



## FAQ Series: Questions About the Alternative Concepts

### 1. How were the 42 alternative concepts reduced to 12?

The 42 preliminary set of alternative concepts evaluated in the Alternative Analysis (AA) phase were identified through the Scoping Sessions. The set of 42 was developed at the initial screening level during the first part of the AA phase.

To focus in on a smaller, viable set of alternatives, a screening process was conducted. The initial screening evaluated the preliminary set of alternative concepts based on eight project objectives listed below. Five objectives were developed to address the project need, and three additional objectives were developed to address environmental impacts, planning considerations, and cost efficiency:

- Minimize travel times
- Improve connectivity and mobility
- Reduce congestion on the freeway system
- Reduce congestion on the local street system
- Increase transit ridership
- Minimize environmental and community impacts related to transportation
- Assure consistency with regional plans and strategies
- Maximize the cost-efficiency of public investments

A total of 23 performance measures were used to assess each alternative concept. There were one to six performance measures for each objective. The performance measures were qualitative and based on technical assessments, but relied on available data and schematic representations of each alternative concept. The screening evaluation was conducted by technical staff with expertise in the relevant disciplines (traffic analysis, transit system planning, highway engineering, environmental analysis, etc.). A Consumer Reports-style scale was used.

To find the best performing alternatives within each mode, in the initial screening, the performance of each of the 42 alternative concepts was compared to that of other alternatives of the same mode. This evaluation step resulted in the identification of the set of 12 alternatives, representing each mode from the preliminary set of alternative concepts.

**2. What happens to the alternatives that did not perform well during the screening process? Are they off the table?**



Parts of screened alternatives may be combined with other alternatives to help maximize benefits and/or reduce impacts. However, when alternatives are screened out due to impacts or poor performance (e.g., right-of-way), they will not be reintroduced into the study without major modifications.

### **3. Regarding Alternative F-7, what would be the length of a tunnel?**

The F-7 alternative will start (at both ends) as a surface/depressed freeway, then it will transition to a “cut-and-cover” tunnel, and then a bored tunnel (underground). From the driver’s perspective, the tunnel will start with a portal at the beginning of the cut-and-cover sections.

The total length of the F-7 alternative is 6.3 miles, broken down as follows:

- Bored tunnel (4.2 miles), starting north of Valley Boulevard and ending north of California Boulevard
- Cut-and-cover sections (0.7 miles), starting at the portals north of Hellman Avenue (northbound) and south of Green Street (southbound)
- Surface/depressed freeway sections (1.4 miles), connecting to the existing SR-710 stubs on each end

Therefore, based on the conceptual engineering, the underground section of F-7 is approximately 4.9 miles.

### **4. What criteria are being used to refine the 12 alternatives?**

More detailed engineering and environmental analysis was conducted on the 12 alternatives. As part of that process, improvements and variations were developed, leading to three new variations to alternatives, for a total of 15. Those alternatives included BRT (three alternatives), LRT (four alternatives), Freeway (four alternatives), Highway (two alternatives), TSM/TDM, and No-build. Like the initial screening, the evaluation focused on the eight project objectives, including the project need elements and impacts. In this step, the more comprehensive evaluation included 42 performance measures (1 to 11 for each objective). The evaluation using those 42 performance measures was reported in technical terms (e.g., 7.022 million vehicle miles, 1.26 percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, or 16,329 new transit boardings). Ultimately, the evaluation was simplified to focus on the objectives using a 1 (worst) to 7 (best) scale. The refinement process used a pair-wise comparison to eliminate alternatives that did not address the project need effectively and/or resulted in too many impacts. The end result was a set of five alternatives: BRT, LRT, Freeway, TSM/TDM, and No-build.

### **5. How were the scoping comments used in the process of determining the alternatives?**

The alternative concepts were selected based on feedback and comments received during Scoping meetings. The range and type of alternative concepts were the direct result of this feedback. The



details of the alternatives were developed by the Study Team to address the need elements previously identified.

**6. Is there a cost/benefit analysis for each alternative?**

The Study Team is in the process of developing a preliminary cost estimate for each alternative. As with any planning process, the estimate is based on increasing levels of detail about the alternatives. The details of the cost estimates of alternatives will be included in the Alternative Analysis (AA) Report which will be available in late Fall 2012. A formal cost-benefit analysis has not yet been conducted. An accurate cost-benefit analysis requires more detailed engineering on the alternatives, and more detailed traffic, right-of-way, air quality, and noise data than is currently available. These analyses require comprehensive modeling, and will be completed on the remaining set of alternatives as part of the EIR/EIS document.

**7. Will the technical studies be available to the public and will they be put on the website?**

Yes, the technical studies will be made available for public review and posted on Metro's SR-710 website during the release of draft environmental document. Periodic updates will be provided to stakeholders to keep them informed of the progress during the development of the draft environmental document.

**8. While the SR-710 and I-710 projects are distinct, is the proposed widening of the I-710 (aka 710 South) being considered in the SR-710 (aka 710 North) study?**

Part of the environmental process is to consider other projects that may affect the study area; this is referred to as the Cumulative Impacts analysis. The improvements to I-710 south (from the Ports to SR 60) are under study in a separate environmental document. The I-710 Corridor Project is evaluating alternatives to modernize and add lanes to I-710 between Ocean Boulevard in Long Beach to the SR-60 freeway in East Los Angeles; The Draft EIR/EIS for this project was circulated for a 90-day public review period from June 29-September 28, 2012, and may be viewed at: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist07/resources/envdocs/docs/710corridor/>. The transportation needs in the (north) SR 710 study area are different than for I-710 Corridor project in the south. These two projects have independent utility, which means they can address the defined project needs but do not rely on other projects to provide the intended mobility benefits. However, there is the potential for focused impacts to be common between the two projects (as well as other major planned projects). The cumulative effects of these two projects will be studied and discussed in the Cumulative Impacts section of the Draft EIR/EIS for the SR 710 project (as it was in the Draft EIR/EIS for the I-710 Corridor Project).

**9. Why aren't goods movement/freight alternatives being considered as part of the SR-710 study?**



Multiple studies have shown that the primary destinations of trucks on I-710 from the Ports are the rail yards south of I-5 and the distribution centers and warehouses to the east of the study area via SR 60 and I-10. Other studies have shown that the majority of the land most suited to future warehouse development (large, open, and flat) is also located in the Inland Empire. Additionally, while the Ports are a large generator of trucks, less than 10 percent of the trucks in LA County are from the Port, and less than 10 percent of the overall traffic is from trucks. Based on these data, less than 1 percent of LA County traffic is Port trucks, and that estimate is even lower in the Study Area. The project need is focused on regional and local street congestion, and goods movement alternatives addressing that small component of the transportation system do not address that need.

**10. Who is ultimately responsible for making the final decisions regarding the alternatives?**

The Metro Board of Directors, in conjunction with Caltrans, will select a preferred alternative.

