

transit projects will ever be approved, and the transportation system will deteriorate from neglect, and overuse. Nonetheless, building the Route 7] 0 does demonstrate specific benefits in specific terms in terms of less delay on arterials and freeways and associated costs of that delay.

Conclusions

The purpose and need for the project is to address the issues listed below. The table compares the performance of the Build Alternative and the Low Build Proposal relative to the No Build in terms of fulfilling specific local and regional transportation needs.

Table 20 Overall Comparison of Low Build Proposal and Build Alternative

Transportation issue	Build Alternative Resolves Issue?	Low Build Proposal Resolves Issue?
Reduce primary street congestion	YES	NO, Increases
Reduce local street congestion	YES	NO, Increases
Increases Improved mobility & Accessibility	YES	NO
Complete freeway network	YES	NO
Complete HOV network	YES	NO
Promote carpool & van pool formation	YES	NO, decreases
Promote transit ridership	MAYBE	NO, decreases
Reduce drive alone car trips	MAYBE	NO, decreases
Reduce accident & fatality rates	YES	NO
Improve air quality	YES	NO

- Rerouting of existing express bus service to the new HOV lanes would increase transit ridership, and reduce drive alone vehicle trips. If this service is not implemented, the effects of the Build Alternative are negative for this issue.
- The Low Build Proposal increases the burden of TOG and CO while the NOx burden is reduced slightly. The NOx for the Build Alternative goes up slightly. This is not considered significant, however, since Federal Standards for NOx have been met in Los Angeles County since 1992. The State standard was exceeded only once at one station in 1993. (Ref. 1994 South Coast Air Quality Management Plan, SCAG). There are also small changes in PM.10 For detailed information, see Appendices I and J.

Conclusions

The Low Build Proposal proposes spending a significant amount of money (\$319 million) to get a negative or at best a negligible benefit in almost all the categories.

The central question that needs to be asked when assessing the impact of different alternatives and proposals, and the question that transportation demand modeling attempts to answer, is "How does implementing this particular project or scenario affect the operation of the transportation system?" In assessing these impacts, the comparison is always against the impact of doing nothing, or in our case, of implementing the No Build Alternative. From this perspective, the Build Alternative demonstrates specific advantages over the No Build Alternative. Specifically, the traffic flow on the streets within the corridor is less congested. Building the Route 710 also helps relieve some of the bottlenecks in north-south traffic through the region by relieving Route 5 through downtown Los Angeles and in the San Fernando Valley. By including a carpool lane within the project, the Route 710 also encourages carpool formation and reduces the number of regional drive alone trips.

By contrast, South Pasadena's Low Build Multi-Modal Proposal in many ways makes matters worse. Traffic along city streets in the corridor is more congested than when doing nothing at all. While the patronage of the Pasadena Blue Line goes up, overall transit usage goes down, and at best the Low Build does nothing or actually worsens the congestion on the freeways that remain. These results are outlined in the table on the previous page.

