SUBJECT: TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDIES

ACTION: AUTHORIZE WORK ON THE TRANSIT CORRIDOR STUDY
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS FOR
RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVES

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the Major Investment Studies for the Eastside, Mid-City/Westside, and San Fernando Valley Corridors, the summary findings and recommendations of which were presented at the February 4, 2000 Board Workshop, authorize the Chief Executive Officer to proceed with work on Draft Environmental Impact Statements/Reports for the following alternatives in each corridor:

Eastside:
**Light Rail Transit (LRT)**, from Union Station to Atlantic via First Street to Lorena, then transitioning to Third Street and proceeding east via Third Street/Beverly Boulevard to Atlantic, including consideration of a tunnel segment option between First/Boyle and First/Lorena (See Attachment A).

Mid-City/Westside:
**Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)** on Wilshire Boulevard from Vermont Avenue to San Vicente Boulevard (see Attachment B);

**Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)** along the Exposition right-of-way from Figueroa Street to downtown Santa Monica, with consideration of minimal operable segments to Crenshaw, La Cienega, and Venice/Robertson (see Attachment C);

**Light Rail Transit (LRT)** along the Exposition right-of-way from the Long Beach Blue Line station at Washington Boulevard to downtown Santa Monica, with consideration of minimal operable segments to Crenshaw, La Cienega, and Venice/Robertson (see Attachment D).
San Fernando Valley:
**Bus Rapid Transit** (BRT) along the Burbank-Chandler right-of-way from the North Hollywood Red Line Station to Warner Center, with consideration of a minimal operable segment between Woodman Avenue and Balboa Boulevard with rapid bus connections at each end (Attachment E).

Direct the Chief Executive Officer to consult with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) on any issues related to these alternatives.

**ISSUE**

In June 1999, the Board authorized the preparation of corridor studies for the Eastside, Mid-City/Westside and San Fernando Valley. For the Eastside and Mid-City/Westside Corridors, the studies were to evaluate more cost effective alternatives to the suspended Metro Red Line Extensions. For the San Fernando Valley, the study would restart previous environmental work suspended in 1998, allowing evaluation of this corridor to proceed at the same pace as the Eastside and Mid-City/Westside. Phase I of the corridor studies (the Major Investment Study phase) has been completed, and Board action is necessary to move into Phase II, which is preparation of draft environmental documents on selected alternatives.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

The corridor studies are the next step in the policy framework adopted by the MTA Board in the 1998 Regional Transit Alternatives Analysis (RTAA) Study. The RTAA Study recommended further analysis of candidate alternatives for each of the three corridors.

The Major Investment Studies for the Eastside, Mid-City/Westside, and San Fernando Valley Corridors provide the criteria to identify the most cost effective fixed guideway transit investment(s) in each corridor. The studies have been prepared in compliance with federal fixed guideway planning regulations. Acceptance of the Major Investment Studies and completion of the environmental clearance phase of each study is necessary to implement fixed guideway transit projects in these corridors and to secure federal funding.

**OPTIONS**

- The Board could choose not to accept the Major Investment Studies for the Eastside, Mid-City/Westside or San Fernando Valley Corridors and order further study prior to continuing the Environmental Impact Studies/Reports for any of the three corridors. Delay might reduce Los Angeles County’s likelihood of receiving federal funds.
• The Board could choose to carry forward to the environmental clearance phase different alternative(s) based on the information presented in the Major Investment Studies.

• The Board could choose to not continue the Environmental Impact Statements/Reports. This would be incompatible with prior Board direction and the goals of the RTAA Study.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The recommendations have no impact on the current MTA budget. Funding for each corridor study has already been included in the FY 2000 budget as follows:

• Eastside: $2,300,000, Cost Center 4320, Project 400019/01.01 (federally-funded, local match)
• Mid-City/Westside: $2,110,000, Cost Center 4350, Project 400019/02.01 (federally-funded, local match)
• San Fernando Valley: $1,090,000, Cost Center 4350, Project 405511/01.04 (locally-funded)

These funds covered the costs of the Phase I Major Investment Studies, and will cover a portion of the draft environmental documents. Since these studies will extend beyond the end of FY 2000, the cost center manager and Executive Officer will be accountable for budgeting the balance of the costs in the FY 2001 budget.

The current conceptual cost estimates for the project alternatives are based on industry standards taken from previously implemented transit projects throughout the country. The eventual local financial impact of projects depends on the alternative(s) selected and the refined alignment costs developed during the environmental clearance phase of each study. Current project costs included in the Major Investment Study reports include contingency allowances appropriate for the conceptual phases of work and will be subject to further refinement as project designs are refined.

BACKGROUND

In January 1998, the MTA Board suspended work on Eastside and Mid-City Red Line Extensions and planning work on the San Fernando Valley East-West Transit Corridor. In November 1998, the MTA completed the RTAA Study which identified the types of transit projects which could be considered as alternatives to the previously approved subway extensions.

Per the recommendations of the RTAA Study, the Board authorized staff in June 1999 to commence simultaneous corridor studies of the Mid-City/Westside, Eastside and San Fernando Valley Corridors. Phase I of the corridor studies has been completed. These Major Investment Studies identified and evaluated low-cost alternatives to the suspended projects.
Basis for Recommendations- At the February 4, 2000 Board Workshop, staff and consultants presented a summary of the Major Investment Study results and recommended alternatives for further consideration in Phase II of the corridor studies, which is the preparation of draft environmental documents. The basis for these recommendations is as follows:

**Eastside**

**Light Rail Transit**, from Union Station, via First Street to Lorena and Third/Beverly to Atlantic
- Reduces cost by 50% (as compared to the Eastside Metro Red Line suspended project)
- Reduces community impact with a short tunnel through the congested narrow streets of Boyle Heights while preserving the option of an at-grade alternative if impacts can be mitigated
- Has high potential to maximize the region’s transit connectivity
- Has substantive community stakeholder support

**Mid-City/Westside**

**Bus Rapid Transit** on Wilshire Boulevard
- Has potential as interim solution to feed Metro Red Line and serves high volume Wilshire Corridor at low cost
- Allows faster speeds than Metro Rapid Bus in future as congestion grows
- Further detailed analysis warranted to see how impacts can be mitigated

**Bus Rapid Transit** along the Exposition right-of-way
- Offers significant long term transportation benefits if community impacts can be resolved
- Connection to Downtown LA, USC, Exposition Park and Harbor Freeway Transitway from key centers in Santa Monica, West LA and Culver City
- Achieves similar ridership to light rail transit at less cost

**Light Rail Transit** along the Exposition right-of-way
- Offers significant long term transportation benefits if community impacts can be resolved
- Direct connection via Blue Line to Downtown LA, USC, Exposition Park and Harbor Freeway Transitway from key centers in Santa Monica, West LA, and Culver City
- Less frequent disruption of intersections and adjacent properties than bus rapid transit
- Has capacity to serve post-2020 demand

**San Fernando Valley**

**Bus Rapid Transit** along the Burbank-Chandler right-of-way
- Lowest capital and operating and maintenance costs
- Most cost effective per new transit rider
- On exclusive, landscaped right-of-way with substantial cross valley travel time savings over local and rapid bus
- Future speeds primarily not affected by future automobile traffic congestion
- Rail not precluded in the future
Comparative Costs of Recommended Alternatives- At the February 4 workshop, several Board members raised questions about the differences in costs and costs per mile of the BRT and LRT alternatives in the three corridors. Staff has prepared a breakdown of the costs per mile and an explanation of major cost differences. This analysis is contained in Attachment F.

NEXT STEPS

Upon receipt of Board authorization, the consultants will continue work on Phase II of the corridor studies, which is preparation of the draft environmental documents. These environmental documents will be prepared in compliance with both the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Upon completion, those documents will be forwarded to the FTA for review and approval to circulate. Upon approval by the FTA, the documents will be publicly circulated for a minimum of 45 days and public hearings will be held to receive comment.

At the conclusion of the public comment period, the Board will be asked to certify the adequacy and completeness of the draft environmental documents and formally adopt the Locally Preferred Alternatives for each corridor. The MTA will then ask the FTA for approval to commence Phase III of the studies, which are the final environmental documents and preliminary engineering.

ATTACHMENTS

A: Map of Eastside Corridor Light Rail Transit
B: Map of Bus Rapid Transit - Wilshire Boulevard
C: Map of Bus Rapid Transit - Exposition Right-of-Way
D: Map of Light Rail Transit - Exposition Right-of-Way
E: Map of Bus Rapid Transit - Burbank-Chandler Right-of-Way
F: Comparison of Costs/Mile and Cost Differences Among Alternative Corridors

Prepared by: Andrea Burnside, Transportation Planning Manager
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Transportation Development & Implementation

JAMES L. de la LOZA
Executive Officer
Regional Transportation Planning and Development
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ATTACHMENT A
Eastside Corridor
Light Rail Transit (LRT)

Recommended Project
Union Station to Beverly & Atlantic

Potential Tunnel Segment
1st/Boyle thru 1st/Lorena
ATTACHMENT B
MID-CITY/WESTSIDE
WILSHIRE BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT)
ATTACHMENT D
MID-CITY/WESTSIDE
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LEGEND:
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- PARKING

MOS MINIMUM OPERABLE SEGMENTS
ATTACHMENT E

SAN FERNANDO VALLEY
Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
Attachment F

Estimated Capital Cost Comparisons of BRT, LRT and TSM Alternatives

At the Board Workshop on February 4, 2000, questions were asked about the relative capital costs of the alternatives. Because the alternatives are different lengths, comparisons between alternatives are provided on a Cost per Mile basis to highlight and explain major differences.

- Table F-1 provides a comparison of the Bus Rapid Transit Alternatives;
- Table F-2 provides a comparison of the Light Rail Transit Alternatives.

Additionally, a cost breakout of the Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Alternative is provided for each corridor. The TSM Alternative, which is also referred to as the “Best Bus Alternative” is required to be included in the study by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). This alternative represents the best transit solution for each corridor that does not employ major capital expenditure for fixed guideways. It is generally composed of improvements to the bus system such as increased frequency of service and distribution of service.

- Table F-3 provides a TSM breakout for the Eastside Corridor;
- Table F-4 provides a TSM breakout for the Mid-City/Westside Corridor;
- Table F-5 provides a TSM breakout of the San Fernando Valley Corridor.

An adjustment factor has been provided for the Cost per Mile figures to present the amount of TSM service that should be assumed for each of the Build Alternatives. The Eastside Corridor provided for the costs of continuing the TSM bus improvements in each of the Build Alternatives. The Mid-City/Westside and San Fernando Valley Corridors measured the incremental benefit of the Build Alternatives in comparison to the TSM and therefore did not include the full costs of the TSM in the Build Alternatives. An adjustment is therefore provided in these tables for purposes of comparing the corridors.

A summary table illustrating the adjusted capital costs for each of the recommended alternatives is included as Table F-6.

**BRT Comparisons**

Costs for the BRT Alternatives range from a high of $31.2 million per mile for the Eastside BRT to a low of $17.4 million/mile for the Wilshire BRT. The Expo BRT is estimated to cost $22.1 million/mile and the San Fernando Valley BRT is estimated to cost $19.5 million/mile.
The higher costs for the Eastside BRT Alternative are principally due to a larger bus fleet size, both on the fixed guideway facility and in the feeder bus lines. The Eastside BRT Alternative assumes frequent bus service on the exclusive guideway and also adds the greatest number of buses to provide feeder service. Because of the larger number of buses, the Eastside cost estimate includes the cost of a Bus Maintenance Division and the costs of the land for such a facility. Also, the Eastside Alternative requires land and facilities to provide replacement lots for displaced on-street parking.

Costs for the Exposition and San Fernando Valley BRT Alternatives were somewhat lower than the Eastside Alternative because very little land acquisition is required. The rights-of-way for these corridors were purchased in 1990. Much of the park and ride lots can be accommodated along the existing rights-of-way. In addition, neither of these alternatives displace significant numbers of on-street parking, so replacement lots are not required.

Costs for the Wilshire BRT were the lowest of the alternatives compared. Although this alternative had similar bus frequencies on the fixed guideway facility as the Eastside BRT, the feeder network on the Mid-City/Westside is already very well developed, and less new feeder service was included. Furthermore, Wilshire Boulevard is in better condition than streets in East Los Angeles and less in-street construction is required.

### LRT Comparisons

Costs for the LRT Alternatives range from a high of $59.4 million/mile for the Eastside LRT to a low of $44.8 million/mile for the San Fernando Valley LRT. The Expo LRT is estimated to cost $46.0 million/mile.

The higher costs for the Eastside LRT Alternative are principally due to a larger fleet of LRT vehicles and more buses added for feeder service. LRT vehicles on the Eastside were estimated to run in 3-car trains which maximizes capacity, while the Mid-City/Westside and San Fernando Valley estimated initial operation with 1 and 2-car trains to match projected peak hour loads. The Eastside also assumed a fleet of 134 feeder buses versus 92 in the Mid-City/Westside area and 99 in the San Fernando Valley.

Right-of-way and Vehicle Maintenance and storage facility costs were higher for the Eastside Alternative due to the need to service a larger fleet of transit vehicles and the lack of MTA owned right-of-way. New right-of-way would need to be acquired on the Eastside for such facilities. The Eastside also acquires right-of-way for park and ride lots. The MTA already owns substantial right-of-way along the Exposition and San Fernando Valley alignments. Also, similar to the BRT discussion above, the Eastside provides replacement parking lots which are not necessary for the Exposition and San Fernando Valley segments.
Table F-1
BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT)
COST PER MILE COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Component</th>
<th>Eastside</th>
<th>SFV</th>
<th>SFV+TSM*</th>
<th>Wilshire</th>
<th>Wilshire+TSM*</th>
<th>Expo</th>
<th>Expo+TSM*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt #4</td>
<td>Alt #1</td>
<td>Alt #1</td>
<td>Alt #1</td>
<td>Alt #1</td>
<td>Alt #2</td>
<td>Alt #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideway and Structures &amp; Systemwide Equipment</td>
<td>$8.8</td>
<td>$8.6</td>
<td>$8.6</td>
<td>$4.2</td>
<td>$4.2</td>
<td>$12.0</td>
<td>$12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stations</td>
<td>$1.7</td>
<td>$1.7</td>
<td>$1.7</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
<td>$2.7</td>
<td>$2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Facility</td>
<td>$3.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
<td>$1.9</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>$11.8</td>
<td>$2.3</td>
<td>$6.1</td>
<td>$6.3</td>
<td>$9.0</td>
<td>$2.2</td>
<td>$4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-way</td>
<td>$5.4</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
<td>$0.6</td>
<td>$0.6</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other miscellaneous cost not included above</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$0.6</td>
<td>$0.6</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$31.2</td>
<td>$13.7</td>
<td>$19.5</td>
<td>$12.9</td>
<td>$17.4</td>
<td>$17.7</td>
<td>$22.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of major differences:

- Wilshire BRT assumes modest street improvements due to relatively good condition of existing street. Other corridors provide for more extensive improvements, including new grading & paving, utility or street reconstruction & more extensive landscaping. Expo project also has several grade separations.
- No significant difference between alternatives.
- Eastside assumes one new bus division because the Eastside is adding more buses for feeder service & fixed-guideway service frequency than the SFV and Mid-City/Westside corridor projects. Other corridors assume allowance/pro-rata share toward expansion of a division due to the lesser number of vehicles added.
- The Eastside is adding more buses for feeder service and for higher frequency fixed guideway service than the Mid-City/Westside or San Fernando Valley Corridors:
  - Eastside fleet = 207 vehicles (95 artic+112 reg) Wilshire fleet = 186 vehicles (all regular buses) Expo fleet = 97 vehicles (36 artic + 61 reg)
  - SFV fleet = 127 vehicles (26 artic+101 reg)
- Eastside requires land for larger Maintenance Facility than other corridors plus land for Park & Ride Lots and for replacement parking lots. SFV and Exposition generally have existing acquired ROW for park & ride lots and do not displace street parking.
- Wilshire BRT has fewer park and ride lots, due to the more urban nature of the corridor.
- No significant difference among alternatives.
- Eastside is higher than other corridors due to increased number of vehicles, ROW requirements and support facilities for buses.

*The adjustments in the starred columns are made to SF Valley & Mid-City/Westside project costs to add necessary Transit System Management (TSM) components in order to make a meaningful comparison to Eastside Corridor costs. Eastside Corridor project costs already include all necessary TSM component costs.*
Table F-2
LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT (LRT)
COST PER MILE COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Component</th>
<th>Estimated Cost per Mile (Millions $1999)</th>
<th>Explanation of major differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastside Alt #5 (12.6 mi.)</td>
<td>SFV Alt #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideway and Structures &amp; Systemwide Equipment</td>
<td>$ 27.5</td>
<td>$ 24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stations</td>
<td>$ 2.9</td>
<td>$ 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Facility</td>
<td>$ 3.7</td>
<td>$ 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>$ 19.3</td>
<td>$ 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-way</td>
<td>$ 6.0</td>
<td>$ 4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other miscellaneous cost not included above</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$ 59.4</td>
<td>$ 39.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The adjustments in the starred columns are made to SF Valley & Mid-City/Westside project costs to add necessary Transit System Management (TSM) components in order to make a meaningful comparison to Eastside Corridor costs. Eastside Corridor project costs already include all necessary TSM component costs.*
Table F-3  
Eastside Transit Corridor Study  
TSM Alternative  
Estimated Capital Costs (Millions $1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TSM Component</th>
<th>Estimated Capital Cost</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Bus Line Stations (24) and Real Time Bus Displays (96)</td>
<td>$16.6</td>
<td>Cost of Whittier/Wilshire Rapid Bus Line are already included in the MTA financial baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special vehicle equipment for rapid bus line buses (all buses)</td>
<td>$1.7</td>
<td>Cost of Whittier/Wilshire Rapid Bus Line are already included in the MTA financial baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Rapid Bus Line New Buses (Standard Bus)</td>
<td>$10.6</td>
<td>Cost included in Eastside Build Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Standard Buses for increased north-south and east-west service in the Eastside Corridor over the No Build condition</td>
<td>$23.7</td>
<td>Cost included in Eastside Build Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total TSM Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$52.6</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total TSM to be added to Build Alts.</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table F-4
Mid-City/Westside Transit Corridor
TSM Alternative
Estimated Capital Costs ( Millions $1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TSM Component Full Length Project</th>
<th>Full Length (100% Length)</th>
<th>Alt. 1 Wilshire to San Vicente (35% Length)</th>
<th>Alt. 2/3 Expo to Crenshaw (25% Length)</th>
<th>Alt. 2/3 Expo to La Cienega (44% Length)</th>
<th>Alt. 2/3 Expo to Venice (54% Length)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Rapid Bus Lines + Stations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wilshire/Whittier</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>Costs for Wilshire/Whittier Rapid Bus are already included in the MTA financial baseline. The Santa Monica Blvd Rapid Bus is not necessary to operate the Build Alternative and costs do not need to be added. Crenshaw should be added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Crenshaw</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Santa Monica Boulevard</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 Standard Buses for increased north-south and east-west service in the Mid-City/Westside Corridor over No Build condition</td>
<td>$37.1</td>
<td>$13.0</td>
<td>$9.3</td>
<td>$16.3</td>
<td>$20.0</td>
<td>MTA fleet expands from 2600 to 2678 buses. Costs are not included in Mid-City/Westside Build Alternatives and should be added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Maintenance Facility Expansion Allowance</td>
<td>$25.0</td>
<td>$8.8</td>
<td>$6.3</td>
<td>$11.0</td>
<td>$13.5</td>
<td>Costs not included in Mid-City/Westside Build Alternatives and should be added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total TSM Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$92.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$51.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>$45.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$57.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$63.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total TSM to be added to Build Alts.</strong></td>
<td><strong>$72.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$37.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$43.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table F-5
San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor
TSM Alternative
Estimated Capital Costs (Millions $1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TSM Component Full Length Project</th>
<th>Full Length No Hollywood to Warner Center (100% Length)</th>
<th>MOS- Alt 1 Woodman to Balboa (35% Length)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Rapid Bus Lines + Stations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ventura Boulevard</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Van Nuys Boulevard</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94 Standard Buses for increased north-south and east-west service in the San Fernando Valley Corridor over No Build condition</td>
<td>$49.6</td>
<td>$17.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Maintenance Facility Expansion Allowance</td>
<td>$25.0</td>
<td>$8.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total TSM Costs</td>
<td>$94.6</td>
<td>$46.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total TSM to be added to Build Alts.</td>
<td>$74.6</td>
<td>$26.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Costs for Ventura Boulevard Rapid Bus are already included in the MTA financial baseline. The Van Nuys Blvd Rapid Bus is not necessary to operate the Build Alternative and costs do not need to be added.

MTA fleet expands from 2600 to 2694 buses. Costs are not included in San Fernando Valley baseline Build Alternatives and should be added.

Costs not included in San Fernando Valley baseline Build Alternatives and should be added.
Table F-6
Adjusted Project Cost Estimates for Recommended Alternatives
($1999 Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Base Project Costs</th>
<th>Additional TSM Costs</th>
<th>Capital Cost Including TSM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastside</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LRT Modified At-Grade to Atlantic</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LRT modified w/tunnel to Atlantic</td>
<td>$590</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-City/Westside</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BRT Wilshire to San Vicente</td>
<td>$62</td>
<td>$32</td>
<td>$94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BRT Expo to Santa Monica</td>
<td>$188</td>
<td>$72</td>
<td>$260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BRT Expo to Venice/Robertson</td>
<td>$87</td>
<td>$44</td>
<td>$131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BRT Expo to La Cienega</td>
<td>$76</td>
<td>$37</td>
<td>$113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BRT Expo to Crenshaw</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LRT Expo to Santa Monica</td>
<td>$589</td>
<td>$72</td>
<td>$661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LRT Expo to Venice/Robertson</td>
<td>$398</td>
<td>$44</td>
<td>$442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LRT Expo to La Cienega</td>
<td>$312</td>
<td>$37</td>
<td>$349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LRT Expo to Crenshaw</td>
<td>$178</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>$204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Fernando Valley</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BRT to Warner Center</td>
<td>$176</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BRT - Woodman to Balboa</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>$106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AMENDING MOTION

Item #53 - Corridor Studies

February 24, 2000

I MOVE that the MTA Board add the following recommendation for the Eastside Draft Environmental Impact Statements/Report:

Bus Rapid Transit from Union Station to Whittier/Norwalk via First Street to Lorena, then transitioning to Third Street and proceeding east via Third Street/Beverly Boulevard/Whittier Boulevard to Whittier/Norwalk, with consideration of a minimal operable segment to Atlantic, including consideration of a tunnel segment option between First/Boyle and First/Lorena.
MOTION by Supervisor Yvonne B. Burke February 24, 2000

ITEM #53

I MOVE that the MTA Board adopt the following positions:

The MTA shall seek funding for all three proposed Corridors from the State.

MTA shall request that the State identify separate funding for each proposed Corridor.

All three Corridor Projects shall move forward together.

In the event that one Corridor Project moves more quickly than the other two corridor projects it will not jeopardize funding for any of the three projects.

If the State finds that it cannot fund one or more of the three proposed Corridor Projects the MTA Board will re-assess all three Projects.

I further MOVE that the MTA adopt the policy position that the Wilshire Corridor cannot be supplanted or replaced by the Exposition Corridor.