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Agenda

- 2017 ATP Regional Program/Sustainability Planning Grant Active Transportation Call for Projects
- OCCOG Complete Streets Handbook and Funding Toolkit
- Health and Economic Impact Study
- Active Transportation Database
- Go Human Update
- Other Funding Opportunities
2017 ATP Regional Program/ Sustainability Planning Grant Active Transportation Call for Projects

July 20, 2016

Stephen Patchan
Active Transportation and Special Programs
2017 Active Transportation Program

- 3 Funding Programs
- Cycle 3 total funds=~$240 M
- Funding Breakdown:

  - **Small Urban and Rural**
    - 10%
  - **Statewide**
    - 50%
  - **MPO**
    - 40%

  **SCAG Regional Program**

  - $50 million
  - Fiscal Years 2019-2020, 2020-2021
2017 ATP Regional Guidelines

- **June 7, 2016**: SCAG Regional Guidelines were approved by SCAG Regional Council.
- **August 17, 2016**: SCAG Regional Guidelines will be approved by the California Transportation Commission.
2017 ATP Regional Guidelines

- 25% set aside for Disadvantaged Communities
- Infrastructure project funding will be allocated using population based funding targets for each County.
- Planning projects must be in Disadvantaged Communities.
- 2% Planning Cap
- Supplemental Call for Projects to fund planning and capacity building projects: Sustainability Grant Program-Active Transportation (SPG-AT)
2017 ATP Schedule

- **August/September 2016:** Evaluation Window
- **October 28, 2016:** CTC staff recommendations for statewide/small urban/rural projects
- **December 7-8, 2016:** CTC adopts statewide and small urban/rural projects
- **January 27, 2017:** Deadline for SCAG Regional Program Recommendations
- **February 2, 2016** SCAG Regional Council Approval
- **March 2017:** CTC adopts SCAG Regional Program
2017 ATP: Key Issues

- Alignment of process with regional and countywide plans
- Application complexity
- “One-size-fits all” application
- 50%+ SCAG jurisdictions don’t have plans
2017 ATP Approach

- Use CTC application/project selection for Capital Projects (No change from Cycle 1,2)

- Planning & Capacity Building Call for Projects
  - “New” applicants only
  - Project requests <$200,000
  - $2.5+ M available

- Coordinate with Sustainability Planning Grant Program to expand resources/eligibility
Sustainability Call for Proposals

- Grant program support since 2005 for local planning efforts throughout SCAG region
- 2013 Call for Proposals
  - 70 projects
  - $9 million
- Categories
  - Active Transportation
  - Green Region
  - Integrated Land Use & Transportation
Funding Strategy

- Multi-year Budget: FY 16-17, 17-18, 18-19
- Multiple Funding Sources
  - SCAG (CPG, TDA)
  - ATP Regional Program—Planning & NI Funds
  - MSRC (tentative)
- Fund Estimate to be released in September
Active Transportation Guidelines

- Eligible Projects
  - Plans (DAC, non-DAC)
  - Programs
  - Capacity Building
- County Funding Targets (minimums)
- SCAG-CTC Evaluation Teams (1 per county)
- ATP Scoring Criteria
The goals of the SPG-AT program are to:

- Expand *GoHuman* by increasing funding and inviting more cities and counties to host demonstration projects and events.
- Integrate multiple funding streams to increase the overall budget for active transportation planning and capacity building projects.
- Seed active transportation concepts within a wide range of communities and provide a preliminary step for future ATP applicants.
- Continue to foster jurisdictional support and promote implementation of the goals, objectives and strategies of 2016 RTP/SCS.
The following entities, within the SCAG region, are eligible to apply for SPG-AT funds:

- **Local or Regional Agency** - Examples include cities, counties, Regional Transportation Planning Agency and County Public Health Departments.

- **Transit Agencies** - Any agency responsible for public transportation that is eligible for funds under the Federal Transit Administration.

- **Public schools or School districts**

- **Tribal Governments** - Federally-recognized Native American Tribes.
SPG-AT Project Types

- Community or Area-Wide Active Transportation Plans (maximum award: $200,000)
- Non-Infrastructure Projects (maximum award: $200,000)
- Project Level Planning Exercises (Maximum project award: $50,000)
Community or Area-Wide Active Transportation Plans

Examples of eligible plans include:

- Community-wide Active Transportation Master Plan
- Community-wide Bicycle or Pedestrian Master Plan
- Safe Routes to School Master Plan
- First-Last Mile Plans (active transportation improvements only)
- Neighborhood Mobility Area (NMA) Plan (active transportation only). See RTP/SCS for description of NMAs.
Non-Infrastructure Projects

Examples of eligible projects include:

- Development and implementation of bike-to-work or walk-to-work school day/month programs.
- Conducting bicycle and/or pedestrian counts, walkability and/or bicycle friendly assessments or audits, or pedestrian and/or bicycle safety analysis.
- Conducting pedestrian and bicycle safety education programs.
- Development and publishing of community walking and biking maps, including school route/travel plans.
- Development and implementation of walking school bus or bike train programs.
- Open Streets Event directly linked to the promotion of a new infrastructure project or designed to promote walking and biking on a daily basis.
Project Level Planning Exercises

- Examples of eligible projects include:
  - Site Level Plan
  - Corridor Studies/Plans
  - Design Charrettes
  - Capacity Building/Educational Initiatives
  - Other
### Scoring Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #1: Project Need</th>
<th>50 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged Communities</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #2: Project Goals, Objectives and Outcomes</th>
<th>35 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Participation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #3: Partnerships and Leveraging</th>
<th>15 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leveraging</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Participation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SPG-AT Schedule

- **September 2016** Call for Projects Open
- **November 11, 2016** Application Deadline
- **December 21, 2016** Staff Recommendations
- **December 21, 2016 to January 27, 2017**
  County Transportation Commission Approvals
- **February 2, 2016** SCAG Regional Council Approval
- **March 2017 CTC** adopts Regional Program
Orange County Council of Governments

Complete Streets

SCAG Presentation

19 July, 2016
Introduction

Role of OCCOG

- Funding
- Procurement and Project Management

Stakeholder Engagement

- Needs Assessment Survey – 100% return
- Face to face meeting with all 35 jurisdictions
- Also Caltrans, Transportation Corridor Agencies and Building Industry Association
- 3 Public Workshops
Study aims

Goal:

- Inform the design and operation of a transportation network that enables safe access for all users, regardless of age, ability or mode of transportation

Study objectives:

- Provide policy to help jurisdictions meet California Complete Streets Act (2008)
- Provide design guidance to help planners and engineers design streets that are more complete

Output:

- The OC Complete Streets Handbook and Funding Toolkit
- Guidance, not mandatory

“The Orange County Complete Streets Initiative (OCCSI) is a tool to help realise Complete Streets in Orange County

It is written to be used by all - local communities, jurisdictions, agencies, advocacy groups, developers, elected officials and more – to understand what Complete Streets are, how to shape policies to help deliver them, how to design them, and how to evaluate success”
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Vision Statement

Complete Streets in Orange County communities offer safety, comfort and convenience for all streets users, regardless of transport mode, user age, or ability.

Complete Streets are designed in response to their unique local context in Orange County, while also recognizing their role in moving people and goods from one place to another, and also as spaces for people to recreate, exercise, conduct business, engage in community activities and interact with their neighbors.

The implementation of Complete Streets will benefit Orange County communities through decreased numbers of and severity of traffic collisions; reduced expenditure on road-widening; increased physical activity and reduced health risks; reduced consumption of resources and a cleaner environment; and encouraging local spending and supporting economic vitality.
Orange County Street types

- Different types of streets mapped against both movement and place axes
- Position varies according to how ‘local’ or significant they are in terms of movement and place
- Nine broad types identified that recognizes the diversity of streets and roads in Orange County
- The movement and place concept works with existing designations of streets
Policy Framework

- A tool and resource to aid Orange County jurisdictions in the development of written policies related to Complete Streets

- The policy framework provides
  - A summary of various policy and planning tools and processes
  - Guidance on how to develop written policy
Policy Guidance

- The document provides guidance on how to develop written policy for Complete Streets that meets the ten best practice elements defined by the National Complete Streets Coalition
- For each of the ten elements guidance is given on what should be covered to write two types of policy
  - Basic level
  - Advanced level
- Best practice examples of policies written elsewhere are also given
Design Goals

A set of ten overarching goals to complement the delivery of Complete Streets

- Create safer cities
- Reinforce walkability
- Ensure connectivity
- Improve bicycle networks
- Maintain vehicular mobility
- Integrate transit networks
- Effective truck and goods movement
- Design for sustainable streets
- Promote streets as public spaces
- Promote context-sensitive design and neighborhood character
Movement priorities

- A layered street network prioritizes streets for a specific mode (or multiple modes)
- This approach recognizes that not all complete streets are the same
Existing roadway classifications and OCCSH street types

- The existing street designation classification is the starting point
- The purpose of the OCCSH street classification is to encourages users to consider the streets context

| TABLE 1: COMPARISON OF STREET TYPOLOGIES WITH EXISTING ROADWAY CLASSIFICATIONS |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                                  | Multimodal Freeway Corridor      | Movement Corridor  | Mixed Land Use Corridor Hub | Industrial / Business Park Street | Neighborhood Main Street | Downtown Street | Alley | Residential Street | Shared Street |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| OCCSI categories:                 |                                  |                   |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Position on movement and place matrix:|                                  |                   |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| FREWAY OR THE TOLL ROADS          |                                  |                   |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Transportation Corridor:          | **✓**                           |                   |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| MPAH CLASSIFICATIONS              |                                  |                   |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Principal Arterial:               | **✓**                           | **✓**             |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Major Arterial:                   | **✓**                           | **✓**             |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Primary Arterial:                 | **✓**                           | **✓**             | **✓**           |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Secondary Arterial:               | S=                           | S=               | S=             |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Divided Collector Arterial:       | S=                           | S=               | S=             |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Smart Streets (Special Designation): | S=                           | S=               | S=             |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Collector Arterial:               | S=                           | S=               | S=             |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| UNCLASSIFIED ROADS                | S=                           | S=               | S=             |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Other local roads                 | S=                           | S=               | S=             |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
Orange County Complete Streets

Street types

- Multimodal Freeway Corridor
- Movement Corridor
- Mixed Land Use Corridor / Hub
- Industrial / Business Park Street
- Neighborhood Main Street
- Downtown Street
- Alley
- Residential Street
- Shared Street
Technical Guidance

- Street design strategy
- Pedestrian environment components
- Bicycle and non automobile components
- Roadway components
- Intersections and crossings
- Transit components
- Curbside management
- Place-making
- Landscape and ecology
Street Design Strategy and Components

- Design strategy for street geometry, layout, and placement of items within it
- Design guidance for streetscape components
Complete Street project implemented - Del Prado, Dana Point
Complete street components
Project types and implementation processes

- Street Improvement / retrofit projects
  - Roadway reconstruction
  - Utility replacement
  - Modal improvement
  - Maintenance
- Development related projects
  - Upgrade ROW adjacent to a development
  - Large scale masterplanning
- Outline process of implementation
Capital and maintenance costs

- Integrating with city planning and operations
- Working within existing budgets
- Obtaining funding for specific projects
- Working with developers
- Holding temporary events
The Funding Toolkit - Document aims

- “This funding toolkit is intended to complement the OCCOG Complete Streets Initiative Design Handbook by providing a baseline understanding of how to secure grant funding for complete street initiatives”
Contents

Part A: Funding Toolkit
- The Grant Life Cycle

Part B: Successful Grant Case Studies
- 4 Case Studies

Part C: Preparing a Grant Budget
- Characteristics of a Grant Budget
- How to Develop a Cost Budget

Appendices
- Grant Application Quick Reference Checklist
- Costs for Retrofitting Complete Streets
- Costs for New Build Complete Streets
- Costs by Item
- Existing & Future Funding Sources
Orange County
Complete Streets

Funding Toolkit - The Grant Life Cycle

- The Pre-Announcement Phase
- Pre-Award Phase Part 1: Funding Opportunity Announcement and Application
- Pre-Award Phase Part 2: Grant Making Authority Review of Applications
- The Award Phase
- The Post Award Phase
Preparing a Grant Budget

- Characteristics of a Grant Budget
- How to Develop a Cost Budget
- What to include
- Justifications
- Match Funding
- Budget Variations and Risks
- Long term Funding Post Grant
- Useful Resources
- Cost Estimates
- Funding Sources
Questions
Contact Details

- **OCCOG**
  - Marnie Primmer - edoccog@gmail.com
  - Marika Poynter - mpoynter@ci.irvine.ca.us

- **Steer Davies Gleave**
  - Lisa Buchanan - Lisa.Buchanan@sdgworld.net
  - Peter Piet - peter.piet@sdgworld.net
  - Geoff England – geoff.england@sdgworld.net
  - Richard Crappsley – richard.crappsley@sdgworld.net

- **Fehr & Peers**
  - Jason Pack - J.Pack@fehrandpeers.com

- **Leslie Scott Consulting**
  - Leslie Scott - lesscottco@aol.com
Health and Economic Impact Study
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Background

**Goal:** Estimate current annual public health, transportation and economic costs and benefits of bicycling and walking on the SCAG region’s economy

**Key Elements:**
- Build from evidence and best practices
- Use local data when available
- Identify appropriate non-local data when needed
- Develop a study process for use by local partners
- Monetize previously modeled health benefits of RTP/SCS
How Do We Monetize the Benefits of Active Transportation Infrastructure?

By assessing the built environment and travel pattern behaviors, cases of hypertension, heart disease, and diabetes can be understood as events prevented by physical activity attributed to active transportation infrastructure. By applying cost-of-illness figures, the prevented cases can be translated into predicted savings and monetized health outcomes through the following process:

1. **Characterize Built Environment**
   - Studies suggest somewhere between 40% and 60% of physical activity is due to available infrastructure like bike lanes and sidewalks. This analysis conservatively attributes **the first 50% of active travel** to land use destinations or basic transportation needs, and the remainder to active transportation infrastructure.

2. **Model Physical Activity**
   - Assuming 50% of active travel is attributable to infrastructure, the active transportation system prompts the average adult to spend **18.3 minutes of walking** for transport and **2.4 minutes of biking** each week.

3. **Model Public Health**
   - These minutes spent in active travel equate to preventing **70,621 cases of hypertension**, **7,132 cases of heart disease**, and **16,151 cases of diabetes** in adults ages 18-64. In those over age 65, an additional **14,153 cases of hypertension**, **6,884 cases of heart disease**, and **13,673 cases of diabetes** are prevented.

4. **Apply Cost-of-Illness**
   - The cases prevented by the SCAG region’s active transportation system saves **$275.5 million** in health-related costs each year from physical activity in adults ages 18-64. An additional **$212.5 million** in health-related costs would be saved from those over age 65, for a total regional savings of **$488 million** in health related costs each year.
Draft Infographics

Active Transportation Usage in the SCAG Region

In the California the average trip per day per person is **3.6 trips per day**. Collectively, individuals in the SCAG region alone make **8.6 million active transportation trips** (walk, bike, or walk to transit) daily. Of those, the vast majority are the **6.7 million walk trips** for a total daily distance of **14.5 million miles**.

![Graph showing daily trips by mode](image)

- **1.33 Miles** Walked
- **6.02 Miles** Biked
- **8.58 Miles** Traveled by Transit
- **6.20 Miles** Driven in 2-Person Carpool
- **7.33 Miles** Driven Alone

**Average Length of Trip by Mode**

- **3.3 Million** Hours of Daily Walk Trips
- **1.9 Million** Hours of Daily Bike Trips
- **139 Thousand** Hours of Daily Walk to Transit Trips
## SCAG Region Economic Burden of Disease

Chronic diseases are costly, contributing to both health care expenditures and lost productivity expenses. Using econometric modeling, cost-of-illness studies calculate a “per case” estimate of additional spending attributable to diabetes, heart disease, and hypertension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>6.6% 753,000 Cases</td>
<td>21.1% 428,000 Cases</td>
<td>$7,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart Disease</td>
<td>3.4% 391,000 Cases</td>
<td>19.2% 488,000 Cases</td>
<td>$4,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>22.0% 2,514,000 Cases</td>
<td>61.1% 1,238,000 Cases</td>
<td>$551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$12.8 Billion

Total annual regional costs of diabetes, heart disease, and hypertension in ages 18-64. Seniors add an additional $8.5 billion in health costs for the same conditions.
### Draft Infographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Condition</th>
<th>Expected Increase in Prevalence without Active Transportation Infrastructure (Ages 18-64)</th>
<th>Estimated SCAG Region Health Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>0.14% 16,151 Cases</td>
<td>$179M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart Disease</td>
<td>0.06% 7,132 Cases</td>
<td>$54M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>0.60% 70,621 Cases</td>
<td>$42M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**$275 Million**

Estimated total annual physical activity health savings for ages 18-64 due to avoided health care expenditures and increased productivity.

- $82M
- $193M

- Direct costs (health care savings)
- Indirect costs (increased productivity)
Monetized Health Benefits Per Capita for Adults (18-64) by County

- **Diabetes**
- **Heart Disease**
- **Hypertension**

**Los Angeles**
- Total: $23.58
- Diabetes: $15.45 ($3.59 on hypertension)
- Heart Disease: $4.54
- Hypertension: $3.30

**Orange County**
- Total: $20.11
- Diabetes: $12.49
- Heart Disease: $4.31
- Hypertension: $3.30

**Riverside**
- Total: $26.52
- Diabetes: $17.36
- Heart Disease: $5.36
- Hypertension: $3.80

**San Bernardino**
- Total: $25.59
- Diabetes: $16.89
- Heart Disease: $4.93
- Hypertension: $3.77

**Ventura**
- Total: $23.06
- Diabetes: $14.61
- Heart Disease: $4.77
- Hypertension: $3.68
Predicted Annual Physical Activity Savings in 2040 for Adults (Age 18-64)

- Diabetes: $167M
- Heart Disease: $122M
- Hypertension: $48M
Consumer Costs of Active Transportation

Travel costs vary by mode for residents in the SCAG region. Consumers spend money throughout the year on active transportation items such as tires, clothing, shoes, helmets, and parts. While these costs add up, it is relatively cheaper to own and maintain a bicycle ($0.05 per mile) compared to owning a car ($1.22 per mile).

$62M
Annual consumer cost of walking a daily 9.6 million miles daily to destinations and transit

$91M
Annual consumer cost of the upkeep of biking a daily 4.9 million miles daily
2.3M
Estimated annual vehicle-miles traveled that could be eliminated in the year 2040 through RTP active transportation programming

$976M
Potential annual savings in the year 2040 from estimated reduced vehicle-miles traveled
Economic Impact of Active Transportation

Communities sometimes look to running or biking events as a community or economic development strategy. Large running events, such as the Los Angeles Marathon, generate the greatest revenue per participant. Conversely, open streets events, such as CicLAvia, generate very little revenue per participant, in part due to the lack of registration fees.

$697
Large Running Event

$208
Medium/Small Running Event

$180
Bike Races

$180
Triathlons

$180
Novelty Races

$5
Other Open Streets

$2
CicLAvia

$10.5M
Estimated revenue generated per large running event

$200M
Approximate spending of cycling, running, and walking participants in SCAG region active transportation events
Next Steps

- REMI Inputs Include
  - Infrastructure Costs
  - Vehicle Operations
  - Retail Sales
  - Mobility
  - Health Care
- Summarize Final Results
- Present Results to Technical Working Group
Takeaways

- Estimates of health care savings are conservative
  - Only includes 18-64 year olds (senior costs tend to be higher)
  - Attributes last 50% of active minutes to infrastructure
- Estimates are for only three diseases
  - Does not include full spectrum of benefits (obesity related chronic diseases)
- Small improvements in chronic disease rates can lead to large savings
Background

- Released in 2012
- Allows storage of manual counts
- Primarily focused on bicyclists
Goals of the Update

- Integrate Pedestrian Data
- Improve Usability
- Improve Data Retrieval and Reporting
- Support Mobile App Integration
- Provide a Planning Tool for ATP and other Projects
- Integrate Automated Counters
- Support Regional Modeling Efforts
Preliminary Timeline

- May (2016)-Kick Off
- August (2016)-Strategic Plan
- December-January (2016)-Beta Version
  - Database
  - Applications
  - Automated Counter Interface
- April (2017)-Public Release/Trainings
Stakeholder Survey

Southern California Active Transportation Safety & Encouragement Campaign

Active Transportation Working Group

July 20, 2016

Julia Lippe-Klein
Open Streets/Demo Projects:
Fontana’s Sunset on Sierra 7/30

Saturday, July 30, 2016
sábado, 30 de julio de 2016
5 pm – 10 pm

Fontana’s Sunset on Sierra
Open Streets/Demo Projects: Phase 2 Jurisdictions

October 2016 – May 2017

Comprehensive Events (7)
- Orange County (OC) Loop
- City of Riverside
- City of Rialto
- City of Cudahy
- City of Long Beach
- City of Rancho Cucamonga
- City of Fullerton

Programming Events (2)
- City of Santa Ana
- City of Garden Grove
Go Human Toolbox Content

- Best Practices & Case Studies
- How to Take Action
- Using Data for Active Transportation Decision Making
- Grant Funding 101: Tips & Checklists
- How to Work with the Media
- Conducting Bicycle Trainings
- Hosting Group Rides
- Conducting Walk & Bike Audits
- Developing Open Streets Events
- Promoting Active Transportation at Work
- Commuter Program Start Kit
- FAQs & County Specific Data
Bicycle Workshops + Group Rides

• “Need to Know” Bicycle Safety Workshops offered across the region throughout August (15 total) – 2 hrs.

• 1 Group Ride per County to explore best practice bike facilities

• Target audience: Community champions, elected officials, city planners, transportation and health professionals, community groups, and employers

• Trainings and rides facilitated by two League of American Bicyclists LCIs
Updates

• Award: National Association of Government Communicators recognized *Go Human* at the 2016 Blue Pencil & Gold Screen Awards (brand identity and transit shelter poster designs)

• Op Ed: “It’s not just a sign: 4 Reasons why “Bikes May Use Full Lane”
  
  Al Murray, Tustin Councilmember, OCTA Director, former Irvine police lieutenant
  
  OC Register, July 2016

• Parking Day – September 16th
  
  Partnership opportunities

• Cross promoting events – What’s happening in your community?
More information:

Open Streets & Temporary Events
Stephen Patchan
patchan@scag.ca.gov

Toolbox/Trainings & Bicycle Classes

Alan Thompson
thompson@scag.ca.gov

Julia Lippe-Klein
Lippe-klein@scag.ca.gov
Upcoming Funding Opportunities

July 20, 2016

Sarah Jepson and Stephen Patchan
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Big Jump Project

- The Big Jump Project is a three-year effort to help 10 places achieve a big jump in biking – a doubling or tripling of people riding – by building a network of safe and comfortable places to ride and engaging the community.

- [http://www.peopleforbikes.org/pages/the-big-jump-project-application](http://www.peopleforbikes.org/pages/the-big-jump-project-application)
Big Jump Project

- The goal is also to validate a core concept: that if a city does all the right things, more people will ride and the community will be a better place to live, work and play.

- Information Webinar **Thursday, July 21, 2016 at 10am PT.**

- [https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/rt/3267665370435146756](https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/rt/3267665370435146756).