

GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Transportation Committee

AGENDA

*Wednesday, September 10, 2014
4:00 p. m. Meeting*

*Gateway Cities Council of Governments
16401 Paramount Boulevard, 2nd Floor Conference Room
Paramount, California*

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 16401 PARAMOUNT BOULEVARD, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The Transportation Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The Transportation Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the Transportation Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the Transportation Committee at the following times:

- A. AGENDA ITEM: at this time the Transportation Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the Transportation Committee agenda; and
- C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.

- I. **CALL TO ORDER**
- II. **ROLL CALL – BY SELF INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS - Three minutes for each speaker.

VI. MATTERS FROM STAFF

VII. CONSENT CALENDAR: All items under the Consent Calendar may be enacted by one motion. Any item may be removed from the Consent Calendar and acted upon separately by the Transportation Committee.

A. Approval of Minutes – Minutes of the Transportation Committee Meeting of August 6, 2014, are presented for approval.

CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION:

A MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM.

VIII. REPORTS

A. Metro Draft Complete Streets Policy – Presentation by Tham Nguyen, MTA Project Manager

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

B. Strategic Transportation Plan Update – Presentation by Yvette Kirrin, Gateway Cities COG Engineer

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

C. Cap and Trade Funding Update – Oral Report by Nancy Pfeffer, Gateway Cities COG Director of Regional Planning

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

IX. REPORTS – COMMITTEES/AGENCIES

A. Matters from Gateway Cities Service Council by David Hershenson, MTA – Oral Report

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

B. LOSSAN Update – Oral Report

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

C. Matters from I-5 JPA – Oral Report

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

D. Matters from I-710 EIR/EIS Corridor Project – Oral Report

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

E. Matters from SR-91/I-605/I-405 Major Corridor Project – Oral Report

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

F. Matters from Eco-Rapid Transit – Oral Report

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

G. Communications

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

X. MATTERS FROM TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS

XI. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 5:30 p.m. unless the Transportation Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular Transportation Committee meeting scheduled for Wednesday, October 1, 2014 4:00 PM.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

VII. CONSENT CALENDAR
Item A
Approval of Minutes

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE GATEWAY CTITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

Chair - MTA Director Diane DuBois

Gateway Cities COG Office, 16401 Paramount Blvd., Paramount, CA 90723

August 6, 2014

CALL TO ORDER: MTA Director Diane DuBois called the meeting to order at 4:17 pm. Roll-call was taken by self-introduction.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Diane DuBois – MTA Director, Gene Daniels – Paramount, Mohammad Moshtakami – Downey, Bill Pagett – Paramount, Tom Modica-Long Beach, Mike Egan – Norwalk, Dana Pynn – Port of Long Beach, Bruce Barrows - Cerritos

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Rosa Perez - Huntington Park, Brent Tercero – Pico Rivera

OTHERS PRESENT: Richard Powers, Nancy Pfeffer, Karen Heit, Yvette Kirrin, Kekoa Anderson – COG staff, David Hershenson – MTA.

The Consent Calendar was moved and approved. Director DuBois began with an explanation of the MTA Short Range Transportation Plan. She outlined the SRTP and what is represented. She briefly discussed what the planned contained and the lack of new funds for this plan.

She discussed the status of funds and the shortcomings of available funding in the plan for items like active transportation and the partially funded transit corridors, including the West Santa Ana Branch (Eco-Rapid Transit Project) and the Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension Phase II

She talked about the two Board Motions beginning with item # 25, which requires the development of a bicycle strategic plan and possible ways to fund it. She applauded the creation of a comprehensive strategy for active transportation but cautioned about the potential diversion of transit O & M eligible funds.

She went on to discuss item #76 and how it would move certain SFV projects into a better position for funding. She outlined the projects that were asked to be amended into the LRTP. She went on to explain the newly acquired legislative ability to move ahead with at-grade rail in the SFV.

Lastly, she discussed the Knabe/DuBois/O'Connor Motion that expanded the changes to the LRTP. She explained about how this was a way to meet the demand on a fair equitable Countywide manner. She stated that she would continue to work to see that Gateway

Cities projects continued to be fairly and equitably represented in the LRTP and not supplanted by other projects. There was general discussion about the adoption of the SRTP.

Karen Heit, Transportation Deputy discussed the I-405 HOV Lane Feasibility Study and the recommendations from this study. Directors Garcetti, Bonin, Fasana Dupont-Walker and DuBois authored a Motion to move forward with Project Approval/Environmental Documents (PA/ED) for the I-105 segment of the Alternative 3 only and to expand the I-110 Express Lane south of the I-405/I-100 interchange. Creation of a HOT Lane on the I-105 will provide relief commuters along the I-105 by providing them with the option of paying to use the carpool lane. The issue of connecting to the I-605 via direct connectors can be studied at a later date. This option is consistent with the COG's input to the I-405 HOV project study.

David Hershenson, Gateway Service Sector Manager updated the Committee on the upcoming Metro Blue Line rehabilitation and the approaching 30-day closure of the Long Beach Transit Mall to effect repairs and upgrades to the MBL tracks and stations. The closure was negotiated with the City of Long Beach to lessen the impact on residents and businesses. Bus bridges will serve Blue Line riders inconvenienced by the closure.

Director DuBois gave an update of the progress with the LOSSAN Interagency transfer agreement. The LOSSAN lead agency, OCTA is working on the Agreement with the State. It is anticipated that the transfer agreement will be signed and executed ahead of schedule.

Yvette Kirrin, Executive Director I-5 JPA gave an overview of the project and that the Alondra Bridge was preparing for reopening by the end of the month. The last two segments for the project were tying up right-of-way issues and were close to going out to bid.

Kekoa Anderson, COG Transportation Engineer reviewed the recommendations made by the I-710 Project Committee to move forward with the study of two build options as well as the no-build and TSM options. The I-710 PC also recommended supporting Community Alternative-7 which had already been rejected by Caltrans. The Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental EIS is expected for public review in early 2016. Anderson went on to discuss the advancement of project study and engineering reports for the SR-91/I-605/I-405 Hot Spots project. These studies will soon be out for contract by the MTA and will allow the projects to proceed towards construction.

Karen Heit gave the Eco-Rapid Transit update and the continuing progress being made furthering the technical refinement report.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55

VIII. REPORTS

ITEM A

**Metro Draft Complete Streets Policy-
Presentation by Tham Nguyen, MTA
Project Manager**

TO: Transportation Committee
FROM: Diane Dubois, MTA Director
BY: Karen Heit, Transportation Deputy
SUBJECT: Metro Draft Complete Streets Policy

Issue

MTA has drafted a Complete Streets Policy for Los Angeles County. The intent of this policy is to guide jurisdictions in developing comprehensive and integrated transportation networks that are safe, comfortable, and convenient by

- Serving all users and modes (accommodating bicycle and pedestrian uses as full modes)
- Context sensitive to the environment and community
- Coordination within organizations and between partner agencies
- Supports projects and programs implemented by Metro to support regional transportation goals

An advantage of adopting a Complete Streets concept is it will provide guidance to local jurisdictions in competing for Active Transportation and other state and federal funding opportunities.

Metro Project Manager - Tham Nguyen will discuss the attached document that was developed by Metro staff and received broad input at two Countywide workshops that were held at the MTA. The policy has been distributed to the GCCOG Public Work Officers and Planning Directors for their input. Draft comments will be prepared for the October GCCOG Board meeting

Recommended Action

Recommend that staff gather comments and submit them to the Gateway COG Board for transmittal to the MTA

Attachment

Draft Complete Streets Policy.

Metro Complete Streets Policy DRAFT

August 2014



Metro[®]

Table of Contents

Summary	2
Introduction	3
Goal	3
Background	3
Policy Context	4
Defining Complete Streets	5
Challenges	6
Metro’s Role in Supporting Complete Streets: Opportunities	10
Complete Streets Principles	12
Implementation	13
Exceptions	18
Attachment 1: Los Angeles County Jurisdictions with Complete Streets Policy/Updated General Plan	19

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
COMPLETE STREETS POLICY SUMMARY**

As transportation planner and coordinator, designer, funder, builder and transit operator, Metro has the opportunity to help advance state, regional and local efforts to create a more “complete” and integrated transportation network that serves all users and supports environmental sustainability. The term “Complete Streets” describes a comprehensive, integrated transportation network with infrastructure and design that allows safe and convenient travel along and across streets for all users, including pedestrians, users and operators of public transit, bicyclists, persons with disabilities, seniors, children, motorists, and movers of commercial goods.

The State of California has emphasized the importance of Complete Streets by enacting the California Complete Streets Act of 2008, which requires that when cities or counties make substantive revisions to the circulation elements of their general plans, they identify how they will provide for the mobility needs of all users of the roadways, as well as through Deputy Directive 64, in which the California Department of Transportation explained that it “views all transportation improvements as opportunities to improve safety, access, and mobility for all travelers in California and recognizes bicycle, pedestrian, and transit modes as integral elements of the transportation system.” The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 sets a mandate for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in California, and the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 requires emissions reductions through coordinated regional planning that integrates transportation, housing, and land-use policy. Achieving the goals of these laws will require significant increases in travel by public transit, bicycling, and walking.

Since September 2013, Metro staff has conducted extensive outreach to solicit input in the development of the Complete Streets Policy. Internal feedback was obtained from Metro Planning, Operations and Construction Departments, as well as input from agency partners, including the Metro Technical Advisory Committee and its Subcommittees, the California Department of Transportation, Southern California Association of Governments, Councils of Governments, and other stakeholders. On February 12, 2014, Metro convened a stakeholder workshop to solicit input that drew over 250 participants, consisting of representatives from local and regional government, Metro staff from various departments, transit operators, the private sector, health sector, nonprofits, advocates, and other stakeholders.

The Complete Streets Policy builds upon projects and programs already underway at Metro to increase mobility options, improve air quality and health, and strengthen the economy in Los Angeles County jurisdictions. It is a tool to help guide Metro to better coordinate within the various functions and departments of the agency and between partner organizations that have influence or jurisdiction over the public realm. To maximize the benefits of significant transportation investments within the county over the next decades, concerted effort and active collaboration within the organization and among partner agencies are necessary to create a fully integrated transportation system that serves all users.

INTRODUCTION

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) has developed this Complete Streets Policy to establish a standard of excellence for multimodal design. A Complete Streets approach views all transportation improvements as opportunities to create safe, more accessible streets for all users, including public transit users and operators, pedestrians, bicyclists, children, persons with disabilities, seniors, motorists, and movers of commercial goods. As transportation planner and coordinator, designer, funder, builder and transit operator, Metro has the opportunity to help advance state, regional and local efforts to create a more “complete” and integrated transportation network that serves all users and supports environmental sustainability. Metro has been entrusted with expanding the county’s transit system and planning highway improvements over the next decades that will support the public’s interest in more travel choices.

As a Regional Transportation Planning Agency, Metro does not own or operate many elements of the region’s transportation system, particularly the public rights of way. However, the agency is responsible for programming a significant portion of the county’s transportation funds and for the planning and funding of the regional transit system and highway corridors. In this capacity, Metro approaches implementation of regional policies through a combination of financial investments based on policy-driven funding criteria; by providing a policy framework and guidance to local agencies; and through collaboration with local jurisdictions and regional, state, and federal partners to advance the region’s transportation agenda. In addition, Metro operates an extensive and expanding transit network within the county. Although the streets and infrastructure that comprise the first/last mile, the portion of the journey where transit passengers get to a transit stop or from the transit stop to their final destination, fall outside the boundaries of Metro’s jurisdiction and control, these elements remain critical components of an

effective public transportation system. Metro recognizes that the planning and coordinated development of Complete Streets infrastructure not only can improve regional transportation effectiveness but also provides benefits for local governments in the areas of infrastructure cost savings; public health; and environmental sustainability and acknowledges the benefits and value for the public health and welfare of reducing vehicle miles traveled and increasing transportation choices.

GOAL

The Complete Streets Policy demonstrates Metro’s ongoing commitment to improving mobility in the region and ensuring that streets form a comprehensive and integrated transportation network promoting safe and convenient travel for all users while preserving flexibility, recognizing community context, and using design guidelines and standards that support best practices. The policy is intended to achieve the following goals:

- Improve access to public transit by making it convenient, safe, and attractive for transit users;
- Maximize multi-modal benefits and efficiencies;
- Facilitate multi-jurisdictional coordination and leverage partnerships and incentive programs to achieve a “complete” and integrated transportation system that serves all users;
- Establish active transportation improvements as integral elements of the countywide transportation system;
- Foster healthy, equitable, and economically vibrant communities where all residents have greater mobility choices.

BACKGROUND

The Complete Streets Policy is to further the vision laid out in the Metro Board-adopted Countywide Sustainability Planning Policy and Implementation Plan, which guides the integration of sustainability in the agency’s planning functions. The Complete Streets Policy will further advance the Board’s Active Transportation Agenda, which includes short and long term strategies for leveraging urban

Complete Streets Policy – DRAFT

design, partnerships and project development to create environments that promote walking, bicycling, transit use, and public health.

POLICY CONTEXT

Federal

Federal, state, regional, and local policies have echoed the need for accommodating all users of the roadway. The U.S. Department of Transportation Policy Statement on Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation Regulations and Recommendations supports the development of fully integrated active transportation system networks, which foster safer, more livable, family-friendly communities; promote physical activity and health; and reduce vehicle emissions and fuel use. The policy encourages transportation agencies to go beyond the minimum requirements and to proactively provide convenient, safe, and context-sensitive facilities that accommodate people of all ages and abilities, including people too young to drive, people who cannot drive, and people who choose not to drive. Furthermore, Federal Transit Law specifies that all pedestrian improvements located within one-half mile and all bicycle improvements located within three miles of a public transportation stop or station have a de facto physical and functional relationship to public transportation.

State and Regional

The State of California has emphasized the importance of Complete Streets by enacting the California Complete Streets Act of 2008 (AB 1358), which requires that when cities or counties make substantive revisions to the circulation elements of their general plans, they identify how they will provide for the mobility needs of all users of the roadways. The California Department of Transportation's Deputy Directive 64-R1 emphasizes all transportation improvements as opportunities to improve safety, access, and mobility for all travelers in California and recognizes bicycle, pedestrian, and transit modes as integral elements of the transportation system. The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) sets a mandate for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in the state, and the Sustainable Communities and Climate

Protection Act of 2008 (SB 375) requires emissions reductions through coordinated regional planning that integrates transportation, housing, and land-use policy. Achieving the goals of these laws will require significant increases in travel by public transit, bicycling, and walking. Strategies to support greenhouse gas emissions targets in support of SB 375 were adopted by the Southern California Association of Governments in the 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). In 2013, the State enacted SB 743, which eliminates level of service (LOS) metrics for projects within Transit Priority Areas. Under SB 743, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research has been tasked with developing alternative criteria to LOS. Particularly within areas served by transit, the alternative criteria must promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses.

The Metro Board has been a champion for sustainability and supportive of federal and state policy initiatives to address climate change and promote sustainable transportation. In April 2011, the Board directed staff to develop a Health and Active Transportation Agenda, which includes short and long term strategies for leveraging urban design, partnerships and project development to create environments that promote walking and biking, transit use, and public health. This was followed in July 2012 by the Board's adoption of the Metro/SCAG Joint-Work Program to support the RTP/SCS and advance sustainable transportation options. In December 2012, the Board adopted the Countywide Sustainability Planning Policy and Implementation Plan to guide the integration of sustainability in the agency's planning functions. In April 2014, the Board adopted the First Last Mile Strategic Plan, which outlines a specific infrastructure improvement strategy designed to facilitate easy, safe, and efficient access to the Metro system. In June 2014, the Board approved the expansion of membership on Metro's legislatively mandated Technical Advisory Committee to include two voting



Figure 1. Complete Streets are streets for everyone. They are designed and operated to enable safe access for all users. Photos (1-4 from left): Dan Burden, Walkable and Livable Communities Institute . Photo on right: Metro.

members and alternates representing active transportation, one for bicycle issues and one for pedestrian issues, and one ex-officio (non-voting) and alternate representing public health issues.

The development of a Metro Complete Streets Policy is a continuation of the agency's commitment to supporting an integrated multimodal transportation system.

Local Jurisdictions

Within Los Angeles County, a number of local jurisdictions have adopted policies and resolutions or updated the circulation element of the General Plan to support Complete Streets and advance the health, safety, welfare, economic vitality, and environmental well-being of their communities as summarized in Attachment 1.

Historically, the streets throughout Los Angeles County carried a world-class transit system consisting of streetcars, light rail, and buses that connected cities throughout the county and between neighboring regions in Southern California. These streets accommodated many different modes of transportation. Through policies and investments that prioritized the movement of automobiles, the streets became more incomplete and limited transportation choices by making walking, bicycling, and taking public transportation inconvenient and unattractive. Although many arterials have infrastructure for automobiles and transit, most have sidewalks, and some have bicycle lanes, the challenge lies

with the quality of those facilities, rather than the mere presence of these elements, and whether they are integrated into a seamless network. For example, streets may have elements for different users. However, sidewalks may be broken. Street crossings may be lengthy and dangerous. Sidewalks may lack curb ramps for ADA access. There may be bicycle lanes, but those lanes may be poorly designed or may not be integrated into a bicycle network, leaving gaps in the system that create unsafe conditions for bicyclist trying to travel from point A to point B. Therefore, improvements can be made to better facilitate transit, pedestrian, and bicycle travel across the transportation system. Given the increasingly congested nature of our roadways, getting more productivity out of the existing road and public transportation systems is vital to increasing mobility.¹

DEFINING COMPLETE STREETS

The term "Complete Streets" describes a comprehensive, integrated transportation network with infrastructure and design that allows safe and convenient travel along and across streets for all users, including pedestrians, users and operators of public transit, bicyclists, persons with disabilities, seniors, children, motorists, and movers of commercial goods. The California Department of Transportation defines a Complete Street as

¹ National Complete Streets Coalition. <http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/complete-streets/complete-streets-fundamentals/complete-streets-faq/>

Complete Streets Policy – DRAFT

“a transportation facility that is planned, designed, operated, and maintained to provide safe mobility for all users, including bicyclists, pedestrians, transit riders, and motorists appropriate to the function and context of the facility.”² Complete Streets is a high level policy direction that helps redefine how transportation agencies approach streets and highways so that the default outcome is a transportation system that balances the needs of all users, regardless of age, ability, or mode of transportation. Through continued and incremental changes in capital projects, regular maintenance and operations work, the street network gradually becomes safer and more accessible for travelers of all ages and abilities. Since communities have different context, needs, and characteristics, Complete Streets is a flexible, comprehensive planning and design approach to transportation. There is no specific design prescription; each street is unique and its design reflects the context of the community and street network. Each street project is considered within the context of the overall transportation system.

Some streets may be prioritized for pedestrian travel, others for transit, bicycling, motorists, or goods movement. Some streets will have robust facilities that accommodate all modes; however, many streets might not contain all those features due to physical right of way constraints and other considerations. A Complete Street in a suburban setting will look very different from a highly urbanized area. But all streets will allow for safe travel within an integrated network.

Completes Streets Policies Across the U.S.

Over 600 jurisdictions throughout the United States have adopted Complete Streets policies, which can take the form of ordinances, resolutions, inclusion in general plans, policies adopted by city and county councils, rewrites to design guidelines, internal memos from directors of transportation agencies, and executive orders from elected officials.

²California Department of Transportation. (October 2008). Deputy Directive 64-R1: Complete Streets – Integrating the Transportation System.

According to the National Complete Streets Coalition, which has been compiling decades of research and practice on this topic, an ideal Complete Streets policy includes the following ten elements:

1. Includes a vision for how and why the community wants to complete its streets.
2. Specifies that ‘all users’ includes pedestrians, bicyclists and transit passengers of all ages and abilities, as well as trucks, buses and automobiles.
3. Applies to both new and retrofit projects, including design, planning, maintenance, and operations, for the entire right of way.
4. Makes any exceptions specific and sets a clear procedure that requires high-level approval of exceptions.
5. Encourages street connectivity and aims to create a comprehensive, integrated, connected network for all modes.
6. Is adoptable by all agencies to cover all roads.
7. Directs the use of the latest and best design criteria and guidelines while recognizing the need for flexibility in balancing user needs.
8. Directs that Complete Streets solutions will complement the context of the community.
9. Establishes performance standards with measurable outcomes.
10. Includes specific next steps for implementation of the policy.

Additional information on each policy element is available at <http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/complete-streets/changing-policy/policy-elements>.

CHALLENGES

Numerous cities and authorities have jurisdiction over the public realm throughout the county. The development of an integrated transportation network that serves all users requires collaboration among the many custodians of the transportation system. Challenges to implementing Complete Streets projects include concerns about increased project cost, limited funding availability, auto-centric policies and guidelines, concerns about impacts on congestion, first and last mile

Complete Streets Policy – DRAFT

challenges to connect to transit, potential operational conflicts between transit operations and bicycle facilities, provision for goods movement, and the need for educating transportation professionals and decision makers to implement Complete Streets.

Cost and Funding

The concern about increased project cost and limited funding availability were mentioned as barriers to implementing Complete Streets. Although a Complete Streets approach can ultimately save agencies money over the long run, there can be upfront costs for educating transportation staff, updating internal agency procedures and processes, designing and constructing Complete Streets treatments. However, cost savings can be achieved by creating more efficiency in how roadway funds are spent so that all modes are considered during the initiation of project planning and design rather than retrofitting the project in the future, which can be more costly. In some instances, the cost of developing a Complete Street can be high; however, many Complete Streets improvements can also be modest in size and low cost. With a Complete Streets approach, every time work is done to the street, it is made better for all users. This means that small and routine tasks such as restriping and updating signal timing, not just the larger construction and reconstruction projects, provide opportunities to implement Complete Streets. Many small, low-cost improvements can, when thoughtfully implemented over time, create a much friendlier and safer environment for everyone.

Within Los Angeles County, various federal, state, and local funding sources are available to implement complete streets, as shown in Table 1. Additional offsets can be achieved by timing and coordinating complete streets implementation with routine roadway maintenance, street repaving, retrofits, and other capital improvement projects; re-prioritizing projects and allocating funds to projects that improve overall mobility; and pursuing grant opportunities and new funding sources.

CASE STUDY: Managing Traffic in the Sacramento Region. The City of Sacramento uses the opportunity presented by regular road maintenance work to add missing crosswalks and bicycle lanes and reduce exceedingly wide lanes to improve road safety for all travel modes in many neighborhoods. This has proven to be a cost-effective way to create more complete streets over time. On several streets receiving new treatments, the City has seen total collisions drop by 32% and even sharper reductions in bicycle and pedestrian crashes.

Source: National Complete Streets Coalition and Local Government Commission. (2012) It's a Safe Decision: Complete Streets in California.

CASE STUDY: A Low Cost Complete Streets Project Helps Improve a Neighborhood in San Diego. The City added a mid-block street crossing with a wide, high-visibility crosswalk and a pedestrian refuge island on Adams Avenue, for a total cost of \$20,000 in a lower-income neighborhood. According to Andy Hamilton, President of WalkSanDiego, the project has “made a huge difference calming the traffic for two blocks, giving a whole neighborhood better access to its only park.” On another low cost project, the City spent \$4,500 to enhance safety and calm traffic through the application of paint and the installation of a few bollards at the 50th and University Avenue intersection.



Photo: Andy Hamilton

Source: National Complete Streets Coalition and Local Government Commission. (2012) It's a Safe Decision: Complete Streets in California.

Table 1. Potential Funding Sources for Complete Streets in Los Angeles County

Local
Propositions A Local Return
Proposition C Local Return
Proposition C 25%
Measure R Local Return
Transportation Development Act Article 3
Transportation Development Act Article 8
Developer Mitigation Fees
Gas Tax
ExpressLanes Net Toll Revenue
State
Active Transportation Program
Cap and Trade
Federal
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program
Regional Surface Transportation Program
Surface Transportation Program Local
Urbanized Area Formula Grant (5307)
Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities (5310)
Formula Grants for Rural Areas (5311)

Policies

The streets in Los Angeles County once carried an extensive transit system and accommodated different modes of transportation. However, policies and funding over the course of the twentieth century began prioritizing a singular mode, as automobiles became more prevalent. Streets were retrofitted or built that facilitated automobile travel but provided limited transportation options for other modes, such as walking, bicycling, and taking public transportation, which became inconvenient and unattractive travel choices. When more single-occupancy vehicles use the roadway, it can create congestion that ultimately affects the travel time for transit, making it less convenient. Conflicts with existing plans and policies pose challenges for implementation of Complete Streets. For example, each local jurisdiction has an adopted General Plan, which includes a circulation element. Many of these plans were developed prior to the California Complete Streets Act of 2008 and primarily focus on prioritizing auto travel. Although a number of

jurisdictions within the county have updated their circulation elements to be consistent with state law, many local jurisdictions have yet to do so. This is complicated by the fact that local jurisdictions may face tight budgetary constraints.

Prior to the passage of SB 743, the analyses of environmental impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) focused on the delay that vehicles experience at intersections and on roadway segments. Many jurisdictions currently use auto delay standards, such as level of service (LOS), to assess potential traffic impacts during a project’s environmental review. Mitigation for LOS impacts typically involves reducing project size or adding motor vehicle capacity. Without affecting project demand, reducing the size of the project simply transfers development, and its associated traffic, elsewhere. When infill projects are reduced in size, development may be pushed to less transportation-efficient locations, which results in greater total travel. Meanwhile, adding motor vehicle capacity may induce additional vehicle travel, which negatively impacts the environment and human health. It also negatively impacts other modes of transportation, lengthening pedestrian crossing distances, adding delay and risk to pedestrian travel, displacing bicycle and dedicated transit facilities, and adding delay and risk to those modes of travel. Tradeoffs frequently occur between automobile convenience and the provision of safe and efficient facilities for active modes and users of transit. LOS metrics mischaracterize transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements as being detrimental to transportation, since any improvements for other modes that might inconvenience motorists is characterized as an impediment to transportation.³ In response to SB 743, the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research has issued draft guidance that proposes the use of vehicle miles traveled as

³ State of California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research. (2013). Preliminary Evaluation of Alternative Methods of Transportation Analysis. <http://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/PreliminaryEvaluationTransportationMetrics.pdf>

Complete Streets Policy – DRAFT

the performance measure for transportation impacts of a project under CEQA, shifting the focus to reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, creation of multimodal networks, and promotion of a mix of land uses.^{4,5} A project's effect on automobile delay does not constitute a significant environmental impact. The comment period for the draft guideline is open until October 10, 2014. Jurisdictions with policies that focus primarily on the automobile may conflict with those of a Complete Streets Policy.

Transit Operations in the Context of Complete Streets

There are a number of challenges with improving first and last mile connections to transit in Los Angeles County. In many situations, especially along higher traveled corridors, right-of-way is limited and already encumbered. Providing robust access facilities could potentially put strain on other complementary travel modes. For example, providing protected bike lanes on a heavily used transit access route may affect vehicular throughput and bus operations in some instances. Coordination is a challenge since there are many custodians of the public realm.⁶ In some instances, lane reallocations to accommodate bicycle facilities have not been coordinated with bus operators ahead of time, leading to transit operational conflicts resulting

⁴ State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research. (2013). Preliminary Evaluation of Alternative Methods of Transportation Analysis. <http://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/PreliminaryEvaluationTransportationMetrics.pdf>

⁵ State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research. (2014). Updating Transportation Impacts Analysis in the CEQA Guidelines: Preliminary Discussion Draft of Updates to the CEQA Guidelines Implementing Senate Bill 743 (Steinberg, 2013). http://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/Final_Preliminary_Discussion_Draft_of_Updates_Implementing_SB_743_080614.pdf

⁶ Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority and Southern California Association of Governments. (2014). First Last Mile Strategic Plan and Planning Guidelines. http://media.metro.net/docs/sustainability_path_design_guidelines.pdf

from these new facilities. Although Metro is committed to the continuous improvement of an efficient and effective transportation system for the County, the agency does not own or have jurisdictional control over transit access routes beyond the immediate footprint of station facilities. In addition, the physical environment poses a challenge for transit users, including the lengthy distance and time to access stations, broken sidewalks, and hazardous street crossings.⁷

All these challenges can be addressed through thoughtful consideration, strategic planning, engineering, design and, most importantly, active coordination.⁸ Metro is currently developing guidelines to coordinate with local jurisdictions early in the process to avoid and resolve potential transit operational conflicts as local agencies implement Complete Streets.

Provision for Goods Movement

Movers of commercial goods are another important user of the transportation system, as they provide significant economic benefits to Los Angeles County and enable goods, primarily by truck, to travel to and from warehouses, to local retail stores, businesses, and homes.

To operate, trucks require adequate intersection width and parking/loading zones to deliver their goods. Furthermore, implementing bicycle and pedestrian projects on arterials with high truck volume could inadvertently create and/or increase conflicts between those modes. Therefore, provision for goods movement and coordination with goods movement stakeholders will be essential when planning for complete streets improvements. In doing so, potential conflicts between trucks and other users can be minimized or avoided.

Training and Education

Since a Complete Streets approach represents a change from "business as usual," ongoing training and education is necessary to ensure that planners, engineers, and partner agencies

⁷ Ibid

⁸ Ibid

learn how to incorporate appropriate design elements into road projects, as well as have a thorough understanding of new processes and procedures. Community leaders need to understand how the general policy goals will manifest into actual projects implemented on the ground. Communication with the public will be an essential element to ensure that the street project reflects the context, needs, and desires of the community. Transportation professionals should be able to convey how the project benefits residents, businesses, and other stakeholders nearby.

METRO'S ROLE IN SUPPORTING COMPLETE STREETS: OPPORTUNITIES

The Complete Streets Policy builds upon projects and programs already underway at Metro to increase mobility options, improve air quality and health, and strengthen the economy in Los Angeles County jurisdictions. It is a tool to help guide Metro to better coordinate within the various functions and departments of the agency and between partner organizations that have influence or jurisdiction over the public realm. To maximize the benefits of significant transportation investments within the county over the next decades, concerted effort and active collaboration within the organization and among partner agencies are necessary to create a fully integrated transportation system that serves all users.

A review of policies, plans and practices across a number of Metro departments and functional areas (e.g., Planning, Engineering and Construction, Joint Development, Operations), as well as input from Metro staff and external stakeholders, revealed opportunities to further enhance the existing activities underway at Metro to support Complete Streets. Two of the agency's major functions that have significant influence over the public realm include corridor planning and transportation funding. Opportunities to enhance these efforts, as well as other activities and programs, are discussed below and in Table 2.

Corridor Planning

Metro, in collaboration with local jurisdictions, plans, designs and constructs transit corridor projects that will significantly expand the transit network throughout the county over the next decades. There have been instances where key intermodal connectivity elements, such as bus layover and first/last mile facilities were removed from a project's scope during post-planning phases of project implementation. For example, a critical bus layover facility was removed from the project definition of a Metro rail project as a "value engineering" decision. Although the facility may still be funded or implemented, possibly as a separate project, a clearer statement in the project definition may have more strongly supported its implementation. A statement of this type is critical at the beginning of the planning phase, such as during the development of the Purpose and Need Statement, and further emphasized at the completion of the planning phase. Intermodal connectivity elements provide a means by which a new transit project, or transit-oriented developments built by developers through Metro's Joint Development Program, becomes useful to passengers beyond the immediate transit corridor area, and is therefore fundamental to the overall success of the project.⁹

In new projects, these issues can be addressed by better defining intermodal connectivity elements as an intrinsic part of the project's scope during project planning and in environmental documents, to the extent required, and project definition for construction. Key sections of environmental documents where Metro can better specify the intermodal connectivity elements are in the Purpose and Need Statement, Project Definition, Basis of Design, and Mitigation Measures.¹⁰ For transit projects currently

⁹ Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority. (2013). Review of Policies, Plans and Practices Related to Transit Service Planning and Delivery.

¹⁰ Los Angeles County Metro Transportation Authority. (2013). Review of Policies, Plans and

Complete Streets Policy – DRAFT

underway or already in operation, Metro has developed a First Last Mile Strategic Plan to outline a specific infrastructure improvement strategy designed to facilitate easy, safe, and efficient access to the Metro system.

Transportation Funding

Metro is responsible for the distribution of local, state and federal transportation funds in Los Angeles County. Over the next ten years, transportation funds available to local jurisdictions through local return sales tax revenue (i.e., Proposition A, Proposition C, Measure R), gas tax, and federal STP-L are estimated to reach over \$10 billion.¹¹ These funds are used by local jurisdictions throughout the county for transportation projects and distributed on a per capita basis. In addition, Metro uses a Call for Projects process for programming regional funds to cities, the County, and local agencies. Opportunities exist to leverage these sources to incentivize partner agencies to develop projects that serve all users of the roadway and to promote greater efficiency in how transportation funds are used, for example to:

- encourage agencies to coordinate complete streets implementation with routine roadway maintenance, street repaving, retrofits, widenings;
- consider all users during project planning and design to avoid costly retrofits in the future;
- re-prioritize projects that provide the greatest mobility benefits.

Other agencies with a similar funding role as Metro have addressed this through project selection and funding. For example, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) administers the One Bay Area grant program in the San Francisco Bay Area to support the Sustainable Communities

Strategies. Local jurisdictions can meet the Complete Streets requirements by either adopting a Complete Streets Resolution that incorporates MTC's elements or a General Plan that complies with the California Complete Streets Act of 2008.¹²

Local jurisdictions throughout the County have used grants awarded through the Call for Projects Program to fund regionally significant projects that improve multimodal corridors, enhance streetscape, improve linkages to transit and spur innovations. An increasing share of Call for Projects funds over the last ten years has been used to promote active transportation projects. Since the 2011 Call for Projects cycle, Metro has included an impact checklist in applications to encourage applicants to document how the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists were considered in the process of planning and/or designing the proposed project. Within the Regional Surface Transportation Improvements modal category, a significant number of points have been assigned to encourage multimodal projects. With each cycle of the program, Metro continues to refine the application and process to encourage multimodal projects that benefit the region.

However, opportunities exist to further enhance the program to:

- encourage high quality design,
- improve integration between modes,
- reduce modal conflicts (e.g., projects that widen roadways to increase vehicle capacity should also address how lengthening the crossing distance impacts pedestrians and transit passengers crossing the streets),
- avoid piecemeal or inefficient investments,
- maximize person throughput, and

Practices Related to Transit Service Planning and Delivery

¹¹ Los Angeles County Metro Transportation Authority. (2014). Board Report: 2014 Short Range Transportation Plan. Appendix G.. http://media.metro.net/board/Items/2014/07_july/20140724rbmitem25.pdf

¹² Co, Sean. (2012). Memorandum: One Bay Area Grant: Complete Streets Required Elements. <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/onebayarea/CompleteStreetsResoOBAG2.pdf>

Complete Streets Policy – DRAFT

- streamline application process for multimodal projects that provide the greatest mobility benefits.

Opportunities exist to eliminate such conflicting effects by:

- providing more rigorous performance criteria to select projects that improve mobility and access for all modes and increase person throughput,
- prioritizing projects that are designed to mitigate modal conflicts,
- training project evaluation staff to distinguish between complete streets versus incomplete streets projects,
- providing additional tools to increase coordination between Modal Leads and improving tracking of all projects to ensure that those awarded under different modal categories located in the same corridor are not cancelling the benefits of each other (e.g., a road-widening project to increase automobile throughput would not be funded in the same corridor as a traffic calming streetscape project).

Opportunities to support Complete Streets were also identified in other functional areas and programs at Metro, including Joint Development, Transit Project Delivery, and Operations, which are summarized in Table 2.

COMPLETE STREETS PRINCIPLES

The principles below guide Metro’s core commitments to include the needs of all users, regardless of how they travel, into the everyday decision-making process.

1. Complete Streets Serving All Users and Modes. Metro expresses its commitment to work with partner agencies and local jurisdictions to plan and fund Complete Streets that provide safe, comfortable, and convenient travel along and across streets (including streets, roads, transit facilities, highways, bridges, and other portions of the transportation system) through a comprehensive, integrated transportation network that serves all categories of users, including pedestrians, users and operators of

public transit, bicyclists, persons with disabilities, seniors, children, motorists, and movers of commercial goods.

2. Context Sensitivity. In planning and implementing transportation projects, Metro departments, partner agencies, and funding recipients will maintain sensitivity to local conditions in both residential and business districts as well as urban, suburban, and rural areas, and will work with residents, merchants, and other stakeholders to ensure that a strong sense of place ensues. Improvements that will be considered shall contribute to safe travel for all users and be consistent with best practices, such as the Metro First/Last Mile Strategic Plan, NACTO Urban Street Design Guide, NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide, Los Angeles County Model Design Manual for Living Streets, or equivalent.

3. Complete Streets Routinely Addressed by All Departments. All relevant departments at Metro, partner agencies, and funding recipients will work towards making Complete Streets practices a routine part of everyday operations; approach every relevant project, program, and practice as an opportunity to improve streets and the transportation network for all categories of users; and work in coordination with other departments, agencies, and jurisdictions to maximize opportunities for Complete Streets, connectivity, and cooperation.

4. All Projects and Phases. Complete Streets infrastructure sufficient to enable reasonably safe travel along and across the right of way for each category of users will be incorporated into all planning, funding, design, approval, and implementation processes for any transit and highway planning and design, new construction, reconstruction, retrofits, rehabilitations, and capital grant programs, except that specific infrastructure for a given category of users may be excluded if an exception is approved via the process set forth in the “Exceptions” section of this policy. Even for projects with limited scope, opportunities to implement incremental improvements leading to long-term accommodations for all

Complete Streets Policy – DRAFT

users shall be incorporated. In new Metro corridor projects, intermodal connectivity elements shall be an intrinsic part of the project's scope in environmental documents, to the extent required, and project definition for construction.

IMPLEMENTATION

1. Design. Metro will design and evaluate projects using the latest design standards and innovative design options, with a goal of balancing user needs. Metro strongly encourages partner agencies and Metro fund recipients to use the best design guidelines and standards to foster safe travel for all users.

2. Network/Connectivity. Metro will work with partner agencies and local jurisdictions to incorporate Complete Streets infrastructure into transit and highway planning and design, new construction, reconstruction, retrofits, rehabilitations, and Metro capital grant programs to improve the safety and convenience of all users, with the particular goal of creating a connected network of facilities accommodating each category of users, and increasing connectivity across jurisdictional boundaries and for anticipated future transportation investments. Transportation facilities are long-term investments that shall anticipate likely future demand for walking, bicycling, and transit facilities and not preclude the provision of future improvements. These facilities should address the need for pedestrians and bicyclists to cross corridors as well as travel along them; this may include, but is not limited to, addressing the need along an adjacent corridor. Even where pedestrians and bicyclists may not commonly use a particular travel corridor that is being improved or constructed, key points should be identified for cross corridor accessibility. Therefore, the design of intersections, interchanges and bridges shall accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians in a manner that is safe, accessible, and convenient.

3. Implementation Next Steps. Metro will take the following specific next steps to implement this Complete Streets Policy:

- A. **Plan Consultation and Consistency:** Maintenance, planning, and design of projects affecting the transportation system will be consistent with local bicycle, pedestrian, transit, multimodal, and other relevant plans.
- B. **Stakeholder Consultation:** Develop and/or clearly define a process to allow for continued stakeholder involvement on projects and plans including, but not limited to, local bicycle and pedestrian advisory groups, transit riders, accessibility advisory groups, automobile interests and/or other advisory groups, as defined necessary to support implementation of this Complete Streets policy by Metro. Consultation with these stakeholder groups is part of the overall project outreach effort.
- C. As identified in Table 2.

4. Performance Measures. All relevant capital grant funding recipients shall perform evaluations of how well the streets and transportation network planned, designed, implemented, and funded by Metro are serving each category of users by collecting baseline data and collecting follow-up data after project implementation. This requirement has been incorporated into the 2015 Call for Projects cycle and will apply to all subsequent capital grant funding program cycles.

Table 2. Complete Streets Implementation Plan

Category	Initiation Timeframe
1. Education and Technical Assistance	
1.1 Provide education and training for policy makers, elected officials, planners, engineers, and the general public on the benefits, needs, and implementation of Complete Streets.	Ongoing
1.2 Encourage the use of best practices in Complete Streets design, such as NACTO Urban Street Design Guide, NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide, Los Angeles County Model Design Manual for Living Streets, and other guidelines and standards that promote a standard of excellence for multimodal design.	Ongoing
1.3 Develop and maintain Complete Streets website to provide agencies and interested stakeholders with relevant information, resources, and best-practices to implement Complete Streets. Provide information on local, state, and federal grant opportunities related to Complete Streets promotion, planning, design and construction. Provide access to timely and informative data, information, and research.	Ongoing
1.4 Create and publish performance metrics that can be used to help local jurisdictions prioritize projects for funding, and to evaluate projects once they have been completed.	0 – 2 years
1.5 Explore strategies to provide technical assistance to low-resourced cities, including providing applicable templates, exploring partnership opportunities, pursuing grant opportunities, and connecting agencies to other local organizations and expert sources, where applicable.	0 – 2 years
1.6 Metro will highlight best practices to assist local jurisdictions in the development of design guidelines and policies.	0 – 2 years
2. Joint Development	
2.1 Include appropriate text in Requests for Proposals to ensure excellence in multimodal design and access.	0 – 1 year
2.2 Work with local jurisdictions to incentivize developer mitigations to address first and last mile solutions, consistent with the First Last Mile Strategic Plan.	0 – 2 years
3. System Connectivity and Integration	
3.1 Develop Active Transportation Strategic Plan to identify strategies to improve and expand the active transportation network and improve first/last mile access to transit; provide guidance to Metro and partner organizations in setting regional active transportation policies and guidelines to meet transportation goals and targets in support of the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Community Strategies and other future planning efforts; engage local government and other stakeholders to identify key regional active transportation projects and programs within Los Angeles County through a collaborative stakeholder process and explore strategies to expedite implementation.	0 – 2 year
3.2 Better design street treatments around freeway on and off ramps in highway corridor projects to facilitate safer and convenient access for pedestrians and bicyclists who must cross these corridors. Ensure project team members have staff skilled and experienced to address multimodal and complete streets planning and design by providing training to Metro staff members involved in project and/or as part of criteria during consultant team	0 – 1 year

Complete Streets Policy – DRAFT

Category	Initiation Timeframe
selection.	
3.3 Seek opportunities to implement first and last mile connections to transit.	Ongoing
3.4 Seek opportunities to include pedestrian and bicycle facilities and other first and last mile components onto new or retrofit Metro capital projects, transit and highway corridor planning and design, and Metro facilities to maximize efficiencies, when appropriate.	0 – 5 years
3.5 Conduct periodic bicycle and pedestrian counts at various locations to determine needs and opportunities for improving pedestrian and bicycle travel and access to transit.	0 – 2 years
3.6 Partner with local jurisdictions and agencies to expedite implementation of high priority active transportation projects.	0 – 4 years
3.7 Expand bicycle parking at Metro stations and stops, including creating bicycle hubs, increasing bicycle parking, implementing bikeshare, and providing other bicycle facilities.	Ongoing
3.8 Develop online interactive map to facilitate countywide network planning and coordination. The map(s) will provide overview of priority routes for various modes, as identified through local and regional plans, including local bicycle, pedestrian, transit, multimodal, goods movement and other relevant plans.	0 – 3 years
4. Corridor Projects	
4.1 During project planning phase, define intermodal connectivity elements as an intrinsic part of the project's scope during project planning and in environmental documents, to the extent required, and project definition for construction. Key sections within environmental documents where intermodal connectivity elements can be better specified include: Purpose and Need Statement, Project Definition, Basis of Design, and Mitigation Measures. Ensure project team members have staff skilled and experienced to address multimodal and complete streets planning and design by providing training to Metro staff members involved in project and/or as part of criteria during consultant team selection.	0 – 5 years
4.2 Identify hot spot corridors and facilitate transportation improvements across jurisdictions.	0 – 5 years
4.3 During project design-build phase for new projects, ensure that Complete Streets and first and last mile solutions are integrated into project scope, design, and implementation. Provide relevant directive drawing and appropriate budget set aside in Life of Project for construction of these facilities. Ensure project team members have staff skilled and experienced to address multimodal and complete streets design and implementation by providing training to Metro staff members involved in project and/or as part of criteria during consultant team selection.	0 – 5 years
4.4 Establish standard complete streets language for capital projects, as necessary, in Request for Proposals/Request for Qualifications	0 – 2 years
5. Operations	
5.1 Establish Preferred Strategies for Developing Bicycle and Bus Infrastructure guidelines that can be communicated to local jurisdictions for early coordination to avoid and resolve potential operational conflicts as local agencies implement complete streets. Establish a seamless process to coordinate Complete Streets	0 – 1 year

Complete Streets Policy – DRAFT

Category	Initiation Timeframe
implementation with transit operations.	
5.2 Provide bicyclist and bus operator education to help improve awareness and safer interactions between these users of the roadway.	0 – 2 years
5.3 Explore opportunities to add additional bicycle accommodations on buses and trains.	Ongoing
5.4 Identify key locations and responsibility to evaluate the outcome of Complete Streets implementation and opportunities for improvements to accommodate all users of the roadway and track before and after performance measures, such as person throughput, bus/bike collision, bike/pedestrian/vehicle collision, bus speed, run time.	0 – 3 years
6. Funding	
6.1 Since the 2011 Call for Projects cycle, Metro has included an impact checklist in applications to encourage applicants to document how the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists were considered in the process of planning and/or designing the proposed project. The impact checklist will be further refined and included in the development of a Complete Streets project initiation checklist for use by Metro and local agencies that receive funding through any Metro capital grant program, including Call for Projects and ExpressLanes Net Toll Revenue Re-Investment Grant Program, to ensure that project sponsors have considered all users during project planning, design, and construction.	0 – 1 year
6.2 Require that by January 1, 2017, project applicants have an adopted Complete Streets policy, an Adopted City Council Resolution supporting Complete Streets, or an adopted General Plan consistent with the Complete Streets Act of 2008 in order to be eligible for the next cycle of Metro capital grant funding programs, including the 2017 and subsequent Call for Projects cycles and the next and subsequent ExpressLanes Net Toll Revenue Re-Investment Grant Program cycles, to reduce barriers and conflicts related to policy and implementation. Develop customizable Complete Streets Policy sample to assist local agencies comply with requirements. Jurisdictions will be encouraged to adapt the elements and language of the sample policy to meet their own circumstances and plans. These conditions for funding eligibility apply to new grant funding cycles and will not be retroactive.	0 – 1 year
6.3 Provide Complete Streets training for all Modal Leads, project evaluation team members, and project managers involved with any Metro capital grant funding program, including Call for Projects and ExpressLanes Net Toll Revenue Re-Investment Grant Program.	0 – 1 year
6.4 Develop appropriate performance criteria to prioritize projects that achieve Complete Streets goals and improve mobility options in the Call for Projects, ExpressLanes Net Toll Revenue Re-Investment Grant Program, and other Metro capital grant programs.	0 – 2 years
6.5 Increase coordination between Modal Leads and develop geo-spatial inventory of projects that can be easily tracked across modes and funding years for projects funded in Metro capital grant programs, including Call for Projects and ExpressLanes Net Toll Revenue Re-Investment Grant Program.	0 – 2 years
6.6 With each cycle of the Call for Projects, Metro continues to refine the application and process to encourage multimodal projects that benefit the region. Metro will seek opportunities to further streamline the Call for Projects application and process to promote and encourage multimodal projects that serve multiple types of users	0 – 2 years

Complete Streets Policy – DRAFT

Category	Initiation Timeframe
and contribute to an integrated transportation system.	
6.7 Within the Call for Projects, program local or state funds for bike and pedestrian improvements of \$500,000 or less, when funding is available, and leverage larger grants from federal sources for bigger projects in order to reduce the resource-intensive administration that accompanies federal funds.	0 – 2 years
6.8 Continue Transit Oriented Development Planning Grant to encourage local agencies to accelerate the adoption of local land use regulations that will increase access to transit and improve utilization of public transit by reducing the number of modes of transportation necessary to access regional and local transit.	0 – 2 years
7. Goods Movement	
7.1 Work with local jurisdictions to identify a network of strategic arterial truck routes. These routes may be less desirable for full Complete Streets treatment; however, accommodations for other users of the roadways or provision for parallel bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities should be considered, where feasible. Local jurisdictions are encouraged to refer to this plan to help coordinate planning to minimize potential operational conflicts between different users of the roadway.	0 – 2 years
7.2 Encourage local jurisdictions to consider truck access when implementing complete streets projects and balancing user needs, as appropriate.	0 – 2 years
8. Procedures and Process	
8.1 Develop an internal procedure that can enhance interdepartmental coordination and communication to facilitate Complete Streets planning and implementation.	0 – 1 year
8.2 Assemble an internal working group to address Complete Streets planning and implementation within various Metro functional units.	0 – 1 year

Complete Streets Policy – DRAFT

EXCEPTIONS

Projects that seek Complete Streets exceptions within upcoming Metro capital grant funding program cycles must be documented with supporting data that indicates the reasons for the decision and are limited to the following:

1. Non-motorized users are prohibited on the roadway by law (e.g., specific freeways and expressways that prohibit pedestrian and bicycle travel as specified by local or state law). In this case, key points should be identified for cross corridor accessibility. The design of intersections, interchanges and bridges shall accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians in a manner that is safe, accessible, and convenient.
2. Scarcity of population, travel and attractors, both existing and future, indicate an absence of need for such accommodations.
3. Detrimental environmental or social impacts outweigh the need for these accommodations.
4. Cost of accommodations is excessively disproportionate to the cost of the project, as set forth in the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Accommodating Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/guidance/design_guidance/design.cfm.

The approval for exceptions will be decided by the lead staff responsible for the application evaluation of the grant funding program. The exceptions shall be documented and included in the funding recommendation report to the Metro Board of Directors and posted on Metro's Complete Streets webpage.

Complete Streets Policy – DRAFT
Attachment 1: Los Angeles County Jurisdictions with Complete Streets Policy/Updated General Plan

Jurisdiction	Plan/Policy	Status	Complete Streets-Related Language in the Policy/Plan
Agoura Hills	Agoura Hills' Final General Plan 2035 update	Adopted on 3/24/2010	<p>Goal M-2: Complete Streets. A transportation system that serves all modes of travel and meets the needs of all users, as specified in the Complete Streets Act.</p> <p>Policy M-2.1 Complete Streets. Ensure that the existing and future transportation system serves multiple modes of travel, such as driving, walking, biking, and transit.</p> <p>M-2.2 Equal Mobility for all City Residents. Provide a transportation network that meets the needs of a wide range of users, including adults, children, seniors, and the disabled.</p> <p>M-2.3 Transportation Planning. Encourage desired land use patterns, such as mixed-use walkable developments, through transportation planning and design.</p> <p>M-2.4 Interconnected System. Develop an interconnected mobility system that allows travel on alternative routes and modes.</p> <p>M-2.5 Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian System. Develop and maintain a safe, integrated, and comprehensive bicycle and pedestrian system that serves all ages and abilities in Agoura Hills.</p>
Arcadia	Arcadia General Plan	Adopted on 11/16/2010	<p>The City's transportation network will consist of a system of complete streets that provide for a balanced integration of all transportation modes. This element address the complete streets concept by identifying a hierarchy of travel corridors in the City, defining a citywide transit plan, setting the framework for a citywide bicycle network, and highlighting pedestrian enhancement zones.</p> <p>Goal CI-1: An efficient roadway system that serves all of Arcadia, supports all transportation modes, and balances the roadway system with planned land uses.</p> <p>Policy CI-2.2: Design and operate arterials and intersections for the safe operation of all modes, including transit, bicyclists, and pedestrians.</p>
Artesia	Artesia General Plan 2030	Adopted November, 2010	In sustainability Element: By integrating land uses in a compact design that also supports safe streets accessible by all modes of transportation, the City can encourage people to leave their cars behind.
Avalon	Avalon 2030 General Plan/ Local Coastal Plan	Adopted on June, 2013	<p>Goals: Balance the needs of all travel modes within the City.</p> <p>Policies: VI-7 Ensure that residents and visitors can walk, bicycle, or use transit to access key Avalon attractions, businesses, and places.</p> <p>VI-8 Include alternative mode accommodations in transportation capital improvement projects and programs.</p> <p>VI-9 Enhance the pedestrian environment by providing a continuous network of pedestrian facilities and minimizing conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles.</p> <p>VI-10 Enhance bicycle facilities serving both residents and tourists to provide safe bicycle access throughout the community.</p> <p>VI-11 Enhance wayfinding for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users.</p>
Azusa	Complete Streets Policy	Adopted on 10/17/2011	Complete Streets Policy
Baldwin Park	Complete Streets Policy	Adopted on 8/17/2011	Complete Streets Policy

Complete Streets Policy – DRAFT
Attachment 1: Los Angeles County Jurisdictions with Complete Streets Policy/Updated General Plan

Jurisdiction	Plan/Policy	Status	Complete Streets-Related Language in the Policy/Plan
Bradbury	2012-2030 General Plan Update	Latest Draft on 2/5/2014	<p>Circulation-Transportation Objective 2: Strive for the creation of new transportation facilities for motorists, equestrians, pedestrians, and bicyclists. Emphasize design standards that result in the construction of circulation and transportation systems that are safe and efficient; and sensitive to the needs of the disabled and City’s unique rural residential character.</p> <p>Circulation-Transportation Action 7: Complete Streets Network – Continue to examine the existing circulation system in order to identify improvements that will lead to improved compliance with the “Complete Streets Network” as envisioned by AB 1358.</p>
Burbank	Burbank 2035 General Plan update	Adopted on 2/19/2013	<p>Burbank prioritizes streets that are complete, safe, and efficient. All users of city streets are valued equally, and the street is considered an essential public place.</p> <p>Citywide Land Use Goals and Policies: GOAL 4 PUBLIC SPACES AND COMPLETE STREETS</p> <p>Burbank has attractive and inviting public spaces and complete streets that enhance the image and character of the community.</p> <p>Policy 4.1 Develop complete streets that create functional places meeting the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, wheelchair users, equestrians, and motorists.</p> <p>Citywide Mobility Goals and Policies: GOAL 3 COMPLETE STREETS</p> <p>Burbank’s complete streets will meet all mobility needs and improve community health.</p> <p>Policy 3.1 Use multi-modal transportation standards to assess the performance of the City street system.</p> <p>Policy 3.2 Complete city streets by providing facilities for all transportation modes.</p> <p>Policy 3.3 Provide attractive, safe street designs that improve transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and equestrian connections between homes and other destinations.</p> <p>Policy 3.4 All street improvements should be implemented within the existing right-of-way. Consider street widening and right-of-way acquisition as methods of last resort.</p> <p>Policy 3.5 Design street improvements so they preserve opportunities to maintain or expand bicycle, pedestrian, and transit systems.</p> <p>Note: Planning to develop complete streets standard by 2014.</p>
Calabasas	2030 General Plan	Adopted on December, 2008	<p>Implementation of the Circulation Element will improve the balance between various modes of transportation by increasing the desirability of transit, walking, and bicycling.</p> <p>Reduces dependence on single occupant automobile travel by providing a high level of pedestrian, bicycle, and public transit travel opportunities; Considers the movement of people and vehicles in the design and operation of transportation systems;</p> <p>Recognizes the special mobility needs of seniors, youth, and persons with disabilities.</p>
Compton	General Plan 2030	Latest Draft on January, 2011	<p>This Element must identify: A plan for a balanced, multimodal transportation network that meets the needs of all users of the streets, roads, and highways for safe and convenient travel.</p> <p>Residential Neighborhoods, Commercial Districts and Mixed Use Districts, Industrial Districts, will be designed or improved when possible to accommodate bicyclists, children, motorists, commercial drivers, disabled persons, and senior citizens.</p>

Complete Streets Policy – DRAFT
Attachment 1: Los Angeles County Jurisdictions with Complete Streets Policy/Updated General Plan

Jurisdiction	Plan/Policy	Status	Complete Streets-Related Language in the Policy/Plan
El Monte	General Plan	Adopted on June, 2011	Goal HW-8 “Living Streets” are developed throughout the City. Policy HW-8.1 “Complete Streets” Policy. Adopt a policy to create “Complete Streets” that accommodate all travel modes appropriate to their function, are designed for the comfort and use of people of all ages and physical abilities, address green storm water management practices, and allow for public uses and closures for events.
Glendale	Glendale 2035 General Plan	Update in progress	City is updating its General Plan 2035.
Hermosa Beach	Living Streets Policy	Adopted on 12/5/2012	Complete Streets Policy
Huntington Park	Complete Streets Policy	Adopted on 4/16/2012	Complete Streets Policy
Industry	General Plan	Latest Draft on February, 2014	2.4.2 Complete Streets In addition to vehicular traffic, roadways accommodate bicyclists, children, persons with disabilities, pedestrians, users of public transportation, and seniors. Designing roadways to accommodate this spectrum of mobility options is essential to the City's prosperity and to providing convenient access to jobs, schools, shopping, services, parks, and other key destination points.
La Cañada Flintridge	General Plan	Adopted on 1/22/2013	CE Policy 1.1.3: Develop a “Complete Streets” Plan in the City, which is designed and operated to enable safe and convenient access for all users of all ages and abilities, including pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, transit riders, and equestrians.
La Habra Heights	General Plan	Adopted on 1/21/2014	The City’s roadway network is planned in consideration of complete streets principles for streets to be designed to enable safe and convenient travel by all users. RN 1.11 Complete Streets. Implement complete street improvements and maintenance as funding becomes available. The City shall continue to implement capital improvements as defined in the Annual CIP (refer to Annual Implementation, D4, Capital Improvement Programs). Depending on need and funding availability, these may include, but not be limited to, the following: Improvements of local streets to comply with Complete Streets objectives and criteria. Identification, funding, and scheduling of roadway improvements including restriping, turning lanes, and intersection widening with modifications for compliance with Complete Streets requirements.

Complete Streets Policy – DRAFT
Attachment 1: Los Angeles County Jurisdictions with Complete Streets Policy/Updated General Plan

Jurisdiction	Plan/Policy	Status	Complete Streets-Related Language in the Policy/Plan
Long Beach	General Plan 2035	Adopted on October, 2013	Plans, maintains, and operates mobility systems consistent with the principles of complete streets, active living, and sustainable community design. STRATEGY No. 1: Establish a network of complete streets that complements the related street type. MOP Policy 1-1: To improve the performance and visual appearance of Long Beach’s streets, design streets holistically using the “complete streets approach” which considers walking, those with mobility constraints, bicyclists, public transit users, and various other modes of mobility in parallel. MOP Policy 1-2: Where streets are too narrow to accommodate all modes of travel, consider parallel routes working together to accommodate all modes in a “complete corridors” strategy. MOP Policy 1-3: Improve auto-oriented streets (such as Pacific Coast Highway and Lakewood Boulevard) so pedestrians using the stores or services can walk comfortably and feel safer navigating the busy thoroughfare, regardless of their point of origin — from the surrounding neighborhoods or via transit. MOP Policy 1-4: Allow for flexible use of public rights-of-way to accommodate all users of the street system, while maintaining safety standards.
Los Angeles City	Mobility Plan 2035	Latest Draft on 2/13/2014	Mobility Plan 2035 incorporates “Complete Streets” principles and lays the policy foundation for how future generations of Angelenos interact with their streets. This Plan recognizes the importance of our City’s streets as the lifeblood of our health and economy and seeks to prioritize resources to transform and maintain our streets as Complete Streets that serve all users, now and into the future. The approach to implementing complete streets in the City of Los Angeles has taken shape through a layered network concept. The Complete Street Network layers roadway systems that prioritize a certain mode (transit/bicycle/vehicle) within each layer. While each street will still accommodate all modes, layering networks serves to emphasize a particular mode on a particular street as part of a larger system. A layered network approach has the benefit of increasing connectivity between modes. The concept of complete streets extends to goods movement as well. As transportation systems evolve, the economic necessity of moving goods to places with large trucks on City streets will still be an important issue to consider in the balancing act of roadway prioritization.
Los Angeles County	Los Angeles County General Plan 2035 Update	Latest Draft on 6/23/2014.	Goal M1: Street designs that incorporate the needs of all users. Policy M 1.1: Provide for the accommodation of all users, including pedestrians, motorists, bicyclists, equestrians, users of public transit, seniors, children, and persons with disabilities when requiring or planning for new, or retrofitting existing transportation corridors/networks whenever appropriate and feasible. Policy M 1.2: Ensure that streets are safe for sensitive users, such as seniors and children. Policy M 1.3: Utilize industry standard rating systems to assess sustainability and effectiveness of street systems for all users.
Manhattan Beach	Mobility Plan	Latest Draft 6/4/2014	Vision of the mobility plan: Maintain and operates mobility systems consistent with the principles of Complete Streets, active living and sustainable community design. Manhattan Beach is considering a Living Streets policy and participates in South Bay Living Streets initiatives. Policy I-6.5: Develop and implement standards to encourage pedestrian-oriented design for commercial properties consistent with Complete Streets and/or Living Streets Policies.

Complete Streets Policy – DRAFT
Attachment 1: Los Angeles County Jurisdictions with Complete Streets Policy/Updated General Plan

Jurisdiction	Plan/Policy	Status	Complete Streets-Related Language in the Policy/Plan
Pasadena	General Plan - Mobility Element update- Objectives and policies	Latest Draft on 1/30/2014	Policies: 1.5 Consider the transportation needs of the disabled, students and especially seniors. 1.7 Design streets to achieve safe interaction for all modes of travel particularly for pedestrians and bicycle users. 1.12 Apply traffic management measures to manage vehicular speeds as a function of designated street type to ensure safe and orderly movement of all modes of travel.
Pomona	General Plan Update	Latest Draft on March, 2011	The City will consider developing a program to consistently identify appropriate traffic calming measures throughout Pomona. This program would allow the City to explore traffic calming strategies that add physical design features to the traveled way in an effort to control vehicle speeds, moderate driver behavior, and improve general safety for all street users. Streetscape changes also support the City's "Complete Streets" approach to its mobility network. Streetscape design and street function will be coordinated to safely accommodate multiple "modes of travel," not just motor vehicle travel.
	Green Plan	Adopted on 11/27/2012	Evolve the corridors and connected street network towards pedestrian, transit and bicycle-friendly "Complete Streets," linked with the City's promenades, trails, parks, and other public open spaces through adoption and implementation of the Corridors Specific Plan.
Rancho Palos Verdes	General Plan Circulation Element	Latest Draft on 9/11/2013	Goal: 5. Where appropriate, utilize complete street concepts to integrate the needs of all users of the roadway system consistent with the California Complete Streets Act of 2008 (AB 1358).
Santa Clarita	General Plan- Circulation Element	Adopted on 6/14/2011	Goal C 1: An inter-connected network of circulation facilities that integrates all travel modes. Policy C 1.1.2: Promote expansion of alternative transportation options to increase accessibility to all demographic and economic groups throughout the community, including mobility-impaired persons, senior citizens, low-income persons, and youth. Policy C 1.1.7: Consider the safety and convenience of the traveling public, including pedestrians and cyclists, in design and development of all transportation systems.
Santa Monica	General Plan- Land Use and Circulation Element	Adopted on 7/6/2010	Goal LU19: Design Complete Streets – Design and manage complete streets and alleys to support adjacent land uses and human activity, keeping in mind the unique character of each area of the City. LU19.2 Balanced Modes. Design and operate streets with all users in mind including bicyclists, transit users, drivers and pedestrians of all ages and abilities. The Streets section is the heart of the Circulation Element. It synthesizes the Walking, Bicycle, Transit and Automobile sections, describing how the needs of each mode should be balanced with the others. Goal T3: Ensure that Santa Monica's streets are pleasant for all users. Goal T5: Establish performance measures and design guidelines for the City's transportation system that reflect the LUCE priorities. T5.4 Develop design guidelines and management tools for all City streets, so that each street supports the land uses along it and provides an optimal accommodation for all modes of transportation. Actions: Adopt transportation performance criteria to reflect the Circulation Element goals and principles and incorporate these into the Sustainable City Plan.

Complete Streets Policy – DRAFT
Attachment 1: Los Angeles County Jurisdictions with Complete Streets Policy/Updated General Plan

Jurisdiction	Plan/Policy	Status	Complete Streets-Related Language in the Policy/Plan
Sierra Madre	General Plan update	Draft on 5/7/2013	Objective L 46: Develop a balanced and multi-modal transportation system to serve the needs of all roadway users, including motorists, public transit patrons, pedestrians and cyclists. L 47: Improve streets to maintain levels of service, vehicular, cyclists and pedestrian safety.
Signal Hill	General Plan Circulation Element	Adopted on December, 2009	The city of Signal Hill is largely built-out, and no significant changes are proposed to the city's roadway system. Future improvements will primarily consist of capacity, safety, and aesthetic improvements to existing rights-of-way. Additionally, a renewed emphasis will be placed on creating "complete streets"— streets that serve the needs of all users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, the disabled, and others. GOAL 2: Provide a safe and efficient roadway system for all users. Policy 2.f: As areas develop or are redeveloped, require the construction of “complete streets” which serve all users of the roadway, including motor vehicles, pedestrians, bicyclists, and others.
South Gate	General Plan-Mobility Element	Adopted in 2009	Goal ME 1: Provide and maintain an efficient roadway system serving all parts of the City and support multimodal transportation Policy P.2 The City should develop and implement street design standards on arterial corridors that are context sensitive to adjacent land uses and districts, and to all roadway users including transit, bicycles, and pedestrians, where appropriate. P.4 The City should design and operate arterials and intersections for the safe operation of all modes including transit, bicyclists, and pedestrians.
West Hollywood	General Plan 2035	Adopted on 9/19/2011	Four primary strategies under the influence of West Hollywood will help reduce travel demand and enhance the multi-modal transportation system by encouraging people to walk, bike and take transit instead of driving. These are sometimes referred to as the 4D's of travel—density, diversity, design, and destinations. The 4D's encompass both improvements to the physical form of the transportation network and policies, programs, and services that sustainably and equitably meet the travel needs of all users and support a multi-modal transportation system.

VIII. REPORTS
ITEM B
Gateway Cities Strategic
Transportation Plan (STP) – Update
Including the Major
Elements, Remaining Challenges and
Next Steps

TO: Transportation Committee & Board of Directors

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director

BY: Yvette Kirrin, Gateway Cities COG Engineer

SUBJECT: Gateway Cities Strategic Transportation plan (STP) – Update Including the Major Elements, Remaining Challenges and Next Steps

Background

The Gateway Cities Strategic Transportation Plan (STP) is being developed to create a unified, sub-regional multimodal transportation improvement strategy that can be used to obtain funding for the GCCOG Cities. Elements of the multimodal plan include highways, arterials, transit, park & ride, active transportation and goods movement, including transportation technologies, truck enforcement and logistics.

Status of the STP Technical Work

Over the past month, significant work was completed in concert with the STP consultant, GCCOG/Metro staff and the GCCOG Member Agencies/Cities including a 2 hour workshop which was necessary to re-baseline or calibrate each of the STP major elements/chapters, bring new members up to speed, provide a status of the work completed to date, and to collaborate regarding the final 10 month schedule. The final roadmap includes a monthly STP focus meeting, including an approvals process for the technical elements, which is needed to ultimately request the GCCOG Board for approval.

There has been an ongoing assessment of the STP technical work as well as the input provided by the member agencies, along with an aggressive outreach to ensure all agencies are participating.

Next Steps

A roadmap has been developed, including next steps, to get the STP to completion. The seven (7) steps are outlined in the PowerPoint presentation.

The goal of the STP to stitch, or connect, all the multimodal transportation elements together, into one (1) sub-regional plan to help the Cities obtain additional funding to fully design and construct regionally significant transportation projects over the next 30-50 years.

Recommended Action

Receive and File