2017 Working Group Outlook

- Summer 2017/Winter 2018 – Listening Sessions
- Spring 2018 – Draft Public Health Framework
- Summer 2018 – Review with Stakeholders
- Fall 2018 – Policy Committee Approval
Regional Transportation Plan

- Integrated Land-Use and Transportation Plan
- Developed through “bottoms-up” process that respects city control
- Aims to meet state-adopted GHG reduction targets for 2020, 2035
- First RTP/SCS adopted April 2012
- 2016 RTP/SCS adopted April 2016
Public Health Framework

- Broad document summarizing Working Group Feedback
- Used for as a base for future outreach with regional stakeholders including sub-regions and county agencies
- Highlight focus areas for SCAG to begin early data collection and analysis
Listening Sessions

- Thematic review of focus areas in the plan
- Discussion of new possible analysis related to each area and identification of data needs
- Discussion of how the Health Analysis in the RTP/SCS can be improved as a planning tool for local jurisdictions and stakeholders
2016 RTP/SCS: Public Health Plan Analysis Focus Areas

- Physical Activity
- Affordable Housing
- Economic Opportunity
- Climate Adaptation
- Access
- Transportation Safety
- Air Quality

Public Health Appendix

Listening Session Schedule

- March – Economy and Housing
- August – Climate and Air Quality
- February – Access and Physical Activity
- Spring – Health Equity and Environmental Justice
- Spring – Draft Framework
## Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant Performance Measures</th>
<th>Public Health Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional jobs supported by improving competitiveness</td>
<td>Regional Economic Model REMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional jobs supported by transportation investments</td>
<td>Regional Economic Model REMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net contribution to Gross Regional Product</td>
<td>Regional Economic Model REMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions</td>
<td>Travel Demand Model/ARB ENRAC Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of growth in High Quality Transit Areas (NODA)</td>
<td>RTP/SCS socio-economic small area data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average distance for work and non-work trips</td>
<td>Travel Demand Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of trips less than 3 miles</td>
<td>Travel Demand Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Trip Length Duration</td>
<td>Travel Demand Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Consumption</td>
<td>Scenario Planning Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode share of walking and bicycling</td>
<td>Travel Demand Model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Access to Essential Destinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Result of Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2040 Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of growth in High Quality Transit Areas (HQTAs) from Base Year (% of Households in HQTAs)</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs/Housing Balance in HQTAs</td>
<td>36% Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average distance for work trips (miles)</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average distance for non-work trips (miles)</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of work trips less than 3 miles</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of non-work trips less than 3 miles</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Trip Length Duration</td>
<td>Auto 25.3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit 79.9 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walk 25.7 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bike 26.9 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of PM Peak transit trips &lt;45 min</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of PM Peak HOV Trips &lt;45 min</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of PM Peak SOV Trips &lt;45 min</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please see the Performance Measures Appendix for more information on data sources and methodology used to calculate these outcomes.
# Physical Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Result of Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2040 Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of work trips less than 3 miles</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of non-work trips less than 3 miles</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode share of walking</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode share of bicycling</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obese population*</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High blood pressure*</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart Disease*</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes Type 2*</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Results are for areas experiencing land use and population changes not the entire SCAG region. *Please see the Performance Measures Appendix for more information on data sources and methodology used to calculate these outcomes.
Rye Baerg
baerg@scag.ca.gov
Metro First Last Mile Program
Background

- Health and Active Transportation Motion
- Active Transportation Agenda
- SCAG/Metro Joint Work Program

First Last Mile Strategic Plan
Purpose

Looking at the transit catchment areas of stations and stops and with an emphasis on improving multi-modal access

Designed to facilitate easy access
Components of the Plan

In-depth case studies of 10 prototypical sites will provide a range of geographic, demographic, and physical challenges.

The findings of the study will be compiled into a strategic plan with modal access targets, an assembly of best practices, and implementable design guidelines and recommendations.
TRANSIT TO OPEN SPACE AND PARKS STRATEGIC PLAN
Why Does LA County Need a Transit to Parks Plan?
Why Does LA County Need a Transit to Parks Plan?
Why Does LA County Need a Transit to Parks Plan?

1. Angeles National Forest
2. Department of Public Health
3. County Parks Need Assessment
4. Ongoing Community Efforts
New designation as a National Monument requires new Transportation Plan to increase non-automobile access, especially for disadvantaged communities.
Why Does LA County Need a Transit to Open Space and Parks Strategic Plan?

- Public Health
  - 2016 LA County Department of Public Health study
  - Correlation between economic hardship, reduced local park space, and premature mortality, cardiovascular disease, and diabetes.
WHY?
LA County Needs Assessment

LOS ANGELES COUNTYWIDE COMPREHENSIVE PARKS & RECREATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT
MAY 9, 2016
Why Does LA County Need a Transit to Parks Plan?

How much of the population has access to parks?

49% of population Countywide lives within 1/2 mile of a park

51% of population Countywide lives beyond 1/2 mile of a park

Population in Each Need Category:

- Very High: 32.2%
- Very Low: 4.6%
- Low: 16.5%
- High: 20.4%
- Moderate: 26.2%

*0.7% Not Participating
Ongoing Community Efforts

- LA County DPW shuttles to beach and Baldwin Hills
- Griffith Observatory DASH
- Pasadena implementing Transit to Parks
- Community Based Organizations
In the Transit to Open Space and Parks Access Motion (June 23, 2016 – Board Agenda Item 52), the Board requested:

> Action Plan to Improve Parks Access, to Include:
  > Assessment of Current Service
  > Identification of Funding
  > Potential Support Efforts
  > Ways to Promote/Expand Service
What is the Transit to Open Space and Parks Strategic Plan?

Recommend cost-effective investments for connecting disadvantaged and park poor communities to open space and parks using transit.
What Metro is aware of:

- Substantial Prior Work and Data
- Range of Prior/Current Access Projects with mixed success
- Many Parks can currently be accessed by Transit
- Some Grants/Funding Programs Available
THE OBJECTIVES

- Analyze park access needs across the County with a focus on disadvantaged park-poor communities
- Review and evaluate prior efforts to improve open space access
- Guide decision making on future projects and investments
- Engage potential partners and other stakeholders
- Recommend potential activities to improve park access
T2P Team

> Project Team
  + Here LA
  + Nelson\Nygaard
  + Placeworks
  + Nature for All
  + Community Nature Connection

> Advisory Committee
  + Local and county government agencies
  + Social justice and environmental CBO
  + Geographic diversity
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Milestone/Task</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kick-off</td>
<td>Nov 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Dec 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Best Practices Review</td>
<td>Feb 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Feb 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Data Compilation and Analysis</td>
<td>Mar 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Advisory Committee</td>
<td>May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Strategic Plan and Recommendations</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Advisory Committee</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>August 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case Studies

- Fifteen case studies
- Shuttle Programs
- Bus Route Modifications / Additions
- First/Last Mile (walking and biking)
- Carshare/Shared Ride
- Promotional, Marketing, Educational
- Supportive programs like bike racka, surfboard racks on transit, special target population programs.
Case Studies - Lessons Learned

• Marketing and advertising play a big role
• Hours of operation need to match demand
• Service capacity needs to match demand
• Provision of transit service can be provided with TDM practices
• Carshare/Shared Ride
• Use data to track and modify
• No one size fits all approach
Next steps- Data Analysis

- Parks/Open Space (typologies, swimming)
- People/Communities (demographics)
- Transit (time, frequency)
Final Plan

- Identifying lots of existing efforts
- Toolkit
- Completed August 2018
Thank You
California Public Health Assessment Model
Modeling Process

1. Characterize Built Environment
2. Model Physical Activity
3. Model Public Health
4. Apply Cost-of-Illness
Mode Choice – Total Trips
Plan vs. Trend Baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode Choice</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking and Biking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These figures include additional improvements in walking and biking associated with the benefits of certain active transportation investments, which are analyzed as a supplement to SCAG's Regional Trip Based Model.
Public Health Outcomes in 2040 – Adults Aged 18-65
Plan vs. Trend Baseline

- Daily Per Capita Walking (Minutes Daily):
  - Plan: 33%
  - Trend Baseline: 26%

- Daily Per Capita Biking (Minutes Daily):
  - Plan: 26%
  - Trend Baseline: 26%

- Rate of Diabetes - Type 2:
  - Plan: -2%
  - Trend Baseline: -2%

- Obese Population:
  - Plan: -3%
  - Trend Baseline: -3%

- Rate of Heart Disease:
  - Plan: -3%
  - Trend Baseline: -3%

- Rate of High Blood Pressure:
  - Plan: -3%
  - Trend Baseline: -3%

* Results are for the new population in areas of the plan experiencing land use changes.
Goal: Estimate current annual public health, transportation and economic costs and benefits of bicycling and walking on the SCAG region’s economy
## Current Costs to the Region

<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>

- **Direct costs (health care spending)**
- **Indirect costs (reduced productivity)**

- Diabetes: $3,311
- Heart Disease: $3,633
- Hypertension: $44
Current Costs to the Region

$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.
Physical Activity

Daily Trips in the SCAG Region by Mode

- **3.3 Million**
  - Hours of Daily Walking

- **1.9 Million**
  - Hours of Daily Biking

- **139 Thousand**
  - Hours of Daily Walking to Transit

- **78.4%** Walking Trips
- **9.5%** Biking Trips
- **12.1%** Walking to Transit Trips
$488 Million
Estimated total annual physical activity health savings for adults and seniors due to avoided health care expenditures and increased productivity.
Additional Savings from 2016 RTP/SCS Implementation

**Predicted Annual Physical Activity Savings in 2040 for Adults (Age 18-64)**

- **Diabetes**: $167M
- **Heart Disease**: $122M
- **Hypertension**: $48M

**$337 Million**

Predicted annual physical activity savings in 2040 in adults ages 18-64 from full RTP implementation.
$4.5 Billion

Overall, accumulated savings from reduced hypertension, diabetes, and heart disease in adults (ages 18-64) is predicted to be $4.5 billion throughout the life of the RTP.
2016 RTP/SCS Implementation

RTP Active Transportation Investment Areas

- **$2.8B**
  Regional Trip Strategies

- **$2.2B**
  Transit Integration Strategies

- **$7.6B**
  Short Trip Enhancements (sidewalks and bikeways)

- **$288M**
  Education and Encouragement Campaigns
Consumer Savings

Yearly and Per Mile Costs by Mode

- Walk: $0.02, $30 yearly average cost
- Bike: $0.05, $395 yearly average cost
- Transit: $0.11, $1,182 yearly average cost
- 2-Person Carpool: $0.72, $5,704 yearly average cost
- Drive Alone: $1.22, $11,407 yearly average cost
Consumer Savings

2.3 Million
Estimated annual vehicle-miles traveled daily that could be eliminated in the year 2040 through RTP active transportation programming

$976 Million
Potential annual savings in the year 2040 from estimated reduced vehicle-miles traveled
Regional Impact

Average Annual Economic Impacts due to Active Transportation

- Employment (total jobs)
  - The total number of jobs associated with active transportation infrastructure spending and the associated health effects

- Personal Income ($B)
  - Employment total multiplied by average wages by position type

- Sales Output ($B)
  - Sales output discounted for prior stages of manufacturing that occurred outside the SCAG region.

- Value Added (ve)
  - The difference between retail sale prices and the cost to purchase the item being sold.

Dollars (Billions):

- $113
- $70
- $36

Jobs:

- 11,500 Jobs
Thank You!
2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

- $554 Billion Plan
- $12.9 dedicated to Active Transportation (2.3% of plan)
- Doubling of Active Transportation investments compared to 2012 RTP
- Links Active Transportation Investment to Land-Use/Transit.
2016 RTP/SCS

Regional Trips ($2.8B)
- Regional Bikeways
- Regional Greenways

Short Trips ($7.6 B)
- Neighborhood Mobility Areas (Neighborhood Greenways)
- Sidewalks/Local Bikeways (1st/last mile to...)

Education/Encouragement ($288M)
- Safe Routes to School
- Safety/Encouragement Campaigns
- Demonstration Projects

Access to Transit ($2.2B)
- First Mile/Last Mile
- Livable Corridors
- Bike Share
2020 Active Transportation

- How can we continue to coordinate/integrate strategies with other modes and land-use in RTP/SCS?
- How do we meet mandated targets such as safety?
- How do we make RTP/SCS more useful for local jurisdictions?
- What is impact of new technology?
  - Ride share,
  - Autonomous vehicles,
  - Electric bikes
2020 Active Transportation Plan Development

Strategy Development

Regional Trip Strategies
- Regional Greenways
- Regional Bikeways

Transit Strategies
- 1st/Last Mile Strategies
- Bike Share

Short Trip Strategies
- Neighborhood Mobility Areas (Neighborhood Greenways)
- Livable Boulevards
- Other Strategies

RTP Process
- Coordination
- Modeling
- Outreach
- Editing

Active Transportation Plan

Safety & Encouragement Campaign

Caltrans Planning Grants

ATP Grants
Regional Trip Strategies

#### Regional Bikeways
- Connects across jurisdictions
- Connects to local bikeway networks and destinations
- 2,200 miles

#### Regional Greenways
- Class 1 and Class 4 bikeways
- Connects to regional bikeway networks
- Connects to local walking networks
- 2,200 miles
Regional Trips Research

• What is status of Regional Bikeways and Greenways?

• What opportunities/challenges has the region faced in implementing, maintaining and optimizing use of these facilities?

• How can regional planning, policies, programs improve outcomes?
Transit Strategies

**First Last Mile**
- Rail Corridors (224 Stations)
- Transit-Oriented Development
- Complete Streets

**Livable Boulevards**
- Bus Corridors
- Increased Density Development at Nodes
- First-Last Mile to Nodes + Corridor Improvements

**Bike Share**
Near Rail Transit Stations
218 Bike stations/ 2,180 bikes
Transit Strategies Research

• What is status of First/Last Mile networks?

• What opportunities/challenges has the region faced in implementing, maintaining and optimizing use of facilities?

• How can regional planning, policies, programs improve outcomes?
Short Trip Strategies

**Neighborhood Mobility Areas**
- “Main Street” Strategy
- Outside HQTA
- Neighborhood Electric Vehicles + Active Transportation

**Local Bikeway Networks**
Connections between residences and regional networks, transit and local activities
12,900 miles if bikeways in 2040.
Short Trips

- Short trips represent 38% of all trips in the region.
- 78% of these short trips are currently taken by automobile.
Short Trips Research

What strategies are available to:

a) Shift these trips to non-SOV trips?
b) Make longer trips shorter/achieve trip segments with other modes?

What impact would this have on:

a) GHG and air quality outcomes?
b) Physical activity rates?
c) Regional economic impacts?

What are impacts of new tech/innovations?

a) E-Bikes
b) Ride Share
Local Planning Need

| Number of Cities in SCAG Region with No Active Transportation Plan |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|
| Total Cities  | Local Bike | Local Ped | Local SRTS | % Incomplete |
| IMP           | 7          | 43%       | 86%       | 100%            | 76%             |
| LA            | 88         | 60%       | 80%       | 82%             | 74%             |
| OC            | 34         | 65%       | 79%       | 94%             | 79%             |
| RIV           | 28         | 75%       | 89%       | 89%             | 85%             |
| SBD           | 24         | 50%       | 58%       | 63%             | 57%             |
| VEN           | 10         | 50%       | 80%       | 80%             | 70%             |
| Total         | 191        | 66%       | 84%       | 90%             | 80%             |

Number of Missing Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Components</th>
<th>Average Cost per Component</th>
<th>Total Planning Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>459</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$45,900,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?
Alan Thompson, Senior Regional Planner (Active Transportation Safety)
Thompson@scag.ca.gov  213-236-1940
Active Transportation Database

Project Overview

2-15-18

Rye Baerg
Senior Regional Planner
Bicycle Data Clearinghouse Background

• Released in 2012
• Allows storage of manual counts
• Primarily focused on bicyclists
Original BDC Deliverables

• Conducting Bicycle and Pedestrian Count Manual
• Count Forms
• Literature Review
• Modeling Integration White Paper
• Union Station Bike Count Report
Goals of the ATDB 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
BDC Schema
ATDB Schema

- Fully conforms to the 2016 TMG
- Allows for intersection and screenline counts
- Allows for manual and automated counts
- Captures facility and environment data
System Architecture

**Database** (Geo & spatial)
- MS SQL Server 2016
- Geo & spatial database

**ArcGIS Server – ArcGIS Feature Service APIs**
- Select features for dissemination API

**Web Server – SharePoint**
- Main ATDB website components:
  - Count data upload sections
  - Count data publish sections
  - Other admin functionality

**Application Server (RESTful APIs)**
- ATDB APIs

**SCAG’s Esri Apps**
- ATDB map page templates

**Esri-hosted layers**
- ESRI online

**Automated Counters**

**Mobile Counter App**
New User Interface

Active Transportation Database

ATDB FACT | In 2017, over 340,000 pedestrians and cyclists passed through the Metro Downtown Santa Monica station.
User Roles

- Counter
- Count Admin
- System Admin
Counter Role
Count Admin
System Admin

- Manage Agencies
- Manage Users
Manual Data Upload

Load Tally Data

Agency: [Input]
Study: [Input]
Location: [Input]
Start Time: [12:00 AM]
Interval Duration (in Minutes): [15]
Number of Intervals: [5]
Dates Counts Taken: [1/30/2018]

Modes Counted: [Pedestrians]
Weather Factor: [Precipitation]

Other Usual Factors:

Format Tally Entry Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flow</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Flow</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>1:00 AM</td>
<td>1:15 AM</td>
<td>Bicycles</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td>1:00 AM</td>
<td>1:15 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>1:00 AM</td>
<td>1:15 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL

TOTAL

TOTAL

TOTAL

TOTAL

TOTAL
Mobile App
Automated Counter Interface

Load Counts File Page

Load New Automated Counter Data for Santa Monica

Counter: EcoCounter PYRO 134370
Location: Wilshire btw Lincoln and 7th

Facilities and Flows Included in Counts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Flow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>North-side bike lane</td>
<td>West-bound bikes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>North-side bike lane</td>
<td>East-bound bikes (wrong way)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>North-side sidewalk</td>
<td>West-bound pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>North-side sidewalk</td>
<td>East-bound pedestrians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Load Data from File:

Choose: WildfireCountsSantaMonica.csv

Load Counts File  Cancel

Notes:
This screen lets the user specify an temporary automated counter data set to be loaded. This includes selecting one of the counter devices for the agency, selecting a location at which the counts were collected, indicating which facility/flow contributions for the location are included in the counts along with their sequencing, and pointing to the file location. The user can then choose to load the file (subsequent to which they will be able to review and verify the data) or abort out.
Data Download/Planning Portal
Data Download/Planning Portal
Siting Selection Methodology
Regional Bikeway Shapefile Standardization

Project Overview

2-15-18

Ali Masterson
Intern
Collaboration Process

• Collected shapefiles from each CTC
• Standardized Fields Across Files
• Aligned shapefile with actual roadway network
• Working through Local Input Process to validate current version
• Develop a web option to send SCAG updates for individual routes
• Standardized fields for future consulting contracts
Bikeway Shapefile

- Current version is on SCAG’s Open Data Portal
  https://gisdata-scag.opendata.arcgis.com/
- 29 fields
- 25,221 records (segments)
- 4,130 miles of existing bikeways
- 6,807 miles of proposed upgrades/additional bikeways
List of Variables

- FID (Object ID)
- BPID
- CALTRNS_ID
- Seg ID
- Last_Updt
- Name
- City
- County
- Class_E
- FacDes_E
- Class_P
- FacDes_P
- Install_Da
- Miles_1
- Shape_Leng
- On_
- From_
- To_
- Plan_Adop
- Plan_Ref
- Plan_Juris
- Plan_URL
- Plan_Stage
- UCOST
- SCOST
- APP_ID
- FTIP_ID
- RBN
- Comment
Data Dictionary

Class

0 – Segment does not include an existing bikeway

Class 1 - Bike Path/Multiuse Path

Class 2 - Bike Lane

Class 3 - Bike Route

Class 4 - Separated Bikeway

Class 5 - Bicycle Friendly Boulevard

Facility Description

A qualitative description of the bikeway.

E.g.; two-way cycle track, contra-flow bike lane, Roseway
Next Steps

• Metro to provide refined file for LA County
• Incorporate Local Input Process data
• Complete Metadata
• Republish to SCAG’s Open Data Portal
• Complete Data Collection Tool
Southern California Active Transportation Safety & Encouragement Campaign

February 2018

Julia Lippe-Klein
Associate Planner
Southern California Association of Governments
What is *Go Human?* 4 piece set.
Spring and Summer Advertising Campaign

- 2 flights of paid advertising across 6 counties
  - May 2018 (National Bike Month)
  - July/Aug 2018 (Back to School)
- Campaign to align with Vision Zero efforts and strategies
- Currently exploring new creative options for focus group testing
- Goal to achieve 250 million new impressions (1/2 billion to date!)
- Seeking partners interested in participating
Opportunities for Co-Branding & Printing
Open Streets & Demonstration Projects

• Arrow Highway (SGV) (Fall 2018)
• Baldwin Park
• Buena Park
• Costa Mesa
• Culver City
• El Monte
• Hemet
• La Canada
• La Quinta (12/18/17)
• Orange County
• Ontario (Summer 2018)
• San Jacinto (9/29/18)
• South El Monte
• Walnut Park (June 2018)
• West Covina
• Chino
• Lake Elsinore
• (10/27/2018)
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Active Transportation and Special Programs
Goals and Objectives

• Increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking.
• Increase the safety and mobility of non-motorized users.
• Advance the active transportation efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals as established pursuant to Senate Bill 375 (Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008) and Senate Bill 391 (Chapter 585, Statutes of 2009).
• Enhance public health, including reduction of childhood obesity through the use of programs including, but not limited to, projects eligible for Safe Routes to School Program funding.
• Ensure that disadvantaged communities fully share in the benefits of the program.
• Provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of active transportation users.
What stays the same?

- State selects highest scoring projects first (60% of program funding)
- MPOs select projects after State selection (40% of program funding)
- SCAG receives 50% of MPO share. (Approx $109 M)
- Funding match is not required but encouraged
- Disadvantaged communities will receive at least 25% of funding
- Planning awards will be capped at 2% of funding
- All planning awards will be awarded to disadvantaged communities
What is changing?

- More money!!! SB1 adds $200m per cycle.
- 4 year cycle (2019/20 to 2022/23)
- Caltrans is an eligible applicant
- Emphasis on context sensitive design and transformative projects
- Separate applications for project type
  - Plan
  - Non-infrastructure
  - Small project- Infrastructure/Non-infrastructure
  - Medium project- Infrastructure/Non-infrastructure
  - Large project- Infrastructure/Non-infrastructure
- Public Health question is merged into the Statement of Need
## Draft Statewide Guidelines

### Cycle 4 ATP Question Matrix by Application Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Non-Infrastructure</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged Communities (DAC)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Participation* **</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope/Implementation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context Sensitive &amp; Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformative Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leveraging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corps (0 or -5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Performance (0 to -10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The matrix represents the percentage of questions allocated to each topic based on application type.*
Draft Statewide Guidelines
Schedule

• CTC adopts ATP Guidelines
  May 16, 2018
• Call for projects
  May 16, 2018
• Project applications to CTC (postmark date)
  July 31, 2018
• CTC adopts Statewide project list
  January 2019

• http://www.catc.ca.gov/programs/atp/
Draft Regional Guidelines

• The SCAG region will receive approximately $109m
  – $104m will be awarded to implementation projects (Projects or Programs, no Planning)
  – $5.4m will be awarded to planning and capacity building projects
• Regional Guidelines developed by SCAG in collaboration with the County Transportation Commissions
• Geographic equity will be implemented to ensure all counties receive awards for infrastructure projects
Draft Regional Guidelines

Implementation Projects

- Eligible Applicants Submit Proposals through Statewide Application Process
- County Transportation Commissions can add up to 10 points to CTC score
- Population-based Funding Targets Determine Funding Available in Each County
Draft Regional Guidelines

Planning & Capacity Building Projects

• SCAG to issue a supplemental call for projects through Sustainability Planning Grant (SPG) Program (Fall 2018)
• Funding Requests To Be Capped to Encourage Agencies to Continue to Apply in Statewide ATP Competition
• SPG Guidelines and Applications to be developed Spring/Summer 2018
Regional Guidelines Schedule

- RC Approves ATP Regional Program Guidelines  
  April 5, 2018
- CTC approves or rejects MPO Guidelines  
  August 15, 2018
- RC Adopts SCAG Regional Program Approval  
  April 4, 2019
- Commission adopts MPO selected projects  
  June 2019
Goals

- Increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking
- Increase safety and mobility of non-motorized users
- Continue to foster jurisdictional support and promote implementation of the goals, objectives, and strategies of the 2016 RTP/SCS.
- Seed active transportation concepts and produce plans that provide a preliminary step for future ATP applications.
Eligibility

- SPG will fund Planning and Capacity Building (Non-Infrastructure) projects
- NO Minimum; $250k Max
- Planning and Eligible Non-infrastructure projects not awarded through the ATP Statewide are eligible but grants to be capped at $250k

Other SCAG Considerations

- In past cycles, SPG has leveraged non-ATP funding to broaden eligibility
- In past cycles, SCAG has administered ATP grants awarded through SPG
SPG Schedule—Discussion Draft

- RC Adopts SCAG SPG Guidelines  Sep 6, 2018
- SPG Call for Projects  Sep 6, 2018
- SPG Application Deadline  Oct 31, 2018
- RC Adopts SCAG Regional Program Approval  April 4, 2019
- CTC adopts MPO Program  June 2019
Sustainability Planning Grants—Discussion Draft

Proposed Project Types (RTP/SCS Alignment):

- Regional Corridors
- Transit Integration/First-Last Mile
- Short Trip Strategy (Network Plans, including SRTS)
- Go Human (Demos, Open Streets, Ads)
- Comprehensive Community-Wide Plans
Thank you!

Stephen Patchan
patchan@scag.ca.gov