



Board Report

File #: 2023-0592, File Type: Informational Report

Agenda Number: 8.

PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 15, 2023  
EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 16, 2023

**SUBJECT: THE LONG BEACH-EAST LA (FORMERLY I-710 SOUTH) CORRIDOR MOBILITY INVESTMENT PLAN**

**ACTION: RECEIVE AND FILE**

**RECOMMENDATION**

RECEIVE AND FILE report on the status of the Long Beach-East LA (formerly I-710 South) Corridor Task Force progress, draft Corridor Mobility Investment Plan, and original I-710 South Corridor Project.

**ISSUE**

This report provides an update on the development of the Draft LB-ELA Corridor Mobility Investment Plan (CMIP) that will be published in January 2024, along with an update to the Board on the progress made by the Task Force since the June 2023 meeting.

This report also provides an update on the status of the “No Build” conclusion to the original I-710 South Corridor Project Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) and grant activities supporting a LB-ELA Corridor project that was part of the Board-approved Pre-Investment Plan Opportunity.

**BACKGROUND**

In May 2021, the Metro Board approved a motion to suspend further work to advance the current 710 S Corridor Project EIR/EIS. The motion also directed staff to collaborate with a variety of stakeholders to conduct outreach and develop a funding plan in order to advance a revised Early Action Program that includes projects that can be advanced separately from mainline 710 South infrastructure improvements and to identify additional locally-supported projects to enhance mobility along the 710 South Corridor.

As a result, staff initiated the LB-ELA (formerly I-710 South) Corridor Task Force in September 2021 to re-engage local impacted communities and stakeholders to develop a set of recommendations for

Metro investment in multimodal projects and programs that would take the place of the original I-710 South Corridor Project, for which the Board suspended the environmental process and then took action to replace its original Locally Preferred Alternative 5C with Alternative 1, the “No Build” Alternative.

Staff convened a Task Force that included local jurisdictions, community advocates, and stakeholders representing goods movement, business, labor, public health, and air quality. Staff worked with the Task Force to establish the advisory Community Leadership Committee (CLC) that comprises local residents and related working groups to articulate the values of the communities and stakeholders within the corridor to guide the development of the LB-ELA CMIP. Based on this input, the Board approved the corridor Vision, Goals, and Guiding Principles at its September 2022 meeting.

With this foundation in place, staff launched the next phase of the Task Force’s workplan by conducting extensive community engagement and stakeholder outreach to develop the Task Force’s Initial List of Multimodal Strategies, Projects, and Programs (MSPPs). At the June 2023 Planning and Programming Committee, staff presented an overview of this process and the framework for generating the evaluation criteria that would be used to determine each of the MSPPs alignment with the Vision, Goals, and Guiding Principles.

Since June 2023, staff has led the Task Force and CLC, in joint and separate meetings to develop the evaluative criteria, receive feedback, and present on how the criteria were applied to the MSPPs. Staff has recently worked with the technical team to combine these results with additional factors and criteria to identify candidate projects and programs to be included in the Draft CMIP for consideration of Board investment.

## **DISCUSSION**

The Draft CMIP will feature an overarching, multimodal, community-driven, and regionally significant transportation vision and investment strategy for the LB-ELA Corridor in response to the Board’s direction in May 2021 to re-engage community and corridor stakeholders to develop a new approach to investing Measure R and M funding intended for the I-710 South Corridor. This investment strategy will be aligned with and advance the Vision, Goals, and Guiding Principles as developed by the Task Force and community members and approved by the Board in September 2022.

The Draft CMIP will feature a set of investment recommendations for near-term, multimodal corridor projects and initiatives, implementation strategies to advance recommended projects and initiatives over time, and modal programs that will develop additional projects and programs for future investment opportunities.

At the heart of the CMIP will be a multimodal set of projects recommended for Board approval that will:

- (1) Advance and align with the LB-ELA Corridor’s Vision, Goals, and Guiding Principles.
- (2) Leverage Measure R and M funding committed to the corridor with state, federal and other sources of funding.
- (3) Identify other funding opportunities and strategic partners to advance projects and programs

not eligible for the use of Measure R and M funding.

To identify the multimodal set of projects recommended for Board approval and investment, the technical team evaluated the hundreds of projects across all modes (active transportation, arterial highways, community, freeway, goods movement, and transit) that were received from public and stakeholder input earlier this year (Attachment A). The Task Force will need to prioritize these projects as part of the Draft CMIP.

The evaluation process used numerous criteria-quantitative and qualitative-that the Task Force adopted in June 2023. These criteria were selected to reflect the Task Force's Vision, Goals, and Guiding Principles and offer ways of evaluating the wide array of projects staff received across all modes and states of readiness (Attachment B). A more detailed look into the evaluation criteria, how they were formulated, and methodology can be found in Attachments B and C.

Staff presented evaluation results to, and received feedback from, the Task Force, CLC, and stakeholders in October 2023. A summary of comments received from the Task Force and CLC is in Attachment D. After reviewing the draft evaluation scores with Task Force members and corridor stakeholders and incorporating input, staff made revisions and produced the final scoring results for each project evaluated (Attachment A).

Staff then assessed each project for readiness factors to determine which projects could be eligible for discretionary grant funding in near-term funding cycles. Staff considered the fact that readiness factors varied across modes given the complexity of each project; therefore, the readiness threshold for each mode will be tailored accordingly.

### Tiering Analysis of Candidate Projects and Programs

Staff created a "Tiering Analysis" that would sort projects by (1) the evaluation scores that demonstrate alignment with the Task Force's Vision, Goals, and Guiding Principles and (2) the state of readiness to seek discretionary grant funding and be implemented near-term (Attachment E). Tier 1 projects score well across evaluation criteria, while Tier A projects are deemed to have a high state of readiness. A project that scores well across evaluation criteria and has a high state of readiness is considered a "Tier 1A" project, while a project that does not score as well across evaluation criteria and does not have a high state of readiness is considered a "Tier 2B" project.

Staff will assess projects in the Tier 1A, Tier 1B, and Tier 2A categories (Attachment F) to determine suitability for inclusion in the Draft CMIP as an investment priority for the Board. The Tier 1A category will include projects and planning efforts that will be competitive for near-term discretionary grant opportunities. Tier 1B projects may receive project development funding to support seeking future discretionary grant opportunities and implementation. Tier 2A projects have two pathways for selection - one is to be packaged with other Tier 2A projects-or with a Tier 1A project-to become a priority project, the other is if the project would be considered competitive for a specific, available grant opportunity tailored to such a project. Tier 2B projects will not be considered for investment at this time but will be re-considered in the future as part of the modal program development process.

Staff are currently presenting tiering analysis to and receiving feedback from the Task Force, CLC,

and stakeholders. A summary of preliminary comments received will be presented verbally by Staff during the Executive Management Committee Meeting on November 16, 2023.

### Implementation Assessment

To help further refine the overall evaluation of projects, Tier 1A, 1B, and 2A projects (Attachment F) will then be assessed against several strategic factors to determine if the projects to be considered ultimately for Board funding will have a clear pathway toward implementation. These factors will help staff and the Task Force to prioritize projects and make its final recommendations for the Draft CMIP.

The prioritization factors are as follows:

- **Identified Roles and Responsibilities:** Metro will not be considered the lead agency for implementing many of the projects under consideration-particularly those that are on local roads. For a project to be prioritized for Metro funding and to be successful in securing discretionary funds, the roles and responsibilities for implementing the project must be understood and agreed upon. For projects under consideration, Metro is expected to play one or more of the following roles: Lead, Partner, Fund, Support, or Collaborate (Attachment G).
- **Discretionary Grant Strategy:** This factor will examine how well candidate projects and programs align with state, federal, and other discretionary grant programs to leverage local funding. Please see Attachment H for the methodology staff intends to use to help review alignment between candidate CMIP projects and prospective grant opportunities.
- **Project Cost / Local Match Required:** Combined with the discretionary grant strategy assessment, staff will also consider how project cost and how much local match would be needed to deliver the project, considering the amount of funding available - and when it is available - to serve as local match. This factor will be important to ensure that staff recommends a full program of projects for Board consideration as part of the Draft CMIP given limitations on Measure R and M funding available (Attachment I)
- **Political / Institutional / Jurisdictional Support:** Staff will navigate any existing or expected legitimate concerns to be raised by relevant institutions or political jurisdictions that could undermine the project's potential for implementation.
- **Equity Considerations:** The CMIP must align with the LB-ELA Guiding Principle of Equity, deliver benefits to Equity Focus Communities and under-resourced jurisdictions, and consider equity-based concerns in the design, construction, and outcomes phases of CMIP implementation. This factor will assess the equitable geographic distribution of funds, consider opportunities to provide technical assistance to jurisdictions with fewer shovel-ready projects, and identify a path forward for concerns to be addressed after approval of the CMIP.
- **Practical Feasibility / Constructability:** Projects and Programs will be assessed for any potential limitations to their construction or implementation.

---

These prioritization factors will be evaluated concurrently with the presentation of the tiering analysis to the Task Force and CLC. Staff will use these factors, the evaluation scores, and the tiering analysis to develop a recommended set of projects for Task Force consideration in December 2023. Following that discussion, staff will finalize the recommended set of projects and programs to prioritize for inclusion in the Draft CMIP.

### Modal Programs

The CMIP is intended to be a “living” document in the sense that Measure R funding available now will be supplemented by future allocations of Measure M (FY26 and FY32). Accordingly, the plan will feature Modal Programs that will enable staff, in collaboration with local jurisdictions and/or partners, to develop and refine projects not selected for funding by the Board in the initial release of the CMIP to become better candidates for funding in future cycles, by improving evaluation or readiness factors. Staff is considering setting funding targets for each Modal Program to demonstrate current and future Measure R and M commitments to these modes going forward while specific projects and programs are developed for securing grants and/or implementation.

Modal Programs will also be the “workshop” in which new strategic initiatives and pilot programs will be developed or launched to advance the Vision, Goals, and Guiding Principles of the Task Force, whether Metro serves as the lead, partner, or collaborator.

The Modal Programs will comprise the following categories:

- Active Transportation
- Arterial
- Community
- Freeway (incorporating multimodal Improvements)
- Goods Movement
- Transit

Modal Programs will also allow staff to develop new projects in Equity Focus Communities that did not have projects ready for evaluation at this time, or to incorporate equity features into existing projects, to help the CMIP align with its Equity Principle and its overarching Vision and Goals.

Within the Modal Programs, Community Programs offer an opportunity to advance programs and initiatives supported by local communities that align with the Vision and Goals of the Task Force and promote a greater quality of life for local impacted residents across a wide array of policy areas. Community members have made it clear that they would like, as an outcome of the CMIP, a focus on community health and workforce development, among other priorities. Staff recognizes that Metro may not be the appropriate lead agency or funder for these programs and is evaluating for each of these Community Programs the appropriate role for Metro, whether Measure R/M funding or another funding source should be considered, and what other agencies should be convened to develop and advance these programs. A final assessment of these issues related to Community Programs will be provided as part of the Draft CMIP recommendations.

### Public Engagement Process

Staff has continuously conducted public engagement as the work of the Task Force progresses toward the development of its project priorities and funding recommendations for Metro. As part of the Draft CMIP release, scheduled for January 2024, Metro will be holding a series of community meetings and other engagement activities throughout the corridor area to generate public awareness and elicit comments on the draft. These engagement activities will encourage the community to get involved to learn more and provide feedback on the recommended funding strategies and project list for the LB-ELA corridor communities. To support these efforts, staff will implement a robust Community Engagement Program (CEP) that is equitable, educational, and engaging, with the goal of receiving informed input from the diverse corridor area audiences.

### Engagement Approach Leading up to and Following Release of Draft CMIP

From mid-January through late February 2024, the CEP will include a strategic sequence of communication tactics, including an inclusive, multilingual, and grassroots-oriented approach leading up to the release of the Draft CMIP as well as a comprehensive community engagement campaign. A monthly e-newsletter will be circulated leading up to the Draft CMIP release, accompanied with links to interactive features on the corridor StoryMap, to ensure that the communities are being engaged and informed leading up to that milestone.

The approach for the CEP will be initially informed by the prior public engagement campaigns as well as with insights from the ongoing Task Force and CLC efforts. In-person, digital, and grassroots strategies will be further refined and coordinated in partnership with Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) that have an established presence and reach to the 18 cities and 5 unincorporated communities in the corridor area.

### CBO Partnerships

Following Metro's Community Based Organization Partnership Plan, staff has coordinated with interested CBOs to help inform the approach for the CEP and support the implementation of community engagement activities. Leading up to the release of the Draft CMIP, two roundtable meetings are planned with more than 30 CBO partners to receive input and coordinate their support with notification and community engagement tactics leading up to and during the Draft CMIP release and community engagement campaign period.

CBO Partners are anticipated to lead and/or support community engagement events and notification activities. CBO partners include, but are not limited to:

- Mexican American Opportunity Foundation (MAOF; 12 locations)
- YMCA (three locations)
- Community Family Guidance Center
- Rio Hondo College
- East LA Chamber of Commerce
- Northwest Downey Little League
- Regional Hispanic Institute

- Black Women Rally for Action
- Hoops 4 Justice
- South Gate Junior Athletics Association
- Southern California Area National Council of Negro Women
- Tower of Faith Evangelic Church
- Salvation Army Long Beach Red Shield
- Compton Community Garden
- Calvary Chapel Compton
- Humble Servants N Motion
- Para Los Niños
- Eastmont Community Center
- Southeast LA (SELA) Collaborative.

#### Communications Campaign - Following Draft CIP Review Period

The CEP includes a multilingual communications campaign that will include e-newsletter updates, emails, and information-sharing booths at community events and pop-up events as well as activities that continue to promote public awareness on the CMIP.

#### I-710 South Corridor Project “No Build” Update

At its May 2022 meeting, the Board acted on a request from Caltrans to rescind the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) 5C and, in its place, approve Alternative 1, the “No Build” alternative, as the new LPA for the I-710 South Corridor Project Final Environmental Document ([File #2022-0100 <https://boardagendas.metro.net/board-report/2022-0100/>](https://boardagendas.metro.net/board-report/2022-0100/)). This action effectively concluded the prior environmental process and cleared the path forward for the Task Force to provide a new set of projects and programs as part of the I-710/Long Beach-East LA Corridor Mobility Investment Plan for Board consideration to deliver much-needed investment for the communities directly impacted by the movement of people and goods through the I-710 South Corridor ([File #2022-0336 <https://boardagendas.metro.net/board-report/2022-0336/>](https://boardagendas.metro.net/board-report/2022-0336/)).

Caltrans District 7 initiated the process to close out and finalize the EIR/EIS for the I-710 South Corridor Project. On October 4, 2023, Caltrans District 7 submitted letters to the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) (Attachment J) and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) (Attachment K) transmitting the I-710 South Administrative Final EIR/EIS and seeking comments by November 1, 2023. Providing an early review of the draft final environmental document to USEPA and USACE is required per the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Memorandum of Understanding between the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Caltrans. The I-710 South Corridor Project Final Environmental Document is expected to be signed by Caltrans District 7 in mid-2024.

#### Update on LB-ELA Corridor Grant Activities

Staff presented an overview (File #2023-0019  [<https://boardagendas.metro.net/board-report/2023-](https://boardagendas.metro.net/board-report/2023-)

---

0019/>) of grant applications submitted by Metro and other agencies for multimodal projects and programs in the LB-ELA Corridor. As a result, state and federal agencies awarded nearly \$1 billion in discretionary grant and surplus funding programs to these corridor projects and programs, including three of four Board-approved Pre-Investment Plan Opportunity (PIPO) projects.

Metro recently submitted a set of grant applications for the remaining PIPO project, the I-710 Humphreys Avenue Crossing Project. These applications were for the federal Reconnecting Communities and Neighborhoods Program and the state's Reconnecting Communities: Highways to Boulevards program, seeking vital planning and construction funding for this project and to identify additional opportunities to improve related freeway crossings that need improvement to better serve bus, bicycle, and pedestrian mobility across the freeway to connect communities separated by I-710. Additional information about these grants can be found in Attachment L.

## **EQUITY PLATFORM**

The LB-ELA Task Force endeavors to advance equity through its process and its ultimate outcome through the Investment Plan. Staff is engaging stakeholders, including those most likely to be impacted by potential improvements in the corridor, through a Community Leadership Committee (CLC), Community Based Organization (CBO) Partnering Strategy, and other avenues of public engagement to develop the LB-ELA Corridor Investment Plan. Staff has also continued coordinating meetings of the Equity Working Group (EWG), attended by Task Force and CLC members, to advise on overall equity considerations and pilot the Equity Planning and Evaluation Tool (EPET).

The CLC is composed entirely of residents from the communities along the corridor, the majority of which are Equity Focus Communities, and meetings are facilitated in English and Spanish. Further, CLC members are compensated through the agency's Advisory Body Compensation Policy. The CLC continues to participate in orientations and CLC business meetings as well as in the Equity and Zero Emission Truck Working Group meetings. Through their participation, the CLC reviews proposals and develops recommendations for consideration by the Task Force. During the evaluation process, CLC members recommended changes to criteria, advised on community priorities, and provided feedback on the results, such as concerns about geographic equity, which are being considered by the technical team in the prioritization process.

Staff has also implemented a CBO Partnering Strategy with more than 30 CBOs that are based in and work with the communities along the LB-ELA Corridor and predominantly serve Black, Indigenous, People of Color (BIPOC) populations (Attachment M). Metro's goal is to continue to identify needs and priorities during the next phase of this work by gathering input from CBOs and the people they serve. A complete list of CBO Partners and a description of planned engagement activities is included in this report.

In June 2023, the EWG participated in an EPET workshop focused on documenting community histories for the EPET and CMIP. Task Force and CLC members contributed accounts of lived experiences (personal and interpersonal) to paint a more complete history from diverse community perspectives. Following the meeting, staff distributed a community history survey completed by several Task Force and CLC members. Accounts collected at the workshop and through the survey



will be part of the Draft CMIP presented to the Metro Board and the public in early 2024.

Between now and the next update to the Metro Board in January 2024, the LB-ELA Corridor Task Force and its attendant working groups and CLC will continue to promote community-driven conversations to ensure an equitable decision-making process as the Task Force develops multimodal strategies and identifies priority projects and programs for the LB-ELA Corridor to be brought to the Metro Board for consideration.

### **IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS**

Collaboration among the LB-ELA Corridor communities impacted residents, Caltrans District 7, the Gateway Cities Council of Governments, and stakeholders through Task Force meetings and its attendant committees and public outreach forums will lead to the development of the multimodal, multiyear LB-ELA Investment Plan. The process and the outcome of the Task Force will help implement three key Metro Vision 2028 Strategic Plan Goals:

- Goal 1: Provide high-quality mobility options that enable people to spend less time traveling
- Goal 3: Enhance communities and lives through mobility and access to opportunity
- Goal 4: Transform LA County through regional collaboration and national leadership

### **NEXT STEPS**

The Task Force will provide its input into the Draft CMIP and test for consensus in December 2023.

Metro will publish the Draft LB-ELA Corridor Mobility Investment Plan and provide it to the Board in January 2024.

Staff will continue their public engagement process (Attachment N) on the development of the Investment Plan and return to the Board with the Final CMIP, including an official version of the CMIP that serves as a qualifying Comprehensive Multimodal Corridor Plan for the purpose of securing funding from the California Transportation Commission's Solutions for Congested Corridors Program.


### **ATTACHMENTS**

- Attachment A - Draft Candidate Projects and Combined Evaluation Scores
- Attachment B - Evaluation Criteria and Rubric
- Attachment C - Evaluation Summary
- Attachment D - Summary of Task Force / CLC Comments on Evaluation Scores
- Attachment E - Tiering Analysis
- Attachment F - Tiered CMIP Candidate Project List
- Attachment G - Metro Roles in Implementing the CMIP
- Attachment H - Grant Pursuit Strategy Implementation Steps

Attachment I - Measures R and M Funding Availability  
Attachment J - Caltrans District 7 Letter to the US Army Corps of Engineers  
Attachment K - Caltrans District 7 Letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency  
Attachment L - LB-ELA Corridor Grant Activities  
Attachment M - List of CBO and FBO Partners  
Attachment N - Community Engagement Activities Summary

Prepared by: Michael Cano, Executive Officer, Multimodal Integrated Planning,  
(213) 418-3010  
Avital Barnea, Senior Executive Officer, Multimodal Integrated Planning, (213) 547-  
4317  
Ray Sosa, Deputy Chief Planning Officer, (213) 547-4274

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

  
Stephanie N. Wiggins  
Chief Executive Officer

ATTACHMENT C - DRAFT CANDIDATE PROJECTS AND COMBINED EVALUATION SCORES

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	List Order	Project Source	Jurisdiction	AQ Smry	CH Smry	MB Smry	SF Smry	EN Smry	OP Smry	EQ Smry	SA Smry	Goal Score	Principle Score	Draft Total Score
Active Transportation / TDM	Bicycle Routes / Facilities	LB-ELA_0007	LA River Path – Central LA	An eight-mile bicycle and pedestrian path gap closure between Elysian Valley and Maywood, through downtown Los Angeles.	1	Metro LRTP, SPP Survey, SPP Mapping	Maywood to Elysian Valley	0.8	2.1	1.9	2.2	1.1	2.1	1.6	1.1	10.2	2.7	12.8
Active Transportation / TDM	Bicycle Routes / Facilities	LB-ELA_0017	Regionally significant bike projects from the Metro Active Transportation Plan	Implement regionally significant active transportation projects adopted as part of the Metro Active Transportation Plan (over 40 projects throughout the study area). See Attachment A for more detail.	2	Metro ATSP, SPP Survey, SPP Mapping, CA-7	Multiple Jurisdictions	2.5	2.7	2.2	2.3	1.3	2.4	2.0	1.1	13.4	3.1	16.5
Active Transportation / TDM	Bicycle Routes / Facilities	LB-ELA_0055	I-710 LA River Bike Path	Proposed walking/bicycling path along the LA River, specifically along I-710, which connects Maywood to Long Beach.	3	SHOPP, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	0.8	2.1	2.0	1.8	1.4	1.9	1.7	1.1	10.1	2.8	12.9
Active Transportation / TDM	Bicycle Routes / Facilities	LB-ELA_0066	Randolph Bike & Pedestrian Project	Randolph, from Bell western city limit to eastern city limit. Complete Phase 2 of the Randolph Metro Active Transportation (MAT) Corridor.	4	City of Bell/COG, SPP Mapping	Bell	0.8	1.8	2.0	2.3	0.8	1.7	1.9	1.2	9.4	3.1	12.5
Active Transportation / TDM	Bicycle Routes / Facilities	LB-ELA_0111	West Santa Ana Branch Bike & Pedestrian Trail	Implement Phases 1-4 of Bike & Pedestrian Trail (Class I) along RR ROW between LA River and Sommerset. Includes lighting, fencing, landscaping, flashing beacons, decomposed granite, ADA curb ramps and street furniture.	5	City of Paramount/COG, SPP Mapping, PIPO	Multiple Jurisdictions	2.5	2.7	1.9	2.2	1.2	1.3	1.6	1.7	11.8	3.3	15.1
Active Transportation / TDM	Bicycle Routes / Facilities	LB-ELA_0128	Randolph Street Bike and Pedestrian Facilities Project	This project would involve the construction of bike and pedestrian facilities on Randolph St from District Blvd to the Los Angeles River Trail System.	6	PIPO (City of Maywood), SPP Mapping	Maywood	0.8	1.8	1.9	1.7	0.6	1.7	1.7	0.9	8.4	2.6	11.0
Active Transportation / TDM	Bicycle Routes / Facilities	LB-ELA_0162	City of Long Beach 8-to-80 Bikeways	Implement planned 8-to-80 bikeway projects adopted as part of the City of Long Beach Bicycle Master Plan within the LB-ELA Corridor, including gap closure projects, backbone facilities, and pipeline bikeways (over 40 projects within the study area). See Attachment A for more detail.	7	City of Long Beach Bicycle Master Plan, SPP Survey, CA-7	Long Beach	2.5	2.7	2.2	2.3	1.3	2.3	1.7	0.9	13.2	2.6	15.8
Active Transportation / TDM	Bicycle Routes / Facilities	LB-ELA_0163	LB-ELA Corridor Bicycle Gap Closure Projects	Implement regionally significant bicycle projects in areas with insufficient existing and planned bicycle infrastructure within the LB-ELA Corridor (several projects within the study area). See Attachment A for more detail. Would include potential routes identified by the community, but which will require further planning and design in cooperation with the local jurisdictions (Cities, County of Los Angeles).	8	SPP Mapping, CA-7	Multiple Jurisdictions	2.5	2.7	2.2	2.3	1.3	2.3	2.0	1.1	13.2	3.1	16.3
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0005	Rail to River Active Transportation Corridor Segment A	A 5.6-mile active transportation path connecting the Fairview Height Station of the soon-to-be-open Crenshaw Line in Inglewood to the Slauson A (Blue) Line station in South Los Angeles.	9	Metro LRTP, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	0.8	2.1	2.0	2.2	1.2	1.8	2.2	1.1	10.2	3.4	13.5
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0006	Rail to River Active Transportation Corridor Segment B	An approximate 4.5-mile active transportation corridor between the LA River to the Slauson A (Blue) Line station that connects to Segment A.	10	Metro LRTP, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	1.7	2.4	2.0	2.4	1.0	1.8	2.2	1.1	11.3	3.3	14.6
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0008	Blue Line First Last Mile Plan Improvements	Implement projects identified in the Blue Line First/Last Mile Plan within the LB-ELA Corridor, with an emphasis on Del Amo Station. Projects to include ramp reconfigurations, sidewalk and bike lane improvements, and crossing improvements, among others. The First/Last Mile (FLM) Plan for the Blue Line was adopted in April 2018 and represents a first-of-its-kind effort to plan comprehensive access improvements for an entire transit line. The Plan covered all 22 stations on the Metro A (Blue) Line and piloted an inclusive, equity focused community engagement process. The Plan included planning-level, community-identified pedestrian and bicycle improvements within walking (1/2-mile) and biking (3-mile) distance of each A Line station.	11	Metro LRTP, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	2.5	2.7	1.9	2.1	1.2	1.9	2.2	1.6	12.3	3.8	16.0
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0070	Pedestrian Bridge	Construct Pedestrian Bridge (Connecting Asmus Park to planned West Santa Ana Branch LRT Station)	12	City of Bell Gardens/COG	Bell Gardens	1.7	2.1	1.7	2.0	0.8	1.3	1.7	0.9	9.5	2.6	12.2
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0076	Pedestrian and Bike Facilities	Provide pedestrian facility improvements. Provide safe routes for bike riders. (Various locations within the City of Commerce)	13	City of Commerce/COG, SPP Survey	Commerce	1.7	2.4	1.7	2.1	0.8	1.6	1.8	0.9	10.2	2.7	12.9
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0082	Enhanced Pedestrian Crosswalk (Rives Ave. & Adwen St.)	Enhance pedestrian cross walk at Rives Ave. & Adwen St.	14	City of Downey/COG	Downey	0.8	1.2	1.1	1.7	0.8	0.9	0.3	0.9	6.5	1.2	7.7
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0094	Hill Street Pedestrian Bridge Overcrossing	Construct bridge over the I-710 and Los Angeles River at Hill Street for pedestrians and bicyclists.	15	City of Long Beach/COG, I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept	Long Beach	1.7	2.4	1.7	2.0	0.6	1.5	1.9	0.9	9.9	2.8	12.6
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0102	Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan improvements	Provide pedestrian facility improvements. Provide safe routes for bike riders. (Various locations within the City of Maywood per the city's master plan)	16	City of Maywood/COG, SPP Survey	Maywood	1.7	2.4	1.7	2.3	1.0	1.6	2.0	0.9	10.6	2.9	13.5
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0114	Walnut Pedestrian Pathway	Provide pedestrian pathway along 25th Street, from west of Walnut Avenue to Gundry Avenue	17	City of Signal Hill/COG, SPP Survey	Signal Hill	1.7	1.8	1.7	1.4	0.8	1.2	0.4	0.7	8.6	1.1	9.7
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0138	Spring Avenue Pedestrian/Bicycle Overcrossing	Construct bridge over the I-710 and Los Angeles River at Spring Street for pedestrians and bicyclists.	18	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept	Long Beach	1.7	2.1	1.7	2.0	0.6	1.3	0.6	0.9	9.3	1.5	10.8

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	List Order	Project Source	Jurisdiction	AQ Smry	CH Smry	MB Smry	SF Smry	EN Smry	OP Smry	EQ Smry	SA Smry	Goal Score	Principle Score	Draft Total Score
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0139	Humphreys Avenue Pedestrian/Bicycle Overcrossing	Construct bridge over I-710 along Humphreys Avenue for pedestrians and bicyclists.	19	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept, SPP Mapping	East LA	1.7	2.1	1.5	2.0	0.5	1.5	1.9	0.9	9.3	2.8	12.0
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0158	Del Amo Pedestrian Gap Closure Project	Provide sidewalks and lighting at Del Amo undercrossing at the I-710 freeway. Currently there are no existing sidewalks. Would also help those seeking walk access to Del Amo LRT Station.	20	SPP Mapping	Ranch Dominguez / Long Beach	1.7	2.1	1.7	1.9	1.0	1.1	0.8	0.7	9.4	1.4	10.8
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0159	Southern Ave. Pedestrian Connector Project	New pedestrian path along Southern Ave./East Frontage Rd./Miller Way/West Frontage Road to connect Garfield Ave. with Urban Orchard Park	21	SPP Mapping	South Gate	1.7	2.4	1.7	2.0	0.7	1.1	0.9	0.7	9.5	1.6	11.1
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0204	Pedestrian Gap Closure Projects	Close gaps within the pedestrian circulation network in communities within the LB-ELA Corridor through the implementation of new pedestrian facilities. A funding program would be made available to award financial resources to local jurisdictions (Cities, unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County) on a competitive basis to design and construct new pedestrian facilities in areas where this infrastructure is currently missing. Projects would include: - New sidewalks and pedestrian paths - Extensions of existing pedestrian paths/trails - Pedestrian/bicycle overpasses - New Crosswalks/Signals for Pedestrians - Provision of connections and access to existing trails (for example, greater access to Los Angeles/Rio Hondo River Trail) - Provision of pedestrian access/connections to existing and planned Metro transit stations/stops - Implementation of Safe School Pedestrian/Biking Zones	22	SPP Survey, SPP Mapping, CA-7	Study Area Wide	1.7	2.4	2.2	2.3	1.5	2.3	2.0	1.1	12.3	3.1	15.4
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0211	City of Long Beach Mid-City Pedestrian and Bicycle Connections	Create an interconnected network of walking and bicycle routes including creation of bicycle boulevards along 8th and 11th Streets. Includes active transportation network south of Anaheim Street, north of 7th Street, east of Long Beach Boulevard, and west of Cherry Avenue within the City of Long Beach.	23	PIPO	Long Beach	1.7	2.4	2.0	2.1	1.5	1.7	2.2	0.9	11.3	3.1	14.5
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0213	West Santa Ana Branch [WSAB] Light Rail Station First-Last Mile Bikeway Safety and Access Project	Install 0.3 miles of sidewalk, 1.5 miles of bicycle lanes (Class II), 2 miles of bike route sharrows (Class III), street lighting, center median islands, curb ramps, and a rest area near the LA River Bike Path. Located in the eastern quadrant of the City of South Gate, along the existing Union Pacific Railroad /future West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor.	24	PIPO	Multiple Jurisdictions	1.7	2.4	1.7	2.4	1.5	1.5	2.0	0.9	11.1	2.9	14.0
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0220	Micromobility Pilot Project	Develop a pilot project along Long Beach Boulevard/Pacific Boulevard between Ocean Boulevard [Long Beach] and East. 57th Street [Vernon] in order to evaluate the design and implementation of Micromobility features along this planned Complete Streets Corridor. Micromobility is defined as any small, low-speed, human or electric-powered device, including bicycles, scooters, electric-assist bicycles (e-bikes), electric scooters (e-scooters), and other small, lightweight, wheeled conveyances. Micromobility devices help to close first- and last-mile gaps to transit and can offer individuals greater access to jobs, health care, and other services. Powered and adaptive micromobility devices may also increase mobility for older adults or individuals with disabilities, as they are less strenuous to operate than traditional bicycles or scooters. The Micromobility Pilot Project would test and evaluate various concepts, including but not limited to: - Protected Bicycle Lanes. These lanes physically separate micromobility users from vehicles and pedestrians. These should be designed to accommodate electric and non-electric modes. Streets with speed limits above 30 miles per hour should include a protected lane. - Speed Limits. For example, micromobility devices should self-regulate their speeds below 15 miles/hour to use the protected lane or should ride in the road. - Enforcement / Signage. Motorcycles and other high-speed devices not permitted in the protected lanes. - Designated Parking Stations. Provide designated parking areas for all types of micromobility devices and keep devices out of pedestrian rights of way. - Examine policies and regulations that would permit private companies to operate shared micromobility services, including e-scooters and e-bicycles, to the communities.	25	Task Force	Multiple Jurisdictions	1.7	1.5	2.0	1.2	1.1	1.9	2.2	1.1	9.4	3.4	12.8
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0090	Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons at Pedestrian Crossings	Install rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs) at Pedestrian Crossings at various locations within the City of Long Beach.	26	City of Long Beach/COG, SPP Survey	Long Beach	0.8	0.9	1.1	1.3	0.5	1.5	0.7	0.9	6.2	1.6	7.7

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	List Order	Project Source	Jurisdiction	AQ Smry	CH Smry	MB Smry	SF Smry	EN Smry	OP Smry	EQ Smry	SA Smry	Goal Score	Principle Score	Draft Total Score
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0095	Pedestrian Crosswalk Improvements	Provide pedestrian crosswalk improvements (pedestrian buttons, signage, and electrical infrastructure) at Rosewood/Abbott, MallisoNAbbott, Long Beach/Tecumseh, Imperial/Ruth & Atlantic/Brewster intersections. (Phase 1)	27	City of Lynwood/COG, SPP Survey	Lynwood	0.8	0.9	0.9	1.5	1.1	1.3	1.7	0.9	6.5	2.6	9.1
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0165	Compton Creek Bike Underpasses	Along Compton Creek Bike Path, between 120th Street and Greenleaf Blvd., construct bike path under-crossings at 120th Street, El Segundo Ave., Rosecrans Ave., Compton Ave., and Alondra Ave. Add lighting, landscaping, benches, and shade to the existing path.	28	SPP Mapping, Community Leadership Committee (CLC)	Compton	1.7	2.4	2.0	2.5	1.3	1.7	2.2	1.4	11.5	3.6	15.1
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0170	Huntington Park Safe Routes for Seniors & Students	Project will construct curb ramps, crossing improvements, sidewalks, wayfinding, speed-calming, and other active transportation improvements for pedestrians on segments of Belgrave Ave., Clarendon Ave., E. 61st St., Randolph St., Seville St., Zoe Ave., State St., Yahualica Place, and walking/biking paths adjacent to Veteran's Park. Includes 130 curb ramps and high-visibility crosswalks, 3 raised islands, 1 HAWK beacon, 3,266 linear feet of sidewalks, 20 wayfinding signs, 10 flashing beacons, 329 illuminated bollards, 20 speed humps, 10 raised crosswalks, wastebins, and shade trees.	29	PIPO (Huntington Park), SPP Survey	Huntington Park	0.8	2.1	1.9	2.4	1.2	2.0	2.1	1.4	10.5	3.5	13.9
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0200	Bike Share Programs and Bicycle Amenities	This initiative would build upon Metro's existing Bike Share Program framework, focusing on the LB-ELA Corridor. This involves collaboration with local jurisdictions (Cities, County of Los Angeles), non-profit organizations, and/or creating public-private partnerships for purpose of expanding access to bike share programs and for the provision of key amenities for bicycle users within the LB-ELA Corridor Study Area. Financial support would be provided to help leverage local funding for small scale capital projects such as: bicycle parking and storage lockers; lighting for bike paths; bicycle repair/maintenance stations; signage and wayfinding; electric bicycle charging stations; and safety features.	30	SPP Survey, SPP Mapping, CA-7	Study Area Wide	1.7	1.2	1.6	2.0	1.4	2.2	1.8	2.1	10.1	3.9	13.9
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0201	Pedestrian / Bicycle Enhancements and Safety Features	Work with the local jurisdictions (Cities, unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County) to improve safety and enhance the walking/biking environment throughout the LB-ELA Corridor. Active transportation measures and features would include items such as: - Shade structures, trees, benches, and trash cans; - Wider sidewalks, bulb outs, upgrades to crosswalks, and ADAaccessibility improvements (including repositioning utility boxes on sidewalks); - Stop signs, traffic signals, pedestrian/bicycle signal phases, colored pavement markings, signage and striping; - Alternative traffic signal phasing options, such as "scramble" pedestrian crossings; - Flashing crosswalks, and other traffic controls such as pedestrianflashing beacons; - Lighting along pedestrian/bicycle paths, including under-crossings; - Landscaping, hardscaping, and other aesthetic features; - Protection buffers and barriers, improved fencing Provide technical and grant writing assistance to local jurisdictions, if requested, to define and develop potential projects. Provide financial support in order to help leverage local funds for project construction and implementation. Funds would be made available based on criteria such as: project need, project readiness, and project benefits relative to costs, among other factors.	31	SPP Survey, SPP Mapping, CA-7, Community Leadership Committee (CLC)	Study Area Wide	2.5	2.7	2.2	2.6	1.9	2.3	2.3	1.9	14.1	4.2	18.3
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0206	City of Bell Gardens Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements	Citywide pedestrian, bike and traffic calming improvements to create a complete streets environment – cross walks, mini traffic circles, HAWK pedestrian signals, curb extensions, Class 3 bike routes, ADA ramps, Leading Pedestrian Interval (LBI) signal timing, and striping improvements. Would be applied to various locations within the City of Bell Gardens, including: Sprecht Ave., Live Oak St., Priority St., Purdy Ave., Gephart Ave., Perry Rd., and Hannon St.	32	PIPO	Bell Gardens	1.7	2.4	1.7	1.9	1.0	1.9	2.1	0.9	10.5	3.0	13.5
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0207	City of Carson Citywide Community Safety Improvements	Improve bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and safety with Class 2 bike lanes, bike racks, crosswalk improvements, Accessible Pedestrian Signal push buttons, countdown pedestrian signals, and curb ramps. Various locations within the City of Carson and Santa Fe Avenue between 218th Place and Del Amo Boulevard.	33	PIPO	Carson	1.7	2.1	1.5	1.9	1.0	1.5	0.7	0.9	9.7	1.6	11.2
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0208	Salt Lake Avenue Pedestrian Accessibility Project	East side of Salt Lake Avenue within the City of Cudahy. Widen sidewalk, install pedestrian lighting, signage, curb extensions, and ADA compliant wheelchair ramps.	34	PIPO	Cudahy	1.7	1.5	1.3	2.0	0.8	1.5	1.9	0.9	8.8	2.8	11.6

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	List Order	Project Source	Jurisdiction	AQ Smry	CH Smry	MB Smry	SF Smry	EN Smry	OP Smry	EQ Smry	SA Smry	Goal Score	Principle Score	Draft Total Score
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0209	South Downey Safe Routes to School Project (Phase 2)	Safety education and construction of sidewalks, crosswalks, and curb ramps. Various locations within South Downey: Brunache St., Laura St., Nada St., Pomeroy Rd, Quoit St., Lankin St., Orizaba Ave., Gneiss Ave., Devenir Ave., Blodgett Ave. and Premiere Ave.	35	PIPO	Downey	0.8	1.5	1.3	1.7	1.0	1.9	1.2	0.9	8.2	2.1	10.3
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0210	Greenway Traffic Circle Improvement Project	At the intersection of Rives Avenue / Phlox Street in the City of Downey, construct traffic circle, bulb outs with directional curb ramps, enhanced crosswalks, signage, landscaping, shade, and bioswales.	36	PIPO	Downey	0.8	0.9	0.9	1.7	0.9	0.9	0.6	1.0	6.2	1.5	7.7
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0212	Tweedy Boulevard Active Transportation Improvements	Install improvements on Tweedy Boulevard to improve non-motorized user safety and promote walking, biking, and use of local transit. Tweedy Boulevard, between Alameda Street and Dearborn Avenue and between Dorothy Avenue and the Los Angeles River Bicycle Trail, within the City of South Gate.	37	PIPO	South Gate	2.5	2.7	1.7	2.3	1.0	1.9	1.5	0.9	12.0	2.4	14.4
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0214	I-710 Livability Initiative	A compendium of proposed projects and improvements as outlined in the I-710 Livability Initiative conceptual plan. Proposed projects include improvements such as: - Lighting for people walking/biking. - New/improved bike lanes and bike amenities. - New improved sidewalks and cross walks. - Landscaping and shade. Public art. - Improved bus stops. Improved curbs. Street furniture. - Traffic calming to slow speeds. - New connections and crossings. Improve under/overpasses. Proposals address improvements along a network of 21 east-west and 6 north-south roadway segments located within one-mile of I-710.	38	COG Ad Hoc Committee	Multiple Jurisdictions	2.5	2.7	2.2	2.4	1.7	2.3	2.2	1.9	13.8	4.1	17.9
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0216	Bicycle Safety and Education Program (BEST)	Expand Metro's efforts to promote bicycle safety and improve roadway awareness for bicyclists, pedestrians, bus operators, and motorists within the Long Beach-East Los Angeles Corridor communities. This program includes: - Education and encouragement campaigns to promote a shift from driving to more walking, bicycling, and the use of public transit. - Bicycle skills and traffic safety classes. - Community rides. Safe Routes to Schools rides. - Collaboration with key stakeholders in the development of campaigns and printed materials such as safe riding kits for bicycle safety class participants.	39	Task Force, Community Leadership Committee (CLC)	Study Area Wide	0.8	1.3	0.8	1.2	0.8	0.8	1.0	1.7	5.8	2.7	8.5
Active Transportation / TDM	Travel Demand Management (TDM) Strategies	LB-ELA_0198	Carpool/Vanpool Programs	Extend Metro's carpool and vanpool programs by focusing on the LB-ELA Study Area. Carpooling is an inexpensive and effective travel option that involves finding nearby commuters to share the ride. Provide access to ride-matching services to find nearby residents looking to carpool. In addition, promote vanpool services, including coordination, administration support, and financial subsidies for commuters especially in areas less served by transit operators.	40	SPP Survey	Study Area Wide	1.7	1.3	1.1	NA	0.8	1.1	1.4	0.8	6.0	2.2	8.2
Active Transportation / TDM	Travel Demand Management (TDM) Strategies	LB-ELA_0199	Telecommuting Programs	Building upon "lessons learned" during the COVID pandemic, encourage employers to modify their work policies to retain hybrid work schedules, flexible work hours, and "work from home" options. Coordinate with public agencies and large employers. Share research/promote studies on the effectiveness of telecommuting. In addition, identify supportive infrastructure for telecommuting. Expand broadband capacity and internet service provider (ISP) capabilities within the LB-ELA Corridor by co-locating digital communications infrastructure (such as fiber optic cable) with major public works projects and infrastructure.	41	SPP Survey	Study Area Wide	1.7	1.7	1.1	1.6	0.8	1.6	1.4	0.8	8.5	2.2	10.7

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	AQ Smry	CH Smry	MB Smry	SF Smry	EN Smry	OP Smry	EQ Smry	SA Smry	Goal Score	Principle Score	Draft Total Score
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0010	Shoemaker Bridge/Shoreline Drive	I-710 Improvements/Shoemaker Bridge Replacement: Replace the Existing Shoemaker Bridge with a New Bridge. The New Bridge Will Be Reduced to Have Two Mixed-Flow Lanes in the NB and in the SB Directions to Tie the Flow into I-710. The New Bridge Will Also Include Pedestrian and Bicycle Access. Additionally, Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Street Enhancements Will Be Provided on Adjacent Thoroughfares.	SCAG RTP, PIP0, City of Long Beach/COG	Long Beach	1.4	1.8	1.9	2.4	1.5	1.7	1.8	1.6	10.6	3.4	14.0
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0056	Artesia Complete Street Corridor	Artesia Blvd., between Central Ave. and Lakewood Blvd. Reconstruct Artesia Blvd. to establish a Complete Street Corridor, including: bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities and crosswalks, transit stop features and amenities, safety and traffic calming features, landscaping, hardscaping, public art (aesthetic treatments), public green spaces, trees, and water quality features such as bioswales and tree wells.	COG/Cities/County, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	1.7	2.4	1.5	2.4	2.1	1.7	1.5	1.7	11.7	3.2	15.0
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0057	Atlantic Complete Street Corridor	Atlantic Ave./Blvd., between Ocean Blvd. and SR-60. Reconstruct Atlantic Ave./Blvd. to establish a Complete Street Corridor, including: bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities and crosswalks, transit stop features and amenities, safety and traffic calming features, landscaping, hardscaping, public art (aesthetic treatments), public green spaces, trees, and water quality features such as bioswales and tree wells.	COG/Cities/County, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	2.5	2.7	1.6	2.4	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	13.4	4.2	17.7
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0058	Florence Complete Street Corridor	Florence Ave., between Alameda St. and Lakewood Blvd. Reconstruct Florence Ave. to establish a Complete Street Corridor, including: bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities and crosswalks, transit stop features and amenities, safety and traffic calming features, landscaping, hardscaping, public art (aesthetic treatments), public green spaces, trees, and water quality features such as bioswales and tree wells.	COG/Cities/County, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	2.5	2.7	1.5	2.4	2.1	1.9	2.1	1.7	13.0	3.8	16.8
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0059	Imperial Complete Street Corridor	Imperial Hwy., between Alameda St. and Lakewood Blvd. Reconstruct Imperial Hwy. to establish a Complete Street Corridor, including: bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities and crosswalks, transit stop features and amenities, safety and traffic calming features, landscaping, hardscaping, public art (aesthetic treatments), public green spaces, trees, and water quality features such as bioswales and tree wells.	COG/Cities/County, SPP Survey	Lynwood/South Gate/Downey	2.5	2.7	1.5	2.4	2.1	1.9	1.5	1.7	13.0	3.2	16.2
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0060	Alondra Complete Street Corridor	Alondra Blvd., between Central Ave. and Lakewood Blvd. Reconstruct Alondra Blvd. to establish a Complete Street Corridor, including: bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities and crosswalks, transit stop features and amenities, safety and traffic calming features, landscaping, hardscaping, public art (aesthetic treatments), public green spaces, trees, and water quality features such as bioswales and tree wells.	COG/Cities/County, SPP Survey	Compton/Paramount	2.5	2.7	1.3	2.4	1.9	1.7	2.0	1.7	12.6	3.7	16.3
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0061	Slauson Complete Street Corridor	Slauson Ave., between Alameda St. and Lakewood Blvd. Reconstruct Slauson Ave. to establish a Complete Street Corridor, including: bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities and crosswalks, transit stop features and amenities, safety and traffic calming features, landscaping, hardscaping, public art (aesthetic treatments), public green spaces, trees, and water quality features such as bioswales and tree wells.	COG/Cities/County, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	1.7	2.4	1.5	2.4	2.1	1.9	2.1	1.7	11.9	3.8	15.7
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0062	Long Beach Complete Street Corridor	Long Beach Blvd./Pacific Blvd. Reconstruct Long Beach Blvd./Pacific Blvd., between Ocean Blvd. and Slauson Ave. to establish a Complete Street Corridor, including: bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities and crosswalks, transit stop features and amenities, safety and traffic calming features, landscaping, hardscaping, public art (aesthetic treatments), public green spaces, trees, and water quality features such as bioswales and tree wells.	COG/Cities/County, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	2.5	2.7	1.6	2.4	2.1	2.0	2.1	2.1	13.3	4.2	17.5
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0064	Gage Avenue Street Improvements	Gage Ave., from Bell western city limit to eastern city limit. Upgrade Gage Ave. to provide safety and aesthetic features (drought tolerant landscaping, hardscaping). Proposed improvements will include new pedestrian sidewalks, street lighting, street furniture, bus shelters, parkway landscaping, monument entry signs, and drainage enhancements with the installation of curb drains and drywells in the project site.	City of Bell/COG	Bell	2.5	2.7	1.9	2.6	1.7	1.6	2.2	1.7	13.0	3.9	16.9
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0086	Gage Avenue Operational and Safety Improvements	Between Alameda Street and Atlantic Blvd., upgrade Gage Avenue to provide operational and safety improvements.	City of Huntington Park/COG	Bell/Huntington Park	0.8	0.3	1.5	1.5	0.7	1.2	1.4	0.5	6.0	1.9	7.9
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0126	Slauson Avenue Corridor & Citywide Pedestrian, Bike, Transit Improvements	Project focuses on pedestrian, bike, & transit safety improvements along the Slauson Avenue, between I-710 and I-5, as well as 10 other unsignalized intersections or midblock crossings citywide. The project location includes the 2.6-mile Slauson Avenue corridor between I-710 and I-5 freeways and 10 unsignalized intersections or midblock crossings citywide.	PIPO (City of Commerce), SPP Survey	Commerce	0.8	1.8	1.3	2.3	1.3	1.4	1.7	0.9	8.9	2.6	11.5

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	AQ Smry	CH Smry	MB Smry	SF Smry	EN Smry	OP Smry	EQ Smry	SA Smry	Goal Score	Principle Score	Draft Total Score
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0127	Lakewood Boulevard Improvement Project	Lakewood Blvd., between Del Amo Blvd. and Ashworth Street. The project would install a Class I Bike Path and pedestrian sidewalk in the parkway area and will construct minor roadway capacity enhancements on Lakewood Boulevard. Project includes 1.5 miles of new bicycle and pedestrian facilities, utility undergrounding, traffic signal improvements, LED street lighting, ADA enhancements, and green street improvements such as landscaped median islands, parkway trees, and stormwater retention.	PIPO (City of Lakewood), SPP Survey	Lakewood	0.8	1.8	1.7	2.6	1.7	1.4	0.8	1.7	10.0	2.5	12.5
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0129	Garfield Avenue Improvement Project	Garfield Avenue, between Century Boulevard and Firestone. The project would transform the corridor to a more attractive and pedestrian and bike friendly environment. Improvements include: (a) implementing new bicycle facilities including bike racks, Class II Bike Lanes and Class III Bike Routes, (b) pedestrian improvements including flashing beacons, curb extensions and sidewalks, (c) raised, landscape center road medians, (d) enhancing the bus shelters, and (e) adding roadway signing and striping.	PIPO (City of South Gate), SPP Survey	South Gate	2.5	2.7	1.5	2.1	1.6	1.6	1.4	1.4	12.1	2.8	14.9
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0117	Burnett Street/Skyline Drive Improvement Project	Improve Burnett Street/Skyline Drive, including the addition of Bike Lanes, between East Walnut Avenue and Dawson Avenue. Installation of sidewalks between Gaviota Avenue and Cherry Avenue, Class 2 bike lanes between Walnut Avenue and Dawson Avenue, and related roadway amenities/improvements.	City of Signal Hill/COG, SPP Survey	Signal Hill	0.8	1.5	1.5	1.7	0.8	1.3	0.6	1.0	7.7	1.6	9.2
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0003	Integrated Corridor Management (ICM) Project	ICM is an Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) strategy to manage non-recurring congestion along a corridor by utilizing advanced technologies and systems. ICM components include active monitoring of all transportation modes and facilities within the corridor, on and off the freeway, including ramp metering, traffic signal coordination, incident traffic management, advanced traveler information system, and other advanced technologies and techniques. Would be applied on I-710 and a network of key connecting arterials, within the LB-ELA Corridor between SR-91 and SR-60.	Metro LRTP, PIPO, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	0.8	0.8	2.0	0.4	0.4	2.0	1.3	2.4	6.5	3.7	10.1
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0013	Tweedy Blvd Signal Sync	Tweedy Boulevard Signal Synchronization Project: (1) Interconnects 18 Traffic Signals Using Fiber Optic Cable And Wireless Communications (2) Synchronizes Signal Timing To Improve Traffic Flow, And Reduces Delays Along The 2.7-Mile Arterial and (3) Install A Closed Circuit Television Camera (CCTV) At The Intersection Of Long Beach Bl., to Support the Advance Transportation Management Systems (ATMS).	SCAG RTP, SPP Survey	Lynwood/South Gate	0.4	0.3	1.3	0.9	0.2	1.3	1.2	0.3	4.3	1.4	5.8
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0020	Sports Park Transportation Performance Modeling Network	Traffic signal controller and cabinets upgrades and the installation of fiber optic communication infrastructure to provide redundant high bandwidth network in Long Beach within the LB-ELA Corridor. The purpose of these equipment upgrades is to improve traffic signal coordination and strengthen data connections among traffic management systems.	Metro 2028 Mobility Concept Plan	Long Beach	NA	1.6	1.6	0.4	0.0	1.7	1.3	0.0	5.3	1.3	6.5
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0051		Route 1. In Los Angeles County, on various routes at various locations. Upgrade existing fiber communication system and rehabilitate Transportation Management System (TMS) elements, including video cameras, ramp meters, and Changeable Message Signs (CMS).	SHOPP, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	NA	1.6	1.6	0.9	0.0	1.7	1.2	0.0	5.7	1.2	7.0
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0069	Traffic / Ped Signal Upgrades	Targeted upgrades to 38 intersections, citywide, in the City of Bell Gardens. Would replace outdated infrastructure such as signal poles, cabinets, pedestrian poles, and vehicle detection systems.	City of Bell Gardens/COG	Bell Gardens	0.4	0.0	1.6	0.8	0.2	1.8	1.0	0.3	4.8	1.2	6.0
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0071	Mixmaster Traffic signal Improvements (Telegraph/ Eastern/ Atlantic)	Traffic signal upgrade at Telegraph / Eastern / Atlantic. Also consider improvements such as turning lane pavement markings, striping, and enhanced signage so that approaching traffic can get properly aligned well in advance of this intersection.	City of Commerce/COG, Community Leadership Committee (CLC)	Commerce	0.0	0.4	1.6	0.8	0.0	0.9	1.2	0.5	3.6	1.7	5.4
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0072	Traffic Signal Coordination Projects	Various arterials within the City of Commerce	City of Commerce/COG, SPP Survey	Commerce	0.4	0.3	1.3	0.4	0.2	1.4	1.3	0.5	4.0	1.8	5.7
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0074	Traffic Signal Upgrades	Upgrade various signals within the City of Commerce	City of Commerce/COG	Commerce	0.4	0.3	1.1	0.8	0.2	1.4	1.2	0.5	4.2	1.8	6.0
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0075	Video Camera installation	Video Camera installation on all Signalized intersections within the City of Commerce	City of Commerce/COG, SPP Survey	Commerce	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.8	0.0	1.7	1.5	0.0	3.7	1.5	5.2
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0081	Firestone Blvd. Traffic Signal Upgrades & Safety Enhancements	Along Firestone Boulevard between Downey West City Limit and Lakewood Boulevard, provide traffic signal updates and safety enhancements.	City of Downey/COG	Downey	0.4	0.3	2.0	1.1	0.2	1.1	0.2	0.3	5.1	0.5	5.6



Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	AQ Smry	CH Smry	MB Smry	SF Smry	EN Smry	OP Smry	EQ Smry	SA Smry	Goal Score	Principle Score	Draft Total Score
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0083	Traffic Signal Upgrades	Along Florence Ave., between Downey Ave. & Brookshire Ave., upgrade traffic signals	City of Downey/COG	Downey	0.0	0.4	2.0	0.8	0.0	0.9	0.9	0.3	4.1	1.1	5.2
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0084	Video Detection Upgrades	At 25 intersections in various locations within the City of Downey, provide video detection upgrades.	City of Downey/COG, SPP Survey	Downey	0.4	0.0	1.6	1.1	0.3	1.7	0.4	0.3	5.1	0.6	5.7
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0087	Traffic Signal Equipment Improvements	Upgrade traffic signal equipment at various locations within the City of Long Beach	City of Long Beach/COG	Long Beach	0.4	0.3	1.1	0.8	0.2	1.4	0.4	0.3	4.2	0.7	4.9
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0089	Emergency Vehicle Pre-Emption	Install emergency vehicle pre-emption (EMVE) for traffic signals at various locations within the City of Long Beach.	City of Long Beach/COG	Long Beach	0.0	0.0	1.6	1.2	0.0	0.8	0.6	0.5	3.7	1.2	4.8
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0096	Traffic Signal Improvements	Install new traffic signals and signage at the following locations: 1) Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd./Abbott Rd., 2) Arlington and Atlantic Ave., 3) El Segundo and State St., 4) Carlin and Bullis Rd., 5) Alameda St. and Industry Way, 6) Alameda St. and Lynwood Rd., 7) Martin Luther King Blvd/ Norton Ave., 8) Martin Luther King Blvd/Bullis Rd., 9) Martin Luther King Blvd/Ernestine St., 10) Martin Luther King Blvd and California, 11) State Street and Fernwood. (Phase 1)	City of Lynwood/COG	Lynwood	0.4	0.3	1.1	0.8	0.2	1.4	0.7	0.3	4.2	1.0	5.2
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0097	Traffic Signal Improvements	Provide traffic signal upgrades at the following locations: 1) Long Beach Blvd/Carlin, 2) Long Beach Blvd/El Segundo, 3) Long Beach Blvd and Sanborn, 4) Long Beach Blvd./Euclid, 5) Long Beach Blvd/Imperial Hwy, 6) Atlantic Ave/Cortland, 7) Atlantic Ave./Abbott Rd, 8) Alameda/Deputy Blaire. (Phase 2)	City of Lynwood/COG	Lynwood	0.4	0.3	1.1	0.8	0.2	1.4	1.2	0.3	4.2	1.5	5.7
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0099	Traffic Signal Synchronization Projects	Various arterials within the City of Maywood	City of Maywood/COG, SPP Survey	Maywood	0.4	0.3	1.7	0.4	0.2	1.1	1.2	0.3	4.0	1.4	5.5
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0100	Traffic Signal Upgrade Projects	Upgrade traffic signal equipment at various locations within the City of Maywood	City of Maywood/COG	Maywood	0.4	0.3	1.6	0.8	0.2	1.1	1.1	0.3	4.4	1.4	5.8
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0101	Video Camera installation	Video Camera installation at all Signalized intersections within the City of Maywood	City of Maywood/COG, SPP Survey	Maywood	0.0	0.0	1.7	1.1	0.0	1.4	1.4	0.0	4.3	1.4	5.7
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0112	Signal Coordination/ITS Projects	Implement signal coordination and ITS projects at various locations within the City of Signal Hill.	City of Signal Hill/COG, SPP Survey	Signal Hill	0.4	0.3	1.3	0.4	0.2	1.1	0.3	0.3	3.6	0.5	4.2
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0116	Traffic Signal Operational Upgrade	Upgrade the traffic signal at Willow Street & Temple Avenue	City of Signal Hill/COG	Signal Hill	0.4	0.3	1.1	0.8	0.2	0.9	0.2	0.3	3.7	0.5	4.2
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0166	LB-ELA Corridor Vulnerable Road User Connected Vehicle Infrastructure Deployment	Design and Implementation of Connected Vehicle Infrastructure to improve vulnerable road user safety within the LB-ELA Corridor. This would allow units in vehicles to communicate with units built into transportation infrastructure. Additional technology applications would allow vehicles to communicate with other vehicles, data networks, or pedestrians. The main purpose of this technology is to share information related to items such as safety warnings, roadway hazards, routing information, truck route restrictions, and pedestrian safety zones.	Metro	Multiple Jurisdictions	0.4	0.3	1.8	1.1	0.2	1.9	0.9	0.4	5.6	1.3	6.9
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0167	I-710 Arterial Signal Performance Measurement	Deploy arterial signal performance measures at all signalized intersection within the LB-ELA Corridor to allow for the optimization of traffic signal operation to improve arterial corridor mobility.	Metro, SPP Survey	Study Area Wide	0.4	0.3	1.3	0.4	0.2	2.3	0.8	0.5	4.8	1.4	6.2
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0215	I-710 Arterial Traffic Signal Control Communication Upgrades	Design and implement upgraded arterial traffic signal control interconnect and central traffic management communications to elevate subregional traffic system management and operations.	Metro, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	0.4	0.3	1.3	0.4	0.2	2.3	0.8	0.5	4.8	1.4	6.2

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	AQ Smry	CH Smry	MB Smry	SF Smry	EN Smry	OP Smry	EQ Smry	SA Smry	Goal Score	Principle Score	Draft Total Score
Arterial Roadway	Traffic Calming	LB-ELA_0202	Traffic Calming	Implement Traffic Calming Features within the LB-ELA Corridor to slow traffic on local streets or near schools. Collaborate with local jurisdictions (Cities, unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County) to design, construct, and implement traffic calming features in areas that experience frequent speed violations and/or high levels of accident rates. Based on available funding, provide financial support in order to help leverage local funds for project construction and implementation. Traffic calming features could include: - Speed limit reductions, signage, variable speed signs, and enforcement devices - Speed bumps - Truck restrictions (trucks over a certain weight) on non-designated truck routes, including signage and geofencing alerts - Roundabouts - Trees, vegetation, landscaping features to help direct and slow traffic - Bulb outs - Stop signs, traffic signals, striping, raised decorative pavement, and other traffic controls - Road diets - Speed enforcement cameras - Enhanced use of signage, striping, flashing crosswalks, other pedestrian warning devices in school zones	SPP Survey, SPP Mapping, Community Leadership Committee (CLC)	Study Area Wide	1.7	2.4	1.0	2.4	1.4	1.6	1.4	1.9	10.5	3.3	13.8
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0012	Garfield Widening	Garfield Avenue Improvements, from 70th Street to Howery Street. Widen Street 1 to 4 Feet for 2 Miles to Accommodate a Third Lane in Each Direction during Peak Hours. Add Medians, Narrow Existing Medians, Add Second Left Turn Lane in All Directions at Two Intersections, (Rosecrans Ave. And Alondra Blvd.), Resurface Street, Concrete Intersections, and add Traffic Signal Improvements, Street Lights, Underground Utilities, Green Street Improvements, and Stormwater and Watershed BMPs.	SCAG RTP, PIPO	Paramount	0.4	0.2	2.0	0.6	0.3	1.6	0.8	0.9	5.1	1.7	6.8
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0040		Route 1, In the cities of Long Beach and Los Angeles, install stormwater treatment Best Management Practices (BMPs), including bioswales and Design Pollution Prevention Infiltration Areas (DPPIAs).	SHOPP	Wilmington/Long Beach	NA	NA	NA	1.6	1.6	2.4	1.5	1.7	5.6	3.2	8.8
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0041		Route 1. In Long Beach, from Temple Avenue to De Forest Avenue. Upgrade traffic signals, crosswalks, curb ramps, sidewalks, driveways, and Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APS) to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.	SHOPP	Long Beach	1.4	2.0	1.3	2.2	1.0	1.9	1.7	0.9	9.8	2.6	12.4
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0044		Route 1, MP 7.0-7.2. In Long Beach, at Los Angeles River Bridge No. 53-0341 and De Forest Avenue Undercrossing No. 53-1047. Seismic retrofit, upgrade bridge rails, and upgrade facilities to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.	SHOPP	Long Beach	2.5	2.4	0.9	2.0	0.8	1.6	1.7	0.8	10.2	2.5	12.7
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0063	Gage Ave. Bridge	Rehabilitate/replace Gage Avenue Bridge over the LA River	City of Bell/COG	Bell	2.5	1.7	1.1	1.6	0.4	1.6	1.5	0.0	8.9	1.5	10.4
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0065	Slauson Ave. Bridge	Rehabilitate/replace Slauson Avenue Bridge over the LA River	City of Bell/COG	Bell	1.7	1.3	0.9	1.6	0.4	1.6	1.4	0.0	7.4	1.4	8.8
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0067	Florence Ave. Bridges	Replace Florence Ave. Bridges over LA River & I-710	City of Bell/COG	Bell	1.7	1.3	1.4	1.6	0.8	1.6	1.5	0.0	8.4	1.5	9.8
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0068	Systematic Safety Analysis Report Program (SSARP) Improvements	Targeted safety improvements to 38 intersections, citywide, in the City of Bell Gardens. Includes installing signs; changing pavement markings; adding protected turn phasing; installing channelization; parking restrictions; and signal timing adjustments.	City of Bell Gardens/COG, SPP Survey	Bell Gardens	0.0	1.4	1.9	1.4	0.5	2.0	1.0	0.0	7.2	1.0	8.2
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0073	Telegraph Road Improvements	Improve Telegraph Road between Marianna Ave. and Atlantic Blvd (safety features and pedestrian circulation)	City of Commerce/COG	Commerce	1.7	1.5	1.1	1.9	0.6	1.3	1.7	0.4	8.1	2.2	10.3
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0078	Randolph Street Gap Closure	Provide arterial roadway bridge over LA River and I-710 to connect Randolph Street west and east of the LA River/I-710	City of Commerce/COG	Commerce	0.8	0.6	1.7	0.4	0.0	1.3	1.3	0.3	4.9	1.6	6.5
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0079	Florence Avenue Bridge Rehabilitation	Rehabilitate arterial bridge over the Rio Hondo River Channel	City of Downey/COG	Downey	2.5	1.7	1.1	1.6	0.8	1.6	0.4	0.0	9.3	0.4	9.8
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0080	Florence Ave. & Paramount Blvd. Intersection Improvement	Improve the intersection at Florence Ave. & Paramount Blvd. by adding turn lanes to reduce congestion and enhance safety.	City of Downey/COG, SPP Survey	Downey	0.0	0.4	2.0	1.1	0.0	0.9	0.4	0.3	4.3	0.7	5.0

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	AQ Smry	CH Smry	MB Smry	SF Smry	EN Smry	OP Smry	EQ Smry	SA Smry	Goal Score	Principle Score	Draft Total Score
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0085	Intersection Improvements (Huntington Park)	Provide intersection improvements at various locations within the City of Huntington Park	City of Huntington Park/COG, SPP Survey	Huntington Park	0.4	0.2	1.3	1.3	0.3	1.4	1.1	0.2	4.9	1.3	6.2
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0088	Protected Left Turns at Signals	Implement protected left-turns along major arterials at various locations with the City of Long Beach.	City of Long Beach/COG, SPP Survey	Long Beach	0.0	0.4	1.6	1.1	0.0	1.4	0.5	0.4	4.5	0.9	5.4
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0098	City Re-Striping Projects	Replace striping on major arterials (lane striping, school zone striping) at various locations within the City of Lynwood.	City of Lynwood/COG	Lynwood	NA	NA	1.2	1.5	0.5	0.8	0.6	0.0	4.0	0.6	4.7
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0104	Rosecrans Ave. Bridge	Replace/rehabilitate Rosecrans Ave. Bridge over the LA River	City of Paramount/COG	Paramount	2.5	1.7	1.4	1.6	0.4	1.6	1.4	0.0	9.2	1.4	10.6
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0105	Garfield Avenue Improvement Project	Improve Garfield Avenue from South City Limit to North City Limit [City of Paramount]	City of Paramount/COG	Paramount	0.4	0.2	1.9	1.6	0.2	1.1	0.9	0.3	5.4	1.2	6.6
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0107	Alondra Blvd. Bridges	Replace Alondra Blvd. Bridges over the LA River and I-710	City of Paramount/COG	Paramount	0.8	0.4	0.8	1.6	0.5	2.1	1.1	0.8	6.3	1.9	8.2
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0108	Garfield Ave. Intersection Improvements	Provide dual left turn lanes on all approaches for the following intersections along Garfield Avenue: 1) Rosecrans, 2) Somerset, and 3) Alondra.	City of Paramount/COG, SPP Survey	Paramount	1.7	0.9	1.6	0.9	0.0	1.1	1.3	0.2	6.1	1.4	7.5
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0109	Alondra Blvd. Intersection Improvements	Provide dual left turn lanes on all approaches for the following intersections along Alondra Blvd: 1) Garfield, 2) Paramount, and 3) Downey.	City of Paramount/COG, SPP Survey	Paramount	2.5	1.1	1.3	0.9	0.0	1.1	1.2	0.2	7.0	1.3	8.3
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0110	Rosecrans Intersection Improvements	Provide dual left turn lanes on all approaches for the following intersections along Rosecrans Ave: 1) Garfield, 2) Paramount, and 3) Downey.	City of Paramount/COG, SPP Survey	Paramount	1.7	0.9	1.3	0.9	0.0	1.1	1.2	0.2	5.9	1.3	7.2
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0113	Orange Avenue Improvement Project	Improve Orange Avenue, including the addition of Bike Lanes, between 25th Street and Spring Street	City of Signal Hill/COG, SPP Survey	Signal Hill	1.7	1.8	1.5	2.0	0.8	1.3	0.5	0.9	9.1	1.4	10.5
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0115	California Ave. Improvement Project	Improve California Avenue, including the addition of Bike Lanes, between Willow Street and Spring Street	City of Signal Hill/COG, SPP Survey	Signal Hill	0.8	1.5	1.5	2.1	0.7	1.3	0.5	0.9	7.9	1.4	9.3
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0119	Wright Road Improvement Project	Improve Wright Road, including the addition of Bike Lanes, between Imperial Hwy. and Atlantic Ave.	City of South Gate/COG, SPP Survey	South Gate	2.5	2.1	1.5	2.1	1.3	1.1	0.6	0.9	10.6	1.5	12.1
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0120	Safety-Related Road Improvement Projects	Within the East Rancho Dominguez (unincorporated LA County), implement safety-related improvement projects along the following roadways: Compton Boulevard, Atlantic Avenue, Rosecrans Avenue, and Alondra Boulevard	East Rancho Domingo (County of LA)/COG, SPP Survey	East Rancho Dominguez	2.5	2.4	1.7	1.5	0.8	1.6	0.9	0.2	10.5	1.1	11.6
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0205	Arterial/General Roadway Improvements Program	Implement local roadway projects within the local jurisdictions and communities (cities, unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County) which comprise the LB-ELA Corridor. The objective of these projects will be to improve mobility, safety, and the travel experience for all users of the roadways (pedestrians, bicyclists, transit, and vehicles). This program would help fund projects such as: - Intersection improvements - Bridge replacements - Street widenings and enhancements including lighting, safety features, landscaped medians, and parkways - Complete Streets projects and features, including active transportation (bicycle, pedestrian), and transit stop improvements - Traffic controls (traffic signals, stop signs), signal coordination, and Intelligent Transportation Systems	Metro, Gateway Cities COG, SPP Survey, SPP Mapping	Study Area Wide	0.9	1.4	1.3	2.2	1.3	2.7	1.6	1.4	9.7	3.0	12.7
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0221	Atlantic Blvd. widening Over I-5 at Mixmaster Intersection	Would widen Atlantic Avenue bridge structure over I-5 at intersection of Telegraph Road, Eastern Avenue, and Atlantic Boulevard in the City of Commerce. Would help relieve traffic congestion and provide a safer roadway for all modes of transportation.	City of Commerce	Commerce	0.4	0.0	1.9	0.9	0.2	1.4	1.1	0.5	4.8	1.6	6.5

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	AQ Smry	CH Smry	MB Smry	SF Smry	EN Smry	OP Smry	EQ Smry	SA Smry	Draft Total Score
Community Programs	Air Quality / Community Health	LB-ELA_0133	LB-ELA Corridor Community Health Benefit Program	Under this program, funding would be made available to implement air quality projects to reduce exposure to air pollution as well as health education and screening programs in areas adversely affected by existing and proposed transportation infrastructure projects. The LB-ELA Community Health Benefit Program would serve the communities within the LB-ELA Corridor Study Area. This program would provide subsidy funding to implement projects and outreach activities to improve air quality and public health, including but not limited to: - Air Quality Projects for Schools and Community Facilities: air filtration, HVAC upgrades, replacement/sealing of windows and doors, vegetation barriers or buffer landscaping. - Health Education and Screening: community health screening and diagnosis, health education, training for community health workers, outreach programs.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept, SPP Survey, CA-7	Study Area Wide	NA	2.1	NA	1.6	1.2	1.2	1.6	0.8	8.5
Community Programs	Air Quality / Community Health	LB-ELA_0191	Zero Emission Infrastructure for Autos	Work with local jurisdictions (Cities, County of Los Angeles), public agencies, and private-public partners to develop and site additional charging stations for zero emissions vehicles within the LB-ELA Corridor. Provide grant writing assistance in order to help secure funding. In addition, provide technical support to share best practices such as: identification of incentives and/or policy requirements for new development.	SPP Survey, SPP Mapping, CA-7	Study Area Wide	1.7	0.8	NA	NA	1.2	1.2	1.5	1.2	7.7
Community Programs	Air Quality / Community Health	LB-ELA_0192	Bus Electrification Projects	Seek incentives to accelerate the deployment of zero emissions vehicles within the LB-ELA Corridor. Projects could include bus electrification (public transit buses, school buses) as well as zero emissions charging infrastructure. Provide technical and grant writing assistance to define and develop potential projects.	Metro, SPP Survey, SPP Mapping, CA-7	Study Area Wide	1.7	1.6	NA	NA	2.0	1.2	1.5	0.9	8.9
Community Programs	Air Quality / Community Health	LB-ELA_0218	Air Quality Monitoring Stations	Add four, new air quality monitoring stations within the LB-ELA Study Area. Sites to be identified in cooperation with the South Coast Air Quality Management District.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept	Multiple Jurisdictions	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.8	NA	0.8	1.6
Community Programs	Environment	LB-ELA_0134	LB-ELA Corridor Energy Reduction / Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Program	Under the Energy Reduction / Greenhouse Gas Reduction (GHG) Program, funding would be made available to implement energy reduction as well as greenhouse gas reduction projects in areas impacted by transportation projects within the LB-ELA Corridor. This program would be an important element of any major transportation initiative that takes place within the LB-ELA Corridor. The program would provide subsidy funding to implement projects and educational activities targeted to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Examples of these projects include: renewable energy projects, solar-power generation, energy efficient lighting, and tree planting, among others.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept, SPP Mapping	Study Area Wide	2.5	1.6	NA	2.4	1.8	1.2	1.3	1.7	12.5
Community Programs	Environment	LB-ELA_0187	LB-ELA Corridor "Urban Greening" Initiative	Under this initiative, proposed projects implemented through the LB-ELA Corridor Investment Plan must consider context sensitive solutions as part of the project design as well as "urban greening" elements that foster environmental resilience. These "urban greening" elements may include items such as: provision of green space/greenbelts; parklets; tree planting; community gardens and community farms; drought tolerant planting; habitat restoration and connectivity; stormwater capture/flood diversion/water management projects; brownfield remediation, natural trail restoration, and green infrastructure, among others. Through the LB-ELA Urban Greening Initiative, project proponents may also partner with other localities, non-profit organizations, or communities in order to plan, design, and implement "green" projects that demonstrate that they provide publicly accessible open-space and ecosystem benefits such as urban heat island reduction within the LB-ELA Corridor.	SPP Survey, SPP Mapping, CA-7, Equity Working Group	Study Area Wide	NA	2.6	NA	1.2	2.0	2.5	1.9	1.7	11.8
Community Programs	Environment	LB-ELA_0190	Public Art / Aesthetics	Policy initiative that would require that a percentage of transportation construction funds for major public work projects be earmarked for public art, landscaping, urban design elements, and other aesthetic features for the projects.	SPP Survey, SPP Mapping	Study Area Wide	NA	2.4	NA	1.2	1.1	0.8	1.3	1.2	8.0



Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	AQ Smry	CH Smry	MB Smry	SF Smry	EN Smry	OP Smry	EQ Smry	SA Smry	Draft Total Score
Community Programs	Housing Stabilization / Land Use	LB-ELA_0009	West Santa Ana Branch Transit-Oriented Development Strategic Implementation Plan and Program (TOD SIP)	The TOD SIP provides an overarching vision and strategic guidance for local West Santa Ana Branch (WSAB) jurisdictions to use as a resource as they develop and implement their own plans, policies and economic development and mobility strategies in the 12 WSAB station areas along the alignment. Additionally, in 2019, the Metro Board approved a \$1M implementation program to fund WSAB jurisdictions to implement TOD SIP recommendations.	Metro LRTP	Multiple Jurisdictions	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	2.6	2.1	2.4	15.1
Community Programs	Housing Stabilization / Land Use	LB-ELA_0135	Housing Stabilization Policies	Applying an integrated approach, work with cities, County of Los Angeles, and public agencies to propose and pass community stabilization policies to support disadvantaged communities within the LB-ELA Corridor, improve their resilience, and address the social determinants of health. Provide grant writing assistance to secure needed funding. Housing stabilization policies and incentives include measures such as: - Mandates for process improvement: Engaging the community/forming partnerships with Community Based Organizations; - Community benefits: establish a framework/menu/equitable development scorecard for new development projects; - Develop community land trusts/land banks: for new housing and/or to support naturally occurring affordable housing; - Local wealth creation: encourage production of local for sale affordable housing, down payment assistance programs, homeowner maintenance assistance programs; - Inclusionary housing policies with or without option of in lieu fees; - Housing Trust Fund to support and increase funding for affordable housing production; - Density bonus programs to incentivize affordable and mixed income housing production; - Affordable accessory dwelling unit (ADU) programs and ADU amnesty programs; - Policies to reduce housing costs, such as parking reduction/unbundling, innovative construction techniques, fee waivers, permit streamlining; - Anti-displacement programs for tenants: tenant rights programs including anti-harassment policies/ just cause eviction policies, legal assistance for tenants, no net loss housing policies for new development, limits on residential demolition & conversion, tenant right-to-return policies, local resident preference programs for new housing; - Rent stabilization policies; - Low-income rental assistance programs, low interest loan programs for	COG Ad Hoc Committee, SPP Survey, SPP Mapping	Study Area Wide	NA	NA	1.6	1.6	2.3	NA	2.0	NA	7.5
Community Programs	Housing Stabilization / Land Use	LB-ELA_0193	Transit Oriented Communities /Land Use	Work with the local jurisdictions (Cities, County of Los Angeles) to apply best practices and design guidelines to encourage transit-oriented development near rail stations and heavily utilized bus routes within the LB-ELA Corridor. Provide technical resources such as grant writing assistance and technical assistance for community development and land use planning. Assist local jurisdictions in coordination with property owners and developers to ensure safe construction and strengthen connections to transit.	Metro, SPP Mapping	Study Area Wide	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.6	2.0	1.7	1.6	0.8	12.6
Community Programs	Housing Stabilization / Land Use	LB-ELA_0194	Homeless Programs	Support homeless initiatives within the LB-ELA Corridor and efforts and recommendations that have emerged from Metro's Homeless Task Force, Reimagining Public Safety Initiatives, and other County initiatives and studies to address homelessness in and around the transit system including provisions to: enhance the customer experience; maintain a safe and secure system; and connect homeless persons in the transit system to services and resources.	SPP Survey, SPP Mapping	Study Area Wide	NA	2.4	1.2	2.4	1.6	NA	1.6	NA	9.2

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	AQ Smry	CH Smry	MB Smry	SF Smry	EN Smry	OP Smry	EQ Smry	SA Smry	Draft Total Score
Community Programs	Job Creation / Work Opportunities	LB-ELA_0186	Economic Stabilization Policies	Work with Cities, County of Los Angeles, and public agencies to propose and pass community stabilization policies to support disadvantaged communities within the LB-ELA Corridor. Provide grant writing assistance to secure needed funding. Economic stabilization policies and incentives include measures such as: - Mandates for process improvement: Engaging the community/forming partnerships with Community Based Organizations; - Community financial empowerment programs: local hire agreements, workforce education & development, credit improvement programs; - Locally owned business support – small business interruption fund and loan funds during construction, guide for business support services, zoning to encourage small businesses, lease to own programs for businesses and housing; - Identify, protect and encourage legacy and culturally significant businesses, and historical and cultural landmarks, mandate inclusion of arts and culture spaces in new development	COG Ad Hoc Committee	Study Area Wide	NA	NA	NA	NA	2.3	2.5	1.9	NA	6.7
Community Programs	Job Creation / Work Opportunities	LB-ELA_0195	Targeted Hire Programs	Support the development of targeted and local hire programs to increase the share of public dollars that is devoted to creation of local jobs for community residents within the LB-ELA Study Area. Include measures such as the establishment of Project Labor Agreements (PLAs) that specify local and targeted hire goals for specific construction projects as well as first source hire requirements. Collaborate with local jurisdictions and public agencies to align local and targeted hire policies, thresholds, and requirements.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept, SPP Survey, CA-7	Study Area Wide	NA	NA	NA	NA	2.3	2.6	1.2	0.8	6.9
Community Programs	Job Creation / Work Opportunities	LB-ELA_0196	Employment/Recruitment Initiatives	Partner with public agencies, large employers, and local businesses to conduct recruitment drives at locations within the LB-ELA Corridor (both virtual and in person.) This initiative would also include job fairs and workshops at community facilities and community colleges to provide information to local residents regarding work opportunities as well as networking resources. Conduct promotional campaigns to actively publicize these events within the LB-ELA Corridor communities.	SPP Survey	Study Area Wide	NA	NA	NA	NA	2.3	2.6	1.2	0.8	6.9
Community Programs	Job Creation / Work Opportunities	LB-ELA_0197	Vocational Educational Programs	Partner with public agencies, private-sector employers, community colleges, labor organizations and non-profit organizations to expand vocational and educational programs for community residents within the LB-ELA Corridor. Examples could include training for mechanics who work for small businesses that service zero emissions vehicles. These programs would provide opportunities to establish a career pathway to work in key economic sectors and move up through the ranks by focusing on workforce development and skills training.	SPP Survey	Study Area Wide	1.7	NA	NA	NA	2.3	2.0	1.2	0.9	8.0

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	AQ Smry	CH Smry	MB Smry	SF Smry	EN Smry	OP Smry	EQ Smry	SA Smry	Goal Score	Principle Score	Draft Total Score
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0028	I-710/Willow Interchange Improvements	Reconfiguration of I-710/Willow Interchange to improve operations, safety, and sight distance for traffic entering and exiting the freeway. Improve traffic controls to address safety concerns of bicyclists, pedestrians at ramp termini. Upgrade bridge structures to allow space for bicycle/pedestrian connections across I-710 and LA River Channel.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept, SPP Mapping, City of Long Beach/COG	Long Beach	0.9	1.9	1.9	1.7	0.8	1.6	0.8	1.1	8.7	1.8	10.5
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0029	I-710/Del Amo Interchange Improvements	Reconfiguration of I-710/Del Amo Interchange to improve operations, safety, and sight distance for traffic entering and exiting the freeway. Improve traffic controls to address safety concerns of bicyclists, pedestrians at ramp termini. Upgrade bridge structures to allow space for bicycle/pedestrian connections across I-710 and LA River Channel.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept, SPP Mapping, City of Long Beach/COG	Long Beach/Carson	0.9	1.9	1.7	1.7	0.8	1.8	0.6	1.1	8.7	1.7	10.4
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0030	I-710/Long Beach Blvd. Interchange Improvements	Upgrade of I-710/Long Beach Blvd. Interchange to improve operations, safety, and sight distance for traffic entering and exiting the freeway. Improve traffic controls to address safety concerns of bicyclists, pedestrians at ramp termini. Upgrade bridge structures to allow space for bicycle/pedestrian connections across I-710 and LA River Channel.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept	Long Beach	0.9	1.7	2.0	1.5	0.9	1.8	0.7	1.1	8.8	1.7	10.6
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0031	I-710/Alondra Interchange Improvements & Modification of SB I-710 to SR-91 Connectors	Reconfiguration of I-710/Alondra Interchange to improve operations, and safety for traffic entering and exiting the freeway. Improve, relocate SB I-710 to SR-91 Connectors to reduce weaving movements. Improve traffic controls to address safety concerns of bicyclists, pedestrians at ramp termini. Upgrade bridge structures to allow space for bicycle/pedestrian connections across I-710 and LA River Channel.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept, SPP Mapping	Compton	0.9	1.9	2.2	1.5	0.9	2.0	1.9	1.1	9.5	2.9	12.4
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0032	I-710/Imperial Interchange Improvements	Reconfiguration of I-710/Imperial Interchange to improve operations, safety, and sight distance for traffic entering and exiting the freeway. Improve traffic controls to address safety concerns of bicyclists, pedestrians at ramp termini. Upgrade bridge structures to allow space for bicycle/pedestrian connections across I-710 and LA River Channel.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept, SPP Mapping	Downey/Lynwood	0.9	1.9	1.7	1.7	0.8	1.8	0.8	0.9	8.7	1.7	10.4
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0033	I-710/Firestone Interchange Improvements	Upgrade of I-710/Firestone Blvd. Interchange to improve operations and safety for traffic entering and exiting the freeway. Improve traffic controls to address safety concerns of bicyclists, pedestrians at ramp termini. Upgrade bridge structures to allow space for bicycle/pedestrian connections across I-710 and LA River Channel.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept, SPP Mapping	South Gate	0.9	1.9	2.2	1.5	0.9	1.8	0.8	1.1	9.3	1.8	11.1
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0034	I-710/Florence Interchange Improvements	Reconfiguration of I-710/Florence Interchange to improve operations, safety, and sight distance for traffic entering and exiting the freeway. Improve traffic controls to address safety concerns of bicyclists, pedestrians at ramp termini. Upgrade bridge structures to allow space for bicycle/pedestrian connections across I-710 and LA River Channel.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept, City of Bell Gardens/COG	Bell / Bell Gardens	0.9	1.9	1.9	1.7	0.8	1.6	2.0	0.9	8.7	2.8	11.5
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0035	I-710 Auxiliary Lanes (Willow to Wardlow)	Provide auxiliary lanes in the NB and SB directions of I-710, between Willow St. and I-405 Connectors at Wardlow Road to better manage traffic weaving conflicts and related congestion.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept	Long Beach	0.4	1.4	1.9	1.6	0.6	1.3	0.3	0.6	7.2	0.9	8.1
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0036	I-710 / I-405 Connector Project Improvements	Modify SB I-710 Collector Distributor Road/Eliminate SB I-710 to EB Wardlow Boulevard exit at Wardlow Road. Modify NB I-710 to SB I-405 Connector/Eliminate WB Wardlow Boulevard on ramp to NB I-710/I-405 Connectors.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept	Long Beach	0.9	1.9	1.7	2.0	0.7	2.0	0.5	0.4	9.2	0.9	10.1
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0037	I-710/I-105 Connector Project Improvements	Modify and relocate I-710 / I-105 Connectors along I-710 between I-105 and Imperial Highway in both directions to resolve weaving issues and related congestion on I-710 between I-105 and Imperial Highway.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept	Lynwood / Paramount	0.9	1.8	2.0	1.6	0.6	2.3	1.5	0.6	9.3	2.1	11.4
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0038	I-710 Auxiliary Lanes (Del Amo Boulevard to Long Beach Boulevard)	Provide auxiliary lanes in the NB and SB directions of I-710, between Del Amo Boulevard and Long Beach Boulevard to better manage traffic weaving conflicts and related congestion.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept	Rancho Dominguez/Long Beach	0.4	1.4	1.9	0.8	0.5	1.5	0.3	0.6	6.5	0.9	7.3
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0043		I-710, MP 22.2. In Commerce and Vernon, at Hobart Rail Yard Overhead No. 53-0840. Rehabilitate, clean, and paint bridge.	SHOPP	Commerce/Vernon	NA	0.8	1.6	2.4	NA	0.8	1.3	0.0	5.5	1.3	6.8
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0045		Route 91, MP R11.7. In Long Beach, at LA River (W91 -N710 & S710) Bridge No. 53-2143F. Replace portions of the bridge deck and apply polyester concrete overlay.	SHOPP	Long Beach	NA	0.8	1.6	2.4	0.8	0.8	0.5	0.0	6.3	0.5	6.8
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0053		I-405, MP 7.2. In Long Beach, at the Pacific Place Maintenance Station at 3725 Pacific Place. Replace a deteriorated building with a new building at the maintenance station.	SHOPP	Long Beach	NA	NA	0.8	1.6	NA	0.8	0.5	0.0	3.1	0.5	3.6
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0091	I-710/Anaheim Interchange Improvement	Reconstruct I-710/Anaheim Interchange to provide operational and safety improvements.	City of Long Beach/COG	Long Beach	0.8	1.2	1.9	1.9	0.2	1.8	1.0	0.2	7.7	1.2	8.9
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0092	I-710/PCH Interchange Improvement	Reconstruct I-710/Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) Interchange to provide operational and safety improvements.	City of Long Beach/COG, SPP Mapping	Long Beach	0.9	1.4	1.9	2.0	0.5	1.8	2.0	0.6	8.6	2.6	11.1
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0093	I-710/Wardlow Interchange Improvement	Reconstruct I-710/Wardlow Interchange to provide operational and safety improvements.	City of Long Beach/COG	Long Beach	0.9	1.4	1.7	1.9	0.5	2.0	0.5	0.4	8.3	0.9	9.3
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0156	Traffic Controls at I-710 Freeway Ramps	Add traffic signals with protected pedestrian/bicycle phase(s), crosswalks, lighting, landscaping, signing and striping, and other safety-related pedestrian features at the ramp termini of I-710.	SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	2.5	2.4	2.1	2.3	1.1	1.2	1.6	0.9	11.5	2.5	14.0



Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	AQ Smry	CH Smry	MB Smry	SF Smry	EN Smry	OP Smry	EQ Smry	SA Smry	Goal Score	Principle Score	Draft Total Score
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0180	I-710 Truck Bypass Lanes	Construct truck bypass lanes on I-710 between Willow Street and Del Amo Boulevard. The purpose of the improvement would be to separate cars from trucks through the congested I-710/I-405 interchange for purposes of safety and mobility.	SPP Survey	Long Beach	0.4	1.4	1.3	1.1	0.5	2.3	0.7	0.6	7.0	1.3	8.3
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0181	Freeway Lids, Caps, and Widened Bridge Decks	Widen arterial bridge decks at key locations over the I-710 Freeway/LA River Channel to provide "land islands," "urban parklets," and "green belt" connections over I-710 and the LA River. Include pedestrian / bicycle pathways.	SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	0.8	2.1	1.7	1.8	1.5	2.0	1.4	1.4	9.9	2.8	12.7
Freeway	Freeway Amenities / ITS	LB-ELA_0039		I-710, MP R6.0-14.1. In Long Beach and Compton, from Shoreline Drive to north of Alondra Boulevard. Enhance highway worker safety by constructing Maintenance Vehicle Pullouts (MVPs), upgrading guardrail and end treatments, paving beyond the gore, installing erosion control and replacing pull boxes.	SHOPP	Long Beach/Compton	NA	0.8	1.6	1.7	2.3	1.6	0.4	0.0	8.0	0.4	8.4
Freeway	Freeway Amenities / ITS	LB-ELA_0046		I-405. In and near the cities of Long Beach, Signal Hill, Los Angeles, and Carson, rehabilitate pavement, upgrade signs, rehabilitate bridge, upgrade lighting, improve safety, rehabilitate Transportation Management System (TMS) elements and replace copper cabling with fiber, rehabilitate culverts, and upgrade facilities to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.	SHOPP	Multiple Jurisdictions	NA	2.4	1.4	2.0	0.8	2.5	0.8	0.0	9.1	0.8	9.9
Freeway	Freeway Amenities / ITS	LB-ELA_0048		I-105, MP R14.3. In Paramount, at Grove Street at the Garfield Avenue Pump Station. Replace pumps, add lighting, construct Maintenance Vehicle Pullouts (MVPs), and provide a fiber optic connection to the pump house.	SHOPP	Paramount	NA	NA	NA	1.6	1.6	0.8	0.5	0.0	4.0	0.5	4.5
Freeway	Freeway Amenities / ITS	LB-ELA_0049		I-710, MP 18.7-19.6. In South Gate and Bell Gardens, at the South Gate Pump Plant and the Florence Avenue Pump Plant; also in Downey on Route 105 at the Ardis Avenue Pump Plant (PM R16.48). Upgrade pump plants.	SHOPP	South Gate/Bell Gardens/Downey	NA	NA	NA	1.6	NA	0.8	0.5	0.0	2.4	0.5	2.9
Freeway	Freeway Amenities / ITS	LB-ELA_0050		Route 91. In the cities of Carson, Compton, Long Beach, and Bellflower. Upgrade overhead signs and sign structures, rehabilitate landscaping, and enhance highway worker safety.	SHOPP	Multiple Jurisdictions	NA	0.8	NA	2.1	0.8	0.8	0.6	0.0	4.5	0.6	5.0
Freeway	Freeway Amenities / ITS	LB-ELA_0052		Route 47. In Long Beach from Route 710 to north of Route 710 (PM 3.497/3.58). Upgrade Transportation Management System (TMS) elements, replace fiber optic cable, and connect upgraded equipment to communication hubs.	SHOPP	Wilmington	NA	0.8	1.7	NA	0.0	0.9	0.8	0.0	3.4	0.8	4.2
Freeway	Freeway Amenities / ITS	LB-ELA_0054		I-710, MP 24.7. Near the neighborhood of East Los Angeles, at Humphrey Maintenance Station at 102 South Humphreys Avenue. Construct a new office building, an equipment storage building, and a Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) charging station and demolish an existing building.	SHOPP, SPP Survey	East Los Angeles	NA	NA	0.8	NA	0.4	1.2	0.8	0.6	2.4	1.3	3.7
Freeway	Freeway Amenities / ITS	LB-ELA_0137	Freeway Soundwalls	Build higher soundwalls to protect residents from air pollution, noise, and other impacts (Design Package 2, Design Package 3). Perform noise studies for all remaining walls along I-710 that are less than 16 feet high to identify additional, feasible soundwall projects that would realize the greatest benefits for impacted residents and other sensitive receivers.	SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	NA	2.4	NA	NA	1.2	2.1	1.0	0.0	5.6	1.0	6.6
Freeway	Freeway Amenities / ITS	LB-ELA_0155	Drought Tolerant Landscaping, Hardscaping and Aesthetic Features along I-710	Provide drought tolerant landscaping within existing, available right-of-way along I-710. Where needed, add context sensitive lighting features and additional signage to improve safety. Include hardscaping and other aesthetic features to improve the attractiveness of the freeway for users and for adjacent land uses/communities.	SPP Survey, Task Force, Equity Working Group	Multiple Jurisdictions	NA	0.8	NA	1.4	1.2	1.6	0.6	NA	5.0	0.6	5.6
Freeway	Freeway Amenities / ITS	LB-ELA_0157	I-710 Particulate Matter (PM) Reduction Pilot Project	Implement a pilot project on I-710 to deploy and evaluate measures to reduce exposure of nearby populations to particulate matter, specifically localized sources of entrained/fugitive dust, tire wear, and brake wear associated with traffic on the freeway. These measures may include roadside vegetation barriers within available Caltrans' right-of-way, air filters for nearby schools or community facilities, pavement materials, frequent street-sweeping, and deployment of air quality monitoring systems, among others. In addition, include options to examine the effectiveness of "cool pavement" applications to reduce heat island effects. As part of the work plan, the pilot project would include a study element to assess and document the efficacy of the various measures.	SPP Survey, Task Force	Multiple Jurisdictions	NA	2.1	NA	NA	0.8	2.4	1.1	1.7	5.3	2.8	8.1
Freeway	Freeway Amenities / ITS	LB-ELA_0188	Freeway Landscaping / Maintenance	Ongoing Caltrans Program that ensures that maintenance projects and activities such as trash removal, landscaping, provision of drought-resistant vegetation, and graffiti removal take place on a regular basis within state, public rights of way in the LB-ELA Corridor. Ensure that the agency dedicates sufficient resources for this effort.	SPP Survey	Study Area Wide	NA	0.8	0.8	2.1	0.8	2.4	0.6	1.7	6.8	2.3	9.1

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	AQ Smry	CH Smry	MB Smry	SF Smry	EN Smry	OP Smry	EQ Smry	SA Smry	Goal Score	Principle Score	Draft Total Score
Freeway	Zero Emissions Lanes on I-710	LB-ELA_0154	I-710 Zero-Emission Truck Travel Zone Restriction	Establish a zero-emission truck-only travel zone on I-710. Only zero emissions trucks would be able to travel on I-710, while diesel and near-zero emissions heavy duty trucks would be excluded. No new lanes would be added to the existing footprint of I-710. No restrictions would be placed on autos.	SPP Survey, COG Ad Hoc Committee	Multiple Jurisdictions	0.9	1.7	NA	NA	2.3	2.4	1.3	1.3	7.2	2.6	9.8
Freeway	Zero Emissions Lanes on I-710	LB-ELA_0183	Zero Emissions Truck Lane	Explore options and assess the feasibility of converting the right-hand lane on I-710 to create a Zero Emissions Truck Lane. Only zero emissions trucks would be able to travel in this lane, while fossil fuel vehicles would be excluded. No new lanes would be added to the existing footprint of I-710.	Metro, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	0.9	1.7	NA	NA	1.7	2.4	1.3	1.6	6.7	2.9	9.6
Freeway	Congestion Pricing	LB-ELA_0153	Congestion Pricing	Implement congestion pricing strategy for the I-710 freeway. No new lanes would be added to the existing footprint of I-710. Rather single occupant vehicles and trucks entering and exiting the freeway would be tolled by deploying an automated readers and electronic toll collection system that allows users to conveniently pay tolls using a toll tag that is mounted on the interior of their vehicle. Carpools, zero emission trucks, and zero emission autos would travel for free.	SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	1.3	1.8	2.2	0.8	2.2	2.1	0.6	0.9	10.4	1.5	11.9
Freeway	Congestion Pricing	LB-ELA_0182	Express Lanes Strategic Initiative	Advance planning studies to implement express lanes on key freeways in the study area, including I-405, I-105, and SR-91.	Metro, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	1.4	1.8	2.0	0.8	0.8	2.0	1.9	0.8	8.9	2.7	11.6

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	AQ Smry	CH Smry	MB Smry	SF Smry	EN Smry	OP Smry	EQ Smry	SA Smry	Goal Score	Principle Score	Draft Total Score
Goods Movement	Truck Programs/ITS	LB-ELA_0004	Long Beach-East Los Angeles Corridor Clean Truck Program	In January 2021, the Metro Board approved the 2021 Goods Movement Strategic Plan, which included a Countywide Clean Truck Initiative, with the 710 South Clean Truck Program identified as a goods movement strategic priority. At its October 2021 meeting, the Metro Board acted to recommit \$50 million from Measure R I-710 South Corridor funds as seed funding for the 710 South Clean Truck Program, which has been subsequently renamed the LB-ELA Zero Emissions Truck Program. The objective of this program is to turn over diesel trucks in favor of zero emissions trucks in the LB-ELA Corridor. The program would contribute subsidy funding to deploy a number of zero emissions trucks on I-710 as well as seed funding to develop electric charging/refueling stations for zero emissions trucks.	Metro LRTP, SPP Survey, SPP Mapping, CA-7	Study Area Wide	2.5	1.6	NA	NA	2.0	1.7	1.5	2.1	7.8	3.7	11.5
Goods Movement	Truck Programs/ITS	LB-ELA_0023	Clean Truck Infrastructure	Install charging infrastructure for zero emissions trucks.	Metro 2028 Mobility Concept Plan, SPP Survey, SPP Mapping	Multiple Jurisdictions	2.5	1.6	NA	NA	1.4	1.7	1.5	1.4	7.2	3.0	10.2
Goods Movement	Truck Programs/ITS	LB-ELA_0184	Empty Container Management	Provide a mix of incentives/fee penalties to encourage shippers/marine terminals to clear empty containers from docks/near dock facilities at the Ports to reduce congestion and unnecessary truck trip movements. Extend use of off-peak hours for empty returns.	Ports	Ports	NA	NA	2.0	NA	0.4	2.4	0.2	2.4	4.7	2.6	7.3
Goods Movement	Truck Programs/ITS	LB-ELA_0185	Freight Advanced Traveler Information Systems	Application of advanced technologies to manage drayage truck movements to and from the Ports. The system integrates real-time roadway traffic data, vessel/container tracking, real-time container terminal visit times, and GPS-based information to optimize the sequencing of container delivery and pick-up. The purpose is to improve cargo handling and efficiencies and reduce congestion near intermodal yards and Port facilities.	Ports, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	NA	NA	2.0	NA	0.8	2.1	1.6	1.7	4.8	3.3	8.1
Goods Movement	Freight Rail / Goods Movement TDM	LB-ELA_0024	Pier 400 On Dock Rail Modernization	On-dock railyard expansion to accommodate electric operated rail-mounted gantry cranes.	Metro 2028 Mobility Concept Plan	Port of LA	2.5	NA	0.8	NA	1.2	2.1	0.4	1.4	6.6	1.7	8.3
Goods Movement	Freight Rail / Goods Movement TDM	LB-ELA_0025	Terminal Island Transfer Facility Modernization	On-dock railyard expansion to accommodate electric operated rail-mounted gantry cranes.	Metro 2028 Mobility Concept Plan	Port of LA	2.5	NA	0.8	NA	1.2	2.1	0.4	1.1	6.6	1.5	8.1
Goods Movement	Freight Rail / Goods Movement TDM	LB-ELA_0026	West Basin Container Terminal Railyard Modernization	On-dock railyard expansion to accommodate electric operated rail-mounted gantry cranes.	Metro 2028 Mobility Concept Plan	Port of LA	2.5	NA	0.8	NA	1.1	2.1	0.4	1.4	6.5	1.7	8.2
Goods Movement	Freight Rail / Goods Movement TDM	LB-ELA_0124	Port of Los Angeles National Multimodal Freight Network Improvement Program: Rail System Improvement Projects	Additional rail tracks in POLA to improve overall rail operations, including supporting on-dock railyards	Port of Los Angeles/COG, SPP Survey	Port of LA	NA	NA	1.1	0.0	0.4	2.5	0.3	0.6	4.0	0.9	4.9
Goods Movement	Freight Rail / Goods Movement TDM	LB-ELA_0151	Goods Movement Freight Rail Study	Conduct an assessment to evaluate options for deriving greater utilization of the Alameda Corridor as a potential means for reducing truck trips within the Southern California subregion. This assessment would include options such as: opportunities to increase on-dock freight rail mode share; implementation of short-haul, freight rail shuttle service to new inland rail facilities; and increased use/improved operational efficiencies of existing near dock and off dock intermodal facilities. This evaluation would take into account updated cargo forecasts, economic factors and projections, current trends associated with the goods movement logistics chain including transload truck trips, and railroad and intermodal capacity constraints in the Southern California region. The Goods Movement Freight Rail Study would assess options from a systemwide perspective and would include factors such as changes in truck trip travel patterns, land use implications, and the potential for environmental impacts as well as institutional constraints.	SPP Survey	Study Area	NA	NA	1.1	0.0	0.8	2.4	0.8	0.6	4.3	1.4	5.7
Goods Movement	Freight Rail / Goods Movement TDM	LB-ELA_0217	Freight Rail Electrification Pilot Project	Work with the Union Pacific (UP) and BNSF railroads to develop and test battery electric locomotives for operation on the Pacific Harbor Line and in the Alameda Corridor with an ultimate goal of advancing a zero-emissions technology capable of entering commercial, revenue service operation.	Task Force, Equity Working Group	Multiple Jurisdictions	1.7	1.6	0	0	2.0	1.6	1.5	1.3	6.9	2.8	9.7
Goods Movement	Ports	LB-ELA_0011	SR-47 Navy Way Interchange	SR 47/Navy Way Interchange: Construction of Interchange At SR-47 / Navy Way, between SR-47 Vincent Thomas Bridge and Pier S Avenue Interchange, to eliminate traffic signal and movement conflicts. This Project was a S. Cal Trade Corridor Tier II TCIF Project as submitted to the CTC in 2008. This project would remove the last signal on SR 47 between Desmond and V. Thomas Bridges; NHS Intermodal Connector Route	SCAG RTP, PIPO, Ports	Port of Los Angeles	NA	NA	1.8	1.2	0.0	1.7	0.8	0.0	4.7	0.8	5.5

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	AQ Smry	CH Smry	MB Smry	SF Smry	EN Smry	OP Smry	EQ Smry	SA Smry	Goal Score	Principle Score	Draft Total Score
Goods Movement	Ports	LB-ELA_0021	Alameda Corridor Terminus Enhancements	New Cerritos channel rail bridge and supporting connections throughout Port of LA.	Metro 2028 Mobility Concept Plan	Port of Los Angeles	NA	NA	1.8	0.0	0.2	2.5	0.3	0.4	4.4	0.7	5.2
Goods Movement	Ports	LB-ELA_0022	Terminal Way Grade Separation	New grade separation to replace at-grade crossing to improve freight traffic flow.	Metro 2028 Mobility Concept Plan	Port of Los Angeles	NA	NA	1.8	1.2	0.5	1.2	0.3	0.4	4.8	0.7	5.5
Goods Movement	Ports	LB-ELA_0121	Pier D Street Realignment	Realign Pier D Street, from Middle Harbor Exit gate to Pico Avenue. Currently Pier D Street has sight distance issues, inadequate curve radii, and drainage/flooding issues at the low point. The Pier D Realignment project will provide redundancy through Pier D thereby improving safety and traffic flows. The scope of the project is to widen & reconstruct Pier D Street between the Middle Harbor Exit Gate and Pico Avenue and to reconfigure West Broadway. Additional scope items includes construction of a new pump station, retaining walls, utility upgrades, striping, signage and traffic signal work.	Port of Long Beach/COG, SPP Mapping	Port of Long Beach	NA	NA	1.3	1.7	0.0	2.0	0.2	0.0	5.1	0.2	5.2
Goods Movement	Ports	LB-ELA_0122	Harbor Scenic Drive Roadway & Infrastructure Improvements	Improve Harbor Scenic Drive, from Harbor Plaza to Ocean Boulevard. The project would: increase the roadway pavement structural section to replace the existing aged pavement; provide horizontal and vertical alignments improvements for enhanced safety; improve striping, traffic signage and way-finding signage; improve highway lighting; enhance drainage facilities (including the introduction of permanent water quality enhancements such as bio-swales and catch basin inlet/pipe screens); revamp the parkway and median landscaping and irrigation; and provide utility improvements and enhancements.	Port of Long Beach/COG, SPP Survey	Port of Long Beach	NA	NA	1.3	1.7	0.5	1.8	0.3	0.5	5.3	0.8	6.1
Goods Movement	Ports	LB-ELA_0123	Pico Avenue Street Improvement	Improve Pico Avenue, between Pier D Street and Pier E Street. This roadway improvement project would: widen a short segment of roadway; improve truck congestion and truck safety; reconstruct the pavement; improve the existing surface drainage and upgrade the storm drain inlets; upsize the sewer line; provide continuous sidewalks with ADA accessible features; upgrade street lighting; and extend landscaping and hardscape features.	Port of Long Beach/COG, SPP Survey	Port of Long Beach	NA	2.4	1.3	2.0	0.5	2.2	0.5	0.5	8.5	1.0	9.5
Goods Movement	Ports	LB-ELA_0131	Port of Los Angeles National Multimodal Freight Network (NMFN) Improvement Program: Maritime Support Facility Access/Terminal Island Rail System Grade Separation	The project consists of constructing a four-lane, rail-roadway grade separation that eliminates a significant truck access impediment to an important container terminal support facility located on Terminal Island, at the centroid of the Ports of Los Angeles-Long Beach (POLA-POLB).	PIPO (Port of Los Angeles)	Port of Los Angeles	NA	NA	1.8	0.8	0.3	2.1	0.3	0.4	4.9	0.7	5.7
Goods Movement	Ports	LB-ELA_0132	Pier 300 Wharf Expansion/Vessel Emission Reduction Project	Pier 300 Wharf Expansion/Vessel Emission Reduction Project. This project constructs 1,250 lineal feet of container terminal wharf and supporting backland for Pier 300. It includes electrical infrastructure to operate ship-to-shore cranes and shore-side power to operate all necessary vessel systems, which will reduce about 80 percent of emissions while at berth.	PIPO (Port of Los Angeles)	Port of Los Angeles	2.5	1.6	0.8	NA	0.4	2.1	0.4	0.6	7.4	1.0	8.4

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	AQ Smry	CH Smry	MB Smry	SF Smry	EN Smry	OP Smry	EQ Smry	SA Smry	Goal Score	Principle Score	Draft Total Score
Transit	High Capacity Transit (Rail & BRT)	LB-ELA_0001	West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor (LRT)	The Project consists of 12 stations and is a 19-mile light rail transit corridor that will connect southeast LA County to downtown Los Angeles, serving the cities and communities of Artesia, Cerritos, Bellflower, Paramount, Downey, South Gate, Cudahy, Bell, Huntington Park, Vernon, unincorporated Florence-Graham community of LA County and downtown Los Angeles. Complete 4.5-mile section between Slauson A Line and Union Station.	Metro LRTP, SPP Survey, SPP Mapping	Multiple Jurisdictions	1.8	2.4	2.9	0.8	1.8	2.6	1.8	0.6	12.2	2.4	14.6
Transit	High Capacity Transit (Rail & BRT)	LB-ELA_0002	C Line (Green) Eastern Extension (Norwalk) (LRT)	Extends the C Line (Green) 2.8 miles from Norwalk to the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs Metrolink Station.	Metro LRTP	Norwalk	0.9	1.8	2.3	0.8	1.5	2.1	1.0	0.6	9.3	1.5	10.8
Transit	High Capacity Transit (Rail & BRT)	LB-ELA_0019	Atlantic Bus Only Lane and Transit Signal Prioritization (Next Gen Improvements)	BRT project along Atlantic to provide improved speed, reliability, and frequency.	Metro 2028 Mobility Concept Plan, SPP Survey, SPP Mapping	Multiple Jurisdictions	1.4	2.1	2.1	1.4	1.6	1.9	1.9	0.6	10.5	2.5	12.9
Transit	High Capacity Transit (Rail & BRT)	LB-ELA_0219	Metrolink Regional Rail Line between Union Station and Long Beach	Construct a new Metrolink regional rail line between Union Station and downtown Long Beach. Trains would be powered using electrical multiple unit (EMU) traction motors, which are anticipated to be required by the California Air Resources Board after 2030. Specific EMU technology has yet to be determined, but could be powered by overhead catenary, hydrogen fuel cell, or catenary/battery electric. Trains would operate along the existing SCRRA Metrolink line between Los Angeles and Commerce and then transition into Union Pacific (UP) railroad right of way (potentially along the San Pedro Subdivision Corridor) for the segment between Commerce and Lakewood. However, sections of a second track would likely need to be constructed in this middle section in order to operate up to four trains per hour in each direction in the peak period. In addition, substantial portions of the southern section of the alignment, between Lakewood and downtown Long Beach, would require new right-of way to provide needed trackage to connect to the downtown Long Beach area. New stations would be constructed and spaced every 1 to 3 miles depending upon the location. It is anticipated that these Metrolink trains would interline through Link US (at Union Station) with the Antelope Valley Line to the north.	Task Force (SCRRA)	Multiple Jurisdictions	2.0	2.1	2.7	0.8	2.1	2.7	1.6	0.6	12.4	2.2	14.6
Transit	Rail Line / Station Improvements	LB-ELA_0160	Line A (Blue Line) Transit Priority/Signal Synchronization	Enhanced signal prioritization/synchronization so that the A Line (Blue Line) has higher priority in areas where the LRT trains operate in mixed flow traffic	SPP Mapping, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	0.9	1.5	2.0	1.6	1.8	2.1	1.7	0.8	9.9	2.5	12.4
Transit	Rail Line / Station Improvements	LB-ELA_0171	Commuter Rail Maintenance, Repair, and Safety Projects	Implement planned repair, maintenance, and safety projects to Metro-owned railroad infrastructure along the Los Angeles/Orange County commuter rail line within the LB-ELA Corridor study area.	Annual Commuter Rail State of Good Repair (SOGR) Program	Multiple Jurisdictions	1.7	1.3	1.4	1.6	0.8	2.0	1.3	0.8	8.8	2.1	10.9
Transit	Rail Line / Station Improvements	LB-ELA_0172	Commerce Metrolink Station Improvements	Improve train platforms, shift tracks, install pedestrian barriers and pedestrian crossing safety features, extend and widen sidewalks and walkways, add lighting, install new ADA accessibility features, replace equipment, provide bike path striping, add wayfinding signage, and provide new landscaping.	LA County Metrolink Station Assessment & Improvement Plan	Commerce	0.8	1.7	0.9	1.9	1.5	2.0	1.8	1.2	8.9	3.0	11.8
Transit	Rail Line / Station Improvements	LB-ELA_0173	Grade Separation(s) of the A Line [Blue Line] at Washington Street	Provide grade separation of the A Line [Blue Line] at the Washington St./Flower St. junction and at Washington Street.	Metro, SPP Survey, SPP Mapping	Los Angeles	1.7	1.3	1.7	0.5	0.9	1.5	1.9	0.3	7.5	2.2	9.7
Transit	Rail Line / Station Improvements	LB-ELA_0174	New Metrolink Station at planned Commerce/Citadel Station	Construct a new Metrolink Station on the Los Angeles – Riverside Metrolink Commuter Rail Line at the planned Eastside Transit Corridor station at Commerce/Citadel.	Metro	Commerce	0.9	1.5	1.9	0.8	1.2	1.1	1.2	0.3	7.3	1.4	8.7
Transit	Rail Line / Station Improvements	LB-ELA_0175	Install Quad Safety Gates at all A Line [Blue Line] Crossings	Install Quad Safety Gates at all A Line [Blue Line] Crossings for safety and increased speed/safety zones	Metro	Multiple Jurisdictions	1.7	1.7	1.4	2.0	1.6	1.4	2.1	0.8	9.8	2.9	12.7
Transit	Rail Line / Station Improvements	LB-ELA_0176	Install Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition System for A Line [Blue Line]	Install Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition System [SCADA] along the A Line [Blue Line] in the downtown area of Long Beach. This technology would allow Metro to better operate and manage the rail transit line to improve train reliability	Metro	Long Beach	1.7	1.7	1.5	NA	1.1	1.6	1.9	0.8	7.5	2.7	10.2
Transit	Rail Line / Station Improvements	LB-ELA_0177	Add Second Elevator to Firestone and Slauson A Line [Blue Line] Stations	Add second elevator to Firestone and Slauson A Line [Blue Line] Stations for improved access and reliability	Metro	Florence-Graham	1.7	1.7	1.5	NA	1.2	1.7	2.2	0.8	7.8	3.0	10.7
Transit	Bus Transit	LB-ELA_0016	Connecting C Line (Green) and Metrolink Norwalk Station	New express shuttle service between C Line Norwalk Station and Metrolink Norwalk Station to close existing transit gap. Near term solution until C Line is extended eastward.	Metro 2028 Mobility Concept Plan	Norwalk	2.5	2.1	1.7	NA	1.1	1.5	1.1	0.8	8.8	1.9	10.7

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	AQ Smry	CH Smry	MB Smry	SF Smry	EN Smry	OP Smry	EQ Smry	SA Smry	Goal Score	Principle Score	Draft Total Score
Transit	Bus Transit	LB-ELA_0130	Long Beach Transit (LBT) Solar Charging Electrification Project	The project would convert the current bus parking area, at the agency's main operating base, into a facility for charging Battery Electric Buses (BEBs) through the erection of solar-powered parking canopies, to enable Long Beach Transit to transition to 100% emission bus fleet by 2030.	PIPO (Long Beach Transit), SPP Mapping	Long Beach	1.8	1.3	0.8	NA	1.6	1.2	1.8	2.1	6.8	3.9	10.6
Transit	Bus Transit	LB-ELA_0140	Metro Micro Transit Zone(s)	Implementation of new Metro on-demand, flexible transit service for the northern section of the I-710 Study Area between Lynwood and Commerce. - Rides can be booked online, by app, or by phone. Rides are prescheduled, same day/multiple days. - Uses small capacity vans (seats 7-10 riders). - Pick-up/drop-off where safe (virtual stops). Targeted maximum wait time is 15 minutes.	COG Ad Hoc Committee, SPP Mapping	Multiple Jurisdictions	2.5	2.6	2.4	1.6	0.8	2.1	2.2	0.9	11.9	3.1	15.0
Transit	Bus Transit	LB-ELA_0141	Metro Bus Priority Lane Corridor along Line 60 (Long Beach Blvd.)	Improve bus times, speeds, and reliability along Line 60 (Long Beach Blvd.). Proposed improvements would include: transit signal prioritization, bus priority lanes and bus stop bulb outs, all door boarding, bus stop and layover improvements.	SPP Survey, COG Ad Hoc Committee	Multiple Jurisdictions	1.4	2.1	2.2	1.6	1.2	1.8	1.9	0.8	10.2	2.7	12.9
Transit	Bus Transit	LB-ELA_0142	Metro Bus Priority Lane Corridor along Line 108 (Slauson)	Improve bus times, speeds, and reliability along Line 108 (Slauson). Proposed improvements would include: transit signal prioritization, bus priority lanes and bus stop bulb outs, all door boarding, bus stop and layover improvements.	SPP Survey, COG Ad Hoc Committee	Multiple Jurisdictions	0.9	1.8	2.0	1.6	1.2	1.6	1.9	0.8	9.1	2.7	11.8
Transit	Bus Transit	LB-ELA_0143	Metro Bus Priority Lane Corridor along Line 110 (Gage)	Improve bus times, speeds, and reliability along Line 110 (Gage). Proposed improvements would include: transit signal prioritization, bus priority lanes and bus stop bulb outs, all door boarding, bus stop and layover improvements.	SPP Survey, COG Ad Hoc Committee	Multiple Jurisdictions	1.4	2.1	2.2	1.6	1.4	1.6	2.2	0.8	10.3	3.0	13.3
Transit	Bus Transit	LB-ELA_0144	Metro Bus Priority Lane Corridor along Line 111 (Florence)	Improve bus times, speeds, and reliability along Line 111 (Florence). Proposed improvements would include: transit signal prioritization, bus priority lanes and bus stop bulb outs, all door boarding, bus stop and layover improvements.	SPP Survey, COG Ad Hoc Committee	Multiple Jurisdictions	1.4	2.1	2.2	1.6	1.4	1.9	2.1	0.8	10.6	2.9	13.6
Transit	Bus Transit	LB-ELA_0145	Metro Bus Priority Lane Corridor along Line 115 (Firestone)	Improve bus times, speeds, and reliability along Line 115 (Firestone). Proposed improvements would include: transit signal prioritization, bus priority lanes and bus stop bulb outs, all door boarding, bus stop and layover improvements.	SPP Survey, COG Ad Hoc Committee	South Gate / Downey	0.9	1.8	1.9	1.6	1.4	1.6	1.6	0.8	9.2	2.4	11.6
Transit	Bus Transit	LB-ELA_0146	Metro Bus Priority Lane Corridor along Line 260 (Atlantic Blvd.)	Improve bus times, speeds, and reliability along Line 260 (Atlantic Blvd.). Proposed improvements would include: transit signal prioritization, bus priority lanes and bus stop bulb outs, all door boarding, bus stop and layover improvements.	SPP Survey, COG Ad Hoc Committee	Multiple Jurisdictions	1.4	2.1	2.2	1.6	1.4	1.9	2.0	0.8	10.6	2.8	13.5
Transit	Bus Transit	LB-ELA_0164	Improved Frequency of Metro Buses in the LB-ELA Study Area	Provide a 50 percent improvement on all Metro fixed bus routes greater than 10 minutes in the AM and PM peak periods. And, provide a 50 percent improvement on all Metro fixed bus routes greater than 15 minutes in the Midday and Evening periods. [For example, a bus route that has as frequency of a bus every 30 minutes would improve to a bus arriving every 15 minutes.]	SPP Survey, SPP Mapping, CA-7	Study Area Wide	1.8	2.4	2.3	1.6	1.9	2.0	1.8	0.8	12.0	2.6	14.6
Transit	Bus Transit	LB-ELA_0178	Metro Bus Priority Lane Corridor along Line 18 (Whittier Blvd.)	Improve bus times, speeds, and reliability along Line 18 (Whittier Blvd.). Proposed improvements would include: transit signal prioritization, bus priority lanes and bus stop bulb outs, all door boarding, bus stop and layover improvements.	SPP Survey	Los Angeles / East LA	1.4	2.1	2.2	1.6	1.4	1.6	2.1	0.8	10.3	2.9	13.2
Transit	Bus Transit	LB-ELA_0179	Metro Bus Priority Lane Corridor along Line 66 (Olympic Blvd.)	Improve bus times, speeds, and reliability along Line 66 (Olympic Blvd.). Proposed improvements would include: transit signal prioritization, bus priority lanes and bus stop bulb outs, all door boarding, bus stop and layover improvements.	SPP Survey	Los Angeles / East LA	0.9	1.8	1.9	1.6	1.4	1.3	2.2	0.8	8.9	3.0	11.9
Transit	Transit Amenities	LB-ELA_0077	Bus Stop Improvements	Installation of Bus shelters and benches at Metro and City of Commerce Transit Stop (Various locations within the City of Commerce)	City of Commerce/COG, SPP Survey	Commerce	0.8	1.3	1.1	1.2	1.2	0.9	1.5	0.8	6.5	2.3	8.8
Transit	Transit Amenities	LB-ELA_0103	Bus Stop Improvements	Installation of Bus shelters and benches at Metro and City of Maywood Transit Stop (Various locations within the City of Maywood)	City of Maywood/COG, SPP Survey	Maywood	0.8	1.3	1.1	1.2	1.2	0.9	1.4	0.8	6.5	2.2	8.7
Transit	Transit Amenities	LB-ELA_0118	Bus Shelter Upgrades	Upgrade bus shelters at various locations within the City of Signal Hill.	City of Signal Hill/COG, SPP Survey	Signal Hill	0.8	1.3	1.1	1.2	1.2	0.8	0.3	0.8	6.5	1.1	7.6
Transit	Transit Amenities	LB-ELA_0136	Enhanced Transit Security	Provide enhanced transit security measures and features on Metro trains, buses, and at Metro rail stations including: security devices such as cameras and call buttons, improved incident response, and additional security officers and/or plainclothes staff.	SPP Mapping	Multiple Jurisdictions	1.7	1.7	1.4	2.4	1.1	1.6	1.7	0.8	9.9	2.5	12.4
Transit	Transit Amenities	LB-ELA_0147	Transit Traveler Information System Application (ITS)	Integrated system and web-based application to provide real-time information to users on optimal transit routes and transit options based on time of day as well as estimated arrival times of buses under real time travel conditions.	SPP Survey	Study Area Wide	1.7	2.1	1.3	1.6	1.1	1.6	1.6	0.8	9.4	2.4	11.8

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	AQ Smry	CH Smry	MB Smry	SF Smry	EN Smry	OP Smry	EQ Smry	SA Smry	Goal Score	Principle Score	Draft Total Score
Transit	Transit Amenities	LB-ELA_0148	Transit Fare Discount Program	Expand Metro’s program to provide increased transit fare discounts for low-income riders, students, and seniors. Target low income or disadvantaged communities within the LB-ELA Corridor Study Area.	SPP Survey	Study Area Wide	2.5	2.1	1.6	NA	1.4	0.8	1.8	0.8	8.4	2.6	11.0
Transit	Transit Amenities	LB-ELA_0149	Increased Security Features at Metro’s Existing and Planned Light Rail Stations	Lighting, security cameras, improved line of sight, incident/emergency response plans, and other safety features at Metro stations/parking structures.	SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	1.7	1.7	1.4	2.4	1.4	1.2	1.7	0.8	9.8	2.5	12.3
Transit	Transit Amenities	LB-ELA_0152	Transit Marketing and Education Program	Expansion of Metro’s collaborative effort with Metrolink, Long Beach Transit, and city municipal bus lines to promote transit and alternative modes of transportation to the single occupant vehicle. Include features such as “free transit” day and transit passes to employees or students to encourage transit use.	SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	2.5	2.1	1.7	NA	1.1	0.8	1.6	0.8	8.3	2.4	10.7
Transit	Transit Amenities	LB-ELA_0161	Transit Ambassador Program	Enhance Metro’s Transit Ambassador Program within the LB-ELA Corridor to bring non-law enforcement representatives to improve the customer experience, reinforce public safety, and increase ridership on the transit system.	SPP Mapping	Study Area Wide	1.7	2.1	1.2	2.4	1.2	1.2	1.5	0.8	9.8	2.3	12.1
Transit	Transit Amenities	LB-ELA_0168	Compton Transit Management Operations Center Enhancements	Project improvements would include: beautification, art, monuments, safety, increased bike storage, bike parking, walkways, and bike paths (Phases 1 -5). Location: Compton Transit Management Operations Center: 275 N. Willowbrook Ave., Compton.	Task Force	Compton	1.7	2.4	1.7	2.2	1.6	1.6	1.0	0.8	11.3	1.8	13.1
Transit	Transit Amenities	LB-ELA_0169	Southeast LA Transit Improvement Program	Pending stakeholder input and local jurisdiction approval, this project could include a “cloud-based” Countywide Signal Priority upgrade, 100 bus stop shelters at existing bus stops with over 50 daily boardings but without an existing shelter, 100-solar powered real-time arrival displays, 100 bus stop solar light upgrades for stops without shelters that have lighting, terminal/layover expansion improvements at the Norwalk, Artesia, and Compton Stations, and 100 Zero-Emissions Bus charging masts.	PIPO (Southeast LA), SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	2.3	2.1	1.8	1.6	1.4	2.0	1.6	0.8	11.3	2.4	13.7
Transit	Transit Amenities	LB-ELA_0189	Transit System Cleanliness/Maintenance	Strengthen policies committing Metro to regular cleaning and maintenance activities on all transit vehicles and at bus and rail stations within the LB-ELA Corridor. These activities consist of cleaning and disinfection of high touchpoint surfaces, graffiti removal, cleanup of spills and biohazards, and trash removal. Maintain station landscaping. Provide high-efficiency air filters on bus and rail transit vehicles. Ensure that the agency dedicates sufficient resources for this effort.	SPP Survey, SPP Mapping	Study Area Wide	1.7	1.8	1.1	0.8	1.1	2.1	1.2	NA	8.5	1.2	9.7
Transit	Transit Amenities	LB-ELA_0203	Bus Stop Improvements	Collaborate with the local jurisdictions (cities, unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County) to implement bus stop improvements within the LB-ELA Corridor. Bus stop improvements would include items such as: - Lighting - Security Features - Benches - Shade and shelters - Drinking Fountains - Solar-powered arrival displays - Trashcans - Landscaping - Signage - Crosswalks - Improved ADA accessibility, including repositioning of utility boxes on the sidewalk Provide financial support in order to help leverage local funds for project implementation. Funds would be made available based on criteria such as: project need, project readiness, and project benefits relative to costs, among other factors.	SPP Survey, SPP Mapping, CA-7, Community Leadership Committee (CLC)	Study Area Wide	1.7	2.1	1.6	2.0	1.5	2.0	1.8	1.5	10.8	3.3	14.1

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	Design Concerns	Construction Concerns	Outcome Concerns	Total Concerns
Active Transportation / TDM	Bicycle Routes / Facilities	LB-ELA_0007	LA River Path – Central LA	An eight-mile bicycle and pedestrian path gap closure between Elysian Valley and Maywood, through downtown Los Angeles.	Metro LRTP, SPP Survey, SPP Mapping	Maywood to Elysian Valley	1	1	1	3
Active Transportation / TDM	Bicycle Routes / Facilities	LB-ELA_0017	Regionally significant bike projects from the Metro Active Transportation Plan	Implement regionally significant active transportation projects adopted as part of the Metro Active Transportation Plan (over 40 projects throughout the study area). See Attachment A for more detail.	Metro ATSP, SPP Survey, SPP Mapping, CA-7	Multiple Jurisdictions	5	1	0	6
Active Transportation / TDM	Bicycle Routes / Facilities	LB-ELA_0055	I-710 LA River Bike Path	Proposed walking/bicycling path along the LA River, specifically along I-710, which connects Maywood to Long Beach.	SHOPP, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	2	1	1	4
Active Transportation / TDM	Bicycle Routes / Facilities	LB-ELA_0066	Randolph Bike & Pedestrian Project	Randolph, from Bell western city limit to eastern city limit. Complete Phase 2 of the Randolph Metro Active Transportation (MAT) Corridor.	City of Bell/COG, SPP Mapping	Bell	2	1	0	3
Active Transportation / TDM	Bicycle Routes / Facilities	LB-ELA_0111	West Santa Ana Branch Bike & Pedestrian Trail	Implement Phases 1-4 of Bike & Pedestrian Trail (Class I) along RR ROW between LA River and Somerset. Includes lighting, fencing, landscaping, flashing beacons, decomposed granite, ADA curb ramps and street furniture.	City of Paramount/COG, SPP Mapping, PIPO	Multiple Jurisdictions	1	1	1	3
Active Transportation / TDM	Bicycle Routes / Facilities	LB-ELA_0128	Randolph Street Bike and Pedestrian Facilities Project	This project would involve the construction of bike and pedestrian facilities on Randolph St from District Blvd to the Los Angeles River Trail System.	PIPO (City of Maywood), SPP Mapping	Maywood	3	1	0	4
Active Transportation / TDM	Bicycle Routes / Facilities	LB-ELA_0162	City of Long Beach 8-to-80 Bikeways	Implement planned 8-to-80 bikeway projects adopted as part of the City of Long Beach Bicycle Master Plan within the LB-ELA Corridor, including gap closure projects, backbone facilities, and pipeline bikeways (over 40 projects within the study area). See Attachment A for more detail.	City of Long Beach Bicycle Master Plan, SPP Survey, CA-7	Long Beach	5	1	0	6
Active Transportation / TDM	Bicycle Routes / Facilities	LB-ELA_0163	LB-ELA Corridor Bicycle Gap Closure Projects	Implement regionally significant bicycle projects in areas with insufficient existing and planned bicycle infrastructure within the LB-ELA Corridor (several projects within the study area). See Attachment A for more detail. Would include potential routes identified by the community, but which will require further planning and design in cooperation with the local jurisdictions (Cities, County of Los Angeles).	SPP Mapping, CA-7	Multiple Jurisdictions	5	1	0	6
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0005	Rail to River Active Transportation Corridor Segment A	A 5.6-mile active transportation path connecting the Fairview Height Station of the soon-to-be-open Crenshaw Line in Inglewood to the Slauson A (Blue) Line station in South Los Angeles.	Metro LRTP, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	1	0	2	3
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0006	Rail to River Active Transportation Corridor Segment B	An approximate 4.5-mile active transportation corridor between the LA River to the Slauson A (Blue) Line station that connects to Segment A.	Metro LRTP, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	1	1	2	4
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0008	Blue Line First Last Mile Plan Improvements	Implement projects identified in the Blue Line First/Last Mile Plan within the LB-ELA Corridor, with an emphasis on Del Amo Station. Projects to include ramp reconfigurations, sidewalk and bike lane improvements, and crossing improvements, among others. The First/Last Mile (FLM) Plan for the Blue Line was adopted in April 2018 and represents a first-of-its-kind effort to plan comprehensive access improvements for an entire transit line. The Plan covered all 22 stations on the Metro A (Blue) Line and piloted an inclusive, equity focused community engagement process. The Plan included planning-level, community-identified pedestrian and bicycle improvements within walking (1/2-mile) and biking (3-mile) distance of each A Line station.	Metro LRTP, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	5	1	0	6
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0070	Pedestrian Bridge	Construct Pedestrian Bridge (Connecting Asmus Park to planned West Santa Ana Branch LRT Station)	City of Bell Gardens/COG	Bell Gardens	3	1	0	4
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0076	Pedestrian and Bike Facilities	Provide pedestrian facility improvements. Provide safe routes for bike riders. (Various locations within the City of Commerce)	City of Commerce/COG, SPP Survey	Commerce	2	1	0	3
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0082	Enhanced Pedestrian Crosswalk (Rives Ave. & Adwen St.)	Enhance pedestrian cross walk at Rives Ave. & Adwen St.	City of Downey/COG	Downey	0	0	0	0
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0094	Hill Street Pedestrian Bridge Overcrossing	Construct bridge over the I-710 and Los Angeles River at Hill Street for pedestrians and bicyclists.	City of Long Beach/COG, I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept	Long Beach	5	1	0	6
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0102	Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan Improvements	Provide pedestrian facility improvements. Provide safe routes for bike riders. (Various locations within the City of Maywood per the city's master plan)	City of Maywood/COG, SPP Survey	Maywood	2	1	0	3
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0114	Walnut Pedestrian Pathway	Provide pedestrian pathway along 25th Street, from west of Walnut Avenue to Gundry Avenue	City of Signal Hill/COG, SPP Survey	Signal Hill	2	1	0	3
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0138	Spring Avenue Pedestrian/Bicycle Overcrossing	Construct bridge over the I-710 and Los Angeles River at Spring Street for pedestrians and bicyclists.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept	Long Beach	5	2	0	7
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0139	Humphreys Avenue Pedestrian/Bicycle Overcrossing	Construct bridge over I-710 along Humphreys Avenue for pedestrians and bicyclists.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept, SPP Mapping	East LA	4	2	0	6
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0158	Del Amo Pedestrian Gap Closure Project	Provide sidewalks and lighting at Del Amo undercrossing at the I-710 freeway. Currently there are no existing sidewalks. Would also help those seeking walk access to Del Amo LRT Station.	SPP Mapping	Ranch Dominguez / Long Beach	3	1	0	4
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0159	Southern Ave. Pedestrian Connector Project	New pedestrian path along Southern Ave./East Frontage Rd./Miller Way/West Frontage Road to connect Garfield Ave. with Urban Orchard Park	SPP Mapping	South Gate	2	1	0	3



Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	Design Concerns	Construction Concerns	Outcome Concerns	Total Concerns
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0204	Pedestrian Gap Closure Projects	Close gaps within the pedestrian circulation network in communities within the LB-ELA Corridor through the implementation of new pedestrian facilities. A funding program would be made available to award financial resources to local jurisdictions (Cities, unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County) on a competitive basis to design and construct new pedestrian facilities in areas where this infrastructure is currently missing. Projects would include: - New sidewalks and pedestrian paths - Extensions of existing pedestrian paths/trails - Pedestrian/bicycle overpasses - New Crosswalks/Signals for Pedestrians - Provision of connections and access to existing trails (for example, greater access to Los Angeles/Rio Hondo River Trail) - Provision of pedestrian access/connections to existing and planned Metro transit stations/stops - Implementation of Safe School Pedestrian/Biking Zones	SPP Survey, SPP Mapping, CA-7	Study Area Wide	5	1	0	6
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0211	City of Long Beach Mid-City Pedestrian and Bicycle Connections	Create an interconnected network of walking and bicycle routes including creation of bicycle boulevards along 8th and 11th Streets. Includes active transportation network south of Anaheim Street, north of 7th Street, east of Long Beach Boulevard, and west of Cherry Avenue within the City of Long Beach.	PIPO	Long Beach	2	1	1	4
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0213	West Santa Ana Branch [WSAB] Light Rail Station First-Last Mile Bikeway Safety and Access Project	Install 0.3 miles of sidewalk, 1.5 miles of bicycle lanes (Class II), 2 miles of bike route sharrows (Class III), street lighting, center median islands, curb ramps, and a rest area near the LA River Bike Path. Located in the eastern quadrant of the City of South Gate, along the existing Union Pacific Railroad /future West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor.	PIPO	Multiple Jurisdictions	4	1	0	5
Active Transportation / TDM	Pedestrian / First Last Mile	LB-ELA_0220	Micromobility Pilot Project	Develop a pilot project along Long Beach Boulevard/Pacific Boulevard between Ocean Boulevard [Long Beach] and East. 57th Street [Vernon] in order to evaluate the design and implementation of Micromobility features along this planned Complete Streets Corridor. Micromobility is defined as any small, low-speed, human or electric-powered device, including bicycles, scooters, electric-assist bicycles (e-bikes), electric scooters (e-scooters), and other small, lightweight, wheeled conveyances. Micromobility devices help to close first- and last-mile gaps to transit and can offer individuals greater access to jobs, health care, and other services. Powered and adaptive micromobility devices may also increase mobility for older adults or individuals with disabilities, as they are less strenuous to operate than traditional bicycles or scooters. The Micromobility Pilot Project would test and evaluate various concepts, including but not limited to: - Protected Bicycle Lanes. These lanes physically separate micromobility users from vehicles and pedestrians. These should be designed to accommodate electric and non-electric modes. Streets with speed limits above 30 miles per hour should include a protected lane. - Speed Limits. For example, micromobility devices should self-regulate their speeds below 15 miles/hour to use the protected lane or should ride in the road. - Enforcement / Signage. Motorcycles and other high-speed devices not permitted in the protected lanes. - Designated Parking Stations. Provide designated parking areas for all types of micromobility devices and keep devices out of pedestrian rights of way. - Examine policies and regulations that would permit private companies to operate shared micromobility services, including e-scooters and e-bicycles, to the communities.	Task Force	Multiple Jurisdictions	2	NA	0	2
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0090	Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons at Pedestrian Crossings	Install rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs) at Pedestrian Crossings at various locations within the City of Long Beach.	City of Long Beach/COG, SPP Survey	Long Beach	0	0	0	0
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0095	Pedestrian Crosswalk Improvements	Provide pedestrian crosswalk improvements (pedestrian buttons, signage, and electrical infrastructure) at Rosewood/Abbott, MallisoNAbbott, Long Beach/Tecumseh, Imperial/Ruth & Atlantic/Brewster intersections. (Phase 1)	City of Lynwood/COG, SPP Survey	Lynwood	0	0	0	0
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0165	Compton Creek Bike Underpasses	Along Compton Creek Bike Path, between 120th Street and Greenleaf Blvd., construct bike path under-crossings at 120th Street, El Segundo Ave., Rosecrans Ave., Compton Ave., and Alondra Ave. Add lighting, landscaping, benches, and shade to the existing path.	SPP Mapping, Community Leadership Committee (CLC)	Compton	2	2	0	4
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0170	Huntington Park Safe Routes for Seniors & Students	Project will construct curb ramps, crossing improvements, sidewalks, wayfinding, speed-calming, and other active transportation improvements for pedestrians on segments of Belgrave Ave., Clarendon Ave., E. 61st St., Randolph St., Seville St., Zoe Ave., State St., Yahualica Place, and walking/biking paths adjacent to Veteran's Park. Includes 130 curb ramps and high-visibility crosswalks, 3 raised islands, 1 HAWK beacon, 3,266 linear feet of sidewalks, 20 wayfinding signs, 10 flashing beacons, 329 illuminated bollards, 20 speed humps, 10 raised crosswalks, wastebins, and shade trees.	PIPO (Huntington Park), SPP Survey	Huntington Park	1	1	0	2

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	Design Concerns	Construction Concerns	Outcome Concerns	Total Concerns
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0200	Bike Share Programs and Bicycle Amenities	This initiative would build upon Metro’s existing Bike Share Program framework, focusing on the LB-ELA Corridor. This involves collaboration with local jurisdictions (Cities, County of Los Angeles), non-profit organizations, and/or creating public-private partnerships for purpose of expanding access to bike share programs and for the provision of key amenities for bicycle users within the LB-ELA Corridor Study Area. Financial support would be provided to help leverage local funding for small scale capital projects such as: bicycle parking and storage lockers; lighting for bike paths; bicycle repair/maintenance stations; signage and wayfinding; electric bicycle charging stations; and safety features.	SPP Survey, SPP Mapping, CA-7	Study Area Wide	0	NA	0	0
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0201	Pedestrian / Bicycle Enhancements and Safety Features	Work with the local jurisdictions (Cities, unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County) to improve safety and enhance the walking/biking environment throughout the LB-ELA Corridor. Active transportation measures and features would include items such as: - Shade structures, trees, benches, and trash cans; - Wider sidewalks, bulb outs, upgrades to crosswalks, and ADA accessibility improvements (including repositioning utility boxes on sidewalks); - Stop signs, traffic signals, pedestrian/bicycle signal phases, colored pavement markings, signage and striping; - Alternative traffic signal phasing options, such as “scramble” pedestrian crossings; - Flashing crosswalks, and other traffic controls such as pedestrian flashing beacons; - Lighting along pedestrian/bicycle paths, including under-crossings; - Landscaping, hardscaping, and other aesthetic features; - Protection buffers and barriers, improved fencing Provide technical and grant writing assistance to local jurisdictions, if requested, to define and develop potential projects. Provide financial support in order to help leverage local funds for project construction and implementation. Funds would be made available based on criteria such as: project need, project readiness, and project benefits relative to costs, among other factors.	SPP Survey, SPP Mapping, CA-7, Community Leadership Committee (CLC)	Study Area Wide	1	1	0	2
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0206	City of Bell Gardens Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements	Citywide pedestrian, bike and traffic calming improvements to create a complete streets environment – cross walks, mini traffic circles, HAWK pedestrian signals, curb extensions, Class 3 bike routes, ADA ramps, Leading Pedestrian Interval [LBI] signal timing, and striping improvements. Would be applied to various locations within the City of Bell Gardens, including: Sprecht Ave., Live Oak St., Priority St., Purdy Ave., Gephart Ave., Perry Rd., and Hannon St.	PIPO	Bell Gardens	3	1	0	4
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0207	City of Carson Citywide Community Safety Improvements	Improve bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and safety with Class 2 bike lanes, bike racks, crosswalk improvements, Accessible Pedestrian Signal push buttons, countdown pedestrian signals, and curb ramps. Various locations within the City of Carson and Santa Fe Avenue between 218th Place and Del Amo Boulevard.	PIPO	Carson	3	1	0	4
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0208	Salt Lake Avenue Pedestrian Accessibility Project	East side of Salt Lake Avenue within the City of Cudahy. Widen sidewalk, install pedestrian lighting, signage, curb extensions, and ADA compliant wheelchair ramps.	PIPO	Cudahy	2	1	0	3
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0209	South Downey Safe Routes to School Project (Phase 2)	Safety education and construction of sidewalks, crosswalks, and curb ramps. Various locations within South Downey: Brunache St., Laura St., Nada St., Pomeroy Rd, Quoit St., Lankin St., Orizaba Ave., Gneiss Ave., Devenir Ave., Blodgett Ave. and Premiere Ave.	PIPO	Downey	2	1	0	3
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0210	Greenway Traffic Circle Improvement Project	At the intersection of Rives Avenue / Phlox Street in the City of Downey, construct traffic circle, bulb outs with directional curb ramps, enhanced crosswalks, signage, landscaping, shade, and bioswales.	PIPO	Downey	1	1	0	2
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0212	Tweedy Boulevard Active Transportation Improvements	Install improvements on Tweedy Boulevard to improve non-motorized user safety and promote walking, biking, and use of local transit. Tweedy Boulevard, between Alameda Street and Dearborn Avenue and between Dorothy Avenue and the Los Angeles River Bicycle Trail, within the City of South Gate.	PIPO	South Gate	3	1	0	4
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0214	I-710 Livability Initiative	A compendium of proposed projects and improvements as outlined in the I-710 Livability Initiative conceptual plan. Proposed projects include improvements such as: - Lighting for people walking/biking. - New/improved bike lanes and bike amenities. - New improved sidewalks and cross walks. - Landscaping and shade. Public art. - Improved bus stops. Improved curbs. Street furniture. - Traffic calming to slow speeds. - New connections and crossings. Improve under/overpasses. Proposals address improvements along a network of 21 east-west and 6 north-south roadway segments located within one-mile of I-710.	COG Ad Hoc Committee	Multiple Jurisdictions	1	1	0	2

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	Design Concerns	Construction Concerns	Outcome Concerns	Total Concerns
Active Transportation / TDM	Safety and Amenities	LB-ELA_0216	Bicycle Safety and Education Program (BEST)	Expand Metro’s efforts to promote bicycle safety and improve roadway awareness for bicyclists, pedestrians, bus operators, and motorists within the Long Beach-East Los Angeles Corridor communities. This program includes: - Education and encouragement campaigns to promote a shift from driving to more walking, bicycling, and the use of public transit. - Bicycle skills and traffic safety classes. - Community rides. Safe Routes to Schools rides. - Collaboration with key stakeholders in the development of campaigns and printed materials such as safe riding kits for bicycle safety class participants.	Task Force, Community Leadership Committee (CLC)	Study Area Wide	0	NA	0	0
Active Transportation / TDM	Travel Demand Management (TDM) Strategies	LB-ELA_0198	Carpool/Vanpool Programs	Extend Metro’s carpool and vanpool programs by focusing on the LB-ELA Study Area. Carpooling is an inexpensive and effective travel option that involves finding nearby commuters to share the ride. Provide access to ride-matching services to find nearby residents looking to carpool. In addition, promote vanpool services, including coordination, administration support, and financial subsidies for commuters especially in areas less served by transit operators.	SPP Survey	Study Area Wide	0	NA	0	0
Active Transportation / TDM	Travel Demand Management (TDM) Strategies	LB-ELA_0199	Telecommuting Programs	Building upon “lessons learned” during the COVID pandemic, encourage employers to modify their work policies to retain hybrid work schedules, flexible work hours, and “work from home” options. Coordinate with public agencies and large employers. Share research/promote studies on the effectiveness of telecommuting. In addition, identify supportive infrastructure for telecommuting. Expand broadband capacity and internet service provider (ISP) capabilities within the LB-ELA Corridor by co-locating digital communications infrastructure (such as fiber optic cable) with major public works projects and infrastructure.	SPP Survey	Study Area Wide	0	NA	0	0

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	Design Concerns	Construction Concerns	Outcome Concerns	Total Concerns
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0010	Shoemaker Bridge/Shoreline Drive	I-710 Improvements/Shoemaker Bridge Replacement: Replace the Existing Shoemaker Bridge with a New Bridge. The New Bridge Will Be Reduced to Have Two Mixed-Flow Lanes in the NB and in the SB Directions to Tie the Flow into I-710. The New Bridge Will Also Include Pedestrian and Bicycle Access. Additionally, Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Street Enhancements Will Be Provided on Adjacent Thoroughfares.	SCAG RTP, PIPO, City of Long Beach/COG	Long Beach	3	3	1	7
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0056	Artesia Complete Street Corridor	Artesia Blvd., between Central Ave. and Lakewood Blvd. Reconstruct Artesia Blvd. to establish a Complete Street Corridor, including: bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities and crosswalks, transit stop features and amenities, safety and traffic calming features, landscaping, hardscaping, public art (aesthetic treatments), public green spaces, trees, and water quality features such as bioswales and tree wells.	COG/Cities/County, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	4	3	0	7
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0057	Atlantic Complete Street Corridor	Atlantic Ave./Blvd., between Ocean Blvd. and SR-60. Reconstruct Atlantic Ave./Blvd. to establish a Complete Street Corridor, including: bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities and crosswalks, transit stop features and amenities, safety and traffic calming features, landscaping, hardscaping, public art (aesthetic treatments), public green spaces, trees, and water quality features such as bioswales and tree wells.	COG/Cities/County, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	3	3	0	6
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0058	Florence Complete Street Corridor	Florence Ave., between Alameda St. and Lakewood Blvd. Reconstruct Florence Ave. to establish a Complete Street Corridor, including: bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities and crosswalks, transit stop features and amenities, safety and traffic calming features, landscaping, hardscaping, public art (aesthetic treatments), public green spaces, trees, and water quality features such as bioswales and tree wells.	COG/Cities/County, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	3	3	0	6
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0059	Imperial Complete Street Corridor	Imperial Hwy., between Alameda St. and Lakewood Blvd. Reconstruct Imperial Hwy. to establish a Complete Street Corridor, including: bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities and crosswalks, transit stop features and amenities, safety and traffic calming features, landscaping, hardscaping, public art (aesthetic treatments), public green spaces, trees, and water quality features such as bioswales and tree wells.	COG/Cities/County, SPP Survey	Lynwood/South Gate/Downey	3	3	0	6
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0060	Alondra Complete Street Corridor	Alondra Blvd., between Central Ave. and Lakewood Blvd. Reconstruct Alondra Blvd. to establish a Complete Street Corridor, including: bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities and crosswalks, transit stop features and amenities, safety and traffic calming features, landscaping, hardscaping, public art (aesthetic treatments), public green spaces, trees, and water quality features such as bioswales and tree wells.	COG/Cities/County, SPP Survey	Compton/Paramount	3	3	0	6
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0061	Slauson Complete Street Corridor	Slauson Ave., between Alameda St. and Lakewood Blvd. Reconstruct Slauson Ave. to establish a Complete Street Corridor, including: bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities and crosswalks, transit stop features and amenities, safety and traffic calming features, landscaping, hardscaping, public art (aesthetic treatments), public green spaces, trees, and water quality features such as bioswales and tree wells.	COG/Cities/County, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	3	3	0	6
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0062	Long Beach Complete Street Corridor	Long Beach Blvd./Pacific Blvd. Reconstruct Long Beach Blvd./Pacific Blvd., between Ocean Blvd. and Slauson Ave. to establish a Complete Street Corridor, including: bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities and crosswalks, transit stop features and amenities, safety and traffic calming features, landscaping, hardscaping, public art (aesthetic treatments), public green spaces, trees, and water quality features such as bioswales and tree wells.	COG/Cities/County, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	3	3	0	6
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0064	Gage Avenue Street Improvements	Gage Ave., from Bell western city limit to eastern city limit. Upgrade Gage Ave. to provide safety and aesthetic features (drought tolerant landscaping, hardscaping). Proposed improvements will include new pedestrian sidewalks, street lighting, street furniture, bus shelters, parkway landscaping, monument entry signs, and drainage enhancements with the installation of curb drains and drywells in the project site.	City of Bell/COG	Bell	3	2	0	5
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0086	Gage Avenue Operational and Safety Improvements	Between Alameda Street and Atlantic Blvd., upgrade Gage Avenue to provide operational and safety improvements.	City of Huntington Park/COG	Bell/Huntington Park	7	2	1	10
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0126	Slauson Avenue Corridor & Citywide Pedestrian, Bike, Transit Improvements	Project focuses on pedestrian, bike, & transit safety improvements along the Slauson Avenue, between I-710 and I-5, as well as 10 other unsignalized intersections or midblock crossings citywide. The project location includes the 2.6-mile Slauson Avenue corridor between I-710 and I-5 freeways and 10 unsignalized intersections or midblock crossings citywide.	PIPO (City of Commerce), SPP Survey	Commerce	5	2	0	7
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0127	Lakewood Boulevard Improvement Project	Lakewood Blvd., between Del Amo Blvd. and Ashworth Street. The project would install a Class I Bike Path and pedestrian sidewalk in the parkway area and will construct minor roadway capacity enhancements on Lakewood Boulevard. Project includes 1.5 miles of new bicycle and pedestrian facilities, utility undergrounding, traffic signal improvements, LED street lighting, ADA enhancements, and green street improvements such as landscaped median islands, parkway trees, and stormwater retention.	PIPO (City of Lakewood), SPP Survey	Lakewood	3	2	0	5

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	Design Concerns	Construction Concerns	Outcome Concerns	Total Concerns
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0129	Garfield Avenue Improvement Project	Garfield Avenue, between Century Boulevard and Firestone. The project would transform the corridor to a more attractive and pedestrian and bike friendly environment. Improvements include: (a) implementing new bicycle facilities including bike racks, Class II Bike Lanes and Class III Bike Routes, (b) pedestrian improvements including flashing beacons, curb extensions and sidewalks, (c) raised, landscape center road medians, (d) enhancing the bus shelters, and (e) adding roadway signing and striping.	PIPO (City of South Gate), SPP Survey	South Gate	3	2	0	5
Arterial Roadway	Complete Streets	LB-ELA_0117	Burnett Street/Skyline Drive Improvement Project	Improve Burnett Street/Skyline Drive, including the addition of Bike Lanes, between East Walnut Avenue and Dawson Avenue. Installation of sidewalks between Gaviota Avenue and Cherry Avenue, Class 2 bike lanes between Walnut Avenue and Dawson Avenue, and related roadway amenities/improvements.	City of Signal Hill/COG, SPP Survey	Signal Hill	4	1	0	5
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0003	Integrated Corridor Management (ICM) Project	ICM is an Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) strategy to manage non-recurring congestion along a corridor by utilizing advanced technologies and systems. ICM components include active monitoring of all transportation modes and facilities within the corridor, on and off the freeway, including ramp metering, traffic signal coordination, incident traffic management, advanced traveler information system, and other advanced technologies and techniques. Would be applied on I-710 and a network of key connecting arterials, within the LB-ELA Corridor between SR-91 and SR-60.	Metro LRTP, PIPO, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	1	1	5	7
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0013	Tweedy Blvd Signal Sync	Tweedy Boulevard Signal Synchronization Project: (1) Interconnects 18 Traffic Signals Using Fiber Optic Cable And Wireless Communications (2) Synchronizes Signal Timing To Improve Traffic Flow, And Reduces Delays Along The 2.7-Mile Arterial and (3) Install A Closed Circuit Television Camera (CCTV) At The Intersection Of Long Beach Bl., to Support the Advance Transportation Management Systems (ATMS).	SCAG RTP, SPP Survey	Lynwood/South Gate	2	0	3	5
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0020	Sports Park Transportation Performance Modeling Network	Traffic signal controller and cabinets upgrades and the installation of fiber optic communication infrastructure to provide redundant high bandwidth network in Long Beach within the LB-ELA Corridor. The purpose of these equipment upgrades is to improve traffic signal coordination and strengthen data connections among traffic management systems.	Metro 2028 Mobility Concept Plan	Long Beach	0	0	0	0
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0051		Route 1. In Los Angeles County, on various routes at various locations. Upgrade existing fiber communication system and rehabilitate Transportation Management System (TMS) elements, including video cameras, ramp meters, and Changeable Message Signs (CMS).	SHOPP, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	0	0	0	0
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0069	Traffic / Ped Signal Upgrades	Targeted upgrades to 38 intersections, citywide, in the City of Bell Gardens. Would replace outdated infrastructure such as signal poles, cabinets, pedestrian poles, and vehicle detection systems.	City of Bell Gardens/COG	Bell Gardens	0	0	3	3
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0071	Mixmaster Traffic signal Improvements (Telegraph/ Eastern/ Atlantic)	Traffic signal upgrade at Telegraph / Eastern / Atlantic. Also consider improvements such as turning lane pavement markings, striping, and enhanced signage so that approaching traffic can get properly aligned well in advance of this intersection.	City of Commerce/COG, Community Leadership Committee (CLC)	Commerce	1	0	0	1
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0072	Traffic Signal Coordination Projects	Various arterials within the City of Commerce	City of Commerce/COG, SPP Survey	Commerce	2	0	3	5
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0074	Traffic Signal Upgrades	Upgrade various signals within the City of Commerce	City of Commerce/COG	Commerce	0	0	3	3
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0075	Video Camera installation	Video Camera installation on all Signalized intersections within the City of Commerce	City of Commerce/COG, SPP Survey	Commerce	0	0	2	2
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0081	Firestone Blvd. Traffic Signal Upgrades & Safety Enhancements	Along Firestone Boulevard between Downey West City Limit and Lakewood Boulevard, provide traffic signal updates and safety enhancements.	City of Downey/COG	Downey	0	0	3	3
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0083	Traffic Signal Upgrades	Along Florence Ave., between Downey Ave. & Brookshire Ave., upgrade traffic signals	City of Downey/COG	Downey	0	0	0	0
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0084	Video Detection Upgrades	At 25 intersections in various locations within the City of Downey, provide video detection upgrades.	City of Downey/COG, SPP Survey	Downey	0	0	3	3
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0087	Traffic Signal Equipment Improvements	Upgrade traffic signal equipment at various locations within the City of Long Beach	City of Long Beach/COG	Long Beach	0	0	3	3
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0089	Emergency Vehicle Pre-Emption	Install emergency vehicle pre-emption (EMVE) for traffic signals at various locations within the City of Long Beach.	City of Long Beach/COG	Long Beach	0	0	2	2

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	Design Concerns	Construction Concerns	Outcome Concerns	Total Concerns
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0096	Traffic Signal Improvements	Install new traffic signals and signage at the following locations: 1) Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd./Abbott Rd., 2) Arlington and Atlantic Ave., 3) El Segundo and State St., 4) Carlin and Bullis Rd., 5) Alameda St. and Industry Way, 6) Alameda St. and Lynwood Rd., 7) Martin Luther King Blvd/ Norton Ave., 8) Martin Luther King Blvd/Bullis Rd., 9) Martin Luther King Blvd/Ernestine St., 10) Martin Luther King Blvd and California, 11) State Street and Fernwood. (Phase 1)	City of Lynwood/COG	Lynwood	0	0	3	3
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0097	Traffic Signal Improvements	Provide traffic signal upgrades at the following locations: 1) Long Beach Blvd/Carlin, 2) Long Beach Blvd/El Segundo, 3) Long Beach Blvd and Sanborn, 4) Long Beach Blvd./Euclid, 5) Long Beach Blvd/Imperial Hwy, 6) Atlantic Ave/Cortland, 7) Atlantic Ave./Abbott Rd, 8) Alameda/Deputy Blaire. (Phase 2)	City of Lynwood/COG	Lynwood	0	0	3	3
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0099	Traffic Signal Synchronization Projects	Various arterials within the City of Maywood	City of Maywood/COG, SPP Survey	Maywood	2	0	3	5
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0100	Traffic Signal Upgrade Projects	Upgrade traffic signal equipment at various locations within the City of Maywood	City of Maywood/COG	Maywood	0	0	3	3
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0101	Video Camera installation	Video Camera installation at all Signalized intersections within the City of Maywood	City of Maywood/COG, SPP Survey	Maywood	0	0	2	2
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0112	Signal Coordination/ITS Projects	Implement signal coordination and ITS projects at various locations within the City of Signal Hill.	City of Signal Hill/COG, SPP Survey	Signal Hill	2	0	3	5
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0116	Traffic Signal Operational Upgrade	Upgrade the traffic signal at Willow Street & Temple Avenue	City of Signal Hill/COG	Signal Hill	0	0	1	1
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0166	LB-ELA Corridor Vulnerable Road User Connected Vehicle Infrastructure Deployment	Design and Implementation of Connected Vehicle Infrastructure to improve vulnerable road user safety within the LB-ELA Corridor. This would allow units in vehicles to communicate with units built into transportation infrastructure. Additional technology applications would allow vehicles to communicate with other vehicles, data networks, or pedestrians. The main purpose of this technology is to share information related to items such as safety warnings, roadway hazards, routing information, truck route restrictions, and pedestrian safety zones.	Metro	Multiple Jurisdictions	0	1	5	6
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0167	I-710 Arterial Signal Performance Measurement	Deploy arterial signal performance measures at all signalized intersection within the LB-ELA Corridor to allow for the optimization of traffic signal operation to improve arterial corridor mobility.	Metro, SPP Survey	Study Area Wide	2	NA	5	7
Arterial Roadway	Signal Coordination / TSM / ITS	LB-ELA_0215	I-710 Arterial Traffic Signal Control Communication Upgrades	Design and implement upgraded arterial traffic signal control interconnect and central traffic management communications to elevate subregional traffic system management and operations.	Metro, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	1	0	5	6
Arterial Roadway	Traffic Calming	LB-ELA_0202	Traffic Calming	Implement Traffic Calming Features within the LB-ELA Corridor to slow traffic on local streets or near schools. Collaborate with local jurisdictions (Cities, unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County) to design, construct, and implement traffic calming features in areas that experience frequent speed violations and/or high levels of accident rates. Based on available funding, provide financial support in order to help leverage local funds for project construction and implementation. Traffic calming features could include: - Speed limit reductions, signage, variable speed signs, and enforcement devices - Speed bumps - Truck restrictions (trucks over a certain weight) on non-designated truck routes, including signage and geofencing alerts - Roundabouts - Trees, vegetation, landscaping features to help direct and slow traffic - Bulb outs - Stop signs, traffic signals, striping, raised decorative pavement, and other traffic controls - Road diets - Speed enforcement cameras - Enhanced use of signage, striping, flashing crosswalks, other pedestrian warning devices in school zones	SPP Survey, SPP Mapping, Community Leadership Committee (CLC)	Study Area Wide	1	2	1	4
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0012	Garfield Widening	Garfield Avenue Improvements, from 70th Street to Howery Street. Widen Street 1 to 4 Feet for 2 Miles to Accommodate a Third Lane in Each Direction during Peak Hours. Add Medians, Narrow Existing Medians, Add Second Left Turn Lane in All Directions at Two Intersections, (Rosecrans Ave. And Alondra Blvd.), Resurface Street, Concrete Intersections, and add Traffic Signal Improvements, Street Lights, Underground Utilities, Green Street Improvements, and Stormwater and Watershed BMPs.	SCAG RTP, PIPO	Paramount	7	3	4	14

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	Design Concerns	Construction Concerns	Outcome Concerns	Total Concerns
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0040		Route 1, In the cities of Long Beach and Los Angeles, install stormwater treatment Best Management Practices (BMPs), including bioswales and Design Pollution Prevention Infiltration Areas (DPPIAs).	SHOPP	Wilmington/Long Beach	0	1	0	1
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0041		Route 1. In Long Beach, from Temple Avenue to De Forest Avenue. Upgrade traffic signals, crosswalks, curb ramps, sidewalks, driveways, and Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APS) to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.	SHOPP	Long Beach	2	2	1	5
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0044		Route 1, MP 7.0-7.2. In Long Beach, at Los Angeles River Bridge No. 53-0341 and De Forest Avenue Undercrossing No. 53-1047. Seismic retrofit, upgrade bridge rails, and upgrade facilities to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.	SHOPP	Long Beach	0	1	0	1
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0063	Gage Ave. Bridge	Rehabilitate/replace Gage Avenue Bridge over the LA River	City of Bell/COG	Bell	1	2	0	3
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0065	Slauson Ave. Bridge	Rehabilitate/replace Slauson Avenue Bridge over the LA River	City of Bell/COG	Bell	1	2	0	3
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0067	Florence Ave. Bridges	Replace Florence Ave. Bridges over LA River & I-710	City of Bell/COG	Bell	1	3	0	4
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0068	Systematic Safety Analysis Report Program (SSARP) Improvements	Targeted safety improvements to 38 intersections, citywide, in the City of Bell Gardens. Includes installing signs; changing pavement markings; adding protected turn phasing; installing channelization; parking restrictions; and signal timing adjustments.	City of Bell Gardens/COG, SPP Survey	Bell Gardens	0	0	0	0
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0073	Telegraph Road Improvements	Improve Telegraph Road between Marianna Ave. and Atlantic Blvd (safety features and pedestrian circulation)	City of Commerce/COG	Commerce	5	1	0	6
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0078	Randolph Street Gap Closure	Provide arterial roadway bridge over LA River and I-710 to connect Randolph Street west and east of the LA River/I-710	City of Commerce/COG	Commerce	5	3	0	8
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0079	Florence Avenue Bridge Rehabilitation	Rehabilitate arterial bridge over the Rio Hondo River Channel	City of Downey/COG	Downey	0	2	0	2
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0080	Florence Ave. & Paramount Blvd. Intersection Improvement	Improve the intersection at Florence Ave. & Paramount Blvd. by adding turn lanes to reduce congestion and enhance safety.	City of Downey/COG, SPP Survey	Downey	1	1	0	2
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0085	Intersection Improvements (Huntington Park)	Provide intersection improvements at various locations within the City of Huntington Park	City of Huntington Park/COG, SPP Survey	Huntington Park	5	1	1	7
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0088	Protected Left Turns at Signals	Implement protected left-turns along major arterials at various locations with the City of Long Beach.	City of Long Beach/COG, SPP Survey	Long Beach	3	1	0	4
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0098	City Re-Striping Projects	Replace striping on major arterials (lane striping, school zone striping) at various locations within the City of Lynwood.	City of Lynwood/COG	Lynwood	0	0	0	0
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0104	Rosecrans Ave. Bridge	Replace/rehabilitate Rosecrans Ave. Bridge over the LA River	City of Paramount/COG	Paramount	1	2	0	3
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0105	Garfield Avenue Improvement Project	Improve Garfield Avenue from South City Limit to North City Limit [City of Paramount]	City of Paramount/COG	Paramount	4	2	1	7
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0107	Alondra Blvd. Bridges	Replace Alondra Blvd. Bridges over the LA River and I-710	City of Paramount/COG	Paramount	3	3	1	7
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0108	Garfield Ave. Intersection Improvements	Provide dual left turn lanes on all approaches for the following intersections along Garfield Avenue: 1) Rosecrans, 2) Somerset, and 3) Alondra.	City of Paramount/COG, SPP Survey	Paramount	3	2	0	5
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0109	Alondra Blvd. Intersection Improvements	Provide dual left turn lanes on all approaches for the following intersections along Alondra Blvd: 1) Garfield, 2) Paramount, and 3) Downey.	City of Paramount/COG, SPP Survey	Paramount	3	2	0	5

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	Design Concerns	Construction Concerns	Outcome Concerns	Total Concerns
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0110	Rosecrans Intersection Improvements	Provide dual left turn lanes on all approaches for the following intersections along Rosecrans Ave: 1) Garfield, 2) Paramount, and 3) Downey.	City of Paramount/COG, SPP Survey	Paramount	3	2	0	5
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0113	Orange Avenue Improvement Project	Improve Orange Avenue, including the addition of Bike Lanes, between 25th Street and Spring Street	City of Signal Hill/COG, SPP Survey	Signal Hill	3	1	0	4
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0115	California Ave. Improvement Project	Improve California Avenue, including the addition of Bike Lanes, between Willow Street and Spring Street	City of Signal Hill/COG, SPP Survey	Signal Hill	3	1	0	4
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0119	Wright Road Improvement Project	Improve Wright Road, including the addition of Bike Lanes, between Imperial Hwy. and Atlantic Ave.	City of South Gate/COG, SPP Survey	South Gate	3	1	0	4
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0120	Safety-Related Road Improvement Projects	Within the East Rancho Dominguez (unincorporated LA County), implement safety-related improvement projects along the following roadways: Compton Boulevard, Atlantic Avenue, Rosecrans Avenue, and Alondra Boulevard	East Rancho Domingo (County of LA)/COG, SPP Survey	East Rancho Dominguez	5	2	0	7
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0205	Arterial/General Roadway Improvements Program	Implement local roadway projects within the local jurisdictions and communities (cities, unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County) which comprise the LB-ELA Corridor. The objective of these projects will be to improve mobility, safety, and the travel experience for all users of the roadways (pedestrians, bicyclists, transit, and vehicles). This program would help fund projects such as: - Intersection improvements - Bridge replacements - Street widenings and enhancements including lighting, safety features, landscaped medians, and parkways - Complete Streets projects and features, including active transportation (bicycle, pedestrian), and transit stop improvements - Traffic controls (traffic signals, stop signs), signal coordination, and Intelligent Transportation Systems	Metro, Gateway Cities COG, SPP Survey, SPP Mapping	Study Area Wide	5	2	1	8
Arterial Roadway	General Local / Regional Roadway	LB-ELA_0221	Atlantic Blvd. widening Over I-5 at Mixmaster Intersection	Would widen Atlantic Avenue bridge structure over I-5 at intersection of Telegraph Road, Eastern Avenue, and Atlantic Boulevard in the City of Commerce. Would help relieve traffic congestion and provide a safer roadway for all modes of transportation.	City of Commerce	Commerce	5	3	1	9



Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	Design Concerns	Construction Concerns	Outcome Concerns	Total Concerns
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0028	I-710/Willow Interchange Improvements	Reconfiguration of I-710/Willow Interchange to improve operations, safety, and sight distance for traffic entering and exiting the freeway. Improve traffic controls to address safety concerns of bicyclists, pedestrians at ramp termini. Upgrade bridge structures to allow space for bicycle/pedestrian connections across I-710 and LA River Channel.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept, SPP Mapping, City of Long Beach/COG	Long Beach	5	3	1	9
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0029	I-710/Del Amo Interchange Improvements	Reconfiguration of I-710/Del Amo Interchange to improve operations, safety, and sight distance for traffic entering and exiting the freeway. Improve traffic controls to address safety concerns of bicyclists, pedestrians at ramp termini. Upgrade bridge structures to allow space for bicycle/pedestrian connections across I-710 and LA River Channel.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept, SPP Mapping, City of Long Beach/COG	Long Beach/Carson	8	3	1	12
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0030	I-710/Long Beach Blvd. Interchange Improvements	Upgrade of I-710/Long Beach Blvd. Interchange to improve operations, safety, and sight distance for traffic entering and exiting the freeway. Improve traffic controls to address safety concerns of bicyclists, pedestrians at ramp termini. Upgrade bridge structures to allow space for bicycle/pedestrian connections across I-710 and LA River Channel.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept	Long Beach	5	3	1	9
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0031	I-710/Alondra Interchange Improvements & Modification of SB I-710 to SR-91 Connectors	Reconfiguration of I-710/Alondra Interchange to improve operations, and safety for traffic entering and exiting the freeway. Improve, relocate SB I-710 to SR-91 Connectors to reduce weaving movements. Improve traffic controls to address safety concerns of bicyclists, pedestrians at ramp termini. Upgrade bridge structures to allow space for bicycle/pedestrian connections across I-710 and LA River Channel.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept, SPP Mapping	Compton	8	3	1	12
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0032	I-710/Imperial Interchange Improvements	Reconfiguration of I-710/Imperial Interchange to improve operations, safety, and sight distance for traffic entering and exiting the freeway. Improve traffic controls to address safety concerns of bicyclists, pedestrians at ramp termini. Upgrade bridge structures to allow space for bicycle/pedestrian connections across I-710 and LA River Channel.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept, SPP Mapping	Downey/Lynwood	8	3	1	12
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0033	I-710/Firestone Interchange Improvements	Upgrade of I-710/Firestone Blvd. Interchange to improve operations and safety for traffic entering and exiting the freeway. Improve traffic controls to address safety concerns of bicyclists, pedestrians at ramp termini. Upgrade bridge structures to allow space for bicycle/pedestrian connections across I-710 and LA River Channel.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept, SPP Mapping	South Gate	3	3	1	7
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0034	I-710/Florence Interchange Improvements	Reconfiguration of I-710/Florence Interchange to improve operations, safety, and sight distance for traffic entering and exiting the freeway. Improve traffic controls to address safety concerns of bicyclists, pedestrians at ramp termini. Upgrade bridge structures to allow space for bicycle/pedestrian connections across I-710 and LA River Channel.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept, City of Bell Gardens/COG	Bell / Bell Gardens	7	3	1	11
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0035	I-710 Auxiliary Lanes (Willow to Wardlow)	Provide auxiliary lanes in the NB and SB directions of I-710, between Willow St. and I-405 Connectors at Wardlow Road to better manage traffic weaving conflicts and related congestion.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept	Long Beach	8	3	3	14
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0036	I-710 / I-405 Connector Project Improvements	Modify SB I-710 Collector Distributor Road/Eliminate SB I-710 to EB Wardlow Boulevard exit at Wardlow Road. Modify NB I-710 to SB I-405 Connector/Eliminate WB Wardlow Boulevard on ramp to NB I-710/I-405 Connectors.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept	Long Beach	5	3	1	9
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0037	I-710/I-105 Connector Project Improvements	Modify and relocate I-710 / I-105 Connectors along I-710 between I-105 and Imperial Highway in both directions to resolve weaving issues and related congestion on I-710 between I-105 and Imperial Highway.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept	Lynwood / Paramount	4	3	1	8
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0038	I-710 Auxiliary Lanes (Del Amo Boulevard to Long Beach Boulevard)	Provide auxiliary lanes in the NB and SB directions of I-710, between Del Amo Boulevard and Long Beach Boulevard to better manage traffic weaving conflicts and related congestion.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept	Rancho Dominguez/Long Beach	7	3	3	13
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0043		I-710, MP 22.2. In Commerce and Vernon, at Hobart Rail Yard Overhead No. 53-0840. Rehabilitate, clean, and paint bridge.	SHOPP	Commerce/Vernon	0	1	0	1
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0045		Route 91, MP R11.7. In Long Beach, at LA River (W91 -N710 & S710) Bridge No. 53-2143F. Replace portions of the bridge deck and apply polyester concrete overlay.	SHOPP	Long Beach	0	1	0	1
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0053		I-405, MP 7.2. In Long Beach, at the Pacific Place Maintenance Station at 3725 Pacific Place. Replace a deteriorated building with a new building at the maintenance station.	SHOPP	Long Beach	0	1	0	1
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0091	I-710/Anaheim Interchange Improvement	Reconstruct I-710/Anaheim Interchange to provide operational and safety improvements.	City of Long Beach/COG	Long Beach	8	3	0	11
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0092	I-710/PCH Interchange Improvement	Reconstruct I-710/Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) Interchange to provide operational and safety improvements.	City of Long Beach/COG, SPP Mapping	Long Beach	8	3	1	12
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0093	I-710/Wardlow Interchange Improvement	Reconstruct I-710/Wardlow Interchange to provide operational and safety improvements.	City of Long Beach/COG	Long Beach	6	3	1	10
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0156	Traffic Controls at I-710 Freeway Ramps	Add traffic signals with protected pedestrian/bicycle phase(s), crosswalks, lighting, landscaping, signing and striping, and other safety-related pedestrian features at the ramp termini of I-710.	SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	1	1	0	2
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0180	I-710 Truck Bypass Lanes	Construct truck bypass lanes on I-710 between Willow Street and Del Amo Boulevard. The purpose of the improvement would be to separate cars from trucks through the congested I-710/I-405 interchange for purposes of safety and mobility.	SPP Survey	Long Beach	9	3	2	14
Freeway	Freeway Improvements	LB-ELA_0181	Freeway Lids, Caps, and Widened Bridge Decks	Widen arterial bridge decks at key locations over the I-710 Freeway/LA River Channel to provide "land islands," "urban parklets," and "green belt" connections over I-710 and the LA River. Include pedestrian / bicycle pathways.	SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	4	3	0	7

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	Design Concerns	Construction Concerns	Outcome Concerns	Total Concerns
Freeway	Freeway Amenities / ITS	LB-ELA_0039		I-710, MP R6.0-14.1. In Long Beach and Compton, from Shoreline Drive to north of Alondra Boulevard. Enhance highway worker safety by constructing Maintenance Vehicle Pullouts (MVPs), upgrading guardrail and end treatments, paving beyond the gore, installing erosion control and replacing pull boxes.	SHOPP	Long Beach/Compton	0	1	0	1
Freeway	Freeway Amenities / ITS	LB-ELA_0046		I-405. In and near the cities of Long Beach, Signal Hill, Los Angeles, and Carson, rehabilitate pavement, upgrade signs, rehabilitate bridge, upgrade lighting, improve safety, rehabilitate Transportation Management System (TMS) elements and replace copper cabling with fiber, rehabilitate culverts, and upgrade facilities to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.	SHOPP	Multiple Jurisdictions	2	1	0	3
Freeway	Freeway Amenities / ITS	LB-ELA_0048		I-105, MP R14.3. In Paramount, at Grove Street at the Garfield Avenue Pump Station. Replace pumps, add lighting, construct Maintenance Vehicle Pullouts (MVPs), and provide a fiber optic connection to the pump house.	SHOPP	Paramount	0	1	0	1
Freeway	Freeway Amenities / ITS	LB-ELA_0049		I-710, MP 18.7-19.6. In South Gate and Bell Gardens, at the South Gate Pump Plant and the Florence Avenue Pump Plant; also in Downey on Route 105 at the Ardis Avenue Pump Plant (PM R16.48). Upgrade pump plants.	SHOPP	South Gate/Bell Gardens/Downey	0	1	0	1
Freeway	Freeway Amenities / ITS	LB-ELA_0050		Route 91. In the cities of Carson, Compton, Long Beach, and Bellflower. Upgrade overhead signs and sign structures, rehabilitate landscaping, and enhance highway worker safety.	SHOPP	Multiple Jurisdictions	0	1	0	1
Freeway	Freeway Amenities / ITS	LB-ELA_0052		Route 47. In Long Beach from Route 710 to north of Route 710 (PM 3.497/3.58). Upgrade Transportation Management System (TMS) elements, replace fiber optic cable, and connect upgraded equipment to communication hubs.	SHOPP	Wilmington	0	1	0	1
Freeway	Freeway Amenities / ITS	LB-ELA_0054		I-710, MP 24.7. Near the neighborhood of East Los Angeles, at Humphrey Maintenance Station at 102 South Humphreys Avenue. Construct a new office building, an equipment storage building, and a Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) charging station and demolish an existing building.	SHOPP, SPP Survey	East Los Angeles	3	1	0	4
Freeway	Freeway Amenities / ITS	LB-ELA_0137	Freeway Soundwalls	Build higher soundwalls to protect residents from air pollution, noise, and other impacts (Design Package 2, Design Package 3). Perform noise studies for all remaining walls along I-710 that are less than 16 feet high to identify additional, feasible soundwall projects that would realize the greatest benefits for impacted residents and other sensitive receivers.	SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	2	2	0	4
Freeway	Freeway Amenities / ITS	LB-ELA_0155	Drought Tolerant Landscaping, Hardscaping and Aesthetic Features along I-710	Provide drought tolerant landscaping within existing, available right-of-way along I-710. Where needed, add context sensitive lighting features and additional signage to improve safety. Include hardscaping and other aesthetic features to improve the attractiveness of the freeway for users and for adjacent land uses/communities.	SPP Survey, Task Force, Equity Working Group	Multiple Jurisdictions	1	0	0	1
Freeway	Freeway Amenities / ITS	LB-ELA_0157	I-710 Particulate Matter (PM) Reduction Pilot Project	Implement a pilot project on I-710 to deploy and evaluate measures to reduce exposure of nearby populations to particulate matter, specifically localized sources of entrained/fugitive dust, tire wear, and brake wear associated with traffic on the freeway. These measures may include roadside vegetation barriers within available Caltrans' right-of-way, air filters for nearby schools or community facilities, pavement materials, frequent street-sweeping, and deployment of air quality monitoring systems, among others. In addition, include options to examine the effectiveness of "cool pavement" applications to reduce heat island effects. As part of the work plan, the pilot project would include a study element to assess and document the efficacy of the various measures.	SPP Survey, Task Force	Multiple Jurisdictions	0	0	0	0
Freeway	Freeway Amenities / ITS	LB-ELA_0188	Freeway Landscaping / Maintenance	Ongoing Caltrans Program that ensures that maintenance projects and activities such as trash removal, landscaping, provision of drought-resistant vegetation, and graffiti removal take place on a regular basis within state, public rights of way in the LB-ELA Corridor. Ensure that the agency dedicates sufficient resources for this effort.	SPP Survey	Study Area Wide	0	0	0	0
Freeway	Zero Emissions Lanes on I-710	LB-ELA_0154	I-710 Zero-Emission Truck Travel Zone Restriction	Establish a zero-emission truck-only travel zone on I-710. Only zero emissions trucks would be able to travel on I-710, while diesel and near-zero emissions heavy duty trucks would be excluded. No new lanes would be added to the existing footprint of I-710. No restrictions would be placed on autos.	SPP Survey, COG Ad Hoc Committee	Multiple Jurisdictions	0	0	1	1
Freeway	Zero Emissions Lanes on I-710	LB-ELA_0183	Zero Emissions Truck Lane	Explore options and assess the feasibility of converting the right-hand lane on I-710 to create a Zero Emissions Truck Lane. Only zero emissions trucks would be able to travel in this lane, while fossil fuel vehicles would be excluded. No new lanes would be added to the existing footprint of I-710.	Metro, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	0	0	1	1
Freeway	Congestion Pricing	LB-ELA_0153	Congestion Pricing	Implement congestion pricing strategy for the I-710 freeway. No new lanes would be added to the existing footprint of I-710. Rather single occupant vehicles and trucks entering and exiting the freeway would be tolled by deploying an automated readers and electronic toll collection system that allows users to conveniently pay tolls using a toll tag that is mounted on the interior of their vehicle. Carpools, zero emission trucks, and zero emission autos would travel for free.	SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	0	1	10	11
Freeway	Congestion Pricing	LB-ELA_0182	Express Lanes Strategic Initiative	Advance planning studies to implement express lanes on key freeways in the study area, including I-405, I-105, and SR-91.	Metro, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	1	NA	8	9

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	Design Concerns	Construction Concerns	Outcome Concerns	Total Concerns
Community Programs	Air Quality / Community Health	LB-ELA_0133	LB-ELA Corridor Community Health Benefit Program	Under this program, funding would be made available to implement air quality projects to reduce exposure to air pollution as well as health education and screening programs in areas adversely affected by existing and proposed transportation infrastructure projects. The LB-ELA Community Health Benefit Program would serve the communities within the LB-ELA Corridor Study Area. This program would provide subsidy funding to implement projects and outreach activities to improve air quality and public health, including but not limited to: - Air Quality Projects for Schools and Community Facilities: air filtration, HVAC upgrades, replacement/sealing of windows and doors, vegetation barriers or buffer landscaping. - Health Education and Screening: community health screening and diagnosis, health education, training for community health workers, outreach programs.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept, SPP Survey, CA-7	Study Area Wide	0	NA	0	0
Community Programs	Air Quality / Community Health	LB-ELA_0191	Zero Emission Infrastructure for Autos	Work with local jurisdictions (Cities, County of Los Angeles), public agencies, and private-public partners to develop and site additional charging stations for zero emissions vehicles within the LB-ELA Corridor. Provide grant writing assistance in order to help secure funding. In addition, provide technical support to share best practices such as: identification of incentives and/or policy requirements for new development.	SPP Survey, SPP Mapping, CA-7	Study Area Wide	6	1	0	7
Community Programs	Air Quality / Community Health	LB-ELA_0192	Bus Electrification Projects	Seek incentives to accelerate the deployment of zero emissions vehicles within the LB-ELA Corridor. Projects could include bus electrification (public transit buses, school buses) as well as zero emissions charging infrastructure. Provide technical and grant writing assistance to define and develop potential projects.	Metro, SPP Survey, SPP Mapping, CA-7	Study Area Wide	1	0	0	1
Community Programs	Air Quality / Community Health	LB-ELA_0218	Air Quality Monitoring Stations	Add four, new air quality monitoring stations within the LB-ELA Study Area. Sites to be identified in cooperation with the South Coast Air Quality Management District.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept	Multiple Jurisdictions	0	0	0	0
Community Programs	Environment	LB-ELA_0134	LB-ELA Corridor Energy Reduction / Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Program	Under the Energy Reduction / Greenhouse Gas Reduction (GHG) Program, funding would be made available to implement energy reduction as well as greenhouse gas reduction projects in areas impacted by transportation projects within the LB-ELA Corridor. This program would be an important element of any major transportation initiative that takes place within the LB-ELA Corridor. The program would provide subsidy funding to implement projects and educational activities targeted to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Examples of these projects include: renewable energy projects, solar-power generation, energy efficient lighting, and tree planting, among others.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept, SPP Mapping	Study Area Wide	0	NA	0	0
Community Programs	Environment	LB-ELA_0187	LB-ELA Corridor "Urban Greening" Initiative	Under this initiative, proposed projects implemented through the LB-ELA Corridor Investment Plan must consider context sensitive solutions as part of the project design as well as "urban greening" elements that foster environmental resilience. These "urban greening" elements may include items such as: provision of green space/greenbelts; parklets; tree planting; community gardens and community farms; drought tolerant planting; habitat restoration and connectivity; stormwater capture/flood diversion/water management projects; brownfield remediation, natural trail restoration, and green infrastructure, among others. Through the LB-ELA Urban Greening Initiative, project proponents may also partner with other localities, non-profit organizations, or communities in order to plan, design, and implement "green" projects that demonstrate that they provide publicly accessible open-space and ecosystem benefits such as urban heat island reduction within the LB-ELA Corridor.	SPP Survey, SPP Mapping, CA-7, Equity Working Group	Study Area Wide	0	NA	0	0
Community Programs	Environment	LB-ELA_0190	Public Art / Aesthetics	Policy initiative that would require that a percentage of transportation construction funds for major public work projects be earmarked for public art, landscaping, urban design elements, and other aesthetic features for the projects.	SPP Survey, SPP Mapping	Study Area Wide	1	NA	0	1
Community Programs	Housing Stabilization / Land Use	LB-ELA_0009	West Santa Ana Branch Transit-Oriented Development Strategic Implementation Plan and Program (TOD SIP)	The TOD SIP provides an overarching vision and strategic guidance for local West Santa Ana Branch (WSAB) jurisdictions to use as a resource as they develop and implement their own plans, policies and economic development and mobility strategies in the 12 WSAB station areas along the alignment. Additionally, in 2019, the Metro Board approved a \$1M implementation program to fund WSAB jurisdictions to implement TOD SIP recommendations.	Metro LRTP	Multiple Jurisdictions	0	NA	0	0

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	Design Concerns	Construction Concerns	Outcome Concerns	Total Concerns
Community Programs	Housing Stabilization / Land Use	LB-ELA_0135	Housing Stabilization Policies	<p>Applying an integrated approach, work with cities, County of Los Angeles, and public agencies to propose and pass community stabilization policies to support disadvantaged communities within the LB-ELA Corridor, improve their resilience, and address the social determinants of health. Provide grant writing assistance to secure needed funding. Housing stabilization policies and incentives include measures such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mandates for process improvement: Engaging the community/forming partnerships with Community Based Organizations;</li> <li>- Community benefits: establish a framework/menu/equitable development scorecard for new development projects;</li> <li>- Develop community land trusts/land banks: for new housing and/or to support naturally occurring affordable housing;</li> <li>- Local wealth creation: encourage production of local for sale affordable housing, down payment assistance programs, homeowner maintenance assistance programs;</li> <li>- Inclusionary housing policies with or without option of in lieu fees;</li> <li>- Housing Trust Fund to support and increase funding for affordable housing production;</li> <li>- Density bonus programs to incentivize affordable and mixed income housing production;</li> <li>- Affordable accessory dwelling unit (ADU) programs and ADU amnesty programs;</li> <li>- Policies to reduce housing costs, such as parking reduction/unbundling, innovative construction techniques, fee waivers, permit streamlining;</li> <li>- Anti-displacement programs for tenants: tenant rights programs including anti-harassment policies/ just cause eviction policies, legal assistance for tenants, no net loss housing policies for new development, limits on residential demolition &amp; conversion, tenant right-to-return policies, local resident preference programs for new housing;</li> <li>- Rent stabilization policies;</li> <li>- Low-income rental assistance programs, low interest loan programs for maintenance and improvement in rent stabilized units;</li> <li>- Anti-displacement programs for homeowners: tax relief/loans/grants for maintenance/foreclosure assistance;</li> <li>- Basic Income Program</li> </ul>	COG Ad Hoc Committee, SPP Survey, SPP Mapping	Study Area Wide	0	NA	0	0
Community Programs	Housing Stabilization / Land Use	LB-ELA_0193	Transit Oriented Communities /Land Use	<p>Work with the local jurisdictions (Cities, County of Los Angeles) to apply best practices and design guidelines to encourage transit-oriented development near rail stations and heavily utilized bus routes within the LB-ELA Corridor. Provide technical resources such as grant writing assistance and technical assistance for community development and land use planning. Assist local jurisdictions in coordination with property owners and developers to ensure safe construction and strengthen connections to transit.</p>	Metro, SPP Mapping	Study Area Wide	0	NA	0	0
Community Programs	Housing Stabilization / Land Use	LB-ELA_0194	Homeless Programs	<p>Support homeless initiatives within the LB-ELA Corridor and efforts and recommendations that have emerged from Metro's Homeless Task Force, Reimagining Public Safety Initiatives, and other County initiatives and studies to address homelessness in and around the transit system including provisions to: enhance the customer experience; maintain a safe and secure system; and connect homeless persons in the transit system to services and resources.</p>	SPP Survey, SPP Mapping	Study Area Wide	0	NA	0	0
Community Programs	Job Creation / Work Opportunities	LB-ELA_0186	Economic Stabilization Policies	<p>Work with Cities, County of Los Angeles, and public agencies to propose and pass community stabilization policies to support disadvantaged communities within the LB-ELA Corridor. Provide grant writing assistance to secure needed funding. Economic stabilization policies and incentives include measures such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mandates for process improvement: Engaging the community/forming partnerships with Community Based Organizations;</li> <li>- Community financial empowerment programs: local hire agreements, workforce education &amp; development, credit improvement programs;</li> <li>- Locally owned business support – small business interruption fund and loan funds during construction, guide for business support services, zoning to encourage small businesses, lease to own programs for businesses and housing;</li> <li>- Identify, protect and encourage legacy and culturally significant businesses, and historical and cultural landmarks, mandate inclusion of arts and culture spaces in new development</li> </ul>	COG Ad Hoc Committee	Study Area Wide	0	NA	0	0

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	Design Concerns	Construction Concerns	Outcome Concerns	Total Concerns
Community Programs	Job Creation / Work Opportunities	LB-ELA_0195	Targeted Hire Programs	Support the development of targeted and local hire programs to increase the share of public dollars that is devoted to creation of local jobs for community residents within the LB-ELA Study Area. Include measures such as the establishment of Project Labor Agreements (PLAs) that specify local and targeted hire goals for specific construction projects as well as first source hire requirements. Collaborate with local jurisdictions and public agencies to align local and targeted hire policies, thresholds, and requirements.	I-710 Motion 5.1/5.2 Early Action Concept, SPP Survey, CA-7	Study Area Wide	0	NA	0	0
Community Programs	Job Creation / Work Opportunities	LB-ELA_0196	Employment/Recruitment Initiatives	Partner with public agencies, large employers, and local businesses to conduct recruitment drives at locations within the LB-ELA Corridor (both virtual and in person.) This initiative would also include job fairs and workshops at community facilities and community colleges to provide information to local residents regarding work opportunities as well as networking resources. Conduct promotional campaigns to actively publicize these events within the LB-ELA Corridor communities.	SPP Survey	Study Area Wide	0	NA	0	0
Community Programs	Job Creation / Work Opportunities	LB-ELA_0197	Vocational Educational Programs	Partner with public agencies, private-sector employers, community colleges, labor organizations and non-profit organizations to expand vocational and educational programs for community residents within the LB-ELA Corridor. Examples could include training for mechanics who work for small businesses that service zero emissions vehicles. These programs would provide opportunities to establish a career pathway to work in key economic sectors and move up through the ranks by focusing on workforce development and skills training.	SPP Survey	Study Area Wide	0	NA	0	0

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	Design Concerns	Construction Concerns	Outcome Concerns	Total Concerns
Goods Movement	Truck Programs/ITS	LB-ELA_0004	Long Beach-East Los Angeles Corridor Clean Truck Program	In January 2021, the Metro Board approved the 2021 Goods Movement Strategic Plan, which included a Countywide Clean Truck Initiative, with the 710 South Clean Truck Program identified as a goods movement strategic priority. At its October 2021 meeting, the Metro Board acted to recommit \$50 million from Measure R I-710 South Corridor funds as seed funding for the 710 South Clean Truck Program, which has been subsequently renamed the LB-ELA Zero Emissions Truck Program. The objective of this program is to turn over diesel trucks in favor of zero emissions trucks in the LB-ELA Corridor. The program would contribute subsidy funding to deploy a number of zero emissions trucks on I-710 as well as seed funding to develop electric charging/refueling stations for zero emissions trucks.	Metro LRTP, SPP Survey, SPP Mapping, CA-7	Study Area Wide	2	1	0	3
Goods Movement	Truck Programs/ITS	LB-ELA_0023	Clean Truck Infrastructure	Install charging infrastructure for zero emissions trucks.	Metro 2028 Mobility Concept Plan, SPP Survey, SPP Mapping	Multiple Jurisdictions	4	1	0	5
Goods Movement	Truck Programs/ITS	LB-ELA_0184	Empty Container Management	Provide a mix of incentives/fee penalties to encourage shippers/marine terminals to clear empty containers from docks/near dock facilities at the Ports to reduce congestion and unnecessary truck trip movements. Extend use of off-peak hours for empty returns.	Ports	Ports	0	0	0	0
Goods Movement	Truck Programs/ITS	LB-ELA_0185	Freight Advanced Traveler Information Systems	Application of advanced technologies to manage drayage truck movements to and from the Ports. The system integrates real-time roadway traffic data, vessel/container tracking, real-time container terminal visit times, and GPS-based information to optimize the sequencing of container delivery and pick-up. The purpose is to improve cargo handling and efficiencies and reduce congestion near intermodal yards and Port facilities.	Ports, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	0	0	0	0
Goods Movement	Freight Rail / Goods Movement TDM	LB-ELA_0024	Pier 400 On Dock Rail Modernization	On-dock railyard expansion to accommodate electric operated rail-mounted gantry cranes.	Metro 2028 Mobility Concept Plan	Port of LA	1	1	0	2
Goods Movement	Freight Rail / Goods Movement TDM	LB-ELA_0025	Terminal Island Transfer Facility Modernization	On-dock railyard expansion to accommodate electric operated rail-mounted gantry cranes.	Metro 2028 Mobility Concept Plan	Port of LA	1	1	0	2
Goods Movement	Freight Rail / Goods Movement TDM	LB-ELA_0026	West Basin Container Terminal Railyard Modernization	On-dock railyard expansion to accommodate electric operated rail-mounted gantry cranes.	Metro 2028 Mobility Concept Plan	Port of LA	1	1	0	2
Goods Movement	Freight Rail / Goods Movement TDM	LB-ELA_0124	Port of Los Angeles National Multimodal Freight Network Improvement Program: Rail System Improvement Projects	Additional rail tracks in POLA to improve overall rail operations, including supporting on-dock railyards	Port of Los Angeles/COG, SPP Survey	Port of LA	1	1	0	2
Goods Movement	Freight Rail / Goods Movement TDM	LB-ELA_0151	Goods Movement Freight Rail Study	Conduct an assessment to evaluate options for deriving greater utilization of the Alameda Corridor as a potential means for reducing truck trips within the Southern California subregion. This assessment would include options such as: opportunities to increase on-dock freight rail mode share; implementation of short-haul, freight rail shuttle service to new inland rail facilities; and increased use/improved operational efficiencies of existing near dock and off dock intermodal facilities. This evaluation would take into account updated cargo forecasts, economic factors and projections, current trends associated with the goods movement logistics chain including transload truck trips, and railroad and intermodal capacity constraints in the Southern California region. The Goods Movement Freight Rail Study would assess options from a systemwide perspective and would include factors such as changes in truck trip travel patterns, land use implications, and the potential for environmental impacts as well as institutional constraints.	SPP Survey	Study Area	1	NA	0	1
Goods Movement	Freight Rail / Goods Movement TDM	LB-ELA_0217	Freight Rail Electrification Pilot Project	Work with the Union Pacific (UP) and BNSF railroads to develop and test battery electric locomotives for operation on the Pacific Harbor Line and in the Alameda Corridor with an ultimate goal of advancing a zero-emissions technology capable of entering commercial, revenue service operation.	Task Force, Equity Working Group	Multiple Jurisdictions	0	NA	0	0
Goods Movement	Ports	LB-ELA_0011	SR-47 Navy Way Interchange	SR 47/Navy Way Interchange: Construction of Interchange At SR-47 / Navy Way, between SR-47 Vincent Thomas Bridge and Pier S Avenue Interchange, to eliminate traffic signal and movement conflicts. This Project was a S. Cal Trade Corridor Tier II TCIF Project as submitted to the CTC in 2008. This project would remove the last signal on SR 47 between Desmond and V. Thomas Bridges; NHS Intermodal Connector Route	SCAG RTP, PIPO, Ports	Port of Los Angeles	3	1	0	4
Goods Movement	Ports	LB-ELA_0021	Alameda Corridor Terminus Enhancements	New Cerritos channel rail bridge and supporting connections throughout Port of LA.	Metro 2028 Mobility Concept Plan	Port of Los Angeles	3	1	0	4
Goods Movement	Ports	LB-ELA_0022	Terminal Way Grade Separation	New grade separation to replace at-grade crossing to improve freight traffic flow.	Metro 2028 Mobility Concept Plan	Port of Los Angeles	3	1	0	4

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	Design Concerns	Construction Concerns	Outcome Concerns	Total Concerns
Goods Movement	Ports	LB-ELA_0121	Pier D Street Realignment	Realign Pier D Street, from Middle Harbor Exit gate to Pico Avenue. Currently Pier D Street has sight distance issues, inadequate curve radii, and drainage/flooding issues at the low point. The Pier D Realignment project will provide redundancy through Pier D thereby improving safety and traffic flows. The scope of the project is to widen & reconstruct Pier D Street between the Middle Harbor Exit Gate and Pico Avenue and to reconfigure West Broadway. Additional scope items includes construction of a new pump station, retaining walls, utility upgrades, striping, signage and traffic signal work.	Port of Long Beach/COG, SPP Mapping	Port of Long Beach	4	2	0	6
Goods Movement	Ports	LB-ELA_0122	Harbor Scenic Drive Roadway & Infrastructure Improvements	Improve Harbor Scenic Drive, from Harbor Plaza to Ocean Boulevard. The project would: increase the roadway pavement structural section to replace the existing aged pavement; provide horizontal and vertical alignments improvements for enhanced safety; improve striping, traffic signage and way-finding signage; improve highway lighting; enhance drainage facilities (including the introduction of permanent water quality enhancements such as bio-swales and catch basin inlet/pipe screens); revamp the parkway and median landscaping and irrigation; and provide utility improvements and enhancements.	Port of Long Beach/COG, SPP Survey	Port of Long Beach	1	1	0	2
Goods Movement	Ports	LB-ELA_0123	Pico Avenue Street Improvement	Improve Pico Avenue, between Pier D Street and Pier E Street. This roadway improvement project would: widen a short segment of roadway; improve truck congestion and truck safety; reconstruct the pavement, improve the existing surface drainage and upgrade the storm drain inlets; upsize the sewer line; provide continuous sidewalks with ADA accessible features; upgrade street lighting; and extend landscaping and hardscape features.	Port of Long Beach/COG, SPP Survey	Port of Long Beach	1	1	0	2
Goods Movement	Ports	LB-ELA_0131	Port of Los Angeles National Multimodal Freight Network (NMFN) Improvement Program: Maritime Support Facility Access/Terminal Island Rail System Grade Separation	The project consists of constructing a four-lane, rail-roadway grade separation that eliminates a significant truck access impediment to an important container terminal support facility located on Terminal Island, at the centroid of the Ports of Los Angeles-Long Beach (POLA-POLB).	PIPO (Port of Los Angeles)	Port of Los Angeles	3	1	0	4
Goods Movement	Ports	LB-ELA_0132	Pier 300 Wharf Expansion/Vessel Emission Reduction Project	Pier 300 Wharf Expansion/Vessel Emission Reduction Project. This project constructs 1,250 lineal feet of container terminal wharf and supporting backland for Pier 300. It includes electrical infrastructure to operate ship-to-shore cranes and shore-side power to operate all necessary vessel systems, which will reduce about 80 percent of emissions while at berth.	PIPO (Port of Los Angeles)	Port of Los Angeles	4	1	0	5

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	Design Concerns	Construction Concerns	Outcome Concerns	Total Concerns
Transit	High Capacity Transit (Rail & BRT)	LB-ELA_0001	West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor (LRT)	The Project consists of 12 stations and is a 19-mile light rail transit corridor that will connect southeast LA County to downtown Los Angeles, serving the cities and communities of Artesia, Cerritos, Bellflower, Paramount, Downey, South Gate, Cudahy, Bell, Huntington Park, Vernon, unincorporated Florence-Graham community of LA County and downtown Los Angeles. Complete 4.5-mile section between Slauson A Line and Union Station.	Metro LRTP, SPP Survey, SPP Mapping	Multiple Jurisdictions	12	3	1	16
Transit	High Capacity Transit (Rail & BRT)	LB-ELA_0002	C Line (Green) Eastern Extension (Norwalk) (LRT)	Extends the C Line (Green) 2.8 miles from Norwalk to the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs Metrolink Station.	Metro LRTP	Norwalk	9	3	1	13
Transit	High Capacity Transit (Rail & BRT)	LB-ELA_0019	Atlantic Bus Only Lane and Transit Signal Prioritization (Next Gen Improvements)	BRT project along Atlantic to provide improved speed, reliability, and frequency.	Metro 2028 Mobility Concept Plan, SPP Survey, SPP Mapping	Multiple Jurisdictions	7	3	2	12
Transit	High Capacity Transit (Rail & BRT)	LB-ELA_0219	Metrolink Regional Rail Line between Union Station and Long Beach	Construct a new Metrolink regional rail line between Union Station and downtown Long Beach. Trains would be powered using electrical multiple unit (EMU) traction motors, which are anticipated to be required by the California Air Resources Board after 2030. Specific EMU technology has yet to be determined, but could be powered by overhead catenary, hydrogen fuel cell, or catenary/battery electric. Trains would operate along the existing SCRRA Metrolink line between Los Angeles and Commerce and then transition into Union Pacific (UP) railroad right of way (potentially along the San Pedro Subdivision Corridor) for the segment between Commerce and Lakewood. However, sections of a second track would likely need to be constructed in this middle section in order to operate up to four trains per hour in each direction in the peak period. In addition, substantial portions of the southern section of the alignment, between Lakewood and downtown Long Beach, would require new right-of way to provide needed trackage to connect to the downtown Long Beach area. New stations would be constructed and spaced every 1 to 3 miles depending upon the location. It is anticipated that these Metrolink trains would interline through Link US (at Union Station) with the Antelope Valley Line to the north.	Task Force (SCRRA)	Multiple Jurisdictions	15	3	1	19
Transit	Rail Line / Station Improvements	LB-ELA_0160	Line A (Blue Line) Transit Priority/Signal Synchronization	Enhanced signal prioritization/synchronization so that the A Line (Blue Line) has higher priority in areas where the LRT trains operate in mixed flow traffic	SPP Mapping, SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	1	0	1	2
Transit	Rail Line / Station Improvements	LB-ELA_0171	Commuter Rail Maintenance, Repair, and Safety Projects	Implement planned repair, maintenance, and safety projects to Metro-owned railroad infrastructure along the Los Angeles/Orange County commuter rail line within the LB-ELA Corridor study area.	Annual Commuter Rail State of Good Repair (SOGR) Program	Multiple Jurisdictions	0	0	0	0
Transit	Rail Line / Station Improvements	LB-ELA_0172	Commerce Metrolink Station Improvements	Improve train platforms, shift tracks, install pedestrian barriers and pedestrian crossing safety features, extend and widen sidewalks and walkways, add lighting, install new ADA accessibility features, replace equipment, provide bike path striping, add wayfinding signage, and provide new landscaping.	LA County Metrolink Station Assessment & Improvement Plan	Commerce	1	1	0	2
Transit	Rail Line / Station Improvements	LB-ELA_0173	Grade Separation(s) of the A Line [Blue Line] at Washington Street	Provide grade separation of the A Line [Blue Line] at the Washington St./Flower St. junction and at Washington Street.	Metro, SPP Survey, SPP Mapping	Los Angeles	5	3	0	8
Transit	Rail Line / Station Improvements	LB-ELA_0174	New Metrolink Station at planned Commerce/Citadel Station	Construct a new Metrolink Station on the Los Angeles – Riverside Metrolink Commuter Rail Line at the planned Eastside Transit Corridor station at Commerce/Citadel.	Metro	Commerce	3	2	1	6
Transit	Rail Line / Station Improvements	LB-ELA_0175	Install Quad Safety Gates at all A Line [Blue Line] Crossings	Install Quad Safety Gates at all A Line [Blue Line] Crossings for safety and increased speed/safety zones	Metro	Multiple Jurisdictions	0	0	0	0
Transit	Rail Line / Station Improvements	LB-ELA_0176	Install Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition System for A Line [Blue Line]	Install Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition System [SCADA] along the A Line [Blue Line] in the downtown area of Long Beach. This technology would allow Metro to better operate and manage the rail transit line to improve train reliability	Metro	Long Beach	1	NA	0	1
Transit	Rail Line / Station Improvements	LB-ELA_0177	Add Second Elevator to Firestone and Slauson A Line [Blue Line] Stations	Add second elevator to Firestone and Slauson A Line [Blue Line] Stations for improved access and reliability	Metro	Florence-Graham	0	0	0	0
Transit	Bus Transit	LB-ELA_0016	Connecting C Line (Green) and Metrolink Norwalk Station	New express shuttle service between C Line Norwalk Station and Metrolink Norwalk Station to close existing transit gap. Near term solution until C Line is extended eastward.	Metro 2028 Mobility Concept Plan	Norwalk	0	0	0	0
Transit	Bus Transit	LB-ELA_0130	Long Beach Transit (LBT) Solar Charging Electrification Project	The project would convert the current bus parking area, at the agency's main operating base, into a facility for charging Battery Electric Buses (BEBs) through the erection of solar-powered parking canopies, to enable Long Beach Transit to transition to 100% emission bus fleet by 2030.	PIPO (Long Beach Transit), SPP Mapping	Long Beach	0	0	0	0
Transit	Bus Transit	LB-ELA_0140	Metro Micro Transit Zone(s)	Implementation of new Metro on-demand, flexible transit service for the northern section of the I-710 Study Area between Lynwood and Commerce. - Rides can be booked online, by app, or by phone. Rides are prescheduled, same day/multiple days. - Uses small capacity vans (seats 7-10 riders). - Pick-up/drop-off where safe (virtual stops). Targeted maximum wait time is 15 minutes.	COG Ad Hoc Committee, SPP Mapping	Multiple Jurisdictions	0	NA	0	0



Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	Design Concerns	Construction Concerns	Outcome Concerns	Total Concerns
Transit	Bus Transit	LB-ELA_0141	Metro Bus Priority Lane Corridor along Line 60 (Long Beach Blvd.)	Improve bus times, speeds, and reliability along Line 60 (Long Beach Blvd.). Proposed improvements would include: transit signal prioritization, bus priority lanes and bus stop bulb outs, all door boarding, bus stop and layover improvements.	SPP Survey, COG Ad Hoc Committee	Multiple Jurisdictions	4	2	2	8
Transit	Bus Transit	LB-ELA_0142	Metro Bus Priority Lane Corridor along Line 108 (Slauson)	Improve bus times, speeds, and reliability along Line 108 (Slauson). Proposed improvements would include: transit signal prioritization, bus priority lanes and bus stop bulb outs, all door boarding, bus stop and layover improvements.	SPP Survey, COG Ad Hoc Committee	Multiple Jurisdictions	4	2	3	9
Transit	Bus Transit	LB-ELA_0143	Metro Bus Priority Lane Corridor along Line 110 (Gage)	Improve bus times, speeds, and reliability along Line 110 (Gage). Proposed improvements would include: transit signal prioritization, bus priority lanes and bus stop bulb outs, all door boarding, bus stop and layover improvements.	SPP Survey, COG Ad Hoc Committee	Multiple Jurisdictions	4	2	3	9
Transit	Bus Transit	LB-ELA_0144	Metro Bus Priority Lane Corridor along Line 111 (Florence)	Improve bus times, speeds, and reliability along Line 111 (Florence). Proposed improvements would include: transit signal prioritization, bus priority lanes and bus stop bulb outs, all door boarding, bus stop and layover improvements.	SPP Survey, COG Ad Hoc Committee	Multiple Jurisdictions	4	2	3	9
Transit	Bus Transit	LB-ELA_0145	Metro Bus Priority Lane Corridor along Line 115 (Firestone)	Improve bus times, speeds, and reliability along Line 115 (Firestone). Proposed improvements would include: transit signal prioritization, bus priority lanes and bus stop bulb outs, all door boarding, bus stop and layover improvements.	SPP Survey, COG Ad Hoc Committee	South Gate / Downey	4	2	2	8
Transit	Bus Transit	LB-ELA_0146	Metro Bus Priority Lane Corridor along Line 260 (Atlantic Blvd.)	Improve bus times, speeds, and reliability along Line 260 (Atlantic Blvd.). Proposed improvements would include: transit signal prioritization, bus priority lanes and bus stop bulb outs, all door boarding, bus stop and layover improvements.	SPP Survey, COG Ad Hoc Committee	Multiple Jurisdictions	4	2	3	9
Transit	Bus Transit	LB-ELA_0164	Improved Frequency of Metro Buses in the LB-ELA Study Area	Provide a 50 percent improvement on all Metro fixed bus routes greater than 10 minutes in the AM and PM peak periods. And, provide a 50 percent improvement on all Metro fixed bus routes greater than 15 minutes in the Midday and Evening periods. [For example, a bus route that has as frequency of a bus every 30 minutes would improve to a bus arriving every 15 minutes.]	SPP Survey, SPP Mapping, CA-7	Study Area Wide	2	NA	0	2
Transit	Bus Transit	LB-ELA_0178	Metro Bus Priority Lane Corridor along Line 18 (Whittier Blvd.)	Improve bus times, speeds, and reliability along Line 18 (Whittier Blvd.). Proposed improvements would include: transit signal prioritization, bus priority lanes and bus stop bulb outs, all door boarding, bus stop and layover improvements.	SPP Survey	Los Angeles / East LA	4	2	2	8
Transit	Bus Transit	LB-ELA_0179	Metro Bus Priority Lane Corridor along Line 66 (Olympic Blvd.)	Improve bus times, speeds, and reliability along Line 66 (Olympic Blvd.). Proposed improvements would include: transit signal prioritization, bus priority lanes and bus stop bulb outs, all door boarding, bus stop and layover improvements.	SPP Survey	Los Angeles / East LA	4	2	4	10
Transit	Transit Amenities	LB-ELA_0077	Bus Stop Improvements	Installation of Bus shelters and benches at Metro and City of Commerce Transit Stop (Various locations within the City of Commerce)	City of Commerce/COG, SPP Survey	Commerce	0	0	0	0
Transit	Transit Amenities	LB-ELA_0103	Bus Stop Improvements	Installation of Bus shelters and benches at Metro and City of Maywood Transit Stop (Various locations within the City of Maywood)	City of Maywood/COG, SPP Survey	Maywood	0	0	0	0
Transit	Transit Amenities	LB-ELA_0118	Bus Shelter Upgrades	Upgrade bus shelters at various locations within the City of Signal Hill.	City of Signal Hill/COG, SPP Survey	Signal Hill	0	0	0	0
Transit	Transit Amenities	LB-ELA_0136	Enhanced Transit Security	Provide enhanced transit security measures and features on Metro trains, buses, and at Metro rail stations including: security devices such as cameras and call buttons, improved incident response, and additional security officers and/or plainclothes staff.	SPP Mapping	Multiple Jurisdictions	0	NA	0	0
Transit	Transit Amenities	LB-ELA_0147	Transit Traveler Information System Application (ITS)	Integrated system and web-based application to provide real-time information to users on optimal transit routes and transit options based on time of day as well as estimated arrival times of buses under real time travel conditions.	SPP Survey	Study Area Wide	0	NA	0	0
Transit	Transit Amenities	LB-ELA_0148	Transit Fare Discount Program	Expand Metro's program to provide increased transit fare discounts for low-income riders, students, and seniors. Target low income or disadvantaged communities within the LB-ELA Corridor Study Area.	SPP Survey	Study Area Wide	0	NA	0	0
Transit	Transit Amenities	LB-ELA_0149	Increased Security Features at Metro's Existing and Planned Light Rail Stations	Lighting, security cameras, improved line of sight, incident/emergency response plans, and other safety features at Metro stations/parking structures.	SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	0	0	0	0
Transit	Transit Amenities	LB-ELA_0152	Transit Marketing and Education Program	Expansion of Metro's collaborative effort with Metrolink, Long Beach Transit, and city municipal bus lines to promote transit and alternative modes of transportation to the single occupant vehicle. Include features such as "free transit" day and transit passes to employees or students to encourage transit use.	SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	0	NA	0	0
Transit	Transit Amenities	LB-ELA_0161	Transit Ambassador Program	Enhance Metro's Transit Ambassador Program within the LB-ELA Corridor to bring non-law enforcement representatives to improve the customer experience, reinforce public safety, and increase ridership on the transit system.	SPP Mapping	Study Area Wide	0	NA	0	0
Transit	Transit Amenities	LB-ELA_0168	Compton Transit Management Operations Center Enhancements	Project improvements would include: beautification, art, monuments, safety, increased bike storage, bike parking, walkways, and bike paths (Phases 1 -5). Location: Compton Transit Management Operations Center: 275 N. Willowbrook Ave., Compton.	Task Force	Compton	2	0	0	2

Project Type	Project SubType	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Source	Jurisdiction	Design Concerns	Construction Concerns	Outcome Concerns	Total Concerns
Transit	Transit Amenities	LB-ELA_0169	Southeast LA Transit Improvement Program	Pending stakeholder input and local jurisdiction approval, this project could include a “cloud-based” Countywide Signal Priority upgrade, 100 bus stop shelters at existing bus stops with over 50 daily boardings but without an existing shelter, 100-solar powered real-time arrival displays, 100 bus stop solar light upgrades for stops without shelters that have lighting, terminal/layover expansion improvements at the Norwalk, Artesia, and Compton Stations, and 100 Zero-Emissions Bus charging masts.	PIPO (Southeast LA), SPP Survey	Multiple Jurisdictions	0	1	0	1
Transit	Transit Amenities	LB-ELA_0189	Transit System Cleanliness/Maintenance	Strengthen policies committing Metro to regular cleaning and maintenance activities on all transit vehicles and at bus and rail stations within the LB-ELA Corridor. These activities consist of cleaning and disinfection of high touchpoint surfaces, graffiti removal, cleanup of spills and biohazards, and trash removal. Maintain station landscaping. Provide high-efficiency air filters on bus and rail transit vehicles. Ensure that the agency dedicates sufficient resources for this effort.	SPP Survey, SPP Mapping	Study Area Wide	0	NA	0	0
Transit	Transit Amenities	LB-ELA_0203	Bus Stop Improvements	Collaborate with the local jurisdictions (cities, unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County) to implement bus stop improvements within the LB-ELA Corridor. Bus stop improvements would include items such as: - Lighting - Security Features - Benches - Shade and shelters - Drinking Fountains - Solar-powered arrival displays - Trashcans - Landscaping - Signage - Crosswalks - Improved ADA accessibility, including repositioning of utility boxes on the sidewalk Provide financial support in order to help leverage local funds for project implementation. Funds would be made available based on criteria such as: project need, project readiness, and project benefits relative to costs, among other factors.	SPP Survey, SPP Mapping, CA-7, Community Leadership Committee (CLC)	Study Area Wide	0	0	0	0

# LB-ELA Multimodal Corridor Investment Plan

Project And Program Performance  
Evaluation Methodology

## Contents

Common Assumptions and Definitions .....	4
Project Scale .....	4
Equity Focus Communities .....	4
Project Types and Sub Categories .....	4
Air Quality.....	5
AQ1: Reduce Emissions (NOx, PM2.5).....	5
AQ2: Facilitates clean technologies & lower emissions vehicles .....	7
AQ3: Mode Shift to cleaner modes .....	9
Community and Health .....	10
CH1: Reduce Emissions (Health Effects metrics: DPM, PM2.5) .....	10
CH2: Reduce exposure at receptors (HVAC/HEPA, near-roadway vegetation) .....	12
CH3: Mode Shift to active transportation, transit.....	15
CH4: Improve the User Experience (may be different metrics for different modes).....	15
CH5: Bike/Ped Access to parks, recreational areas, or open spaces.....	19
Mobility .....	20
MB1: Transit Ridership .....	20
MB2: Speeds / Travel Times (people, goods) .....	21
MB3: Reduce Congestion (hours of delay for people & goods) .....	22
MB4: Modal Accessibility (by zone).....	23
MB5: Reliability (transit, roadway, goods movement).....	24
MB6: Gap Closures .....	25
MB7: Increase in travel options.....	26
Safety .....	29
SF1: Protections for Bike / Users (bike class) .....	29
SF2: Traffic Protections (bike/ped).....	30
SF3: Personal Security .....	31
SF4: Includes Safety Features.....	32
SF5: Reducing conflict points (vehicle safety) .....	33
SF6: Traffic Calming Features .....	35
SF7: Improves / rehabilitates existing infrastructure .....	36
Environment.....	37
EN1: Improved Environment from Mode Shifts.....	37
EN2: GHG Reduction Potential .....	39
EN3: Protects natural habitat (Greening Features).....	41

EN4: Water Quality, Water Capture, Drainage, and Flood Management features ..... 43

EN5: Reducing energy use ..... 44

EN6: Reduce Heat Island Effect; Provide Cooling Features for Users ..... 45

EN7: Potential for Noise Reduction ..... 47

EN8: Supports transportation efficient land use principles ..... 47

Opportunity and Prosperity ..... 50

OP1: Access to jobs..... 50

OP2: Accessibility (improving mobility challenges for all ages and abilities) ..... 51

OP3: Increases Regional Competitiveness ..... 53

OP4: Work Force Development..... 54

OP5: Potential Targeted Hire, New Construction Jobs..... 55

OP6: Access to QoL amenities (grocery stores, healthcare services, schools)..... 57

OP7: Access to open space, recreation and parks, LA river, etc. .... 58

Equity ..... 59

EQ-AQ1: Reduce Emissions (NOx, PM2.5)..... 59

EQ-AQ3: Mode Shift to cleaner modes ..... 60

EQ-CH1: Reduce Emissions (Health Effects metrics: DPM, PM2.5)..... 61

EQ-CH2: Reduces exposure to air pollution in communities facing high pollution burden and asthma rates..... 61

EQ-CH3: Mode Shift to active transportation, transit..... 62

EQ-CH5: Increases access to high quality recreational facilities in areas lacking active transportation infrastructure and parks ..... 64

EQ-MB1: Ridership ..... 65

EQ-MB2: Speeds / Travel Times (people, goods) ..... 65

EQ-MB3: Reduce Congestion (hours of delay for people & goods) ..... 66

EQ-MB4: Modal Accessibility..... 67

EQ-MB5: Reliability (Transit, Roadway, Goods Movement) ..... 68

EQ-MB6: Gap Closures ..... 68

EQ-MB7: Increases reliable and accessible transportation options for those who cannot or prefer not to drive ..... 69

EQ-SF1: Improves physical safety for people, walking, biking, and rolling ..... 70

EQ-SF3: Improves perceptions of personal security for people walking, biking, rolling, and taking transit..... 71

EQ-EN3: Contributes to remediation of environmental damage or loss of natural features 73

EQ-EN6: Includes urban greening and cooling for areas of low tree canopy and high heat island burden..... 74

EQ-EN7: Potential for Noise Reduction ..... 75

EQ-OP1: Access to jobs..... 76

EQ-OP6: Access to Quality-of-Life amenities (grocery stores, healthcare services, schools) 76

EQ-OP7: Access to open space, recreation and parks, LA river, etc. .... 77

EQ-OP8: Increases quantity and quality of employment opportunities for underemployed and low-income workforce ..... 78

EQ-OP9: Reduces housing or transportation costs for low-income households ..... 79

EQ-OP10: Reduces residential or commercial displacement risk ..... 80

Sustainability ..... 81

SA1: Reduces reliance on polluting and energy-intensive modes of travel and goods movement ..... 81

SA2: Promotes physical activity and health through active transportation and recreation. 82

SA3: Improves climate resilience through mitigation of flooding and extreme heat impacts ..... 82

SA4: Supports job creation in, and workforce transitions to green technology and infrastructure sectors ..... 83

SA5: Improves cargo efficiencies to minimize trip volumes and emissions from goods movement activity..... 84

Concerns ..... 85

CON1: Potential for Displacements..... 85

CON2: Potential for Physical Impacts (ROW) ..... 86

CON3: Potential for Increased Commute Times ..... 87

CON4: Potential for Traffic Diversion / Emissions Shifting..... 88

CON5: Potential to Increase Localized Emissions..... 88

CON6: Potential for bike/ped safety impacts..... 91

CON7: Potential for concentrated congestion impacts..... 92

CON8: Potential Construction Impacts..... 93

CON9: Potential for VMT Increases..... 94

CON10: Potential to increase user costs ..... 95

CON11: Potential to increase impervious cover ..... 95

CON12: Potential to increase economic displacement..... 96

CON13: Potential to increase noise pollution ..... 98

CON14: Potential for reduced transit ridership ..... 99

CON15: 15. Potential for new physical transportation barriers..... 100

Appendix A - Sub Classification Scoring and Applicability..... 103

Appendix B - Project Sub Classification, Scale, and EFC Category....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

## Common Assumptions and Definitions

### Project Scale

Definitions of Project Scales utilized in various rubrics:

- > **Localized:** Intervention applies to small street segment or single location (contained within 1-mile extent /radius)
- > **Semi-Localized:** Intervention applies to large street segment (> 1-mile) or multiple locations within a defined area (of greater than 1-mile radius). This often applies to city-wide programs
- > **Corridor-wide:** Intervention potentially applies to all jurisdictions and neighborhoods within the LB-ELA Corridor Study Area or applies to a transportation project or corridor that traverses the majority of the length of the Study Area

### Equity Focus Communities

Metro’s Equity Focus Communities (EFCs)<sup>1</sup> identify where transportation needs are greatest by considering concentrations of resident and household demographics associated with mobility barriers:

- Low-income households earning less than \$60,000 per year
- Black, Indigenous or People of Color (BIPOC) population
- Households that do not have a car

For the purpose of the “Equity-lens” metrics, the following designations were applied to each project to determine whether a project provides substantial benefit to EFCs:

- 0%: No part of project or program is located in an EFC
- 1-33% of project or program is located in an EFC
- 33-66% of project or program is located in an EFC (also applies to corridor-wide programs)
- 67+% of the project or program is located in an EFC

### Project Types and Sub Categories

Each project on the initial list was categorized into a project type (e.g. Highway, transit, goods movement, etc) and a subtype. For the purposes of evaluation, some metric rubrics listed below include qualitative scoring based on additional subclassification. These subclassifications and scores can be found in Appendix A.

---

<sup>1</sup> Metro: <https://www.dropbox.com/s/ew25aelmuvwqizv/equity-focus-communities-overview.pdf?dl=0>

## Air Quality

### **AQ1: Reduce Emissions (NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>)**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Reduces oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) and fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) emissions from on-road vehicles or offroad mobile equipment.

**Evaluation Method Description (Use of one or more of the following):** Travel Demand Forecasting Model (TDM) for a certain suite of projects; EMFAC Model; GIS-based project type locations or other methods for individuals project scores

#### **Data Sources Used:**

- > EMFAC Model<sup>2</sup> used to calculate on-road vehicle emissions, including changes in emissions due to project implementation
- > CARB adjustment factors for recently adopted regulations: Heavy-Duty Inspection and Maintenance Program (HD I/M)<sup>3</sup>, Advanced Clean Cars II (ACC II)<sup>4</sup>, and Advanced Clean Fleets (ACF)<sup>5</sup>
- > California Air Resources Board (CARB) methodology<sup>6</sup> used to calculate entrained road dust
- > OFFROAD Model<sup>7</sup> used to calculate off-road vehicle/equipment emissions, including changes in emissions due to project implementation
- > TDM used to model vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and speeds along analyzed roadways; used as input to EMFAC model to determine changes in emissions
- > ArcGIS map with project locations
- > South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD) Air Quality Significance Thresholds<sup>8</sup>
- > South Coast AQMD Localized Significance Threshold Methodology<sup>9</sup>

<sup>2</sup> CARB. EMFAC2021v1.02 Emissions Inventory - Onroad Emissions. Available at: <https://arb.ca.gov/emfac/emissions-inventory/>. Accessed: May 2023.

<sup>3</sup> CARB. HD I/M Regulation. December 9, 2021. Available here: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/rulemaking/2021/hdim2021>. Accessed: May 2023.

<sup>4</sup> CARB. ACC II Regulation. August 25, 2022. Available here: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/rulemaking/2022/advanced-clean-cars-ii>. Accessed: May 2023.

<sup>5</sup> CARB. ACF Regulation. April 28, 2023. Available here: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/rulemaking/2022/acf2022>. Accessed: May 2023.

<sup>6</sup> CARB. Miscellaneous Process Methodology 7.9 Entrained Road Travel, Paved Road Dust. March 2021. Available at: [https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/ei/areasrc/fullpdf/2021\\_paved\\_roads\\_7\\_9.pdf](https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/ei/areasrc/fullpdf/2021_paved_roads_7_9.pdf). Accessed: May 2023.

<sup>7</sup> CARB. Mobile Source Emissions Inventory Documentation – Off-Road – Diesel Equipment. Available at: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/mobile-source-emissions-inventory/road-documentation/msei-documentation-road>. Accessed: May 2023

<sup>8</sup> South Coast AQMD. 2023. South Coast AQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds. March. Available at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/south-coast-aqmd-air-quality-significance-thresholds.pdf?sfvrsn=25>. Accessed: May 2023.

<sup>9</sup> South Coast AQMD. Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology. July 2008. Available at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook/localized-significance-thresholds>. Accessed: May 2023.



**Assumptions:**

Not all freeway or arterial roadway projects were included in the TDM modeling. See project information matrix.

- > According to the 2021 Metrolink Climate Action Plan<sup>10</sup>, Metrolink has a target of becoming a zero-emissions railroad by 2028. As such, this analysis assumes zero emissions from passenger locomotive engines by 2045. Further, the proposed CARB In-Use Locomotive Regulation<sup>10</sup> requires all passenger locomotives to operate in a zero emissions configuration by 2030. Under the proposed In-Use Locomotive Regulation, by 2047, all locomotives operated by fleet operators must have 100% of annual fleet usage as zero emissions. Similar to CARB regulatory analyses, this analysis does not include the indirect emissions that may result from generation of electricity used to power these locomotives.
- > As of August 2023, CARB does not consider or calculate non-exhaust emission factors for locomotives in their locomotive models.<sup>11</sup>

**SCORING METHODOLOGY\***

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
0 – No Benefit	Project’s measures provide no total emission reductions If total emissions are increased, indicate concerns	
1 – Low Benefit	Total emission reductions are less than 55 pounds per day (lbs/day) for PM2.5 AND NOx compared to future baselines	If total emission reductions are less than 0.1 % of study area emissions, then project should be scored as No Benefit
2 – Medium Benefit	Total emission reductions is greater than or equal to 55 lbs/day to less than 110 lbs/day for PM2.5 or NOX compared to future baselines	If the total emissions reductions for both PM2.5 AND NOX are greater than 55 lbs/days, upgrade to High Benefit
3 – High Benefit	Total emission reductions is greater than or equal to 110 lbs/day for PM2.5 or NOX compared to future baselines	
NA	Project that is not modeled by TDM or does not affect vehicle type, VMT, speed, idle time, or any other parameter affecting emissions	

\*For Freeway, Arterial Roadway, and Transit Projects

**For Active Transportation/TDM Projects**

These projects will be accounted for in AQ3. Not sufficient information/methodologies to calculate the impacts for AQ1, CH1, and EN2 therefore these projects will get a score of NA.

<sup>10</sup> Metrolink. Climate Action Plan The Link to a Zero Emissions Future. March 26, 2021. Available here: <https://metrolinktrains.com/globalassets/about/agency/sustainability/climate-action-plan.pdf>. Accessed: August 2023.

<sup>11</sup> CARB. DRAFT Truck vs. Train Emissions Analysis FAQ. November 12, 2021. <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/fact-sheets/draft-truck-vs-train-emissions-analysis-faq>. Accessed August 2023.

**For Good Movements Projects**

Most of these projects will be accounted for in AQ2. Not sufficient information/methodologies to calculate the impacts for AQ1, CH1, and EN2 therefore these projects will get a score of NA.

**For Community Programs Projects**

These projects will be accounted for in AQ2 or CH2 or EN6. Not sufficient information/methodologies to calculate the impacts for AQ1, CH1, and EN2 therefore these projects will get a score of NA.

**Additional Documentation:**

- > Project emission inventory
- > Localized impacts for freeway and arterial roadway suites of projects are provided in the gridded emissions maps with the following legend. Study area and localized concerns are discussed in the Con#5 Potential to localized emissions increases/emission shifting rubric.

PM <sub>2.5</sub> Incremental Emissions (lb/day)	NO <sub>x</sub> Incremental Emissions (lb/day)	Legend
≤-5	≤-55	High Benefit
≤-5	>-55 to ≤-5	Medium Benefit
≤-5	>-5 to <5 : No change	Medium Benefit
>-0.05 to <0.05 : No change	≤-55	Medium Benefit
>-5 to ≤-0.05	≤-55	Medium Benefit
>-5 to ≤-0.05	>-55 to ≤-5	Low Benefit
>-5 to ≤-0.05	>-5 to <5 : No change	Low Benefit
>-0.05 to <0.05 : No change	>-55 to ≤-5	Low Benefit
>-0.05 to <0.05 : No change	>-5 to <5 : No change	No Benefit
≤-0.05	≥5	Mixed Benefit/Concern
≥0.05 to <5	<-5	Mixed Benefit/Concern
>-0.05 to <0.05 : No change	≥5 to <55	Low Concern
≥0.05 to <5	>-5 to <5 : No change	Low Concern
≥0.05 to <5	≥5 to <55	Low Concern
>-0.05 to <0.05 : No change	≥55	Medium Concern
≥5	>-5 to <5 : No change	Medium Concern
≥0.05 to <5	≥55	Medium Concern
≥5	≥5 to <55	Medium Concern
≥5	≥55	High Concern

**AQ2: Facilitates clean technologies & lower emissions vehicles**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Facilitates the deployment of zero emission (ZE) vehicles/equipment. Examples include but are not limited to funding clean vehicle/equipment technology purchase and zero emission fueling infrastructure.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project descriptions
- California Air Resources Board (CARB) and South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD) rule documents have information on benefits of ZE vehicles/equipment. Examples include but are not limited to rulemaking documents for the Advanced Clean Cars II (ACC II) regulation<sup>12</sup>, the Advanced Clean Trucks (ACT) regulation<sup>13</sup>, the Advanced Clean Fleet (ACF) regulation<sup>14</sup>, Warehouse Indirect Source Rule (ISR)<sup>15</sup>.

**Assumptions:**

- ACC II, ACT, and ACF are adopted and implemented per their schedule
- Need for public charging facilities and local electrical generation/storage
- Need for local trade workforce to construct and maintain new ZE fueling infrastructure and ZE vehicles/equipment
- For ZE truck/car lanes, the benefits will be limited due to the accelerated regulatory ZE purchase/implementation schedule that will result in a significant number of ZE vehicles in 2045. In addition, these lanes would not specifically target the benefits to people in the corridor, but these lanes would mostly benefit people throughout the region who already have electrical cars and trucks.

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
0 – No benefit	Project’s clean vehicle or infrastructure component is already captured by existing regulations	Potentially move to low/medium/high benefit if the project implementation is ahead of the regulatory schedule
1 – Low Benefit	<u>Example Projects:</u> ZE truck/car lanes	
2 – Medium Benefit	<u>Example Projects:</u> Workforce training, demonstration projects, grant writing assistance for ZE vehicle and/or infrastructure projects	Grant writing projects that are not coupled with electric vehicle (EV) infrastructure projects or demonstration projects downgrade to low benefit
3 – High Benefit	<u>Example Projects:</u> ZE vehicle/equipment infrastructure projects, ZEV funding projects	High benefit for difficult to electrify equipment/vehicles or greater than 5 megawatts (MW) infrastructure projects, otherwise downgrade to no benefit, low

<sup>12</sup> CARB. ACC II Regulation. August 25, 2022. Available here: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/rulemaking/2022/advanced-clean-cars-ii>. Accessed: May 2023.

<sup>13</sup> CARB. ACT Regulation. June 25, 2020. Available here: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/rulemaking/2019/advancedcleantrucks>. Accessed: May 2023

<sup>14</sup> CARB. ACF Regulation. April 28, 2023. Available here: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/rulemaking/2022/acf2022>. Accessed: May 2023.

<sup>15</sup> South Coast AQMD. Warehouse ISR. May 7, 2021. Available here: <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/reg-xxiii/r2305.pdf?sfvrsn=15>. Accessed: May 2023.

		benefit, or medium benefit (e.g. vehicles/equipment in current regulation) High benefit for public ZE vehicle infrastructure projects greater than 1 MW, downgrade to no benefit, low benefit, or medium benefit for private ZE vehicle infrastructure
NA	Projects that do not have any clean vehicle or infrastructure component and Projects that include equipment/technologies that are currently and will continue to be all zero emission, for example: Metro Light Rail projects	

**AQ3: Mode Shift to cleaner modes**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Increases the share of trips made by transit, walking and bicycling.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Quantitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- > SCAG Regional Travel Model, adapted for use in study area analysis.

**Assumptions:**

- > Projects considered in the SCAG 2020 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) are modeled as defined by the RTP.
- > BRT projects assume a 25% increase in speed and a one-half lane reduction in vehicle capacity.
- > Transit priority projects assume a 15% increase in speed and a one-quarter lane reduction in vehicle capacity.
- > Projects are ranked on a per-mile basis so that large projects are not automatically ranked higher than smaller but locally impactful projects.
- > Ranking is considered separately for rail, bus, and active transportation projects.
- > For projects that were not modeled, the results of the model were used to estimate benefits of similar projects and programs

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
0 – No benefit (vs no info)	Project does not increase transit ridership or provide improve active transportation opportunities.	
1 – Low Benefit	Project results in a slight increase in transit passengers served, generally in the lowest group of projects. Or, project has a low potential to improve non-motorized travel.	

2 – Medium Benefit	Project results in a moderate increase in transit passengers served. Or, project has a moderate potential to improve non-motorized travel.	Project LB-ELA_0164, which increases frequency of Metro buses that currently have low frequency, is scored based on the high overall ridership increase instead of on a per-mile basis.
3 – high Benefit	Project results in a high increase in transit passengers served, generally in the top 20%-30% of projects. Or, project has a high potential to improve non-motorized travel.	

## Community and Health

### **CH1: Reduce Emissions (Health Effects metrics: DPM, PM2.5)**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Reduces diesel particulate matter (DPM) and fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) emissions from on-road vehicles which in turn can generate health benefits.

**Evaluation Method Description:** (Use of one or more of the following): Travel Demand Forecasting Model (TDM) for a certain suite of projects; EMFAC Model; GIS-based project type locations or other methods for individuals project scores

#### **Data Sources Used (see AQ1 for links to sources):**

- > EMFAC Model used to calculate on-road vehicle emissions, including changes in emissions due to project implementation
- > CARB adjustment factors for recently adopted regulations: Heavy-Duty Inspection and Maintenance Program (HD I/M), Advanced Clean Cars II (ACC II), and Advanced Clean Fleets (ACF)
- > California Air Resources Board (CARB) methodology used to calculate entrained road dust
- > OFFROAD Model used to calculate off-road vehicle/equipment emissions, including changes in emissions due to project implementation
- > TDM used to model vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and speeds along analyzed roadways; used as input to EMFAC model to determine changes in emissions
- > ArcGIS map with project locations
- > South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD) Air Quality Significance Thresholds
- > South Coast AQMD Localized Significance Threshold Methodology
- > South Coast AQMD Permit Application Package “N” for Use in Conjunction with the Risk Assessment Procedures for Rules 1401, 1401.1, and 212

#### **Assumptions:**

- > Not all freeway or arterial roadway projects were included in the TDM modeling. See project information matrix.
- > According to the 2021 Metrolink Climate Action Plan<sup>10</sup>, Metrolink has a target of becoming a zero-emissions railroad by 2028. As such, this analysis assumes zero emissions from

passenger locomotive engines by 2045. Further, the proposed CARB In-Use Locomotive Regulation<sup>11</sup> requires all passenger locomotives to operate in a zero emissions configuration by 2030. Under the proposed In-Use Locomotive Regulation, by 2047, all locomotives operated by fleet operators must have 100% of annual fleet usage as zero emissions. Similar to CARB regulatory analyses, this analysis does not include the indirect emissions that may result from generation of electricity used to power these locomotives.

- > As of August 2023, CARB does not consider or calculate non-exhaust emission factors for locomotives in their locomotive models.<sup>12</sup>
- > Changes in PM<sub>2.5</sub> have been associated with mortality/illness impacts. Changes in DPM have been associated with cancer risk. For more information on health and air quality studies, see South Coast AQMD 2022 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) Appendix I: Health Effects<sup>13</sup> and South Coast AQMD Multiple Air Toxics Exposure Study V (MATES V) Final Report<sup>14</sup>.

**SCORING METHODOLOGY\***

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
0 – No benefit	Project’s measures provide no overall emission reductions If total emissions are increased, indicate concerns	
1 – Low Benefit	Total PM <sub>2.5</sub> emission reductions are less than 5 pounds per day (lbs/day) compared to future baselines <b>OR</b> Total DPM emission reductions are greater than 0 but less than 0.4 lbs/day	If total emission reductions are less than 0.1 % of study area emissions, then project should be scored as No Benefit
2 – Medium Benefit	Total PM <sub>2.5</sub> emission reductions are greater than or equal to 5 lbs/day compared to future baselines <b>OR</b> Total DPM emission reductions are greater than or equal to 0.4 lbs/day	
3 – High Benefit	Total PM <sub>2.5</sub> emission reductions are greater than 5 lbs/day compared to future baselines <b>AND</b> Total DPM emission reductions are greater than 0.4 lbs/day	
NA	Project that is not modeled by TDM or does not affect vehicle type, VMT, speed, idle time, or any other parameter affecting emissions	

\*For Freeway, Arterial Roadway, and Transit Projects

**For Active Transportation/TDM Projects**

These projects will be accounted for in AQ3. Not sufficient information/methodologies to calculate the impacts for AQ1, CH1, and EN2 therefore these projects will get a score of NA.

**For Good Movements Projects**

Most of these projects will be accounted for in AQ2. Not sufficient information/methodologies to calculate the impacts for AQ1, CH1, and EN2 therefore these projects will get a score of NA.

**For Community Programs Projects**

These projects will be accounted for in AQ2 or CH2 or EN6. Not sufficient information/methodologies to calculate the impacts for AQ1, CH1, and EN2 therefore these projects will get a score of NA.

Additional Documentation:

- Project emission inventory
- Localized impacts for freeway and arterial roadway suites of projects are provided in the gridded emissions maps with the following legend. Study area and localized concerns are discussed in the *Con#5 Potential to localized emissions increases/emission shifting* section below.

PM <sub>2.5</sub> Incremental Emissions (lb/day)	DPM Incremental Emissions (lb/day)	Legend
≤-5	≤-0.4	High Benefit
≤-5	>-0.4 to ≤-0.004	Medium Benefit
≤-5	>-0.004 to <0.004 : No change	Medium Benefit
>-0.05 to <0.05 : No change	≤-0.4	Medium Benefit
>-5 to ≤-0.05	≤-0.4	Medium Benefit
>-5 to ≤-0.05	>-0.4 to ≤-0.004	Low Benefit
>-5 to ≤-0.05	>-0.004 to <0.004 : No change	Low Benefit
>-0.05 to <0.05 : No change	>-0.4 to ≤-0.004	Low Benefit
>-0.05 to <0.05 : No change	>-0.004 to <0.004 : No change	No Benefit
≤-0.05	≥0.004	Mixed Benefit/Concern
≥0.05 to <5	<-0.004	Mixed Benefit/Concern
>-0.05 to <0.05 : No change	≥0.004 to <0.4	Low Concern
≥0.05 to <5	>-0.004 to <0.004 : No change	Low Concern
≥0.05 to <5	≥0.004 to <0.4	Low Concern
>-0.05 to <0.05 : No change	≥0.4	Medium Concern
≥5	>-0.004 to <0.004 : No change	Medium Concern
≥0.05 to <5	≥0.4	Medium Concern
≥5	≥0.004 to <0.4	Medium Concern
≥5	≥0.4	High Concern

**CH2: Reduce exposure at receptors (HVAC/HEPA, near-roadway vegetation)**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Reduces exposure at sensitive receptors (e.g. schools and day care centers, hospitals and healthcare clinics, senior centers, and residences) by installing

filtration systems at these receptors and/or installing near-roadway vegetation between major roadways and these receptors.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- > Project descriptions
- > Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC)/High Efficiency Particulate Filter (HEPA) guidance from the following source such as:
  - South Coast Air Quality Management District’s (South Coast AQMD’s) Project Plan Reducing Air Pollution Exposure in Schools and Other Facilities.<sup>16</sup>
- > Near-roadway vegetation research and or recommendations from the following sources such as:
  - U.S. Environmental protection Agency’s (EPA’s) workshop on The Role of Vegetation in Mitigating Air Quality Impacts from Traffic Emissions<sup>17</sup>
  - EPA’s Recommendations for Constructing Roadside Vegetation Barriers to Improve Near-Road Air Quality<sup>18</sup>
  - California Air Resources Board’s (CARB’s) Strategies to Reduce Air Pollution Exposure Near High-Volume Roadways<sup>19</sup>
- > ArcGIS map with project locations and locations of Equity-Focus Community (EFC) areas
  - ArcGIS map of sensitive receptors (e.g. schools and day care centers, hospitals and healthcare clinics, senior centers, residences) developed from the following sources such as:
    - Locations of day care centers, child care centers, adult residential facilities, and senior centers from the Community Care Licensing Division website
    - Location of health care centers from the State of California Office of Statewide Health Planning & Development website, the Los Angeles County GIS Data Portal, and the Network of Care for Mental/Behavioral Health website
    - School locations in the form of point place markers from the GIS data file provided by ESRI for ArcGIS, data from the Los Angeles County GIS Data Portal, and from Google Earth

<sup>16</sup> South Coast AQMD. *Project Plan Reducing Air Pollution Exposure in Schools and Other Facilities*. March 2022. Available at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/tao-capp-incentives/ab617---school-air-filtration-project-plan.pdf>. Accessed May 2023.

<sup>17</sup> EPA *The Role of Vegetation in Mitigating Air Quality Impacts from Traffic Emissions Seminar*, EPA Campus, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, April 27-28, 2010. Available at: <https://archive.epa.gov/nrmrl/archive-appcd/web/html/workshop.html>. Accessed May 2023.

<sup>18</sup> EPA. “Recommendations for Constructing Roadside Vegetation Barriers to Improve Near-Road Air Quality”. July 2016. Available at: <https://www.epa.gov/air-research/recommendations-constructing-roadside-vegetation-barriers-improve-near-road-air>

<sup>19</sup> CARB. “Strategies to Reduce Air Pollution Exposure Near High-Volume Roadways”. April 2017. Available at: [https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2017-10/rd\\_technical\\_advisory\\_final.pdf](https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2017-10/rd_technical_advisory_final.pdf)



- Location of nursing and convalescent centers from the Medicare website

**Assumptions:**

- > Not all projects will be able to use near-road vegetation because there are constraints for planting vegetation that are related to safety, availability of water, and fires
- > Near roadway vegetation must meet certain criteria to be considered effective at reducing particulate matter (PM)
- > HVAC/HEPA systems must meet certain design criteria to be considered effective at reducing PM

**SCORING METHODOLOGY:**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
0 – No benefit	Project’s specific design features unlikely to provide any benefit. For example, project does not include filters or vegetation. Additionally, project that have these features but filters efficiency is lower than Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) 13 or vegetation barriers are not close enough to traffic or not dense enough to reduce PM emissions.	
1 – Low Benefit	<u>Example Projects:</u> High-efficiency air filters on bus and rail transit vehicles [small time fraction in travel, is used by sensitive population (children, ill, and seniors)], soundwalls that meet specific design criteria	If the soundwall does not meet specific design criteria [distance from roadway, traffic level on roadway, barrier design and composition, and length] downgrade rating
2 – Medium Benefit	<u>Example Projects:</u> Roadway vegetation barriers	If the roadway vegetation barrier does not meet specific design criteria [distance from roadway, traffic level on roadway, density of vegetation, type of vegetation, and length] downgrade rating
3 – High Benefit	<u>Example Projects:</u> Air filters of MERV 13 or higher efficiency coupled with HVAC upgrades as needed	If the air filtration does not reduce exposure for large groups of people and/or highly sensitive population (children, ill, and seniors) downgrade rating
NA	Projects do not physically modify the roadway design. For example, signal coordination, TDM, and funding opportunities for zero emissions infrastructure and vehicles	The following project types will also receive a score of a NA: Bike lanes [no on-road vehicle emissions] Bridges [above grade no opportunity for vegetation] Local roadway interchange improvements [no opportunity for vegetation]

**CH3: Mode Shift to active transportation, transit**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Increases the share of trips made by transit, walking and bicycling.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Quantitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- > SCAG Regional Travel Model, adapted for use in study area analysis.

**Assumptions:**

- > Projects considered in the SCAG 2020 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) are modeled as defined by the RTP.
- > BRT projects assume a 25% increase in speed and a one-half lane reduction in vehicle capacity.
- > Transit priority projects assume a 15% increase in speed and a one-quarter lane reduction in vehicle capacity.
- > Projects are ranked on a per-mile basis so that large projects are not automatically ranked higher than smaller but locally impactful projects.
- > Ranking is considered separately for rail, bus, and active transportation projects.
- > For projects that were not modeled, the results of the model were used to estimate benefits of similar projects and programs

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
0 – No benefit (vs no info)	Project does not increase transit ridership or provide improve active transportation opportunities.	
1 – Low Benefit	Project results in a slight increase in transit passengers served, generally in the lowest group of projects. Or, project has a low potential to improve non-motorized travel.	
2 – Medium Benefit	Project results in a moderate increase in transit passengers served. Or, project has a moderate potential to improve non-motorized travel.	Project LB-ELA_0164, which increases frequency of Metro buses that currently have low frequency, is scored based on the high overall ridership increase instead of on a per-mile basis.
3 – high Benefit	Project results in a high increase in transit passengers served, generally in the top 20%-30% of projects. Or, project has a high potential to improve non-motorized travel.	

**CH4: Improve the User Experience (may be different metrics for different modes)**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Provides intuitive roadway network for all users, includes gap closures, exclusive pathways for active transportation, provision of wayfinding, access to information regarding directions or transportation options, includes technological solutions that make travel information including directions and modal options more available to the user.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- Assessment of project’s impact on user experience based on project materials and professional judgement – see project materials

**Assumptions:**

- The “user” is generally assumed to be a member of the public.
- Project score better when they specifically address a multimodal context and enhancing the experience in some way for sustainable transportation options thus benefitting the greater good.
- Improves experience of targeted user group and targeted travel mode of the improvement
- User experience of all roadway users considered. For example, if one mode benefits at the expense of other more sustainable modes, user experience of all modes is considered.
- Also depends on area land uses. For example, pedestrian projects where there are places to walk (such as businesses) will score better than projects without any public destinations.
- Evaluation looks at how the system functions as a whole – longer bike routes benefit the network more than shorter bike routes (for example)
- Individual connections within the bike network are important but rank lower without significant jobs, housing or other attractors/generators (ex: Randolph rail to trail in Bell).
- Because this criterion is specific to the assumed user experience, its rating can be subjective based on the perceived benefit of the project as it is described in the materials.

**Scoring Methodology:**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
0 – No benefit	<p>Projects that attempt to address users but may not be the appropriate solution                      Project replaces or rehabilitates existing infrastructure without indicating any changes to design that improve experience for existing or new user groups</p>	
1 – Low Benefit	<p>Fewer users may benefit due to the location or configuration of the improvement. Benefit may have a small impact on individual user experience</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Active Transportation: Minor improvements that facilitate safer navigation of vehicle-oriented roadways</li> <li>&gt; Arterial Roadway: Localized spot improvements in low-traffic locations; traffic system and intersection improvements that primarily benefit vehicle users</li> </ul>	<p>Benefits to freeway and electric vehicle users (other than increasing traffic speed) because investment should be focus on promoting alternatives to driving for most users                      Spot-level roadway improvements (examples: Greenway Traffic Circle, or Telegraph Road Improvements) appear they would not benefit many users due to location and configuration of the project                      Traffic signal projects, intersection and roadway improvements (such as adding turn lanes or widening) only benefit car drivers (and speeds them up on city roads) unless project specifically states that they will benefit other modes.                      Maintenance and rehabilitation projects are assumed to have low impact since system is unchanged                      Video cameras for enforcement (red light running) are assumed to have low impact on the user experience                      Pedestrian activation buttons because they prioritize auto throughput and require pedestrians to request the ability to cross the street rather than that being an entitlement                      Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFB) are a suitable treatment for some locations.</p>
2 – Medium Benefit	<p>Benefit appears moderate, or somewhat but not significant, or does not appear to be the right match for the area land uses (eg, industrial land use context)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Active Transportation: Localized scale, low level of change in infrastructure (no major roadway reconfiguration)</li> <li>&gt; Arterial Roadway: Includes benefits for all modes; does not increase vehicle volume or speed near areas of high pedestrian activity</li> </ul>	<p>Pedestrian improvements on local/collector streets near schools are assumed to have a medium impact                      Ped/bike projects such as Class 2/3 facilities or education programs / program-only solutions                      Interchange improvements for all modes that are NOT near a commercial area, where people are likely to be mostly driving                      Creating a vehicle for economic benefit such as jobs fairs is assumed to provide</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Transit: Includes new or upgraded amenities</li> <li>&gt; Various Programs: Contributes to improved air quality</li> </ul>	<p>a moderate benefit to job seekers and employers</p> <p>Clean truck program and other individual programs that provide air quality benefits for the surrounding community.</p>
3 – High Benefit	<p>Provides a clear benefit for more than one modal user of the roadway, or at least does not make conditions worse for other users, in a location where multiple types of modal users are likely to be present. Projects that improve conditions for sustainable transportation modes where there demand based on land uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Active Transportation: strong 1<sup>st</sup> / last mile connections to major transit hubs, longer / regionally significant class 1 or 4 bikeways, citywide / plan level bike/ped improvements, strongly beneficial projects in areas with mixed land uses</li> <li>&gt; Arterial Roadway: roadway improvements that strongly benefit all users of the roadway such as complete streets projects in mixed-land-use areas, citywide or area traffic calming</li> <li>&gt; Freeway: if the program benefits freeway users without negative impacting other members of the public</li> <li>&gt; Transit: Major transit infrastructure such as LRT expansions, BRT projects, microtransit programs, systemwide bus stop improvements</li> <li>&gt; Various Programs: promoting telecommuting with local employers; greening initiatives, public art, and homeless programs</li> </ul>	<p>Larger scale projects that benefit sustainable modes such as study area wide traffic calming or bus stop safety and amenity programs</p> <p>Interchange improvements for all modes that are near a commercial area where people are likely to be using various modes</p> <p>All class I or IV bike lane implementations are assumed to have a high benefits to the users of those facilities.</p> <p>Gap closures for active modes</p> <p>Economic programs such as local hire and support for local small businesses are assumed to have a high benefit to their recipients (or “users”)</p> <p>Any project that includes upgrade for ADA accessibility</p> <p>Most public transit improvements (such as better buses, improved reliability on LRT, signal priority), have a positive but not necessarily a “high” benefit to the community of transit users.</p>
NA	No clear impact on public users	<p>Projects that are a “study” or creation of a “plan” are assumed to have no impact on the user (yet)</p> <p>Projects that are internal to the port, and do not directly impact the general public users of the roadway network or AQ impacts</p> <p>Maintenance station projects, pump plant projects are not assumed to impact the using public</p>

**CH5: Bike/Ped Access to parks, recreational areas, or open spaces**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Provides new or upgraded bike/ped facilities that connect with parks, recreational areas, or open spaces. For the purposes of this analysis, this is defined as within ¼ mile of a recreational space.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative in its assessment of the impact of the project on active transportation. Then quantitative if the project is within ¼ mile of recreational space.

**Data Sources Used:**

- Qualitative assessment (professional judgement based on knowledge of the research and transportation conditions) of the impact of a project on conditions for active transportation users (e.g., bike lanes or paths improve conditions for active transportation users, road widening and increasing traffic speeds reduce the quality of the conditions for the active transportation user)
- Quantitative assessment of the distance between the project and the nearest recreational space using google maps directions

**Assumptions:**

- This metric is binary:
  - Either the project provides access to parks etc. or it does not.
    - Note – the LA River path is proximate to most of the corridor, so it is treated differently in the rubric below
  - Either it is an active transportation project or it is not
    - Active transportation projects were evaluated based on the level of benefit they are likely to offer to bicyclists and pedestrians:
      - Insignificant benefit – localized crosswalks, small-scale pedestrian improvements
      - Minor projects – such as class 2 bike lanes, bike/ped undercrossing and bridges
      - Major projects – class 1 and 4 bike and pedestrian paths, corridor or city wide safety and/or bike/ped improvements

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
0 – No benefit	Projects which would likely have a negative impact on active transportation and are within ¼ mile of a recreational space Any roadway design projects that don't incorporate active transportation infrastructure due to missed opportunity to improve access.	
1 – Low Benefit	Improvement considered to be insufficient to provide improved safe conditions for active transportation user and are within ¼ mile of a recreational space (example: push button crossing, RRFB) Projects that introduce minor benefits to the bike/ped network but aren't within ¼-mile of a recreational space.	Exception is the micromobility and bikeshare projects (LB-ELA_0220 and LB-ELA_0200) which have a very large, spread out service area which may not be successful in providing enough equipment to serve the community
2 – Medium Benefit	Projects that will benefit the ped/bike network but only serve the Los Angeles River (and I-710) and NOT near any other parks Projects that introduce major benefits to the bike/ped network but aren't within ¼-mile of a recreational space.	
3 – High Benefit	Projects that provide significant benefit and are within ¼ mile of LA River or parks / recreational areas	
NA	Applies to most non-active transportation projects, including rehabilitation projects, with the exception of general arterial projects	

## Mobility

### **MB1: Transit Ridership**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Increases transit ridership by shifting trips to transit from other modes.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Quantitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- > SCAG Regional Travel Model, adapted for use in study area analysis.

**Assumptions:**

- > Projects considered in the SCAG 2020 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) are modeled as defined by the RTP.
- > Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) projects assume a 25% increase in speed and a one-half lane reduction in auto capacity.

- > Transit priority projects assume a 15% increase in speed and a one-quarter lane reduction in auto capacity.
- > For projects that were not modeled, the results of the model were used to estimate benefits of similar projects and programs

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
NA – Not Applicable	Project does not relate to transit mode.	
1 – Low Benefit	Project results in a slight increase in transit passenger miles traveled per project mile, generally in the lowest group of projects. Ranking is considered separately for rail and bus projects.	
2 – Medium Benefit	Project results in a moderate increase in transit passenger miles traveled per project mile.	
3 – high Benefit	Project results in a high increase in transit passenger miles traveled per project mile, generally in the top 20%-30% of projects. Ranking is considered separately for rail and bus projects.	Project LB-ELA_0164, which increases frequency of Metro busses that currently have low frequency, is scored based on the high overall ridership increase instead of on a per-mile basis.

**MB2: Speeds / Travel Times (people, goods)**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Increase roadway speeds (or reduce travel times) for people and goods.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Quantitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- > SCAG Regional Travel Model, adapted for use in study area analysis.

**Assumptions:**

- > Projects considered in the SCAG 2020 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) are modeled as defined by the RTP.
- > Interchanges, auxiliary lanes, and truck lanes along I-710 were modeled using assumptions consistent with past studies.
- > Projects that improve arterial street operations without adding lanes were modeled by increasing speed and capacity in a manner consistent with SCAG modeling practices.
- > Project rankings consider project length so that large projects are not automatically ranked higher than smaller but locally impactful projects.



- > For projects that were not modeled, the results of the model were used to estimate benefits of similar projects and programs

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
NA – Not applicable	Project does not impact travel times because it is non-mobility related or active transportation.	
0 – No benefit	Project does not reduce travel times and/or may increase travel times.	
1 – Low Benefit	Project results in a slight reduction in travel times based on a weighted combination of passenger miles traveled, severity of congestion under no-build conditions, and reduction in delay for people and goods.	Interchanges were ranked based on the number of vehicles served, as this high-level analysis does not compare the effectiveness of detailed interchange designs.
2 – Medium Benefit	Project results in a moderate reduction in travel times based on a weighted combination of passenger miles traveled, severity of congestion under no-build conditions, and reduction in delay for people and goods.	
3 – high Benefit	Project results in a significant reduction in travel delay based on a weighted combination of passenger miles traveled, severity of congestion under no-build conditions, and reduction in delay for people and goods.	

**MB3: Reduce Congestion (hours of delay for people & goods)**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Reduce hours of delay for people and goods.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Quantitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- > SCAG Regional Travel Model, adapted for use in study area analysis.

**Assumptions:**

- > Projects considered in the SCAG 2020 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) are modeled as defined by the RTP.
- > Interchanges, auxiliary lanes, and truck lanes along I-710 were modeled using assumptions consistent with past studies.
- > Projects that improve arterial street operations without adding lanes were modeled by increasing auto speed and capacity in a manner consistent with SCAG modeling practices.
- > For projects that were not modeled, the results of the model were used to estimate benefits of similar projects and programs

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
NA – Not applicable	Project does not impact travel delay because it is non-mobility related or active transportation.	
0 – No benefit	Project does not reduce delay and/or may increase travel delay.	
1 – Low Benefit	Project results in a slight reduction in travel delay. Projects are ranked based on a weighted combination of passenger miles traveled, severity of congestion under no-build conditions, and reduction in auto and truck delay.	Interchanges were ranked based on the number of vehicles served, as this high-level analysis does not compare the effectiveness of detailed interchange design details.
2 – Medium Benefit	Project results in a moderate reduction in travel delay. Projects are ranked based on a weighted combination of passenger miles traveled, severity of congestion under no-build conditions, and reduction in auto and truck delay.	
3 – high Benefit	Project results in a significant reduction in travel delay. Projects are ranked based on a weighted combination of passenger miles traveled, severity of congestion under no-build conditions, and reduction in auto and truck delay.	

**MB4: Modal Accessibility (by zone)**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Improves access to new transportation facilities for residents. Quantifies the population benefiting from the improvement based on a ¼ mile distance from the new transportation facility.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Quantitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- > Project descriptions/type
- > Project location using GIS
- > 2020 Census data for population by Census Block Group

**Assumptions:**

- > The scale of the project (localized, semi-localized, corridor-wide) was used in the evaluation of each project (see common definitions section above for definition of project scales)
- > Projects were identified as a “new transportation facility” – see the applicability based on sub classification in Appendix A.

**Scoring Methodology:**

- > A ¼ mile buffer was created around all projects

- > The population within the buffer was calculated using 2020 census data and the assumption of uniform density throughout the block group
- > Projects were scored based on the total population in the buffer
- > Programs were evaluated based on the scale of the program

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No benefit	There are no “No Benefit” for this metric
1 – Low Benefit	Project provides new access for: 1-19,999 people in ¼ buffer Or: A program that is localized
2 – Medium Benefit	Project provides new access for: 20,000-79,999 people in ¼ buffer Or: A program that is “semi-localized”
3 – High Benefit	Project provides new access for: >=80,000 people in ¼ buffer Or: A program that is “Corridor-wide”
NA	Project or program does not provide new transportation facilities

**MB5: Reliability (transit, roadway, goods movement)**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Improves transportation travel time reliability, providing consistent range of predictable travel times across all modes. Reliability is improved by optimizing existing transportation systems and expanding travel capacity and reducing travel delay. Examples of things that improve reliability include: improving safety (reducing crashes/unexpected delay), signal timing, transit signal priority, dedicated transit lanes, separate facilities for active modes, transportation demand management, and dynamic road user charges.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project descriptions and project location

**Assumptions:**

- Projects received scores based on their type, subtype, and additional sub-classification (see Appendix A). Project descriptions were used to make adjustments to the sub-classification scores if projects contain additional reliability features.

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
0 – No benefit	Project is likely to maintain existing reliability or decrease system reliability. There are no projects that fall into this category	
1 – Low Benefit	<u>Example Projects:</u> Projects that provide small or temporary improvements to reliability, such as street widening, pilot projects, housing/jobs projects, localized spot improvements to connectivity, or maintenance projects that would mitigate system failures in case of emergency (bridge rehab, stormwater improvements)	
2 – Medium Benefit	<u>Example Projects:</u> Projects that provide medium levels of reliability improvement potential, upgrades to infrastructure/technology that could be used to improve reliability (i.e. new signals, fiber upgrades, safety projects.	If complete streets projects have a major safety improvement, they can receive a medium benefit
3 – High Benefit	<u>Example Projects:</u> Projects whose sole purpose is to improve reliability, such as signal synchronization, bike network gap closures, transit signal prioritization, and separate facilities	Active Transportation projects that just enhance existing infrastructure vs filling in gaps are scored a 2
NA	Projects that will not reduce reliability and have little opportunity to improve it such as emission reduction program or ZE transition.	

**MB6: Gap Closures**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Addresses a gap in the transportation network or removes a transportation barrier, by providing a new service or new transportation facility

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project descriptions and project location

**Assumptions:**

- Projects received scores based on their project descriptions. Projects described as new facilities (ie. ‘construct,’ ‘implement,’ ‘build’ ‘add’) were considered to be net new gap closures and scored a 3, while ‘enhance’ ‘improve’ and ‘upgrade’ were scored as 1. Project types were used to screen out project types that would not have any impact on gap closures, for example, zero emission improvements. Anything that upgraded an existing facility to be ADA compliant received a 2.
- Applied scores to all projects based on the sub classification scores (Appendix A) and then adjusted rating based on details of the project description.

**SCORING METHDOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
0 – No benefit	Project is likely to increase gaps in the transportation system	
1 – Low Benefit	Infrastructure Project enhances safety/accessibility to allow more people to use a segment of the transportation system comfortably (For example, upgrading an unprotected bike lane to a buffered bike lane, or adding in curb cuts)	Project that is enhancing/updating a facility to be ADA compliant gets bumped up to a 2
2 – Medium Benefit	Project that provides a new service or expands an existing transportation service option.	
3 – High Benefit	Infrastructure Projects closes a physical gap in the transportation network or extends an existing network to a new place	
NA	Projects that will not reduce or improve transportation network gaps, including non-infrastructure projects and those that do not add new infrastructure.	

**MB7: Increase in travel options**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Makes a range of (sustainable, non-SOV) transportation options more realistic for likely user trips

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:** Project descriptions

**Assumptions:**

- Projects are scored based on their relative benefit to people who may consider using one or more sustainable transportation options instead of driving alone. Benefits are quantified based on aggregating independent standards listed:
  - Geographic scale – corridors or areas will score better than spot improvements, larger projects better than smaller projects (+/-1)
  - Level of impact – better improvements (eg class 1 or 4 bike facilities) score better than lower impact improvements (class 2 or 3). New light rail service will score better than bus stop improvements. (+/-1)
  - Multimodal – if a project benefits more than one sustainable modal option, it will score better than a project that only benefits one sustainable mode (+/-1 per additional mode)

- Land use – projects in areas where people are, and with a combination of commercial and residential land uses, will score better than projects with just one land use, especially if that is industrial. (+/-1)
- Type of improvement – infrastructure scores better than programmatic and marketing improvements (+/-1)

**By travel mode:**

- Non-driving modes
  - Investments include improvements to transit, bicycle or pedestrian networks
- Reliability
  - Transit features that are known to prevent delays / increase headways
  - Active transportation features are Class 1 or 4 bike facilities (separated or shared use paths)
  - Although reliability is typically used to quantitatively measure transit and vehicular trips, for the purpose of active transportation and bicycles in particular, we consider direct routes that are comfortable for cyclists as reliable. Since this criteria is qualitative for projects/programs where trip origins and destinations are not evaluated, the class of bike facilities is used as a proxy for comfort.
- Accessibility
  - Features are known to improve safety for people with disabilities, the elderly or children
  - Protected bicycle lanes meet standards for All Ages and Abilities (AAA)

**Other notes:**

- Signal timing, unless for public transit, prioritizes automobile through-put, and speeds up cars. Slowing down traffic fosters better harmony with other users of the roadway.
- Area land uses play an important role. If there are places to go (eg shops) within a reasonable walking distance of the improvement, the multimodal improvement has a stronger impact on increasing travel options. Complete streets projects that benefit less from MB7 might be because there is not significant non-automobile centric attractions along the corridor such as retail and shops.
- Improvements in reliability and availability (frequency, coverage) of public transit and active transportation options benefit travel options.

**SCORING METHODOLOGY:**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No benefit	<p>Disbenefits include project/program features known to add delays for sustainable travel modes or that increase the speed of automobile traffic fostering an incentive to continue to use only that one travel mode. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Traffic signal upgrades because they are an investment in automobiles rather than multimodal. They effectively speed up traffic which reduces the roadway safety for other modes (exception is if the timing change is for transit or bikes).</li> <li>&gt; Road widening, or adding turn lanes, projects or any project that prioritizes speeding up traffic or improving traffic through-put.</li> <li>&gt; Freeway amenities unless they include upgrades that benefit other modes</li> </ul>
1 – Low Benefit	<p>Single-location (spot-level) multimodal improvements that are not in locations well served by mixed area land uses. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Interchange improvements for all modes that are NOT near a commercial area (where people are likely to be mostly driving)</li> <li>&gt; Roadway improvements for pedestrians and bicyclists that may not be the right application for the need. Examples include RRFBs, pedestrian buttons, signage, and electrical infrastructure, bike share program which are not likely to be the best solution for the context.</li> <li>&gt; Projects that represent an improvement but are also potentially duplicative of existing infrastructure.</li> <li>&gt; Marketing programs such as BEST, ridesharing, telecommuting likely have a low benefit on travel options without companion infrastructure improvements (which would be shown as a separate project).</li> <li>&gt; Restriping programs, and other non-specific roadway improvements, have a low benefit on travel options by making it slightly safer to share the road between modes.</li> </ul>
2 – Medium Benefit	<p>Moderate level of encouragement for one sustainable transportation mode. Examples include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Class 2 or 3 bicycle facilities</li> <li>&gt; Spot-level encouragement for multiple transportation modes. Examples include interchange improvements for all modes that are near a commercial area where people are likely to be using different modes</li> <li>&gt; Corridor-level encouragement for multiple modes but not necessarily in the most efficient location. Examples include: complete streets projects in areas were there is not a strong diversity of land uses</li> <li>&gt; Roadway (pavement) maintenance makes it possible for bicycle commuters to ride safely (vs. on broken up pavement).</li> <li>&gt; Bus stop and shelter improvement programs at the zonal or corridor level (not just one bus stop).</li> </ul>
3 – High Benefit	<p>High level of service and encouragement for at least one sustainable transportation mode. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Class 1 or 4 bicycle facilities and new or improved high-quality public transit.</li> <li>&gt; Infrastructure that fosters multiple sustainable transportation modes together. Examples include: complete streets in areas where there is existing mixed use development.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Sustainable transportation and multimodal project that cover larger geographic areas such as mixed use corridors or areas targeted for high quality improvements.</li> <li>&gt; Transit-Oriented Development (TOD)</li> </ul>
NA	<p>Projects that do not impact individual travel modes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Video camera installation</li> <li>&gt; Emergency vehicle preemption</li> <li>&gt; Community / Air quality / community health</li> <li>&gt; Community / environment projects</li> <li>&gt; Housing Stabilization / Land Use except when specific to TOD</li> <li>&gt; Congestion pricing provides discouragement for driving but does not assist with providing new options on its own.</li> <li>&gt; Zero Emissions Lanes on I-710</li> <li>&gt; Freight Rail / Goods Movement TDM</li> <li>&gt; Port projects unless they specific include improvements for sustainable transportation modes for individuals</li> <li>&gt; Converting bus fleets to sustainable fuel</li> <li>&gt; Metro railyard and infrastructure improvements</li> </ul>

## Safety

### SF1: Protections for Bike / Users (bike class)

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Provides exclusive and separated pathways for bikes

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative, binary based on project descriptions

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project descriptions
- Google maps for view of current roadway conditions

### SCORING METHODOLOGY



Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
0 – No benefit	Roadway improvements for traffic that do not include protections for bikes	General beautification and safety improvements may not apply, and we categorized as “NA”
1 – Low Benefit	Class 3 bike facilities	Wide curb lanes only
2 – Medium Benefit	Class 2 bike facilities	Projects that include both class 2 and 3 but also include other multimodal design features such as traffic calming
3 – High Benefit	Class 1 or 4 facilities Citywide or long corridor (5+ miles) bicycle plans are assumed to provide an integrated improvement in benefits for bicycle protections.	Projects that include enhancements for bike paths such as improved lighting or fences Pedestrian bridges are assumed to provide access for bikes
Na	Projects that do not include any roadway or pathway changes or reconfigurations	Applies to most traffic signal and ITS projects Bikeshare project does not include any bicycle protections though it does include other physical improvements for bike riders

**SF2: Traffic Protections (bike/ped)**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Provides new or upgraded separation between bikes/peds and automobile traffic

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative, binary by project

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project descriptions

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
0 – No benefit	Road widening or other modification in favor of automobile throughput without the addition of protections for active modes	
1 – Low Benefit	Projects that provide a low level of improvement for pedestrians – see examples	Generally “intersection improvements” are assumed to have some (low) benefit for pedestrian safety including pedestrian crossings such as “pedestrian buttons, signage, and electrical infrastructure” Restriping alone provides a low level of protections for bikes/peds Undefined “safety” related roadway improvements
2 – Medium Benefit	Projects with a “medium benefit” are generally projects that provide a good protection but will only benefit a relatively small number of people given surrounding land uses	Sidewalk widening and crossing improvements where there is not commercial destinations to draw pedestrians
3 – High Benefit	Physical separation for bicycles and pedestrians such as exclusive paths, widening sidewalks and providing significant crossing improvements in commercial areas	Sidewalk widening and curb extensions provide protections for pedestrians Projects that specifically bring a location into compliance with ADA for pedestrians
Na	Projects that do not impact pedestrian or bicycle conditions	Protected left turn lanes do not impact pedestrian or bicycle protections Applies to most traffic signal and ITS projects

**SF3: Personal Security**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Provides features and/or services to protect individual users from crime and personal harm

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative and binary

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project Descriptions

**Assumptions:**

- High Capacity Transit (Rail & BRT) – Metro’s new transit line stations are assumed/known to have safety features such as lighting and security cameras
- Improved maintenance programs are assumed to provide some increase sense of personal security
- Bus Shelters are assumed to include lighting
- Improved transit headways and reliability minimizes time spent waiting at transit stops for transfer passengers or from transit delays

- Transit oriented development projects put more transit riders closer to transit and have more pedestrian activity improving safety for users
- Video cameras are assumed to provide some surveillance and resulting personal security benefit
- Upgrades to existing light is assumed to provide low personal security benefit

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No benefit	Projects that do not directly mention providing personal security features in categories where other projects specifically mention personal security features
1 – Low Benefit	Examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Upgrades to existing lighting</li> <li>&gt; “Highway lighting” and “highway cameras” likely have a low impact</li> <li>&gt; Programs that include improved maintenance provide a low level of additional personal security</li> <li>&gt; Arterial roadway cameras may provide some surveillance benefit improving personal security after the fact.</li> </ul>
2 – Medium Benefit	Smaller size or lower scale projects – such as lighting locations at a single point rather than a corridor, lighting projects in areas with very low pedestrian traffic due to surrounding land uses. Other examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; High Capacity Transit (Rail &amp; BRT) – new transit lines</li> <li>&gt; Bus shelters typically include lighting which would benefit personal security.</li> <li>&gt; Improved bus transit reliability and frequency reduces time waiting at bus stops for transfers or from service delays.</li> <li>&gt; Housing stabilization and other economic stabilization programs</li> <li>&gt; Transit oriented development projects and programs</li> </ul>
3 – High Benefit	Projects with a specific personal security benefit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Lighting projects along corridors or areas</li> <li>&gt; Personal security projects</li> <li>&gt; Projects that contain specific reference to “personal safety”, “security”, and “lighting”</li> </ul>
Na	Categories where personal security features are not mentioned for any projects. These included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Zero Emission Lanes</li> <li>&gt; Freight Rail / Goods Movement Projects</li> <li>&gt; Truck Programs/ITS</li> <li>&gt; Job training</li> </ul>

**SF4: Includes Safety Features**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Safety from automobile collisions primarily for other modes using the roadway; includes roadway safety for truck use, but not Metro rail safety unless it is interacting with roadway users in the project.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative and binary

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project descriptions

**Assumptions:**

- Project descriptions are assumed to be an accurate reflection of if they address safety
- Professional judgement used when a project does not specifically mention safety, but likely does contain safety features, or if the safety mentioned is actually personal security

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
0 – No benefit	Any physical project that does not address the safety of users	
1 – Low Benefit	Not used for this metric	
2 – Medium Benefit	Not used for this metric	
3 – High Benefit	If the project says it is a safety improvement project, we assumed it was. There was not enough information to distinguish between the effectiveness of each “safety” project	We did distinguish between “safety” projects (from collisions and road user conflict) and “security” projects (crime, theft, assault) though the words are sometimes used interchangeably. This metric is about “safety” as described in the previous sentence. Changeable message signs provide the opportunity to convey safety-related messages
NA	A program or project that does not have a physical component, or where multiple modes will not interact with each other (such as a recreational multi-use pathway)	Traffic signal projects are generally not specific to safety

**SF5: Reducing conflict points (vehicle safety)**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Reduces the number and severity of conflict points between vehicles traveling on highways and roadways to improve vehicle safety. This metric focuses on vehicle vs. vehicle safety and does not address any interactions of vehicles with active transportation modes such as bicycles or pedestrians.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- Analysis of I-710 vehicle conflict locations as part of the assessment of Early Action Projects
- FHWA Complete Streets web site<sup>20</sup>

**Assumptions:**

- Focuses on projects that specifically address auto vehicle movements. Projects that do not specifically address auto/truck movements are assumed to not have an impact on vehicle conflicts
- Addresses vehicle to vehicle interactions and does not consider interactions between auto and truck vehicles and other users of the roadway such as pedestrians or bicycles.
- Ranking is based on the number of vehicles impacted by the improvement as described below. This is based on ADT of the roadways and number of roadways or intersections included in the project.

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
N/A	Projects that do not affect motorized vehicle operations	
0 – No benefit	Roadway infrastructure or traffic operational Projects that don’t reduce vehicle conflict points	
1 – Low Benefit	Has localized spot reduction in vehicle/vehicle-conflicts (e.g., between 1-5 intersections with traffic signal improvements or adding signal controlled turn lanes)	
2 – Medium Benefit	Has arterial corridor reduction in vehicle/ vehicle conflicts for facilities with 20,000+ ADT and more than 5+ signalized intersections or adding signal controlled turn lanes. Arterial/freeway interchange improvements with 1-3 existing merge/weave conflict that project improves through revised design	Applies to complete streets corridors with more than 5 signalized intersections Applies to arterial/freeway interchange improvements (those with 1-3 existing merge/weave conflicts that project improves through revised design
3 – High Benefit	Has reduction in vehicle/vehicle conflict locations for facilities with 75,000+ ADT	Applies to arterial/freeway interchange improvements (those with 4 or more existing merge/weave conflicts that project improves through revised design, e.g. DDI interchange Improves mainline weave/merge by addition of auxiliary lanes

<sup>20</sup> <https://highways.dot.gov/complete-streets>

**SF6: Traffic Calming Features**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Has the effect of slowing down automobile traffic

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:** Project descriptions

**Assumptions:**

- Must impact city streets and interaction with traffic (rather than interstate only) – if no impact, then project is “NA”

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No benefit	<p>Projects that reduce delay or improve flow. Any project that speeds up cars has does not provide traffic calming benefits.</p> <p>Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Signal upgrades, synchronization and enhancements because the assumption is they are aimed at speeding up cars rather than calming traffic (unless they specifically say they would be timed for bikes),</li> <li>&gt; Arterial improvements</li> <li>&gt; Interchange reconfigurations</li> <li>&gt; Protected turn lanes</li> <li>&gt; Transit grade separation</li> <li>&gt; ITS for congestion</li> </ul>
1 – Low Benefit	<p>Low benefit examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; RRFBs generally not considered an ideal application for calming traffic flows</li> <li>&gt; Roadway improvements surrounding the bike share system are likely to have a low benefit to traffic calming</li> <li>&gt; “LB-ELA Corridor Vulnerable Road User Connected Vehicle Infrastructure Deployment”(LB-ELA_0166) appears to support all users of the roadway but there isn’t any indication that it would slow traffic significantly.</li> <li>&gt; Bus stop amenities such as shelters, benches and lighting – constitute pedestrian amenities but are limited in geographic scope</li> </ul>

<p>2 – Medium Benefit</p>	<p>Medium benefit examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; BRT and transit-oriented roadway improvements, including addition transit-priority lanes (without additional lanes for car traffic) and transit signal priority and including route-level, have a traffic calming impact.</li> <li>&gt; Projects adding sidewalks and class 3 bike lanes are assumed to have a medium traffic calming affect</li> <li>&gt; Roadway improvements for pedestrian circulation</li> <li>&gt; School zone striping</li> <li>&gt; Urban greening</li> <li>&gt; Bike/Ped adaptation for traffic signals</li> <li>&gt; Adding bike lanes</li> <li>&gt; Intersection improvements for pedestrians at a single location</li> <li>&gt; Bringing roadways into compliance with ADA without other, companion pedestrian upgrades</li> <li>&gt; Public art projects are assumed to provide street-level interest having the effect of drivers slowing down and improving street safety for pedestrians</li> </ul>
<p>3 – High Benefit</p>	<p>High benefit projects include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Widening sidewalks and curb extensions</li> <li>&gt; Implementing the regionally-significant bike network plans, active transportation plans, bicycle gap closer projects</li> <li>&gt; Traffic lane reductions</li> <li>&gt; Complete Streets projects regardless of length or land uses because complete streets will “calm” traffic by definition</li> <li>&gt; Corridor level bike/ped/safety projects including intersection improvements (example: LB-ELA_0126)</li> <li>&gt; 1<sup>st</sup>/last mile transit improvement projects at for the entire transit line</li> <li>&gt; Citywide, zonal and study-area-wide bike/ped improvements and gap closures – implementation of citywide pedestrian plans</li> </ul>
<p>NA</p>	<p>The following project categories are considered to be “not applicable” to the traffic calming metric:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Camera enforcement (when not combined with other signal improvements because impact is after the speeding may have occurred)</li> <li>&gt; Increasing truck traffic speed in the highway because does not impact city streets</li> <li>&gt; Pedestrian bridges do not slow traffic because it does not interface with cars/trucks</li> <li>&gt; Exclusive ped/bike pathways that do not interact with traffic would not have a traffic calming impact</li> <li>&gt; Freeway and Goods movement improvements that do not interact with city streets</li> <li>&gt; Ports projects</li> <li>&gt; Rail line projects</li> <li>&gt; Storm water management</li> <li>&gt; Congestion Pricing</li> </ul>

**SF7: Improves / rehabilitates existing infrastructure**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Contains elements specifically targeting state of good repair or makes tangible improvements to existing transportation infrastructure

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:** Project descriptions

**Assumptions:**

- Projects received scores based on their type, subtype, and additional sub-classification (see Appendix A). Project descriptions were used to make adjustments to the sub-classification scores if projects contain specific elements to maintain or upgrade existing infrastructure.

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
0 – No benefit	0 – Capital projects with physical infrastructure component in a new right of way	
1 – Low Benefit	<u>Example Projects:</u> Projects in existing rights-of-way that make little improvement to existing infrastructure and/or make no mention of rehabilitation.	
2 – Medium Benefit	<u>Example Projects:</u> Projects that make some improvement to existing infrastructure	Projects with descriptions mention repair, upgrade, maintain, and other terms that otherwise would have gotten a lower score
3 – High Benefit	<u>Example Projects:</u> Projects that make significant improvements to existing infrastructure on high-use corridors. Examples include complete streets projects that include roadway reconfiguration and sewer and utility work.	
NA	Projects or programs that do not make physical changes to infrastructure or built and natural environment.	

**Environment**

**EN1: Improved Environment from Mode Shifts**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Considers the impact of the mode shift resulting from the project on the surrounding community and environment, takes into consideration the likelihood of mode shift from the project and the benefit of that particular mode shift on others in the community.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:** Project descriptions

**Assumptions:**

- The following considerations influenced the development of this metric:



- **How Realistic mode shift would be based on project impact** – that is, is it physically possible or reasonable for people to make sustainable trips passing by this location? Does a bus run between origins and destinations near this location? Is bicycle infrastructure sufficient that normal people would reasonably choose to bike for trips passing by here? Are there sidewalks and crosswalks here? Is there anything within ¼ mile of this location where people are likely to be going such as schools or shops?
- **Likelihood of mode shift based on project impact** – assuming it is physically possible to use sustainable transportation in the project area, would people actually do it? Are the transportation options travel modes that would be attractive to most people? For example, rail transit is generally more appealing than bus transit. Walking, for reasonable distances, is a more likely option than bicycling for most travelers.
- **Impact of mode shift on the surrounding community and other users** – this metric is about how the mode shift resulting from the project benefits all of the users of the roadway. Small shifts or shifts in more remote locations are less beneficial to everyone. If more people are walking, does that mean they are also shopping and bolstering the local economy? If fewer people are driving due to a new rail transit option, does that mean there is less congestion on the road network?
- Project characteristics that are assumed to provide mode shift benefits:
  - Mixed land use locations
  - Larger geographic area of impact
  - Impact of different modes: Pedestrian and rail projects are likely to have the highest benefit, then bus transit projects, and bicycle projects are last because some people will not be comfortable bicycling for transportation even with the best available infrastructure.
  - Quality of the improvement relative to its target mode (example: class 1 or 4 bike facilities are better than class 2 or 3; wider sidewalks are better for pedestrians than just push-bottom activation crossing facilities)
  - Complete streets projects that score lower in this metric may have fewer destinations along the corridor
  - Safe routes to school programs with improved pedestrian infrastructure could be significant in mitigating traffic impacts because of the single timepoint of school start and end times

## SCORING METHODOLOGY

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No benefit	If a project marginalizes other modes at the expense of speeding up cars, it has a negative impact on potential for mode shift and associated improved environment. Examples include roadway widening, auxiliary lanes, interchange and on-ramp improvements (without bike/ped accommodations), adding turn lanes, signal coordination unless specific to prioritizing public transit or bicycle speeds
1 – Low Benefit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Most projects will not immediately have a positive impact on mode shift</li> <li>&gt; If project fosters positive mode shift but may have minimal impact</li> <li>&gt; Bicycle projects without supporting mixed land uses</li> <li>&gt; Programmatic/marketing/education programs</li> <li>&gt; Bus stop or shelter improvements</li> <li>&gt; Storm water management</li> <li>&gt; Bridge projects with a pedestrian or bicycle component due to the wide area over which the bridge must cover making it unlikely to be impactful in terms of mode shift.</li> </ul>
2 – Medium Benefit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Class 1 or 4 bicycle projects along a corridor with mixed use development and/or a large area/distance; area-wide bicycle plans</li> <li>&gt; Single-location (spot-level) pedestrian improvements in locations with mixed land uses</li> <li>&gt; Complete Streets projects without supporting mixed-use development</li> <li>&gt; New, or improved in frequency or hours, bus services</li> </ul>
3 – High Benefit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Pedestrian improvements in an area or corridor with mixed land uses and/or serving a rail line</li> <li>&gt; Complete Streets projects with existing mixed-use development</li> <li>&gt; New rail transit services</li> <li>&gt; Congestion pricing</li> <li>&gt; Transit oriented development projects or projects supported by transportation-efficient land use principles</li> </ul>
NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Projects that do not impact individual travel decisions</li> <li>&gt; Freeway projects that do not speed up traffic and do not address pedestrian and bicycle safety</li> <li>&gt; Metro maintenance projects</li> </ul>

**EN2: GHG Reduction Potential**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Reduces tailpipe greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from on-road and off-road vehicles.

**Evaluation Method Description:** (Use of one or more of the following): Travel Demand Forecasting Model (TDM) for a certain suite of projects; EMFAC Model; GIS-based project type locations or other methods for individuals project scores

**Data Sources Used:**

- For tailpipe, greenhouse gas emissions, EMFAC Model<sup>21</sup> used to estimate on-road vehicle tailpipe emissions including changes in emissions due to project implementation
- TDM used to model vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and speeds along analyzed roadways; used as input to EMFAC model to determine changes in emissions
- OFFROAD Model<sup>22</sup> or other scientific models to calculate off-road vehicle/equipment emissions, renewable energy projects, solar-power generation, energy efficient lighting, etc.
- ArcGIS map with project locations
- Interim California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) GHG Significance Threshold for Stationary Sources, Rules and Plans<sup>23</sup>

#### Assumptions:

- 2024 fleet mix and energy grid mix
- Not all freeway or arterial roadway projects were included in the TDM modeling. See project information matrix.
- According to the 2021 Metrolink Climate Action Plan<sup>24</sup>, Metrolink has a target of becoming a zero-emissions railroad by 2028. As such, this analysis assumes zero emissions from passenger locomotive engines by 2045. Further, the proposed CARB In-Use Locomotive Regulation<sup>25</sup> requires all passenger locomotives to operate in a zero emissions configuration by 2030. Under the proposed In-Use Locomotive Regulation, by 2047, all locomotives operated by fleet operators must have 100% of annual fleet usage as zero emissions. Similar to CARB regulatory analyses, this analysis does not include the indirect emissions that may result from generation of electricity used to power these locomotives.
- All emission reductions for MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr (metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents per year) are annualized.

#### SCORING METHODOLOGY\*

<sup>21</sup> CARB. EMFAC2021v1.02 Emissions Inventory - Onroad Emissions. Available at:

<https://arb.ca.gov/emfac/emissions-inventory/>

<sup>22</sup> CARB. Mobile Source Emissions Inventory Documentation – Off-Road – Diesel Equipment. Available at:

<https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/mobile-source-emissions-inventory/road-documentation/msei-documentation-road>

<sup>23</sup> South Coast AQMD. Interim CEQA GHG Significance Threshold for Stationary Sources, Rules and Plans. December 2008. Available at: [http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/greenhouse-gases-\(ghg\)-ceqa-significance-thresholds/ghgboardsynopsis.pdf?sfvrsn=2](http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/greenhouse-gases-(ghg)-ceqa-significance-thresholds/ghgboardsynopsis.pdf?sfvrsn=2).

<sup>24</sup> Metrolink. Climate Action Plan: The Link to a Zero Emissions Future. March 26, 2021. Available here:

<https://metrolinktrains.com/globalassets/about/agency/sustainability/climate-action-plan.pdf>. Accessed: August 2023

<sup>25</sup> CARB. In-Use Locomotive Regulation. November 17, 2022. Available here:

<https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/rulemaking/2022/locomotive>

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
0 – No benefit	Project’s measures provide no overall emission reductions If overall emissions are increased, indicate concerns	
1 – Low Benefit	Total emission reductions are less than 3,000 MT CO <sub>2</sub> e/yr (metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents per year) compared to future baselines	If total emission reductions are less than 0.1 % of study area emissions, then project should be scored as No Benefit
2 – Medium Benefit	Total emission reductions are greater than or equal to 3,000 or less than 10,000 MT CO <sub>2</sub> e/yr compared to future baselines	
3 – High Benefit	Total emission reductions are greater than or equal to 10,000 MT CO <sub>2</sub> e/yr compared to future baselines	
NA	Project that is not modeled by TDM or does not have a project element related to GHG reduction	

\*For Freeway, Arterial Roadway, and Transit Projects

**For Active Transportation/TDM Projects**

These projects will be accounted for in AQ3. Not sufficient information/methodologies to calculate the impacts for AQ1, CH1, and EN2 therefore these projects will get a score of NA.

**For Good Movements Projects**

Most of these projects will be accounted for in AQ2. Not sufficient information/methodologies to calculate the impacts for AQ1, CH1, and EN2 therefore these projects will get a score of NA.

**For Community Programs Projects**

These projects will generally be accounted for in AQ2 or CH2 or EN6. Not sufficient information/methodologies to calculate the impacts for AQ1, CH1, and EN2 therefore these projects will get a score of NA. Explicit GHG reduction programs would be expected to provide funding for projects resulting in a total GHG reductions of more than 10,000 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/year.

**EN3: Protects natural habitat (Greening Features)**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Supports improved health outcomes associated with clean air and water by protecting or enhancing natural habitats through green infrastructure investments, primarily through the provision of trees, parks and vegetation.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project description and location
- Additional project materials and information available

**Assumptions:**

- The scale of the project (localized, semi-localized, corridor-wide) was used in the evaluation of each project (see common definitions section above for definition of project scales)
- Greening opportunities exist for any project that includes provision of amenities within, or redesign/rehabilitation/expansion of the roadway or sidewalk
- Projects related to railroad infrastructure only are not applicable
- Projects are not assumed to include greening features, unless the available project description and/or documentation directly states that green/blue infrastructure is included as part of the project.

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions/Adjustments
0 – No benefit	0 – Project/program provides no green/blue infrastructure despite opportunities for greening within similar project types or has potential to damage natural features	
1 – Low Benefit	1 - Provides greening or landscaping maintenance as a secondary element of a localized or semi-localized intervention	
2 – Medium Benefit	2 - Provides greening as a secondary element of a corridor-wide intervention; Provides greening as a primary element of a localized intervention	Corridor-wide freeway projects with secondary landscaping element receive a score of 1 – benefits are primarily aesthetic, and freeway environment provides limited capacity for healthy tree canopy growth or biodiversity
3 – High Benefit	3 - Provides greening as a primary element of a corridor-wide or semi-localized intervention	Corridor-wide freeway projects with primary landscaping element receive a score of 2 – benefits are primarily aesthetic, and freeway environment provides limited capacity for healthy tree canopy growth or biodiversity

NA	N/A – Projects or programs do not make physical changes to infrastructure or built and natural environment, or project type involves changes to the built environment without opportunity for greening elements	
----	---	--

**EN4: Water Quality, Water Capture, Drainage, and Flood Management features**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Does the project improve water quality and/or improve drainage and improve flood management

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

Data Sources Used:

- Description of projects in the MSPP list
- Caltrans Highway Design Guidelines
- Other information relevant that is not specific to our projects or project types

**Assumptions:**

- Arterial roadway improvements of greater than a mile in length will include water quality, drainage and flood management features
- Complete streets include water quality and drainage features
- Freeway improvements are required by Caltrans to have features to manage run-off and improve water quality, drainage and flood management

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
0 – No benefit (vs no info)	Project increases amount of impervious surface but does not include features that affect drainage, water quality of flood management	N/A if project does not include features that affect water quality, drainage or flood management
1 – Low Benefit	Project provides localized improvement in water quality, drainage or flood management	(details for exceptions to rules, bonus point systems, etc.)
2 – Medium Benefit	Project provides semi-localized improvement in water quality, drainage or flood management	
3 – High Benefit	Project provides corridor- wide scale improvement in water quality, drainage and flood management	

**EN5: Reducing energy use**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Does the project measurably reduce overall energy use in the corridor (BTUs/passenger-mile (PMT) and/or BTUs/ ton-mile (TM))

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative.

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project descriptions
- US Dept. of Energy website

**Assumptions:**

- Roadway (BTU/PMT):
  - Gas powered auto 3,000-4,000 BTUs per PMT
  - Diesel Bus 2,500-3,000 BTUs per PMT
  - Electric powered auto 1,000-2,000 BTUs per PMT
  - Trains (electric) 800-1,000 BTUs per PMT
  - Electric Bus 800-1,000 BTUs per PMT
  - Active Transportation 0 BTUs per PMT
- Goods Movement (BTU/TM)
  - Trucks average 2,000-6,000 BTUs per TM
  - Trains (Diesel) 400-1,200 BTUs per TM
  - Trains (Electric) 200-600 BTUs per TM
  - Intermodal 200-600 BTUs per TM
- Projects that shift trips from higher energy usage powered vehicles per PMT or TM to lower energy usage powered vehicles or modes per PMT or TM are ranked by project type relative to the PMT or TM reduction potential scale of that mode in the corridor
- The horizon year of 2045 has a much higher percentage of autos, trucks and buses that are EVs and therefore mode shifts have lesser impact on energy use than today's mix of vehicle types
- If project increases VMT or TMT it could use more energy than baseline condition (a concern)

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/MethodologyActive	Exceptions / Adjustments and Examples
NA – Not Applicable	Project does not contain any features that would reduce total energy consumed by transportation modes	Non-mobility projects, such as soundwalls, rehabilitation projects, and community programs.
0 – No benefit	the project is too small to measurably shift corridor PMT or TM from higher energy use mode to lower use mode	Individual bike projects do not move the mode shift needle from higher energy use modes enough to have benefit. (0) Bike Projects and programs with multiple segments are considered collectively to have low benefit (1)
1 – Low Benefit	Project is judged to have a relatively small shift in corridor PMT from higher energy usage mode(s) to lower usage mode(s)	(details for exceptions to rules, bonus point systems, etc.)
2 – Medium Benefit	Project is judged to have moderate shift in BTUs/ PMT or TM from higher energy usage modes to lower energy usage modes	Larger, corridor scale electric powered transit projects (e.g. LRT or EMU)
3 – High Benefit	Project is judged to have a high level shift of PMT or TM from higher BTU/PMT or TM modes to lower BTU/PMT or TM modes	Zero emission trucks; conversion of diesel electric locomotives to electric locomotives

**EN6: Reduce Heat Island Effect; Provide Cooling Features for Users**

Detailed Criteria Description: Reduces heat island effect by deploying cooling features like planting urban shade trees, installing reflective roofs, and using light-colored or high-albedo pavements and surfaces.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project descriptions
- ArcGIS map with project locations and locations of Equity-Focus Community (EFC) areas
- California Air Pollution Control Officers Association’s Handbook for Analyzing Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emission Reductions, Assessing Climate Vulnerabilities, and Advancing Health and Equity<sup>26</sup>

<sup>26</sup> California Air Pollution Control Officers Association. “Handbook for Analyzing Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions, Assessing Climate Vulnerabilities, and Advancing Health and Equity”. December 2023. Available at: [https://www.airquality.org/ClimateChange/Documents/Final%20Handbook\\_AB434.pdf](https://www.airquality.org/ClimateChange/Documents/Final%20Handbook_AB434.pdf)



- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA’s) Cooling Summertime Temperatures Strategies to Reduce Urban Heat Islands<sup>27</sup>
- EPA’s Heat Island Community Actions Database<sup>28</sup>
- Healthy Air Living’s Urban Heat Island Mitigation strategy<sup>29</sup>
- U.S. Green Building Council’s (USGBC)’s Heat island reduction strategy<sup>30</sup>

**Assumptions:**

- Not at projects will be able to add significant vegetation elements because there are constraints for planting vegetation that are related to availability of water and space
- We are using the USGBC “Heat island reduction” requirements section options for scoring below.<sup>31</sup>

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
0 – No benefit	Project’s heat island effect reduction or cooling features for users is limited due to acreage and size, or lack of project information	
1 – Low Benefit	<u>Example Projects:</u> Shade through structures or trees, pilot project study, and grant writing assistance	If grant writing is not coupled with project studies, downgrade to no benefit
2 – Medium Benefit	Projects that meet USGBC guidelines for Option 1 or 2 can include tree planting, public green spaces, and changes in surface reflectance	If the project does not meet all the requirements, downgrade to a low benefit If the project exceeds requirements or is sizable, upgrade to high benefit
3 – High Benefit	See exceptions/adjustments for medium benefit	
NA	Projects that do not have any heat island effect reduction or cooling features for users	

<sup>27</sup> EPA. “Cooling Summertime Temperatures Strategies to Reduce Urban Heat Islands”. September 2003. Available at: <https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2014-06/documents/hiribrochure.pdf>.

<sup>28</sup> US States Environmental Protection Agency. “Heat Island Community Actions Database”. January 2023. Available at: <https://www.epa.gov/heatislands/heat-island-community-actions-database>

<sup>29</sup> Healthy Air Living. “Urban Heat Island Mitigation: An Innovative way to reduce air pollution and energy usage”. March 2011. Available at: <http://www.valleyair.org/programs/fasttrack/2011/urban%20heat%20island%20mitigation.pdf>

<sup>30</sup> USGBC. “Heat island reduction”. Available at: <https://www.usgbc.org/credits/ss7>

<sup>31</sup> USGBC. <https://www.usgbc.org/credits/new-construction-core-and-shell-schools-new-construction-retail-new-construction-data-cent-5>

**EN7: Potential for Noise Reduction**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Reduces transportation noise pollution or includes noise reduction features, such as sound barriers or low-noise technologies

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:** Project descriptions and project location

**Assumptions:**

- Projects received scores based on their type, subtype, and additional sub-classification (see Appendix A). Project descriptions were used to make adjustments to the sub-classification scores if projects contain certain noise mitigation features.

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
0 – No benefit	Project is likely to maintain or increase existing noise levels, for example roadway, transit, and freight projects without noise mitigation components	Some roadway or signal projects, like emergency vehicle pre-emption, would be “NA”
1 – Low Benefit	<u>Example Projects:</u> Projects that provide small levels of ambient noise reduction potential, such as vegetation barriers, grade separations, and certain air quality programs	Roadway projects that would otherwise receive a “0” but include landscaping
2 – Medium Benefit	<u>Example Projects:</u> Projects that use low-noise technology, such as fleet electrification projects	
3 – High Benefit	<u>Example Projects:</u> Projects whose sole purpose is to reduce noise pollution, such as soundwall projects	
NA	Projects that will not increase noise and have little opportunity to reduce noise pollution, such as active transportation and community projects.	

**EN8: Supports transportation efficient land use principles**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Benefits, and benefits from, surrounding land uses that foster connectivity with public transit, multimodal trips, and high-density and mixed-use land development

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project description
- Google maps

- Employment density based on SCAG Regional Travel Demand Model

**Assumptions:**

- Defining transportation efficient land use principles -- Transportation and land use are linked through guiding land development and community expansion with the goal of coordination of land use and transportation that accommodates pedestrian and bike safety, mobility, enhances public transportation service, improves road network connectivity, and includes a multi-modal approach to transportation. That is, ensuring that a human living, working, or shopping in this geographic location has more than one option for traveling to, from and around that location, and specifically, can realistically travel using sustainable transportation such as walking, bicycling, or riding public transportation over being dependent on a private automobile. Typically, EN8 is accomplished by concentrating land use development towards urban centers and by making transportation investment in existing developed areas with a range of land uses including commercial, residential and office. In the case of the LB-ELA project, which is in an existing urban area, EN8 suggests that investment should be made in areas with existing commercial and residential development in close proximity to each other. The objective being to provide a balance of transportation investment in support of existing land use activities (and in a few project cases, to support, grow or define land uses in areas with strong transportation infrastructure). Ranking assumptions include the following overarching premises:
  - Area-wide or long corridor projects are assumed to benefit from strategic application based on land uses – that is, the project is assumed to be implemented with high levels of investment in mixed-use and/or dense land use portions of the project area.
  - This metric benefits projects with a large geographic scale because the study area, as a whole, is urban.

**SCORING METHODOLOGY:**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
0 – No benefit	<p>Projects that work against or damage land-use-transportation balance</p> <p>Projects that are inconsistent with land-use-transportation principles, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Freeway projects without a pedestrian/bicycle or ADA component</li> <li>&gt; Most traffic signal and ITS projects</li> <li>&gt; Roadway projects (arterials, bridges) that do not indicate inclusion of infrastructure for sustainable transportation modes as they are reinforcing inefficient LU-T principles (consistent with scores for traffic signal/ITS projects)</li> </ul>	<p>Telecommuting program because these policies do not leverage employment density to concentrate activities.</p> <p>Infrastructure for private zero emission vehicles perpetuates auto dependency when investing in sustainable travel modes instead would be more conducive to supporting land-use-transportation principles.</p>
1 – Low Benefit	<p>Projects that have a neutral impact on land use transportation balance, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Bridge projects crossing over rivers and/or highways (space not occupied by human activity centers), do not meaningfully contribute to land-use-transportation principles due to the large void of space below them.</li> <li>&gt; Freeway projects with a pedestrian/bicycle or ADA component</li> </ul>	
2 – Medium Benefit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Projects adjacent to a light rail station regardless of area land uses</li> <li>&gt; Public art and other aesthetic urban design improvements help support making urban places more interesting to go, live, and shop and encourage pedestrian activity/other non-driving modes that allow for “path as place” travel (journey-based vs. destination-based travel)</li> </ul>	
3 – High Benefit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Projects in amenity rich locations including retail and commercial land uses combined with housing</li> <li>&gt; Area-level or very long corridor projects are assumed to benefit from strategic application based on surrounding land uses</li> <li>&gt; Housing and economic programs in urban areas foster land-use-transportation principles.</li> <li>&gt; All High-Capacity Transit improvements</li> </ul>	<p>Rail quad gates make it possible for rail lines and other roadway users to coexist more safely</p>
Na	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Marketing and programmatic projects except for those targeting housing, transit-oriented development, transit ridership, and economics.</li> <li>&gt; Bus vehicle fuel types</li> <li>&gt; Microtransit zones</li> <li>&gt; Freight Rail / Goods Movement TDM</li> </ul>	

	> Non-mobility enhancing projects, such as stormwater projects and rehab projects	
--	---	--

## Opportunity and Prosperity

### OP1: Access to jobs

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Average number of jobs accessible within a 30-minute time period by transit or a 45-minute time period by auto.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Quantitative

#### **Data Sources Used:**

- > SCAG Regional Travel Model, adapted for use in study area analysis.

#### **Assumptions:**

- > Projects considered in the SCAG 2020 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) are modeled as defined by the RTP.
- > Interchanges, auxiliary lanes, and truck lanes along I-710 were modeled using assumptions consistent with past studies.
- > Projects that improve arterial street operations without adding lanes were modeled by increasing auto speed and capacity in a manner consistent with SCAG modeling practices.
- > Bus Rapid Transit projects assume a 25% increase in transit speed and a one-half lane of reduction in auto capacity.
- > Transit priority projects assume a 15% increase in transit speed and a one-quarter lane of reduction in auto capacity.
- > For projects that were not modeled, the results of the model were used to estimate benefits of similar projects and programs

## SCORING METHODOLOGY

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No benefit	Project does not increase access to jobs.
1 – Low Benefit	Project provides a small improvement in access to jobs, with respect to improved access, within the freeway, arterial, or transit project package. Packages of projects are ranked by numbers of jobs that can be reached by study area residents. Individual projects are ranked based on the magnitude of work travel served.
2 – Medium Benefit	Project provides a moderate improvement in access to jobs. Packages of projects are ranked by numbers of jobs that can be reached by study area residents. Individual projects are ranked based on the magnitude of work travel served.

3 – high Benefit	Project provides a large improvement in access to jobs, with respect to improved access, within the freeway, arterial, or transit project package. Packages of projects are ranked by numbers of jobs that can be reached by study area residents. Individual projects are ranked based on the magnitude of work travel served.
------------------	---

**OP2: Accessibility (improving mobility challenges for all ages and abilities)**

Detailed Criteria Description: Provides new or improved transportation options, or removes barriers, for users of all abilities, including serving people with disabilities, very young and very old travelers. Projects include ADA accessibility, protected active transportation facilities (example: 8 to 80), , and other programs that make the transportation network more available to its most vulnerable users

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:** Project Descriptions

**Assumptions:**

- Accessibility is defined as providing additional transportation options for vulnerable users or people with mobility limitations
- Mobility limitations may be physical, such as use of a wheelchair or other mobility device, financial, such as lack of funds for a car, or intellectual such as needing additional direction (wayfinding) or limitations (such as a child who might be tempted to wander into traffic if that traffic is too close)
- Projects that serve a larger geographic area receive a higher ranking
- Projects that serve more mixed or dense land uses may score better, depending on the type of project

**SCORING METHODOLOGY:**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
0 – No benefit	Non -SOV projects that do not improve accessibility of the transportation network	Laws protect accessible services; thus, no projects should fall into this category.
1 – Low Benefit	<p>Projects that encourage the use of non-motorized modes but have a low impact on the accessibility of the network. Specific project examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Bike education programs</li> <li>&gt; Transit amenities</li> </ul>	
2 – Medium Benefit	<p>Projects that encourage the use of non-motorized modes but have a medium impact on the accessibility of the network. These projects include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Transportation Demand Management (TDM, carpool and telecommuting programs)</li> <li>&gt; Transit TDM / fare programs</li> <li>&gt; Bike Blvds</li> <li>&gt; Class 2 and 3 bicycle facilities</li> <li>&gt; First / Last Mile</li> <li>&gt; Micro mobility including bike share</li> <li>&gt; Connected / Autonomous Vehicles (arterial roadway)</li> <li>&gt; Transit Grade separation</li> <li>&gt; Transit Increased service</li> <li>&gt; Transit New station</li> <li>&gt; Transit Real time / Customer Experience (CX)</li> <li>&gt; Transit Safety / Rehab</li> <li>&gt; Transit Speed / Reliability</li> <li>&gt; Transit amenities / security / customer experience</li> <li>&gt; Complete streets / greening – freeway caps / lids improve conditions for active transportation</li> </ul>	<p>Less effective active transportation projects such as RRFBs</p> <p>Spot-level projects and/or projects that do not have significant or mixed land use intensity around them</p>
3 – High Benefit	<p>Projects that encourage the use of non-motorized modes and have a high impact on improving the accessibility of the network. Projects that specifically address gaps in service and provide high quality and safe facilities and services for users of all abilities. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Class 1 and 4 bikeways, new ADA accommodations, complete streets projects, on-demand transit service, new sidewalks, and new bridges. Projects include:</li> <li>&gt; Housing – this is an urban area and housing programs will improve mobility and accessibility to opportunities/prosperity</li> </ul>	<p>Any project that specifically addresses ADA</p> <p>Projects that address bicycle and pedestrian conditions over a large geographic area such as a citywide bicycle plan or a long corridor</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Class 1 or 4 Bikeway</li> <li>&gt; Pedestrian Improvements:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ped bridges</li> <li>○ Ped crossings</li> <li>○ Sidewalks</li> <li>○ Groups of bike improvements (eg area bicycle plans)</li> <li>○ Groups of bike/ped improvements (eg area active transportation plans)</li> <li>○ Groups of Ped improvements (eg area pedestrian plans)</li> </ul> </li> <li>&gt; Complete Streets because they benefit all sustainable modes using the network</li> <li>&gt; Complete streets / arterial improvements</li> <li>&gt; New bridges</li> <li>&gt; Traffic calming make the network safer for more of the roadway users</li> <li>&gt; TOD projects bring more people closer to transit options</li> <li>&gt; New Transit improvements /services             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Bus Rapid Transit</li> <li>○ Light Rail</li> <li>○ Metrolink</li> <li>○ Microtransit</li> <li>○ Shuttle</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
NA	<p>Projects focused solely on single occupant vehicle travel and movement of freight are generally not applicable for this metric. Specific Project Types include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Goods Movement</li> <li>● Community Programs</li> <li>● Freeway (except complete streets / greening projects)</li> <li>● Zero emission transit projects</li> </ul>	

**OP3: Increases Regional Competitiveness**

**Detailed description:** Increase the region’s competitive economic advantage compared to other locations in the U.S. Generates jobs throughout the five county LA region and stimulates regional economic activity.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative.

**Data Sources Used:**

- LAEDC Reports
- Other information relevant that is not specific to our projects or project types

**Assumptions:**



- Components of Regional Competitiveness:
  - Economic Infrastructure
  - Human Capital
  - Innovation and Entrepreneurship
  - Business Environment
  - Connectivity and Access
  - Quality of Life
- Documenting any underlying assumptions to the process that are not project specific

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
N/A	Project has no features that affect competitiveness of the region. This includes projects that are considered “non-mobility” projects.
0 – No benefit	Not used for this metric
1 – Low Benefit	Provides enhanced mobility for goods movement but confined to the corridor. Improved goods movement mobility in the corridor Provides somewhat better connections between jobs and workforce in and outside the corridor, which can enhance corridor and regional employment
2 – Medium Benefit	Provides moderate amount of enhanced mobility and reliability for goods movement in the corridor and beyond which expands economic activity and employment and makes the region more competitive in the sectors of the regional economy tied to goods movement and logistics. Provides comparatively medium improved connections between jobs and workforce in and outside of the corridor, which can enhance corridor and regional employment
3 – High Benefit	Provides high amount of enhanced mobility and reliability for goods movement in the corridor and beyond which expands economic activity and employment and makes the region more competitive in the sectors of the regional economy tied to goods movement and logistics. Provides comparatively best connections between jobs in the region and workforce in the corridor which can enhance corridor and regional employment

**OP4: Work Force Development**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Project/program includes a workforce development component.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project/program website and description
- Agencies with Workforce Development Programs:
  - Metro ([link](#))
  - Caltrans ([link](#))
  - LA County ([link](#))

- City of Long Beach ([link](#))
- City of Los Angeles ([link](#))
- City of Santa Ana ([link](#))
- City of Maywood ([link](#))
- City of South Gate ([link](#))
- City of Carson ([link](#))
- City of Bellflower ([link](#))
- City of Huntington Park ([link](#))
- City of Paramount ([link](#))
- Metro (enlace)
- Caltrans (enlace)
- Condado de Los Ángeles (enlace)
- Ciudad de Long Beach (enlace)
- Ciudad de Los Ángeles (enlace)
- Ciudad de Santa Ana (enlace)
- Ciudad de Maywood (enlace)
- Ciudad de South Gate (enlace)
- Ciudad de Carson (enlace)
- Ciudad de Bellflower (enlace)
- Ciudad de Huntington Park (enlace)
- Ciudad de Paramount (enlace)
- 

**Assumptions:**

- If a City/Agency has a workforce development program within one of its departments (e.g., public works, economic development) it does not mean that a specific program/project has a workforce development component; the scale (large, medium/small) should be considered in making this decision. Specifically, larger programs are more likely to have a WFD than smaller projects.

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No benefit	Project/program is large in scale and does not include a WFD component, and the lead agency/city does not have a WFD program specifically for program/project
1 – Low Benefit	Project/program includes potential workforce opportunities for emerging technologies (e.g., clean energy)
2 – Medium Benefit	Project/program includes a workforce development component (e.g., training) but it is not the primary purpose of project/program
3 – High Benefit	Primary purpose of project/program is workforce development and related efforts (e.g., local hiring)
NA	Any project/program that is small or medium sized infrastructure.

**OP5: Potential Targeted Hire, New Construction Jobs**

**Evaluation Criteria:** OP5: Potential Targeted hire, New Construction Jobs

**Detailed Criteria Description:** The responsible agency/city has a targeted hiring policy, and scale of construction/infrastructure project.

**Evaluation Method Description:** For programs, check if lead agency/city has a targeted hiring policy (in general) and if project description mentions targeted hiring specifically in 710 Corridor communities. For construction/infrastructure projects, qualitatively assess the scale of the project based on size and scope.

**Data Sources Used:**

- Lead agency/city websites (Human Resources/Public Works / Project Site)
- Agencies with Targeted Hiring Policies:
  - Metro ([link](#))
  - Caltrans ([link](#))
  - LA County ([link](#))
  - City of Long Beach ([link](#))
  - City of Los Angeles ([link](#))

**Assumptions:**

- Larger projects are more likely to create new construction jobs, thus larger projects are given more weight than smaller projects. Projects that cover a larger area receive a higher score than smaller scale projects.
- If not explicitly mentioned in project description, the assumption is that any lead agency/city with a targeted hiring policy would apply that to any relevant programs.
- If description is vague, assumption is it is a small-scale project (construction)
- While OP5 addresses targeted hiring, EQ-OP8 is a different metric. EQ-OP8 asks the question of whether a lead agency/program has a targeted hiring policy, while OP5 asks if a program has a component that includes targeted hiring, OR a project is large enough to have the potential to create new jobs which gets at the ability/potential to create new jobs. The issue with OP5 is that it is, in essence, asking two different questions. EQ-OP8 is asking strictly about targeted hiring, while OP5 is asking about not only targeted hiring, but the potential for new job creation. Thus, OP5 and EQ-OP8 do not have to be consistent across the board.

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No benefit	Infrastructure project but lead agency/city has no targeted hiring policy
1 – Low Benefit	<b>Construction/Infrastructure:</b> Small scale project <b>Program:</b> Lead agency/city has a targeted hiring policy
2 – Medium Benefit	<b>Construction/Infrastructure:</b> Medium scale project <b>Program:</b> Lead agency/city has a targeted hiring policy
3 – High Benefit	<b>Construction/Infrastructure:</b>

	Large scale project <b>Program:</b> Lead agency/city has a specific targeted hiring policy for 710 Corridor communities
NA	Non-infrasturcture project or program

**OP6: Access to QoL amenities (grocery stores, healthcare services, schools)**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Provides new transportation facilities near QoL amenities. Quantifies the number of quality of life amenities within ¼ mile of new transportation facility.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Quantitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project descriptions/type
- Project location using GIS
- Quality of life amenities include grocery stores, hospitals, urgent care facilities, and institutions of higher education, using data consistent with the Transit Center’s Equity Dashboard<sup>32</sup>

**Assumptions:**

- The scale of the project (localized, semi-localized, corridor-wide) was used in the evaluation of each project (see common definitions section above for definition of project scales)
- Projects were identified as a “new transportation facility” – see the applicability column in Appendix A.

**Scoring Methodology:**

- A ¼ mile buffer was created around all projects
- The buffer was used to calculate the number of amenities within ¼ mile of each project
- Projects were scored based on the total number of amenities in the buffer
- Programs were evaluated based on the project scales listed

**SCORING METHDOLOGY**

---

<sup>32</sup> <https://dashboard.transitcenter.org/methodology>

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No benefit	There are no “No Benefit” for this metric
1 – Low Benefit	Project provides new access for: 1-139 amenities in ¼ buffer Or: A program that is localized
2 – Medium Benefit	Project provides new access for: 140-599 amenities in ¼ buffer Or: A program that is “semi-localized”
3 – High Benefit	Project provides new access for: >=600 amenities in ¼ buffer Or: A program that is “Corridor-wide”
NA	Project or program does not provide new transportation facilities

**OP7: Access to open space, recreation and parks, LA river, etc.**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Provides new transportation facilities near parks and open spaces. Quantifies the acreage of parks within ¼ mile of new transportation facility.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Quantitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project descriptions/type
- Project location using GIS
- Park shapefile downloaded from LA County GIS portal<sup>33</sup>

**Assumptions:**

- The scale of the project (localized, semi-localized, corridor-wide) was used in the evaluation of each project (see common definitions section above for definition of project scales)
- Projects were identified as a “new transportation facility” – see the applicability column in Appendix A.

**Scoring Methodology:**

- A ¼ mile buffer was created around all projects
- The buffer was used to calculate the acreage within ¼ mile of each project

<sup>33</sup><https://egis-lacounty.hub.arcgis.com/datasets/local-parks/explore?location=33.876317%2C-118.170948%2C11.81>

- Projects were scored based on the total acreage of parks in the buffer
- Programs were evaluated based on the project scales listed

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No benefit	There are no “No Benefit” for this metric
1 – Low Benefit	Project provides new access for: 1-24 acres of parks in ¼ buffer Or: A program that is localized
2 – Medium Benefit	Project provides new access for: 25-80 acres of parks in ¼ buffer Or: A program that is “semi-localized”
3 – High Benefit	Project provides new access for: >=80 acres of parks in ¼ buffer Or: A program that is “Corridor-wide”
NA	Project or program does not provide new transportation facilities

**Equity**

**EQ-AQ1: Reduce Emissions (NOx, PM2.5)**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Reduces oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) and fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) emissions from on-road vehicles or offroad mobile equipment

**Evaluation Method Description:** (Use of one or more of the following): Travel Demand Forecasting Model (TDM) for a certain suite of projects; EMFAC Model; GIS-based project type locations or other methods for individuals project scores

**Data Sources Used:**

- See AQ1 above for data sources
- Results from AQ1 scoring evaluation

**Scoring Methodology:**

Relies on score from AQ1 and removes/adds points based on the percent of the project or program that is located in an EFC accordingly:

- Project that is 0% in EFC: -2 from AQ1 score (with minimum value of 0 / No Benefit)
- Project that is 1-33% in EFC: -1 from AQ1 score (with minimum value of 0 / No Benefit)

- Project that is 33-66% in EFC: Same as AQ1 score
- Project that is >66: +1 on top of AQ1 score (capped at maximum of 3 / High Benefit)

**EQ-AQ3: Mode Shift to cleaner modes**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Increases the share of trips made by transit, walking and bicycling for equity focused communities relative to non-EFC areas.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Quantitative

Data Sources Used:

- > SCAG Regional Travel Model, adapted for use in study area analysis.

Assumptions:

- > Projects considered in the SCAG 2020 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) are modeled as defined by the RTP.
- > BRT projects assume a 25% increase in speed and a one-half lane reduction in vehicle capacity.
- > Transit priority projects assume a 15% increase in speed and a one-quarter lane reduction in vehicle capacity.
- > Projects are ranked on a per-mile basis so that large projects are not automatically ranked higher than smaller but locally impactful projects.
- > Ranking is considered separately for rail, bus, and active transportation projects.
- > Project metrics are Evaluated for study area residents of Equity Focus Communities (EFCs) relative to study area residents of non-EFCs
- > For projects that were not modeled, the results of the model were used to estimate benefits of similar projects and programs

**SCORING METHODOLOGY:**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No benefit	Project does not increase transit ridership or provide improve active transportation opportunities.
1 – Low Benefit	Improved transit serves a lower proportion of EFC residents as compared to other projects in the study area.
2 – Medium Benefit	Improved transit serves a similar proportion of EFC residents as compared to other projects in the study area.
3 – high Benefit	Improved transit serves a higher proportion of EFC residents as compared to other projects in the study area.

**EQ-CH1: Reduce Emissions (Health Effects metrics: DPM, PM2.5)**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Reduces diesel particulate matter (DPM) and fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) emissions from on-road vehicles which in turn can generate health benefits.

**Evaluation Method Description:** (Use of one or more of the following): Travel Demand Forecasting Model (TDM) for a certain suite of projects; EMFAC Model; GIS-based project type locations or other methods for individuals project scores

**Data Sources Used:**

- See CH1 above for data sources
- Results from CH1 scoring evaluation

**Scoring Methodology:**

Relies on score from CH1 and removes/adds points based on the percent of the project or program that is located in an EFC accordingly:

- Project that is 0% in EFC: -2 from CH1 score (with minimum value of 0 / No Benefit)
- Project that is 1-33% in EFC: -1 from CH1 score (with minimum value of 0 / No Benefit)
- Project that is 33-66% in EFC: Same as CH1 score
- Project that is >66: +1 on top of CH1 score (capped at maximum of 3 / High Benefit)

**EQ-CH2: Reduces exposure to air pollution in communities facing high pollution burden and asthma rates**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Reduces exposure at sensitive receptors (e.g. schools and day care centers, hospitals and healthcare clinics, senior centers, and residences) by installing filtration systems at these receptors and/or installing near-roadway vegetation between major roadways and these receptors.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- > Project descriptions
- > See CH2 sources above
- > Scoring from CH2

**Assumptions:**



- > Not all projects will be able to use near-road vegetation because there are constraints for planting vegetation that are related to safety, availability of water, and fires
- > Near roadway vegetation must meet certain criteria to be considered effective at reducing particulate matter (PM)
- > HVAC/HEPA systems must meet certain design criteria to be considered effective at reducing PM
- > Equity score is based on the original CH2 score:
  - If the project is >66% located in an area of  $\geq$  to 80 percentile on the asthma or cardiovascular disease indicator maps, the EQ-CH2 is maintained at the same benefit.
  - If the project is not >66% located in an area of  $\geq$  to 80 percentile on the asthma indicator or cardiovascular disease indicator map, the EQ-CH2 is downgraded to a lower benefit.
  - If the project is a corridor-wide program, it is considered to overlap with an area where the asthma or cardiovascular disease percentile  $\geq$  to 80.

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No benefit	Project scores 0 in CH2 or Project scores 1 in CH2 but doesn’t overlap areas where the asthma or cardiovascular disease percentile $\geq$ to 80.
1 – Low Benefit	Project scores 1 in CH2 and Project extent overlaps some areas where the asthma or cardiovascular disease percentile $\geq$ to 80. or Project scores 2 in CH2 but doesn’t overlap areas where the asthma or cardiovascular disease percentile $\geq$ to 80.
2 – Medium Benefit	Project scores 2 in CH2 and Project extent overlaps some areas where the asthma or cardiovascular disease percentile $\geq$ to 80. or Project scores 3 in CH2 but doesn’t overlap areas where the asthma or cardiovascular disease percentile $\geq$ to 80.
3 – High Benefit	Project scores 3 in CH2 and Project extent overlaps some areas where the asthma or cardiovascular disease percentile $\geq$ to 80.
NA	Project/program scores NA in CH2

**EQ-CH3: Mode Shift to active transportation, transit**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Increases the share of trips made by transit, walking and bicycling for equity focused communities relative to non-EFC areas.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Quantitative

Data Sources Used:

- > SCAG Regional Travel Model, adapted for use in study area analysis.

Assumptions:

- > Projects considered in the SCAG 2020 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) are modeled as defined by the RTP.
- > BRT projects assume a 25% increase in speed and a one-half lane reduction in vehicle capacity.
- > Transit priority projects assume a 15% increase in speed and a one-quarter lane reduction in vehicle capacity.
- > Projects are ranked on a per-mile basis so that large projects are not automatically ranked higher than smaller but locally impactful projects.
- > Ranking is considered separately for rail, bus, and active transportation projects.
- > Project metrics are Evaluated for study area residents of Equity Focus Communities (EFCs) relative to study area residents of non-EFCs
- > For projects that were not modeled, the results of the model were used to estimate benefits of similar projects and programs

**SCORING METHODOLOGY:**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No benefit	Project does not increase transit ridership or provide improve active transportation opportunities.
1 – Low Benefit	Improved transit serves a lower proportion of EFC residents as compared to other projects in the study area.
2 – Medium Benefit	Improved transit serves a similar proportion of EFC residents as compared to other projects in the study area.
3 – high Benefit	Improved transit serves a higher proportion of EFC residents as compared to other projects in the study area.

**EQ-CH5: Increases access to high quality recreational facilities in areas lacking active transportation infrastructure and parks**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Supports improved health outcomes associated with physical activity and recreation by providing direct linkages to parks and recreation facilities and providing active transportation infrastructure, particularly in areas lacking access to these facilities and infrastructure elements.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- Score for CH5: Bike/Ped Access to parks, recreational areas, or open spaces
- LA County Park Needs Assessment [PNA+ Map Viewer \(arcgis.com\)](#) - Priority Areas for Increasing Access to Regional Recreation
- Existing Bike Routes
- Project description and location
- Additional project materials and information available

**Scoring Methodology:**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No benefit	0 - Projects/programs score 0 in CH5 Or Project/program lacks bike/ped facilities when they could be included based on project type
1 – Low Benefit	1 - Project/program includes new active transportation (bike/ped) facilities Or Project/program adds transit or micro-mobility service in Priority Areas for Increasing Access to Regional Recreation per the LA County Parks Needs Assessment (PNA+)
2 – Medium Benefit	2 - Project scores 2 in CH5 and Project extent overlaps Priority Areas for Increasing Access to Regional Recreation per the LA County Parks Needs Assessment (PNA+) Or Project scores 3 in CH5 and project extent does not overlap with Priority Areas for Increasing Access to Regional Recreation per PNA+
3 – High Benefit	3 - Project scores 3 in CH5 and Project extent overlaps Priority Areas for Increasing Access to Regional Recreation per the LA County Parks Needs Assessment (PNA+)
NA	4 - Project/program type does not have potential to impact active transportation conditions or access to recreation

**EQ-MB1: Ridership**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Increases transit ridership by shifting trips to transit from other modes, for equity focused communities relative to communities that are not equity focused.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Quantitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- > SCAG Regional Travel Model, adapted for use in study area analysis.

**Assumptions:**

- > Projects considered in the SCAG 2020 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) are modeled as defined by the RTP.
- > BRT projects assume a 25% increase in speed and a one-half lane reduction in auto capacity.
- > Transit priority projects assume a 15% increase in speed and a one-quarter lane reduction in auto capacity.
- > For projects that were not modeled, the results of the model were used to estimate benefits of similar projects and programs

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
0 – No benefit	Project does not increase transit ridership for persons in EFCs.	
1 – Low Benefit	Project results in a slight increase in transit passenger miles traveled per project mile, generally in the group of projects with smallest increases in transit passenger miles traveled per mile, for persons in EFCs. Ranking is considered separately for rail and bus projects.	
2 – Medium Benefit	Project results in a moderate increase in transit passenger miles traveled per project mile, for persons in EFCs.	
3 – high Benefit	Project results in a high increase in transit passenger miles traveled per project mile, for persons in EFCs. Ranking is considered separately for rail and bus projects.	Project LB-ELA_0164, which increases frequency of Metro busses that currently have low frequency, is scored based on the high overall ridership increase, associated with persons in EFCs, instead of on a per-mile basis.

**EQ-MB2: Speeds / Travel Times (people, goods)**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Increase roadway speeds (or reduce travel times) for people and goods movement in equity focus communities.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Quantitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- > SCAG Regional Travel Model, adapted for use in study area analysis.

**Assumptions:**

- > Projects considered in the SCAG 2020 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) are modeled as defined by the RTP.
- > Interchanges, auxiliary lanes, and truck lanes along I-710 were modeled using assumptions consistent with past studies.
- > Projects that improve arterial street operations without adding lanes were modeled by increasing speed and capacity in a manner consistent with SCAG modeling practices.
- > Project metrics are Evaluated for study area residents of Equity Focus Communities (EFCs) relative to study area residents of non-EFCs
- > For projects that were not modeled, the results of the model were used to estimate benefits of similar projects and programs

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No benefit	Project does not improve roadway speeds for residents of Equity Focus Communities (EFCs).
1 – Low Benefit	Project improves roadway speeds and serves a lower proportion of EFC residents as compared to other projects in the study area.
2 – Medium Benefit	Project improves roadway speeds and serves a similar proportion of EFC residents as compared to other projects in the study area.
3 – high Benefit	Project improves roadway speeds and serves a higher proportion of EFC residents as compared to other projects in the study area.

**EQ-MB3: Reduce Congestion (hours of delay for people & goods)**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Reduce hours of delay for persons and goods, for equity focused communities relative to communities that are not equity focused.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Quantitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- > SCAG Regional Travel Model, adapted for use in study area analysis.

**Assumptions:**

- > Projects considered in the SCAG 2020 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) are modeled as defined by the RTP.
- > BRT projects assume a 25% increase in speed and a one-half lane reduction in auto capacity.

- > Transit priority projects assume a 15% increase in speed and a one-quarter lane reduction in auto capacity.
- > For projects that were not modeled, the results of the model were used to estimate benefits of similar projects and programs

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No benefit	Project does not reduce delay for persons in EFCs.
1 – Low Benefit	Project results in a reduction of delay, generally in the group of projects with smallest increases in transit passenger miles traveled per mile, for persons in EFCs. Ranking is considered separately for rail and bus projects.
2 – Medium Benefit	Project results in a moderate reduction in delay, for persons in EFCs.
3 – high Benefit	Project results in a high reduction in delay, for persons in EFCs.

**EQ-MB4: Modal Accessibility**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Improves access to new transportation facilities for residents. Quantifies the population benefiting from the improvement based on a ¼ mile distance from the new transportation facility and the extent to which the facility substantially benefits residents in EFC areas.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Quantitative

**Related Metrics:** MB4: Modal Accessibility

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project descriptions/type
- Project location using GIS
- Equity focus communities definition from LA Metro
- MB4 Score

**Scoring Methodology:**

Relies on score from MB4 and removes/adds points based on the percent of the project that is located in an EFC based on this logic:

- Project or program that is 0% in EFC: -2 from MB4 score (with minimum value of 0 / No Benefit)
- Project or program that is 1-33% in EFC: -1 from MB4 score (with minimum value of 0 / No Benefit)

- Project or program that is 33-66% in EFC (includes corridor-wide programs): Same as MB4 score
- Project that is >66% in EFC: +1 on top of MB4 score (capped at maximum of 3 / High Benefit)

**EQ-MB5: Reliability (Transit, Roadway, Goods Movement)**

**Evaluation Method Description:** Quantitative

**Related Metrics:** MB5 - Reliability

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project descriptions/type
- Project location using GIS
- Equity focus communities definition from LA Metro
- MB5 Score

**Scoring Methodology:**

Relies on score from MB5 and removes/adds points based on the percent of the project that is located in an EFC based on this logic:

- Project or program that is 0% in EFC: -2 from MB5 score (with minimum value of 0 / No Benefit)
- Project or program that is 1-33% in EFC: -1 from MB5 score (with minimum value of 0 / No Benefit)
- Project or program that is 33-66% in EFC (includes corridor-wide programs): Same as MB5 score
- Project that is >66% in EFC: +1 on top of MB5 score (capped at maximum of 3 / High Benefit)

**EQ-MB6: Gap Closures**

**Evaluation Method Description:** Quantitative

**Related Metrics:** MB6 – Gap Closure

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project descriptions/type
- Project location using GIS
- Equity focus communities definition from LA Metro

- MB6 Score

### Scoring Methodology:

Relies on score from MB6 and removes/adds points based on the percent of the project that is located in an EFC based on this logic:

- Project or program that is 0% in EFC: -2 from MB6 score (with minimum value of 0 / No Benefit)
- Project or program that is 1-33% in EFC: -1 from MB6 score (with minimum value of 0 / No Benefit)
- Project or program that is 33-66% in EFC (includes corridor-wide programs): Same as MB6 score
- Project that is >66% in EFC: +1 on top of MB6 score (capped at maximum of 3 / High Benefit)

### **EQ-MB7: Increases reliable and accessible transportation options for those who cannot or prefer not to drive**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Provides reliability and accessibility improvements to support the viability of non-driving travel modes such as active transportation and transit for populations currently marginalized by auto-centric infrastructure, including zero-vehicle households, children, seniors, individuals with disabilities, and those who choose not to drive for environmental, health-related, or other reasons.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

Data Sources Used:

- Project descriptions
- Reference materials/literature: [AAA design Guidance](#), [NACTO](#)

### **Assumptions:**

Benefits are quantified based on aggregating independent standards listed below

**Non-driving modes** - investments include improvements to transit, bicycle or pedestrian networks

### **Reliability**

- Transit features are known to prevent delays / increase headways
- Active transportation features are Class 1 or 4 bike facilities (separated or shared use paths)
- Although reliability is typically used to quantitatively measure transit and vehicular trips, for the purpose of active transportation and bicycles in particular, we as consider direct routes that are comfortable for cyclists as reliable. Since this criteria is qualitative for



projects/programs where trip origins and destinations are not evaluated, the class of bike facilities is used as a proxy for comfort.

**Accessibility**

- Features are known to improve safety for people with disabilities, the elderly or children
- Protected bicycle lanes meet standards for All Ages and Abilities (AAA)
- Disbenefits include project/program features known to add delays for non-driving travel modes

**SCORING METHODOLOGY:**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No benefit	Projects/Programs that improve the movement people through driving
1 – Low Benefit	Project/Program relate to non-driving travel modes
2 – Medium Benefit	Project/Program meets [low benefit] requirement <b>and</b> either the reliability or accessibility criteria
3 – High Benefit	Project/Program meets [low benefit] requirement <b>as well as</b> the reliability and accessibility criteria
NA	Projects/Programs that are non-mobility related

**EQ-SF1: Improves physical safety for people, walking, biking, and rolling**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Supports health outcomes associated with physical injuries and fatalities by improving safety from automobile collisions or modal conflicts, primarily through the provision of protected and separated pathways and ADA features

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project descriptions
- [Complete Street Design Guide.pdf \(lacity.org\)](#)

**Definitions of Bike Facilities:**

- Class 1 - Bike Path / Shared use Path
- Class 2 – Striped bike lane
- Class 3 – Bike Route with mixed traffic
- Class 4 – Separated bike lane
- Complete Streets have Class 1 or 4 facilities

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
0 – No benefit	Road widening or other modification in favor of automobile throughput without the addition of protections for active modes	General beautification and safety improvements may not apply, and we categorized as “NA”
1 – Low Benefit	Class 3 bike facilities OR Projects that provide a low level of improvement for pedestrians (e.g RRFB’s, Restriping, Undefined “safety” related roadway improvements, general “intersection improvements”	
2 – Medium Benefit	Class 2 bike facilities OR Projects that provide a good protection but will only benefit a relatively small number of people given surrounding land uses	Projects that include both class 2 and 3 but also include other multimodal design features such as traffic calming Sidewalk widening and crossing improvements where there is not commercial destinations to draw pedestrians Grade separation between rail and other mode
3 – High Benefit	Class 1 or 4 facilities OR Physical separation for bicycles and pedestrians such as exclusive paths, widening sidewalks and providing significant crossing improvements in commercial areas, near high capacity transit or schools	Also projects that include enhancements for bike paths such as improved lighting or fences Pedestrian bridges are assumed to provide access for bikes Sidewalk widening and curb extensions provide protections for pedestrians Projects that specifically bring a location into compliance with ADA for pedestrians
NA	Projects that do not include any roadway or pathway changes or reconfigurations Projects that do not impact pedestrian or bicycle conditions	Applies to most traffic signal and ITS projects Bikeshare project does not include any bicycle protections though it does include other physical improvements for bike riders Protected left turn lanes do not impact pedestrian or bicycle protections Applies to most traffic signal and ITS projects

**EQ-SF3: Improves perceptions of personal security for people walking, biking, rolling, and taking transit**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Provides features and/or services that may increase the sense of safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and particularly for those from marginalized groups - from crime and personal harm.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:** Project Descriptions

**Assumptions:**

- Upgrades to existing light is assumed to provide low personal security benefit
- High-Capacity Transit (Rail & BRT) – Metro’s new transit line stations are assumed/known to include safety features such as lighting and security cameras
- Assume “Transit stop features and amenities” in Complete Street projects include lighting

**Scoring Methodology:**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
0 – No benefit	Project/program has unmet potential to include elements that increase feelings of personal security for people walking, biking, rolling, and taking transit	
1 – Low Benefit	Project/Program includes increased maintenance or improvements to existing features such as upgraded lighting  and/or  Project/program includes dedicated, formalized bike/pedestrian facilities that reduce the need to use informal routes that are out of public view or contain hazards, and help active transportation users avoid confrontation with aggressive drivers	Features that only provide lighting to drivers (e.g., Freeway lighting) score do not contribute to score
2 – Medium Benefit	Project/program includes <b>one</b> of the following:  > New features that improve perceptions of personal security such as lighting or security cameras  > Increases bus frequency or provide other features or services to minimize time spent waiting at transit stops, particularly after dark	Features that only provide lighting to drivers (e.g., Freeway lighting) do not contribute to score

<p>3 – High Benefit</p>	<p>Program increases presence of personnel dedicated to public safety, incident response, and general assistance</p> <p>And/or</p> <p>Project/program includes <b>two or more</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; New features that improve perceptions of personal security such as lighting or security cameras</li> <li>&gt; Increases bus frequency or provide other features or services to minimize time spent waiting at transit stops, particularly after dark</li> <li>&gt; Dedicated, formalized bike/pedestrian facilities</li> </ul>	<p>Features that only provide lighting to drivers (e.g., Freeway lighting) do not contribute to score</p>
<p>NA</p>	<p>Project/program type does not have realistic opportunity to increase feelings of personal security</p>	

**EQ-EN3: Contributes to remediation of environmental damage or loss of natural features**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Supports health outcomes associated with clean soil, air, and water. Contributes to remediation or restoration of natural features such as vegetation, soil, or bodies of water that have been lost or damaged due to previous infrastructure, development, and land use decisions.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project description and location
- Additional project materials and information available
- Low Tree Canopy data from CA Healthy Places Index<sup>34</sup>

**Assumptions:**

---

<sup>34</sup> <https://www.healthyplacesindex.org/>

- Areas with <5% Tree Canopy land area coverage (below 50<sup>th</sup> percentile per CA Healthy Places Index) to be used as a proxy indicator of ‘environmental damage or loss of natural features’
- Corridor-wide programs are considered to overlap with area of low tree canopy as overall corridor tree canopy is <5%
- Adding greenery or landscaping features to freeways does not meaningfully constitute remediation of environmental damage or loss of natural features relative to past environmental impact of freeway development on natural features and biodiversity.

**Scoring Methodology:**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No benefit	Project/program scores 0 in EN3 or Project/program scores 1 in EN3 but doesn’t overlap areas of low tree canopy or Project/program is part of Freeway infrastructure
1 – Low Benefit	1 – Project/program scores 1 in EN3 and Project extent overlaps areas of low tree canopy (under 5% tree canopy coverage = <50 <sup>th</sup> percentile per HPI data) or Project scores 2 in EN3 but does not overlap areas of low tree canopy.
2 – Medium Benefit	2 – Project/program scores 2 or 3 in EN3 and Project extent overlaps areas of low tree canopy (under 5% tree canopy coverage = <50 <sup>th</sup> percentile per HPI data)
3 – High Benefit	3 – Project/program explicitly incorporates environmental restoration and/or brownfield remediation
NA	Project/program scores NA in EN3

**EQ-EN6: Includes urban greening and cooling for areas of low tree canopy and high heat island burden**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** This equity metric builds off EN6. It adds a +1 benefit if a project is located either in an area with low tree canopy and/or a +1 if located in an area with high heat island temperatures (>= 40 degrees) to the original score in EN6 (added benefit). EN6 scores were subtracted from EQ-EN6.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Cross-checked location of projects with Urban Heat Island map in the Existing Conditions folder, and checked for tree canopy coverage < 5% based on the Healthy Place Index

**Data Sources Used:**

- Urban Heat Island Existing Conditions Map
- Healthy Places Tree Canopy indicator<sup>35</sup>

**Assumptions:**

---

<sup>35</sup> Healthy Places Index. <https://policies.healthyplacesindex.org/neighborhood/tree-canopy/about>

- If a multi-project/program did not specify a specific location but did mention areas like “LB-ELA Corridor” or “within 1-mile of the I-710” or some other language that suggests projects will impact communities around the 710 corridor, then this method assumed that at least one of the projects would be located in an area with low tree canopy and one project in an area with high Heat Island temperatures (thus receiving a +2 bonus)

**Scoring Methodology:**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
1 – Low Benefit	One of these elements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Project/program provides greening/cooling features, in general (same as EN6- does not change)</li> <li>&gt; Project/program provides greening/cooling features in areas of low tree canopy, or</li> <li>&gt; Project/program provides greening/cooling features in areas of high heat island burdens</li> </ul>
2 – Medium Benefit	Two of these elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Project/program provides greening/cooling features, in general (same as EN6- does not change)</li> <li>&gt; Project/program provides greening/cooling features in areas of low tree canopy, and/or</li> <li>&gt; Project/program provides greening/cooling features in areas of high heat island burdens</li> </ul>
3 – High Benefit	All three of these elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Project/program provides greening/cooling features, in general (same as EN6- does not change)</li> <li>&gt; Project/program provides greening/cooling features in areas of low tree canopy, and</li> <li>&gt; Project/program provides greening/cooling features in areas of high heat island burdens</li> </ul>
NA	Projects that receive N/A in EN6

**EQ-EN7: Potential for Noise Reduction**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Reduces transportation noise pollution or includes noise reduction features, such as sound barriers or low-noise technologies, in EFC areas

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project descriptions and project location
- Equity focus communities definition from LA Metro
- EN& Score

**Scoring Methodology:**

Relies on score from EN7 and removes/adds points based on the percent of the project that is located in an EFC based on this logic:

- Project or program that is 0% in EFC: -2 from EN7 score (with minimum value of 0 / No Benefit)
- Project or program that is 1-33% in EFC: -1 from EN7 score (with minimum value of 0 / No Benefit)
- Project or program that is 33-66% in EFC (includes corridor-wide programs): Same as EN7 score
- Project that is >66% in EFC: +1 on top of EN7 score (capped at maximum of 3 / High Benefit)

**EQ-OP1: Access to jobs**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Increases the average number of jobs accessible within a 30-minute time period by transit or a 45-minute time period by auto, for equity focused communities relative to communities that are not equity focused.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Quantitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- > SCAG Regional Travel Model, adapted for use in study area analysis.

**Assumptions:**

- > Projects considered in the SCAG 2020 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) are modeled as defined by the RTP.
- > BRT projects assume a 25% increase in speed and a one-half lane reduction in auto capacity.
- > Transit priority projects assume a 15% increase in speed and a one-quarter lane reduction in auto capacity.
- > For projects that were not modeled, the results of the model were used to estimate benefits of similar projects and programs

**SCORING METHODOLOGY:**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No benefit	Project does not increase access to jobs for persons in EFCs.
1 – Low Benefit	Project results in a slight increase in access to jobs, for persons in EFCs.
2 – Medium Benefit	Project results in a moderate increase in access to jobs, for persons in EFCs.
3 – high Benefit	Project results in a high increase in access to jobs, for persons in EFCs. Ranking is considered separately for rail and bus projects.

**EQ-OP6: Access to Quality-of-Life amenities (grocery stores, healthcare services, schools)**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Provides new transportation facilities near QoL amenities (grocery stores, health care, and schools) and project is located substantially within an EFC area

**Evaluation Method Description:** Quantitative

**Related Metrics:** OP6

**Data Sources Used:**

- > Project descriptions/type
- > Project location using GIS
- > Quality of life amenities include grocery stores, hospitals, urgent care facilities, and institutions of higher education, using data consistent with the Transit Center’s Equity Dashboard<sup>36</sup>
- > Equity focus communities definition from LA Metro
- > OP6 Score

**Scoring Methodology:**

Relies on score from OP6 and removes/adds points based on the percent of the project that is located in an EFC based on this logic:

- > Project or program that is 0% in EFC: -2 from OP6 score (with minimum value of 0 / No Benefit)
- > Project or program that is 1-33% in EFC: -1 from OP6 score (with minimum value of 0 / No Benefit)
- > Project or program that is 33-66% in EFC (includes corridor-wide programs): Same as OP6 score
- > Project that is >66% in EFC: +1 on top of OP6 score (capped at maximum of 3 / High Benefit)

**EQ-OP7: Access to open space, recreation and parks, LA river, etc.**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Provides new transportation facilities near parks and open spaces and project is located substantially within an EFC area

**Evaluation Method Description:** Quantitative

**Related Metrics:** OP7: Access to open space, recreation and parks

**Data Sources Used:**

- > Project descriptions/type
- > Project location using GIS

---

<sup>36</sup> <https://dashboard.transitcenter.org/methodology>



- > Park shapefile downloaded from LA County GIS portal<sup>37</sup>
- > Equity focus communities definition from LA Metro
- > OP7 Score

**Scoring Methodology:**

Relies on score from OP7 and removes/adds points based on the percent of the project that is located in an EFC based on this logic:

- > Project or program that is 0% in EFC: -2 from OP7 score (with minimum value of 0 / No Benefit)
- > Project or program that is 1-33% in EFC: -1 from OP7 score (with minimum value of 0 / No Benefit)
- > Project or program that is 33-66% in EFC (includes corridor-wide programs): Same as OP7 score
- > Project that is >66% in EFC: +1 on top of OP7 score (capped at maximum of 3 / High Benefit)

**EQ-OP8: Increases quantity and quality of employment opportunities for underemployed and low-income workforce**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Project/program provides new job opportunities for underemployed and low-income individuals in the workforce that have the required level of training or education and also live in a disadvantaged community.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Whether or not a project/program’s lead agency/city has a targeted hiring policy, in general

**Data Sources Used:**

- Lead agency/city website (e.g., project/program site, HR)

**Assumptions:**

- Targeted hiring policies would provide job opportunities for residents in the 710 Corridor.
- Clean truck charging station infrastructure projects are construction projects that have the potential to create job opportunities.

**Scoring Methodology:**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
1 – Low benefit	Lead agency/city does not have a hiring policy	If there is a specific program that has a targeted local hiring in place, even though the city/lead agency as a whole does not.

<sup>37</sup><https://egis-lacounty.hub.arcgis.com/datasets/local-parks/explore?location=33.876317%2C-118.170948%2C11.81>

2 –Benefit	2- Lead agency/city has a targeted hiring policy	
NA	Projects that do not add new infrastructure	

**Additional Documentation:** If program/project lead by Metro, Caltrans, City of LA or Long Beach, or LA County, then with was given a moderate benefit score (they have targeted hiring policies); All other agencies/cities were scored 0 due to cities not having a targeted hiring policy; exceptions are made for programs specifically targeting local hire. Language may exist about “inclusive” hiring practices, but that does not mean they are recruiting under employed or low-income individuals.

Note: While OP5 addresses targeted hiring, EQ-OP8 is a different metric. EQ-OP8 asks the question of whether a lead agency/program has a targeted hiring policy, while OP5 asks if a program has a component that includes targeted hiring, OR a project is large enough to have the potential to create new jobs which gets at the ability/potential to create new jobs. The issue with OP5 is that it is, in essence, asking two different questions. EQ-OP8 is asking strictly about targeted hiring, while OP5 is asking about not only targeted hiring, but the potential for new job creation. Thus, OP5 and EQ-OP8 are not necessarily scored the same.

**Agencies with Targeted Hiring Policies:**

- Metro ([link](#))
- Caltrans ([link](#))
- LA County ([link](#))
- City of Long Beach ([link](#))
- City of Los Angeles ([link](#))

**EQ-OP9: Reduces housing or transportation costs for low-income households**

**Evaluation Criteria:** EQ-OP9: Reduces housing or transportation costs for low-income households.

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Whether project reduces housing or transportation costs for low-income households

**Evaluation Method Description:** Assessed whether program/project had the potential to reduce housing or transportation costs through improvements in transit frequency, rail lines, pedestrian projects, bike projects. Essentially, projects that made transportation more efficient or housing costs, in general, were given a positive benefit.

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project Descriptions

**Assumptions:**

**Scoring Methodology:**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No benefit	Not used for this metric
1 –Low Benefit	Not used for this metric •
2 – Medium Benefit	Project or program includes one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Makes improvements on transit frequency, rail lines, pedestrian projects, bike projects, or</li> </ul> Reduces housing costs in general
3 – High Benefit	Project or program includes both of of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Makes improvements on transit frequency, rail lines, pedestrian projects, bike projects, and</li> <li>• Reduces housing costs in general</li> </ul>
NA	Project or program has no impact on housing or transportation costs

**EQ-OP10: Reduces residential or commercial displacement risk**

Detailed Criteria Description: Reduces risk of economic (as opposed to physical) displacement as an adverse effect of infrastructure investment, which may result in new development interest, increasing land prices, property values, and ultimately housing/business costs.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project descriptions and additional project materials
- [White Paper on Anti-Displacement Strategy Effectiveness \(urbandisplacement.org\)](http://urbandisplacement.org)
- [Strategies - Small Business Anti-Displacement Network \(SBAN\) \(antidisplacement.org\)](http://antidisplacement.org)
- [Transit-Oriented Displacement or Community Dividends? Understanding the Effects of Smarter Growth on Communities | Books Gateway | MIT Press](#)

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No benefit	0 - Project/Program broadly influences land use, business, or housing conditions without incorporating protections/benefits targeted to at-risk groups  Project example: New light rail infrastructure (including stations) is known to have potential for catalyzing speculative investment and economic neighborhood change, which can increase displacement pressure.
1 – Low Benefit	1 – Project/program supports indirect displacement prevention strategies such as affordable housing production and workforce development

2 – Medium Benefit	2 – Project/program incorporates direct/near-term displacement prevention strategies such as affordable housing preservation, rent stabilization, small business loans/business interruption funds
3 – High Benefit	3 – Project/program is specifically dedicated to establishing community stabilization strategies and policies throughout the LB-ELA corridor, utilizing both direct and indirect displacement prevention strategies
NA	NA – Project/program type does not have opportunity to influence displacement outcomes

## Sustainability

### **SA1: Reduces reliance on polluting and energy-intensive modes of travel and goods movement**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Supports health outcomes associated with clean air by reducing consumption of fossil fuels in mobility through projects or programs that support **electrification, cleaner fuels** or **travel behavior** that reduces **per capita VMT**.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:** Project descriptions

Assumptions: Benefits are quantified based on aggregating independent standards listed below

- Improvements relate to active or public transportation networks
- Improvements are known to shift commute trips to cleaner modes / away from SOV
- Improvements are known to support clean goods movement
- Improvements support only zero emission vehicles or equipment

### **SCORING METHODOLOGY:**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No benefit	Projects/Programs relate to moving people or goods but do not meet any standards
1 – Low Benefit	Project/Program meets 1 of the standards
2 – Medium Benefit	Project/Program meets 2 of the standards
3 – High Benefit	Project/Program meets 3 of the standards

NA	Projects/Programs that do not relate to moving people or goods
----	--

**SA2: Promotes physical activity and health through active transportation and recreation**  
**Evaluation Criteria:**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Supports physical and mental health outcomes associated with activity by **providing or enhancing access** to infrastructure or services that promotes physical activity.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative, based on project descriptions indicating scale

**Data Sources Used:** Project descriptions

**Assumptions:**

- The scale of the project (localized, semi-localized, corridor-wide) was used in the evaluation of each project (see common definitions section above for definition of project scales)

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
0 – No benefit	Arterial Projects where improvements are not targeted to enhance active transportation	
1 – Low Benefit	Projects enhance bike/ped infrastructure networks at the localized scale	
2 – Medium Benefit	Projects enhance bike/ped infrastructure networks at the semi-localized scale	Although ped bike bridges are typically under a mile in length, they typically make a connection where there was no access and are considered medium benefit
3 – High Benefit	Projects enhance bike/ped infrastructure networks at the corridor-wide scale	
Na	Projects that do not impact pedestrian or bicycle conditions	

**SA3: Improves climate resilience through mitigation of flooding and extreme heat impacts**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Supports improved health outcomes associated with reducing exposure to hazards. Improves community and infrastructure resilience by mitigating the risks and impacts of flooding or extreme heat.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:** Project descriptions

**Assumptions:**

- The scale of the project (localized, semi-localized, corridor-wide) was used in the evaluation of each project (see common definitions section above for definition of project scales)

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
0 – No benefit	Physical projects with no mention of greening/drainage	Although active transportation projects may include these features, they were scored 0 if not mentioned
1 – Low Benefit	Projects reduce flood risk or extreme heat through greening, cooling or drainage at the localized scale	
2 – Medium Benefit	Projects reduce flood risk or extreme heat through greening, cooling or drainage at the semi-localized scale	
3 – High Benefit	Projects reduce flood risk or extreme heat through greening, cooling or drainage at the corridor-wide scale	
N/A	<p>Programs that do not lead to physical improvements/infrastructure</p> <p>Physical projects where operational changes are the primary improvement (e.g. freeway lane configurations where no new lanes are added, signal improvements)</p>	

**SA4: Supports job creation in, and workforce transitions to green technology and infrastructure sectors**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Provides workforce development opportunities and job training in green sectors or supports the transition to green jobs.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:** Project descriptions; workforce opportunities related to green jobs

**Definitions:**

- **Sustainable investments** are any investments that build greener infrastructure for a future without fossil fuels
- **Green tech** refers to any specific technology that is intended to reverse the effects of human activity on the environment.

**Scoring Methodology:**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
N/A	Projects that do not add new infrastructure
0 – No benefit	Projects that add new infrastructure but do not support jobs or investments in green sectors
1 –Low Benefit	One of these elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program creates jobs in sustainable investments,</li> <li>• Promotes green tech, or</li> <li>• Program supports workforce transitions to green tech/infra sectors</li> </ul>
2 – Medium Benefit	Two of these elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program creates jobs in sustainable investments,</li> <li>• Promotes green tech, and/or</li> <li>• Program supports workforce transitions to green tech/infra sectors</li> </ul>
3 – High Benefit	All three of these elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program creates jobs in sustainable investments,</li> <li>• Promotes green tech, and</li> <li>• Program supports workforce transitions to green tech/infra sectors</li> </ul>

**SA5: Improves cargo efficiencies to minimize trip volumes and emissions from goods movement activity**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Improves cargo efficiencies to minimize trip volumes and emissions from goods movement activity.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Quantitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- > SCAG Regional Travel Model, adapted for use in study area analysis.

**Assumptions:**

- > Projects considered in the SCAG 2020 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) are modeled as defined by the RTP.
- > Interchanges, auxiliary lanes, and truck lanes along I-710 were modeled using assumptions consistent with past studies.
- > Projects that improve arterial street operations without adding lanes were modeled by increasing auto speed and capacity in a manner consistent with SCAG modeling practices.
- > BRT projects assume a 25% increase in transit speed and a one-half lane of reduction in auto capacity.
- > Transit priority projects assume a 15% increase in transit speed and a one-quarter lane of reduction in auto capacity.
- > Truck VMT is used as an indicator for truck emissions
- > For projects that were not modeled, the results of the model were used to estimate benefits of similar projects and programs

**SCORING METHODOLOGY:**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
0 – No benefit (vs no info)	Project does not reduce truck emissions.	
1 – Low Benefit	Project results in a slight reduction in truck emissions. Projects are ranked based on truck vehicle-miles traveled per mile.	Interchange projects were ranked based on the number of trucks served, as this high-level analysis does not compare the effectiveness of detailed interchange design details. Arterial operations projects were ranked based on the number of trucks served, as arterial-level project were modeled at a high level.
2 – Medium Benefit	Project results in a moderate reduction in truck emissions. Projects are ranked based on truck vehicle-miles traveled per mile.	
3 – high Benefit	Project results in a significant reduction in truck emissions. Projects are ranked based on truck vehicle-miles traveled per mile.	

**Concerns**

**CON1: Potential for Displacements**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** This concern is intended to capture the potential displacements of residences or businesses caused by the construction of a project.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative/Engineering Judgement

**Related Criteria:** CON2: Physical impacts to adjacent right of way

**Data Sources Used:**

- > Project descriptions
- > I-710 EIR/EIS Alternative 5C design drawings

**Assumptions:**

- > The study area is highly developed and any transportation project or program that requires additional right of way can cause displacement of adjacent residences and businesses.
- > The type of project and its location and length can affect the potential number of displacements
- > See appendix A for the applicability of each project types for this metric; applicable projects were reviewed individually to assess potential for adverse impacts.

**SCORING METHODOLOGY:**



Scoring	Example/Methodology
NA	Project or Program does not add new infrastructure (e.g. rehabilitation/maintenance to existing infrastructure, stations, freeways)
0 – No Impact	Project or Program requires new physical infrastructure, but the improvements are contained within existing ROW with 0 displacements
1 – Low Impact	Project or Program requires new physical infrastructure, but only short segments of the project may require acquisition of adjacent residences or businesses, with a total of less than 3 businesses or residences likely to be displaced
2 – Medium Impact	Project or Program requires new physical infrastructure where the project may require acquisition of adjacent businesses or residences with a total of less than 8 businesses or residences likely to be displaced
3 – High Impact	Project or Program requires new physical infrastructure where the project may require acquisition of adjacent businesses or residences with a total of more than 8 businesses or residences likely to be displaced

**CON2: Potential for Physical Impacts (ROW)**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** This concern is intended to capture the potential physical impacts to adjacent right of way (ROW) caused by the construction of a project.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative/Engineering Judgement

**Related Criteria:** CON1: Physical impacts to adjacent right of way

**Data Sources Used:**

- > Project descriptions
- > I-710 EIR/EIS Alternative 5C design drawings

**Assumptions:**

- > The study area is highly developed and any transportation project or program that requires additional right of way even without causing the displacement of adjacent residences and businesses can impact adjacent properties.
- > The type of project and its location and length can affect the potential number of displacements
- > See appendix A for the applicability of each project types for this metric that may cause physical right of way impacts to adjacent properties; applicable projects were reviewed individually to assess potential for adverse impacts.

**SCORING METHODOLOGY:**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
NA	Project or Program does not add new infrastructure (e.g. rehabilitation/maintenance to existing infrastructure, stations, freeways).
0 – No Impact	Project or Program requires new physical infrastructure but the improvements are contained within existing ROW with no physical impacts.

1 – Low Impact	Project or Program requires new physical infrastructure, but only localized segments of the project may create physical right of way impacts to adjacent properties.
2 – Medium Impact	Project or Program requires new physical infrastructure where several segments of the project may create physical right of way impacts to adjacent properties.
3 – High Impact	Project or Program requires new physical infrastructure where many segments of the project may create physical right of way impacts to adjacent properties.

**CON3: Potential for Increased Commute Times**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Potential for increased commute times.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Quantitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- SCAG Regional Travel Model, adapted for use in study area analysis.

**Assumptions:**

- Projects considered in the SCAG 2020 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) are modeled as defined by the RTP.
- Interchanges, auxiliary lanes, and truck lanes along I-710 were modeled using assumptions consistent with past studies.
- Projects that improve arterial street operations without adding lanes were modeled by increasing speed and capacity in a manner consistent with SCAG modeling practices.
- BRT projects assume a 25% increase in transit speed and a one-half lane of reduction in vehicle capacity.
- Transit priority projects assume a 15% increase in transit speed and a one-quarter lane of reduction in vehicle capacity.

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No Concern	Project unlikely to increase commute times.
1 – Low Concern	Project may result in slight increases to travel times for some commuters.
2 – Medium Concern	Project may result in moderate increases to travel times for some commuters.
3 – High Concern	Project may result in considerable increases to travel times for some commuters.

**CON4: Potential for Traffic Diversion / Emissions Shifting**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Potential for Traffic Diversion / Emission Shifting

**Evaluation Method Description:** Quantitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- SCAG Regional Travel Model, adapted for use in study area analysis.

**Assumptions:**

- Projects considered in the SCAG 2020 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) are modeled as defined by the RTP.
- Interchanges, auxiliary lanes, and truck lanes along I-710 were modeled using assumptions consistent with past studies.
- Projects that improve arterial street operations without adding lanes were modeled by increasing speed and capacity in a manner consistent with SCAG modeling practices.
- BRT projects assume a 25% increase in transit speed and a one-half lane of reduction in vehicle capacity.
- Transit priority projects assume a 15% increase in transit speed and a one-quarter lane of reduction in vehicle capacity.

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No Concern	Project unlikely to cause traffic diversion or emission shifting.
1 – Low Concern	Slight potential to cause traffic diversion or emission shifting.
2 – Medium Concern	Moderate potential to cause traffic diversion or emission shifting.
3 – High Concern	High potential to cause traffic diversion or emission shifting.

**CON5: Potential to Increase Localized Emissions**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Increases in localized diesel particulate matter (DPM) and fine particulate matter (PM2.5) emissions from on-road vehicles which may be related to health concerns.

**Evaluation Method Description:** *Quantitative*

**Data Sources Used:**

- See AQ1 and CH1 data sources. Additional data sources include:
- Gridded Emissions Map
- South Coast AQMD Permit Application Package “N” for Use in Conjunction with the Risk Assessment Procedures for Rules 1401, 1401.1, and 212<sup>38</sup>

#### Assumptions:

- Not all freeway or arterial roadway projects were included in the TDM modeling. See project information matrix.
- Changes in PM<sub>2.5</sub> have been associated with mortality/illness impacts. Changes in DPM have been associated with cancer risk. For more information on health and air quality studies, see South Coast AQMD 2022 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) Appendix I: Health Effects<sup>39</sup> and South Coast AQMD Multiple Air Toxics Exposure Study V (MATES V) Final Report<sup>40</sup>.

#### Scoring Methodology:

- The highest concern ranking of any grid cell is assigned to the suite of modeled projects based on the localized emission increases using scale/breakpoints shown in the legends below. For transit projects, the maximum concern ranking is determined by regional emission increases because localized emission increases and gridded maps are not available.

---

<sup>38</sup> South Coast AQMD. Permit Application Package “N” for Use in Conjunction with the Risk Assessment Procedures for Rules 1401, 1401.1, and 212. October 1, 2017. Available here: <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/permitting/rule-1401-risk-assessment/attachmentn-v8-1.pdf?sfvrsn=4>. Accessed: May 2023.

<sup>39</sup> South Coast AQMD. 2022 AQMP Appendix I: Health Effects. December 2, 2022. Available here: <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/clean-air-plans/air-quality-management-plans/2022-air-quality-management-plan/final-2022-aqmp/appendix-i.pdf?sfvrsn=6>. Accessed: May 2023.

<sup>40</sup> South Coast AQMD. MATES V Final Report. August 2021. Available here: <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/planning/mates-v/mates-v-final-report-9-24-21.pdf?sfvrsn=6>. Accessed: May 2023.

**Emission Categories for AQ1 Evaluation - Freeway, Arterial Roadway, and Transit Projects**

<b>PM<sub>2.5</sub> Incremental Emissions (lb/day)</b>	<b>NO<sub>x</sub> Incremental Emissions (lb/day)</b>	<b>Legend</b>
≤-5	≤-55	High Benefit
≤-5	>-55 to ≤-5	Medium Benefit
≤-5	>-5 to <5 : No change	Medium Benefit
>-0.05 to <0.05 : No change	≤-55	Medium Benefit
>-5 to ≤-0.05	≤-55	Medium Benefit
>-5 to ≤-0.05	>-55 to ≤-5	Low Benefit
>-5 to ≤-0.05	>-5 to <5 : No change	Low Benefit
>-0.05 to <0.05 : No change	>-55 to ≤-5	Low Benefit
>-0.05 to <0.05 : No change	>-5 to <5 : No change	No Benefit
≤-0.05	≥5	Mixed Benefit/Concern
≥0.05 to <5	<-5	Mixed Benefit/Concern
>-0.05 to <0.05 : No change	≥5 to <55	Low Concern
≥0.05 to <5	>-5 to <5 : No change	Low Concern
≥0.05 to <5	≥5 to <55	Low Concern
>-0.05 to <0.05 : No change	≥55	Medium Concern
≥5	>-5 to <5 : No change	Medium Concern
≥0.05 to <5	≥55	Medium Concern
≥5	≥5 to <55	Medium Concern
≥5	≥55	High Concern

**Emission Categories for CH1 Evaluation - - Freeway, Arterial Roadway, and Transit Projects**

<b>PM<sub>2.5</sub> Incremental Emissions (lb/day)</b>	<b>DPM Incremental Emissions (lb/day)</b>	<b>Legend</b>
≤-5	≤-0.4	High Benefit
≤-5	>-0.4 to ≤-0.004	Medium Benefit
≤-5	>-0.004 to <0.004 : No change	Medium Benefit
>-0.05 to <0.05 : No change	≤-0.4	Medium Benefit
>-5 to ≤-0.05	≤-0.4	Medium Benefit
>-5 to ≤-0.05	>-0.4 to ≤-0.004	Low Benefit
>-5 to ≤-0.05	>-0.004 to <0.004 : No change	Low Benefit
>-0.05 to <0.05 : No change	>-0.4 to ≤-0.004	Low Benefit
>-0.05 to <0.05 : No change	>-0.004 to <0.004 : No change	No Benefit
≤-0.05	≥0.004	Mixed Benefit/Concern
≥0.05 to <5	<-0.004	Mixed Benefit/Concern
>-0.05 to <0.05 : No change	≥0.004 to <0.4	Low Concern
≥0.05 to <5	>-0.004 to <0.004 : No change	Low Concern
≥0.05 to <5	≥0.004 to <0.4	Low Concern
>-0.05 to <0.05 : No change	≥0.4	Medium Concern
≥5	>-0.004 to <0.004 : No change	Medium Concern
≥0.05 to <5	≥0.4	Medium Concern
≥5	≥0.004 to <0.4	Medium Concern
≥5	≥0.4	High Concern

**For Active Transportation/TDM Projects**

These projects will be accounted for in AQ3. Not sufficient information/methodologies to calculate the impacts for AQ1, CH1, and EN2 therefore these projects will get a score of NA.

**For Good Movements Projects**

Most of these projects will be accounted for in AQ2. Not sufficient information/methodologies to calculate the impacts for AQ1, CH1, and EN2 therefore these projects will get a score of NA.

**For Community Programs Projects**

These projects will be accounted for in AQ2 or CH2 or EN6. Not sufficient information/methodologies to calculate the impacts for AQ1, CH1, and EN2 therefore these projects will get a score of NA.

**CON6: Potential for bike/ped safety impacts**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Project or program has the potential to introduce new safety hazards or modal conflicts for pedestrians and bicyclists or other active transportation users

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:** Project descriptions

**Assumptions:**

- Increased street widths encourage higher vehicle speeds, create longer crossing distances, and reduce pedestrian/bike visibility
- Addition of vehicle travel lanes creates additional conflict points for active transportation users navigating lane changes
- Projects that encourage uninterrupted vehicle traffic flow on arterial roadways (e.g., signal synchronization) encourage slightly higher vehicle speeds and lower levels of driver awareness at intersections.

**Scoring Methodology:**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions
N/A	Project or Program does not have opportunity to influence safety of roadway conditions for pedestrians or bike/active transportation users	
0 – No Impact	Project or Program improves or maintains safety of roadway conditions for pedestrians or bike/active transportation users	
1 – Low Impact	Project/Program includes road widening or addition of vehicle travel lanes in favor of automobile throughput without the addition of protections for active modes – Localized Scale  Project/program encourages uninterrupted vehicle traffic flow (e.g., signal synchronization)	
2 – Medium Impact	Project/Program includes road widening or addition of vehicle travel lanes in favor of automobile throughput without the addition of protections for active modes – Semi-Localized Scale	
3 – High Impact	Project/Program includes road widening or addition of vehicle travel lanes in favor of automobile throughput without the addition of protections for active modes – Corridor-Wide Scale	Project or program that has bike/ped accommodations receives a 1

**CON7: Potential for concentrated congestion impacts**

**Evaluation Method Description:** Quantitative

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Potential for concentrated congestion impacts

**Data Sources Used:**

- SCAG Regional Travel Model, adapted for use in study area analysis.

**Assumptions:**

- Projects considered in the SCAG 2020 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) are modeled as defined by the RTP.
- Interchanges, auxiliary lanes, and truck lanes along I-710 were modeled using assumptions consistent with past studies.
- Projects that improve arterial street operations without adding lanes were modeled by increasing speed and capacity in a manner consistent with SCAG modeling practices.
- BRT projects assume a 25% increase in transit speed and a one-half lane of reduction in vehicle capacity.
- Transit priority projects assume a 15% increase in transit speed and a one-quarter lane of reduction in vehicle capacity.

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No Concern	Project unlikely to cause concentrated congestion.
1 – Low Concern	Slight potential to cause concentrated congestion.
2 – Medium Concern	Moderate potential to cause concentrated congestion.
3 – High Concern	High potential to cause concentrated congestion.

**CON8: Potential Construction Impacts**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** This concern is intended to capture the potential for construction impacts to communities and travelers caused by the construction of a project.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative/Engineering Judgement

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project descriptions
- I-710 EIR/EIS Alternative 5C design drawings

**Assumptions:**

- The study area is highly developed and any transportation project or program that requires construction has the potential to create construction impacts while being built.
- The type of project, its complexity, its location and its scale will affect the duration and the magnitude of potential construction impacts.

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**



Scoring	Example/Methodology
NA	Project or Program does not add new infrastructure (e.g. rehabilitation/maintenance to existing infrastructure, stations, freeways).
0 – No Impact	Project or Program requires new physical infrastructure, but the improvements are small in scale and take a short time to construct.
1 – Low Impact	Project or Program requires new physical infrastructure, but the scale and duration of construction is localized and is of short duration.
2 – Medium Impact	Project or Program requires new physical infrastructure where the scale and duration of construction will impact several communities for several months.
3 – High Impact	Project or Program requires new physical infrastructure where the scale and duration of construction affects many communities and travelers for a duration of nine months or more.

**CON9: Potential for VMT Increases**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Evaluates whether a project or program has the potential to increase vehicle miles traveled (VMT)

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project Description and type

**Assumptions:**

- Projects that promote single occupant vehicle travel are have the potential to increase VMT
- Projects and programs were evaluated based on the type and sub classification (See appendix A) as well as the scale of the project.
- The scale of the project (localized, semi-localized, corridor-wide) was used in the evaluation of each project (see common definitions section above for definition of project scales)

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
NA	A project or program that does not impact vehicle miles traveled (generally non-roadway projects)
0 – No Concern	A mobility project or program that is unlikely to increase VMT
1 – Low Concern	Project or program that has the potential to impact VMT at a semi-localized scale
2 – Medium Concern	Project or program that has the potential to impact VMT at a corridor-wide scale
3 – High Concern	Not used for this metric

**CON10: Potential to increase user costs**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Evaluates whether a project or program has the potential to increase user costs, either directly or indirectly.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Related Criteria:** EQ-OP9 (Reduces Housing or Transportation Costs for Low-Income Households)

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project Description

**Assumptions:**

- Initial concern focused around increases in direct user costs, i.e., congestion pricing
- Concerns capture “direct” and “indirect” impacts on user costs. Direct impacts refer to projects/programs that directly impact user costs (i.e., congestion pricing). Indirect impacts refer to projects/programs that are assumed to decrease user cost due to more efficient transportation/transit systems, reduced wait times, etc.

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No Concern	Project/program has no impact on user costs related to transportation or housing
1 – Low Concern	Project/program minimally and indirectly increases user costs related to transportation or housing (e.g., congestion pricing)
2 – Medium Concern	Project/program moderately and directly or indirectly increases user costs related to transportation or housing (e.g., congestion pricing)
3 – High Concern	Project/program directly and substantially increases user costs related to transportation or housing (e.g., congestion pricing)

**CON11: Potential to increase impervious cover**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** This concern is intended to capture the potential negative impacts related to the **addition** of impervious surfaces that could increase stormwater run-off, environmental heat gain, or worsen water quality – all of which have negative impacts on ecosystems and human health.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Related Criteria:**

- > EN-3: Protects natural habitat (Greening Features)
- > EN-4: Water Quality, Water Capture, Drainage, and Flood Management features
- > EN-6: Reduce Heat Island Effect; Provide Cooling Features for Users

- > EQ-EN6: Includes urban greening and cooling for areas of low tree canopy and high heat island burden
- > SA3: Improves climate resilience through infrastructure that mitigates the impacts of flooding and increased heat

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project descriptions

**Assumptions:**

- The study area is highly developed with little to no projects occurring on greenfield, agricultural or open space land.
- Any project which mentioned the addition of landscaping, vegetation or greening were not considered as concerns.
- This criterion does not consider land cover change, which would require more detailed design information but rather whether projects - by their scale and type, are likely to increase heat gain and stormwater run-off or hinder stormwater absorption.
- The scale of the project (localized, semi-localized, corridor-wide) was used in the evaluation of each project (see common definitions section above for definition of project scales)

**SCORING METHODOLOGY:**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
NA	Project or Program does not add new infrastructure (e.g. rehabilitation/maintenance to existing infrastructure, stations, freeways)	
0 – No Impact	Project or Program requires new physical infrastructure but includes landscaping, storm water mitigation, or porous surfaces.	Includes street furniture and transit amenities - which are not assumed to have a negative impact
1 – Low Impact	Project or Program requires new physical infrastructure at the localized scale (roadway, freeway, transit) or localized / semi-localized scale (active transportation, pedestrian)	Some semi-localized or corridor-wide projects/programs that add minimal infrastructure
2 – Medium Impact	Project or Program requires new physical infrastructure at the semi- localized scale (roadway, freeway, transit) or corridor wide scale (active transportation, pedestrian)	
3 – High Impact	Project or Program requires new physical infrastructure at the corridor wide scale (roadway, freeway, transit)	

**CON12: Potential to increase economic displacement**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** This concern is intended to capture potential for increased vulnerability to economic (as opposed to physical) displacement of residents or businesses as an adverse effect of infrastructure investment, which may result in new development interest, increasing land prices, property values, and ultimately housing/business costs.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative/GIS

**Related Criteria:** EQ-OP10: Reduces residential or commercial displacement risk

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project descriptions
- Estimated Displacement Risk Model (Urban Displacement Project)
  - [Estimated Displacement Risk - Overall Displacement | Estimated Displacement Risk - Overall Displacement | AFFH Data and Mapping Resources \(arcgis.com\)](#)
  - [California Estimated Displacement Risk Model – Urban Displacement](#)
- Reference materials/literature
  - [Transit-Oriented Displacement or Community Dividends? Understanding the Effects of Smarter Growth on Communities | Books Gateway | MIT Press](#) (Karen Chapple & Anastasia Loukaitou-Sideris)
  - [Green gentrification or ‘just green enough’: Do park location, size and function affect whether a place gentrifies or not? - Alessandro Rigolon, Jeremy Németh, 2020 \(sagepub.com\)](#) (Alessandro Rigolon & Jeremy Nemeth)

**Assumptions:**

- This metric is applicable to new class 1 and 4 bike paths and rail transit projects:
  - Major transit investment (new rail lines and stations) is one of many factors associated with gentrification and displacement in urban areas. While a simple causal relationship has not been established between transit investment and displacement, research based in Los Angeles and beyond demonstrates that housing instability can be exacerbated by transit investment. (Chapple & Loukaitou-Sideris)
  - New greenway parks with an active transportation component may foster gentrification and increase vulnerability to displacement (Rigolon & Nemeth).
    - “Greenway” refers to a recreational active transportation corridor of longer than 1-mile.
- The Urban Displacement Project’s Estimated Displacement Risk Methodology is the best available assessment of displacement risk for all communities within the LB-ELA corridor.
- Levels of residential displacement risk established in EDR model scores can be assumed to reflect relative levels of commercial displacement risk for disadvantaged/small business tenants as well.

- Projects are mapped against the Estimated Displacement Risk map, and joined with associated census tracts (those overlapping and within 500 feet of the project). Displacement risk scores for associated census tracts will be averaged using a numeric scale as described in the scoring matrix

**EDR Model Methodology**

The Urban Displacement Project’s Estimated Displacement Risk (EDR) model uses several household-level and census tract-level metrics including 2014 & 2019 American Community Survey (ACS) data to identify vulnerability to displacement for low-income renter households within each census tract. Using machine learning, the model identifies variables closely associated with household-level displacement to estimate displacement risk at the census tract level. Each census tract is scored for Overall Displacement Risk, with categories of “None,” “Probable Displacement,” “1 Income Group,” or “2 Income Groups.” These scores are explained in more detail in the table at the end of this rubric.

The model uses net loss of extremely low-income (ELI: 0-30% of Area Median Income), very low-income (VLI: 30-50% of AMI) and low-income (LI: 50-80% of AMI) households as a proxy for displacement. In the EDR mapping tool, ELI and VLI groups are consolidated into one “very low-income” group (0%-50% of AMI). If the model predicts a net loss within these income groups, the tract is categorized into three degrees of displacement (in order of decreasing severity: ‘Extreme,’ ‘High,’ or ‘Elevated’); if net loss is uncertain, tracts are categorized as experiencing ‘Probable’ displacement.

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
0 – No Impact	Project does not include a new transit or greenway investment (No displacement risk)
1 – Low Impact	Project includes a new transit or greenway investment, and average estimated displacement risk of associated census tracts is none to low (0-1)
2 – Medium Impact	Project includes a new transit or greenway investment, and average estimated displacement risk of associated census tracts is low to moderate (1.1-2.0)
3 – High Impact	Project includes a new transit or greenway investment, and average estimated displacement risk of associated census tracts is moderate to high (2.1-3.0)

**CON13: Potential to increase noise pollution**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Evaluates whether a project or program has the potential to increase noise pollution

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Related Criteria:** EN7

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project Description
- Rating from EN7

**Assumptions:**

- The scale of the project (localized, semi-localized, corridor-wide) was used in the evaluation of each project (see common definitions section above for definition of project scales)
- Projects that scored a “0” or “No Benefit” on EN7 were screened to determine if they have the potential to increase noise beyond the status quo. This screening occurred at the sub category level first and was refined in the actual rating. See Appendix A below for the applicability of each sub category.

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
NA	Project/program does not have the potential to increase or decrease noise (Rated NA on EN-7)	
0 – No Impact	Project includes noise mitigation features (Rated 1-3 on EN-7) or Projects with no noise mitigation benefit (Rated 0 on EN7) and is “localized”	Projects located within the Ports of LA/LB
1 – Low Impact	Projects with no noise mitigation benefit (Rated 0 on EN7) and is semi-localized	Corridor-wide or projects that shift from one mode to another (e.g. trucks to freight rail) where noise impacts are unclear Signal synchronization and bus ITS projects are “Low impact” regardless of scale
2 – Medium Impact	Projects with no noise mitigation benefit (Rated 0 on EN7) and is corridor-wide	
3 – High Impact	No High Concerns	

**CON14: Potential for reduced transit ridership**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Evaluates whether a project or program has the potential to decrease transit ridership

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project Description and type

**Assumptions:**

Projects and programs were evaluated based on the type and sub classification (See appendix A) as well as the scale of the project.

- The scale of the project (localized, semi-localized, corridor-wide) was used in the evaluation of each project (see common definitions section above for definition of project scales)

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
NA	A project or program that does not impact transit ridership (non-mobility projects)
0 – No Concern	A mobility project or program that is unlikely to decrease transit ridership (transit and active transportation projects)
1 – Low Concern	Project or program that has the potential to reduce transit ridership at a semi-localized scale
2 – Medium Concern	Project or program that has the potential to reduce transit ridership at a corridor-wide scale
3 – High Concern	Not used for this metric

**CON15: Potential for new physical transportation barriers**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** Evaluates whether a project or program has the potential to decrease access through the addition of a new physical barrier

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project Description and type

**Assumptions:**

- Only transit rail projects are applicable for this concern. There are no new roadway projects that add barriers (no new freeways) and no new active transportation projects that add new barriers
- 

**SCORING METHODOLOGY**

Scoring	Example/Methodology
NA	A project or program that does not have new physical infrastructure
0 – No Concern	Infrastructure projects that do not have access barriers (arterial roadways, bus projects, active transportation projects)
1 – Low Concern	Transit projects that mostly use existing rights of way and/or are likely to be elevated
2 – Medium Concern	Transit projects with new right of way and likely to be at-grade
3 – High Concern	Not used for this metric

**CON16: Potential increased storm water runoff and/or increased flood risk**

**Detailed Criteria Description:** This concern is intended to capture the potential negative impacts related to the addition of infrastructure that does not include specific features that address storm water run off or flood management. Risk of flooding is increased when water cannot soak into the ground and instead runs off of impervious surfaces. When rain is heavy, this can lead to flooding, erosion and damage to surrounding infrastructure. These risks increase with weather changes associated with global warming.

**Evaluation Method Description:** Qualitative

**Related Criteria:**

- > EN-3: Protects natural habitat (Greening Features)
- > EN-4: Water Quality, Water Capture, Drainage, and Flood Management features
- > EN-6: Reduce Heat Island Effect; Provide Cooling Features for Users
- > EQ-EN6: Includes urban greening and cooling for areas of low tree canopy and high heat island burden
- > SA3: Improves climate resilience through infrastructure that mitigates the impacts of flooding and increased heat

**Data Sources Used:**

- Project descriptions

**Assumptions:**

- The study area is highly developed with little to no projects occurring on greenfield, agricultural or open space land.
- Any project which mentioned the addition of landscaping, vegetation or greening were not considered as concerns.
- This criterion does not consider land cover change, which would require more detailed design information but rather whether projects - by their scale and type, are likely to increase heat gain and stormwater run-off or hinder stormwater absorption.
- The scale of the project (localized, semi-localized, corridor-wide) was used in the evaluation of each project (see common definitions section above for definition of project scales)

**SCORING METHODOLOGY:**

Scoring	Example/Methodology	Exceptions / Adjustments
NA	Project or Program does not add new infrastructure (e.g. rehabilitation/maintenance to existing infrastructure, stations, freeways)	



0 – No Impact	Project or Program requires new physical infrastructure but includes landscaping, storm water mitigation, or porous surfaces.	Includes street furniture and transit amenities - which are not assumed to have a negative impact
1 – Low Impact	Project or Program requires new physical infrastructure at the localized scale (roadway, freeway, transit) or localized / semi-localized scale (active transportation, pedestrian)	Some semi-localized or corridor-wide projects/programs that add minimal infrastructure
2 – Medium Impact	Project or Program requires new physical infrastructure at the semi- localized scale (roadway, freeway, transit) or corridor wide scale (active transportation, pedestrian)	
3 – High Impact	Project or Program requires new physical infrastructure at the corridor wide scale (roadway, freeway, transit)	

### Appendix A - Sub Classification Scoring and Applicability

Project Type	Sub Classification	Sub Classification Scoring				Metric Applicability									
		MB5	MB6	SF7	EN7	MB4	OP6	OP7	CON1	CON2	CON8	CON9	CON14	CON13	
<b>Active Transportation / TDM</b>	Bike Blvds	1	1 or 3	1	NA	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Bike education	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Class 1 or 4 Bikeway	2	1 or 3	1	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA	
	First Last Mile	1	1 or 3	1	NA	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	Y	NA	NA	NA	
	Micro mobility	1	NA	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Pedestrian (ped) bridge	2	1 or 3	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA	
	Pedestrian crossing	1	1 or 3	1	NA	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Sidewalk	2	1 or 3	2	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA	
	Sidewalk, Class 2, other	1	1 or 3	2	NA	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Transportation Demand Management	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Various bike improvements	2	1 or 3	2	NA	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Various bike/ped improvements	2	1 or 3	2	NA	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Various Ped improvements	2	1 or 3	2	NA	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
<b>Arterial Roadway</b>	Arterial improvement	2	NA	3	0	NA	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	
	Arterial widening	2	NA	1	0	NA	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
	Connected/Autonomous Vehicles	1	NA	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Y	Y	NA	

Project Type	Sub Classification	Sub Classification Scoring				Metric Applicability								
		MB5	MB6	SF7	EN7	MB4	OP6	OP7	CON1	CON2	CON8	CON9	CON14	CON13
	Complete Streets	1	Varies	3	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA
	Complete streets / arterial improvements	1	Varies	3	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA
	Fiber	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Integrated Corridor Management	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Y	Y	NA
	Intersection improvement	2	NA	2	0	NA	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA
	Upgrade Bridge	1	NA	3	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Y	NA	NA	NA
	New Bridge	2	3	0	0	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y
	Restriping	2	NA	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Safety/Operational	2	Varies	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Y	NA	NA	NA
	Signal Synchronization	3	NA	NA	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y
	Signal upgrade	2	NA	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Y	Y	NA
	Storm water	1	NA	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Traffic calming	1	Varies	1	1	NA	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA
	Video	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Y	Y	NA
Community Programs	Emissions mitigation	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Housing	NA*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Jobs	NA*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Landscaping/amenities	NA	NA	1	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Y	NA	NA	NA
	Zero Emission Autos	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Project Type	Sub Classification	Sub Classification Scoring				Metric Applicability									
		MB5	MB6	SF7	EN7	MB4	OP6	OP7	CON1	CON2	CON8	CON9	CON14	CON13	
	Zero Emission Transit	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Freeway	Auxiliary lanes	2	NA	1	0	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
	Upgrade Bridge	2	1	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Y	NA	NA	NA	
	Building	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA	
	Congestion Pricing	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Emissions mitigation	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Express Lanes	3	NA	1	0	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
	Interchange	1	Varies	1	0	NA	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	
	Landscaping/amenities	NA	NA	1	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Maintenance	1	NA	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	Y	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Rehab (Freeway signs)	0	NA	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Safety/Operational	2	Varies	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA	
	Signal upgrade	2	NA	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Soundwalls	NA	NA	NA	3	NA	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA	
	Storm water	NA	NA	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA	
	Transportation Management System upgrade	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Truck bypass	2	Varies	0	0	NA	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	
	Zero Emission Trucks	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Greening	NA	1	1	1	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA		

Project Type	Sub Classification	Sub Classification Scoring				Metric Applicability									
		MB5	MB6	SF7	EN7	MB4	OP6	OP7	CON1	CON2	CON8	CON9	CON14	CON13	
	Rehab (Freeway)	2	NA	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Y	NA	NA	NA	
<b>Goods Movement</b>	Arterial improvement	1	Varies	3	0	NA	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	
	Emissions mitigation	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Freight operation	3	Varies	NA	0	NA	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA	
	Freight rail	1	Varies	0	0	NA	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	Y	
	Grade sep	3	1	1	1	NA	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA	
	Interchange	2	Varies	1	0	NA	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	
	New Bridge	2	3	0	0	NA	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA	
	Zero Emission Trucks	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Zero Emission Freight	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Zero Emission Rail	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	NA	NA	Y	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
<b>Transit</b>	Bus Rapid Transit	3	1	1	0	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	Y	
	First Last Mile / Customer Experience	2	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Grade separation	3	1	1	1	NA	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA	
	Increased service	2	3	NA	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Y	
	Light Rail	3	3	0	0	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	Y	
	Metrolink	3	3	0	0	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	Y	
	Microtransit	2	3	NA	0	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	New station	3	3	0	0	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	Y	

Project Type	Sub Classification	Sub Classification Scoring				Metric Applicability									
		MB5	MB6	SF7	EN7	MB4	OP6	OP7	CON1	CON2	CON8	CON9	CON14	CON13	
	Real time /Customer Experience	2	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Safety/Rehab	2	NA	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Shuttle	1	2	NA	0	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Speed/Reliability Improvements	3	NA	NA	0	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Y	
	Speed/Reliability & Transit amenities	3	1	NA	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Transportation Demand Management / Fare Policy	1	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Transit amenities	1	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Y	NA	NA	NA	
	Transit amenities & Security	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Transit amenities/security/CX	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Zero Emission Transit	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	

## EVALUATION SUMMARY

The LB-ELA Project Team released a draft of the Full Evaluation Results to the Task Force and CLC on Wednesday, October 4, 2023. These materials summarized both the process and the results of the project evaluation. The evaluation process involved the creation and application of the evaluation criteria (metrics), in the form of benefits and potential concerns, towards assessing the projects and programs in terms of attaining the goals, values and principles of the corridor planning efforts and their potential impacts. This process created the draft evaluation results, project ranking by mode which will lead to the next step, the assignment of the projects and programs to tiers.

The LB-ELA Corridor Goals and Guiding Principles provide the foundation for this process. The evaluation criteria metrics aim to create summary findings for each project/program, so that the Task Force and the community can better understand how well each project/program meets the LB ELA Corridor Goals and Guiding Principles.

The evaluation criteria metrics were established, based on these project goals and principles, through collaboration and input among the project team, the CLC, TF, EWG, other stakeholders, and the community. Likewise, the project list is compiled through existing plans and programs and community inputs. The project list includes a wide range of concepts at all stages of development from the concept level to being “shovel-ready” or under construction. As such, the level of information available for each project under review varied widely. Through the evaluation process, the project team used all available information for each project and program to determine the rating of each metric.

Rubrics were developed for each project benefit to define how each of the evaluation criteria would be applied to rate the performance of each project and program. The project team assigned experienced technical staff, who applied their expertise, judgment and available tools, to develop each rubric based on their area of expertise. Some metrics were able to be quantitatively assessed while others were not. The project’s evaluation process was formed by the availability of data to assess each individual metric. Specifically, quantitative assessments are based on information that was able to be provided by data from the SCAG Travel Demand Forecasting Model (TDM), Air-Quality Modeling, and Geographic Information Systems (GIS) analysis. Qualitative assessments are based on past experience with similar projects, literature reviews on expected benefits, and intentions of the project or program based on the information available.

Each evaluation criteria rubric assigns each project or program a ranking between 0 (No Benefit ) and 3 (High Benefit ) A benefit metric can also be determined to be “Not Applicable” or NA with respect to a project or program. The individual rubric for each criterion describe how each project or program was assessed for that criterion.

After the metric scoring of benefits was complete, the technical team proceeded with rating the potential concerns. These potential concerns are developed to capture the possible negative impacts of each project and program. They were developed with input from the TF, CLC and EWG based on observations through the metric ranking and input from leadership, the CLC and TF. Potential Project concerns are scored under the same scale as the benefit metrics to ensure that all factors can be considered before a project is ranked in the investment plan. Projects are assessed to identify if there are additional considerations or potential concerns that are tied to a project.

ATTACHMENT D - SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE/CLC COMMENTS ON EVALUATION  
SCORES

---



## Community Leadership Committee (CLC) Meeting #20 Summary of Comments Received

The October Community Leadership Committee Meeting for the *Long Beach – East LA Corridor Mobility Investment Plan* was held on Tuesday, October 10, 2023, from 5 – 7:30pm. The intent of this meeting was to: (1) Give an overview of where the project is and where it is going; (2) Present Draft Evaluation Results; and (3) Discuss the draft evaluation in small groups. There were 25 CLC members in attendance.

The CLC split into four discussion groups after the presentation, which were primarily based on corridor geographies:

- Spanish Language Group (All communities)
- North Corridor Group (Bell, Bell Gardens, Boyle Heights, Commerce, Cudahy, East LA, Huntington Park, Maywood, Montebello, Vernon, Walnut Park)
- Central Corridor Group (Bellflower, Compton, East Rancho Dominguez, Lakewood, Lynwood, South Gate)
- South Corridor Group (Carson, Long Beach, San Pedro, Signal Hill, Wilmington)

The comments and questions received during the meeting relating to the Draft Evaluation Results are listed below.

GENERAL COMMENTS & QUESTIONS	
1	For prioritizing and tiering, is one more important than the other or are they basically even?
2	When considering the tiering of the projects, is there any weighting aside from the weighting already considered in the evaluation?
3	I am impressed with the tools as a decent way of supporting prioritization going into the tier process.
4	Is the project team tracking the geographic distribution of projects all around the corridor?
5	Will the Project Dashboard be publicly accessible?
6	The table we received doesn't account for project readiness and it's entirely possible for some projects to score well according to these metrics but not be considered due to lack of readiness, right?
7	I live in West Long Beach; will any projects be taking place there? It is always forgotten.
8	With the analysis going on, will that push things back further from the deadline or will the deadline remain the same?



**ATTACHMENT D - SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE/CLC COMMENTS ON EVALUATION  
SCORES**

<b>9</b>	<b>Who is part of reviewing the analysis that will come next? Is the CLC a part of that review?</b>
----------	---

**ATTACHMENT D - SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE/CLC COMMENTS ON EVALUATION SCORES**

10	The information is being shared too quickly; please slow down.
11	The LB-ELA Multimodal Corridor Plan Draft Eval Results document that was mailed to us is not filtered/ordered from highest scoring to lowest scoring, right?
12	Has there been an analysis done on how the projects are distributed across the region geographically? What about an analysis of the distribution of dollars across the different project/program categories? Distribution of dollars geographically?

**SPANISH LANGUAGE GROUP SUMMARY**

This group discussed projects that are not immediately ready but will need to provide a path forward on how these projects can move forward to implementation at a later date. There was concern that this process would be used to eliminate projects. Staff emphasized that the evaluation process is not designed to eliminate projects. Rather, what we are aiming to do is to provide a process for what a project sponsor would need to do to move the project forward and qualify for funding. The group then discussed how to use the evaluation criteria results on few of projects to understand the process.

1	Someone asked if the projects that are not relevant are going to be eliminated, and we will keep only the practical ones. Is that accurate? Will projects be deleted?
2	I believe projects that are the most practical need to be adopted. The Metro Staff need to visit and tour these areas affected by these projects.
3	My concern is regarding the 103 Highway through Long Beach. This space is ugly and of high concern since there are schools there.
4	In the past meeting, we spoke about how those projects that aren't ready yet and how they could return. Is that the case?
5	Are there projects for West Long Beach?
6	I won't believe it until I see it. In Long Beach it is super dangerous to ride a bicycle. Let's not forget there are two freeway exits in that location. It is very dangerous.
7	My general question is what involvement do the adjacent cities have? How will they contribute? Will they contribute? It is my understanding that cities are another avenue to get funds.

**NORTH CORRIDOR GROUP SUMMARY**

This group mainly discussed how to use the spreadsheet (most people were using the hard copies), then they discussed scoring concerns vs benefits, scoring by mode, and the benefits and concerns around ZET project LB-ELA\_0004: Long Beach-East Los Angeles Corridor Clean Truck Program, for example.

1	I actually have a question about what Amber shared about community projects - something about them being considered along the lines of equity or something. Do you mind going over that info again?
2	I also have concerns about anything "zero emissions" because I worry about the use of hydrogen and I'm not sure if the detrimental impacts of hydrogen are considered.
3	I would like to be part of the ZET group, as I drive an electric vehicle for work and commute on the 710 daily.
4	Can you demonstrate how to sort by the highest scoring to lowest?
5	I can't maneuver the tabs so that they are side by side with benefits and concerns. I can't imagine how those with hard copies will flip back and forth.

**ATTACHMENT D - SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE/CLC COMMENTS ON EVALUATION  
SCORES**

---

**ATTACHMENT D - SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE/CLC COMMENTS ON EVALUATION SCORES**

6	It's good to see how the concern factors correlate to benefits.
7	There was a slide earlier that discussed how equity was incorporated into the Community Programs, can we revisit that?
8	I don't see any projects that benefit the East IA area.
9	The ZET Program project description is a lot of money. The project description should be clear and considered. There is too much traffic congestion in this area. Thinking long-term: where is the area/location? What will be displaced? Would we put charging stations over a park? This needs much more information and clarity because it is the highest rated.

**CENTRAL CORRIDOR GROUP SUMMARY**

This group spent time talking about how the spreadsheet is organized, looked at different ways to organize the data, and discussed different ways to review at the spreadsheet (e.g. jurisdiction, projects you've been tracking throughout), and how/when to provide feedback.

1	What are the abbreviations at the top of the sheet?
2	As far as scoring, were the professionals on the project team in their particular field such as "Air Quality" the experts pulled in to qualify the scoring and ensure the accuracy of the scores?
3	In terms of the Task Force, were there any stakeholders there that are transportation professionals that helped craft these scores?
4	It appears that the programs are concepts while projects are actual infrastructure ideas that will have a higher chance to be implemented, is this true?
5	Are we just conducting the scoring now or will there be analysis of these scores being done coincidentally?
6	What is the best suggestion to help digest and go through all the scores to make sure I know how to properly analyze this document?
7	How long do we have to analyze and digest all this information?

**SOUTH CORRIDOR GROUP SUMMARY**

This group noted that the projects prioritized are forward-looking. They looked at Freeway and Goods Movement projects to see what ranked high/low. The initial feeling of some of the group members was that scoring seemed accurate and reflected the goals of the project. The group also had a discussion about equity, relating to geographic distribution and whether economic programs/job creation programs would be spread equally.

1	Carson had one project in there with 4 concerns. I want to make sure the Carson project made it through and got funding. The project has benefits but it also has concerns; is this an issue?
2	On a broad level I understand the criteria. I want to make sure the investments being made will be beneficial in the long term and keep away from further freeway expansion that has larger detrimental effects. Investments need to create communities that are people-oriented rather than car-oriented.
3	Why wasn't the Draft Evaluation document printed on legal paper? It's more challenging for me to digest. The ledger size made it easier for me to write notes.
4	How will "Equity" benefit the community. How will equity be distributed so there is more revenue to the city and there is less debt?



**ATTACHMENT D - SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE/CLC COMMENTS ON  
EVALUATION SCORES**

	<b>In the beginning we also talked about housing, health access, and sustainability. How can we ensure the success of projects in the long term, instead of just being a flash in the pan?</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Can we look at the Goods Movement projects, Freeway Projects, and Active Transportation?</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>(Freeway projects) Can we scroll up and see what the highest scoring freeway projects are?</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>(Community Programs) Since you mentioned the community, is there a project or program that stresses the importance of using community members for the jobs that will be created?</b>

**ATTACHMENT D - SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE/CLC COMMENTS ON  
EVALUATION SCORES**

---



## Task Force Meeting #25 Summary of Comments Received

The Task Force Meeting for the *Long Beach – East LA Corridor Mobility Investment Plan* was held on Monday, October 23, 2023, from 5 – 7:00pm. The intent of this meeting was to provide a live demonstration and interactive discussion with the Task Force Members on the Draft Evaluation Results and Rubrics for a sampling of projects within each transportation mode. There were 17 Task Force Members and 1 Ex-Officio Member in attendance. 11 Members of the Public were also present.

The comments and questions received during the meeting relating to the Draft Evaluation Results are listed below by category and subcategory.

WRITTEN & VERBAL COMMENTS/QUESTIONS			
NAME AND AFFILIATION	QUESTION/COMMENT	CATEGORY	SUBCATEGORY
Laura Cortez, TF, EYCEJ	I saw small groups are happening with TF members, will CLC members receive an invitation to those group meetings as well. Will it be open to CLC members?	Community Engagement	CLC/Small groups
Kimberly Leefatt, TF, NRDC	Use proxies for health and equity. The proxy connections should be explicitly explained in the report, to the extent it will be used as (1) a basis for tiering, or (2) as a justification for elevating projects that have high concerns score for recommendation.	Tiering	Health & Equity
Natalia Ospina, TF, NRDC	I'm not sure I'm seeing the distinction either ( <i>referring to Kimberly Leefatt's comment</i> )	Tiering	Health & Equity
Laura Cortez, TF, EYCEJ	Regarding readiness and evaluation, I am worried about how the results will be weighted or not weighted the same. I want to vocalize the importance of health concerns and I want to see how the metric will truly uplift health.	Tiering	Health



**ATTACHMENT D - SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE/CLC COMMENTS ON  
EVALUATION SCORES**

<p><b>Kerry Cartwright, POLA, TF</b></p>	<p><b>(Freeway)- Now that we have received the results of the application of this convoluted, complex evaluation methodology, I am sure that many TF members and agencies are also concerned regarding this process moving forward. I know we are going to have a subsequent discussion with the team for our projects. I have concerns with the layout of the concerns.</b></p> <p><b>I can highlight some of my concerns and recommendations for moving forward. For example, regarding clean truck infrastructure LB-ELA 0023. You should be aware about the huge amount of effort on charging infrastructure by the ports, the state, Go Biz, CARB, CTC (SB 671 Report), CEC, LA Metro, Federal Government, and an EPA Program (nationwide \$3 billion for ports) are all working on this endeavor. Its inappropriate to have concerns for charging infrastructure. That needs to be revisited.</b></p> <p><b>LB-ELA 0011 SR 47 Navy Way Interchange -this project should be deleted. We're moving forward with that. The state has supported this effort through the Port Infrastructure Program. It's frustrating. This is not appropriate. The program is showing concerns.</b></p> <p><b>Same with LB-ELA 0131 Port of LA NMPN Improvement Program. This project also has funding.</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Concerns</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Projects that have funding support and are moving forward should not have concerns</b></p>
<p><b>Kerry Cartwright, POLA, TF</b></p>	<p><b>The Terminal Island Rail system project should be removed due to the total support by the state and federal government, this should be taken out.</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Concerns</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Projects that have funding support and are moving forward should not have concerns</b></p>
<p><b>Kimberly Leefatt, TF, NRDC</b></p>	<p><b>I feel as if the issues regarding health have not been covered in a way that is meaningful so if we are suggesting the idea of changing the way criteria is being weighted, we should be looking to recategorize all criteria and categories and not specific ones that some TF members are concerned with.</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Final Results</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Health/ Transparency</b></p>

**ATTACHMENT D - SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE/CLC COMMENTS ON  
EVALUATION SCORES**

---

**ATTACHMENT D - SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE/CLC COMMENTS ON  
EVALUATION SCORES**

<b>Laura Cortez, TF, EYCEJ</b>	<b>It is important to make that clear for everyone though- that there should be no score changing behind closed doors</b>	<b>Final Results</b>	<b>Transparency</b>
<b>Hector De La Torre, GCCOG</b>	<b>These scores are out—anyone can question any changes going forward and why.</b>	<b>Final Results</b>	<b>Transparency</b>
<b>Connell Dunning, EPA, Ex-Officio</b>	<b>Thank you for clarifying that any updates and refinements to scoring will be brought to the Task Force and explained. It makes sense that those familiar with each project have further input to share as the Investment Plan is finalized.</b>	<b>Final Results</b>	<b>Transparency</b>
<b>Connell Dunning, EPA, Ex-Officio</b>	<b>I appreciate additional information describing the stage of development (e.g., Design, Construction, and Outcome)</b>	<b>Concerns</b>	<b>Readiness</b>
<b>Connell Dunning, EPA, Ex-Officio</b>	<b>I would advocate that any offline questions and changes to the list should be made available to all TF members. We shouldn't be negotiating these things offline in silos we should be transparent.</b>	<b>Final Results</b>	<b>Transparency</b>
<b>Natalia Ospina, TF, NRDC</b>	<b>It might be more efficient to explain the goods movement project first and then hear recommendations</b>	<b>Final Results</b>	<b>Transparency</b>
<b>Hector De La Torre, GCCOG</b>	<b>There is no expansion. Caltrans submitted the notice of No Build to Army Corps of Engineers and US EPA about the previous/ended project.</b>	<b>Freeway</b>	<b>Expansion</b>
<b>Natalia Ospina, TF, NRDC</b>	<b>The information Connell/USEPA is asking for should be shared with the full Task Force.</b>	<b>Freeway</b>	<b>5C comparison</b>
<b>Connell Dunning, EPA, Ex-Officio</b>	<b>When will be given a representation of what freeway projects that are in this initial list are different and which ones are the same from the ones that were originally listed in the 710 Alternative 5C? It looks like there are some projects that include auxiliary lanes that are directly connected to interchange improvements that are connected to more auxiliary lanes that are going for many miles. I want to know why these are not combined into one project.</b>	<b>Freeway</b>	<b>5C comparison</b>
<b>Chris Chavez, CCA, TF</b>	<b>I want to see what projects that are listed were once part of the original 5C expansion.</b>	<b>Freeway</b>	<b>5C comparison</b>
<b>Theresa Dau-Ngo, TF, POLB</b>	<b>In general, I'd like to better understand how the proposed projects relate to the I-710 corridor, per the Measures R and M funding programs (proximity to the corridor, eligibility to use Measures R &amp; M funding vs. reliance on other funding sources, which projects will be implemented by Metro vs. others, etc.). That will give a better picture of how any of these projects would move towards implementation.</b>	<b>Funding Strategy</b>	<b>Measure R/M criteria; Roles &amp; Responsibilities</b>

**ATTACHMENT D - SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE/CLC COMMENTS ON  
EVALUATION SCORES**

---

**ATTACHMENT D - SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE/CLC COMMENTS ON  
EVALUATION SCORES**

<b>Laura Cortez, TF, EYCEJ</b>	<b>I feel as if some projects will bring harm to the environment will pass through because of the funding and other readiness metrics when in reality those projects may actually bring more harm to the health of the stakeholders of the corridor. I want to uplift the equity metrics to ensure they are weighted in the same regard as other metrics.</b>	<b>Concerns</b>	<b>Readiness</b>
<b>Chris Chavez, CCA, TF</b>	<b>I want to understand what potential emission reductions will be created from these potential projects.</b>	<b>Concerns</b>	<b>Readiness</b>
<b>Natalia Ospina, NRDC, TF</b>	<b>What is the threshold for projects to be placed into Tier 3?</b>	<b>Concerns</b>	<b>Tiering</b>
<b>Laura Cortez, TF, EYCEJ</b>	<b>How will concerns be factored into the final results? Will they be added or are the concerns scores being looked at independently from the overall score?</b>	<b>Concerns</b>	<b>Tiering</b>
<b>Laura Cortez, TF, EYCEJ</b>	<b>So, there will be a score for benefits, a score for concerns and a section to describe the flags for each project?</b>	<b>Concerns</b>	<b>Tiering</b>
<b>Connell Dunning, EPA, Ex-Officio</b>	<b>I am unsure of the stage of development classifications (design, construction, and outcome) as it relates to the concerns. Are these new concerns that were developed?</b>	<b>Concerns</b>	<b>Readiness/ Stages of Development</b>
<b>Kimberly Leefatt, TF, NRDC</b>	<b>Is there a document that will be distributed with an explanation of how the concerns will be compared to the benefits of a project. Is there an assessment being done to compare some concerns that may be mitigated or that will completely negate the benefits of a specific project that is going to be potentially prioritized. I would love to see a document shared to the public that explains the rational used to understand how to view the benefits and concerns together.</b>	<b>Concerns</b>	<b>Readiness/ Stages of Development</b>

**ATTACHMENT D SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE/CLC COMMITTEES ON  
EVALUATION SCORES**

---


## Tiering Analysis

### Overview

This document describes the process proposed to establish the project tiers for the Long Beach to East Los Angeles Corridor Mobility Investment Plan (LB-ELA CMIP). This process, called the “Tiering Analysis”, establishes four tiers for the initial list of projects and programs:

- **Tier 1A:** Higher scoring / More ready for implementation
- **Tier 1B:** Higher scoring / Less ready for implementation
- **Tier 2A:** Lower scoring / More ready for implementation
- **Tier 2B:** Lower scoring / Less ready for implementation


Figure 1: Example of Tiering Analysis Outcomes



Additionally, some projects were removed from the initial list prior to evaluation, such as the mainline capacity improvements on I-710, and some projects were removed during the tiering process that are in construction or fully funded (see attachment F).

The results of the tiering analysis, included in Attachment E, will be used to inform the funding strategy and recommendations included in the Draft CMIP. Figure 2 describes the process for the tiering analysis and how it will be leveraged in the funding recommendations.

Figure 2: Overview of Prioritization Process



The sections below describe how the evaluation results and project readiness are combined to complete the draft tiering analysis.

### 1. Evaluation Results

The results of the evaluation determine if a project is Tier 1 or Tier 2. Within each mode (Active Transportation, Arterial, Community, Freeway, Goods Movement, Transit), the top scoring 40% of projects are included in Tier 1. Two factors were used to determine the top scoring projects, the Total Benefit Score and the Total Outcome Score:

- Total Benefit Score:** The Total Benefit Score is based on the results of the quantitative and qualitative metric evaluations (see Attachment A). The total benefit score is a sum of the six goal summary scores and the two principal summary scores.<sup>1</sup>
- Total Outcome Concerns:** Outcome Concerns are defined as the unintended externalities of a project that are more difficult to mitigate in the design process. Eight of the sixteen Concerns are designated as Outcome Concerns (shown below). The Total Outcome Score is a sum of the Concern scores for each of those eight metrics.

Concern Criteria
Con3: Potential for Increased Commute Times
Con4: Potential for Traffic Diversion
Con5: Potential to Increase Localized Emissions / Emissions shifting

<sup>1</sup> Summary scores are based on an average of the individual metric scores, adjusted for the number of metrics within a goal that the project addresses.



<b>Con7: Potential for concentrated congestion impacts</b>
<b>Con9: Potential for VMT Increases</b>
<b>Con10: Potential to increase user costs</b>
<b>Con12: Potential to increase economic displacement</b>
<b>Con14: Potential for reduced transit ridership</b>

- **Final Ranking Score:** To create the final ranking score used in the tiering analysis, the Total Benefit Score for projects is reduced by a factor depending on the project’s Total Outcome Concern score, as follows:

Total Outcome Score*	# Projects/ Programs	Benefit Score Reduction
<b>0</b>	144	0%
<b>1-2</b>	42	5%
<b>3-4</b>	20	10%
<b>5-10</b>	6	15%

\*See Attachment A for a description of how the Concerns are evaluated. Each concern has the potential for a score of 3 (high potential adverse impact). Therefore, the highest possible Outcome Concern Total would be a total score of 24.

The Final Ranking Score was used for the identification of the top 40% of projects in each mode that are classified as Tier 1 projects or programs. The other 60% of projects in each mode are classified as Tier 2 projects.

## 2. Project Readiness

For the purpose of tiering, project readiness is defined by how soon a project could break ground. Project sponsors provided the project readiness and phasing information to Metro. If no information was available, the project team used their professional judgment to determine the likely timeframe for a given project or program.

- **Projects.** For defined projects, the following thresholds were used to determine if a project timeline is short, medium, or long-term. The number of years in each of these categories vary by project mode as described below.

Mode	Time Frame (years to begin construction)		
	Short	Med	Long
<b>Active Transportation / TDM</b>	0 to 2	3 to 6	7+
<b>Transit</b>	0 to 3	4 to 8	9+
<b>Goods Movement</b>	0 to 3	4 to 8	9+
<b>Arterial Roadway</b>	0 to 3	4 to 8	9+

<b>Freeway</b>	0 to 5	6 to 10	10 +
<b>Community Programs</b>	NA	NA	NA

- **Programs.** Each program was classified as short, medium, or long-term based on the following characteristics:

<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Program Type</b>
<b>Short-term</b>	Expansion of on-going program, a pilot program, or study
<b>Medium-term</b>	Collections of defined or semi-defined projects
<b>Long-term</b>	Collections of undefined strategies or project ideas

For the tiering analysis, Tier “A” projects or programs are those that are designated as “short-term.” Medium and long-term projects and programs are classified as Tier B.

## Tiered CMIP Candidate Project List

The tables below include the Tiered project list organized by mode. There are four separate tables, including:

- Tier 1 Projects and Programs (Sorted by mode and draft ranking score) – Pages 2-18
- Tier 2 Projects and Programs (Sorted by mode and draft ranking score) – Pages 19-34
- Community Programs (All programs ranked by score) – Pages 35-39
- Removed projects and programs – Page 40

## Tier 1 Projects and Programs

Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score	Draft Tier
Active Transportation / TDM	LB-ELA_0201	Pedestrian / Bicycle Enhancements and Safety Features	<p>Work with the local jurisdictions (Cities, unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County) to improve safety and enhance the walking/biking environment throughout the LB-ELA Corridor. Active transportation measures and features would include items such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Shade structures, trees, benches, and trash cans;</li> <li>- Wider sidewalks, bulb outs, upgrades to crosswalks, and ADA accessibility improvements (including repositioning utility boxes on sidewalks);</li> <li>- Stop signs, traffic signals, pedestrian/bicycle signal phases, colored pavement markings, signage and striping;</li> <li>- Alternative traffic signal phasing options, such as “scramble” pedestrian crossings;</li> <li>- Flashing crosswalks, and other traffic controls such as pedestrian flashing beacons;</li> <li>- Lighting along pedestrian/bicycle paths, including under-crossings;</li> <li>- Landscaping, hardscaping, and other aesthetic features;</li> <li>- Protection buffers and barriers, improved fencing</li> </ul> <p>Provide technical and grant writing assistance to local jurisdictions, if requested, to define and develop potential projects. Provide financial support in order to help leverage local funds for project construction and implementation. Funds would be made available based on criteria such as: project need, project readiness, and project benefits relative to costs, among other factors.</p>	18.3	Tier 1B

## Tier 1 Projects and Programs

Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score	Draft Tier
Active Transportation / TDM	LB-ELA_0214	I-710 Livability Initiative	<p>A compendium of proposed projects and improvements as outlined in the I-710 Livability Initiative conceptual plan. Proposed projects include improvements such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lighting for people walking/biking.</li> <li>- New/improved bike lanes and bike amenities.</li> <li>- New improved sidewalks and cross walks.</li> <li>- Landscaping and shade. Public art.</li> <li>- Improved bus stops. Improved curbs. Street furniture.</li> <li>- Traffic calming to slow speeds.</li> <li>- New connections and crossings. Improve under/overpasses.</li> </ul> <p>Proposals address improvements along a network of 21 east-west and 6 north-south roadway segments located within one-mile of I-710.</p>	17.9	Tier 1B
Active Transportation / TDM	LB-ELA_0017	Regionally significant bike projects from the Metro Active Transportation Plan	Implement regionally significant active transportation projects adopted as part of the Metro Active Transportation Plan (over 40 projects throughout the study area). See Attachment A for more detail.	16.5	Tier 1B
Active Transportation / TDM	LB-ELA_0163	LB-ELA Corridor Bicycle Gap Closure Projects	Implement regionally significant bicycle projects in areas with insufficient existing and planned bicycle infrastructure within the LB-ELA Corridor (several projects within the study area). See Attachment A for more detail. Would include potential routes identified by the community, but which will require further planning and design in cooperation with the local jurisdictions (Cities, County of Los Angeles).	16.3	Tier 1B
Active Transportation / TDM	LB-ELA_0008	Blue Line First Last Mile Plan Improvements	Implement projects identified in the Blue Line First/Last Mile Plan within the LB-ELA Corridor, with an emphasis on Del Amo Station. Projects to include ramp reconfigurations, sidewalk and bike lane improvements, and crossing improvements, among others. The First/Last Mile (FLM) Plan for the Blue Line was adopted in April 2018 and represents a first-of-its-kind effort to plan comprehensive access improvements for an entire transit line. The Plan covered all 22 stations on the Metro A (Blue) Line and piloted an inclusive, equity focused community engagement process. The Plan included planning-level, community-	16.0	Tier 1A

## Tier 1 Projects and Programs

Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score	Draft Tier
			identified pedestrian and bicycle improvements within walking (1/2-mile) and biking (3-mile) distance of each A Line station.		
Active Transportation / TDM	LB-ELA_0162	City of Long Beach 8-to-80 Bikeways	Implement planned 8-to-80 bikeway projects adopted as part of the City of Long Beach Bicycle Master Plan within the LB-ELA Corridor, including gap closure projects, backbone facilities, and pipeline bikeways (over 40 projects within the study area). See Attachment A for more detail.	15.8	Tier 1B
Active Transportation / TDM	LB-ELA_0204	Pedestrian Gap Closure Projects	<p>Close gaps within the pedestrian circulation network in communities within the LB-ELA Corridor through the implementation of new pedestrian facilities. A funding program would be made available to award financial resources to local jurisdictions (Cities, unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County) on a competitive basis to design and construct new pedestrian facilities in areas where this infrastructure is currently missing. Projects would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New sidewalks and pedestrian paths</li> <li>- Extensions of existing pedestrian paths/trails</li> <li>- Pedestrian/bicycle overpasses</li> <li>- New Crosswalks/Signals for Pedestrians</li> <li>- Provision of connections and access to existing trails (for example, greater access to Los Angeles/Rio Hondo River Trail)</li> <li>- Provision of pedestrian access/connections to existing and planned Metro transit stations/stops</li> <li>- Implementation of Safe School Pedestrian/Biking Zones</li> </ul>	15.4	Tier 1B
Active Transportation / TDM	LB-ELA_0165	Compton Creek Bike Underpasses	Along Compton Creek Bike Path, between 120th Street and Greenleaf Blvd., construct bike path under-crossings at 120th Street, El Segundo Ave., Rosecrans Ave., Compton Ave., and Alondra Ave. Add lighting, landscaping, benches, and shade to the existing path.	15.1	Tier 1B

<b>Tier 1 Projects and Programs</b>					
<b>Project Type</b>	<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Draft Ranking Score</b>	<b>Draft Tier</b>
Active Transportation / TDM	LB-ELA_0212	Tweedy Boulevard Active Transportation Improvements	Install improvements on Tweedy Boulevard to improve non-motorized user safety and promote walking, biking, and use of local transit. Tweedy Boulevard, between Alameda Street and Dearborn Avenue and between Dorothy Avenue and the Los Angeles River Bicycle Trail, within the City of South Gate.	14.4	Tier 1A
Active Transportation / TDM	LB-ELA_0111	West Santa Ana Branch Bike & Pedestrian Trail	Implement Phases 1-4 of Bike & Pedestrian Trail (Class I) along RR ROW between LA River and Sommerset. Includes lighting, fencing, landscaping, flashing beacons, decomposed granite, ADA curb ramps and street furniture.	14.3	Tier 1B
Active Transportation / TDM	LB-ELA_0213	West Santa Ana Branch [WSAB} Light Rail Station First-Last Mile Bikeway Safety and Access Project	Install 0.3 miles of sidewalk, 1.5 miles of bicycle lanes (Class II), 2 miles of bike route sharrows (Class III), street lighting, center median islands, curb ramps, and a rest area near the LA River Bike Path. Located in the eastern quadrant of the City of South Gate, along the existing Union Pacific Railroad /future West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor.	14.0	Tier 1A
Active Transportation / TDM	LB-ELA_0200	Bike Share Programs and Bicycle Amenities	This initiative would build upon Metro's existing Bike Share Program framework, focusing on the LB-ELA Corridor. This involves collaboration with local jurisdictions (Cities, County of Los Angeles), non-profit organizations, and/or creating public-private partnerships for purpose of expanding access to bike share programs and for the provision of key amenities for bicycle users within the LB-ELA Corridor Study Area. Financial support would be provided to help leverage local funding for small scale capital projects such as: bicycle parking and storage lockers; lighting for bike paths; bicycle repair/maintenance stations; signage and wayfinding; electric bicycle charging stations; and safety features.	13.9	Tier 1A
Active Transportation / TDM	LB-ELA_0170	Huntington Park Safe Routes for Seniors & Students	Project will construct curb ramps, crossing improvements, sidewalks, wayfinding, speed-calming, and other active transportation improvements for pedestrians on segments of Belgrave Ave., Clarendon Ave., E. 61st St., Randolph St., Seville St., Zoe Ave., State St., Yahualica Place, and walking/biking paths adjacent to Veteran's Park. Includes 130 curb ramps and high-visibility crosswalks, 3 raised islands, 1 HAWK beacon, 3,266 linear feet of sidewalks, 20 wayfinding signs, 10 flashing beacons, 329 illuminated bollards, 20 speed humps, 10 raised crosswalks, wastebins, and shade trees.	13.9	Tier 1B

<b>Tier 1 Projects and Programs</b>					
<b>Project Type</b>	<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Draft Ranking Score</b>	<b>Draft Tier</b>
Active Transportation / TDM	LB-ELA_0006	Rail to River Active Transportation Corridor Segment B	An approximate 4.5-mile active transportation corridor between the LA River to the Slauson A (Blue) Line station that connects to Segment A.	13.9	Tier 1B
Active Transportation / TDM	LB-ELA_0211	City of Long Beach Mid-City Pedestrian and Bicycle Connections	Create an interconnected network of walking and bicycle routes including creation of bicycle boulevards along 8th and 11th Streets. Includes active transportation network south of Anaheim Street, north of 7th Street, east of Long Beach Boulevard, and west of Cherry Avenue within the City of Long Beach.	13.7	Tier 1A
Active Transportation / TDM	LB-ELA_0206	City of Bell Gardens Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements	Citywide pedestrian, bike and traffic calming improvements to create a complete streets environment – cross walks, mini traffic circles, HAWK pedestrian signals, curb extensions, Class 3 bike routes, ADA ramps, Leading Pedestrian Interval [LBI] signal timing, and striping improvements. Would be applied to various locations within the City of Bell Gardens, including: Sprecht Ave., Live Oak St., Priority St., Purdy Ave., Gephart Ave., Perry Rd., and Hannon St.	13.5	Tier 1A
Active Transportation / TDM	LB-ELA_0102	Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan improvements	Provide pedestrian facility improvements. Provide safe routes for bike riders. (Various locations within the City of Maywood per the city's master plan)	13.5	Tier 1B
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0057	Atlantic Complete Street Corridor	Atlantic Ave./Blvd., between Ocean Blvd. and SR-60. Reconstruct Atlantic Ave./Blvd. to establish a Complete Street Corridor, including: bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities and crosswalks, transit stop features and amenities, safety and traffic calming features, landscaping, hardscaping, public art (aesthetic treatments), public green spaces, trees, and water quality features such as bioswales and tree wells.	17.7	Tier 1A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0062	Long Beach Complete Street Corridor	Long Beach Blvd./Pacific Blvd. Reconstruct Long Beach Blvd./Pacific Blvd., between Ocean Blvd. and Slauson Ave. to establish a Complete Street Corridor, including: bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities and crosswalks, transit stop features and amenities, safety and traffic calming features, landscaping, hardscaping, public art (aesthetic treatments), public green spaces, trees, and water quality features such as bioswales and tree wells.	17.5	Tier 1B



## Tier 1 Projects and Programs

Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score	Draft Tier
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0064	Gage Avenue Street Improvements	Gage Ave., from Bell western city limit to eastern city limit. Upgrade Gage Ave. to provide safety and aesthetic features (drought tolerant landscaping, hardscaping). Proposed improvements will include new pedestrian sidewalks, street lighting, street furniture, bus shelters, parkway landscaping, monument entry signs, and drainage enhancements with the installation of curb drains and drywells in the project site.	16.9	Tier 1A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0058	Florence Complete Street Corridor	Florence Ave., between Alameda St. and Lakewood Blvd. Reconstruct Florence Ave. to establish a Complete Street Corridor, including: bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities and crosswalks, transit stop features and amenities, safety and traffic calming features, landscaping, hardscaping, public art (aesthetic treatments), public green spaces, trees, and water quality features such as bioswales and tree wells.	16.8	Tier 1A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0060	Alondra Complete Street Corridor	Alondra Blvd., between Central Ave. and Lakewood Blvd. Reconstruct Alondra Blvd. to establish a Complete Street Corridor, including: bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities and crosswalks, transit stop features and amenities, safety and traffic calming features, landscaping, hardscaping, public art (aesthetic treatments), public green spaces, trees, and water quality features such as bioswales and tree wells.	16.3	Tier 1A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0059	Imperial Complete Street Corridor	Imperial Hwy., between Alameda St. and Lakewood Blvd. Reconstruct Imperial Hwy. to establish a Complete Street Corridor, including: bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities and crosswalks, transit stop features and amenities, safety and traffic calming features, landscaping, hardscaping, public art (aesthetic treatments), public green spaces, trees, and water quality features such as bioswales and tree wells.	16.2	Tier 1A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0061	Slauson Complete Street Corridor	Slauson Ave., between Alameda St. and Lakewood Blvd. Reconstruct Slauson Ave. to establish a Complete Street Corridor, including: bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities and crosswalks, transit stop features and amenities, safety and traffic calming features, landscaping, hardscaping, public art (aesthetic treatments), public green spaces, trees, and water quality features such as bioswales and tree wells.	15.7	Tier 1A

## Tier 1 Projects and Programs

Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score	Draft Tier
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0056	Artesia Complete Street Corridor	Artesia Blvd., between Central Ave. and Lakewood Blvd. Reconstruct Artesia Blvd. to establish a Complete Street Corridor, including: bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities and crosswalks, transit stop features and amenities, safety and traffic calming features, landscaping, hardscaping, public art (aesthetic treatments), public green spaces, trees, and water quality features such as bioswales and tree wells.	15.0	Tier 1B
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0129	Garfield Avenue Improvement Project	Garfield Avenue, between Century Boulevard and Firestone. The project would transform the corridor to a more attractive and pedestrian and bike friendly environment. Improvements include: (a) implementing new bicycle facilities including bike racks, Class II Bike Lanes and Class III Bike Routes, (b) pedestrian improvements including flashing beacons, curb extensions and sidewalks, (c) raised, landscape center road medians, (d) enhancing the bus shelters, and (e) adding roadway signing and striping.	14.9	Tier 1B
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0010	Shoemaker Bridge/Shoreline Drive	I-710 Improvements/Shoemaker Bridge Replacement: Replace the Existing Shoemaker Bridge with a New Bridge. The New Bridge Will Be Reduced to Have Two Mixed-Flow Lanes in the NB and in the SB Directions to Tie the Flow into I-710. The New Bridge Will Also Include Pedestrian and Bicycle Access. Additionally, Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Street Enhancements Will Be Provided on Adjacent Thoroughfares.	13.3	Tier 1A

## Tier 1 Projects and Programs

Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score	Draft Tier
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0202	Traffic Calming	<p>Implement Traffic Calming Features within the LB-ELA Corridor to slow traffic on local streets or near schools. Collaborate with local jurisdictions (Cities, unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County) to design, construct, and implement traffic calming features in areas that experience frequent speed violations and/or high levels of accident rates. Based on available funding, provide financial support in order to help leverage local funds for project construction and implementation. Traffic calming features could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Speed limit reductions, signage, variable speed signs, and enforcement devices</li> <li>- Speed bumps</li> <li>- Truck restrictions (trucks over a certain weight) on non-designated truck routes, including signage and geofencing alerts</li> <li>- Roundabouts</li> <li>- Trees, vegetation, landscaping features to help direct and slow traffic</li> <li>- Bulb outs</li> <li>- Stop signs, traffic signals, striping, raised decorative pavement, and other traffic controls</li> <li>- Road diets</li> <li>- Speed enforcement cameras</li> <li>- Enhanced use of signage, striping, flashing crosswalks, other pedestrian warning devices in school zones</li> </ul>	13.1	Tier 1B
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0044		Route 1, MP 7.0-7.2. In Long Beach, at Los Angeles River Bridge No. 53-0341 and De Forest Avenue Undercrossing No. 53-1047. Seismic retrofit, upgrade bridge rails, and upgrade facilities to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.	12.7	Tier 1A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0127	Lakewood Boulevard Improvement Project	Lakewood Blvd., between Del Amo Blvd. and Ashworth Street. The project would install a Class I Bike Path and pedestrian sidewalk in the parkway area and will construct minor roadway capacity enhancements on Lakewood Boulevard. Project includes 1.5 miles of new bicycle and pedestrian facilities, utility undergrounding, traffic signal improvements, LED street lighting, ADA enhancements, and green street improvements such as landscaped median islands, parkway trees, and stormwater retention.	12.5	Tier 1A

<b>Tier 1 Projects and Programs</b>					
<b>Project Type</b>	<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Draft Ranking Score</b>	<b>Draft Tier</b>
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0119	Wright Road Improvement Project	Improve Wright Road, including the addition of Bike Lanes, between Imperial Hwy. and Atlantic Ave.	12.1	Tier 1A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0205	Arterial/General Roadway Improvements Program	Implement local roadway projects within the local jurisdictions and communities (cities, unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County) which comprise the LB-ELA Corridor. The objective of these projects will be to improve mobility, safety, and the travel experience for all users of the roadways (pedestrians, bicyclists, transit, and vehicles). This program would help fund projects such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Intersection improvements</li> <li>- Bridge replacements</li> <li>- Street widenings and enhancements including lighting, safety features, landscaped medians, and parkways</li> <li>- Complete Streets projects and features, including active transportation (bicycle, pedestrian), and transit stop improvements</li> <li>- Traffic controls (traffic signals, stop signs), signal coordination, and Intelligent Transportation Systems</li> </ul>	12.1	Tier 1B
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0041		Route 1. In Long Beach, from Temple Avenue to De Forest Avenue. Upgrade traffic signals, crosswalks, curb ramps, sidewalks, driveways, and Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APS) to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.	11.8	Tier 1A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0120	Safety-Related Road Improvement Projects	Within the East Rancho Dominguez (unincorporated LA County), implement safety-related improvement projects along the following roadways: Compton Boulevard, Atlantic Avenue, Rosecrans Avenue, and Alondra Boulevard	11.6	Tier 1B
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0126	Slauson Avenue Corridor & Citywide Pedestrian, Bike, Transit Improvements	Project focuses on pedestrian, bike, & transit safety improvements along the Slauson Avenue, between I-710 and I-5, as well as 10 other unsignalized intersections or midblock crossings citywide. The project location includes the 2.6-mile Slauson Avenue corridor between I-710 and I-5 freeways and 10 unsignalized intersections or midblock crossings citywide.	11.5	Tier 1A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0104	Rosecrans Ave. Bridge	Replace/rehabilitate Rosecrans Ave. Bridge over the LA River	10.6	Tier 1B
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0113	Orange Avenue Improvement Project	Improve Orange Avenue, including the addition of Bike Lanes, between 25th Street and Spring Street	10.5	Tier 1B

## Tier 1 Projects and Programs

Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score	Draft Tier
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0063	Gage Ave. Bridge	Rehabilitate/replace Gage Avenue Bridge over the LA River	10.4	Tier 1A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0073	Telegraph Road Improvements	Improve Telegraph Road between Marianna Ave. and Atlantic Blvd (safety features and pedestrian circulation)	10.3	Tier 1A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0067	Florence Ave. Bridges	Replace Florence Ave. Bridges over LA River & I-710	9.8	Tier 1B
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0079	Florence Avenue Bridge Rehabilitation	Rehabilitate arterial bridge over the Rio Hondo River Channel	9.8	Tier 1A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0115	California Ave. Improvement Project	Improve California Avenue, including the addition of Bike Lanes, between Willow Street and Spring Street	9.3	Tier 1B
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0117	Burnett Street/Skyline Drive Improvement Project	Improve Burnett Street/Skyline Drive, including the addition of Bike Lanes, between East Walnut Avenue and Dawson Avenue. Installation of sidewalks between Gaviota Avenue and Cherry Avenue, Class 2 bike lanes between Walnut Avenue and Dawson Avenue, and related roadway amenities/improvements.	9.2	Tier 1A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0040		Route 1, In the cities of Long Beach and Los Angeles, install stormwater treatment Best Management Practices (BMPs), including bioswales and Design Pollution Prevention Infiltration Areas (DPPIAs).	8.8	Tier 1A
Freeway	LB-ELA_0156	Traffic Controls at I-710 Freeway Ramps	Add traffic signals with protected pedestrian/bicycle phase(s), crosswalks, lighting, landscaping, signing and striping, and other safety-related pedestrian features at the ramp termini of I-710.	14.0	Tier 1A
Freeway	LB-ELA_0181	Freeway Lids, Caps, and Widened Bridge Decks	Widen arterial bridge decks at key locations over the I-710 Freeway/LA River Channel to provide "land islands," "urban parklets," and "green belt" connections over I-710 and the LA River. Include pedestrian / bicycle pathways.	12.7	Tier 1B
Freeway	LB-ELA_0031	I-710/Alondra Interchange Improvements & Modification of SB I-710 to SR-91 Connectors	Reconfiguration of I-710/Alondra Interchange to improve operations, and safety for traffic entering and exiting the freeway. Improve, relocate SB I-710 to SR-91 Connectors to reduce weaving movements. Improve traffic controls to address safety concerns of bicyclists, pedestrians at ramp termini. Upgrade bridge structures to allow space for bicycle/pedestrian connections across I-710 and LA River Channel.	11.8	Tier 1B

## Tier 1 Projects and Programs

Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score	Draft Tier
Freeway	LB-ELA_0034	I-710/Florence Interchange Improvements	Reconfiguration of I-710/Florence Interchange to improve operations, safety, and sight distance for traffic entering and exiting the freeway. Improve traffic controls to address safety concerns of bicyclists, pedestrians at ramp termini. Upgrade bridge structures to allow space for bicycle/pedestrian connections across I-710 and LA River Channel.	10.9	Tier 1B
Freeway	LB-ELA_0037	I-710/I-105 Connector Project Improvements	Modify and relocate I-710 / I-105 Connectors along I-710 between I-105 and Imperial Highway in both directions to resolve weaving issues and related congestion on I-710 between I-105 and Imperial Highway.	10.8	Tier 1B
Freeway	LB-ELA_0092	I-710/PCH Interchange Improvement	Reconstruct I-710/Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) Interchange to provide operational and safety improvements.	10.6	Tier 1B
Freeway	LB-ELA_0033	I-710/Firestone Interchange Improvements	Upgrade of I-710/Firestone Blvd. Interchange to improve operations and safety for traffic entering and exiting the freeway. Improve traffic controls to address safety concerns of bicyclists, pedestrians at ramp termini. Upgrade bridge structures to allow space for bicycle/pedestrian connections across I-710 and LA River Channel.	10.5	Tier 1B
Freeway	LB-ELA_0153	Congestion Pricing	Implement congestion pricing strategy for the I-710 freeway. No new lanes would be added to the existing footprint of I-710. Rather single occupant vehicles and trucks entering and exiting the freeway would be tolled by deploying an automated readers and electronic toll collection system that allows users to conveniently pay tolls using a toll tag that is mounted on the interior of their vehicle. Carpools, zero emission trucks, and zero emission autos would travel for free.	10.1	Tier 1A
Freeway	LB-ELA_0030	I-710/Long Beach Blvd. Interchange Improvements	Upgrade of I-710/Long Beach Blvd. Interchange to improve operations, safety, and sight distance for traffic entering and exiting the freeway. Improve traffic controls to address safety concerns of bicyclists, pedestrians at ramp termini. Upgrade bridge structures to allow space for bicycle/pedestrian connections across I-710 and LA River Channel.	10.1	Tier 1B
Freeway	LB-ELA_0028	I-710/Willow Interchange Improvements	Reconfiguration of I-710/Willow Interchange to improve operations, safety, and sight distance for traffic entering and exiting the freeway. Improve traffic controls to address safety concerns of bicyclists, pedestrians at ramp termini. Upgrade bridge structures to allow space for bicycle/pedestrian connections across I-710 and LA River Channel.	10.0	Tier 1B

<b>Tier 1 Projects and Programs</b>					
<b>Project Type</b>	<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Draft Ranking Score</b>	<b>Draft Tier</b>
Freeway	LB-ELA_0046		I-405. In and near the cities of Long Beach, Signal Hill, Los Angeles, and Carson, rehabilitate pavement, upgrade signs, rehabilitate bridge, upgrade lighting, improve safety, rehabilitate Transportation Management System (TMS) elements and replace copper cabling with fiber, rehabilitate culverts, and upgrade facilities to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.	9.9	Tier 1A
Freeway	LB-ELA_0029	I-710/Del Amo Interchange Improvements	Reconfiguration of I-710/Del Amo Interchange to improve operations, safety, and sight distance for traffic entering and exiting the freeway. Improve traffic controls to address safety concerns of bicyclists, pedestrians at ramp termini. Upgrade bridge structures to allow space for bicycle/pedestrian connections across I-710 and LA River Channel.	9.9	Tier 1B
Freeway	LB-ELA_0032	I-710/Imperial Interchange Improvements	Reconfiguration of I-710/Imperial Interchange to improve operations, safety, and sight distance for traffic entering and exiting the freeway. Improve traffic controls to address safety concerns of bicyclists, pedestrians at ramp termini. Upgrade bridge structures to allow space for bicycle/pedestrian connections across I-710 and LA River Channel.	9.9	Tier 1B
Freeway	LB-ELA_0182	Express Lanes Strategic Initiative	Advance planning studies to implement express lanes on key freeways in the study area, including I-405, I-105, and SR-91.	9.9	Tier 1A
Goods Movement	LB-ELA_0004	Long Beach-East Los Angeles Corridor Clean Truck Program	In January 2021, the Metro Board approved the 2021 Goods Movement Strategic Plan, which included a Countywide Clean Truck Initiative, with the 710 South Clean Truck Program identified as a goods movement strategic priority. At its October 2021 meeting, the Metro Board acted to recommit \$50 million from Measure R I-710 South Corridor funds as seed funding for the 710 South Clean Truck Program, which has been subsequently renamed the LB-ELA Zero Emissions Truck Program. The objective of this program is to turn over diesel trucks in favor of zero emissions trucks in the LB-ELA Corridor. The program would contribute subsidy funding to deploy a number of zero emissions trucks on I-710 as well as seed funding to develop electric charging/refueling stations for zero emissions trucks.	11.5	Tier 1B
Goods Movement	LB-ELA_0023	Clean Truck Infrastructure	Install charging infrastructure for zero emissions trucks.	10.2	Tier 1B

## Tier 1 Projects and Programs

Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score	Draft Tier
Goods Movement	LB-ELA_0217	Freight Rail Electrification Pilot Project	Work with the Union Pacific (UP) and BNSF railroads to develop and test battery electric locomotives for operation on the Pacific Harbor Line and in the Alameda Corridor with an ultimate goal of advancing a zero-emissions technology capable of entering commercial, revenue service operation.	9.7	Tier 1A
Goods Movement	LB-ELA_0123	Pico Avenue Street Improvement	Improve Pico Avenue, between Pier D Street and Pier E Street. This roadway improvement project would: widen a short segment of roadway; improve truck congestion and truck safety; reconstruct the pavement, improve the existing surface drainage and upgrade the storm drain inlets; upsize the sewer line; provide continuous sidewalks with ADA accessible features; upgrade street lighting; and extend landscaping and hardscape features.	9.5	Tier 1B
Goods Movement	LB-ELA_0024	Pier 400 On Dock Rail Modernization	On-dock railyard expansion to accommodate electric operated rail-mounted gantry cranes.	8.3	Tier 1B
Transit	LB-ELA_0140	Metro Micro Transit Zone(s)	Implementation of new Metro on-demand, flexible transit service for the northern section of the I-710 Study Area between Lynwood and Commerce. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rides can be booked online, by app, or by phone. Rides are prescheduled, same day/multiple days.</li> <li>- Uses small capacity vans (seats 7-10 riders).</li> <li>- Pick-up/drop-off where safe (virtual stops). Targeted maximum wait time is 15 minutes.</li> </ul>	15.0	Tier 1B
Transit	LB-ELA_0164	Improved Frequency of Metro Buses in the LB-ELA Study Area	Provide a 50 percent improvement on all Metro fixed bus routes greater than 10 minutes in the AM and PM peak periods. And, provide a 50 percent improvement on all Metro fixed bus routes greater than 15 minutes in the Midday and Evening periods. [For example, a bus route that has as frequency of a bus every 30 minutes would improve to a bus arriving every 15 minutes.]	14.6	Tier 1B



## Tier 1 Projects and Programs

Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score	Draft Tier
Transit	LB-ELA_0203	Bus Stop Improvements	<p>Collaborate with the local jurisdictions (cities, unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County) to implement bus stop improvements within the LB-ELA Corridor. Bus stop improvements would include items such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lighting</li> <li>- Security Features</li> <li>- Benches</li> <li>- Shade and shelters</li> <li>- Drinking Fountains</li> <li>- Solar-powered arrival displays</li> <li>- Trashcans</li> <li>- Landscaping</li> <li>- Signage</li> <li>- Crosswalks</li> <li>- Improved ADA accessibility, including repositioning of utility boxes on the sidewalk</li> </ul> <p>Provide financial support in order to help leverage local funds for project implementation. Funds would be made available based on criteria such as: project need, project readiness, and project benefits relative to costs, among other factors.</p>	14.1	Tier 1A

## Tier 1 Projects and Programs

Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score	Draft Tier
Transit	LB-ELA_0219	Metrolink Regional Rail Line between Union Station and Long Beach	Construct a new Metrolink regional rail line between Union Station and downtown Long Beach. Trains would be powered using electrical multiple unit (EMU) traction motors, which are anticipated to be required by the California Air Resources Board after 2030. Specific EMU technology has yet to be determined, but could be powered by overhead catenary, hydrogen fuel cell, or catenary/battery electric. Trains would operate along the existing SCRRA Metrolink line between Los Angeles and Commerce and then transition into Union Pacific (UP) railroad right of way (potentially along the San Pedro Subdivision Corridor) for the segment between Commerce and Lakewood. However, sections of a second track would likely need to be constructed in this middle section in order to operate up to four trains per hour in each direction in the peak period. In addition, substantial portions of the southern section of the alignment, between Lakewood and downtown Long Beach, would require new right-of way to provide needed trackage to connect to the downtown Long Beach area. New stations would be constructed and spaced every 1 to 3 miles depending upon the location. It is anticipated that these Metrolink trains would interline through Link US (at Union Station) with the Antelope Valley Line to the north.	13.9	Tier 1B
Transit	LB-ELA_0001	West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor (LRT)	The Project consists of 12 stations and is a 19-mile light rail transit corridor that will connect southeast LA County to downtown Los Angeles, serving the cities and communities of Artesia, Cerritos, Bellflower, Paramount, Downey, South Gate, Cudahy, Bell, Huntington Park, Vernon, unincorporated Florence-Graham community of LA County and downtown Los Angeles. Complete 4.5-mile section between Slauson A Line and Union Station.	13.9	Tier 1B
Transit	LB-ELA_0169	Southeast LA Transit Improvement Program	Pending stakeholder input and local jurisdiction approval, this project could include a "cloud-based" Countywide Signal Priority upgrade, 100 bus stop shelters at existing bus stops with over 50 daily boardings but without an existing shelter, 100-solar powered real-time arrival displays, 100 bus stop solar light upgrades for stops without shelters that have lighting, terminal/layover expansion improvements at the Norwalk, Artesia, and Compton Stations, and 100 Zero-Emissions Bus charging masts.	13.7	Tier 1B

Tier 1 Projects and Programs					
Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score	Draft Tier
Transit	LB-ELA_0168	Compton Transit Management Operations Center Enhancements	Project improvements would include: beautification, art, monuments, safety, increased bike storage, bike parking, walkways, and bike paths (Phases 1 -5). Location: Compton Transit Management Operations Center: 275 N. Willowbrook Ave., Compton.	13.1	Tier 1B
Transit	LB-ELA_0175	Install Quad Safety Gates at all A Line [Blue Line] Crossings	Install Quad Safety Gates at all A Line [Blue Line] Crossings for safety and increased speed/safety zones	12.7	Tier 1B
Transit	LB-ELA_0178	Metro Bus Priority Lane Corridor along Line 18 (Whittier Blvd.)	Improve bus times, speeds, and reliability along Line 18 (Whittier Blvd.). Proposed improvements would include: transit signal prioritization, bus priority lanes and bus stop bulb outs, all door boarding, bus stop and layover improvements.	12.5	Tier 1B
Transit	LB-ELA_0136	Enhanced Transit Security	Provide enhanced transit security measures and features on Metro trains, buses, and at Metro rail stations including: security devices such as cameras and call buttons, improved incident response, and additional security officers and/or plainclothes staff.	12.4	Tier 1A
Transit	LB-ELA_0019	Atlantic Bus Only Lane and Transit Signal Prioritization (Next Gen Improvements)	BRT project along Atlantic to provide improved speed, reliability, and frequency.	12.3	Tier 1B
Transit	LB-ELA_0141	Metro Bus Priority Lane Corridor along Line 60 (Long Beach Blvd.)	Improve bus times, speeds, and reliability along Line 60 (Long Beach Blvd.). Proposed improvements would include: transit signal prioritization, bus priority lanes and bus stop bulb outs, all door boarding, bus stop and layover improvements.	12.3	Tier 1B
Transit	LB-ELA_0149	Increased Security Features at Metro's Existing and Planned Light Rail Stations	Lighting, security cameras, improved line of sight, incident/emergency response plans, and other safety features at Metro stations/parking structures.	12.3	Tier 1A
Transit	LB-ELA_0144	Metro Bus Priority Lane Corridor along Line 111 (Florence)	Improve bus times, speeds, and reliability along Line 111 (Florence). Proposed improvements would include: transit signal prioritization, bus priority lanes and bus stop bulb outs, all door boarding, bus stop and layover improvements.	12.2	Tier 1B

## Tier 1 Projects and Programs

Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score	Draft Tier
Transit	LB-ELA_0146	Metro Bus Priority Lane Corridor along Line 260 (Atlantic Blvd.)	Improve bus times, speeds, and reliability along Line 260 (Atlantic Blvd.). Proposed improvements would include: transit signal prioritization, bus priority lanes and bus stop bulb outs, all door boarding, bus stop and layover improvements.	12.1	Tier 1B

Tier 2 Projects and Programs					
Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score	Draft Tier
Active Transportation / TDM	LB-ELA_0076	Pedestrian and Bike Facilities	Provide pedestrian facility improvements. Provide safe routes for bike riders. (Various locations within the City of Commerce)	12.9	Tier 2B
Active Transportation / TDM	LB-ELA_0220	Micromobility Pilot Project	<p>Develop a pilot project along Long Beach Boulevard/Pacific Boulevard between Ocean Boulevard [Long Beach] and East. 57th Street [Vernon] in order to evaluate the design and implementation of Micromobility features along this planned Complete Streets Corridor. Micromobility is defined as any small, low-speed, human or electric-powered device, including bicycles, scooters, electric-assist bicycles (e-bikes), electric scooters (e-scooters), and other small, lightweight, wheeled conveyances. Micromobility devices help to close first- and last-mile gaps to transit and can offer individuals greater access to jobs, health care, and other services. Powered and adaptive micromobility devices may also increase mobility for older adults or individuals with disabilities, as they are less strenuous to operate than traditional bicycles or scooters. The Micromobility Pilot Project would test and evaluate various concepts, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Protected Bicycle Lanes. These lanes physically separate micromobility users from vehicles and pedestrians. These should be designed to accommodate electric and non-electric modes. Streets with speed limits above 30 miles per hour should include a protected lane.</li> <li>- Speed Limits. For example, micromobility devices should self-regulate their speeds below 15 miles/hour to use the protected lane or should ride in the road.</li> <li>- Enforcement / Signage. Motorcycles and other high-speed devices not permitted in the protected lanes.</li> <li>- Designated Parking Stations. Provide designated parking areas for all types of micromobility devices and keep devices out of pedestrian rights of way.</li> <li>- Examine policies and regulations that would permit private companies to operate shared micromobility services, including e-scooters and e-bicycles, to the communities.</li> </ul>	12.8	Tier 2A

## Tier 2 Projects and Programs

Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score	Draft Tier
Active Transportation / TDM	<b>LB-ELA_0094</b>	Hill Street Pedestrian Bridge Overcrossing	Construct bridge over the I-710 and Los Angeles River at Hill Street for pedestrians and bicyclists.	12.6	Tier 2B
Active Transportation / TDM	<b>LB-ELA_0066</b>	Randolph Bike & Pedestrian Project	Randolph, from Bell western city limit to eastern city limit. Complete Phase 2 of the Randolph Metro Active Transportation (MAT) Corridor.	12.5	Tier 2A
Active Transportation / TDM	<b>LB-ELA_0055</b>	I-710 LA River Bike Path	Proposed walking/bicycling path along the LA River, specifically along I-710, which connects Maywood to Long Beach.	12.2	Tier 2B
Active Transportation / TDM	<b>LB-ELA_0007</b>	LA River Path – Central LA	An eight-mile bicycle and pedestrian path gap closure between Elysian Valley and Maywood, through downtown Los Angeles.	12.2	Tier 2B
Active Transportation / TDM	<b>LB-ELA_0070</b>	Pedestrian Bridge	Construct Pedestrian Bridge (Connecting Asmus Park to planned West Santa Ana Branch LRT Station)	12.2	Tier 2B
Active Transportation / TDM	<b>LB-ELA_0139</b>	Humphreys Avenue Pedestrian/Bicycle Overcrossing	Construct bridge over I-710 along Humphreys Avenue for pedestrians and bicyclists.	12.0	Tier 2B
Active Transportation / TDM	<b>LB-ELA_0208</b>	Salt Lake Avenue Pedestrian Accessibility Project	East side of Salt Lake Avenue within the City of Cudahy. Widen sidewalk, install pedestrian lighting, signage, curb extensions, and ADA compliant wheelchair ramps.	11.6	Tier 2B
Active Transportation / TDM	<b>LB-ELA_0207</b>	City of Carson Citywide Community Safety Improvements	Improve bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and safety with Class 2 bike lanes, bike racks, crosswalk improvements, Accessible Pedestrian Signal push buttons, countdown pedestrian signals, and curb ramps. Various locations within the City of Carson and Santa Fe Avenue between 218th Place and Del Amo Boulevard.	11.2	Tier 2B
Active Transportation / TDM	<b>LB-ELA_0159</b>	Southern Ave. Pedestrian Connector Project	New pedestrian path along Southern Ave./East Frontage Rd./Miller Way/West Frontage Road to connect Garfield Ave. with Urban Orchard Park	11.1	Tier 2A

## Tier 2 Projects and Programs

Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score	Draft Tier
Active Transportation / TDM	<b>LB-ELA_0128</b>	Randolph Street Bike and Pedestrian Facilities Project	This project would involve the construction of bike and pedestrian facilities on Randolph St from District Blvd to the Los Angeles River Trail System.	11.0	Tier 2B
Active Transportation / TDM	<b>LB-ELA_0138</b>	Spring Avenue Pedestrian/Bicycle Overcrossing	Construct bridge over the I-710 and Los Angeles River at Spring Street for pedestrians and bicyclists.	10.8	Tier 2B
Active Transportation / TDM	<b>LB-ELA_0158</b>	Del Amo Pedestrian Gap Closure Project	Provide sidewalks and lighting at Del Amo undercrossing at the I-710 freeway. Currently there are no existing sidewalks. Would also help those seeking walk access to Del Amo LRT Station.	10.8	Tier 2B
Active Transportation / TDM	<b>LB-ELA_0199</b>	Telecommuting Programs	Building upon “lessons learned” during the COVID pandemic, encourage employers to modify their work policies to retain hybrid work schedules, flexible work hours, and “work from home” options. Coordinate with public agencies and large employers. Share research/promote studies on the effectiveness of telecommuting. In addition, identify supportive infrastructure for telecommuting. Expand broadband capacity and internet service provider (ISP) capabilities within the LB-ELA Corridor by co-locating digital communications infrastructure (such as fiber optic cable) with major public works projects and infrastructure.	10.7	Tier 2B
Active Transportation / TDM	<b>LB-ELA_0209</b>	South Downey Safe Routes to School Project (Phase 2)	Safety education and construction of sidewalks, crosswalks, and curb ramps. Various locations within South Downey: Brunache St., Laura St., Nada St., Pomeroy Rd, Quoit St., Lankin St., Orizaba Ave., Gneiss Ave., Devenir Ave., Blodgett Ave. and Premiere Ave.	10.3	Tier 2B
Active Transportation / TDM	<b>LB-ELA_0114</b>	Walnut Pedestrian Pathway	Provide pedestrian pathway along 25th Street, from west of Walnut Avenue to Gundry Avenue	9.7	Tier 2B
Active Transportation / TDM	<b>LB-ELA_0095</b>	Pedestrian Crosswalk Improvements	Provide pedestrian crosswalk improvements (pedestrian buttons, signage, and electrical infrastructure) at Rosewood/Abbott, Mallison/Abbott, Long Beach/Tecumseh, Imperial/Ruth & Atlantic/Brewster intersections. (Phase 1)	9.1	Tier 2A

## Tier 2 Projects and Programs

Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score	Draft Tier
Active Transportation / TDM	LB-ELA_0216	Bicycle Safety and Education Program (BEST)	Expand Metro's efforts to promote bicycle safety and improve roadway awareness for bicyclists, pedestrians, bus operators, and motorists within the Long Beach-East Los Angeles Corridor communities. This program includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Education and encouragement campaigns to promote a shift from driving to more walking, bicycling, and the use of public transit.</li> <li>- Bicycle skills and traffic safety classes.</li> <li>- Community rides. Safe Routes to Schools rides.</li> <li>- Collaboration with key stakeholders in the development of campaigns and printed materials such as safe riding kits for bicycle safety class participants.</li> </ul>	8.5	Tier 2A
Active Transportation / TDM	LB-ELA_0198	Carpool/Vanpool Programs	Extend Metro's carpool and vanpool programs by focusing on the LB-ELA Study Area. Carpooling is an inexpensive and effective travel option that involves finding nearby commuters to share the ride. Provide access to ride-matching services to find nearby residents looking to carpool. In addition, promote vanpool services, including coordination, administration support, and financial subsidies for commuters especially in areas less served by transit operators.	8.2	Tier 2A
Active Transportation / TDM	LB-ELA_0090	Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons at Pedestrian Crossings	Install rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs) at Pedestrian Crossings at various locations within the City of Long Beach.	7.7	Tier 2A
Active Transportation / TDM	LB-ELA_0082	Enhanced Pedestrian Crosswalk (Rives Ave. & Adwen St.)	Enhance pedestrian cross walk at Rives Ave. & Adwen St.	7.7	Tier 2A
Active Transportation / TDM	LB-ELA_0210	Greenway Traffic Circle Improvement Project	At the intersection of Rives Avenue / Phlox Street in the City of Downey, construct traffic circle, bulb outs with directional curb ramps, enhanced crosswalks, signage, landscaping, shade, and bioswales.	7.7	Tier 2A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0065	Slauson Ave. Bridge	Rehabilitate/replace Slauson Avenue Bridge over the LA River	8.8	Tier 2A



## Tier 2 Projects and Programs

Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score	Draft Tier
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0003	Integrated Corridor Management (ICM) Project	ICM is an Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) strategy to manage non-recurring congestion along a corridor by utilizing advanced technologies and systems. ICM components include active monitoring of all transportation modes and facilities within the corridor, on and off the freeway, including ramp metering, traffic signal coordination, incident traffic management, advanced traveler information system, and other advanced technologies and techniques. Would be applied on I-710 and a network of key connecting arterials, within the LB-ELA Corridor between SR-91 and SR-60.	8.6	Tier 2A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0109	Alondra Blvd. Intersection Improvements	Provide dual left turn lanes on all approaches for the following intersections along Alondra Blvd: 1) Garfield, 2) Paramount, and 3) Downey.	8.3	Tier 2A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0068	Systematic Safety Analysis Report Program (SSARP) Improvements	Targeted safety improvements to 38 intersections, citywide, in the City of Bell Gardens. Includes installing signs; changing pavement markings; adding protected turn phasing; installing channelization; parking restrictions; and signal timing adjustments.	8.2	Tier 2B
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0107	Alondra Blvd. Bridges	Replace Alondra Blvd. Bridges over the LA River and I-710	7.8	Tier 2B
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0108	Garfield Ave. Intersection Improvements	Provide dual left turn lanes on all approaches for the following intersections along Garfield Avenue: 1) Rosecrans, 2) Somerset, and 3) Alondra.	7.5	Tier 2A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0086	Gage Avenue Operational and Safety Improvements	Between Alameda Street and Atlantic Blvd., upgrade Gage Avenue to provide operational and safety improvements.	7.5	Tier 2A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0110	Rosecrans Intersection Improvements	Provide dual left turn lanes on all approaches for the following intersections along Rosecrans Ave: 1) Garfield, 2) Paramount, and 3) Downey.	7.2	Tier 2A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0051		Route 1. In Los Angeles County, on various routes at various locations. Upgrade existing fiber communication system and rehabilitate Transportation Management System (TMS) elements, including video cameras, ramp meters, and Changeable Message Signs (CMS).	7.0	Tier 2A

<b>Tier 2 Projects and Programs</b>					
<b>Project Type</b>	<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Draft Ranking Score</b>	<b>Draft Tier</b>
Arterial Roadway	<b>LB-ELA_0020</b>	Sports Park Transportation Performance Modeling Network	Traffic signal controller and cabinets upgrades and the installation of fiber optic communication infrastructure to provide redundant high bandwidth network in Long Beach within the LB-ELA Corridor. The purpose of these equipment upgrades is to improve traffic signal coordination and strengthen data connections among traffic management systems.	6.5	Tier 2B
Arterial Roadway	<b>LB-ELA_0078</b>	Randolph Street Gap Closure	Provide arterial roadway bridge over LA River and I-710 to connect Randolph Street west and east of the LA River/I-710	6.5	Tier 2B
Arterial Roadway	<b>LB-ELA_0221</b>	Atlantic Blvd. widening Over I-5 at Mixmaster Intersection	Would widen Atlantic Avenue bridge structure over I-5 at intersection of Telegraph Road, Eastern Avenue, and Atlantic Boulevard in the City of Commerce. Would help relieve traffic congestion and provide a safer roadway for all modes of transportation.	6.3	Tier 2B
Arterial Roadway	<b>LB-ELA_0105</b>	Garfield Avenue Improvement Project	Improve Garfield Avenue from South City Limit to North City Limit [City of Paramount]	6.3	Tier 2A
Arterial Roadway	<b>LB-ELA_0012</b>	Garfield Widening	Garfield Avenue Improvements, from 70th Street to Howery Street. Widen Street 1 to 4 Feet for 2 Miles to Accommodate a Third Lane in Each Direction during Peak Hours. Add Medians, Narrow Existing Medians, Add Second Left Turn Lane in All Directions at Two Intersections, (Rosecrans Ave. And Alondra Blvd.), Resurface Street, Concrete Intersections, and add Traffic Signal Improvements, Street Lights, Underground Utilities, Green Street Improvements, and Stormwater and Watershed BMPs.	6.1	Tier 2A
Arterial Roadway	<b>LB-ELA_0166</b>	LB-ELA Corridor Vulnerable Road User Connected Vehicle Infrastructure Deployment	Design and Implementation of Connected Vehicle Infrastructure to improve vulnerable road user safety within the LB-ELA Corridor. This would allow units in vehicles to communicate with units built into transportation infrastructure. Additional technology applications would allow vehicles to communicate with other vehicles, data networks, or pedestrians. The main purpose of this technology is to share information related to items such as safety warnings, roadway hazards, routing information, truck route restrictions, and pedestrian safety zones.	5.9	Tier 2B
Arterial Roadway	<b>LB-ELA_0085</b>	Intersection Improvements (Huntington Park)	Provide intersection improvements at various locations within the City of Huntington Park	5.9	Tier 2A

## Tier 2 Projects and Programs

Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score	Draft Tier
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0069	Traffic / Ped Signal Upgrades	Targeted upgrades to 38 intersections, citywide, in the City of Bell Gardens. Would replace outdated infrastructure such as signal poles, cabinets, pedestrian poles, and vehicle detection systems.	5.4	Tier 2B
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0074	Traffic Signal Upgrades	Upgrade various signals within the City of Commerce	5.4	Tier 2A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0088	Protected Left Turns at Signals	Implement protected left-turns along major arterials at various locations with the City of Long Beach.	5.4	Tier 2A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0101	Video Camera installation	Video Camera installation at all Signalized intersections within the City of Maywood	5.4	Tier 2A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0071	Mixmaster Traffic signal Improvements (Telegraph/ Eastern/ Atlantic)	Traffic signal upgrade at Telegraph / Eastern / Atlantic. Also consider improvements such as turning lane pavement markings, striping, and enhanced signage so that approaching traffic can get properly aligned well in advance of this intersection.	5.4	Tier 2A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0167	I-710 Arterial Signal Performance Measurement	Deploy arterial signal performance measures at all signalized intersection within the LB-ELA Corridor to allow for the optimization of traffic signal operation to improve arterial corridor mobility.	5.2	Tier 2A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0215	I-710 Arterial Traffic Signal Control Communication Upgrades	Design and implement upgraded arterial traffic signal control interconnect and central traffic management communications to elevate subregional traffic system management and operations.	5.2	Tier 2A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0083	Traffic Signal Upgrades	Along Florence Ave., between Downey Ave. & Brookshire Ave., upgrade traffic signals	5.2	Tier 2A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0100	Traffic Signal Upgrade Projects	Upgrade traffic signal equipment at various locations within the City of Maywood	5.2	Tier 2A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0013	Tweedy Blvd Signal Sync	Tweedy Boulevard Signal Synchronization Project: (1) Interconnects 18 Traffic Signals Using Fiber Optic Cable And Wireless Communications (2) Synchronizes Signal Timing To Improve Traffic Flow, And Reduces Delays Along The 2.7-Mile Arterial and (3) Install A Closed Circuit Television Camera (CCTV) At The Intersection Of Long Beach Bl., to Support the Advance Transportation Management Systems (ATMS).	5.2	Tier 2A

## Tier 2 Projects and Programs

Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score	Draft Tier
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0072	Traffic Signal Coordination Projects	Various arterials within the City of Commerce	5.2	Tier 2A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0097	Traffic Signal Improvements	Provide traffic signal upgrades at the following locations: 1) Long Beach Blvd/Carlin, 2) Long Beach Blvd/El Segundo, 3) Long Beach Blvd and Sanborn, 4) Long Beach Blvd./Euclid, 5) Long Beach Blvd/Imperial Hwy, 6) Atlantic Ave/Cortland, 7) Atlantic Ave./Abbott Rd, 8) Alameda/Deputy Blaire. (Phase 2)	5.2	Tier 2A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0084	Video Detection Upgrades	At 25 intersections in various locations within the City of Downey, provide video detection upgrades.	5.2	Tier 2A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0081	Firestone Blvd. Traffic Signal Upgrades & Safety Enhancements	Along Firestone Boulevard between Downey West City Limit and Lakewood Boulevard, provide traffic signal updates and safety enhancements.	5.0	Tier 2A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0080	Florence Ave. & Paramount Blvd. Intersection Improvement	Improve the intersection at Florence Ave. & Paramount Blvd. by adding turn lanes to reduce congestion and enhance safety.	5.0	Tier 2B
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0099	Traffic Signal Synchronization Projects	Various arterials within the City of Maywood	4.9	Tier 2A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0075	Video Camera installation	Video Camera installation on all Signalized intersections within the City of Commerce	4.9	Tier 2A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0096	Traffic Signal Improvements	Install new traffic signals and signage at the following locations: 1) Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd./Abbott Rd., 2) Arlington and Atlantic Ave., 3) El Segundo and State St., 4) Carlin and Bullis Rd., 5) Alameda St. and Industry Way, 6) Alameda St. and Lynwood Rd., 7) Martin Luther King Blvd/ Norton Ave., 8) Martin Luther King Blvd/Bullis Rd., 9) Martin Luther King Blvd/Ernestine St., 10) Martin Luther King Blvd and California, 11) State Street and Fernwood. (Phase 1)	4.7	Tier 2A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0098	City Re-Striping Projects	Replace striping on major arterials (lane striping, school zone striping) at various locations within the City of Lynwood.	4.7	Tier 2A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0089	Emergency Vehicle Pre-Emption	Install emergency vehicle pre-emption (EMVE) for traffic signals at various locations within the City of Long Beach.	4.6	Tier 2A

## Tier 2 Projects and Programs

Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score	Draft Tier
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0087	Traffic Signal Equipment Improvements	Upgrade traffic signal equipment at various locations within the City of Long Beach	4.5	Tier 2A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0116	Traffic Signal Operational Upgrade	Upgrade the traffic signal at Willow Street & Temple Avenue	4.0	Tier 2A
Arterial Roadway	LB-ELA_0112	Signal Coordination/ITS Projects	Implement signal coordination and ITS projects at various locations within the City of Signal Hill.	3.8	Tier 2A
Freeway	LB-ELA_0036	I-710 / I-405 Connector Project Improvements	Modify SB I-710 Collector Distributor Road/Eliminate SB I-710 to EB Wardlow Boulevard exit at Wardlow Road. Modify NB I-710 to SB I-405 Connector/Eliminate WB Wardlow Boulevard on ramp to NB I-710/I-405 Connectors.	9.6	Tier 2B
Freeway	LB-ELA_0154	I-710 Zero-Emission Truck Travel Zone Restriction	Establish a zero-emission truck-only travel zone on I-710. Only zero emissions trucks would be able to travel on I-710, while diesel and near-zero emissions heavy duty trucks would be excluded. No new lanes would be added to the existing footprint of I-710. No restrictions would be placed on autos.	9.3	Tier 2B
Freeway	LB-ELA_0188	Freeway Landscaping / Maintenance	Ongoing Caltrans Program that ensures that maintenance projects and activities such as trash removal, landscaping, provision of drought-resistant vegetation, and graffiti removal take place on a regular basis within state, public rights of way in the LB-ELA Corridor. Ensure that the agency dedicates sufficient resources for this effort.	9.1	Tier 2A
Freeway	LB-ELA_0183	Zero Emissions Truck Lane	Explore options and assess the feasibility of converting the right-hand lane on I-710 to create a Zero Emissions Truck Lane. Only zero emissions trucks would be able to travel in this lane, while fossil fuel vehicles would be excluded. No new lanes would be added to the existing footprint of I-710.	9.1	Tier 2B
Freeway	LB-ELA_0091	I-710/Anaheim Interchange Improvement	Reconstruct I-710/Anaheim Interchange to provide operational and safety improvements.	8.9	Tier 2B
Freeway	LB-ELA_0093	I-710/Wardlow Interchange Improvement	Reconstruct I-710/Wardlow Interchange to provide operational and safety improvements.	8.8	Tier 2B

## Tier 2 Projects and Programs

Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score	Draft Tier
Freeway	LB-ELA_0039		I-710, MP R6.0-14.1. In Long Beach and Compton, from Shoreline Drive to north of Alondra Boulevard. Enhance highway worker safety by constructing Maintenance Vehicle Pullouts (MVPs), upgrading guardrail and end treatments, paving beyond the gore, installing erosion control and replacing pull boxes.	8.4	Tier 2A
Freeway	LB-ELA_0157	I-710 Particulate Matter (PM) Reduction Pilot Project	Implement a pilot project on I-710 to deploy and evaluate measures to reduce exposure of nearby populations to particulate matter, specifically localized sources of entrained/fugitive dust, tire wear, and brake wear associated with traffic on the freeway. These measures may include roadside vegetation barriers within available Caltrans' right-of-way, air filters for nearby schools or community facilities, pavement materials, frequent street-sweeping, and deployment of air quality monitoring systems, among others. In addition, include options to examine the effectiveness of "cool pavement" applications to reduce heat island effects. As part of the work plan, the pilot project would include a study element to assess and document the efficacy of the various measures.	8.1	Tier 2A
Freeway	LB-ELA_0180	I-710 Truck Bypass Lanes	Construct truck bypass lanes on I-710 between Willow Street and Del Amo Boulevard. The purpose of the improvement would be to separate cars from trucks through the congested I-710/I-405 interchange for purposes of safety and mobility.	7.8	Tier 2B
Freeway	LB-ELA_0035	I-710 Auxiliary Lanes (Willow to Wardlow)	Provide auxiliary lanes in the NB and SB directions of I-710, between Willow St. and I-405 Connectors at Wardlow Road to better manage traffic weaving conflicts and related congestion.	7.3	Tier 2B
Freeway	LB-ELA_0045		Route 91, MP R11.7. In Long Beach, at LA River (W91 -N710 & S710) Bridge No. 53-2143F. Replace portions of the bridge deck and apply polyester concrete overlay.	6.8	Tier 2A
Freeway	LB-ELA_0043		I-710, MP 22.2. In Commerce and Vernon, at Hobart Rail Yard Overhead No. 53-0840. Rehabilitate, clean, and paint bridge.	6.8	Tier 2A
Freeway	LB-ELA_0038	I-710 Auxiliary Lanes (Del Amo Boulevard to Long Beach Boulevard)	Provide auxiliary lanes in the NB and SB directions of I-710, between Del Amo Boulevard and Long Beach Boulevard to better manage traffic weaving conflicts and related congestion.	6.6	Tier 2B

## Tier 2 Projects and Programs

Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score	Draft Tier
Freeway	LB-ELA_0137	Freeway Soundwalls	Build higher soundwalls to protect residents from air pollution, noise, and other impacts (Design Package 2, Design Package 3). Perform noise studies for all remaining walls along I-710 that are less than 16 feet high to identify additional, feasible soundwall projects that would realize the greatest benefits for impacted residents and other sensitive receivers.	6.6	Tier 2A
Freeway	LB-ELA_0155	Drought Tolerant Landscaping, Hardscaping and Aesthetic Features along I-710	Provide drought tolerant landscaping within existing, available right-of-way along I-710. Where needed, add context sensitive lighting features and additional signage to improve safety. Include hardscaping and other aesthetic features to improve the attractiveness of the freeway for users and for adjacent land uses/communities.	5.6	Tier 2A
Freeway	LB-ELA_0050		Route 91. In the cities of Carson, Compton, Long Beach, and Bellflower. Upgrade overhead signs and sign structures, rehabilitate landscaping, and enhance highway worker safety.	5.0	Tier 2A
Freeway	LB-ELA_0048		I-105, MP R14.3. In Paramount, at Grove Street at the Garfield Avenue Pump Station. Replace pumps, add lighting, construct Maintenance Vehicle Pullouts (MVPs), and provide a fiber optic connection to the pump house.	4.5	Tier 2A
Freeway	LB-ELA_0052		Route 47. In Long Beach from Route 710 to north of Route 710 (PM 3.497/3.58). Upgrade Transportation Management System (TMS) elements, replace fiber optic cable, and connect upgraded equipment to communication hubs.	4.2	Tier 2A
Freeway	LB-ELA_0054		I-710, MP 24.7. Near the neighborhood of East Los Angeles, at Humphrey Maintenance Station at 102 South Humphreys Avenue. Construct a new office building, an equipment storage building, and a Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) charging station and demolish an existing building.	3.7	Tier 2A
Freeway	LB-ELA_0053		I-405, MP 7.2. In Long Beach, at the Pacific Place Maintenance Station at 3725 Pacific Place. Replace a deteriorated building with a new building at the maintenance station.	3.6	Tier 2A
Freeway	LB-ELA_0049		I-710, MP 18.7-19.6. In South Gate and Bell Gardens, at the South Gate Pump Plant and the Florence Avenue Pump Plant; also in Downey on Route 105 at the Ardis Avenue Pump Plant (PM R16.48). Upgrade pump plants.	2.9	Tier 2A

<b>Tier 2 Projects and Programs</b>					
<b>Project Type</b>	<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Draft Ranking Score</b>	<b>Draft Tier</b>
Goods Movement	<b>LB-ELA_0026</b>	West Basin Container Terminal Railyard Modernization	On-dock railyard expansion to accommodate electric operated rail-mounted gantry cranes.	8.2	Tier 2B
Goods Movement	<b>LB-ELA_0185</b>	Freight Advanced Traveler Information Systems	Application of advanced technologies to manage drayage truck movements to and from the Ports. The system integrates real-time roadway traffic data, vessel/container tracking, real-time container terminal visit times, and GPS-based information to optimize the sequencing of container delivery and pick-up. The purpose is to improve cargo handling and efficiencies and reduce congestion near intermodal yards and Port facilities.	8.1	Tier 2A
Goods Movement	<b>LB-ELA_0025</b>	Terminal Island Transfer Facility Modernization	On-dock railyard expansion to accommodate electric operated rail-mounted gantry cranes.	8.1	Tier 2B
Goods Movement	<b>LB-ELA_0122</b>	Harbor Scenic Drive Roadway & Infrastructure Improvements	Improve Harbor Scenic Drive, from Harbor Plaza to Ocean Boulevard. The project would: increase the roadway pavement structural section to replace the existing aged pavement; provide horizontal and vertical alignments improvements for enhanced safety; improve striping, traffic signage and way-finding signage; improve highway lighting; enhance drainage facilities (including the introduction of permanent water quality enhancements such as bio-swales and catch basin inlet/pipe screens); revamp the parkway and median landscaping and irrigation; and provide utility improvements and enhancements.	6.1	Tier 2B
Goods Movement	<b>LB-ELA_0151</b>	Goods Movement Freight Rail Study	Conduct an assessment to evaluate options for deriving greater utilization of the Alameda Corridor as a potential means for reducing truck trips within the Southern California subregion. This assessment would include options such as: opportunities to increase on-dock freight rail mode share; implementation of short-haul, freight rail shuttle service to new inland rail facilities; and increased use/improved operational efficiencies of existing near dock and off dock intermodal facilities. This evaluation would take into account updated cargo forecasts, economic factors and projections, current trends associated with the goods movement logistics chain including transload truck trips, and railroad and intermodal capacity constraints in the Southern California region. The Goods Movement Freight Rail Study would assess options from a systemwide perspective and would include factors such as changes in truck trip travel	5.7	Tier 2A



## Tier 2 Projects and Programs

Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score	Draft Tier
			patterns, land use implications, and the potential for environmental impacts as well as institutional constraints.		
Goods Movement	<b>LB-ELA_0121</b>	Pier D Street Realignment	Realign Pier D Street, from Middle Harbor Exit gate to Pico Avenue. Currently Pier D Street has sight distance issues, inadequate curve radii, and drainage/flooding issues at the low point. The Pier D Realignment project will provide redundancy through Pier D thereby improving safety and traffic flows. The scope of the project is to widen & reconstruct Pier D Street between the Middle Harbor Exit Gate and Pico Avenue and to reconfigure West Broadway. Additional scope items includes construction of a new pump station, retaining walls, utility upgrades, striping, signage and traffic signal work.	5.2	Tier 2B
Goods Movement	<b>LB-ELA_0021</b>	Alameda Corridor Terminus Enhancements	New Cerritos channel rail bridge and supporting connections throughout Port of LA.	5.2	Tier 2B
Goods Movement	<b>LB-ELA_0124</b>	Port of Los Angeles National Multimodal Freight Network Improvement Program: Rail System Improvement Projects	Additional rail tracks in POLA to improve overall rail operations, including supporting on-dock railyards	4.9	Tier 2B
Transit	<b>LB-ELA_0161</b>	Transit Ambassador Program	Enhance Metro's Transit Ambassador Program within the LB-ELA Corridor to bring non-law enforcement representatives to improve the customer experience, reinforce public safety, and increase ridership on the transit system.	12.1	Tier 2A

## Tier 2 Projects and Programs

Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score	Draft Tier
Transit	<b>LB-ELA_0143</b>	Metro Bus Priority Lane Corridor along Line 110 (Gage)	Improve bus times, speeds, and reliability along Line 110 (Gage). Proposed improvements would include: transit signal prioritization, bus priority lanes and bus stop bulb outs, all door boarding, bus stop and layover improvements.	12.0	Tier 2B
Transit	<b>LB-ELA_0172</b>	Commerce Metrolink Station Improvements	Improve train platforms, shift tracks, install pedestrian barriers and pedestrian crossing safety features, extend and widen sidewalks and walkways, add lighting, install new ADA accessibility features, replace equipment, provide bike path striping, add wayfinding signage, and provide new landscaping.	11.8	Tier 2B
Transit	<b>LB-ELA_0160</b>	Line A (Blue Line) Transit Priority/Signal Synchronization	Enhanced signal prioritization/synchronization so that the A Line (Blue Line) has higher priority in areas where the LRT trains operate in mixed flow traffic	11.8	Tier 2B
Transit	<b>LB-ELA_0147</b>	Transit Traveler Information System Application (ITS)	Integrated system and web-based application to provide real-time information to users on optimal transit routes and transit options based on time of day as well as estimated arrival times of buses under real time travel conditions.	11.8	Tier 2B
Transit	<b>LB-ELA_0145</b>	Metro Bus Priority Lane Corridor along Line 115 (Firestone)	Improve bus times, speeds, and reliability along Line 115 (Firestone). Proposed improvements would include: transit signal prioritization, bus priority lanes and bus stop bulb outs, all door boarding, bus stop and layover improvements.	11.0	Tier 2B
Transit	<b>LB-ELA_0148</b>	Transit Fare Discount Program	Expand Metro's program to provide increased transit fare discounts for low-income riders, students, and seniors. Target low income or disadvantaged communities within the LB-ELA Corridor Study Area.	11.0	Tier 2A
Transit	<b>LB-ELA_0171</b>	Commuter Rail Maintenance, Repair, and Safety Projects	Implement planned repair, maintenance, and safety projects to Metro-owned railroad infrastructure along the Los Angeles/Orange County commuter rail line within the LB-ELA Corridor study area.	10.9	Tier 2A
Transit	<b>LB-ELA_0177</b>	Add Second Elevator to Firestone and Slauson A Line [Blue Line] Stations	Add second elevator to Firestone and Slauson A Line [Blue Line] Stations for improved access and reliability	10.7	Tier 2A
Transit	<b>LB-ELA_0016</b>	Connecting C Line (Green) and Metrolink Norwalk Station	New express shuttle service between C Line Norwalk Station and Metrolink Norwalk Station to close existing transit gap. Near term solution until C Line is extended eastward.	10.7	Tier 2A

<b>Tier 2 Projects and Programs</b>					
<b>Project Type</b>	<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Draft Ranking Score</b>	<b>Draft Tier</b>
Transit	<b>LB-ELA_0152</b>	Transit Marketing and Education Program	Expansion of Metro’s collaborative effort with Metrolink, Long Beach Transit, and city municipal bus lines to promote transit and alternative modes of transportation to the single occupant vehicle. Include features such as “free transit” day and transit passes to employees or students to encourage transit use.	10.7	Tier 2A
Transit	<b>LB-ELA_0179</b>	Metro Bus Priority Lane Corridor along Line 66 (Olympic Blvd.)	Improve bus times, speeds, and reliability along Line 66 (Olympic Blvd.). Proposed improvements would include: transit signal prioritization, bus priority lanes and bus stop bulb outs, all door boarding, bus stop and layover improvements.	10.7	Tier 2B
Transit	<b>LB-ELA_0142</b>	Metro Bus Priority Lane Corridor along Line 108 (Slauson)	Improve bus times, speeds, and reliability along Line 108 (Slauson). Proposed improvements would include: transit signal prioritization, bus priority lanes and bus stop bulb outs, all door boarding, bus stop and layover improvements.	10.6	Tier 2B
Transit	<b>LB-ELA_0130</b>	Long Beach Transit (LBT) Solar Charging Electrification Project	The project would convert the current bus parking area, at the agency’s main operating base, into a facility for charging Battery Electric Buses (BEBs) through the erection of solar-powered parking canopies, to enable Long Beach Transit to transition to 100% emission bus fleet by 2030.	10.6	Tier 2B
Transit	<b>LB-ELA_0002</b>	C Line (Green) Eastern Extension (Norwalk) (LRT)	Extends the C Line (Green) 2.8 miles from Norwalk to the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs Metrolink Station.	10.3	Tier 2B
Transit	<b>LB-ELA_0176</b>	Install Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition System for A Line [Blue Line]	Install Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition System [SCADA] along the A Line {Blue Line} in the downtown area of Long Beach. This technology would allow Metro to better operate and manage the rail transit line to improve train reliability	10.2	Tier 2B
Transit	<b>LB-ELA_0173</b>	Grade Separation(s) of the A Line [Blue Line] at Washington Street	Provide grade separation of the A Line [Blue Line] at the Washington St./Flower St. junction and at Washington Street.	9.7	Tier 2B
Transit	<b>LB-ELA_0189</b>	Transit System Cleanliness/Maintenance	Strengthen policies committing Metro to regular cleaning and maintenance activities on all transit vehicles and at bus and rail stations within the LB-ELA Corridor. These activities consist of cleaning and disinfection of high touchpoint surfaces, graffiti removal, cleanup of spills and biohazards, and trash removal. Maintain station landscaping. Provide high-efficiency air filters on bus and rail	9.7	Tier 2A

## Tier 2 Projects and Programs

Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score	Draft Tier
			transit vehicles. Ensure that the agency dedicates sufficient resources for this effort.		
Transit	<b>LB-ELA_0077</b>	Bus Stop Improvements	Installation of Bus shelters and benches at Metro and City of Commerce Transit Stop (Various locations within the City of Commerce)	8.8	Tier 2A
Transit	<b>LB-ELA_0103</b>	Bus Stop Improvements	Installation of Bus shelters and benches at Metro and City of Maywood Transit Stop (Various locations within the City of Maywood)	8.7	Tier 2A
Transit	<b>LB-ELA_0174</b>	New Metrolink Station at planned Commerce/Citadel Station	Construct a new Metrolink Station on the Los Angeles – Riverside Metrolink Commuter Rail Line at the planned Eastside Transit Corridor station at Commerce/Citadel.	8.3	Tier 2B
Transit	<b>LB-ELA_0118</b>	Bus Shelter Upgrades	Upgrade bus shelters at various locations within the City of Signal Hill.	7.6	Tier 2A

<b>Community Programs</b>				
<b>Project Type</b>	<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Draft Ranking Score</b>
Community Programs	<b>LB-ELA_0009</b>	West Santa Ana Branch Transit-Oriented Development Strategic Implementation Plan and Program (TOD SIP)	The TOD SIP provides an overarching vision and strategic guidance for local West Santa Ana Branch (WSAB) jurisdictions to use as a resource as they develop and implement their own plans, policies and economic development and mobility strategies in the 12 WSAB station areas along the alignment. Additionally, in 2019, the Metro Board approved a \$1M implementation program to fund WSAB jurisdictions to implement TOD SIP recommendations.	15.1
Community Programs	<b>LB-ELA_0193</b>	Transit Oriented Communities /Land Use	Work with the local jurisdictions (Cities, County of Los Angeles) to apply best practices and design guidelines to encourage transit-oriented development near rail stations and heavily utilized bus routes within the LB-ELA Corridor. Provide technical resources such as grant writing assistance and technical assistance for community development and land use planning. Assist local jurisdictions in coordination with property owners and developers to ensure safe construction and strengthen connections to transit.	12.6
Community Programs	<b>LB-ELA_0134</b>	LB-ELA Corridor Energy Reduction / Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Program	Under the Energy Reduction / Greenhouse Gas Reduction (GHG) Program, funding would be made available to implement energy reduction as well as greenhouse gas reduction projects in areas impacted by transportation projects within the LB-ELA Corridor. This program would be an important element of any major transportation initiative that takes place within the LB-ELA Corridor. The program would provide subsidy funding to implement projects and educational activities targeted to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Examples of these projects include: renewable energy projects, solar-power generation, energy efficient lighting, and tree planting, among others.	12.5

## Community Programs

Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score
Community Programs	<b>LB-ELA_0187</b>	LB-ELA Corridor “Urban Greening” Initiative	Under this initiative, proposed projects implemented through the LB-ELA Corridor Investment Plan must consider context sensitive solutions as part of the project design as well as “urban greening” elements that foster environmental resilience. These “urban greening” elements may include items such as: provision of green space/greenbelts; parklets; tree planting; community gardens and community farms; drought tolerant planting; habitat restoration and connectivity; stormwater capture/flood diversion/water management projects; brownfield remediation, natural trail restoration, and green infrastructure, among others. Through the LB-ELA Urban Greening Initiative, project proponents may also partner with other localities, non-profit organizations, or communities in order to plan, design, and implement “green” projects that demonstrate that they provide publicly accessible open-space and ecosystem benefits such as urban heat island reduction within the LB-ELA Corridor.	11.8
Community Programs	<b>LB-ELA_0194</b>	Homeless Programs	Support homeless initiatives within the LB-ELA Corridor and efforts and recommendations that have emerged from Metro’s Homeless Task Force, Reimagining Public Safety Initiatives, and other County initiatives and studies to address homelessness in and around the transit system including provisions to: enhance the customer experience; maintain a safe and secure system; and connect homeless persons in the transit system to services and resources.	9.2
Community Programs	<b>LB-ELA_0192</b>	Bus Electrification Projects	Seek incentives to accelerate the deployment of zero emissions vehicles within the LB-ELA Corridor. Projects could include bus electrification (public transit buses, school buses) as well as zero emissions charging infrastructure. Provide technical and grant writing assistance to define and develop potential projects.	8.9

<b>Community Programs</b>				
<b>Project Type</b>	<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Draft Ranking Score</b>
Community Programs	<b>LB-ELA_0133</b>	LB-ELA Corridor Community Health Benefit Program	<p>Under this program, funding would be made available to implement air quality projects to reduce exposure to air pollution as well as health education and screening programs in areas adversely affected by existing and proposed transportation infrastructure projects. The LB-ELA Community Health Benefit Program would serve the communities within the LB-ELA Corridor Study Area. This program would provide subsidy funding to implement projects and outreach activities to improve air quality and public health, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Air Quality Projects for Schools and Community Facilities: air filtration, HVAC upgrades, replacement/sealing of windows and doors, vegetation barriers or buffer landscaping.</li> <li>- Health Education and Screening: community health screening and diagnosis, health education, training for community health workers, outreach programs.</li> </ul>	8.5
Community Programs	<b>LB-ELA_0197</b>	Vocational Educational Programs	Partner with public agencies, private-sector employers, community colleges, labor organizations and non-profit organizations to expand vocational and educational programs for community residents within the LB-ELA Corridor. Examples could include training for mechanics who work for small businesses that service zero emissions vehicles. These programs would provide opportunities to establish a career pathway to work in key economic sectors and move up through the ranks by focusing on workforce development and skills training.	8.0
Community Programs	<b>LB-ELA_0190</b>	Public Art / Aesthetics	Policy initiative that would require that a percentage of transportation construction funds for major public work projects be earmarked for public art, landscaping, urban design elements, and other aesthetic features for the projects.	8.0
Community Programs	<b>LB-ELA_0191</b>	Zero Emission Infrastructure for Autos	Work with local jurisdictions (Cities, County of Los Angeles), public agencies, and private-public partners to develop and site additional charging stations for zero emissions vehicles within the LB-ELA Corridor. Provide grant writing assistance in order to help secure funding. In addition, provide technical support to share best practices such as: identification of incentives and/or policy requirements for new development.	7.7

Community Programs				
Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Ranking Score
Community Programs	LB-ELA_0135	Housing Stabilization Policies	<p>Applying an integrated approach, work with cities, County of Los Angeles, and public agencies to propose and pass community stabilization policies to support disadvantaged communities within the LB-ELA Corridor, improve their resilience, and address the social determinants of health. Provide grant writing assistance to secure needed funding. Housing stabilization policies and incentives include measures such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mandates for process improvement: Engaging the community/forming partnerships with Community Based Organizations;</li> <li>- Community benefits: establish a framework/menu/equitable development scorecard for new development projects;</li> <li>- Develop community land trusts/land banks: for new housing and/or to support naturally occurring affordable housing;</li> <li>- Local wealth creation: encourage production of local for sale affordable housing, down payment assistance programs, homeowner maintenance assistance programs;</li> <li>- Inclusionary housing policies with or without option of in lieu fees;</li> <li>- Housing Trust Fund to support and increase funding for affordable housing production;</li> <li>- Density bonus programs to incentivize affordable and mixed income housing production;</li> <li>- Affordable accessory dwelling unit (ADU) programs and ADU amnesty programs;</li> <li>- Policies to reduce housing costs, such as parking reduction/unbundling, innovative construction techniques, fee waivers, permit streamlining;</li> <li>- Anti-displacement programs for tenants: tenant rights programs including anti-harassment policies/ just cause eviction policies, legal assistance for tenants, no net loss housing policies for new development, limits on residential demolition &amp; conversion, tenant right-to-return policies, local resident preference programs for new housing;</li> <li>- Rent stabilization policies;</li> <li>- Low-income rental assistance programs, low interest loan programs for maintenance and improvement in rent stabilized units;</li> <li>- Anti-displacement programs for homeowners: tax relief/loans/grants for maintenance/foreclosure assistance;</li> <li>- Basic Income Program</li> </ul>	7.5



<b>Community Programs</b>				
<b>Project Type</b>	<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Draft Ranking Score</b>
Community Programs	<b>LB-ELA_0195</b>	Targeted Hire Programs	Support the development of targeted and local hire programs to increase the share of public dollars that is devoted to creation of local jobs for community residents within the LB-ELA Study Area. Include measures such as the establishment of Project Labor Agreements (PLAs) that specify local and targeted hire goals for specific construction projects as well as first source hire requirements. Collaborate with local jurisdictions and public agencies to align local and targeted hire policies, thresholds, and requirements.	6.9
Community Programs	<b>LB-ELA_0196</b>	Employment/Recruitment Initiatives	Partner with public agencies, large employers, and local businesses to conduct recruitment drives at locations within the LB-ELA Corridor (both virtual and in person.) This initiative would also include job fairs and workshops at community facilities and community colleges to provide information to local residents regarding work opportunities as well as networking resources. Conduct promotional campaigns to actively publicize these events within the LB-ELA Corridor communities.	6.9
Community Programs	<b>LB-ELA_0186</b>	Economic Stabilization Policies	Work with Cities, County of Los Angeles, and public agencies to propose and pass community stabilization policies to support disadvantaged communities within the LB-ELA Corridor. Provide grant writing assistance to secure needed funding. Economic stabilization policies and incentives include measures such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mandates for process improvement: Engaging the community/forming partnerships with Community Based Organizations;</li> <li>- Community financial empowerment programs: local hire agreements, workforce education &amp; development, credit improvement programs;</li> <li>- Locally owned business support – small business interruption fund and loan funds during construction, guide for business support services, zoning to encourage small businesses, lease to own programs for businesses and housing;</li> <li>- Identify, protect and encourage legacy and culturally significant businesses, and historical and cultural landmarks, mandate inclusion of arts and culture spaces in new development</li> </ul>	6.7
Community Programs	<b>LB-ELA_0218</b>	Air Quality Monitoring Stations	Add four, new air quality monitoring stations within the LB-ELA Study Area. Sites to be identified in cooperation with the South Coast Air Quality Management District.	1.6

## Projects Removed during Tiering Analysis

Project Type	Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Note
Active Transportation / TDM	LB-ELA_0005	Rail to River Active Transportation Corridor Segment A	A 5.6-mile active transportation path connecting the Fairview Height Station of the soon-to-be-open Crenshaw Line in Inglewood to the Slauson A (Blue) Line station in South Los Angeles.	Under construction
Goods Movement	LB-ELA_0132	Pier 300 Wharf Expansion/Vessel Emission Reduction Project	Pier 300 Wharf Expansion/Vessel Emission Reduction Project. This project constructs 1,250 lineal feet of container terminal wharf and supporting backland for Pier 300. It includes electrical infrastructure to operate ship-to-shore cranes and shore-side power to operate all necessary vessel systems, which will reduce about 80 percent of emissions while at berth.	Fully Funded
Goods Movement	LB-ELA_0184	Empty Container Management	Provide a mix of incentives/fee penalties to encourage shippers/marine terminals to clear empty containers from docks/near dock facilities at the Ports to reduce congestion and unnecessary truck trip movements. Extend use of off-peak hours for empty returns.	Fully Funded
Goods Movement	LB-ELA_0131	Port of Los Angeles National Multimodal Freight Network (NMFN) Improvement Program: Maritime Support Facility Access/Terminal Island Rail System Grade Separation	The project consists of constructing a four-lane, rail-roadway grade separation that eliminates a significant truck access impediment to an important container terminal support facility located on Terminal Island, at the centroid of the Ports of Los Angeles-Long Beach (POLA-POLB).	Fully Funded
Goods Movement	LB-ELA_0011	SR-47 Navy Way Interchange	SR 47/Navy Way Interchange: Construction of Interchange At SR-47 / Navy Way, between SR-47 Vincent Thomas Bridge and Pier S Avenue Interchange, to eliminate traffic signal and movement conflicts. This Project was a S. Cal Trade Corridor Tier II TCIF Project as submitted to the CTC In 2008. This project would remove the last signal on SR 47 between Desmond and V. Thomas Bridges; NHS Intermodal Connector Route	Fully funded
Goods Movement	LB-ELA_0022	Terminal Way Grade Separation	New grade separation to replace at-grade crossing to improve freight traffic flow.	Redundant

# Metro's Roles in Implementing the Investment Plan

Metro Role	Description	Number of Projects and Programs
<b>Lead</b>	Metro plans, funds, and implements the project or program	26
<b>Partner</b>	Metro partners with another agency to help develop and fund transportation projects or programs but will rely on the other agency for implementation.	35
<b>Fund</b>	Metro helps provide partial funding for transportation projects or programs led by other agencies.	128
<b>Support</b>	Metro provides political and/or technical grant support for transportation projects led and funded by other agencies.	13
<b>Collaborate</b>	Metro collaborates with other agencies and helps them identify, develop, and lead Community and other programs outside of Metro's purview and/or not eligible for corridor-specific measure funding.	10
<i>This information will be reviewed by Metro and/or partners</i>		<b>TOTAL: 212</b>

## ATTACHMENT H

### Grant Pursuit Strategy Implementation Steps

The development of a grant pursuit strategy to supplement funding is a multi-step process that requires a targeted approach. The following stages of analysis are ongoing or planned:

1. Program evaluation (ongoing - see Table 1 below for more detail on factors used in evaluation);
2. Project evaluation (ongoing);
3. Interim Steps to Improve Competitiveness and Project Readiness;
4. Understanding the Grant Funding Lifecycle;
5. Project Positioning; and
6. Evaluate Partnership Opportunities.

**Table 1. Factors used for grant funding program evaluation criteria**

<b>Attribute</b>	<b>Description</b>
Issuing Agency	Federal or State agency responsible for issuing and distributing the grant
Transportation Infrastructure Type	Transportation facilities considered as eligible projects
Key Program Objectives	Stated objectives from Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) or Guidelines
Program Scoring Criteria	Evaluation criteria stated in the NOFO or Guidelines
Eligible Activities	Capital, Planning, and/or Operational
Eligible Applicants and Metro Role	Eligible Agencies to Lead, Partner, Fund, Support, and/or Collaborate
Annual Funding Amount	Total annual funding available
Typical Award Size	Average funding award amount and range
Success rate	Qualitative review of selection rate from applicant pool as available (high/medium/low)
Minimum Match Requirement	Local match requirement, with detail on differences for planning or capital or specific terms about the source of the match funding
Anticipated funding availability timing	Date if available, otherwise estimated quarter and year (e.g., Q2 2024)

# How Much Metro Funding is Available?

2023

Measure R  
\$197M

2026

Measure M  
\$250M

2032

Measure M  
\$250M

**This is only enough money to fund *a small amount of the overall need.***

# How Will Projects Be Fully Funded?

## Metro-Led Projects

## City, Jurisdiction, & County Led Projects

## Projects NOT Eligible for Measure R & M Funding

### Other Funding Needed

**Metro Role:**  
lead grant applications

**Metro Role:**  
lead or support  
grant applications

**Metro Role:**  
support grant funding  
(e.g. letters of support, technical assistance,  
application partnership)

Measures R & M Eligible = **\$697M**



Metro must leverage Measure R & M Funds to fully fund eligible projects

## California Department of Transportation

DISTRICT 7  
100 S. MAIN STREET, SUITE 100  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012  
PHONE (213) 507-4301  
FAX (213) 897-0360 TTY 711  
[www.dot.ca.gov](http://www.dot.ca.gov)



October 4, 2023

Ms. Veronica Li  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
915 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 930  
Los Angeles, CA 90017-3401

Dear Ms. Li:

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is pleased to inform you of our continued assignment of consultation responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for federally funded highway projects. An important step in this assignment is the transmittal of the enclosed I-710 South Administrative Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (Admin. FEIR/FEIS). This project is covered by the NEPA Assignment MOU, FHWA has assigned and Caltrans has assumed FHWA responsibility for environmental review, consultation, and coordination on this project.

Caltrans, in cooperation with our partners, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), the Gateway Cities Council of Governments, the Southern California Association of Governments, the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, and the Interstate 5 Joint Powers Authority, are proposing to improve Interstate 710 (I-710) in Los Angeles County between Ocean Blvd. and State Route 60 (SR-60). Caltrans is the lead agency under NEPA as well as the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The Interstate 710 Corridor Administrative Final EIR/EIS has been uploaded through the link provided by USACE.

This document is currently undergoing final refinements. Caltrans identified the "No Build/No Action" alternative as the preferred alternative. As such, the project is not anticipated to have impacts. However, the analysis of the build alternatives is preserved in the Admin. FEIR/FEIS to show a complete record of the process. Please note there are several Spanish translations of responses to comments included in Appendix V which have not yet been updated. The translations will be updated prior to public availability of the Final EIR/EIS. Caltrans is inviting you for an early review of the document. Per 23 CFR 771, as a Cooperating and Participating Agency, you are

Ms. Veronica Li  
October 4, 2023  
Page 2

enabled to discharge your jurisdictional responsibilities or expertise. Caltrans expects that at the end of the process, the EIS will satisfy your NEPA requirements.

Please provide any comments on the Administrative Final EIR/EIS by November 1st, 2023.

If you have questions regarding the proposed project or attachments, please contact Jason Roach at (213) 310-2653.

Sincerely,

*Kelly Ewing-Toledo*

KELLY EWING-TOLEDO  
Deputy District Director (Acting)  
Division of Environmental Planning  
Caltrans, District 7

Enclosures

1. Administrative Final EIR/EIS (via USACE safe link)



## California Department of Transportation

DISTRICT 7  
100 S. MAIN STREET, SUITE 100  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012  
PHONE (213) 507-4301  
FAX (213) 897-0360 TTY 711  
[www.dot.ca.gov](http://www.dot.ca.gov)



October 4, 2023

Ms. Connell Dunning  
Environmental Review Branch  
Tribal, Intergovernmental & Policy Division  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9  
75 Hawthorne Street (TIP-2)  
San Francisco, CA 94105

Dear Ms. Dunning:

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is pleased to inform you of our continued assignment of consultation responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for federally funded highway projects. An important step in this assignment is the transmittal of the enclosed I-710 South Administrative Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (Admin. FEIR/FEIS). This project is covered by the NEPA Assignment MOU, FHWA has assigned and Caltrans has assumed FHWA responsibility for environmental review, consultation, and coordination on this project.

Caltrans, in cooperation with our partners, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), the Gateway Cities Council of Governments, the Southern California Association of Governments, the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, and the Interstate 5 Joint Powers Authority, are proposing to improve Interstate 710 (I-710) in Los Angeles County between Ocean Blvd. and State Route 60 (SR-60). Caltrans is the lead agency under NEPA as well as the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Please access the Interstate 710 Corridor Administrative Final EIR/EIS through the following link:

<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/ij8lmy40m63i4exeywdcv/h?rlkey=0ulo3rd9050v xv9x9li nynpea&dl=0>

This document is currently undergoing final refinements. Caltrans identified the "No Build/No Action" alternative as the preferred alternative. As such, the project is not anticipated to have impacts. However, the analysis of the build alternatives is

Ms. Connell Dunning  
October 4, 2023  
Page 2

preserved in the Admin. FEIR/FEIS to show a complete record of the process. Please note there are several Spanish translations of responses to comments included in Appendix V which have not yet been updated. The translations will be updated prior to public availability of the Final EIR/EIS. Caltrans is inviting you for an early review of the document. Per 23 CFR 771, as a Cooperating and Participating Agency, you are enabled to discharge your jurisdictional responsibilities or expertise. Caltrans expects that at the end of the process, the EIS will satisfy your NEPA requirements.

Please provide any comments on the Administrative Final EIR/EIS by November 1st, 2023.

If you have questions regarding the proposed project or attachments, please contact Jason Roach at (213) 310-2653.

Sincerely,



KELLY EWING-TOLEDO  
Deputy District Director (Acting)  
Division of Environmental Planning  
Caltrans, District 7

Enclosures

1. Administrative Final EIR/EIS (via Dropbox link)

## ATTACHMENT L

### LB-ELA CORRIDOR GRANT ACTIVITIES

Project Name: I-710 Humphreys Avenue Crossing: A Pedestrian and Bicycle Project to Bridge the Divide in the East Los Angeles Community

Grant Program: Reconnecting Communities and Neighborhoods Program (Capital Construction)

Grantor Agency: U.S. Department of Transportation

Grant Request Amount: \$9.96 million

Total Project Cost: \$19.9 million

Project Partners: California Department of Transportation, Los Angeles County Public Works

Project Location(s): East Los Angeles

Project Scope: The I-710 Humphreys Avenue Crossing Project will construct a separate pedestrian and bicyclist overcrossing on Humphreys Avenue over the I-710 freeway to connect the disadvantaged community of East Los Angeles, helping mitigate a barrier for its residents. The Project would be adjacent to an existing vehicular crossing for Humphreys Avenue and would provide a safe passage, free of vehicular traffic, to Humphreys Avenue Elementary School and to the Whittier Boulevard commercial corridor to the south. The scope also includes additional complementary active transportation improvements on both sides of the bridge to improve access, safety, and comfort.

Project Name: I-710 Planning Study: Reconnecting the Long Beach-East LA Corridor Communities

Grant Program: Reconnecting Communities and Neighborhoods Program (Community Planning)

Grantor Agency: U.S. Department of Transportation

Grant Request Amount: \$2 million

Total Project Cost: \$2.5 million

Project Partners: California Department of Transportation, METTRANS Transportation Center

Project Location(s): Long Beach to East Los Angeles Corridor

Project Scope: The Project is for planning activities for the I-710 Long Beach-East Los Angeles Corridor. The I-710 Planning Study: Reconnecting the Long Beach-East LA (LB-ELA) Corridor Communities Plan seeks to identify future capital projects to bridge the communities divided by the I-710 freeway over the past 50 years. A vital stakeholder-identified program of Metro's Long Beach-East LA Corridor Mobility Investment Plan (CMIP), this Plan is a partnership with local communities and corridor stakeholders. Reconnecting Communities and Neighborhoods funding will allow Metro to carry forth the vision of the CMIP's stakeholders to improve outcomes for residents of communities impacted by I-710.

Project Name: Humphreys and Florence Avenue Active Transportation Crossings to Bridge the I-710 Divide in East LA

Grant Program: Reconnecting Communities: Highways to Boulevards

Grantor Agency: California Department of Transportation

Grant Request Amount: To be determined


Total Project Cost: To be determined

Project Partners: California Department of Transportation

Project Location(s): Bell, Bell Gardens, East Los Angeles

Project Scope: Metro is seeking funding to bring together a group of Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) to serve as an advisory group that will begin community engagement activities in developing a concept plan throughout the planning, design, and implementation process for both Florence Avenue and Humphreys Avenue Transportation Crossings. These two identified proposed improvement areas are supported by the community and directly address the historical harms caused by separated homes and commercial areas, direct exposure to diesel exhaust and proximity to industrial areas, increasing traffic volumes, and lack of community connectivity.

# Community Engagement Activities Summary



# Community Engagement Activities Summary



- Executive Committee- Thurs. 1/18
- Board- Thurs. 1/25

TF & CLC Engagement- TBD



- Executive Committee- Wed. 3/13
- Board- Thurs. 3/21

## January 2024

## February 2024

## March 2024



- Roundtable #2- Coordination, Week of 1/8

- Virtual Meeting #1- Lunch, Thurs. 1/18
- Community Meeting #1- Paramount, Mon. 1/22
- Community Meeting #2- Long Beach, Wed. 1/24
- Community Meeting #3- Commerce, Tues. 1/30
- Virtual Meeting #2- Evening, Wed. 1/31

- Signal Hill, TBD
- Paramount, Friday Night Paramount
- Bellflower, Farmers Market
- Lynwood, TBD
- East LA, Farmers Market, TBD
- Downey, TBD

- Bell Gardens, Farmers Market
- Cudahy, Clara Street Park
- South Gate, Northgate Market
- Compton, Free Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Distribution
- East LA, East Los Angeles College
- Commerce, Rosewood Park

- Monthly E-Newsletter Part 1- Early Jan, Engagement Preview
- Monthly E-Newsletter Part 2- Mid Jan, Full StoryMap Launch



- Virtual Meeting #3- Weekend, Sat. 2/3
- Virtual Meeting #4- Evening, Mon. 2/5
- Community Meeting #4- Compton, Thurs. 2/8



- Huntington Park, TBD
- Bell, TBD
- Cudahy, TBD
- Paramount, TBD
- Carson, TBD
- Montebello, TBD
- Bell Gardens, TBD




- Wilmington, Farmers Market
- Boyle Heights, Vallarta Supermarkets
- Bell, Northgate Gonzalez Market
- Lynwood, WIC Center
- East/Dominguez, East Rancho Dominguez Park
- Carson, SouthBay Pavilion Farmers Market
- Commerce, Veteran's Memorial Park



All dates reflected are tentative and are subject to change.

- Monthly E-Newsletter- Late March, Summary & Next Steps

# Community Engagement Activities Summary



# Community Engagement Activities Summary



- Executive Committee- Thurs. 1/18
- Board- Thurs. 1/25

TF & CLC Engagement- TBD



- Executive Committee- Wed. 3/13
- Board- Thurs. 3/21

## January 2024

## February 2024

## March 2024



CBO Partnership

- Roundtable #2- Coordination, Week of 1/8

- Virtual Meeting #1- Lunch, Thurs. 1/18
- Community Meeting #1- Paramount, Mon. 1/22
- Community Meeting #2- Long Beach, Wed. 1/24
- Community Meeting #3- Commerce, Tues. 1/30
- Virtual Meeting #2- Evening, Wed. 1/31

- Signal Hill, TBD
- Paramount, Friday Night Paramount
- Bellflower, Farmers Market
- Lynwood, TBD
- East LA, Farmers Market, TBD
- Downey, TBD

- Bell Gardens, Farmers Market
- Cudahy, Clara Street Park
- South Gate, Northgate Market
- Compton, Free Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Distribution
- East LA, East Los Angeles College
- Commerce, Rosewood Park

- Monthly E-Newsletter Part 1- Early Jan, Engagement Preview
- Monthly E-Newsletter Part 2- Mid Jan, Full StoryMap Launch



Community Meetings



Informational Booths



Pop-Up Events



Informational Campaign

- Virtual Meeting #3- Weekend, Sat. 2/3
- Virtual Meeting #4- Evening, Mon. 2/5
- Community Meeting #4- Compton, Thurs. 2/8

- Huntington Park, TBD
- Bell, TBD
- Cudahy, TBD
- Paramount, TBD
- Carson, TBD
- Montebello, TBD
- Bell Gardens, TBD

- Wilmington, Farmers Market
- Boyle Heights, Vallarta Supermarkets
- Bell, Northgate Gonzalez Market
- Lynwood, WIC Center
- East/Dominguez, East Rancho Dominguez Park
- Carson, SouthBay Pavilion Farmers Market
- Commerce, Veteran's Memorial Park

- Monthly E-Newsletter- Early Feb, Upcoming Engagement Activities

All dates reflected are tentative and are subject to change.

- Monthly E-Newsletter- Late March, Summary & Next Steps






We're developing a new vision for the  
Long Beach-East Los Angeles Corridor

Item #8:  
Status Report on the LB-ELA Corridor  
Mobility Investment Plan  
November 2023


# LB-ELA Corridor Investment Plan Milestones



Caltrans is working concurrently to finalize the “No Build” designation for the prior I-710 South Corridor project

- ◆ Board Action and Milestone Decision
- ◆ Board Status Report


# Project Tiering / Prioritization of Projects



# What's the Path Forward for Projects?

## Tiering Analysis

Determines project tier (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B)



### Based on:

#### 1. Evaluation Results


- Evaluation scores/alignment with goals & principles

#### 2. Project Readiness

- Implementable within a certain number of years?

## Funding Strategy

Helps identify funding priorities



### Funding Strategy Includes:

- Cost & local match required for grants
- Funding potential
- Construction feasibility
- Political/institutional/agency support
- Equity considerations and concerns

# How Will We Fund the Projects?

## Metro-Led Projects

## City, Jurisdiction, or County-Led Projects

## Projects NOT Eligible for Measures R/M Funding

### Other Funding Needed

Metro Role:  
Lead grant applications

Metro Role:  
Lead or support  
grant applications

Metro Role:  
Support grant funding  
(e.g. letters of support, technical assistance,  
application partnership)

Measures R/M Eligible = **\$693M\***


**This is only enough money to fund *a small amount of the overall need.***  
Metro must leverage Measure R & M Funds to fully fund eligible projects

\*Funding will be available in the following tranches:

\$193M (FY2023) from Measure R

\$250M (FY2026) and \$250M (FY2032) from Measure M

# Funding and Development Pathway for Projects & Programs



*\*A separate pathway for Community Programs will be developed*

# How We've Employed Metro's Equity Platform

## Equitable Processes

### Define and Measure

#### Understanding Equity

- **Equity Guiding Principle** adopted to apply across **all project goals**.
- Informs both **participatory** and **technical** aspects of the planning process.
- **Metro's Equity Focus Communities** designation used throughout the process to understand existing disparities and apply Equity evaluation criteria.

### Listen and Learn

#### Task Force Process

- **Task Force of Diverse Stakeholders**
- **Comm. Leadership Committee (CLC)**
  - Compensated through **Advisory Body Compensation Policy**
- **CBO Partnering Strategy**
- **Equity Working Group**
- **Zero-Emission Truck Working Group**
- **Comm. Engagement Strategy W.G.**

#### Project Idea Collection

- Project ideas gathered through **extensive multilingual public outreach** process
- Virtual participation through **Social Pinpoint Mapping Tool and Survey**
- Collected suggestions from **local and regional jurisdictions**

### Train and Grow

#### OER Leadership

- Active and committed leadership role from **Metro's Office of Equity and Race** through the entire planning process.

#### Equity Planning + Evaluation Tool

- Key opportunity to apply **Metro's Pilot Equity Planning and Evaluation Tool (EPET)** as a guide for facilitating equitable processes and delivering equitable outcomes
- EPET has also served as a tool for **documenting and holding the project team accountable** to implement the equity platform throughout the investment plan process

## Equitable Outcomes

### Focus and Deliver

#### Equity Evaluation

- **24 equity evaluation criteria** used to determine likely potential project or program benefits in communities of highest need

#### Concerns Evaluation

- **Outcome concerns (tiering):** Potential unintended/adverse long-term impacts
- **Design & construction concerns (prioritization):** Prevent/mitigate potential impacts through project design or during construction

#### Technical Assistance

- Metro will support lower-resource jurisdictions to develop future projects through Modal programs