM Alternative has the lowest capital costs compared to the build alternatives, it has the second longest travel time and the lowest number of new linked trips.

The Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative is the longer of the two LRT alternatives (9.5 miles) and would provide two more stations than the SR 60 LRT Alternative. In addition, the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative would have the highest average weekday daily boardings, with 19,900.

6.3.2.4 Travel Time and Cost Savings

The project's impact on livability was evaluated by applying USDOT guidance for value of time analysis to calculate the value of the time savings associated with transit provision. Travel cost savings associated with diverting riders from autos to transit were also considered.

The quantity of time saved due to the build alternatives was estimated using Metro's travel demand model. The value of travelers' time relies on local wage rates, the quantity of local and intercity travel, and the distribution of personal and business travel. The value of time for regional, personal, and business travel was estimated following USDOT guidelines.

An overall weighted value of travel time was computed based on local household incomes, regional wages, and number of person hours distributed across travel types, adjusted for the mix of personal and business trips.

The number of auto vehicle miles traveled (VMT) that would be diverted to transit is the basis for estimating the travel costs saved. Average vehicle operating costs were applied to VMT avoided to obtain the estimate of costs avoided.

The TSM Alternative would provide enhanced bus service along major streets and freeways in the project area. The TSM Alternative would save travelers approximately 6.78 million hours of travel time and attract an additional 7.41 million riders per year by 2035 relative to the No Build Alternative. The value of the time savings is $152.9 million and the travel cost savings is $33.5 million in 2035 relative to the No Build Alternative.

Operation of the LRT alternatives would improve mobility within the project area relative to the No Build Alternative. Along the SR 60 corridor, the average peak auto travel time from Peck Road to Union Station in 2035 is projected to be just over 43 minutes. The comparable peak LRT travel time under the SR 60 LRT Alternative with the North Side Design Variation is projected to be less than 37 minutes. The SR 60 LRT Alternative would save travelers 8.8 million hours of travel time and attract an additional 9.3 million riders per year by 2035 relative to the No Build Alternative. The value of the time savings would be just over $191.5 million and the travel cost savings would be just over $42.1 million in 2035 relative to the No Build Alternative.

Along the Washington Boulevard LRT corridor, the average peak auto travel time from Lambert Road to Union Station in 2035 is projected to be just over 46 minutes. The comparable peak LRT travel time under the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative is projected to be 41.5 minutes.

The Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative would result in just over $201.1 million in travel time savings and just over $43.5 million in travel cost savings annually by 2035. The Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative would save travelers just under 9.1 million hours of travel time and attract an additional 9.6 million riders per year by 2035 relative to the No Build Alternative.

The mobility benefits under the light rail alternatives would be greater than those enjoyed under the TSM Alternative. The SR 60 LRT Alternative would have a shorter travel time than the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative. However, the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative benefits are modestly greater than those generated by the SR 60 LRT Alternative, due to the projected land uses and growth in the area.

6.3.2.5 Environmental Impacts Remaining After Mitigation

As shown in Table 6-3 above, the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative would result in more adverse effects/significant impacts remaining after mitigation compared to the SR 60 LRT Alternative. With regards to the unavoidable community and neighborhood impacts associated with the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative, the alternative would provide benefits in most of the other categories that federal guidance (Section 4.5.1.1) considers in weighing the effect of a project on quality of life by increasing mobility and access to the various populations, businesses, and community services listed in that guidance. This would lessen impacts. Nonetheless, the adverse changes to the physical character of the existing community in this area cannot be mitigated. All impacts can be mitigated to less than significant levels for the SR 60 LRT Alternative.

Table ES-2 summarizes the impacts, mitigation measures, and impacts remaining after mitigation associated with each alternative.

6.3.2.6 Areas of Controversy/Issues to be Resolved

Based on comments received from scoping meetings held as part of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) public review period, comments received after the NOP public review period, and coordination with cooperating agencies, the following areas of controversy and issues to be resolved are identified and addressed in this Draft EIS/EIR.

The comments received demonstrated substantial support for the two LRT alternatives, the SR 60 LRT Alternative and the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative. Common themes regarding concerns of the community and public agencies included the importance of transit connectivity, service to colleges and universities, providing service to underserved areas, concerns regarding

environmental and engineering challenges along the two alignments, and potential economic opportunities for the cities along the corridors. Environmental concerns included, but were not limited to, traffic impacts associated with construction and operation, construction impacts to residents and businesses, potential visual impacts to residential and business communities, and the potential for future projects to impact the proposed project's ridership. Appendix H, Final Scoping Report, of this Draft EIS/EIR includes a scoping comment log with comments received during the scoping period. Appendix I, Agency Coordination and Public Involvement, of this Draft EIS/EIR includes public comments received after the close of the scoping period.

Cooperating agencies and the public expressed environmental concerns regarding the proximity of the SR 60 LRT Alternative to the former Operating Industries, Inc. (OII) landfill Superfund site. Cooperating agencies and the public also expressed concern over the proposed location of the Santa Anita Avenue station and park and ride facilities within a flowage easement maintained by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). In coordination with Caltrans, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), and USACE, the SR 60 North Side Design Variation was analyzed as a way to minimize potential impacts to the OII landfill Superfund site, located through the SR 60 corridor in the city of Monterey Park. Appendix I includes formal correspondence from the three cooperating agencies. With this variation, instead of running along the edge of the OII landfill Superfund site on the south side of SR 60, the LRT alignment would transition from the south side to the north side of SR 60 just west of Greenwood Avenue and return to the south side of SR 60 approximately one-quarter mile west of Paramount Boulevard.

Issuance of the Final EIS/EIR to the public will be dependent upon Metro's ability to develop a constrained financial plan which demonstrates construction initiating within three years after issuance of the ROD, the time frame by which information within an EIS/EIR is still valid. If the publication of the Final EIS/EIR occurs sometime prior to 2026 (likely within the next five to ten years), a Supplemental Draft EIS will be required prior to its publication.

The Project is currently included within the constrained component of Metro's LRTP and the 2012-2035 RTP, which commit funding to the project starting in 2026. This commitment is based on the availability of funds from Measure R, which funds $1.25 billion of the project starting in FY 2026. Metro's LRTP envisions the project to begin construction between 2027 and 2035 and to be in operations in 2035.

In an effort to implement the project sooner and to advance the issuance of the Final EIS/EIR, thereby reducing costs and providing new services earlier than originally planned, the Metro Board is pursuing additional funding mechanisms for projects planned for the later years of Measure R. Metro's effort includes the second part of its America Fast Forward legislation, a new class of Qualified Tax Credit Bonds for Transportation.

Measure R was amended by the Metro Board of Directors in June 2013 to reflect changes to the availability date of Measure R funds for Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 and other projects. This amendment reflected the availability of funds for the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 project prior to 2024, but only if certain conditions are met. The change in Measure R funding availability is conditioned on meeting several threshold tests, including passage of the America Fast Forward Tax Credit Bond program. If these conditions are met and the funds are available, then the Metro Board of Directors can amend or reflect this change in availability in the LRTP. As such, the financial plan contained in the Final EIS/EIR will reflect the Measure R amendment and will clearly identify the timeframe in which Measure R funds are available for this project.

In order to accelerate a project in the LRTP, the funds must be available and the Metro Board must approve an amendment to the 2009 LRTP or an update to the overall LRTP, approving the project, its new schedule, and its new funding. Should this occur, and the new dates of construction are

known, a supplemental environmental analysis will be conducted, if warranted.

6.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative

Identification of an environmentally superior alternative is required per Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines. The environmentally superior alternative is based on the results of the technical analysis of all the alternatives as reported in the Draft EIS/EIR and on input from the public during public scoping. The identification of an environmentally superior alternative is separate from the selection of an LPA. The LPA is the alternative eventually studied in a Final EIS/EIR. Following the Draft EIS/EIR public comment period, the Metro Board of Directors may choose to select an LPA after examining the Draft EIS/EIR, comments received during the public comment period, and other relevant information. After certification of the Final EIS/EIR, Metro will consider officially adopting a project alternative for implementation.

Both LRT alternatives provide environmental and social benefits for the project area as described above. The SR 60 LRT Alternative meets all the project objectives, would have the shortest travel time, and would not result in any adverse effects or significant impacts after mitigation. The majority of the SR 60 LRT alignment would occur within the Caltrans ROW. However, there are constraints associated with construction of the alignment adjacent to the OII site, which are minimized with the North Side Design Variation, and with a portion of the alignment within the Whittier Narrows Flood Control Basin. The Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative also meets all of the project objectives and would have more average weekday daily boardings than the SR 60 LRT Alternative. However, the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative would result in unavoidable adverse effects/significant impacts with regard to 16 intersections and the visual character of the existing community. The project benefits along with mitigation measures would lessen some of the unavoidable adverse effects/significant impacts associated with the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative, but not to a level of not adverse/less than significant. Based on the above and the analysis presented in Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Chapter 4, Environmental Analysis, Consequences, and Mitigation, and because the alternative meets all the project objectives, would have the shortest travel time, and would not result in any adverse effects or significant impacts after mitigation, Metro staff has identified the SR 60 LRT Alternative, with the North Side Design Variation, as the environmentally superior alternative.

Table ES-2 is a summary of impacts, mitigation measures, and impacts remaining after mitigation associated with each alternative. For further information regarding impacts and mitigation measures associated with each alternative, refer to the environmental resource sections in Chapter 3, Transportation Impacts and Mitigation, and Chapter 4, Environmental Analysis, Consequences, and Mitigation, of this Draft EIS/EIR.

This page intentionally left blank.