



REGIONAL DEDICATED TRANSIT LANES STUDY

TAC #2

Tuesday, January 25, 2022

10:00pm-11:30pm PT

Zoom Meeting

Attendees

SCAG

Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang, Steve Fox

Consultant Team

Herb Higginbotham (Cambridge Systematics), Lila Singer-Berk (Cambridge Systematics), Jon Overman (Cambridge Systematics), Jimi Mitchell (Nelson/Nygaard), Nina Harvey (Nelson/Nygaard), Amber Hawkes (Here LA), Shannon Davis (Here LA)

Stakeholders

County	Name		Organization	
Los Angeles	Nader	Asmar	Arroyo Verdugo Communities JPA (AVCJPA)	
	Talin	Shahbazian	Arroyo Verdugo Communities JPA (AVCJPA)	
	Alfredo	Torales	Big Blue Bus	
	Riley	O'Brien	Westside Cities COG (WSCOG)	
	Karen	Heit	Gateway Cities COG (GCCOG)	
	Christopher	MacKechnie	Long Beach Transit	
	Shirley	Hsiao	Long Beach Transit	
	James	Shahamiri	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transit Authority (LA Metro)	
	Mark	Yamarone	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transit Authority (LA Metro)	
	Paul	Backstrom	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transit Authority (LA Metro)	
	Makenzi	Rasey	Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT)	
	Tim	Fremaux	Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT)	
	Steve	Lantz	South Bay Cities COG (SBCCOG)	
	Jane	Chan	Culver City	
	Lourdes	Alvarez	Foothill Transit	
	Henry	Lopez	Foothill Transit	
	Orange	Charles	Main	Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA)
		Kurt	Brotcke	Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA)
Riverside	Eric	DeHate	Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC)	
	Rohan	Kurppu	Sunline	
	Jeff	Guidry	Sunline	
San Bernardino	Anna	Jaiswal	Omnitrans	
	Amanda	Fagan	Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC)	
Ventura	Chris	Krugan	Ventura County Public Works Agency	
	Faith	Grant	Conejo Climate Coalition (CCC)	



REGIONAL DEDICATED TRANSIT LANES STUDY

Notes

1. WELCOME REMARKS & INTRODUCTIONS

- Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang, SCAG Project Manager, thanked everyone for attending and stated the purpose of the meeting. She asked everyone to share their names in the Zoom meeting chat box.
- Priscilla introduced the agenda and encouraged the use of interactive meeting tools for meeting participation.
- She then asked for new attendees to put their names, organizations, and title into the Zoom chat feature.

2. PROJECT RECAP

- .
- Herb Higginbotham (CS Project Manager) introduced himself and recapped the project's purpose and progress so far including the stakeholder engagement activities and best practices findings.

3. EXISTING CONDITIONS REVIEW

- Lila Singer-Berk (CS Deputy Project Manager) introduced the purpose of the existing conditions data and document review. She then reviewed planning and data sources, regional transit priority goals, and a series of existing conditions maps.
- Chat Comments:
 - We have two existing bus queue jumpers (sunset/Woodburn and Santa Monica/Overland) and one in the works (5th/flower)
 - You're missing bus lanes on N spring near city hall, and 98th St near LAX, and sunset/Chavez between dodger stadium and union station
 - The US 101 Express bus lanes are shown in the wrong place on your map. The US 101 HOV/Express Bus Lanes Study area goes from SR 33 in Ventura to the Ventura/LA County line. Your map shows a route going north from Oxnard into Santa Barbara, which is not correct.
 - Lila confirmed that the project team will review these limits.
 - The Westside Cities COG has a number of additional BRT corridors, including Sepulveda Blvd, proposed in our unfunded Strategic Project List, but they have not advanced as far as the Metro-identified corridors, so they do not need to be added at this time.
 - Lila asked Riley to send the list of corridors so that they can be documented as part of the project.

4. CORRIDOR SCREENING GOALS, CRITERIA, AND METHODOLOGY

- Herb Higginbotham introduced the next phase of the project, which involves screening corridors. He explained that the existing conditions is a setup for the screening process. He then described a two-step approach to first screen and then evaluate corridors.

Breakout Room #1

Participants:

- Paul Backstrom, LA Metro
- Alfredo Torales, Santa Monica
- Christopher Kurgan, Ventura

Discussion:

- Having local plans and financial commitments are crucial for implementation. Those factors should be prioritized in



REGIONAL DEDICATED TRANSIT LANES STUDY

any list.

- The goal set looks about right.
- Good analysis – glad that you talked about growth areas – how do we focus the investment in these areas?
- If transit is convenient, people will use it, so prioritizing connections and convenience is a great benefit.
- Goals adequately capture what is needed. On System Performance, suggest to focus on the core purpose to improve bus speeds – maybe translate to simpler language, at least for public materials.
- LA has also been highlighting Vision Zero benefits – having safety in here somewhere makes sense. The goal with this is to reduce incidents, conflicts, and speeding. Talk to Tim F and James S on how best to measure this.
- It would be good to have average travel time saved as a metrics (H: maybe as part of Phase II when we have model results?)
- Average travel speed on the roadway is a crucial factor, as well as travel speed reliability – is there a good way to capture that?
- Key hurdle is how to get ROW data – there is no great dataset to do this. In LA, for final screen they looked at curb cuts, road orientation, and setbacks (eg, Western Bl was knocked out because of this)... it took a lot of Google tours and driving around so save it to the last step.
- Lots of empty rhetoric in policies so be cautious of the degree to which you introduce these into the process
- Our challenge is outside the City (of SM). Lincoln Bl plan is a good example of multi-jurisdictional coordination.
- The goal set is very relevant even to outside of LA areas. Important to make sure we are building/collaborating with our communities – transit doesn't always have the same seat at the table in outer parts of the region.

Breakout Room #2

Participants:

- James Shahamiri, LA Metro
- Mark Yamarone, LA Metro
- Jane Chan, Culver City
- Faith Grant, CCC

Discussion:

- Mark: Yes, this aligns with LA Metro Vision and Principals for BRT. Speed and reliability is key
- James LA Metro:
 - LA Metro has been considering this with the Next Gen Bus Plan and work improving access for equity communities.
 - “minimizing traffic impacts” – seems at odds with improving transit performance.
 - Comes down to political support and feasibility. Metro's approach is going after low hanging fruit – converting peak hour lanes to bus only lanes. Next step is going into more difficult conversations about tradeoffs
 - He has done outreach on a number of projects and found that it's sometimes true that people are super hesitant about traffic impacts but not always the case.
- Jane Culver City: Bus and bike lanes increase support for bus lanes in the bike community. Consider including evaluation of bike/ped volumes in part of evaluation.
 - Also seconded comment on traffic impacts because dedicated lanes will make traffic worse. Still looking at data on Move Culver for how to better sell it to the public.
- Faith CCC: Felt goals are in line with Ventura goals
- James: At Metro screening starts with top-level route performers. Challenge with equity framework: Do we consider geographic alignment of route and if it goes through an equity community OR look at the ridership demographics?
- Mark: Transit ridership is key and ODs - If route origin is in an equity community it may not actually serve the destinations they need, so need to cross check with that.
- Jane: Outreach to local businesses is a key concern for parking. How to fit in community.



REGIONAL DEDICATED TRANSIT LANES STUDY

Breakout Room #3

Participants:

- Tim Fremaux, LADOT (TF)
- Eric DeHate, RCTC (ED)
- Karen Heit, Eco-Rapid Transit (KH)
- Charles Main, OCTA (CM)

Discussion:

Goals:

- They are high-level enough and are good. (TF)
- Hard to rank the goals, depends on the lens we are looking through. (TF)
- The more people that use transit, you are going to see more walking and biking; where does safety fit in? We should include that word somewhere, right up front. High incidents of conflicts, including truck/people conflicts. (KH) Weave safety into the first goal (about system performance) and others should be sub-goals within that. (ED)
- Include transit patron's safety too (personal security). (TF)
- Maybe include cost effectiveness (OM costs etc). (CM) Cost effectiveness should be a prioritization tool (but maybe not in screening). (TF and ED agrees)
- Central Harbor Boulevard Corridor Study would be a good reference from OCTA for this exercise. Team should check it out. (CM)
- Very important to distinguish between Goals (where we want to be) and Screening Criteria (ways to get there in the best way possible). (TF)

Metrics:

- Metrics do not seem unreasonable, but might be missing some. Good starting point. (ED)
- Goals in Riverside are different from those in LA. Make sure there are different considerations (weighting, etc), looking at the local environment. (ED)

Anything else important to consider during the corridor screening phase? Does this process make sense?

- Maybe you should estimate potential ridership. It's harder to do, but more interesting that using existing ridership data. (TF)
- Under equity, where do you treat the implications for people that need their vehicles to go to work? There could be potential disadvantages for these sorts of workers. (KH) Yes, look at the job sectors in the area when evaluating (ED).

Breakout Room #4

Participants:

- Riley O'Brien, WSCOG
- Christopher MacKenchnie, Long Beach Transit
- Steve Lantz, SBCCOG
- Jeff Guidry, Sunline

Discussion:

Potential Lack of emphasis on current ridership and quality of service to existing riders

- Revise goal statements to include improvements to reliability, safety, and security. Considerations for aesthetics and passenger comfort (Including cleanliness, crowding etc). Relates back to ridership and peak load estimation

"Minimizing traffic impacts" may be a restrictive consideration.

- Useful recommendations will be impacted by auto bias
- May lower weight/consideration in decision making?

For "Promote Local Priorities and Built Env" consider:

- Spaces should be able to accommodate all modes. Independent mobility issues follow demographic trends



REGIONAL DEDICATED TRANSIT LANES STUDY

- Municipalities allow bikes to use bus lanes
- Creating slow streets or corridors to allow parallel bike routes

How does this consider capital projects that require less incremental O&M funds?

- Ex: low cost improvements (stop amenities) can be highly utilized

Consider implementation timeline for potential projects

- Quick builds

Expansion plans vs reinvestment in Service Plan changes

- Complementary capital investments with long range operational plans/goals for corridor.

Clarification of Considerations

- “Alignment of transit priorities to local priorities for use of their local street network / transportation infrastructure”
- Inclusion of State policies as well as “local”

Breakout Room #5

Participants:

- Talin Shahbazian, Pasadena
- Shirely Hsiao, Long Beach

Discussion:

- Generally, and at a high level, the goals and metrics appear to be clear and comprehensive.
- Talin Shahbazian noted that some cities do not have First/Last Mile policies and/or existing active transportation infrastructure in place. It was suggested that we consider adding metrics to make sure that some of the more suburban neighborhoods within the SCAG region (that do not have FLM infrastructure in place) are not automatically overlooked by the evaluation metrics.
- Shirley Hsiao brought up the notion that travel routes and travel demand may forever be changed following the pandemic. Shirley is curious what metrics can be used in Step I to consider currently evolving travel behaviors. This may ultimately impact the identification of recommended corridors.
- Shirley asked for clarification about the Regional Transit Lanes project itself; specifically who is responsible for deciding to pursue implementation of the recommended transit lanes. Internal note: we may want to briefly remind attendees of the overall intent of the project at the beginning of every TAC meeting. This will help bring everyone up to speed.

5. NEXT STEPS & CLOSING REMARKS

- Herb thanked the group and concluded with a reminder about the next TAC meeting and next steps. Priscilla also thanked attendees for participating in the meeting.