

DRAFT

2012 RTP/SCS Alternative Scenarios

| | | Alternative Scenarios | | |
|------------------------|----------|---|--|--|
| | | Alternative Scenario 1 | Alternative Scenarios 2 and 3 | Alternative Scenarios 4 |
| Alternative Components | Land Use | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Based on the general plans prepared by cities. It includes a significant proportion of suburban, auto-oriented development, but also recognizes the recent trend of increased growth in existing urban areas and around transit. ▪ New housing is mostly single-family, with an increase in smaller-lot, townhome, and multifamily homes; housing mix still falls short of demand for these types, though. | <p>Alternative Scenario 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Focuses more growth in walkable, mixed-use communities and in existing and planned high-quality transit areas. ▪ Employment growth is focused in urban centers around transit. ▪ This scenario strives to meet demand for a broader range of housing types, and new housing is weighted towards smaller-lot single family homes, townhomes, and multifamily condos and apartments. <p>Alternative Scenario 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Builds on the walkable, mixed-use focus of the growth in Scenario 2, and also aims to improve fiscal and environmental performance by shifting a portion of the region’s growth into areas that are closer to transit, less auto-centric, and less intensive for building energy and water needs. ▪ Like Scenario 2, this scenario aims to meet demand for a broader range of housing types, with new housing is weighted towards smaller-lot single family homes, townhomes, and multifamily condos and apartments. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This scenario maximizes growth in urban and mixed-use configurations in already developed areas, and around existing and planned transit investments ▪ Like Scenario 3, this scenario aims to improve fiscal and environmental performance by shifting a portion of the region’s growth into areas that are closer to transit, and have lower demands on building energy and water use. |

| | | Alternative Scenarios | | |
|--|------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | Alternative Scenario 1 | Alternative Scenarios 2 and 3 | Alternative Scenarios 4 |
| | Transit | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand dedicated bus lanes on arterials during peak periods Decrease headways / increase frequency along well-utilized routes Expand the provision of real time passenger information systems Regional fare media consolidation Expand bicycle carrying capacity of bus fleet | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decrease headways/increase frequency along well-utilized routes Consider express bus service in key corridors featuring headways under 15 minutes 5 targeted expansion of fixed guideways to close gaps Increase in Metrolink operations along LOSSAN corridor Add BRT service on HOT Lane Network | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decrease headways/increase frequency along well-utilized routes Consider express bus service in key corridors featuring headways under 15 minutes (NEED IDENTIFICATION OF KEY CORRIDORS) 15 Targeted expansion of fixed guideways to close gaps (e.g., Metro Green Line to Norwalk Metrolink Station Phased implementation of 5% major arterials to have dedicated bus lanes Phased implementation for 10% ZEV transit/fleet vehicles by 2020 Full implementation of point to point bus network Add BRT service on HOT Lane Network |
| | High Speed Rail | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partial implementation of LOSSAN South Strategic Implementation Plan Implementation of proposed Phase I of the California High Speed Rail System | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full upgrade of LOSSAN South Strategic Implementation Plan Partial implementation of the low / high speed phased implementation on LOSSAN Corridor Implementation of proposed Phase I of the California High Speed Rail System | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full upgrade of LOSSAN corridor (NEED MODELING DETAILS) Full implementation of the low / high speed phased LOSSAN Corridor implementation (NEED MODELING DETAILS) Metrolink Antelope Valley and system wide strategic improvements (NEED MODELING DETAILS IF ANY) Implementation of both Phase I and II of the proposed California High Speed Rail System Implementation of the proposed DesertXpress system connecting Victorville with Las Vegas |
| | TSM | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fully integrate traffic signal synchronization network Extensive advanced ramp metering, enhanced incident management, | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Targeted traffic signal synchronization improvements Select advanced ramp metering, enhanced incident management, and | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fully integrate traffic signal synchronization network Convert HOV2 to HOV3 on select corridors (|

| | | | | Alternative Scenarios | | |
|----------------------|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | | | Alternative Scenario 1 | Alternative Scenarios 2 and 3 | Alternative Scenarios 4 |
| | | | | and spot improvements to improve flow (e.g. auxiliary lanes). | spot improvements to improve flow (e.g., auxiliary lanes). ▪ | ▪ Select advanced ramp metering, enhanced incident management, and spot improvements to improve flow (e.g. auxiliary lanes). |
| TDM | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase telecommuting incentives ▪ Phased Implementation of 10 first / last-mile strategies in strategic TPP nodes / multimodal connectivity centers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Parking cash out policy ○ Reduced/preferential parking for carpoolers ○ Guaranteed emergency ride home policies ○ Expand existing bike facility requirements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase telecommuting incentives ▪ Implementation of 10 first / last-mile strategies in priority TPP nodes / multimodal connectivity centers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Parking cash out policy ○ Reduced/preferential parking for carpoolers ○ Guaranteed emergency ride home policies ▪ Expand existing bike facility requirements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase telecommuting incentives ▪ Implementation of 10 first / last-mile strategies in all feasible TPP nodes / multimodal connectivity centers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Parking cash out policy ○ Reduced/preferential parking for carpoolers ○ Guaranteed emergency ride home policies ▪ Expand existing bike facility requirements ▪ Fully fund TMOs |
| Non-Motorized | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Targeted investment at first / last-mile locations ▪ Implement all existing local and county bike plans ▪ Ensure full ADA compliance in TPP areas by 2020 to local jurisdictions ▪ Increase short term bicycle and pedestrian improvements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Targeted investment at first / last mile locations ▪ Implement all existing local and county bike plans ▪ Partial Completion of priority regional connections based on the SCAG Regional Bikeway Network – 900 Miles ▪ Recommend full ADA compliance by 2020 to local jurisdictions ▪ Increase short term bicycle and pedestrian improvements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 10% of primary and secondary arterials to include bike facilities ▪ Implement all existing local and county bike ▪ Phased implementation for full ADA compliance from local jurisdictions by 2020 ▪ Completion of priority regional connections based on the SCAG Regional Bikeway Network – 1800 miles ▪ Targeted investment at first / last mile locations ▪ Completion of priority regional connections based on the SCAG Regional Bikeway Network ▪ Increase short term bicycle and pedestrian improvements |
| Highways | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See TSM ▪ Improve critical truck bottlenecks ▪ Implement CSMP on select | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See TSM ▪ Some Conversion of some HOV2 facilities to HOV3 during peak periods | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See TSM ▪ Some Conversion of some HOV2 facilities to HOV3 during peak periods |

| | | Alternative Scenarios | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | Alternative Scenario 1 | Alternative Scenarios 2 and 3 | Alternative Scenarios 4 |
| | | Corridors | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expand implementation of CSMP on more corridors ▪ Implementation of a Regional HOT Lane Network (including gap closures and HOV expansion) ▪ Implementation of a zero/near zero east-west freight corridor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expand implementation of CSMP on more corridors ▪ Implementation of a Regional HOT Lane Network (including gap closures and HOV expansion) ▪ Implementation of a zero/near zero east-west freight corridor |
| | Goods Movement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improve critical truck bottlenecks ▪ Select rail capacity enhancements and corresponding grade separations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Select rail capacity enhancements and corresponding grade separations ▪ Implementation of a zero / near-zero emission east-west freight corridor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Select rail capacity enhancements and corresponding grade separations ▪ Implementation of a zero / near-zero emission east-west freight corridor |
| | System Preservation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maintain current asset conditions for transit, arterials, and State Highway System (SHS) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Achieve and maintain state of good repair or at least maintain existing conditions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Achieve and maintain state of good repair or at least maintain existing conditions |
| | Pricing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ VMT pricing (or similar mechanism) to manage demand and provide funding for preservation, non-motorized, and transit improvements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Phased implementation of Express / HOT lane network ▪ Cordon pricing around key activity centers – initial pilot projects in downtown Los Angeles and potentially LAX complex | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Phased implementation of Express / HOT lane network ▪ Cordon pricing around key activity centers – initial pilot projects in downtown Los Angeles and potentially LAX complex |

Assumptions:

- Foundation for all alternatives is the 2008 RTP through Amendment 4 with subsequent modifications from county transportation commissions – e.g., OCTA LRTP
- All alternatives would at least achieve GHG per capita emission reductions – some modifications may be necessary to meet target