

JULY 1, 2020

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

THROUGH: PHILLIP A. WASHINGTON
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

FROM: JAMES DE LA LOZA
CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER

SUBJECT: SAN GABRIEL VALLEY TRANSIT FEASIBILITY STUDY

ISSUE

On May 28, 2020 the Board approved Item #5, San Gabriel Valley Transit Feasibility Study, including Motion #5.1 (Attachment A, Legistar File 2020-0368). The motion directed staff to partner with the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG) to deliver the feasibility study. The study will identify a short- and long-term replacement for the Eastside Transit Corridor Route 60 Alternative which was eliminated from further consideration at the February 2020 Board Meeting.

Staff has begun coordination with SGVCOG and is developing a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to create a partnership between Metro and the SGVCOG to procure and complete the study. Metro staff will outline the parameters for Measure M transit capital funding and is working to identify available funds as part of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2021 budget for the procurement and initiation of the feasibility study subject to budget approval.

BACKGROUND

In February 2020 the Board approved staff recommendations to withdraw the State Route (SR) 60 and Combined Alternatives from the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 (ESP2) project due to constraints. In addition, the Board approved Motion Item # 8.1 (Attachment B, Legistar File 2020-0172) which directed staff to commence with an independent feasibility study that evaluates

short-term and long-term transit options to serve the mobility needs of the San Gabriel Valley.

The Board Motion identified \$635.5 million of Measure M Cycle 2 funding during the "funding years" of the Measure R Expenditure Plan for a short-term transit solution and directed staff to return with a funding plan for the transit feasibility study. As a result, Metro Staff initiated the technical and outreach scope of services for the San Gabriel Valley Transit Feasibility Study and developed a funding plan which would require a Measure M ordinance amendment.

The Board approved Item # 5 (Attachment C, Legistar File 2020-0255) at the May 2020 Board Meeting which included an update on the San Gabriel Valley Transit Feasibility Study and the proposed funding plan identifying Measure R and Measure M funding.

Measure M encompasses Measure R funding and provides for two cycles of funding to allow two alignments to be constructed as part of ESP2, but at different points in time. One project to proceed earlier in the Measure M plan (\$3 billion in FY29-35) and a second to go forward later (\$3 billion in FY53-57) when future sales tax and State funding are projected to be available. The funding plan proposes that the funding commitment of \$635.5 million be funded from Cycle 2 Measure M funds for the short-term transit solution. The Measure M ordinance restriction on Cycle 2 construction spending would require an amendment to reallocate funding from Cycle 2 in a clear and transparent manner.

DISCUSSION

Staff has initiated coordination with SGVCOG on this partnership and will enter into an MOU that will allow the SGVCOG to procure professional services to support this effort and submit regular invoices to Metro for reimbursement of incurred expenses. Throughout this study, Metro staff will continue to coordinate with the SGVCOG and provide support as needed.

Community and stakeholder engagement is anticipated to be a key component of this effort to be led by the SGVCOG. Completion of the feasibility study is expected to be a multi-year effort that will be initiated in FY21.

NEXT STEPS

Metro staff will continue to work with the SGVCOG to develop the MOU consistent with Measure M parameters for transit capital funds and Metro procurement requirements including Metro's Diversity and Economic Opportunity goals.

As part of the FY21 budget update, staff is working to identify funds for the feasibility study. Authorization for this study to proceed without delay is subject to the approval of funding in the FY21 budget.

Upon completion of the San Gabriel Valley Transit Feasibility Study, staff will report back to the Board with the results of the feasibility study and proposed amendments to the Measure M ordinance.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - Legistar File 2020-0368

Attachment B - Legistar File 2020-0172

Attachment C - Legistar File 2020-0255

Metro
Board Report

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation
Authority
One Gateway Plaza
3rd Floor Board Room
Los Angeles, CA

File #: 2020-0368, **File Type:** Motion / Motion Response

Agenda Number: 5.1.

PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE
MAY 20, 2020

Motion by:

DIRECTORS SOLIS AND FASANA

Related to Item 5: San Gabriel Valley Transit Feasibility Study

SUBJECT: SAN GABRIEL VALLEY TRANSIT FEASIBILITY STUDY

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE Amending Motion by Directors Solis and Fasana

WE THEREFORE MOVE that the Board direct the CEO to report back in 30 days with recommendations to transfer funding to the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments as part of the FY21 budget for the procurement and completion of the Feasibility Study. Recommendations should include provisions typical of Metro procurements such as small, disadvantaged, and/or disabled veteran business enterprise goals.

Metro

Board Report

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation
Authority
One Gateway Plaza
3rd Floor Board Room
Los Angeles, CA

File #: 2020-0255, **File Type:** Informational Report

Agenda Number: 5.

PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE MAY 20, 2020

SUBJECT: SAN GABRIEL VALLEY TRANSIT FEASIBILITY STUDY

ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION

RECEIVE AND FILE the response to Board Motion Item 8.1 (Attachment A, Legistar File 2020-0172) on the February 2020 Board report, Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 (Attachment B, Legistar File 2020-0027) directing staff to:

- 1) Prepare a feasibility study to evaluate high-quality transit service options to serve the San Gabriel Valley, and
- 2) Include recommendations for a Funding Plan for the San Gabriel Valley and Gateway Cities subregions that encompasses Measure R and Measure M funding for Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 to demonstrate subregional equity.

ISSUE

In February 2020 the Board approved the staff recommendations to withdraw the SR 60 and Combined Alternatives from the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 project (Attachment B) and directed staff to prepare an independent feasibility study that evaluates options to serve the mobility needs of the San Gabriel Valley. The Board approved a Motion (Attachment A) directing staff to return in May 2020 with a plan for the feasibility study and the development of a high-quality transit service option in the San Gabriel Valley subregion including a Funding Plan that encompasses Measure R and Measure M funding. The Board identified \$635.5 million of Measure R funding for improvements to be identified in the San Gabriel Valley transit feasibility study and to be consistent with the funding years in the Measure R Expenditure Plan.

As a result, Metro staff has initiated the development of the technical and outreach scope of services for the San Gabriel Valley transit feasibility study. The feasibility study is anticipated to commence in Fiscal Year (FY) 2021, with an approximate 18-month schedule, and would identify short- and long-term solutions that serve the mobility needs in the San Gabriel Valley. In response to the Board motion, Metro staff has developed a Funding Plan within the parameters identified in the Board motion.

BACKGROUND

Numerous transit alternatives within the San Gabriel Valley and Gateway Cities have been evaluated as part of the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 project. In 2007, the alternatives analysis identified various alternatives including light rail transit (LRT) and bus rapid transit (BRT). Two LRT alternatives, SR 60 and Washington Boulevard, were studied in the 2014 Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (DEIS/EIR). Due in part to concerns regarding the SR 60 Alternative raised by the community, stakeholders, and Cooperating Agencies, the Metro Board deferred the selection of a locally preferred alternative and directed staff to carry out additional technical work to address the issues.

Since that time, Metro conducted additional technical analysis and reinitiated the environmental process. The constraints along the SR 60 freeway became more evident with further technical analysis and in February 2020, the Metro Board approved the withdrawal of the SR 60 and Combined Alternatives from the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 environmental study.

Stakeholders and communities along the SR 60 corridor have shown a vested commitment and support for transit in the southern San Gabriel Valley. Metro recognizes the mobility challenges that exist within the San Gabriel Valley and the need to connect the communities in eastern Los Angeles County to the regional transit network. Metro will continue to work with key stakeholders and the communities in the San Gabriel Valley to evaluate and identify mobility solutions.

Funding

Measure M provides \$3.976 billion to the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2, to be expended in two cycles:

- Cycle 1 includes \$1.086 billion of Measure M and \$3 billion estimated project cost for one alignment with a 2029 groundbreaking date and an expected opening date from 2035-37
- Cycle 2 includes \$2.89 billion of Measure M and \$3 billion estimated project cost with a 2053 groundbreaking date and an opening date from 2057-59

Measure R and Measure M did not provide for splitting the corridor into two concurrent projects. Measure R provided for one corridor to be built with funds conceptually attributable to both sub-regions. Measure M provided additional funding to allow two projects to be constructed, but at different points in time. One project was to proceed earlier in the Measure M plan (\$3 billion in FY29-35) and a second to go forward later (\$3 billion in FY53-57), when future sales tax and State funding are projected to be available.

DISCUSSION

The February 2020 Board action directed staff to commence an independent feasibility study focused exclusively on a San Gabriel Valley transit project to replace the previous SR 60 Alternative. Metro staff has initiated the development of the scope of services for technical and outreach services and will procure professional services to assist with this effort. The anticipated duration of the study is approximately 18 months. The feasibility study will identify short- and long-term solutions that serve

the mobility needs in the San Gabriel Valley. The feasibility study will allow Metro to continue to work with the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments, the SR 60 corridor cities, key stakeholders, and the communities in this area to identify alternative transit solutions including but not limited to BRT, LRT, and monorail. These solutions will be developed in close coordination with stakeholders in the San Gabriel Valley.

The study will build upon the analysis and alternatives developed during early work on the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 planning process and will identify alternatives to serve the SR 60 corridor cities and potentially the communities near the Los Angeles County/San Bernardino County border. Additionally, the feasibility study will identify opportunities to potentially provide new connections to the Foothill section of Metro L (Gold) Line as well as Metrolink and/or Foothill Transit lines. The potential alternatives will be evaluated in order to identify the most promising transit solutions for the subregion. This effort will be supported by a complementary professional services contract for community and stakeholder engagement utilizing the Communications Bench.

In response to the Board Motion Item #8.1, Metro staff are recommending a funding plan to address the parameters included in the Board motion and provide \$635.5 million of funding for the San Gabriel Valley during the "funding years" of the Measure R Expenditure Plan.

Consistency with the Equity Platform

The project is consistent with Metro's Equity Platform and will work to provide a reliable and high-quality transit alternative to the communities of eastern Los Angeles County to help solve the mobility challenges in the San Gabriel Valley and meet the mobility needs of the area's residents and businesses. The feasibility study will incorporate Equity Focused Communities and other demographic data to identify and solve mobility challenges consistent with the Equity Platform. Additionally, the study will incorporate the principle of "listen and learn" and will include comprehensive and meaningful engagement opportunities.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

San Gabriel Valley Transit Feasibility Study- The FY20 budget does not include funding for the proposed San Gabriel Valley transit feasibility study. Staff has identified initial funding sources from Cost Center 4310 (Mobility Corridors Team 1) and is currently working to identify available funds for inclusion in the proposed FY21 budget. Authorization for this study to proceed without delay is subject to the identification and approval of funding in the FY21 budget. Since this is a multi-year program, the Cost Center Manager and Chief Planning Officer will be responsible for budgeting in future years.

San Gabriel Valley Short- and Long-Term Transit Improvements- In response to the Board Motion, Metro staff is recommending a Funding Plan that addresses the following requirements of the motion:

- a) Honor the commitment of \$635.5 million made to the San Gabriel Valley subregion as part of Measure R documentation;
- b) The commitment will be consistent with the funding years in Measure R;

- c) Include recommendations for funding and cash flow that encompasses all Measure R and Measure M funding for the project; and,
- d) Ensure financial capacity to move the project forward as a Pillar Project.

These requirements are generally understood to require that \$635.5 million is made available to the satisfaction of the San Gabriel Valley subregion (i.e., for a transit project that is for the benefit of or is spent within the boundaries of the subregion) during FY22-35, considers funding for both cycles of the project, and does not inhibit the funding of cycle 1.

Given requirement c) above, the commitment could be funded from the cycle 2 Measure M funds, if the Board would support defunding cycle 2. The defunding may reduce the ultimate scope of the cycle 2 project. However, there are several restrictions and important considerations regarding the cycle 2 funds including:

- The Measure M cycle 2 funds (the "Gold Line Eastside Ext. Second Alignment" project funding in the Measure M Expenditure Plan) are not eligible for construction until FY53;
- The cycle 2 funding is programmed in the Metro Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) financial forecast during FY50-57;
- The cycle 1 funding plan is based on preliminary cost estimates from the Expenditure Plan and relies on assumed State grant funding that has yet to be pursued or awarded;
- Moving the Measure M cycle 2 funds from FY50-57 to FY22-35 (the Measure R funding years identified in the Expenditure Plan) will take away funding from both the cycle 2 project and other Board-approved Measure M projects and programs scheduled for FY22-35; and,
- Metro has a policy that the acceleration of Measure M funding cannot negatively impact other Measure M projects.

In order to overcome the ordinance restriction on cycle 2 construction spending, the ordinance can be amended. This would reallocate funding from cycle 2 to cycle 1 in a clear and transparent manner. Alternatively, Metro could consider the trading or swapping of funding as a workaround to the construction spending restriction; however, this creates an administrative need to account for the use of funds that increases the risk of noncompliance with the ordinance, and may not be entirely consistent with the ordinance provisions that specify the amount of Measure M funding by project.

The Funding Plan recommendations are as follows:

1. Retain all funding assigned to the cycle 1 project per the 2019 LRTP financial forecast;
2. Pursue an amendment to the Measure M ordinance that creates a new project or program

(e.g., "San Gabriel Valley Eastside Transit Commitment") with \$635.5 million of Measure M transit funding, exclude the funding for this new commitment from the Measure M inflation adjustments allowed by the ordinance, and reduce Measure M funding for the "Gold Line Eastside Ext. Second Alignment" by approximately \$700 to \$750 million (the precise amount to be determined at the time of the amendment);

3. Pursue a Board action that requires the approval of the San Gabriel Valley subregion of the use of Measure M funding for the commitment;
4. Pursue a Board finding that the addition of \$635.5 million for a new San Gabriel Valley Measure M transit commitment, and corresponding reduction of approximately \$700 to \$750 million from the cycle 2 project does not negatively impact other Measure M projects; and,
5. Defer any of the recommendations upon the completion of the San Gabriel Valley transit feasibility study.

The amount of the reduction in cycle 2 Measure M funding is greater than the \$635.5 million commitment in order to mitigate the financial impact of the acceleration of Measure M funds. The acceleration of funding for the commitment comes at a cost - it will likely result in additional debt financing for Measure M projects and programs, with associated interest cost. The relatively larger reduction in cycle 2 funding in FY50-57 provides capacity to fund the expected additional interest cost.

IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

This response to the Board Motion supports the Metro Vision 2028 Strategic Plan. Specifically, the project supports Goals #1 and #3 of the Strategic Plan: Goal #1. Provide high-quality mobility options that enable people to spend less time traveling and Goal #3. Enhance communities and lives through mobility and access to opportunity.

By continuing efforts that provide high-quality mobility options, enhance communities and lives through mobility and access to transit, and addressing mobility challenges in San Gabriel Valley, Metro is continuing to work towards equitable and accessible transit services, reduce travel times and roadway congestion, and enhance connections to the regional transit network.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The Board could decide to delay this action. This is not recommended as this would delay the initiation of the San Gabriel Valley transit feasibility study.

NEXT STEPS

Staff will continue to develop the scope of services for technical and outreach services required to produce the San Gabriel Valley transit feasibility study. Metro staff will report back to the Board with a request for approval proceeding the procurement process and a budget amendment, if required.


ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - Metro Board Motion Item 8.1 (Legistar File 2020-0172)

Attachment B - Metro Board Report Item 8 (Legistar file 2020-0027)

Prepared by: Eva Moir, Manager, Transportation Planning, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-2961
Lauren Cencic, Senior Director, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-7417
David Mieger, SEO, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-3040
Laurie Lombardi, SEO, Countywide Planning & Development (213) 418-3251

Reviewed by: James de la Loza, Chief Planning Officer, (213) 922-2920



Phillip A. Washington
Chief Executive Officer



Metro

Board Report

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation
Authority
One Gateway Plaza
3rd Floor Board Room
Los Angeles, CA

File #: 2020-0172, **File Type:** Motion / Motion Response

Agenda Number: 8.1

REGULAR BOARD MEETING FEBRUARY 27, 2020

Motion by:

DIRECTORS SOLIS, HAHN, BUTTS, GARCIA, FASANA, AND GARCETTI

Amendment to Item 8: Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2

Since the passage of Measure R in 2008, the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) has been hard at work delivering a \$40 billion, voter-approved program of projects aimed at enhancing Los Angeles County's transportation network. In 2016, voters doubled down on their approval of Measure R with their approval of Measure M, which brought forth \$120 billion in additional sales tax revenues for a slew of transit, highway, and active transportation projects.

Both Measures R and M include the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2, also known as the Gold Line Eastside Extension Phase 2 project (Project), in their expenditure plans with \$1.271 billion in Measure R sales tax revenues and \$1.086 billion in Measure M sales tax revenues programmed for the Project. In total, the Project has approximately \$3 billion programmed for one alignment available in 2029, and another \$3 billion available for a second alignment in 2053. The Project's environmental document is currently in progress and includes the State Route 60 Alternative, the Washington Boulevard Alternative, and the Combined Alternative as potential alignments for the extension of the existing Gold Line light rail eastward from unincorporated East Los Angeles

Agenda Item 8 provides staff recommendations to withdraw the State Route 60 and Combined Alternatives from further consideration as part of the Project's environmental document. Additionally, staff recommendations include moving forward with Project environmental clearance under the California Environmental Quality Act only and forgoing any additional analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act. In parallel to completion of the environmental document, staff will also launch a feasibility study that will evaluate mobility needs in the San Gabriel Valley for communities along the State Route 60 corridor. The recommendations presented by staff have been informed by a number of in-depth technical studies that identified significant costs and engineering challenges for the delivery of both the State Route 60 and Combined Alternatives.

However, recommendation C under Agenda Item 8 would benefit from stronger specificity. It does not provide a timeframe for when the feasibility study would be presented to the Board, it is vague as to what options should be evaluated, and does not commit funding for this effort.

SUBJECT: EASTSIDE TRANSIT CORRIDOR PHASE 2

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE Motion by Directors Solis, Hahn, Butts, Garcia, Fasana, and Garcetti that the Board direct the CEO to add the following directive under Agenda Item 8:

e. Honor the commitment of \$635.5 million made to the San Gabriel Valley subregion as part of Measure R documentation. This commitment will be recognized consistent with the funding years in the Measure R Expenditure Plan.

FURTHER that the Board direct the CEO to provide a report back to the Board in May 2020 that includes:

1. Recommendations for funding and cash flow (Funding Plan) for the San Gabriel Valley and Gateway Cities that encompasses all of the Measure R and Measure M funding for the Gold Line Eastside Extension Phase 2 to demonstrate subregional equity for both the San Gabriel Valley and the Gateway Cities. As part of the Funding Plan, include any potential inter-fund borrowing between Measures R and M, loan options, or other financial mechanisms necessary to retain overall equity while ensuring financial capacity to move the Gold Line Eastside Extension Phase 2 forward as an accelerated Pillar Project under Metro's Twenty-Eight by '28 Initiative.
2. Implementation plan to design, environmentally clear and construct a high-quality transit service option that will serve the State Route 60 Corridor cities and potentially the communities near the Los Angeles County/San Bernardino County border. The strategy should include details for outreach, timeframes to initiate and finish the environmental review, and a preliminary analysis of alternatives.
3. Consideration of, as part of the feasibility study for the San Gabriel Valley, high-quality transit service options including Bus Rapid Transit and Alternative Rail Transit Technology (i.e., Monorail Transit, or MRT) and identification of opportunities to connect Metro's transit network with the Foothill Gold Line as well as the Metrolink and Foothill Transit networks in the San Gabriel Valley.

Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation
Authority
One Gateway Plaza
3rd Floor Board Room
Los Angeles, CA



Board Report

File #: 2020-0027, File Type: Informational Report

Agenda Number: 8.

**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 19, 2020**

SUBJECT: EASTSIDE TRANSIT CORRIDOR PHASE 2

ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION

CONSIDER:

- a. Proceeding with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) only for the project's environmental process;
- b. Withdrawing the SR 60 and Combined Alternatives from further consideration in the environmental study;
- c. Preparing a feasibility study independent from the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 project to evaluate other options that better serve the needs of the San Gabriel Valley; and
- d. Approving the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Title VI Service Equity Analysis.

ISSUE

Measure M allocates \$6 billion to the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 project (Project) to be programmed in two cycles. Cycle 1 identifies \$3 billion for one alignment with a 2029 groundbreaking date and an opening date of 2035. Cycle 2 identifies \$3 billion with a 2053 groundbreaking date and an opening date of 2057. The Project is currently in the environmental review process pursuant to the CEQA and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) with three build alternatives under study to support the adoption of a Locally Preferred Alternative. These three alternatives (SR 60, Washington, and Combined Alternatives as described in this report) were approved for study by the Board in May 2017 (Legistar #2017-0154). This Project is one of the four pillar projects identified by the Board for acceleration efforts to be completed in time for the 2028 Olympic and Paralympic Games in Los Angeles (Motion 32.4, #2019-0108).

The recommendations in this Board Report would facilitate efforts for project acceleration. Discontinuing NEPA analysis would streamline the environmental study by not requiring federal reviews. The current environmental schedule includes NEPA and CEQA clearances of the three project alternatives as well as a no-build Alternative. Final environmental clearance is anticipated in 2023 and construction by 2029, placing the Project at risk of not meeting 2028 acceleration goals. Pillar projects must begin construction no later than the calendar year 2023 to be completed and

enter into revenue service by 2028 (Legistar file 2019-0434).

The SR 60 and Combined Alternative face significant environmental and engineering challenges and are less consistent with adopted Metro policies than the Washington Alternative. These issues and constraints are documented in the attached SR 60 and Combined Alternatives Issues and Constraints Report (Attachment A). Narrowing the project alternatives, in this case, selecting the Washington alternative as the proposed project for continuing environmental review would shorten the project schedule by narrowing and focusing environmental and engineering work currently in progress. The selection of an alternative requires a Title VI service equity analysis which has been completed for this project. Results of the analysis are included in the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Title VI Service Equity Analysis (Attachment B).

BACKGROUND

The Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 has been studied extensively and has evolved since its inception. These studies have included:

- In 2007 an Alternatives Analysis (AA) Study for the Project was initiated, wherein 47 alternatives were evaluated.
- In January 2009, the Metro Board approved the AA Study and identified two build alternatives to be carried forward.
- In 2010 the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) was initiated. The Draft EIS/EIR analyzed two build alternatives, SR 60 and Washington Boulevard, in addition to the No-Build and Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Alternatives. The Draft EIS/EIR was released for public review in August, 2014.
- In November 2014, the Board directed staff to carry out additional technical work to address concerns raised by Caltrans, United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) about the SR 60 Alternative. The technical work also included identifying a new north-south alignment to connect to the Washington Boulevard Alternative.
- At the May 2017 meeting, the Board received the findings of the Post Draft EIS/EIR Technical Study and approved an updated project definition.

Based on these actions the following project alternatives were carried forward and are included in the current study:

SR 60 Alternative

Generally, follows the southern edge of the SR 60 Freeway primarily in an aerial configuration from Atlantic Station, the current Metro Gold Line terminus at Pomona Boulevard and Atlantic Boulevard, and continues to Peck Road in the city of South El Monte. A 1.5-mile segment shifts to the north side of the freeway, between Greenwood Avenue and Paramount Boulevard to address technical issues regarding the proximity to the Operating Industries, Inc. (OII) Superfund site and avoid disturbance of contaminated materials. Proposed stations along this route that are being considered include: Garfield Avenue station serving Montebello and Monterrey Park, The Shops at Montebello station in Montebello, Santa Anita Avenue station in South El Monte, and Peck Road station in South El Monte.

Washington Alternative

Travels south along Atlantic Boulevard in an underground segment between the current Metro Gold Line terminus station at Pomona Boulevard/Atlantic Boulevard and the Citadel Outlets in Commerce. The route then proceeds east along Washington Boulevard via aerial and at-grade (street level) configurations ending at Lambert Road in the city of Whittier. Proposed stations along this route that are being considered include: redesigned Atlantic Boulevard station, Atlantic/Whittier Boulevard station in East Los Angeles, Commerce/Citadel station in Commerce Greenwood Avenue station in Montebello, Rosemead Boulevard station in Pico Rivera, Norwalk Boulevard station serving unincorporated Los Nietos, Whittier, and Santa Fe Springs, and Lambert Road station in Whittier.

Combined Alternative Explores the potential build out and operation of both the SR 60 and Washington Alternatives as described above. The Combined Alternative would allow service from South El Monte and Whittier to downtown Los Angeles and the regional transit network. The alternative would require infrastructure and operational elements that would not otherwise be required if only one of the alternatives was operated as a “stand-alone” line. Trains would alternate between continuing west past Atlantic Boulevard Station and providing a one-seat ride between South El Monte and Whittier in a “C” configuration via a wye junction (i.e., three-way junction). Specifically, the Combined Alternative would include a wye junction in the East Los Angeles area near the Via Campo neighborhood that would connect the SR 60 and Washington Alternatives, allowing alternating train movements between both lines.

In October 2018, the Board authorized the award of professional services contracts (Legistar file 2018-0303) to restart the environmental studies and clear the Project under CEQA and NEPA and to complete Advanced Conceptual Engineering design. As part of the reinitiated environmental review planning process, additional focused technical analysis was done to address concerns raised by Cooperating Agencies for the SR 60 and Combined Alternatives. The constraints and challenges within or along the freeway corridor have become more evident with further technical analysis, additional engineering design, and coordination with future improvements for the SR 60 Freeway. The Combined Alternative compounds these technical challenges by requiring the addition of an underground wye junction at Pomona/Atlantic where the existing Gold Line ends.

Recent Metro Board adopted policies to address emerging transportation priorities, including equity, Transit-Oriented Communities (TOC), First/Last Mile (FLM) planning, and parking policies which were not in place when the project was first introduced. An analysis of TOC- and FLM-related factors relevant to assessing the SR 60 and Washington Alternatives was completed as part of the current planning process. The Washington Alternative shows greater potential compared to the SR 60 Alternative as it relates to TOC and FLM.

DISCUSSION

CEQA Only Environmental Clearance (Discontinuing NEPA)

The Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 is one of the four pillar projects which introduces acceleration goals to the Measure M Program. The Project is primarily funded by Measures M and R and other

state and local sources. Federal funding allocation for this Project is not a significant component of the project's funding plan.

Currently, \$40.4 million out of the \$3 billion Cycle 1 project funding plan are federal. The designated federal funds could be reallocated to other projects with commensurate state and local funding reprogrammed for Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2. In the future, should additional federal funding for the project become available, staff would have the ability to reinitiate NEPA analysis. Pursuing environmental clearance only through CEQA could streamline the environmental analysis and advance acceleration efforts to support the pillar project goals. Federal reviews would no longer be required and FTA could prioritize reviews of other Metro priority projects.

Summary of Technical Issues and Constraints of the SR 60 Alternative

From the onset, the SR 60 Alternative posed environmental and engineering challenges associated with running parallel to the SR 60 Freeway and adjacent to sensitive land uses and environmental resources. These concerns have been analyzed and reevaluated through several studies beginning with the 2014 Draft EIS/EIR Report, the 2017 Post Draft EIS/EIR Technical Study, and additional focused analyses that were initiated in 2019.

Longstanding environmental and engineering challenges raised by Cooperating Agencies and utility providers are detailed in Attachment A. A summary of critical constraints and challenges that have intensified since the 2014 Draft EIS/EIR and the 2017 Post Draft EIS/EIR Technical Study that impede the Project implementation efforts and inability to meet acceleration schedule are described below.

Future Improvements of the SR 60 Freeway

The SR 60 Alternative runs primarily within the existing Caltrans right-of-way (ROW) and must be closely coordinated with major improvements that are planned for the SR 60 Freeway including Caltrans' planned future widening which would bring existing general-purpose lanes up to Caltrans' current standards and add HOV lanes. These planned improvements pose major constraints for the SR 60 Alternative which have become more apparent as engineering and environmental studies have advanced.

Adverse issues associated with the SR 60 Alternative include:

- In meetings in 2019, Caltrans underscored that the SR 60 Alternative would impact Caltrans' ability to widen the freeway in the future. The widening of the SR 60 Freeway would result in shifting the SR 60 Alternative aerial guideway out of the Caltrans ROW in most cases.
- Based on Caltrans' planned criteria for the freeway, an approximate 93-foot buffer was agreed upon as sufficient space to accommodate future improvements. The 93-foot buffer is conceptual and would require Caltrans approval upon submittal of Advanced Conceptual Engineering drawings.
- This alignment shift, if implemented along the full alignment, would further impact adjacent residential and environmentally sensitive areas beyond what was identified in the 2014 Draft EIS/EIR. The impacts would occur particularly to single-family and

multifamily residences, Whittier Narrows Recreation Area and South El Monte High School.

- The SR 60/ I-605 Interchange Improvements project is currently in the environmental clearance phase. This project, managed by Metro's Highways Program in coordination with Caltrans, has led to modifications to the terminus station at Peck Road to accommodate the freeway widening and new ramp configurations. This design places the guideway approximately within 5 feet of the residential condominiums adjacent to the freeway ramp.

Issues related to the required rail transit guideway as it crosses the freeway have raised additional issues:

- The SR 60 Alternative transitions to the north side of the freeway between Greenwood Avenue and Paramount Boulevard to circumvent the OII Superfund site and avoid disturbance of contaminated materials. Caltrans raised concerns about the 2014 design that proposed the placement of bridge column supports in the median of the SR 60 Freeway.
- To address these comments, a focused technical analysis of alternative bridge options and alignments to cross the freeway was undertaken. It was concluded that a clear-span option (i.e., avoiding a column in the median of the freeway) is feasible to address Caltrans' concerns. However, the curve radius for the alignment across these bridge spans would reduce operating speeds from 55 mph to 25 to 30 mph for the Project. The proposed clear-span bridges do not meet the desired operating speeds for light rail. The Metro Rail Design Criteria (MRDC) establishes maximum operating speed of 65 MPH for exclusive and semi-exclusive alignments and states that mainline alignments should be designed for the established maximum operating speed.

Caltrans-Required Lateral Encroachment Permit

Historically, Caltrans has communicated that a Lateral Encroachment Permit would be required for the areas of the guideway that are proposed to be within Caltrans' ROW (partially or fully). This is an added constraint and risk to the Project because of potential delays to obtain such permit. These types of proposed lateral encroachment permits are not conventional within the Caltrans permitting process, which would require extensive reviews to ensure State compliance.

Constrained Maintenance Storage Facility (MSF)

An MSF and potential initial operating segment would need to be identified for each Alternative to serve rail operational functions and demands. Metro Operations' regional needs are being met through this Project based on the Fleet Management Plan. The plan establishes a need for an MSF site, approximately 20 acres in size, that can accommodate storage capacity for 100 to 120 light rail vehicles (LRV) and required operational elements. Issues associated with identifying a Maintenance & Storage Facility have included:

- Identifying an MSF site along the SR 60 Freeway is limited primarily due to the surrounding land uses, including the SR 60 Freeway, the OII Superfund site, the Whittier Narrows Flood Control Basin, and residential and recreational areas.
- The proposed SR 60 MSF is a small site, approximately 15.5 acres in size, with a storage capacity of approximately 70 LRVs. This is less than what would be required for

the SR 60 Alternative, which would require close to 100 to 120 LRVs, and less than required for the Combined Alternative to serve Metro's overall system needs.

- The non-revenue lead tracks would extend beyond the proposed terminus, Peck Road station, in an aerial configuration approximately half-mile. The lead tracks would cross over the San Gabriel River and the San Gabriel River Trail/Bike Path in an aerial configuration.
- The elevated structure would conflict with Southern California Edison (SCE) overhead transmission lines, which would have insufficient vertical clearance. Also, an easement from SCE would be required, including through the middle of the MSF facility.

Summary of Technical Issues and Constraints of the SR 60 Alternative

The Combined Alternative introduces the inclusion of wye junction. The wye junction's proposed location is in unincorporated East Los Angeles County at the intersection of Atlantic Boulevard/3rd Street/Pomona Boulevard in the Via Campo neighborhood. Additional property acquisitions would be required along Pomona Boulevard from La Verne Avenue to Sadler Avenue.

- The approximately 2/3-mile stretch would require the acquisition of the whole first row of mostly commercial properties along the south side of 3rd Street/Pomona Blvd for the construction of the wye junction as part of the Combined Alternative.
- As a stand-alone element, incorporating the Combined Alternative would add approximately \$1.3-1.7 billion to the project capital cost for the wye junction, which is not commensurate with the forecasted number of riders it would serve.

The Washington Alternative does have its challenges, however not as complex relative to the SR 60 and Combined Alternatives. The focused technical analysis for the Washington Alternative included the evaluation of the underground section, design variations at Rosemead and 605 freeway, and the bridge crossings. These challenges are being resolved within the project's predetermined timeline for environmental clearance.

Inconsistencies with Metro Adopted Policies

In June 2018, Metro's TOC Policy was adopted to promote places (such as corridors and neighborhoods) that, by design, allow people to drive less and access transit more. TOCs promote more walkable, bikeable, and sustainable neighborhoods adjacent to transit. The TOC Policy sets the direction to guide Metro decision-making for projects and to assist local jurisdictions in maximizing the potential of transit investments in their communities.

A TOC and FLM Assessment Report is being prepared which establishes TOC and FLM criteria. TOC criteria relate to an evaluation of adjacent land uses, population and employment densities. FLM criteria analyzed bicycle facilities, block sizes, and active transportation elements. In addition to TOC and FLM analysis, the Assessment Report reviews Environment and Equity criteria to assess physical barriers in the surrounding station area environment and the extent to which TOCs are served. Initial findings from the TOC and FLM assessment work indicates that the SR 60 Alternative lacks potential as it correlates to all three criteria: TOC, FLM, and Environment and Equity. This is due to the spatial nature of proposed station areas along the alignment.

The SR 60 Alternative is challenged and constrained because the guideway runs parallel to the freeway. Stations are adjacent to the freeway which lacks direct connections to residential communities within the half-mile station area. Some stations along the SR 60 Alternative are situated in large commercial shopping malls, parking lots and recreational zones near freeway on/off-ramps. Connections to existing residential neighborhoods are hindered by the quality of the public realm, a discontinuous and suburban street network, large block sizes, numerous freeway on/off ramps, and freeway underpasses.

Given the lack of proximity to residential communities and the lack of direct connections within the half-mile station area, the SR 60 Alternative is less supportive of the adopted equity goals, serving fewer low-income and transit-dependent populations. Land uses surrounding these stations are also less transit-supportive than those along the Washington Alternative. Preliminary results of the TOC and FLM Assessment Report are summarized in Attachment A.

The Washington Alternative exhibited better compatibility with Metro's adopted policies. Proposed stations along the Washington Alternative demonstrated greater TOC compatibility. The stations are planned in areas with a connected street network making it easier to walk, bike, and ride transit. Station areas either have existing transit-supportive land use patterns or have the potential for future planning efforts. This is mainly because the stations along this alignment are located close to existing residential neighborhoods and commercial corridors. In general, the Washington Alternative stations are situated in areas with a higher presence of residential land uses, serving more economically disadvantaged communities who would benefit from improved transit access consistent with Metro's Equity Platform.

Public Scoping Meetings

Through the reinitiated environmental review process, a 45-day scoping period was held from May 31 to July 15, 2019. Public scoping meetings were held in June 2019 in the cities of Whittier, South El Monte, Commerce, Montebello, Pico Rivera, and unincorporated Los Angeles County in the East Los Angeles community.

Approximately 300 comments were received during the scoping period. Approximately two-thirds of the comments referenced the build alternatives. Over one-third of the comments referenced the SR 60 Alternative, which received the lowest amount of support from the public. An organized community group-Justice and Equality for the Eastside Coalition-obtained over 400 signatures from residents of the Via Campo neighborhood opposed to the current proposed construction of an at-grade and aerial portion of the SR 60 Alternative. They were concerned with the negative health and quality of life impacts. In general, there was some support for all three project alternatives. The major themes expressed by stakeholders in their comments included:

- Opposition to at-grade alignment on SR 60 Alternative from South Atlantic Boulevard to Findlay Avenue;
- General support for Washington Alternative from communities, business groups and employers along the alignment; and
- Concerns raised over environmental justice and equal consideration for undergrounding in

lower-income areas of the county.

Alternative Solution with the Withdrawal of the SR 60 and Combined Alternatives

The Eastside Transit Corridor studies to date recognize the mobility challenges that exist along the SR 60 Freeway corridor and within the San Gabriel Valley and the need to connect to Metro's regional transit network. The route has been analyzed and reevaluated through several studies since 2007. Stakeholders and communities along the corridor have shown a vested commitment to the project. If the Board approves the withdrawal of the SR 60 and Combined Alternative from the Project's environmental study, the staff recommendation is that Metro should continue to work with the corridor cities, key stakeholders and the communities to prepare a feasibility study that would identify short and long term solutions to evaluate options to serve the mobility needs in the San Gabriel Valley and along the SR 60 Freeway. The short- and long-term plan will include financial review of the Measure R and M commitments. The anticipated duration of the feasibility study would take approximately 18 months to complete. The development of the scope of work for technical services and outreach would commence immediately upon Board approval. Metro staff will report back in six months on the progress of the feasibility study.


Equity Platform

The Project is aimed at providing a more reliable and high-quality transit alternative to the communities of the eastern Los Angeles County that will help to solve the mobility challenges in the Project area and meet the mobility needs of the area's residents and businesses. In the further development of the Equity Platform, the Draft 2020 LRTP includes frameworks that help address the first two Equity Platform pillars (Define and Measure and Listen and Learn).

The equity-focused community (EFC) definition identifies two demographic factors that have historically been determinants of disinvestment and disenfranchisement: household income and race/ethnicity. Households with low vehicle ownership also present an opportunity to target new mobility investments in neighborhoods with a higher propensity to take advantage of them. Together these three factors represent the locations where strategic transportation investments can have the greatest impact on reducing disparities in access to opportunity. The 2017 baseline year demographic data was used to understand communities' social, demographic, and geographic information.

The communities along the SR 60 Alternative, when compared to the county average, have lower densities, fewer communities with non-English speaking population, and fewer communities living below the federal poverty level. Full EFC mapping analysis and framework are described in Attachment A.

The TOC and FLM analysis also evaluated low-income households, zero-car households, and transit-dependent population data within a half-mile of the station areas for the SR 60 and Washington Alternatives. The SR 60 Alternative stations serve substantially fewer low-income, transit-dependent, and zero-car households. The chart below compares the low-income and transit-dependent population data for the SR 60 and Washington Alternatives.



Title VI Service Equity Analysis Findings

Title VI Service Equity Analysis is required to support the identification of a Locally Preferred Alternative for a potential new transit service as part of the proposed Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Project. The analysis was conducted pursuant to Metro’s Title VI thresholds and FTA’s Circular 4702.1B, which require that the service change be analyzed to determine whether the proposed service will have a disproportionate burden or disparate impact on minority and low-income populations relative to the non-low-income and minority populations.

The analysis utilized income and ethnicity demographic data to assess the characteristics of each alternative’s service area and evaluate if the low-income and minority populations would be affected by the proposed Project. Based on the percentage analysis conducted, it was found that there was no disproportionate burden as it relates to low-income populations along the alternatives. The percentage of minority populations along the new transit service were higher than Metro’s service area as a whole. Since the new transit service would be considered a benefit to the corridor cities, providing an additional transportation option and increased accessibility, the analysis determined that the minority populations along the corridor cities would benefit from the project. In summary, this Title

VI Service Equity Analysis concludes that each alternative would prove beneficial and would not impose a disproportionate burden or disparate impact. The analysis and results are detailed in Attachment B.

DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT

These actions will not have any impact on safety of our customers and/or employees because this Project is at the study phase and no capital or operational impacts result from this Board action.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The FY20 budget does not include funding for the proposed feasibility study. Should the Board approve the recommended action, staff would work to identify funding sources from Cost Center 4310 and fund a new project in FY20 in the anticipated amount of \$250,000 for professional services. Since this is a multi-year program, the Cost Center Manager and Chief Planning Officer will be responsible for budgeting in future years.

Impact to Budget

Along with discontinuing NEPA, federal funds will be removed from this project. The new funding sources will be local admin funds, which are not eligible for bus and/or rail operating and capital expenses.

IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

The Project supports the goals outlined in the Metro Vision 2028 Strategic Plan. More specifically, the Project supports Goal #3 - *Enhance Communities through Mobility and Enhanced Access to Opportunity*, as it will connect communities to the regional Metro rail network, which will expand access to jobs, major activity centers, including educational and medical institutions, and recreational opportunities within the project area and across the Los Angeles region.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The Board could decide not to withdraw from the NEPA process. This is not recommended because it extends the Project's environmental schedule with an anticipated final environmental clearance in 2023 placing the Project at risk of not meeting acceleration goals. Allocated federal funds for this Project are marginal and could be reallocated with state and local funding.

The Board could decide not to approve the recommended withdrawal of the SR 60 and Combined Alternatives to be carried forward into the environmental study. These alternatives are not recommended, as this would impact the Project's environmental clearance schedule and would not consider the updated technical findings. The narrowing of the alternatives will ensure the Project remains on schedule and will also support the Project's acceleration goals.

Washington Alternative is a viable option with less constraints in contrast to the SR 60 Alternative. Cooperating Agencies had less concerns regarding the Washington Alternative. More importantly, it avoids conflicts with Caltrans ROW and federally protected resources, and avoids major utility

conflicts that are more prominent along the SR 60 Alternative.

NEXT STEPS

Upon Board approval, staff will notify FTA of the decision to discontinue the NEPA environmental study and will continue to advance the environmental study pursuant to CEQA. The environmental study will evaluate the adopted project alternative, MSF options, and initial operating segments. An update to the Board is anticipated in summer/fall 2020.


Upon Board approval of the feasibility study, a scope of work will be developed immediately for technical work and community engagement, and Metro staff will report back in six months on the progress of the feasibility study.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - SR 60 and Combined Alternatives Issues and Constraints Report
Attachment B - Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Title IV Service Equity Analysis

Prepared by: Jenny Cristales-Cevallos, Senior Manager, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 418-3026
Lauren Cencic, Senior Director, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-7417
David Mieger, SEO, Countywide Planning & Development, (213) 922-3040

Reviewed by: James de la Loza, Chief Planning Officer, (213) 922-2920



Phillip A. Washington
Chief Executive Officer

San Gabriel Valley Transit Feasibility Study

Planning and Programming Committee
May 20, 2020
Legistar File No. 2020-0255

Recommendations

RECEIVE AND FILE response to Board Motion Item 8.1 on the February 2020 Board report:

- Prepare a feasibility study to evaluate high-quality transit service options to serve the San Gabriel Valley, and
- Include recommendations for a Funding Plan for the San Gabriel Valley and Gateway Cities subregions that encompasses Measure R and Measure M funding for Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 to demonstrate subregional equity

Project Background

- Measure M identifies 2 cycles of funding for Eastside Phase II project (ESP2).
- SR-60 Alternative studied as a part of ESP2.
- In February 2020, the Metro Board:
 - Approved the removal of the SR-60 and Combined Alternatives from ESP2 due to constraints, and
 - Directed staff to conduct a feasibility study and recommend a funding plan.

Feasibility Study

- Build on the analysis developed during early work for ESP2.
- Identify short- and long-term solutions to serve the SR 60 corridor cities and potentially communities near the Los Angeles County/San Bernardino County border.
- Consider opportunities to potentially provide new connections to the Foothill section of Metro L (Gold) Line, Metrolink and/or Foothill Transit lines.
- Study multiple transit modes, including but not limited to, BRT and monorail.

Funding Plan Recommendation

- Retain all funding for cycle 1 project.
- Accelerate San Gabriel Valley use of Measure M funding subject to finding that other Measure M projects are not impacted.
- Exclude Measure M inflation adjustments.
- Reduce Measure M for cycle 2 by approximately \$700 to \$750 million.

Next Steps

Pending Metro Board approval and budget availability, staff will

- Continue to develop scope of services for both technical and outreach services for the San Gabriel Valley feasibility study
- Report back to the Board after the procurement process



Metro

Board Report

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation
Authority
One Gateway Plaza
3rd Floor Board Room
Los Angeles, CA

File #: 2020-0172, **File Type:** Motion / Motion Response

Agenda Number: 8.1

**REGULAR BOARD MEETING
FEBRUARY 27, 2020**

Motion by:

DIRECTORS SOLIS, HAHN, BUTTS, GARCIA, FASANA, AND GARCETTI

Amendment to Item 8: Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2

Since the passage of Measure R in 2008, the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) has been hard at work delivering a \$40 billion, voter-approved program of projects aimed at enhancing Los Angeles County's transportation network. In 2016, voters doubled down on their approval of Measure R with their approval of Measure M, which brought forth \$120 billion in additional sales tax revenues for a slew of transit, highway, and active transportation projects.

Both Measures R and M include the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2, also known as the Gold Line Eastside Extension Phase 2 project (Project), in their expenditure plans with \$1.271 billion in Measure R sales tax revenues and \$1.086 billion in Measure M sales tax revenues programmed for the Project. In total, the Project has approximately \$3 billion programmed for one alignment available in 2029, and another \$3 billion available for a second alignment in 2053. The Project's environmental document is currently in progress and includes the State Route 60 Alternative, the Washington Boulevard Alternative, and the Combined Alternative as potential alignments for the extension of the existing Gold Line light rail eastward from unincorporated East Los Angeles

Agenda Item 8 provides staff recommendations to withdraw the State Route 60 and Combined Alternatives from further consideration as part of the Project's environmental document. Additionally, staff recommendations include moving forward with Project environmental clearance under the California Environmental Quality Act only and forgoing any additional analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act. In parallel to completion of the environmental document, staff will also launch a feasibility study that will evaluate mobility needs in the San Gabriel Valley for communities along the State Route 60 corridor. The recommendations presented by staff have been informed by a number of in-depth technical studies that identified significant costs and engineering challenges for the delivery of both the State Route 60 and Combined Alternatives.

However, recommendation C under Agenda Item 8 would benefit from stronger specificity. It does not provide a timeframe for when the feasibility study would be presented to the Board, it is vague as to what options should be evaluated, and does not commit funding for this effort.

SUBJECT: EASTSIDE TRANSIT CORRIDOR PHASE 2

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE Motion by Directors Solis, Hahn, Butts, Garcia, Fasana, and Garcetti that the Board direct the CEO to add the following directive under Agenda Item 8:

e. Honor the commitment of \$635.5 million made to the San Gabriel Valley subregion as part of Measure R documentation. This commitment will be recognized consistent with the funding years in the Measure R Expenditure Plan.

FURTHER that the Board direct the CEO to provide a report back to the Board in May 2020 that includes:

1. Recommendations for funding and cash flow (Funding Plan) for the San Gabriel Valley and Gateway Cities that encompasses all of the Measure R and Measure M funding for the Gold Line Eastside Extension Phase 2 to demonstrate subregional equity for both the San Gabriel Valley and the Gateway Cities. As part of the Funding Plan, include any potential inter-fund borrowing between Measures R and M, loan options, or other financial mechanisms necessary to retain overall equity while ensuring financial capacity to move the Gold Line Eastside Extension Phase 2 forward as an accelerated Pillar Project under Metro's Twenty-Eight by '28 Initiative.
2. Implementation plan to design, environmentally clear and construct a high-quality transit service option that will serve the State Route 60 Corridor cities and potentially the communities near the Los Angeles County/San Bernardino County border. The strategy should include details for outreach, timeframes to initiate and finish the environmental review, and a preliminary analysis of alternatives.
3. Consideration of, as part of the feasibility study for the San Gabriel Valley, high-quality transit service options including Bus Rapid Transit and Alternative Rail Transit Technology (i.e., Monorail Transit, or MRT) and identification of opportunities to connect Metro's transit network with the Foothill Gold Line as well as the Metrolink and Foothill Transit networks in the San Gabriel Valley.