SEPULVEDA TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT

Metro Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)

In July 2025, the Board adopted a CBA framework for evaluating project alternatives, including assessing the regional economic impacts of investment and identifying benefits relative to the costs of investment. The CBA includes two component – Weighted Benefits Analysis and Benefit-Cost Ratio – as described below and used to evaluate the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Alternatives. The evaluation is based on data collected during the Draft EIR process.

Weighted Benefits Analysis: A points-based evaluation comparing the alignments across five goals that are weighted per Metro-adopted CBA methodology. This considers relevant quantitative and qualitative metrics within each of the five goals that are scored relative to each other on a 7-point scale with seven being the highest/best performing.

Table 1: Weighted Benefit Score

Goals	Alt 1	Alt 3	Alt 4	Alt 5	Alt 6	Key Performance Indicators Evaluated
	Average Score by Goal (Unweighted)					
Mobility & Accessibility (Weight: 40%)	**4.6/7**	**5.6/7**	**6.8/7**	**6.8/7**	**6.3/7**	Travel time; project trips; new riders; travel time savings; service frequencies; transfer times at key connection points; non-auto mode share access to stations; proximity to jobs and residents; including Equity Focus Communities (EFC) households without access to a car
Safety & Health (Weight: 15%)	**4.8/7**	**5.2/7**	**5.8/7**	**5.8/7**	**5.2/7**	Proximity to healthcare and parks, exposure to noise during construction and operations, average emergency response times, CalEnviroScreen 4.0 scores.
Environmental Sustainability (Weight: 15%)	**4.2/7**	**4.4/7**	**5.8/7**	**6.2/7**	**5.2/7**	Reductions in vehicle miles traveled, energy consumption, air quality criteria pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions, significant and unavoidable impacts during construction or operations, including historical resources, peak construction criteria pollutant emissions, and impacts to ordinance protected trees and shrubs, and areas of potentially sensitive vegetation.
Operational Sustainability & Delivery (Weight: 15%)	**5.8/7**	**5.4/7**	**5.6/7**	**5.3/7**	**5.3/7**	Project construction and operation and maintenance costs, capital cost funding gap, anticipated opening month, potentially impacted utilities, and FTA New Starts criteria measures including annualized cost per project trip, new systemwide transit trips, and annual project trips.
Economic Impact (Weight: 15%)	**5.2/7**	**5.7/7**	**4.8/7**	**5.2/7**	**5.0/7**	Number of individuals displaced, estimated parcels to be acquired, station proximity to nearest commercially zoned property, person-year jobs created during construction, total regional economic benefits due to increased mobility
Total Weighted Score	**4.8/7**	**5.3/7**	**6.0/7**	**6.1/7**	**5.7/7**	**Project provides significant benefits for all alternatives. Alternative 5 performs the strongest**

The Weighted Benefits Analysis component of the CBA finds that the Project provides significant benefits locally and regionally across all alternatives. The performance of each alternative varies within each goal with Alternatives 4 and 5 performing strongest for Mobility & Accessibility and Safety & Health. Alternative 5 performs the strongest for Environmental Sustainability. Alternative 1 performs the strongest for Operational Sustainability and Delivery. Alternative 3 performs the best for Economic Impact. Overall, Alternative 5 performs the best with a weighted score of 6.1, followed by Alternative 4 with a weighted score of 6.0, Alternative 6 with a weighted score of 5.7, Alternative 3 with a weighted score of 5.3 and Alternative 1 with a weighted score of 4.8.

Benefit-Cost Ratio: Compares the monetized costs of the Project, including capital and operating costs, to the monetized benefits of the Project, including travel time savings, traffic safety, active transportation health benefits, air pollution reduction benefits and regional economic benefits due to improved regional access and travel. A higher ratio of benefits to costs means that there are more monetized benefits for every dollar spent. However, it is important to note that many costs and benefits cannot be monetized. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Benefit-Cost Ratio Findings

	Alt 1	Alt 3	Alt 4	Alt 5	Alt 6
Benefit-Cost Ratio	4.2	3.5	5.4	4.6	4.3

** BCRs are unique to each project and not to be compared across projects, due to specific construction and operation years being considered, travel demand modeling years, and other factors.*

The analysis reveals that all five alternatives offer significant benefits in comparison to their costs. Alternative 4 has the highest BCR (highest monetized benefits compared to costs). Alternative 4 is expected to produce $5.40 of monetized benefits per dollar invested over a 30-year analysis period. Alternative 5 is expected to produce $4.60 as it has similar benefits to Alternative 4 but a higher cost. Alternative 6 is expected to produce $4.30 as it has lower benefits than Alternatives 4 and 5 but a higher cost. Alternative 1 is expected to produce $4.20 as while it has lower benefits, it has the lowest cost. Alternative 3 is expected to produce $3.50 as its higher relative costs are not accompanied by higher relative benefits.