



Planning for Main Streets

Community Workshops Summary

April and May 2026



Table of Contents

Introduction 2

SR 1: Lomita 3

SR 1: Los Angeles..... 4

SR 1: Long Beach 6

SR 18: San Bernardino 7

SR 39: Stanton 9

SR 39: Westminster 10

SR 86: Brawley 11

Introduction

The Planning for Main Streets project is a regional effort led by SCAG, in partnership with Caltrans and local jurisdictions, to reimagine state highway corridors that also function as community main streets. Through this project, SCAG and its partners aim to address transportation inequities, improve safety and mobility for all users, and align infrastructure with everyday needs of residents, workers, and visitors.

The project will help transform four state route (SR) corridors into people-centered places that balance transportation needs with community well-being.

The four SRs are:

1. SR 1 (Pacific Coast Highway), between Pennsylvania Avenue and Harbor Avenue/I-710 Ramps (6.5 miles) in the cities of Los Angeles, Lomita, and Long Beach.
2. SR 18 (Waterman Avenue), between Arrowhead Road and 30th Street (two miles) in the city of San Bernardino.
3. SR 39 (Beach Boulevard), between Starr Street and Hazard Avenue (4.5 miles) in the cities of Westminster and Stanton.
4. SR 86 (Main Street/1st Street/Brawley Avenue), between Las Flores Drive and Legion Road (2 miles) in the city of Brawley.

Community Workshops Overview

As part of the project's community engagement efforts, community workshops were held virtually between April 2026 and May 2026 to share the results of the existing conditions analysis and gather community input on corridor priorities and needs. Participants learned about findings from the existing conditions data analysis, walk audits, and surveys and shared priorities, concerns, and ideas for improvements.

Participants were guided through several discussion questions. Topics included: where people bike (or don't bike) and why, where people feel unsafe walking and crossing, where vehicle speeding occurs, where additional crosswalks would be beneficial, and what the "one big move" for the corridor should be. A digital whiteboard was used to capture discussion notes. Community feedback will inform potential safety, mobility, and placemaking recommendations along the project corridor.

SR 1: Lomita

April 16, 2026 | 6-7 pm

Attendees included representatives from South Bay Cities Council of Governments, Caltrans District 12, and the City of Lomita, as well as five residents, for a total of 9 participants.

Affiliation	Attendees
Caltrans District 12	1
City of Lomita	3
Resident	4
South Bay Cities Council of Governments	1

Discussion Questions

- If you bike in this area, where do you typically ride a bike and why? Where don't you ride and why?
- Where does congestion occur most?
- Where do you most often see vehicle speeding happen?
- Where would additional crosswalks be beneficial?
- What is the ONE big move you want to see on the corridor?

Summary of Input

Biking: Participants preferred biking on lower-speed neighborhood streets (255th Street and 250th Street) and generally avoided SR 1 (Pacific Coast Highway) due to concerns about personal safety, traffic speeds, noise, and stressful riding conditions.

Congestion: Participants identified most congestion occurring between Pennsylvania Avenue and Oak Street, particularly during afternoon peak periods and school pick-up and drop-off times.

Vehicle Speeding: Participants identified ongoing traffic signal synchronization issues and noted concerns about nighttime speeding when traffic volumes were lower.

Pedestrian Crossings: Participants felt that existing pedestrian crossings provided adequate visibility and crossing time. They raised concerns about adding mid-block crosswalks.

Priorities: Participants identified creating a more seamless and connected local travel network across South Bay communities as a major priority. They supported improvements that would make the corridor more comfortable and people-oriented while cautioning that some roadway design changes could unintentionally increase vehicle speeds.

SR 1: Los Angeles

April 20, 2026 | 6-7 p.m.

Attendees included representatives from South Bay Cities Council of Governments, Caltrans District 7, Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), California Transportation Commission, Toole Design, Raimi+Associates, Overstreet, the Rampart Village Neighborhood Council, and five residents, for a total of 14 participants.

Affiliation	Attendees
California Transportation Commission	1
LADOT	1
Los Angeles County Department of Public Health	1
Overstreet	1
Raimi+Associates	1
Rampart Village Neighborhood Council	1
Resident	5
South Bay Cities Council of Governments	1
Toole Design	1

Discussion Questions

- If you bike in this area, where do you typically ride a bike and why? Where don't you ride and why?
- Where should access to the park be improved or added?
- Where do you most often see vehicle speeding happen?
- Where would additional crosswalks be beneficial?
- What is the ONE big move you want to see on the corridor?

Summary of Input

Biking: Participants supported making SR 1 (Pacific Coast Highway) a continuous, bikeable corridor and emphasized its importance as an iconic coastal route. Due to high vehicle speeds, they expressed a preference for protected bike lanes with separation from vehicular traffic.

Pedestrian and Cyclist Barrier: Participants identified freeway crossings at I-110 and I-710 as major barriers and safety "pinch points" for pedestrians and cyclists.

Park Access: Participants identified limited and unclear access points at Banning Park as contributing to informal entry across the grass. They noted that students frequently used the park as a cut-through route after school. Participants also expressed concerns that the high presence of trucks and on-street parking near the park creates an uninviting and unsafe environment for pedestrians and cyclists.

Vehicle Speeding: Participants observed speeding throughout the corridor, especially on wide roadway segments with "runway-like" street designs. They expressed support for reducing speed limits to lower the likelihood and severity of crashes.

Additional Crosswalks: Participants recommended additional crosswalks near the high-activity area (Avalon Boulevard to Eubank Avenue) and transit stops.

Roundabouts: Participants expressed interest in replacing signalized intersections with roundabouts to help calm traffic.

SR 1: Long Beach

April 27, 2026 | 6-7 p.m.

Attendees included representatives from Caltrans Districts 7 and 12, the Office of State Senator Lena A. Gonzalez (D-Southeast Los Angeles), the Long Beach Gray Panthers, a Long Beach disability rights advocate, and five residents for a total of 10 participants.

Affiliation	Attendees
Caltrans District 12	1
Caltrans District 7	1
Long Beach disability rights advocate	1
Long Beach Gray Panthers	1
Office of State Senator Lena A. Gonzalez (D-Southeast Los Angeles)	1
Resident	5

Discussion Questions

- If you bike in this area, where do you typically ride a bike and why? Where don't you ride and why?
- Where should connections to the L.A. River be improved or added?
- Where do you most often see vehicle speeding happen?
- Where would additional crosswalks be beneficial?
- What is the ONE big move you want to see on the corridor?

Summary of Input

Biking: Participants identified bike safety concerns related to blind spots and truck activity around the I-710 freeway crossing. They expressed support for protected bike lanes, buffered lanes, and shorter pedestrian crossings on SR 1 (Pacific Coast Highway).

L.A. River Connections: Participants recommended improving bicycle and pedestrian connections at Santa Fe Avenue, particularly for families and children accessing the LA River path. They also emphasized the need for clearer signage at L.A. River path access points, including street identification for entrances and exits.

Vehicle Speeding: Participants identified Santa Fe Avenue as a key speeding concern area. Participants also noted speeding and weaving during rush hour near I-710 off-ramps.

Additional Crosswalks: Participants expressed support for additional and improved crosswalks at all feasible intersections.

Trees: Participants supported adding more trees and greenery to provide shade, improve air quality, and offset corridor emissions.

Priorities: Participants identified sidewalk widening as a major priority, emphasizing the need for facilities wide enough to accommodate people using mobility devices or pushing carts. They also expressed strong support for protected Class IV bicycle facilities, preferably at sidewalk level.

SR 18: San Bernardino

April 13, 2026 | 6-7 p.m.

Attendees included representatives from Caltrans Districts 8 and 9, OmniTrans, the cities of Adelanto, San Bernardino, and Victorville, the town of Apple Valley, the county of Ventura, several community-based organizations, and six residents for a total of 24 participants.

Affiliation	Attendees
Caltrans District 8	4
Caltrans District 9	1
Carrillo Group CANY	1
City of Adelanto	1
City of San Bernardino	1
City of Victorville	1
County of Ventura	1
LaunchPad Collective	1
NENA San Bernardino	1
OmniTrans	1
Residents	6
Town of Apple Valley	1
Unaffiliated/Not Provided	3
Vision y Compromiso	1

Discussion Questions

- Where do you feel unsafe walking or crossing SR 18?
- Where would additional crosswalks be beneficial?
- Where are school-related safety improvements most needed?
- What school-related safety improvements are needed?
- Where do you most often see vehicle speeding happen?
- What is the ONE big move you want to see on the corridor?

Summary of Input

Unsafe Conditions: Participants identified safety concerns at Waterman Avenue and 40th Street, describing it as an area with frequent crashes. They also noted that driveways along the east side, which provide side and rear property access, make entering and exiting properties feel unsafe.

Poor Visibility: Participants described Waterman Avenue and Marshall Boulevard as unsafe due to poor visibility for pedestrians. They reported being unable to see approaching vehicles until they moved partially into the intersection.

School-Related Safety Improvements: Participants emphasized the need for safe routes to school improvements, including high-visibility crosswalks, curb bulb-outs, and signage near schools.

Vehicle Speeding: Participants observed speeding by vehicles traveling downhill from the mountains and identified Waterman Avenue and 40th Street as a major speeding hotspot. They emphasized the need for speed reduction measures, such as speed humps.

Trees: Participants recommended planting appropriate trees in planter strips along the east side of Waterman Avenue and in front of schools to create shade, enhance the tree canopy, calm traffic, and improve air quality.

Road Diet: Participants recommended a road diet that would narrow travel lanes and reallocate roadway space for Class II bicycle lanes and sidewalks.

Connection to Wildwood Park: Participants recommended providing connections to Wildwood Park to enhance access to this regional destination.

SR 39: Stanton

May 4, 2026 | 6-7 p.m.

Attendees included representatives from the city of Anaheim, city of Garden Grove, Caltrans District 12, Orange County Transportation Authority, and community organization, Abrazar, for a total of five participants.

Affiliation	Attendees
Abrazar	1
Caltrans District 12	1
City of Anaheim	1
City of Garden Grove	1
Orange County Transportation Authority	1

Discussion Questions

- If you bike in this area, where do you typically ride a bike and why? Where don't you ride and why?
- Where do you feel unsafe walking or crossing SR 39?
- Where do you most often see vehicle speeding happen?
- Where would additional crosswalks be beneficial?
- What is the ONE big move you want to see on the corridor?

Summary of Input

Biking: Participants reported feeling unsafe biking on Beach Boulevard and often used sidewalks or neighborhood streets (Dale Street and Western Avenue) instead.

Unsafe Conditions: Participants described freeway underpasses as unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists due to poor lighting, traffic conflicts, high-speed ramps, and unhoused encampments. They noted that several stretches of Beach Boulevard feel dark and uncomfortable at night, with hedges and long walls reducing visibility.

Pedestrian Safety: Participants identified the Garden Grove Boulevard and Beach Boulevard intersection as a major pedestrian safety concern due to long crossings, heavy traffic, and freeway ramp activity.

Additional Crosswalks: Participants suggested that additional signalized crossings may be beneficial near Cerritos Avenue.

Sidewalk Improvements: Participants recommended improving sidewalk conditions and accessibility, including removing obstructions such as poles located in the middle of sidewalks.

Pedestrian Comfort Improvements: Participants recommended adding pedestrian-scale lighting, greenery, and shade, as well as narrowing lane widths to improve pedestrian comfort.

SR 39: Westminster

April 30, 2026 | 6-7 p.m.

Attendees included representatives from the city of Westminster, city of Garden Grove, Caltrans District 12, and Orange County Transportation Authority for a total of five participants.

Affiliation	Attendees
Caltrans District 12	1
City of Garden Grove	1
City of Westminster	2
Orange County Transportation Authority	1

Discussion Questions

- If you bike in this area, where do you typically ride a bike and why? Where don't you ride and why?
- Where do you feel unsafe walking or crossing SR 39?
- Where do you most often see vehicle speeding happen?
- Where would additional crosswalks be beneficial?
- What is the ONE big move you want to see on the corridor?

Summary of Input

Biking: Participants reported avoiding biking on SR 39 due to wide roadways, high traffic volumes, and feeling unsafe near fast-moving vehicles. When necessary, they ride their bikes on the sidewalk.

Unsafe Walking Conditions: Participants described walking as uncomfortable and unsafe due to vehicle speeds, "wind tunnel" effects from traffic, and a lack of shade.

Vehicle Speeding: Participants noted that speeding along the corridor is influenced by proximity to the freeway, where drivers are either accelerating to enter or exiting at high speeds. There was consensus on the need for traffic calming measures.

Additional Crosswalks: Participants identified additional crosswalks as beneficial near bus stops.

Sidewalk Improvements: Participants expressed interest in wider sidewalks, with a parkway separating pedestrian areas from sidewalk-level protected bike facilities (Class IV, where feasible).

Pedestrian Comfort Improvements: Participants recommended adding pedestrian-scale lighting and greenery to improve pedestrian comfort.

SR 86: Brawley

May 11, 2026 | 6-7 p.m.

Attendees included representatives from the city of Brawley, Brawley Elementary School District, Streets Are for Everyone, Caltrans District 11, and residents for a total of 13 participants.

Affiliation	Attendees
Brawley Elementary School District	1
Caltrans District 11	1
City of Brawley	5
Resident	1
Streets Are For Everyone	1
Unaffiliated/Not Provided	4

Discussion Questions

- What improvements would you like to see relating to school traffic?
- Where do you feel unsafe walking or crossing SR 86?
- Where do you most often see vehicle speeding happen?
- Where would additional crosswalks be beneficial?
- What is the ONE big move you want to see on the corridor?

Summary of Input

School Safety Concern: Participants expressed concern about speeding near schools, particularly during pick-up and drop-off times. They suggested adding signage and flashing beacons near schools.

Unsafe Walking Conditions: Participants identified utility poles along the corridor as barriers to sidewalk accessibility and continuity. They also noted that the corridor's wide roadway creates an uncomfortable and unsafe environment for pedestrians.

Vehicle Speeding: Participants identified the stretch between J Street and Main Street as a common speeding area. They also observed speeding on Main Street approaching Vons, with vehicles slowing down closer to the store.

Additional Crosswalks: Participants suggested that additional marked crossings may be beneficial near the hotels on Main Street, where pedestrians frequently cross outside designated crosswalks due to long distances between crossings. They also identified I Street between Main Street and K Street as a location where an additional marked crosswalk and pedestrian signage may be beneficial.

Biking Improvements: Participants recommended improving bicycle access and connectivity along SR 86. Currently, bicyclists avoid the corridor and use neighborhood streets instead.



MAIN OFFICE

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

900 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 1700
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Tel: (213) 236-1800
www.scag.ca.gov

REGIONAL OFFICES

IMPERIAL COUNTY

1503 N. Imperial Ave., Ste. 104
El Centro, CA 92243
Tel: (213) 236-1967

INLAND EMPIRE

3403 10th St., Ste. 805
Riverside, CA 92501
Tel: (951) 784-1513

ORANGE COUNTY

OCTA Building
600 S. Main St., Ste. 1108
Orange, CA 92868
Tel: (213) 630-1599

VENTURA COUNTY

4001 Mission Oaks Blvd., Ste. L
Camarillo, CA 93012
Tel: (213) 236-1960