APPENDIX A: POLICY SETTING

The Complete Streets Plan complements and expands on existing policies established by the City of Beverly Hills, which are included in the City’s General Plan, the 2009 Beverly Hills Sustainable City Plan, the City’s Bicycle Master Plan, the 2012 Bicycle Pilot Feasibility Analysis, and the City’s Municipal Code, as well as policies established by overlapping governmental jurisdictions. This section presents a summary of existing policies and plans that the Complete Streets Report is consistent with, and a discussion of State and Federal policies that could be constraints for implementation.

2010 GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

The City’s 2010 General Plan Update is the long-term vision for growth in Beverly Hills. It discusses increasing traffic congestion and costs for services, and a push toward reduced resource consumption, pollution, and greenhouse gas emissions. A number of overarching themes listed in the General Plan Update’s introduction—such as growing smarter, reducing carbon footprints, and addressing global climate change—are consistent with the concept of complete streets, which are defined in the document as:

Streets that include facilities and designs that enable safe access for all users (i.e., pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists and transit riders) of all ages and abilities with characteristics such as a comprehensive, integrated, and connected network; balanced design; variety of uses and activities that create a varied streetscape; design that relates well to bordering uses and allows for continuous activity; pedestrian and biking facilities that promote safety and maximize access to bordering uses; aesthetically designed street lights that provide sufficient illumination of sidewalks; consistent landscaping that includes street trees and landscaped medians and sidewalks; sustainable design that minimizes runoff, minimizes heat island effects, responds to climatic demands, and conserves scarce resources; and well-maintained facilities.

The Beverly Hills Complete Streets Plan provides guidance that complements the adopted goals and policies outlined in the City’s General Plan.

CIRCULATION ELEMENT

The Circulation Element of the General Plan Update describes the regional transportation setting for all modes, and sets goals and policies for the “safe and efficient” use of the City’s circulation system. This element emphasizes multimodal mobility and regional connectivity, and stresses that functional traffic patterns hinge on coordinated land use and transportation development where alternatives to driving are realistic options for the community. The 2010 Circulation Element Amendment puts greater emphasis on walking, biking, and transit and regional connectivity, which sets a policy groundwork for Complete Streets initiatives.

In 2001, the City supported a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan (NTMP) pilot that tested the viability of traffic calming measures for the neighborhoods between Wilshire and Olympic Boulevards, and Beverly and Doheny Drives. Goal 3 of the 2010 Circulation Element Update calls for the implementation of a NTMP with the goal to improve community character and quality of life.

Goals 7 and 8 respectively are for a “safe and comfortable pedestrian environment that results in walking as a desirable travel choice” and an “integrated, complete, and safe bicycle system to encourage bicycling within the City.”

OPEN SPACE ELEMENT

The Open Space Element of the General Plan is the principal guide for “maintenance and conservation of natural resources, open space, and recreation and park lands in the City of Beverly Hills.” The Open Space Element evaluates the demand for open space and recreational facilities in the City and uses this research “as
a basis for program priorities and recommendation for changes.”

Goals and policies from the Open Space Element related to and consistent with the Complete Streets Plan include the following:

- **OS 7 Improved air quality:**
  - OS 7.1 Promote transit ridership
  - OS 7.3 Encourage City employees to use rideshare for their daily work commute
  - OS 7.4 Encourage the use of zero-emission and low emission vehicles

- **OS 9 Park and recreation preservation**
  - OS 9.2 Provide adequate parking supply around Roxbury and La Cienega parks

- **OS 12 Use of recreation resources**
  - OS 12.4 Development of a jogging trail/route system. The City should consider redesigning certain intersections to improve safety and encourage additional uses
  - OS 12.5 Development of a bikeway/route system, which can serve both transportation and recreation needs

The La Cienega Park and Recreation Complex is currently being studied to determine which amenities and activities residents might like to see included in the future. This public engagement project is seeking feedback and ideas from current park and facility users, stakeholder groups, and residents through focus groups, a community survey, interviews, community presentations, and targeted outreach. One possible approach to the OS 9.2 policy to provide adequate parking supply around the park may be to reduce demand at the park by improving pedestrian connectivity with a pedestrian/bicycle bridge over La Cienega Boulevard.

The Open Space Element also includes a Bicycle Master Plan, which is discussed in detail in **Section 2.2**.

**IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM**

The Implementation Programs chapter lists programs that shall be used to implement the goals and policies described in the General Plan. **Program 3.7 Circulation, Mobility, and Parking** indicates that streets shall be improved to complete streets standards. Other actions within this program include the following:

- Implementation of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)
- Development of a Parking Master Plan
- Development and implementation of a Bicycle Master Plan
- Monitor and improvement of traffic conditions as necessary
- Work with Metro on the subway extension and to improve transit ridership
- Expand transportation demand management programs (TDMP)
- Development of a Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP)

**BICYCLE MASTER PLAN**

The Beverly Hills Bicycle Master Plan is a sub-element to the Open Space Element in the General Plan Update. This sub-element identifies the City’s desire to provide bicycle connectivity between major commercial, recreational, educational, and employment facilities and land uses via the shortest safest possible route.
The City’s original Bicycle Master Plan, adopted in 1977 and shown in Figure A-1, recommended a 22-mile bikeway system that could accommodate recreational and transportation needs. The Bicycle Master Plan was amended in 2010 along with the General Plan Update, detailing the existing bikeways in the City and providing recommendations for development of a bikeway system. The document also calls for the implementation of the Traffic Segregation Plan, which calls to reduce cut-through traffic on local roadways, in order to have a more fluid bikeway system with fewer stop signs. If fully implemented, the system “would connect the major commercial, recreation, educational and employment facilities in the City by the shortest safest possible routes.” The Bicycle Master Plan lists three objectives:

- Reevaluate/build upon City’s Goals and policies associated with bikeways
- Recommend a bikeway plan responsive to long-range needs of various users
- Recommend programs for acquisition, development, and use of bikeways to meet the City’s needs

The following facilities are recommended for further evaluation in the Bicycle Master Plan and were considered during the development of the Complete Streets Report. Not all recommendations were carried over into the Complete Streets Plan as indicated with asterisks below.

- Separated Bike Paths
  - Beverly Gardens Park*
  - Burton Way median strip*
  - Sections through Roxbury, La Cienega and Coldwater Canyon Parks, and the City Hall grounds*

- On-Street Bike Facilities
  - South of Santa Monica Boulevard
    - On-street bikeways (may require removing parking)
    - Development of two-way couplets on adjacent parallel streets (may potentially not impact parking)
  - North of Santa Monica Boulevard
    - Bike lanes adjacent to parked cars
  - Business Triangle
    - Bikeways along one side of mid-block alleys and/or on left side of one-way streets (parking and loading in alleys limited to one side so that bikeway can be accommodated on the other side of the alley)*
  - Connect to bike systems proposed or developed by neighboring jurisdictions

Bike paths through parks and through City Hall are not included in the Beverly Hills Complete Streets Plan recommendations because of potential conflicts with pedestrians and lack of available space to provide paths for bicyclists only. Instead, high quality bikeways are recommended on adjacent streets. The plan also does not include a recommendation for a bike path along Beverly Gardens Park because North Santa Monica Boulevard now includes high visibility bike lanes adjacent to the park.
Figure A-1: Bicycle Master Plan
The Complete Streets Plan also does not include a recommendation for a bike path in the Burton Way median due to the inconvenience it would create for bicyclists to access, as well as potential conflicts with vehicles turning. Instead, this plan recommends upgrading the existing bike lanes on Burton Way to make them more comfortable for bicyclists on the street.

In addition, bikeways in alleys through the Triangle are not included due to potential conflicts with trucks, visibility issues, and reduced accessibility to key destinations. Instead, a robust network of on-street bikeways is recommended to provide bicyclists with a level of facilities comparable to what is provided to drivers.

**BICYCLE FEASIBILITY STUDY**

The 2012 Bicycle Feasibility Study evaluated the potential implementation of bikeways identified in the 2010 Bicycle Master Plan (discussed above) in accordance with adopted design standards by the City of Beverly Hills. Recommendations are presented for six corridors, taking into account traffic elements such as roadway speeds, average daily traffic (ADT), parking, and roadway right-of-way. Figure A-2 shows the recommended corridors for bicycle improvements and Table A-1 summarizes the details of each.

![Figure A-2: Bicycle Facilities – Recommended Corridors](image)

Source: Bicycle Feasibility Study, Fehr & Peers 2012
Table A-1: 2012 Bicycle Feasibility Study - Recommended Bicycle Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>FACILITY TYPE</th>
<th>DESIGN DETAILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Burton Way | Class II bike lanes | Restripe roadway (in both directions) to provide:  
- Two 11' travel lanes  
- 13' shared parking/bike lane allowing 7-8' for parking and 5-6' for bicyclists |
| Charleville Blvd | Class III bike route | Designated bike route signage  
Sharrow striping |
| Carmelita Ave | Class III bike route | Designated bike route signage  
Sharrow striping |
| Crescent Dr (north of Santa Monica Blvd) | Class II bike lanes | Retain existing striping |
| Crescent Dr (Santa Monica Blvd to Charleville Blvd) | Class III bike route | Designated bike route signage  
Sharrow striping |
| Reeves Dr (Charleville Blvd to Olympic Blvd) | Class III bike route | Designated bike route signage  
Sharrow striping |
| Beverly Dr (north of Santa Monica Blvd) | Class II bike lanes | Restripe roadway (in both directions) to provide:  
- One 11' travel lane per direction  
- One 7' parking lane per direction  
- One 12' lane for bicyclists per direction, which include a 6' cycling area and striped buffers of 3' each to separate bicyclists from both parking and travel lanes |
| Beverly Dr (south of Santa Monica Blvd) | Class III bike route | Designated bike route signage  
Sharrow striping  
Diagonal parking |

It’s important to note that the 2012 study was completed before the inclusion of Class IV protected bike lanes in Caltrans facility typology, and before widespread use of striping buffers to further separate bicyclists from motorists. The Complete Streets Plan revisits the designations listed in Table A-1 above and recommends upgraded facility types where appropriate and feasible, as well as supplemental traffic calming measures and pedestrian improvements.

All corridors recommended in the 2012 study are carried over into the Complete Streets Plan with the exception of Reeves Drive, which is replaced by Crescent Drive to connect with the recommended bikeway on Crescent Drive north of Wilshire Boulevard. Reeves Drive between Wilshire Boulevard and Charleville Boulevard remains in the plan as a first/last mile connection to the Metro Purple Line Wilshire/Rodeo station.

SUSTAINABLE CITY PLAN

In 2009, the City adopted its Sustainable City Plan to combat climate change, improve air quality, and develop a sustainability strategy. The plan defines sustainability as “meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.” To the City of Beverly Hills, this involves maintaining a strong economy, promoting social equity, and ensuring sensitivity to the natural environment. The following are the guiding principles of the Sustainable City Plan that will help the City with decision-making and move towards sustainability:

- City policy will be guided by a long-term vision of sustainability
- The City will lead by example
- The City recognized that environmental, economic, and social equity are mutually dependent
- Economic, environmental and social impacts will be key considerations in City policy and actions
- The City will inform and inspire all community members to take action
- The City recognizes that partnerships are essential to achieving a sustainable community
- The City recognizes its linkage with the regional, national, and global community

A significant portion of the City’s goals and policies that promote sustainability both directly and indirectly involve transportation and relate to the Complete Streets Plan. Topic area #5 of the Sustainable City Plan’s list of goals highlights the importance of promoting an energy efficient, walkable, and bikeable community that reduces traffic congestion and its negative effects while encouraging alternative forms of travel.

**MUNICIPAL CODE**

The City of Beverly Hills Municipal Code includes regulations for pedestrian and bicycle use. The Code includes policies that seek to encourage and accommodate pedestrian and bicycle activity, as well as restrict use along certain thoroughfares. Relevant policies are listed below in Table A-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10-3-1653 | Defines “pedestrian oriented areas” within the City restricting land uses to promote pedestrian usage. There are six designated pedestrian oriented areas within the City:  
- Rodeo Drive from South Santa Monica Boulevard to Wilshire Boulevard  
- North Beverly Drive from South Santa Monica Boulevard to Wilshire Boulevard  
- South Beverly Drive from Wilshire Boulevard to Gregory Way  
- North Canon Drive from South Santa Monica Boulevard to Wilshire Boulevard  
- Brighton Way from Wilshire Boulevard to North Canon Drive  
- Dayton Way from Wilshire Boulevard to North Canon Drive |
| 5-6-801 | The operator of a bicycle shall not ride on the public sidewalk in any business district, where “business district” is defined in section 235 of the California Vehicle Code (CVC) as:  
A portion of a highway and the property contiguous thereto (a) upon one side of which highway, for a distance of 600 feet, 50 percent or more of the contiguous property facing thereon is occupied by buildings in use for business, or (b) upon both sides of which highway, collectively, for a distance of 300 feet, 50 percent or more of the contiguous property facing thereon is so occupied. |
| 5-6-802 | It is considered unlawful to operate skateboards, roller skates, in-line skates, and scooters on the grounds of any public school. However, the code does not explicitly prohibit bicycles on public school grounds. |
| 8-1-104 | Riding a bicycle (or similar type of device) is prohibited within parks and recreational facilities except where specially authorized by posted signs. |
| 10-7-301 | For non-residential developments with a total area greater than or equal to 25,000 square feet, the developer is required to provide bicycle racks (or other secure bicycle parking) to accommodate four (4) bicycles for the first 50,000 square feet of development. Further, accommodation for one (1) additional bicycle is required for each additional fifty thousand (50,000) square feet of nonresidential development. |
| 18-O-2757 | Temporarily bans dockless bicycles and scooters from being placed in any public right-of-way or public property and prohibits operators from offering these devices in Beverly Hills. |

At the January 10, 2019 Traffic and Parking Commission Special Meeting (discussed in detail in Chapter 6), City staff presented an option to consider revising the City’s Municipal Code to allow bicyclists on some sections of commercial sidewalks as a way to reduce vehicle/bicyclist conflicts and improve bicycle access until infrastructure was built out, using Santa Monica Boulevard in the City of West Hollywood as an example: when a bicycle lane is present, sidewalk riding is prohibited, but where there isn’t adequate street width to accommodate on-street bikeways, sidewalk riding is permitted. Revising the code is not included as a formal
recommendation in this plan due to concern of the Commission and community with regards to bicycle/pedestrian conflicts; however, allowing sidewalk riding on a limited case-by-case basis on commercial corridors where a gap in the first/last mile network may be present, such as on Wilshire Boulevard near the future La Cienega Metro Purple Line station, may be considered.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY POLICIES

METRO COMPLETE STREETS POLICY

In 2014, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) adopted a Complete Streets Policy to guide multimodal design in Los Angeles County. The policy identifies opportunities and actions for Metro to support local complete streets implementation with partner organizations and agencies. Per the policy, Metro requires all jurisdictions to adopt a complete streets policy to be eligible for Metro Capital Grant funds. The goals of Metro’s Complete Streets Policy include:

- Maximize the benefits of transit service and improve access to public transit by making it convenient, safe, and attractive for users
- Maximize multi-modal benefits and efficiencies
- Improve safety for all users on the transportation network
- 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

Implementation steps set forth by the Policy include:

- **Design**: Design and evaluate projects with the latest design standards and options
- **Network/Connectivity**: Work with partner agencies and local jurisdictions to incorporate complete streets infrastructure with the goal of creating a larger connected network of facilities across jurisdictional boundaries and corridors that can accommodate, as well as anticipate, the future demands of bicyclists and pedestrians. Adjacent intersections, interchanges, and bridges shall accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians in a matter that is safe and accessible.
- **Implementation Next Steps**: Ensure consistency with other relevant plans and engage stakeholders
- **Performance Measures**: Develop performance metrics and track progress toward achieving sustainability policies and priorities, including complete streets implementation

METRO FIRST/LAST MILE STRATEGIC PLAN

Transit travelers often must first walk, bike, or drive themselves to and from the nearest station or stop. This is referred to as the first and last mile of the user’s trip, or “first/last mile” (FLM) for short. Bus and rail services often form the core of a trip, but users complete the first and last portion on their own.

The Metro FLM Plan is an approach for identifying barriers and planning and implementing improvements for the first/last mile portions of an individual’s journey. It provides an adaptable vision for addressing FLM improvements in a systematic way, and results in data and information to justify taking those actions. FLM

---

expands the transit experience, improves safety, and enhances visual aesthetics. Examples of FLM improvements include the following:

- Infrastructure for walking, rolling, and biking (e.g. bike lanes, bike parking, sidewalks, and crosswalks)
- Shared use services (e.g. bike share and car share)
- Facilities for making modal connections (e.g. kiss and ride and bus/rail interface)
- Signage and way-finding, and information and technology that eases travel (e.g. information kiosks and mobile apps)

**METRO LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

Metro is currently working to update its Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) that was last adopted in 2009. Once approved by the Metro Board of Directors, the LRTP serves as a blueprint for how Metro will spend anticipated revenues in the coming decades to:

- Operate and maintain our current and planned system
- Continue to deliver on our commitments from the 2009 LRTP
- Identify any new projects, programs, or initiatives

**METRO ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION STRATEGIC PLAN**

The Active Transportation Strategic Plan (Plan) is Los Angeles Metro's effort to identify strategies to increase walking, bicycling and transit use in Los Angeles County. It presents policy and infrastructure recommendations that will require collaboration between Metro, local and regional agencies, and other stakeholders to ensure implementation. The Active Transportation Strategic Plan will focus on improving first and last mile access to transit and propose a regional network of active transportation facilities, including shared-use paths and on-street bikeways, and develop a funding strategy to get them built.

The funding strategy should be closely monitored by the City of Beverly Hills, as future regional investments should be attracted to the City’s Purple Line station areas for improved FLM connectivity.

**STATE POLICIES**

The Caltrans Complete Streets Implementation Action Plan 2.0 (CSIAP 2.0) establishes the California Department of Transportation’s complete streets policy framework and provides an overview of Caltrans’ complete streets implementation efforts. The plan defines a complete street as:

> A transportation facility that is planned, designed, operated, and maintained to provide safe mobility for all users including bicyclists, pedestrians, transit vehicles, truckers, and motorists, appropriate to the function and context of the facility.\(^2\)

The Plan identifies the benefits of complete streets as:

- Increased Transportation Choices
- Economic Revitalization
- Improved Return on Infrastructure Investments
- Livable Communities

\(^2\) [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/docs/CSIAP2_rpt.pdf](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/docs/CSIAP2_rpt.pdf)
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- Improved Safety
- More Walking and Bicycling
- Greenhouse Gas Reduction and Improved Air Quality

The basis for the plan is the California Complete Streets Act (AB 1358) of 2008, which requires cities and counties to include complete streets policies in their general plans to provide safe roadway design for all users. It also complements an existing Caltrans policy (California Department of Transportation revised version of Deputy Directive 64, an internal policy document that explicitly embraces Complete Streets as the policy covering all phases of state highway projects, from planning to construction to maintenance and repair) to “fully consider the needs of non-motorized travelers (including pedestrians, bicyclists and persons with disabilities) in all programming, planning, maintenance, construction, operations and project development activities and products.”

The State of California also administers the California edition of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), the California Vehicle Code, ADA Accessibility Code, and related programs that dictate minimum standards. At the City’s discretion, minimum standards may be exceeded, but the standards presented in these documents limit the City’s ability to install devices. For example, devices like pedestrian hybrid beacons must meet specific warrants to justify installation per the MUTCD.

FEDERAL POLICIES

In 2010, Secretary of Transportation Ray LaHood and the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) issued the Policy Statement on Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation Regulations and Recommendations. The statement calls for transportation projects to incorporate “safe and convenient walking and bicycling facilities.”

Recommended actions include:

- Considering walking and bicycling as equals with other transportation modes
- Ensuring that there are transportation choices for people of all ages and abilities, especially children
- Going beyond minimum design standards
- Integrating bicycle and pedestrian accommodation on new, rehabilitated, and limited-access bridges
- Collecting data on walking and biking trips
- Setting mode share targets for walking and bicycling and tracking them over time
- Improving non-motorized facilities during maintenance projects

In 2018, the National Complete Streets Coalition updated its Complete Streets framework, which identifies 10 elements of an ideal complete streets policy and a tiered point system to benchmark local policies. The elements, listed below, provide a national model for best practices of new and revised policies. The Beverly Hills Complete Streets Plan incorporates these policies into its recommendations.

- **Vision and intent**: Includes an equitable vision for how and why the community wants to complete its streets. Specifies need to create complete, connected, network and specifies at least four modes, two of which must be biking or walking.

---

3 https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/guidance/policy_accom.cfm
4 https://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/app/legacy/documents/cs/media/cs-ca-pressrelease.pdf
5 https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/guidance/policy_accom.cfm
6 Ibid
• **Diverse users**: Benefits all users equitably, particularly vulnerable users and the most underinvested and underserved communities

• **Commitment in all projects and phases**: Applies to new, retrofit/reconstruction, maintenance of, and ongoing projects

• **Clear, accountable expectations**: Makes any exceptions specific and sets a clear procedure that requires high-level approval and public notice prior to being granted

• **Jurisdiction**: Requires interagency coordination between government departments and partner agencies on complete streets

• **Design**: Directs the use of the latest and best design criteria and guidelines, and sets a time frame for their implementation

• **Land use and context sensitivity**: Considers surrounding communities’ current and expected land use and transportation needs

• **Performance measures**: Establishes performance standards that are specific, equitable, and available to the public

• **Project selection criteria**: Provides specific criteria to encourage funding prioritization for complete streets implementation

• **Implementation steps**: Includes specific next steps for policy implementation

### EXAMPLE COMPLETE STREETS POLICIES

The following summaries of complete streets plans and policies from other cities in Los Angeles County were used as examples to inform the development of the Beverly Hills Complete Streets Plan.

**CITY OF SANTA MONICA**

Adopted in 2010 (last amended in 2015), the City of Santa Monica’s Land Use and Circulation Element (LUCE) is a key component of the City’s General Plan. The award-winning plan establishes a vision to maintain the character of the city while enhancing neighborhoods, managing the transportation system, and encouraging residential development in a sustainable manner. Consistent with the vision, a primary goal of the LUCE is to create complete neighborhoods where residents can walk and bike to a mix of uses and local services, which are linked by green connections and open space. Transit-oriented development is also encouraged especially along the Expo Line corridor and requires the replication of the city’s grid system, improved connectivity among neighborhoods, enhancement of bike facilities, and creation of wide, welcoming sidewalks and pedestrian amenities. LUCE establishes a “No Net New Vehicle Trips” policy to improve access and mobility while accommodating modest growth and development. The LUCE’s 20-year vision reflects a six-year community engagement process and includes phasing and monitoring.

Adopted in 2011, the Santa Monica Bike Action Plan establishes priorities to guide and coordinate the implementation of bicycle programs and the LUCE bicycle network to encourage residents, employees, and visitors to make bicycling a transportation choice. Santa Monica’s Bike Action Plan establishes a five-year implementation strategy and 20-year vision to implement bike programs and bikeway improvements that can be used by bicyclists of all experience levels. The plan embraces the complete streets concept and builds upon existing facilities within a multimodal street network, providing roadway allocation and visibility for bicyclists while also accounting for all road users. Safe bicycling is also encouraged on complete streets through education, awareness, and encouragement efforts with business, employers, and schools.

---

7 [https://smartgrowthamerica.org/resources/elements-complete-streets-policy/](https://smartgrowthamerica.org/resources/elements-complete-streets-policy/)
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The 2016 Santa Monica Pedestrian Action Plan establishes a vision for overall pedestrian well-being, creates policies to enhance the pedestrian environment, and identifies a coordinated set of practices, programs, and projects. Santa Monica’s Pedestrian Action Plan draws from empirical analyses and community engagement to recommend citywide and location-specific actions that will improve safety, access to transit, and overall walkability of the community. The analyses include a review of reported collisions, existing and future supply and demand, health and sustainability, as well as a transit walkshed analysis. Leveraging existing policies and community and fiscal resources, the Plan recommends changes in business practices as well as policy, program, and project actions that will enhance the culture of walking in Santa Monica. A review of infrastructure best practices provides the foundation for a countermeasure selection guide and toolkit of strategies that reflect project goals, street context, and local collision patterns. The toolkit informs high priority safety and transit access projects to be recommended for 5, 10, and 20-year budget planning.

CITY OF WEST HOLLYWOOD
The West Hollywood Pedestrian & Bicycle Mobility Plan adopted in 2017 provides a vision and set of prioritized strategies and tools to enhance the City’s streets to be more comfortable, safe, and inviting to pedestrians and bicyclists of all ages and abilities. Similar to Beverly Hills, the city and its street network is almost entirely built out, meaning that not all streets may be designed to serve all modes. Given this challenge, West Hollywood’s Pedestrian & Bicycle Mobility Plan presents a Complete Network Approach where modal priorities are established on separate streets. The guiding principle of West Hollywood’s Pedestrian & Bicycle Mobility Plan is as follows, “city streets should provide safe connections for residents and visitors, regardless of their mode of transportation. Each public right-of-way should be designed to emphasize the mode(s) that are determined to be most relevant to the particular corridor.”

The objectives of West Hollywood’s Pedestrian & Bicycle Mobility Plan are as follows:

- Implement the West Hollywood General Plan & Climate Action Plan
- Comply with federal and state regulations
- Support multi-modal transportation option to reduce greenhouse gases, congestion, and pollution
- Eliminate barriers along pedestrian routes and enhance sidewalks and crossings
- Provide a convenient and connected walking network
- Strengthen regional bicycle network connections
- Eliminate gaps in existing bicycle network and provide high-quality bicycle infrastructure to improve bicyclist comfort and safety
- Coordinate with neighboring jurisdictions to connect West Hollywood to regional destinations
- Improve City streets and sidewalks to provide enjoyable community living spaces
- Improve end-of-trip experience for bicyclists with lockers, showers, changing areas, secure parking
- Foster educational programs to encourage safety and knowledge of rights and responsibilities
- Support the enforcement of traffic laws for all users of City streets
- Promote the City’s identity as a walkable and bikeable place

West Hollywood’s Pedestrian and Bicycle Mobility Plan identifies planning efforts to improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities. In 2011, the City’s Bicycle Task Force put out a report containing recommendations to

8 http://www.weho.org/home/showdocument?id=34445
improve bicycle mobility as part of the General Plan update, which inspired the formation of the West Hollywood Bicycle Coalition. The Plan provides recommendations for developing a “complete network” in four distinct sections:

- **Design Toolbox Matrix:** Identifies design treatments that will help create a more comfortable walking and biking environment in West Hollywood. Descriptions, benefits, considerations, and locations are provided for each design treatment.

- **Priority Projects:** Identified in response to key issues raised by the community, which would close major gaps in the bikeway network, enhance the pedestrian environment, and improve highly used crosswalks. The five priority projects are identified with the intention that they will be approved and designed within 5 years following the adoption of the plan.

- **Additional Network Improvements:** Recommendations for the citywide network with a longer-term outlook, which would be implemented as funding becomes available, and/or in coordination with street maintenance work. Network improvements include new bike lanes, sharrows, intersection enhancements, and crossing improvements.

- **Programs and Policies:** Education and outreach campaigns, events, policies, and programs intended to encourage, educate, and create a more walkable and bikeable city.

West Hollywood’s Pedestrian and Bicycle Mobility Plan proposes bicycle facilities on the following corridors that connect with the City of Beverly Hills:

- Cynthia Street
- Melrose Avenue
- Beverly Boulevard
- Doheny Drive
- Santa Monica Boulevard

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

Los Angeles’ Mobility Plan 2035 provided a 2016 update to the City’s General Plan. It included the following five goals: Safety First, World Class Infrastructure, Access for all Angelinos, Informed Choices, and Clean Environments for a Healthy Community. These goals establish a clear policy foundation for using complete streets as a strategy for goal implementation. The City also published a Complete Streets Design Guide, which falls under the authority of the City of Los Angeles’ Street Standards Committee. The Design Guide is intended to provide flexible guidance for implementation that can change as innovations are introduced into the city’s landscape. Key policy initiatives from the Mobility Plan include:

- Lay the foundation for a network of complete streets and establish new complete street standards that will provide safe and efficient transportation for pedestrians (especially for vulnerable users such as children, seniors and the disabled), bicyclists, transit riders, and car and truck drivers, and more
- Consider the needs of public safety when evaluating changes that implement complete streets improvements

---

9 https://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/app/legacy/documents/cs/media/cs-ca-pressrelease.pdf
Implement a balanced transportation system on all streets, tunnels, and bridges using complete street principles to ensure the safety and mobility of all users.\(^{10}\)

The City’s Safety First goal is supported by its Vision Zero work. In 2014, the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) released its first Vision Zero Strategic Plan, with the goals of reducing traffic deaths by 20 percent by 2017, and eliminating traffic fatalities citywide by 2025. The action plan includes the following approaches to implementation:

- **Engineering and Planning:** Focusing on high priority intersections and corridors on the High Injury Network, the City will increase visibility of the most vulnerable people on the road, such as pedestrians and bicyclists, children, and older adults; reduce conflicts; and set speed limits that protect human life. Safety projects will be prioritized based on crash profiles, cost effectiveness, and proven countermeasures.

- **Enforcement:** Enforcement will focus on high crash locations and target unsafe travel behavior (e.g., driving under the influence, distracted driving, failure to yield to people in crosswalks). Enhanced reporting statistics, including expanding pedestrian collisions reporting by LAPD and developing strategies based on long-term collision trends, will assist in directing safety efforts to high injury areas.

- **Education and Outreach:** The City will partner with community and neighborhood groups (especially in areas with high collision rates) and will develop safety campaigns to encourage safe travel behavior and draw attention to the most vulnerable people.

- **Evaluation and Monitoring:** The City will continue to collect and analyze collision, public health, and land use data to prioritize locations for (and evaluate results of) engineering, enforcement, and education efforts.

- **Partnerships:** Partners include County of Los Angeles Public Health, Los Angeles Unified School District, and the City’s police, fire, and public works departments. The City will continue to work with community partners to improve safety at the neighborhood level.

- **Equity:** Prioritizing safety initiatives will focus on communities with both high levels of collisions and poor health outcomes.\(^{10}\)

Vision Zero Strategic Plan proposes bicycle facilities on the following corridors that connect with the City of Beverly Hills:

- Burton Way
- 6th Street
- Wilshire Boulevard
- North Santa Monica Boulevard
- Robertson Boulevard
- Beverwil Drive

\(^{10}\)https://planning.lacity.org/documents/policy/mobilityplnmemo.pdf
APPENDIX B: BEST PRACTICES

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

ITS / TRAFFIC SIGNAL SYNCHRONIZATION
Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) are a broad group of technologies that provide information and automation for the transportation industry to deliver benefits of improved safety, mobility, and environmental outcomes for travelers. Agencies across the United States have deployed or are testing ITS technologies such as changeable message signs, advisory speed limits, transit signal priority, and adaptive traffic signal timing.

Changeable message signs are used in San Francisco to provide drivers with crucial information like emergency street closures, public service announcements (e.g., reminding drivers to slow down), special events where congestion is expected, and wayfinding around congestion. They are also used in Beverly Hills for notifying drivers to take alternative streets during Metro Purple Line construction.

Advisory speed limits have been used on Portland and Seattle freeways, primarily as a tool to alert drivers about upcoming incidents (e.g., crashes, inclement weather, or other sudden slowdowns). Innovative agencies are exploring options to communicate suggested variable speed limits, inclusive of explanations of why reduced speeds are suggested (e.g., high volumes of pedestrians and/or bicycle traffic ahead). This takes advantage of the increasing connectivity being built into new vehicles. General Motors, Ford, Toyota, Audi and Tesla all communicate posted speed limits on the vehicle instrument panel, and some communicate warnings to drivers.

Transit signal priority is a technology that provides an early green light or extends the existing green light so that transit vehicles can move through the intersection without delay if needed to maintain or regain schedule adherence.

Adaptive traffic signal timing is used in many cities with high vehicular traffic so that vehicles continuously arrive at a green light while traveling through a corridor. The number and speed of approaching vehicles on each intersection leg are known to the traffic signal controller, and traffic signal green time is adaptively reallocated to maximize throughput. A good example of this is the Mercer corridor in Seattle, which is a very wide eight-lane arterial that has intermittent yet significant bicycle traffic crossings. The City uses smart sensor video detection to distinguish when bicyclists are present and extends green time to assure slower moving bicyclists safely cross the intersection when they are present; when no bicycles are present that traffic signal green time is reallocated back to the main street for better vehicle flow. The City should evaluate adaptive signal technology for applicability in Beverly Hills.

Video detection at traffic signals is also more effective in maintaining signal coordination through construction zones. Detection zones are simply redrawn as lane assignments shift with various construction stages, and both communications and counting capabilities are maintained. The count data can be sent from the controller to the cloud to the agency staff desktop, in a format ready for direct input for programming optimal traffic signal coordination for construction-induced traffic pattern shifts.

CURB SPACE MANAGEMENT
The efficient use of curbside space is one of the most valuable and underutilized tools that cities have to manage freight, shuttle, and for-hire vehicle traffic. As technology continues to change, changes in demand at the curbside changes, as well. For example, in recent years there has been an increase in urban freight due to online shopping and personal deliveries, such as app-based meal purchasing.
The following are examples of curb space management strategies implemented in other cities to help better organize uses and address demand.

- **Flexible Curb Zones**: Cities with curbsides in high demand have adopted new strategies to accommodate a wide range of priorities. Washington, D.C. tested a pilot zone that removed on-street parking at the Golden Triangle Business Improvement District. This neighborhood attracts high transportation network company (TNC) traffic from 10 PM – 2 AM during the weekends resulting in traffic congestion and a higher likelihood of pedestrian/vehicle conflicts as many TNCs would pickup and drop-off in the travel lane. By prohibiting parking from 10 PM – 7 AM, business owners noted increased customer traffic and reduced dwell times for TNC vehicles. Flexible curb zones are likely to be a more common best practice as on-street parking demand gives way to increased pick-up and drop-off activities as a result of more shared rides.

- **TNC Geo-fencing**: Many commercial districts struggle with accommodating TNC (for example, Lyft and Uber) pickup/drop-off activity during high-demand periods. Lack of coordination among TNCs and the City controlling the curb space results in TNC vehicles blocking travel lanes and bike lanes, compromising bike and pedestrian safety. Cities are increasingly working with TNCs directly to set up “geofences” – restricted zones that require TNC drivers/riders to pick-up/drop-off only from dedicated locations. Users are instructed to set their desired pickup/drop-off locations at the predetermined locations within the respective TNC apps. Geofencing generally prohibits TNCs from pickup/drop-off at key transit stops/stations and where loading presents significant conflicts with other modes. Geofencing for TNCs is becoming increasingly prevalent at landmarks with surges in demand, such as at sports arenas. Geofencing areas around the future Metro Purple Line stations could help address issues with unloading and loading in travel lanes adjacent to the stations.

- **Off-peak loading**: Management of loading and deliveries aims to reduce heavy truck traffic and conflicts with other modes by discouraging commercial loading during peak travel periods. Cities such as Philadelphia and New York provide incentives for overnight freight deliveries, while parts of central Boston ban mid-day truck traffic altogether. The City requires commercial deliveries to occur in alleys, but this still invites truck traffic on city streets during peak hours.

**AUTOMATED ENFORCEMENT**

Automated enforcement measures can help reduce red light violations and control speeding without diverting law enforcement resources from other areas. Such measures are intended to reduce congestion and improve safety. A factor in road congestion is collisions and incidents, which some experts believe cause half of all traffic congestion due to related traffic backups.

Traffic cameras cannot be used for speed enforcement in California. Some other States use radar to identify and photograph drivers exceeding the speed limit or running red lights. They are often combined with signs warning drivers that traffic laws are photo enforced. Traffic cameras are usually implemented on major arterials with a history of crashes attributed to high speeds or red light violations. In Portland, Oregon, red light cameras have been found to reduce total crashes at intersections by an average of 40 percent and injuries by an average of 48 percent.\(^\text{11}\)

Radar speed signs can be either permanent or mobile signs that detect and display the speed of vehicles as they approach. The signs raise the awareness of people driving and encourage them to slow down if they are

\(^{11}\) City of Portland, Bureau of Transportation
above the speed limit. They are best used on busy streets where people are frequently observed driving above the speed limit, and/or on approaches to school zones and other high pedestrian activity areas prioritized with data collected on pedestrian counts at traffic signals by smart sensors. The radar speed signs can be configured to alert enforcement officers of locations and times of flagrant speeding, so that patterns can be discerned and effective enforcement can be scheduled.

A major factor that can affect public perceptions and attitudes toward automated traffic enforcement for red light running is the way in which these programs are implemented. A well-designed implementation plan can maximize opportunities to garner community support and raise public awareness of the reasons for deployment, while poorly implemented programs can generate negative public reactions and harsh media attention right from the start, potentially leading to program termination. Many factors in automated speed enforcement development and delivery are thought to affect the level of public acceptance and the success of speed camera programs. These factors include:

- Having specific target sites for enforcement (e.g., school zones, work zones, etc.)
- Program funding and use of any excess revenue
- Nature of citations issued (citing vehicle owner vs. driver)
- Type of citation review (e.g., police officer, vendor)
- Penalties for violations (level of fines, points on license, etc.)
- Existence and results of program evaluations
- Media reports and level of media exposure
- Public perception of the program

**PARKING**

**REVERSE ANGLED PARKING**

Reverse angled parking rotates head-in angled parking so that motorists instead back into stalls. This rotation improves sight distance of motorists exiting parking stalls so they can better see bicyclists and other motorists in the travel lanes. Reverse angled parking also has benefits to pedestrians as drivers can load cargo and children into vehicles from the sidewalk rather than the street.

Some United States cities that have installed reverse angled parking include Seattle, Tacoma, Olympia, Vancouver, Portland, Salem, Tucson, Austin, Salt Lake City, Washington, D.C., and Indianapolis. Tucson tracked data for bicycle/vehicle crashes before and after installing reverse angled parking and found that in the first four years after implementation it resulted in zero reported crashes, as compared to an average of three to four crashes associated with head-in angled parking.

**PARK ONCE DISTRICT**

Park Once is a concept for a pedestrian-friendly district that allows people to park their cars once and walk through the area for errands/tasks instead of driving from destination to destination, as shown in Figure B-1.
Parking is located such that most visitors are within the walking distance of their destinations\textsuperscript{12}. This parking program provides the users with information on space availability and cost of parking. It utilizes the existing parking capacity more efficiently through applications that can be downloaded to personal cellphones, available online on the City’s website, and shown at the entrance of parking garages. The Park Once District can improve the mobility of pedestrians in the area, enhance the business viability, and reduce traffic congestion and fuel consumption. The Park Once strategy has been widely used in downtown mobility plans and implemented in cities such as Glendale\textsuperscript{13} and Ventura\textsuperscript{14}.

\textbf{Figure B-1: Schematic Demonstration of Park Once District}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Figures/FigureB1.png}
\caption{Schematic Demonstration of Park Once District}
\end{figure}

\textbf{Source: Nelson\slash Nygaard, based on an illustration by Walter Kulash}

\section*{REAL-TIME PARKING INFORMATION}

Visibility of available parking in off-street lots is a common issue in dense, urban areas. In many cases, motorists drive around searching for on-street parking spaces because they cannot see other available options. Using dynamic signs that show real-time availability of parking in lots can make the stalls more visible to the motorists and reduce traffic congestion. The City of Santa Monica includes static signs directing motorists to available off-street parking and nearby parking lots, and digital signs that show the number of available parking stalls at public facilities.\textsuperscript{15} The City of Beverly Hills provides indicator lighting over stalls in some parking structures to alert drivers of available parking stalls downstream.

Real-time information on parking availability and price can be collected to build an interactive parking map to

\textsuperscript{12} http://www.pedbikeinfo.org/
\textsuperscript{13} Glendale Downtown Mobility Study, 2007. https://www.glendaleca.gov/home/showdocument?id=20140
\textsuperscript{15} City of Santa Monica, https://www.smgov.net/Departments/PCD/
provide to drivers, for example through the “ParkMe” website/application. Figure B-2 shows a screenshot of a ParkMe map, demonstrating the available parking in Santa Monica, CA along with the parking prices in real-time.

Figure B-2: ParkMe Website Snapshot

Source: https://www.parkme.com/

PEDESTRIAN INFRASTRUCTURE

CURB EXTENSIONS

Curb extensions can improve safety for pedestrians by narrowing the roadway to slow traffic and increasing space for pedestrian- and transit-friendly infrastructure. Curb extensions can shorten the crossing distance for pedestrians, therefore reducing the conflict zone with drivers. They can increase pedestrian visibility and provide additional space for amenities like street furniture. Curb extension treatments can also be installed on a temporary basis with paint, bollards, and planters, like along Pico Boulevard in Los Angeles. Types of curb extensions include:

- **Conventional**: Conventional curb extensions can be installed at corners or intersections where there is on-street parking to increase pedestrian visibility and reduce crossing distances.
- **Midblock**: Also known as pinch points or chokers, midblock curb extensions are useful for calming traffic at mid-block crossing locations on streets where there is on-street parking preceding and/or proceeding the crossing area.
- **Offset**: Also known as chicanes, offset curb extensions slow traffic speeds by requiring vehicles to move in a lateral motion.
Curb extensions may include pervious pavement to effectively treat, detain, and infiltrate stormwater runoff where landscape-based strategies are restricted or less desired. Pervious pavements have multiple applications, including sidewalks, street furniture zones, and entire roadways (or just their parking lane or gutter strip portions). Where landscape options are available, bioswales are recommended. They are vegetated, shallow, landscaped depressions designed to capture, treat, and infiltrate stormwater runoff as it moves downstream. They are typically sized to treat the water quality event, also known as the “first flush,” which is the first and often most polluted volume of water resulting from a storm event. Bioswales are the most effective type of green infrastructure facility in slowing runoff velocity and cleansing water while recharging the underlying groundwater table. They have flexible siting requirements, allowing them to be integrated with medians, cul-de-sacs, curb extensions, and other public space or traffic calming strategies.

INTERSECTION TREATMENTS
Most conflicts between roadway users occur at intersections where vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians cross paths. In general, intersections should be designed to avoid conflicts by making right-of-way clear and heightening the visibility of pedestrians and bicyclists. Types of intersection treatments include:

- **Tight Corner Radii:** Make the turning angles at corners as narrow as possible (10 to 15 foot radii) to reduce the crossing distance, increase visibility of pedestrians, and slow down turning vehicles.

- **Mitigate Skewed Intersections:** Reduce instances where vehicles approach a roadway at an obtuse angle rather than perpendicularly. Skewed intersections can increase crossing distances for pedestrians, require longer signal phases, encourage speeding, and reduce visibility of pedestrians. Mitigations include tightening corner radii, squaring off the intersection (90-degree angles), installing pedestrian refuge islands (discussed below), and striping guidelines for motorists and bicyclists through undefined areas. Skewed intersections are prevalent along Wilshire Boulevard in Beverly Hills.
• **Mitigate Multi-leg Intersections**: Reduce intersections with more than four legs because they have multiple conflict points and potentially longer crossing distances. Mitigations include traffic circles (roundabouts) or closing one leg to create a minor intersection further up or downstream.

• **Traffic Circles or Roundabouts**: Reduce vehicle-pedestrian conflicts, reduce vehicle speeds, and reduce crash severity. In particular, roundabouts eliminate the most common types of crashes at intersections, which are left-turning movements and right-angle crashes.

• **Advanced Limit Lines**: Reduce vehicle encroachment into crosswalks and improve visibility of pedestrians for motorists. Stop lines should be set back between four to six feet from the crosswalk at signalized intersections, up to 40 feet where right turn on red conflicts exist, and a minimum of 40 feet at signalized midblock crossings.

• **High visibility crosswalks**: Improve visibility of pedestrians. When complemented with curb extensions and advance stop lines, high visibility crosswalks reduce the incidences of vehicle and pedestrian conflicts at intersections. The City of Beverly Hills’ new standard crosswalk style is high visibility continental.

**PEDESTRIAN REFUGE ISLANDS**
Pedestrian refuge islands reduce pedestrian exposure to vehicles and help people cross wide streets by allowing them to cross one approach at a time. Refuge islands should ideally be 8-10 feet wide with a cut-through accessible ramp equal to the width of the crosswalk. As shown in the image at right, islands should have a “nose” extending past the crosswalk and curbs and/or bollards to protect people waiting.

**ROADWAY RECONFIGURATION**
Roadway reconfigurations repurpose vehicle travel lanes to create space for people walking and riding bicycles. A typical reconfiguration converts a four-lane roadway to two travel lanes, a center turn lane, and space for active modes. The images below show an example of a roadway reconfiguration in Downtown Los Angeles, where the City converted the curb lane to public space. These restriping treatments are generally deemed feasible where average daily traffic volumes do not exceed 20,000 vehicles per day on streets with two lanes in each direction.

A key benefit of roadway reconfiguration is the creation of additional space in the roadway for pedestrian and/or bicycle amenities, such as pedestrian refuge islands, bike lanes, or wide sidewalks. Reducing the number of vehicle travel lanes shortens the crossing distance for pedestrians and can slow speeds by visually narrowing the roadway, thus also potentially reducing crash severity. Roadway reconfigurations can also improve traffic flow by moving left-turning vehicles to the center lane where they do not queue in front of through traffic.
SIGNAL MODIFICATIONS
Signal modifications can be made to better communicate pedestrian rights of way, both to the pedestrian and to conflicting traffic. Most vehicle collisions with pedestrians occur at intersections where turning vehicles conflict with people walking. Pedestrian safety at intersections can be improved through changes to signals, which are often designed to accommodate or maximize motor vehicle traffic with little to no considerations given for pedestrians. Types of signal enhancements include:

- **Leading Pedestrian Intervals** (LPIs): Typically give pedestrians a 3 to 7 second head start before vehicles are permitted to proceed at an intersection. This makes pedestrians more visible in the intersection and reinforces their right-of-way over turning vehicles. LPIs can be relatively low cost to install because they typically only require adjustments to the existing signal timing. LPIs have been shown to reduce pedestrian-involved collisions by as much as 60 percent.

- **Scramble Crossings**: Exclusive pedestrian phase that allows pedestrians to cross in any direction—including diagonally—while vehicles from all directions are stopped. The City of Beverly Hills has several pedestrian scrambles in the Business Triangle and was one of the first cities in Los Angeles County to install this treatment.

- **Automated Pedestrian Detection**: Microwave and infrared devices are able to sense when a pedestrian is waiting at a crosswalk and automatically send a signal to switch to a pedestrian WALK phase. Some automated pedestrian detection devices are also able to determine whether a pedestrian needs more time to cross the roadway and will lengthen the crossing interval to accommodate the slower pedestrian. Automated pedestrian detection devices reduce the percentage of pedestrians who cross roadways at inappropriate times, such as when the DON’T WALK signal is visible. A delay can be built into either of the devices so that the Walk signal is called only if the pedestrian stays within the detection zone for a certain amount of time. The delay helps to prevent pedestrians who walk by the detection zone from accidentally activating the WALK signal.

FLASHING BEACONS
Long blocks or gaps between signalized intersections can create a challenging crossing situation for pedestrians and bicyclists. The following tools increase visibility of active modes at unsignalized crossings.

- **Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons** (RRFB): Alert drivers to pedestrians crossing at unsignalized intersections via pedestrian push button. RRFBs have been shown to generate high yield compliance by drivers.
• **Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons**: Alert drivers to people crossing through a pedestrian push button that activates an overhead warning light. Once activated, the signal turns yellow to notify vehicles that a pedestrian is preparing to cross, before moving to a steady red while the pedestrian is crossing, and a flashing red during the pedestrian clearance interval. A study on the safety effects of hybrid beacons showed a 69 percent reduction in pedestrian-involved collisions.

![Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon Image](image1)

• **In-roadway Flashing Lights**: Pedestrian-activated lights embedded in the pavement in front of the crosswalk that flash to notify drivers of pedestrians crossing. In-roadway flashing lights to date have degraded over time and require significant maintenance, but new technology appears to be improved.

![In-roadway Flashing Lights Image](image2)

• **Toucan Signals**: Provide a protected crossing for bicyclists and pedestrians on roads that prioritize non-motorized traffic. Vehicle traffic is required to turn right or left, which can help calm traffic on streets with these signals.

![Toucan Signals Image](image3)
PARKLETS
A parklet converts an on-street parking stall or underutilized roadway space into an extension of the sidewalk to provide additional public space. They are appropriate in areas with high pedestrian activity through most of the day and can effectively widen narrow sidewalks with limited space for pedestrian amenities like street furniture. Parklets can include seating, games, bike parking, or other amenities that activate the public realm.

PEDESTRIAN SCALE LIGHTING
Street lighting of lower height can improve accessibility and visibility by illuminating sidewalks, crosswalks, and signs. Pedestrian-scale lighting and vehicle-scale lighting should complement each other to ensure that both sidewalks and travel lanes are effectively illuminated. Lampposts are recommended to be staggered on opposite sides of the street to act as vertical buffers between the sidewalk and street and help define pedestrian areas. Pedestrian-scale lighting can be applied to the following uses to enhance the public realm:

- Landscaping
- Transit stops
- Building entrances
- Edges of parks and plazas
- Retail displays
- Architectural details
- Signage
- Focal points
- Traffic calming

BICYCLE INFRASTRUCTURE

SHARED USE PATHS
Shared-use paths allow for two-way, off-street bicycle and pedestrian use. They are appropriate for riders of all abilities, particularly children and older adults, because they are completely separated from the roadway. If heavy use by pedestrians or other non-motorized users is expected, separated space for bicyclists may be appropriate.

BIKE LANE UPGRADES
Buffered bicycle lanes are on-street bike lanes with an additional buffer between either the bike lane and the travel lane, or the bike lane and the parking lane (or both). They are more comfortable for bicyclists because they provide more separation from moving traffic and can move bicyclists out of the door zone.

16 https://nacto.org/docs/usdg/best_practices_ped_master_planning_design_sacramento.pdf
A before and after study of buffered bicycle lane installation in Portland, OR found an overwhelmingly positive response from bicyclists, with 89 percent of bicyclists feeling safer riding after installation and 91 percent expressing that the facility made bicycling easier.\textsuperscript{17}

Where pavement widths are constrained, consideration may be given to striping uphill bike lanes (to better protect the slower moving ascending bicyclists) and downhill sharrows (to position the faster descending cyclists in the right-third of the travel lane). This provides a bike lane in one direction, providing separation from vehicle traffic in the more critical direction.

Often due to roadway constraints, bike lanes drop at intersections and allow for right turning vehicle movements. Striping combined bike and right turn lanes like what is currently at several intersections on North Santa Monica Boulevard in Beverly Hills can encourage drivers and bicyclists to share space and move more slowly in conflict zones.

Advisory bike lanes provide for two-way motor vehicle and bicycle traffic using a central travel lane and “advisory” bike lanes on either side. The center lane is dedicated to, and shared by, motorists traveling in both directions. Cyclists are given preference in the bike lanes, but motorists can move into the bike lanes in order to pass other road users after yielding to cyclists. Advisory bike lanes are most appropriate for lower volume streets. They exist throughout the United States and Canada. Cities in the United States must apply for FHWA authorization for an experimental treatment to implement advisory bike lanes.

\textsuperscript{17} National Cooperative Highway Research Program, 2014. Report #766: Recommended Bicycle Lane Widths for Various Roadway Characteristics.
Contra-flow bike lanes effectively convert one-way streets to two-way streets by allowing bicyclists to ride in the opposite direction of traffic in the bike lane (the street remains one-way for motorists). Contra-flow lanes can provide greater connectivity and access to bicyclists, as well as shorter trip distances and travel times. Contra-flow lanes can be placed next to the bike lane in the same direction as motor vehicle traffic to create two-way separated bike lanes.

BIKE BOULEVARDS
Bicycle boulevards are bike routes on low volume streets that are enhanced with traffic calming and intersection treatments to prioritize active modes of travel. They are appropriate for all levels of bicyclists, especially children and older adults that may not feel comfortable biking on arterial streets. They are intended to bring vehicle travel speeds down to the approximate speed of cyclists, and work well to resolve speeding complaints along low volume local streets. If space permits, they can also include bike lanes in one or two directions.

SEPARATED BIKEWAYS
Separated bikeways are one- or two-way bike lanes physically separated from moving traffic through bollards, planters, concrete, or other vertical delineation. Separated bikeways are significantly more comfortable for less confident bicyclists, especially children or older adults that do not feel comfortable riding adjacent to moving vehicles. Due to reduced conflict points, separated bikeways can reduce vehicle-bicycle collisions.

SIGNAL MODIFICATIONS
Bicycle signals can facilitate safer and more convenient bicyclist crossings at intersections along shared use paths and separated bikeways by providing a bicycle signal phase, which minimizes bicycle-vehicle conflicts. An intersection with bicycle signals may reduce stress and delays for a crossing bicyclist, and discourage illegal and unsafe crossing maneuvers.\(^{18}\)

Bicyclists typically need more time to travel through an intersection than motor vehicles. Green light times for bicycle signals should be determined using the bicycle crossing time for standing bicycles. In the United States, bicycle signal heads typically use standard three-lens signal heads in green, yellow, and red lenses. Further, push buttons, signage, and pavement markings may be used to highlight these facilities for both bicyclists and motorists.

At unsignalized intersection crossings, flashing amber warning beacons and signals, such as the Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon or Toucan signals discussed in earlier in this chapter, are often used to assist bicyclists crossing. Determining which type of signal or beacon to use depends on vehicle speed limits, vehicle traffic volumes, anticipated bicycle crossing traffic, and the configuration of planned or existing bicycle facilities.

Traffic signal detection should be provided with sensors that are smart enough to distinguish bicycles from vehicles, so that green times can be extended for safe passage of bicycles when they are present and green time can be reallocated to more congested approaches when they are not present. Detection with sensors that distinguish bicycles from vehicles can alert the signal controller of bicyclists waiting to cross the street.

Supplemental bike indicators are available to communicate to waiting bicyclists that the signal knows they are waiting on red, and a green light will be provided long enough to safely clear them. A supplemental pavement marking may be used to instruct bicyclists where to position themselves to trigger the signal, although this is not necessary with video detection. For non-video detection the type of detection must be adjusted for bicycle metallic mass, and non-metallic bikes are not detected. All existing and new traffic signals should be timed for bicyclist speeds so that people on bikes can clear the intersection before the next signal phase begins, which minimizes vehicle-bicycle conflicts.

CONFLICT ZONE AND INTERSECTION TREATMENTS

Green colored pavement can be used on bikeways, in conflict areas, in intersection treatments, and behind pavement markings (like shared lane markings) to increase awareness of bicyclists. Colored pavement application materials include paint, durable liquid pavement markings, and thermoplastic.

Bike boxes can be placed at the start of a travel lane at signalized intersections to provide bicyclists a separated space to queue during the red signal phase. They can increase the visibility of bicyclists, reduce bicyclist signal delay, assist with merges from bike lanes to shared travel lanes (like on eastbound North Santa Monica Boulevard at Doheny Drive in Beverly Hills), and facilitate bicyclist left turns. Bike boxes are appropriate at conflict zones, such as at vehicle right or left turn locations; at signalized intersections with high bicycle volumes; and at signalized intersections with high vehicle volumes.

Intersection crossing markings guide bicyclists through intersections, driveways, and ramps, and highlight the bicyclist path of travel to drivers, making bicyclists more predictable in conflict zones. They are best applied on streets with bike lanes or separated bikeways, at direct paths through intersections, on streets with high volumes of adjacent traffic, and in potential conflict zones.

The design of intersection crossing markings is an emerging practice area. The National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices has submitted a request to include additional options for bicycle lane extensions through intersections as a part of future MUTCD updates. Their proposal includes the following options for striping elements within the crossing: bicycle lane markings, double chevron markings indicating the direction of travel, and green colored pavement.
Two-stage left turn queueing boxes offer bicyclists a safe way to make left turns at multi-lane signalized intersections from a separated bikeway or bike lane. Two-stage turn queue boxes may also be used at unsignalized intersections to simplify turns from a bicycle lane or separated bikeway, as for example, onto a bicycle boulevard.

The protected intersection is a way of accommodating separated bikeways at intersections. It is modeled after Dutch intersection design and includes features for corner refuge islands that put the stop bar for bicyclists ahead of the stop bar for vehicles and bicyclist crossings set back approximately one car length from the adjacent travel lane. Protected Intersection design has promise, yet there are some challenges in implementation. Known issues include:

- Intersection capacity implications of added bicycle signal phases
- Non-MUTCD compliant signalization schemes, such as the leading bicycle interval
- Truck turning requirements for freight movement
- Bicyclist deflection at corner islands and impacts to operating speed
- Interaction between bicyclists and pedestrians
- Pedestrian deflection at crossings
- Considerations for pedestrians with disabilities

BICYCLE PARKING

High quality bicycle parking provides a secure place for people to leave their bicycles when they reach their destinations. Design guidance on short- and long-term bike parking can be found in the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals’ (APBP) Bicycle Parking Design Guide. Short-term bicycle parking is appropriate for storage of bicycles for up to 2 hours and typically takes the form of bike racks. Recommended bike rack styles that provide more security and stability include U-racks, post and ring racks, and staple racks. Bike racks should be placed as close as possible to destination entrances and ideally provide weather protection.

Where the placement of racks on sidewalks is not possible due to narrow sidewalk width or sidewalk obstructions, an on-street parking stall or underutilized roadway space can be converted to a bike corral, which contains multiple bike racks (typically space for 6-10 bicycles).

Long-term bike parking is appropriate for storage of bicycles for more than 2 hours, for example at work places or transit stations, so it must provide greater security and protection for people to feel comfortable leaving their bikes. Recommended long-term bike parking types include lockers, secure parking areas (SPAs), and closed rooms with in-person or TV monitoring. Long-term bike parking areas can include bike repair stations and changing facilities to encouraging bike commuting.
BIKE SHARE
As discussed in Chapter 3, bike share is a form of public transportation where bicycles are made available 24/7 for rent for short, point-to-point trips. Should the City of Beverly Hills expand the existing bike share system, best practices in bike share programs include:

- Implement an integrated, connected network of low-stress bicycle facilities so bicyclists have a comfortable place to ride
- Deploy stations in areas where increased population and job densities, popular destinations such as parks, schools, public transit hubs, and retail centers positively impact ridership
- Locate stations no more than one-half mile apart to minimize distances users must walk to access the service
- Evaluate data, customer information, and feedback for system improvement
- Encourage helmet use
- Enhance functionality with mobile and web applications
- Integrate with other active transportation options to provide multiple choices

WAYFINDING
Bicycle wayfinding signage and markings can help bicyclists efficiently navigate the bikeway network to reach their destinations. Wayfinding is especially helpful to guide bicyclists along bike boulevards where the routes may make frequent turns to keep bicyclist on low-stress streets. Types of wayfinding signs include:

- **Confirmation Signs**: Show bicyclists they are on a designated bikeway
- **Turn Signs**: Indicate where a bikeway turns from one street to another
- **Decision Signs**: Identifies the intersection of two bikeways or the route to key destinations

Wayfinding pavement markings can be used to supplement wayfinding signage that may be difficult to see and help bicyclists navigate routes that turn. Portland, OR, for example, uses shared lane markings with angled chevrons to tell bicyclists where to turn to stay on bike boulevards.

TRANSIT INFRASTRUCTURE

BUS ONLY LANES
Bus-only lanes are travel lanes dedicated exclusively to buses either during peak commute hours or all day to increase the efficiency of transit systems by improving bus travel speed and reliability. As shown in the graphics below, bus lanes can be curb-adjacent or center-running. Curb-adjacent bus lanes are appropriate for bus lanes that are only available during peak hours, such as the existing bus-only lanes on Wilshire Boulevard in the Cities of Los Angeles and Santa Monica.

---
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Shared bus-only and bike lanes can accommodate both modes when buses travel at slow speeds with moderate headways (applications should generally be limited to bus lanes with operating speeds of 20 mph or less and transit headways of 4 minutes or longer), where buses are discouraged from passing, and bicyclists pass buses only at stops. In appropriate conditions, bus-bike lanes are an option on streets where both dedicated bus and separate high-comfort bicycle facilities cannot be provided.

**BUS BULBS AND PLATFORMS**

Bus bulbs are curb extensions that put the bus stop in line with the parking lane, which enables buses to load/unload passengers without leaving the travel lane. Bus bulbs can help make buses more reliable and reduce travel time by not having to merge in and out of traffic. Where bike lanes are present, bike lane cut-outs should be provided to create floating bus islands, along with appropriate signage and markings to highlight bicycle-pedestrian conflict zones.

Where a bike lane is present without a parking lane, bus platforms should be considered. Bus platforms raise the bike lane up to sidewalk level, allowing the bus to load/unload passengers without pulling into the bike lane and reduce bus-bicycle conflicts.

**ENHANCED BUS STOPS**

Enhancing transit stops can improve the user experience and encourage people to take transit more often. Providing amenities like bus shelters, lighting, benches, and trash facilities where space is available, even at low-ridership stops, helps to provide a level of comfort for transit riders in line with that typically prioritized for drivers. Additionally, real-time travel information, like changeable signs displaying when the next bus is coming, or automated displays can help make transit more predictable and make transfers more convenient.

**TRANSIT SIGNAL PRIORITY**

Transit signal priority modifies traffic signal timing or phasing when buses (and trains) are present, either conditionally for vehicles that are behind schedule or unconditionally for all vehicles. This can improve transit reliability and travel time, especially on arterial streets with long signal cycles and distances between signals. In urban settings, transit signal priority has the largest benefits when implemented in conjunction with infrastructure like bus-only lanes.
MICROTTRANSPORT
Microtransit is a small-scale, demand responsive transit system, providing more flexibility over conventional public transit. Riders call the service when they want it, are picked up at/near their locations, and are dropped off at/near their destinations. Unlike conventional public transit, routes do not have to be fixed and can be modified based on real-time demand and real-time traffic conditions. Microtransit can offer amenities like Wi-Fi, USB, and chargers to enhance user comfort. Microtransit should be considered where it could fill in gaps in the existing transit system, not as a replacement. An opportunity for microtransit in Beverly Hills is providing an autonomous shuttle to/from the Metro Purple Line stations.

MOBILITY HUBS
Clustering transit stops with bike share stations, car share, and for-hire-vehicle zones to create neighborhood mobility hubs can make the best use of station and sidewalk investments and addressing ADA and accessibility through the design process. These concepts will be key to the two Metro Purple Line stations, where station area planning should be integrated with placemaking to capitalize on local assets, inspiration, and the potential to create public spaces that promote people’s health, happiness, and wellbeing.
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Technology applications in transportation have advanced rapidly in recent years, from the explosive growth in on-demand and ride-hailing services such as Uber and Lyft; to microtransit services such as Chariot and Via; to connected and autonomous vehicular technologies and drones. Technology advances have been characterized in multiple research studies as three transportation revolutions:

- Electrification of Vehicles and Transportation Network,
- Connected and Autonomous Vehicles, and
- Widespread Shared Mobility (sharing of vehicle trips)

These revolutions give public agencies reasons to pause and reconsider how to design, operate, and maintain transportation networks to maximize the benefits of improved safety, mobility, convenience, and greenhouse gas emissions reduction while minimizing the negative externalities associated with these transformations. Without adequate public policies and infrastructure, technological changes may produce negative externalities such as increased vehicle miles traveled (VMT), reduced vehicle occupancy, increased congestion, reduced transit ridership, and an increase in intermodal conflicts.

**ELECTRIFICATION OF VEHICLES AND THE TRANSPORTATION NETWORK**

The internal combustion engine has dominated automobile propulsion for 100 years. The push to reduce vehicle greenhouse gas emissions as a primary means of mitigating the effects of climate change involves both shifting the fuel mix of the vehicle fleet to zero-emissions sources and reducing vehicle miles traveled.

The use of electric and hydrogen fuel-cell electric vehicles is encouraged through the California Air Resources Board’s Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) program. The ZEV program supports the development of plug-in electric vehicle and hydrogen electric fuel cell stations throughout the state.

Electrify America, a subsidiary of Volkswagen created in the wake of the company’s emissions scandal, will invest $2 billion in Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) infrastructure and education programs in the United States over a 10-year period ending in 2027. Of this $2 billion, $800 million will be invested in California, the largest single ZEV market in the world. This investment represents the largest of its kind ever made, and it will establish a network of approximately 2,000-3,000 non-proprietary chargers across 400+ individual stations in California. As part of Electrify America’s first 30-month investment plan, approximately 350 new Level 2 charging stations and 50 DC Fast Charging stations will be built in six California regions: Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Francisco, San Diego, San Jose, and Fresno. Of these charging stations, 75 percent will be located at workplaces and the remainder at apartment buildings, condominiums and other multi-family properties.
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21 https://www.epa.gov/vw/learn-about-volkswagen-violations, accessed 07/26/18
22 Electrify America 3Q 2017 Report to California Air Resources Board, Cycle 1, November 21, 2017.
23 Level 2 chargers are used for both residential and commercial charging stations. They use a 240 V (for residential) or 208 V (for commercial) plug, and can deliver 20 to 25 miles of vehicle range per hour of charging.
24 DC Fast Chargers, also known as Level 3 or CHAdeMO charging stations, can offer 60 to 100 miles of range for electric vehicles in just 20 minutes of charging. However, they are typically only used in commercial and industrial applications – they require highly specialized, high-powered equipment to install and maintain. DC Fast Chargers are not compatible with most plug-in hybrid electric vehicles.
25 https://www.electrifyamerica.com/our-plan
**ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING INFRASTRUCTURE**

A greater density of charging infrastructure makes electric vehicles (EVs) a more viable option for a wider range of vehicle trips. Fast, ubiquitous EV charging infrastructure in urban areas is necessary to ensure that vehicle fleets become not just increasingly electric, but also increasingly shared. Widespread availability of DC Fast Charging stations is necessary to facilitate the high vehicle turnover required to sustain car share fleets – and even more so for expected autonomous ride-hail fleets – and minimize recharging downtime. Car share and ride-hail fleets have lower handling costs if their vehicles are parked closer to electric vehicle (EV) charging. Overall, the technology and market outlook for EVs appears promising, though the timing of when the technology will become widely adopted remains to be seen. Continuing strong local, regional and federal policy will be needed for many years to achieve a full electrification of the vehicle fleet.26

The City should explore EV car sharing, especially in neighborhoods with permit parking, to nudge its transportation operations towards a more sustainable future. According to the study *The Impact of Carsharing on Household Vehicle Ownership*, for every car share vehicle up to 13 personally owned vehicles can be given up by their owners.27 The cited research found that carsharing lowers the total number of vehicles owned by members. Across the sample, households owned 2,968 vehicles before carsharing, which translates to 0.47 vehicles per household. After carsharing, the sample owned 1,507 vehicles, or 0.24 vehicles per household. The difference between these means (−0.23) is statistically significant at the 99 percent confidence level. Notably, much of this shift involved households becoming carless: 80 percent of the sample owned no vehicle after joining carsharing. Most of this shift was the result of one-car households becoming no-car households. A smaller change occurred with two-car households becoming one-car households. Carsharing not only reduces the number of personal vehicles owned across the sample; it can also deter carless households from acquiring a vehicle. Most of the households that join carsharing are carless: 62 percent of households joining carsharing owned no vehicle when they joined, while 31 percent of households owned one vehicle. That is, some carsharing members who consider buying a car ultimately decide against it and use carsharing instead. This effect is hard to measure because a decision not to purchase something is difficult to observe. However, the survey conducted as part of this study asked respondents whether in the absence of carsharing they would buy a car. The available responses included “definitely not,” “probably not,” “maybe,” “probably,” and “definitely.” This question gives insight into the degree to which carsharing substituted for a personal vehicle that would have been purchased. About 25 percent of the total sample indicated that they “maybe,” “probably,” or “definitely” would buy a car in the absence of carsharing.

The implementation of electric vehicle charging infrastructure should be coordinated with the City’s Parking Manager.

**HYDROGEN FUEL-CELL ELECTRIC VEHICLES**

Hydrogen fuel-cell technology is an emerging partner in the electrification of California’s vehicle fleet. Whereas plug-in EVs use rechargeable lithium-ion batteries to power the vehicle, hydrogen fuel cells use a process of reverse electrolysis – combining compressed hydrogen on the anode side of the fuel-cell and oxygen on the
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26 Three Revolutions in Global Transportation, UC Davis and the Institute for Transportation & Development Policy, May 2017, p 33.
cathode side – to create water and the electric energy used to power the vehicle’s motion. Like plug-in EVs, hydrogen fuel-cell vehicles create no greenhouse gas emissions; the only waste from its exhaust pipe is water vapor. Hydrogen fuel-cell vehicles can recharge in minutes and typically offer a vehicle range of about 300 miles of travel between charges, roughly equivalent to the range of internal combustion vehicles, and considerably greater than the average range of 200 miles on a typical plug-in EV model.\textsuperscript{28} However, hydrogen fuel-cell technology is not nearly as advanced as that of plug-in EVs. Hydrogen fuel-cell vehicles currently sell for more than double the typical plug-in EV.\textsuperscript{29} In addition, the hydrogen fuel supply network is in its infancy: there are currently just 35 hydrogen fuel stations in California. Due to the scarcity of fuel stations and high costs in the production of technical-grade hydrogen, hydrogen fuel currently costs at least twice as much as gasoline.\textsuperscript{30}

The transport and storage of hydrogen costs about 13% of the energy in the best-case scenario. By contrast, Battery EVs only have to contend with grid losses, which average around 5% in the US. Once it’s in the vehicle, hydrogen has an efficiency of around 60% - much better than the dismal 20% efficiency of a gas or diesel engine, but lower than the 75% for a Battery EVs. So Hydrogen Fuel Cell Vehicles are less efficient than Battery EVs at every stage of the process: generating hydrogen; transportation and storage; and converting it back to energy in the vehicle. Considering all these steps together, in the best-case scenario, hydrogen is about half as efficient as battery technology. However, comparing the real-world costs of fuel, Real Engineering found that driving a Tesla Model 3 costs between 2 and 2.4 cents per kilometer, whereas the hydrogen to power a Toyota Mirai costs 17.7 cents per kilometer.\textsuperscript{31}

Nevertheless, several automakers, including Volkswagen, Honda, Toyota, Mercedes-Benz, and GM are making strategic investments in hydrogen fuel-cell technologies as a hedge against the potential stabilization of the price of lithium-ion batteries used in plug-in EVs, which has plummeted in recent years\textsuperscript{32}. As these investments mature, it is anticipated that a wider range of mass market, hydrogen fuel-cell vehicles (and fuels) will become available at prices more comparable to internal combustion vehicles by around 2025.

The ZEV program supports hydrogen fuel-cell vehicles in tandem with plug-in EVs, while recognizing that the supply chain and market adoption for plug-in EVs are far more mature. In response to pressure from CARB, Electrify America has committed to including hydrogen fuel-cell electric vehicle technologies in its public marketing and education campaigns, exploring opportunities to upgrade technical-grade hydrogen supply networks, and considering the installation of EV charging stations at existing hydrogen fuel stations. A hydrogen fuel cell station is in a pre-permit application as part of a retail development at 9988 Wilshire Boulevard according to the California Fuel Cell Partnership.\textsuperscript{33} The State’s Plug-in Electric Vehicle Resource Center offers a \textit{ZEV Community Readiness Guidebook}\textsuperscript{34} which offers example for building codes and zoning for Plug-In Electric Vehicle Charging and Plug-In Electric Vehicle Parking Codes.

\section*{CONNECTED AND AUTONOMOUS VEHICLES}

Connected and autonomous vehicles (C/AV) are a series of technologies in development and pilot deployment that allow communication among infrastructure and vehicles to provide more efficient operations. Some of the potential benefits of C/AVs are:

- **Collision reduction**: Removing human error increases the potential for collision-free driving. The

\begin{itemize}
  \item [29] Lee, Kristen. 2017, October 26. “Toyota Wants To Make Its Hydrogen Cars Cost The Same As Hybrids By 2025”
  \item [30] https://cafcp.org/content/cost-refill
  \item [31] https://evannex.com/blogs/news/are-hydrogen-fuel-cells-competitive-with-battery-electric-technology
  \item [32] https://jalopnik.com/toyota-wants-to-make-its-hydrogen-cars-cost-the-same-as-1819873773
  \item [33] https://cafcp.org/stationmap
  \item [34] https://www.driveclean.ca.gov/pev/Resources_For_Cities.php
resulting improvements in vehicle safety could dramatically improve traffic circulation and roadway capacity.

- **Reduced VMT and policy requirements to get there**: With appropriate regulation by public policies to limit the use of low- and zero-occupancy autonomous vehicles and reduce conflict at the curbside, autonomous vehicles have the potential to significantly reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT). This outcome is more likely if autonomous vehicles are primarily deployed in shared vehicle fleets (e.g. ride-hailing or on-demand transit) rather than the personal vehicle market. Policies to limit the negative externalities of autonomous vehicles include VMT taxes (to supplement shrinking gas tax revenues), surcharges on low- and zero-occupancy vehicles, congestion charges to discourage low-occupancy travel on congested corridors, and demand-based parking pricing to ensure sufficient space availability at the curb. Mobility as a Service (Maas) platforms – digital applications that provide integrated, multimodal trip planning, trip booking, and fare payment services – are also needed to incentivize public transit ridership, reduce VMT, advance shared mobility services, and increase vehicle occupancy in shared, autonomous vehicles.

- **Smaller roadway facilities due to reduced VMT and less conservative design requirements**: With the policies to reduce VMT above in place, autonomous vehicles can encourage more flexible, streamlined roadway designs. Safer, more efficient vehicle operations – due to the decline of crashes caused by human error, and lower traffic volumes due to higher vehicle occupancies in shared fleets – could result in a need for smaller, right-sized roadways that provide safer environments for people walking, biking, and riding transit. With declining VMT and traffic volumes, some travel lanes could be narrowed or reallocated to other uses, such as bike lanes, sidewalks, parklets, or loading zones.

- **Smaller parking portfolios as demand for personal vehicle storage declines**: C/AVs deployed in shared fleets are expected to become cost-competitive with conventional vehicles within several decades, causing average vehicle occupancies to rise and personal vehicle ownership to decline. Even without autonomous functions, current ride-hailing platforms like Uber and Lyft are already causing declines in parking demand of 5-20 percent at airport parking facilities, 70 percent in hotel parking from business travelers, and 80 percent from bar/restaurant valet services. C/AV fleets are likely to cause more significant declines in parking demand, particularly in densely populated urban cores. Additionally, there can be an approximate 20 percent reduction in parking aisle and stall size where human ingress/egress is not needed. As a result, cities and parking managers will be compelled to densify existing parking supplies by spacing vehicles tightly together, or through increasing use of mechanical lifts and stackers. Falling parking demand will also create opportunities for adaptive reuse of some above-ground parking structures (with level floorplates) into offices, residences, or other more active uses. The growth of shared, ride-hailing fleets will reduce the need for on-street parking but increase the need for curbside loading zones, particularly at key destinations.

- **Travel time dependability**: The convergence of sensor-based technologies (e.g. LiDAR imaging) and connected-vehicle communications can substantially reduce uncertainty in travel times. These technologies underpinning C/AVs are well-suited to provide real-time, predictive assessment of travel times on all routes and by all modes of travel, improving overall travel time dependability for travelers.

- **Productivity improvements**: C/AVs could allow travelers to make use of travel time productively, as they will no longer be occupied by operating the vehicle and keeping their attention on the road.

- **Improved energy efficiency**: C/AVs deployed in shared fleets could lead to reduced energy consumption in at least three ways: more efficient routing; lighter, more fuel-efficient vehicles (particularly if they are electric vehicles); and efficient infrastructure.

---

• **New models for mobility**: Autonomous vehicles could lead to a major shift from vehicle ownership to rides accessed on-demand, and expand opportunities for shared, on-demand transit fleets (e.g. shuttles, vans, or minibuses) as well as ride-hail fleets.

• **New business models and scenarios**: C/AV technologies may realign industries such that ecosystem participants need to compete and collaborate at the same time.

**CONNECTED VEHICLES**

Connected vehicles are vehicles that use any of a number of different communication technologies to communicate with the driver, other vehicles on the road (vehicle-to-vehicle [V2V]), roadside infrastructure (vehicle-to-infrastructure [V2I]), and the cloud computing systems. This technology can be used to improve vehicle safety, routing efficiency, and commute times. Although adding connectivity to vehicles has its benefits, it also has challenges. Connected vehicles raise issues of security, privacy, data analytics, and data aggregation due to the abundance of data being accessed and shared by vehicles. This technology may seem new, but the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), in a joint research effort with the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE), has already started setting V2V and V2I communication standards, such as using a 5 GHZ frequency for data transmission.

**Vehicle-to-Vehicle**

Vehicle-to-vehicle (V2V) communication’s ability to wirelessly exchange information about the speed and position of surrounding vehicles shows great promise in helping to avoid collisions, ease traffic congestion and reduce emissions. But the greatest benefits can only be achieved when all vehicles can communicate with each other, which will require long-term vehicle fleet turnover.

V2V applications enable crash prevention, and require low latency/rapid communications via Dedicated Short Range Communications (DSRC) devices or future 5G services. V2I applications enable telecommunication, safety, mobility, and environmental benefits with DSRC or slower 4G communications. Their foundation of physical and digital infrastructure support data communications to enable real-time driver advisories and warnings of imminent threats and roadway hazards.

**Vehicle-to-Infrastructure**

Vehicle-to-Infrastructure (V2I) is the next generation of intelligent transportation system (ITS). V2I technologies capture vehicle-generated traffic data, wirelessly providing information such as advisories from the infrastructure to the vehicle that inform driver safety, mobility, or environment-related conditions. State and local agencies are likely to install V2I infrastructure alongside or integrated with existing ITS equipment. Because of this, the majority of V2I deployments may qualify for similar federal-aid programs as ITS deployments, if the managing agency meets certain eligibility requirements (the City would need to explore eligibility). Convenient V2I services like e-parking and electronic tolling are already in use. These communication technologies can be enhanced to provide better traffic and travel condition information to facilitate better decision-making among travelers and transportation managers.

V2I is part of V2X, where the vehicle is able to communicate with everything (the internet of things). Pedestrians are included in this, and it is becoming clear through V2I pilot deployments that pedestrian-carried devices using GPS to track their location, heading and speed are too imprecise (plus or minus several feet) to serve as a crash reduction tool. The need to supplement on-vehicle sensors with video detection/smart sensors is key to delivery of pedestrian in crosswalk warning to connected (not yet automated) vehicles expected to have significant market penetration by 2022.
Together, V2V and V2I applications have the potential to significantly reduce many of the deadliest types of crashes through real-time advisories alerting drivers to imminent hazards. Connected vehicles have the potential to detect hazards such as veering close to the edge of the road; vehicles suddenly stopped ahead; collision paths during merging; the presence of nearby communications devices and vehicles; sharp curves or slippery patches of roadway ahead.

Connected vehicle safety applications are designed to increase situational awareness and reduce or eliminate crashes through V2V and V2I data communications. Connected vehicle mobility applications provide a connected, data-rich travel environment. These communications may support driver advisories, driver warnings, and vehicle and/or infrastructure controls, by capturing real-time data from equipment located on-board vehicles (automobiles, trucks, and buses) and within the transportation infrastructure. A Connected Vehicle infrastructure deployment will generally include several elements such as:

- Roadside sensors and communications equipment (for DSRC or other wire-less services) together with enclosures, mountings, power, and network backhaul. Smart sensor detection systems are needed at intersections to assure that pedestrian and bicycles are detected, regardless of whether they possess mobile devices. These systems are unlikely to improve safety outcomes on their own; the underlying pedestrian and bicycle safety issues, principally intersection designs that create unsafe conditions for people walking and biking, must first be addressed. National data shows 25 to 60 percent of pedestrian and 37 to 65 percent of bicycle injury and fatal crashes occur at intersections.

- Backhaul communications are essential supporting infrastructure needed for V2I deployment. Both fiber and wireless broadband needs are expected to grow exponentially to accommodate the growth of CVs and AVs. Organizations such as the National League of Cities encourage public agencies to be proactive in reaching out to the dominant providers in their region to plan the growth of wireless broadband and fiber optic infrastructure.

- The importance of maintenance of existing signage and markings is critical, as new materials are coming
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to market that provide better retro-reflectivity and “digitize” the infrastructure for better communications with CAVs. The City should prioritize and fund necessary operations and maintenance budgets for all transportation technology currently deployed, even at the basic level of signs and markings.

- Upgrade traffic signal controllers to Advanced Traffic Controllers (ATCs). These ATCs have the functionality and capabilities necessary to support future deployment of roadside units (RSUs) for V2I communications, for applications that require signal phase and timing (SPaT) data. As a part of an ongoing Traffic Signal Synchronization program, the City should focus on increasing the deployment of ATCs City-wide, and should continue to track ATC deployment until 100 percent of all traffic signal controllers are ATC. Systems and processes required to manage security credentials and assure a trusted network are also recommended.

- Mapping services that provide highly detailed roadway geometries, signage, and asset locations for the various Connected Vehicle applications.

- Positioning services for establishing vehicle locations to high degrees of accuracy and precision. These will likely include smart sensors at signals and street lights to supplement on-board vehicle detection, especially of vulnerable road users such as people walking and biking.

- Data servers for collecting and processing vehicle data and for distributing user advisories and alerts.

The National League of Cities encourages cities to become active investment partners in deployment of V2I. They emphasize that cities should assess their current procurement policies, and evaluate whether these policies might inadvertently present any roadblocks to purchasing the technology and smart infrastructure necessary to support AV deployment. Likewise, cities should proactively establish partnerships with the dominant V2I technology provider(s) in their region to plan the growth of infrastructure while meeting future needs with respect to public safety, multimodal transportation network conditions, and the interaction of connected devices with local mobility policy priorities.38

The City must first update its policies to ensure that C/AV comply with established policy priorities and value frameworks. These frameworks and policy priorities include, but are not limited to, transportation demand management and VMT reduction strategies, the “people-first” approach to managing public rights-of-way, the creation and maintenance of low-stress bicycle and pedestrian networks, equity-related objectives that redirect mobility resources to underserved communities, and crash-reduction frameworks such as Vision Zero. The City will then need to update its infrastructure to enable connected and autonomous vehicle technology.

AUTONOMOUS VEHICLES

Autonomous or “self-driving” vehicles are defined by the U.S. Department of Transportation’s National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) as “those in which operation of the vehicle occurs without direct driver input to control the steering, acceleration, and braking and are designed so that the driver is not expected to constantly monitor the roadway while operating in self-driving mode.”39 An autonomous vehicle (AV) is one that takes full control of all aspects of the dynamic driving task for at least some of the time. To operate most efficiently, AVs must also be CVs.

The Society of Automotive Engineers International (SAE) has defined six levels of automation, illustrated in Figure D-1. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) adopted these definitions in 2016. As levels of automation increase, the role of the driver shifts from one of active control of the vehicle, to monitoring, to limited or no involvement in driving tasks. When discussing Level IV and Level V automation, which do not require human operations in most conditions, vehicles are generally considered “autonomous,”

while “automated” vehicles can possess any level of automated functions, from Levels I through V.

**Figure D-1: Levels of Automation**

Current AV technologies rely on complex systems of cameras and sensors used to navigate the road without the need for human operation. These technologies allow for people to occupy themselves with activities other than operating the vehicle during trips—akin to activities on public transportation—but do not by themselves represent a large potential for efficiency at the scale of regional roadway networks. This is particularly true during the early period of autonomous vehicle adoption, when autonomous vehicles make up a small share of total vehicles on the road. However, connected vehicle technology offers the potential to reduce the need for the camera systems through a mix of V2I and V2V technologies, which will allow traffic system management to regulate (mostly autonomous) vehicle operations at a large scale to maximize system efficiency rather than individual vehicle efficiency.

Many original equipment manufacturers (OEM), such as Ford and General Motors (GM), have made ambitious claims as to their timeframe for making Level 4 AV technology available in new models as early as 2021.40 There is evidence that automakers are taking necessary intermediate steps to meet this timeline. For instance, in January 2018 GM submitted a petition seeking US government approval for a fully autonomous car (one without a steering wheel, brake pedal or accelerator pedal) to enter their first commercial ride-sharing fleet in 2019. The company followed this move with an investment of $100 million to upgrade two major factory facilities as it prepares to build production versions of its Cruze self-driving car to introduce a Level 4 AV ridesharing service in 2019.41

There are also Level 4 autonomous, low-speed electric vehicles (LSEV) now being manufactured by firms such as Local Motors, Navya, and EasyMile. Because they lack steering wheels and brake pedals, they require
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waivers from the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards (FMVSS) to operate on public roads.

Typically deployed as shuttles within campuses and other controlled operating environments, they can carry eight to 15 passengers at speeds of 15 to 25 mph. EasyMile’s EZ10 driverless shuttle became the first such bus approved to run on public roads in California, as it made its debut on the public roads of Bishop Ranch on March 6, 2018.\(^{42}\) LSEV speeds are compatible with bicycle boulevards, where the speeds of vehicles are reduced to support a small differential between vehicle and bicycle speeds. On lower-speed streets and on appropriately wide multi-purpose paths, LSEV and bicycle networks may be compatible for parallel operations. The timeframe for bringing Level 5/full automation technology to market is hard to forecast; however, several studies estimate that Level 5 cars will be available on public roads in the late 2020s. This information is from the recent NCHRP Research Report 845, Advancing Automated and Connected Vehicles: Policy and Planning Strategies for State and Local Transportation Agencies, which defines options as:

“The transportation community can choose to wait and react. Or, decision makers can reframe the conventional public policy discussion to responsibly and assertively advance AV and CV technologies in light of social interests, adopting the principles of rapid learning and shared knowledge creation.”

Efforts to deploy more C/AV technology into the transportation network are being led by the Vehicle-to-Infrastructure Deployment Coalition, a nationwide partnership among infrastructure owners and operators and automobile manufacturers with a vision for “An integrated national infrastructure that provides the country a connected, safe and secure transportation system taking full advantage of the progress being made in the Connected and Autonomous Vehicle arenas.”\(^{43}\)

**C / AV INTERACTIONS WITH VULNERABLE USERS**

The Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center cautions\(^{44}\) that it is not yet well-understood how C/AVs will interact with other modes, particularly people walking and biking. Hastily planned C/AV infrastructure may create difficult conditions for people walking and biking, while even carefully planned C/AV infrastructure may result in unintended consequences for vulnerable road users. Some of the potential conflicts between C/AVs and people walking and biking may include:

- **Detection:** C/AVs may be unable to detect people walking and biking to the same degree of accuracy as other vehicles, particularly in low-visibility conditions. This is because the underlying automation programming of C/AVs is typically better trained to anticipate vehicle movements than person-
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movements, which are less predictable. Some of the current C/AV detection systems rely on cues from the built environment, such as lane striping. There is a need to consider roadway design enhancements such as high-visibility bike lane striping and pedestrian crossings to provide additional contextual warnings to improve C/AV detection of people walking and biking.

- **V2P:** Wireless beacons mounted on C/AVs may improve detection of people walking and biking by connecting directly with people’s mobile devices (V2P) as well as with infrastructure (V2I). However, consideration must be given to people who are not carrying mobile devices either by choice or because they do not have the means to own one. For instance, children, who typically have less access to mobile devices, may not be detected by wireless beacons. Wireless beacons may also not function properly in areas with wireless service interference (e.g., urban canyons), or general system failure during inclement weather or emergencies. All people have a right to travel on public streets safely, so ultimately C/AV systems must find a way to detect and respond to all road users, not just those carrying mobile devices.

- **Communications:** Currently, interaction between human drivers and people walking and biking is often negotiated by head movements, hand gestures, facial expressions, or verbal signals. For instance, a conflict in which a driver turns across a sidewalk to enter a driveway and interrupts a pedestrian’s trajectory may be resolved by the pedestrian using hand motions to let the vehicle pass (or vice versa). Many of these communication cues could be absent from or presented differently among C/AVs. Ongoing research at USDOT is evaluating methods of communicating cues and intentions between humans and C/AVs. Communication issues are likely to be made more challenging by mixed fleets with many different interfaces. Data-sharing across C/AV systems may be necessary to ensure that human/computer interactions are consistently integrated and tested across all vehicle makes and models and can be safely understood by people walking and biking.

- **Right-of-Way:** Driver failure to give right-of-way to pedestrians and legal crossings is a leading cause of pedestrian crashes. It is not well-established how C/AVs will yield right-of-way. Automobiles, regardless of the level of automation, should give pedestrians the right-of-way at legal crossings and make every effort to avoid crashes with people walking. It is important for the City to establish the safety of people walking and biking as a high priority in the hierarchy of rules governing C/AV operations.

- **Passing and Pickup/Drop-off Conflicts:** At the curbside, the increase of ride-hailing services has already caused an increase of pickup and drop-off activity in many areas. By increasing the volume of hailed rides, C/AVs may increase challenges to people biking when attempting to pass a bicyclist or make a pickup/drop-off at the curbside, interrupting the bicyclist’s trajectory. With sufficient C/AV infrastructure, a safe bicycle passing and/or following distance could be standardized by state or federal regulators. Additionally, cities can regulate where ride-hailing vehicles may pickup and drop-off passengers in dedicated loading zones in high-demand areas, restricting them from the most popular bike or transit corridors.

- **Automation and Driver Handoff:** Level II and Level III automated vehicles, which may alternate between human and autonomous operations, present a particular challenge for people walking and biking. Due to problems with detection or communications (see above), Level II and III automated functions may be unable to make critical decisions and may hand over control back to a human driver in some mixed-traffic environments. The handoff between automated and human operations may leave a significant delay, and the human driver may be unprepared to make essential braking or swerve maneuvers to avoid a crash. In the absence of state or federal standards, there may be opportunities for cities to regulate where and when Level II and III automated operations are permitted. School
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zones, shared streets, and pedestrian-oriented districts may be unsuitable for these automated operations.

VERTICAL TAKEOFF AND LANDING (VTOL) VEHICLES
Planning for emerging transportation technologies may well include electric or hybrid-electric vertical takeoff and landing (VTOL) vehicles, popularly called flying cars or passenger drones. They are designed to accommodate around two to five passengers or the equivalent cargo weight; be highly energy efficient, with reduced or zero emissions; and be substantially quieter than a traditional helicopter due to their smaller electric engines. The vehicles are ultimately intended to operate autonomously, though they would be piloted in initial stages, under various concepts proposed by companies such as Boeing, Airbus, Google, and Uber. “Uber Elevate” is a research endeavor that would use Uber data collected by their ride-hailing service to assess items like hub location, hub size, hub occupation, load factor (passengers in seats), flight time, airspace separation, minimum ground time, charging time, passenger capacity, platform size and many more. This would allow starting on high-frequency routes providing passengers a minimum time-saving of 40 percent of the usual trip time. The “UberElevate Network” has proposed testing in Los Angeles, Dallas and Dubai starting in 2020. After this testing phase, Uber plans to launch a consumer-facing “Uber Air” service with VTOL vehicles as soon as 2023. The top level of parking garages are viewed as vertiport opportunities. The City of Beverly Hills has the Santa Monica Five parking structures and several other above-ground structures in the business triangle which may become candidates for vertiport conversion. However, significant technological and regulatory hurdles—such as the need for new air traffic control networks, airspace regulations, and VTOL vehicle electric batteries—may block VTOL vehicles from becoming widely adopted. It is also questionable whether companies like Uber could operate VTOL vehicles at fares low enough to be both financially sustainable and viable as a consumer transportation service.

SHARED USE MOBILITY
Shared mobility services – the shared use of a vehicle, bicycle, or other mode – enable users to gain short-term access to transportation modes on-demand. The term shared mobility includes various forms of car sharing, bike sharing, on-demand ride sharing (carpooling and vanpooling), and on-demand ride-hailing services. It can also include alternative transit services, such as paratransit, circulators/shuttles, and and microtransit. With many new options for mobility emerging, so have multimodal trip planning applications that aggregate these options and optimize routes for travelers.

MOBILITY AS A SERVICE
Taking the goal of ubiquitous, shared mobility a step further, Mobility as a Service (MaaS) is the integration of various forms of transportation services (public and private) into a single, digital mobility platform available on demand. At its core, MaaS relies on a digital platform that integrates end-to-end trip planning, booking, electronic ticketing, and payment services across all modes of transportation, public or private. If operated by public agencies, MaaS platforms are indispensable tools necessary to ensure that cities continue to achieve...

---

49 Three Revolutions in Global Transportation, UC Davis and the Institute for Transportation & Development Policy, May 2017, p 11.
their mobility objectives despite the expected influx of low-cost transportation from C/AVs. Along with other pricing and curb/right-of-way management policies, Maas platforms are key instruments to incentivize public transit ridership, reduce VMT, advance shared mobility services, and increase vehicle occupancy in shared, autonomous vehicles. Private sector Maas tools may also add creative partnerships and incentives, and some are creating subscription payment models.

Many people increasingly do not make distinctions between public and private transportation options, rather assessing mode by cost, convenience, comfort, and travel times. With a deluge of potential new information about travel options and services, Maas offers an opportunity to make the existing transportation network more efficient and user-friendly. Maas involves the ability to plan, book, and pay for trips among variety of modes from single interface - ideally help improve access and save money among customers. Maas offers cities the ability to create increasingly attractive incentives to take transit and other high-capacity modes, even in response to real-time operational changes or major travel demand changes. Maas is a marked departure from where most cities are today, and from how mobility has been delivered until now. Building a platform that allows someone to move among multiple modes for a single payment is a challenging order for both public agencies and technology firms.

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) recently issued a request for proposals to develop a microtransit program, intended to produce a pilot program that would provide low-cost, on-demand transit service hailed by a mobile app. The service is intended to improve transit ridership by reducing travel times, improving access to employment centers, and enhance first/last-mile access to key transit lines. Metro runs trains and buses, serves as the county’s congestion management agency, and pursues pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure and initiatives. They are positioned “to leverage the opportunities new mobility services provide by, for example, working with member cities to thoughtfully allocate roadway space for transit, shared ride providers, bicyclists, etc., and shifting resources between buses, rail service, and shared ride services to efficiently move people around”.50 The City should engage in focused collaboration with Metro to consolidate the large volume of trips passing through the City into fewer vehicles, and to maximize local benefits.

Transportation network companies (TNCs) like Uber and Lyft, and e-commerce companies like Amazon, are not just disrupting markets – they also disrupt the flow of traffic. TNC pickups have been documented in San Francisco to account for about 20 percent of traffic51 – but account for 65 percent of traffic violations.52 Parcel volume from the rise of e-commerce and just-in-time deliveries will only continue to grow – and with it, the number of double-parked trucks conducting deliveries. UPS racks up over $1 million in parking fines annually in Washington, DC alone, and it is considered a cost of doing business.53 This has made the most overlooked part of city streets into a fertile ground for innovation that does not disrupt traffic: the curb.54

To achieve widespread shared mobility, TNCs need dedicated pickup/drop off locations, and freight vehicles need enough commercial loading zones to accommodate booming e-commerce. A possible solution that can help to alleviate some of the congestion, safety risks, and inefficiencies that come with the digital economy is to create a network of dedicated loading zones on each block that ensure that ride-hail, microtransit, or other

private transit vehicles, can queue safely while picking up and dropping off passengers, without causing conflicts or shutting down through traffic. Through integration with ride-hailing platforms, each time a ride is requested, both drivers and passengers would be shown the location of the nearest Shared Use Mobility (SUM) Zone. The passenger would be picked up and dropped off at the legal SUM Zone, loading zone, or parking space closest to their destination. Likewise, expanding the use of urban freight management strategies such as metered commercial loading zones or off-hour loading strategies could help to reduce conflicts with other modes.

Though re-designating parking spaces as SUM Zones could provoke some opposition, as does the repurposing of any urban parking spaces, there are several precedents. The adjacent graphic shows a typical application in Washington DC, where 32 on-street parking spaces are reduced to 24 so that 8 SUM zones can be provided.

Cities are also increasingly dedicating on-street parking spaces to car and bike share services to encourage the use of shared mobility options. San Francisco is testing a two-year pilot of roughly 150 parking spaces specifically for car share services, like City Carshare and Zipcar, and similar programs are operating in Seattle and Washington, DC. Similarly, bike share programs, such as CitiBike in New York City, often take over one or multiple on-street parking spaces to site a station. Local communities such as West Hollywood and Santa Monica are also replacing on-street spaces with bike share stations, which now share a bike share system with Beverly Hills. Like Washington’s SUM Zones, these involve repurposing parking spaces in support of conscious efforts by municipalities across the country to encourage a shift in our transportation paradigm toward more convenient, environmentally friendly, and cost-effective options. Communities and businesses can leverage immediate benefits by reallocating on-street parking for higher-capacity, shared use modes. By letting go of a few parking spaces, residents, employees, customers, and visitors can enjoy smoother traffic flow and a wider range of mobility options.

ELECTRIC SCOOTER SHARE
Electric scooter-share services have recently been rolled out by startup firms in the Los Angeles region. Electric scooters are intended as an affordable commuting alternative to cut down on pollution and traffic congestion. These scooters, which weigh between 30 and 40 pounds and reach speeds of 15 mph, are picked up every night to charge, and repositioned each morning for commuters. Users find and unlock scooters with a smartphone app, and ride at costs of one dollar minimum plus 15 cents for each minute of riding. Users are required to have a driver’s license. The scooter’s 15 mph speed makes them incompatible for operation on sidewalks, and residents have complained to the City of Beverly Hills about scooters parked where they block people walking or using wheelchairs on city sidewalks. In response, the City of Beverly Hills City Council approved a temporary ban on any shared mobility device (Ordinance NO. 18-O-2757). These include dockless bikes, electric scooters and any other “wheeled device” powered by a motor (not including vehicles and motorcycles). Despite the ban, electric scooters continue to grow in popularity as a convenient alternative to driving.

REGULATING MOBILITY SERVICE PROVIDERS
In the past decade, cities have struggled to resolve the question of how to appropriately regulate mobility service providers that have often launched on public rights-of-way with little or no consultation with relevant authorities, and with varying degrees of adherence to applicable regulations. Despite the many benefits of on-

55 http://wehopeddals.com/map/
demand mobility – such as reductions in drunk driving and enhanced first/last mile access to transit – TNCs (and to a much lesser extent, microtransit services) have led to increased traffic congestion and, in many cities, declines in transit ridership, walking and biking.\textsuperscript{57} These mobility service providers have also created numerous other problems that cities are still resolving, such as:

- Increased conflicts with bike lanes and public transit operators;
- Failure to properly license and background-check drivers according to existing taxi industry standards;
- Creation of a new class of low-wage, independent contractor employees who are not entitled to employment protections;
- Companies’ refusal to share all but the most cursory data on travel patterns with regulatory agencies.

The extent to which cities should reallocate public rights-of-way to private mobility service providers – in effect, leveraging public resources for private gain – remains an open question that depends on how far cities are willing to go to enact and enforce regulations against the undesirable outcomes these providers may create. The newest chapter of this conflict has emerged since early 2017, when a variety of newer mobility service providers began deploying dockless bikes, electric bikes, and scooters in similar fashion to early TNCs. As with TNCs, these new operators seldom sought to operate within existing regulations, often resulting in official pushback and, eventually, conditional operating agreements establishing the terms under which the providers can legally operate in the city. Alongside user convenience and ubiquitous, low-cost mobility choices, the newest generation of bike share providers has led to unforeseen problems such as bicycle clutter on sidewalks and in front of building entrances, conflicts with pedestrians, poor bike maintenance and safety issues, user data security, and ongoing questions about the long-term sustainability of the operators’ business model.

Before engaging with mobility service providers of any type, cities should carefully outline their policy outcomes and the benefits they seek from shared mobility, whether it is VMT reduction, enhanced first/last-mile access to destinations, or simply expanding local mobility options. Cities should then establish firm regulations and guidelines about how shared mobility providers may operate in the city such that these policy outcomes can be effectively met. These regulations may include caps on the number of TNCs or shared bikes allowed in various zones, pricing incentives to increase vehicle occupancies and reduce congestion, licensing and fair labor standards, and data-sharing requirements, among others. These measures underscore the fact that a city’s rights-of-way are its most valuable public asset, and one that should be leveraged judiciously and under conditions that benefit all citizens, not just those who happen to be users of a particular shared mobility service.

The California Public Utilities Commission oversees statewide policies for TNCs, and is currently engaged in Phase III of a rulemaking process to refine regulations for these companies. In addition to existing state regulations, there are local business registration requirements and airport permit requirements in place in some areas of the state. San Francisco County Transportation Authority is seeking partners from the public and private sector to conduct a series of studies to better understand how these services and technologies are influencing our transportation network. Conclusions from these evaluations may be used to develop strategies, partnerships, or policy options that support citywide goals. If the City is interested in a research collaboration, they may contact: https://www.sfcta.org/user/454/contact

HYPERLOOP

Hyperloop has attracted a lot of attention recently as a fifth mode of transportation. Hyperloop is a fast transportation mode that is claimed to be the future of rapid transport of people and goods. Hyperloop system consists of a vacuum tube in which the vehicles are moving rapidly, vehicles are also known as passenger capsule cars.\textsuperscript{58} Hyperloop can reach a speed of 700 miles per hour, making it possible to travel from Los Angeles to San Francisco in about 30 minutes. The advantages of Hyperloop system is its fast speed, low power consumption and relatively low cost of operation on a long run\textsuperscript{59}. Despite these advantages, there are major criticisms on the feasibility of such systems. Many experts believe that development and construction of such system is too expensive. The Hyperloop system could be very vulnerable to disruptive events (e.g. earthquakes, terror attacks, power outage, etc.) and has a very high risk to life\textsuperscript{58}. The images below show the Hyperloop project in Dubai. Virgin Hyperloop One, an LA-based startup, is working on this project. This project is supposed to make it possible to travel from Dubai to Abu Dhabi (86 miles) in about 12 minutes. The project is expected to be completed in 2020\textsuperscript{60}. Virgin Hyperloop One is also working on a demonstration project in Nevada and completed a feasibility study for a project in Missouri

\textsuperscript{59} http://futureforall.org/2017/november/virgin-hyperloop-one.html
\textsuperscript{60} https://hyperloop-one.com/
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APPENDIX D: DESIGN GUIDANCE

The following sections provide best practice design guidance for the City for implementation of the Complete Streets Plan.

BIKEWAY DESIGN GUIDANCE

High-Visibility Bike Lanes
Dedicated bike lanes that utilize bright green paint to increase visibility of the bicycle ROW and demarcate conflict areas between bicyclists and vehicles.

Benefits
Improve awareness of bicycle ROW.
Improve safety and perceptions of safety,
promotion of multi-modality,
discouragement of illegal parking in bike lane.

Design Considerations
A skid-resistant, retro-reflective green paint should be used, delineated with standard white bike lane lines to provide consistency with other bike facilities and enhance nighttime visibility.
Appropriate signage and consistency in application should be used to aid motorists’ awareness.
The colored markings may be applied along the entirety of the bike lane, at intersection approaches, and/or at conflict areas with driveways, turn pockets, or curbside parking.

Possible Locations
Corridors recommended for bike lanes or separated bikeways

High-Visibility Bike Lane on North Santa Monica Boulevard

Example of High-Visibility Bike Lane

Source: MyFigueroa Project
High-Visibility Bike Box

Designated spaces at signalized intersections that utilize bright green paint to offer bicyclists a safe and visible way to get in front of queuing vehicle traffic.

**Benefits**
- Improves safety through increased visibility and prevention of right turn conflicts between vehicles and bicyclists.
- Reduces signal delay and provides priority to bicyclists while reducing vehicle encroachment into crosswalk.
- Can facilitate left turns and street crossing for bicyclists when extending across the vehicle ROW.

**Design Considerations**
- A skid-resistant, retro-reflective green paint should be used, delineated with standard white bike lane lines to provide consistency with other bike facilities and enhance nighttime visibility.
- The box abuts the intersection at the head of the vehicle traffic lane and is typically 10-16 feet deep. Stop lines for and pavements marking shall be used to demarcate where vehicles must stop and designate bicycle ROW.

Source: http://streetwise.kittelson.com/posts/58-portland-or-aims-to-keep-cyclists-safe

Bike Parking

Bicycle racks or lockers installed at transit stops and key destinations providing safe, convenient storage for bicycles.

**Benefits**
- Supplements transit ridership and can expand transit sheds by enhancing intermodal connectivity and access.
- Can make transit more efficient by replacing time and space-consuming bicycle racks on trains and/or buses.

**Design Considerations**
- Ensure there is adequate space surrounding bicycle parking to avoid impeding traffic on sidewalks and at transit loading locations. If multiple racks are installed, ensure at least three feet of space between them.

**Possible Location**
- At major transit stops/hubs and major destinations, such as Wilshire Boulevard.

Source: Bike/Walk Tampa Bay
Bicycle-Only Signals

Bicycle-only signals use dedicated signal heads to facilitate bicycle movements at intersections separately from vehicles. This is for Class IV facilities.

Benefits

- Improve safety by reducing bicycle/vehicle conflicts at intersections and discourage illegal and unsafe crossing maneuvers.\(^{61}\)

Design Considerations

Green light times should be determined using the bicycle crossing time for standing bicycles at all existing signals and any new all-mode signals. In the United States, bicycle signal heads typically use standard three-lens signal heads in green, yellow, and red lenses. Push buttons, signage, and pavement markings highlight these facilities for bicyclists and motorists.

Examples of Bicycle-Only Signal Head and Signage

Source: LADOT Bike Blog

Source: MyFigurooa Project

Bicycle Detection/Indicator

System using a video detection camera that can distinguish bikes from vehicles, supplemented with an indicator communicating to the cyclist that the signal that is aware a bicycle is present and adequate green time is coming.

**Benefits**
- Reduces delays and increases efficiency for bicycle traffic.
- Improves safety by discouraging illegal and unsafe crossing maneuvers.

**Design Considerations**
There should be clear guidance to bicyclists on how to activate detection (e.g. what button to push, where to stand) and a visual indication that detection has occurred (e.g. a SmartCycle indicator light).\(^\text{62}\)

**Possible Locations**
Best applied at actuated intersections with bicycle infrastructure present. Can be combined with a bicycle-only signal, an advance bicycle phase, or split signal phasing for optimal effects.

Example of Bicycle loop detector marking on Broadway in Santa Monica, CA

Source: Alta Planning + Design

---

**Pedestrian Infrastructure Design Guidance**

**Pedestrian-scale Lighting**

Provides pedestrians with necessary illumination of the roadway and sidewalk and improves pedestrian mobility.

**Benefits**
- Increases visibility of pedestrians at nighttime.
- Increases visibility of intersections, crosswalks, ramps, and pathway.
- May help reduce pedestrian-related collisions.

**Design Considerations**
The City shall refer to the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America (IESNA) Lighting Handbook for guidance on lighting requirements for different types of roadways, pedestrian activity, and land use context. Typically pedestrian-scale fixtures are 12-15 feet high.

**Possible Locations**
- Business triangle
- North Santa Monica Boulevard South
- Santa Monica Boulevard
- Burton Way
- Wilshire Boulevard
- Olympic Boulevard

Source: Lincoln Neighborhood Corridor Plan "The LiNC", CD+A
Sidewalk & Curb Ramp Repair and Maintenance

Provide pedestrians with continuous and unobstructed sidewalks. Curb ramps provides access for all users. The City’s 2017 Sidewalk Inventory Report highlights existing sidewalk locations that need improvement and maintenance.

Benefits
   - Well maintained sidewalks encourage and support walking.
   - Ensures access and mobility for all users.

Design Considerations
   - Sidewalks shall be ADA compliant by providing a minimum width of 5 feet clear path.
   - Repair curb ramps to provide access between sidewalks.
   - Curb ramps should be designed with detectable warning strips per MUTCD standards.

Possible Locations
   - Citywide. See City’s Sidewalk Inventory Report for specific locations and prioritization.

Example of Wide Sidewalk on Rodeo Drive, Beverly Hills, CA

Median and Pedestrian Refuge Island

Provides pedestrians with a protected area when additional time is needed to cross a two-way roadway.

Benefits
   - Enhances pedestrian safety and accessibility.
   - Reduces crossing distances.
   - Can serve as a traffic calming tool since roads would need to narrowed at the intersection.

Possible Locations
   - North Santa Monica Boulevard
   - La Cienega Boulevard
   - Olympic Boulevard

Source: Google Maps
Curb Extensions & Bulb-outs

Curb extensions that reduce roadway width at the corners of intersections. Also known as gateway treatment when installed at the entrance or to mark a transition to a residential or low-speed street. Landscape bioswales and pervious pavement may be included in design.

**Benefits**
Improved safety for pedestrians due to higher visibility, shortened crossing distances, and reduced speed for vehicles turning due to narrower curb radii.

**Design Considerations**
Length of the bulbout should at least be equal to the width of the crosswalk, usually extending to the vehicle stop bar. Usually one or two feet narrower than the parking lane, when applicable. Changes may need to be made to accommodate drainage and/or bicycle infrastructure.

**Possible Locations**
Best applied at intersections with high pedestrian volumes and/or a high frequency of pedestrian conflict with turning vehicles. Limited to intersections of streets with parking lanes.

Source: NACTO

Example of Bulb-out on Canon Drive, Beverly Hills, CA

Source: Google Maps
**Chokers**

Mid-block curb extensions that reduce roadway width. Alternatively known as a “pinchpoint”.

**Benefits**
- Reduces vehicle speeds and facilitation of pedestrian crossings for low-volume streets.

**Design Considerations**
- If facilitating mid-block crossings, a marked crosswalk should be installed if the volume exceeds 2000-3000 vehicles per day.
- Landscaping along the curb extension will give higher visibility and narrow the road profile for motorists, encouraging slower speeds.
- Changes may need to be made to accommodate drainage and/or bicycle infrastructure.

**Possible Locations**
- Best applied on low-volume residential or collector streets with moderate pedestrian activity.

---

**Chicanes**

Staggered mid-block curb extensions that alternate from one side of the street to another to form an S-shaped curve in the roadway. Alternatively known as “deviations” or “serpentes”.

**Benefits**
- Reduces vehicle speeds due to horizontal deflection of vehicles along the ROW.

**Design Considerations**
- Additional signing and striping may be necessary to ensure motorists are aware of the horizontal deviation in the roadway.
- Chicanes can also be accomplished with alternating curbside parking availability on either side of the street.
- Changes may need to be made to accommodate drainage and/or bicycle infrastructure.

**Possible Locations**
- Best applied to low-volume residential or downtown commercial streets if loss of parking is not an issue.

Source: Bike.LAcity.org
Leading Pedestrian Interval

Leading pedestrian intervals (LPI) are proposed to allow pedestrians a head start to enter an intersection before vehicles. This allows for increased visibility of pedestrians and could reduce conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles.

**Benefits**
- Collisions involving vehicles versus pedestrians within an intersection crosswalk could be reduced by the LPI treatment due to the increased visibility that pedestrians would have by getting the head start into the intersection. Locations for implementation should be guided by crash history documentation.

Source: TRB 2015 Annual Meeting

---

**TRANSIT STOP DESIGN GUIDANCE**

**BUS STOP DESIGN AND PLACEMENT**

Bus stop design elements can vary considerably, but generally fall into the following categories:

- **Passenger Experience**: Intended to ensure that passengers are comfortable and secure, that their experiences using transit are enjoyable, and that their needs are met
- **Information**: Help passengers quickly and easily understand the transportation options available to them, how the transit options work, and when or how often the transit options will service the location, including in real-time
- **Operations**: Designed so that both the buses and users can utilize the location as efficiently and safely as possible, while also minimizing bus delay

The amenities that should be provided at a transit stops and stations are dependent on the type of service and the ridership (measured in typical daily boardings) at the location. All minimum design elements presented below should be included in the appropriate stop types when possible. However, circumstances that might preclude installation of elements at a particular stop include:
A standard bus stop (lower ridership) includes the minimum elements that should be provided for transit users to be safe and comfortable. Standard bus stops are typically located on local routes. As such, these bus stops often have bus routes with long headways, so providing seating would dramatically improve the rider experience. Recommended design elements of standard bus stops can be found in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSENGER EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>INFORMATION</th>
<th>OPERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>Distinctive Branding</td>
<td>Paved Boarding Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Pole and Sign</td>
<td>ADA-compliant Pedestrian Connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating</td>
<td>Information and Schedules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash/Recycling</td>
<td>System Map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Connections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enhanced bus stops are designed to accommodate large loads of passengers and multiple buses at the same time. An enhanced stop is often located on a very active corridor and may provide transfers among different types of transit services, such as light or heavy rail corridors. An enhanced bus stop is typically located on both local and rapid bus routes. In addition to all elements of a standard low-ridership stop, enhanced high-ridership stops should provide real-time travel information about when various routes are arriving, raised platforms and bus bulbs to improve the efficiency of the routes, bike parking, and transfers to other types of transportation services, like bikeshare or microtransit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSENGER EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>INFORMATION</th>
<th>OPERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Distinctive Branding</td>
<td>Paved Boarding Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating</td>
<td>Pole and Sign</td>
<td>ADA-compliant Pedestrian Connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>Information and Schedules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash/Recycling</td>
<td>System Map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containers</td>
<td>Real-Time Display</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raised Platform/Level Boarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bus Bulb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bikeshare/Micromobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stop placement guidelines describe the considerations that are involved in making decisions regarding new or relocated bus stops. The proper location of bus stops is critical to the safety of passengers, pedestrians, and motorists, as well as the safe and efficient operation of buses.

The initial step of determining placement of a new or relocated bus stop involves its proximity to the intersection. The placement of each bus stop can be classified as one of the following:

- **Near-side**: immediately prior to an intersection
- **Far-side**: immediately after an intersection
- **Mid-block**: between two intersections

Bus stops are generally located at street intersections to maximize pedestrian accessibility from both sides of
the street and provide connectivity to intersecting bus routes. Bus turning movements, driveways, and
dedicated turn lanes sometimes restrict the placement of stops at or near an intersection and necessitate a
mid-block stop. Mid-block stops may also be considered when destinations are a significant distance from
intersections.

Each new or relocated bus stop must be examined on a case-by-case basis to determine their exact location.
The following list details bus stop placement considerations related to customer convenience and comfort,
accessibility, operational safety, and adjacent land use:

- **Customer Convenience and Comfort**
  - Proximity to expected trip generators
  - Visibility of bus stop zone and presence of street illumination
  - Connections to intersecting bus routes

- **Accessibility**
  - Adequate right-of-way to ensure the bus stop meets the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)
    accessibility standards
  - Presence and conditions of sidewalks leading to trip generators
  - Marked crosswalks and curb ramps at street intersections or midblock crossings

- **Operational Safety**
  - Volume and turning movements of other vehicles including bicycles
  - Adequate curb space to accommodate multiple buses, if necessary
  - Adequate sight distance to/from adjacent streets, intersections, and driveways
  - Proximity to rail crossings

- **Adjacent Land Use**
  - Ridership potential to support the investment of new stops
  - Adequate right-of-way to prevent encroachment onto private property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bus Stop Placement Considerations</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near-side stops</td>
<td>Encourages riders to use nearby crosswalks</td>
<td>Most exposure to traffic delays. May require more than one traffic signal cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increases conflict with right-turning vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May block travel lane with queuing buses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May obscure motorists’ view of traffic control devices and crossing pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advantages</td>
<td>Disadvantages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-block stops</strong></td>
<td>![Person] Typically improves access to destinations on large tracts</td>
<td>![Bus] May require bus pullout on high-speed streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>![Person] May encourage riders to cross street mid-block</td>
<td>![Car] Motorists typically do not expect mid-block crossing pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Far-side stops</strong></td>
<td>![Car] Encourages riders to use nearby crosswalks</td>
<td>![Car] May restrict travel lanes on far-side of intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>![Car] Reduces delay as operators have better chance of avoiding red light</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>![Car] Allows additional right-turning capacity before intersection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following situations are common determinants of bus stop placement:

- If the route alignment turns left at an intersection, the preferred location for the stop is the far-side of the intersection after the bus turns.
- If the route alignment turns right at the intersection, the preferred location for the bus stop should be on the far-side of the intersection after the bus turns.
- If there is a high volume of vehicles turning right at an intersection, the preferred location for a bus stop is on the far-side of the intersection after the turn.
- At intersections with complex, multi-phased traffic signals or dual right or left turn lanes, far-side bus stops are preferred because they eliminate buses from an area of complicated traffic movement at that intersection.
- When the route alignment requires the bus to make a left turn and it is not feasible or desirable to locate the bus stop on the far-side of the intersection after the bus turns, a mid-block stop may be warranted.
- Mid-block bus stops prior to left turns should be located a distance from the intersection that allows the bus to easily maneuver into the proper lane to turn left (a minimum of 100-150 feet for each lane change, depending on street speeds).
- When connections between two bus routes show a strong directional pairing (e.g., passengers connecting from eastbound to southbound route), placing one bus stop on the nearside and the other on the far-side can reduce pedestrian crossings at the intersection.
- Stops may be situated within the travel lane (i.e., at “bump outs” or “bulbs”) along highways situated within the urban core with two travel lanes in the same direction.
- Bus pullouts are acceptable at high ridership stops with significant dwell times or route terminal points.
Whenever possible, bus stops should not be placed within proximity of a driveway. However, if a driveway is unavoidable:

- Attempt to keep at least one exit and entrance open to vehicles accessing the property while a bus is loading or unloading passengers.
- Locate bus stops to allow good visibility for vehicles leaving the property and to minimize vehicle/bus conflicts. This is best accomplished by placing bus stops where driveways are behind the stopped bus.
- Never place a bus stop that forces passengers to wait for a bus in the middle of a driveway.

It is preferable to fully block (rather than partially block) a driveway to prevent vehicles from attempting to squeeze by the bus in a situation with reduced sight distance. The lack of parking restrictions can negatively impact bus service by limiting sight distances and passenger access. Potential issues that may arise include:

- Buses not being able to access the curb/sidewalk area to pick or drop off passengers
- Passengers forced to maneuver between parked vehicles when they board or alight
- Buses blocking travel lanes due to inability to access the curb

**FIRST / LAST MILE IMPROVEMENTS**

Regional transit agencies provide the bus and rail services in Beverly Hills, but users must complete the first and last portions of their trips on City-managed transportation infrastructure. First-last mile refers to the portion of a user’s trip between their origin/destination and primary mode of travel. Per California’s Complete Street law (AB 1358), streets must accommodate safe and efficient multi-modal transfer activity and support a wide range of mobility options. Reasonable thresholds for first-last mile sheds from a transit station as provided by the FTA are one-half mile for pedestrians and three miles for bicycles. The following recommendations should help guide the City in implementation of infrastructure to get people safely and efficiently to/from transit stops and stations.

Active transportation modes (i.e. walking, biking, wheelchairs, etc.) represent 85 percent of access/egress at Metro rail/BRT stations and 95 percent of access/egress systemwide. The following are recommended for first-last mile transit connectivity through active modes and the built environment:

- **Increase average speed of active transportation users**: Decrease wait times at intersections and increase speed and capacity along key walking/biking routes to transit. Improvements near transit stations should include: pedestrian prioritized signal timing, reduced crossing distances through curb extensions, and provision of sidewalk widths that cater to a growing range of mobility demands. Sidewalks providing access to transit should have a minimum through width of 6 feet and of 8 feet if directly adjacent to moving traffic.
- **Provide a clear path of travel**: Minimum pedestrian through widths should be maintained separate from amenities that require additional width. For example, if the sidewalk is adjacent to a ticket vending machine or transit information kiosk, the minimum clear path of travel should be maintained outside of the area containing transit stop amenities to ensure station activity areas do not impede pedestrian travel. Pedestrian paths of travel from drop-off/pick-up zones and bus stops to rail station entrances should be direct as possible.
- **Enhance pathway safety**: Active transportation routes serving transit stations should be well-lit to accommodate riders traveling at all hours. Pedestrian-oriented lighting should be placed approximately every 30 feet focused on the center of the pathway.

---

63 First Last Mile Strategic Plan, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority – Metro, 2014.
• **Ensure pathway quality:** Broken sidewalks or missing curb ramps present a significant barrier to pedestrians and users that require a wheeled mobility device. Pedestrian facilities serving transit should be kept in good maintenance and provide adequate provisions for users with mobility impairments, such as truncated domes.

• **Provide clear and intuitive navigation:** Pathways to transit should provide directional markers with walking and biking times to the station(s). Where applicable, signage to stations can be enhanced with real-time transit arrivals information.

• **Provide cut-throughs and shortcuts:** Where applicable, such as public parks or parking lots, provide cut-throughs that provide a shortcut over the standard street network with improved paving, lighting, shade, and directional signage.

• **Provide Pedestrian Scrambles at Metro rail stations:** Having already enhanced pedestrian safety and comfort in the Business Triangle of Beverly Hills, scrambles should be considered at the intersections serving Purple Line stations to prioritize pedestrian safety and visibility while reducing crossing times. Scrambles should have continental striping or highly visible patterns, with informational signage denoting appropriate crossing movements.

• **Support multi-modal transfer activity:** Bike share stations should be located at key bus stops and all rail stations with easy and identifiable access between the modes. Beverly Hills Bike Share, along with the other three systems of Bike Share Connect, should enable free transfers to transit, through multimodal fare integration with L.A. Metro’s TAP card fare payment system. This approach is in keeping with L.A. Metro’s approach to Metro Bike Share, which implemented a joint transit/bike-share balance on the TAP card in the system’s next iteration, TAPforce. Under TAPforce, fares paid to bike-share and transit operators are treated interchangeably, enabling free or discounted transfers between bike-share and transit, just as the current system allows between bus and light rail.

• **Encourage appropriate parking behavior of dockless bikes and scooters:** Shared electric scooters (i.e. Bird and Lime) provide a powerful tool for bridging first-last mile gaps, albeit requiring new regulation for proper management. In regulating the devices around transit stations the City should require operators to imbed geo-fencing within their mobile applications to encourage proper parking behavior which would require users to park and lock the devices in designated drop zones that do not interfere with pedestrian paths of travel or transit operations.

• **Provide covered and secure bicycle parking:** Bicycle parking at transit stations should be located adjacent to desire lines, and as close as possible to the station entrance, but not in locations that obstruct pedestrian movements.

---

64 As of July 2018, the City of Beverly Hills has instituted a temporary ban on dockless bikes and scooters to allow time to evaluate how the devices can be properly managed on public rights-of-way.
VEHICLE INFRASTRUCTURE DESIGN GUIDANCE

Speed Humps
Raised, rounded surfaces placed across the width of the roadway between intersections. Longer and higher than speed “bumps” typically found in parking lots.

**Benefits**
Effective at slowing vehicle speeds at select locations, the magnitude of which depending on their spacing along a particular street segment.

**Design Considerations**
Usually 10 to 14 feet long and 3 to 4 inches high at the center with tapered ends near curbs to allow for proper drainage. Requires proper signage alerting drivers of their location.

**Possible Locations**
Best applied to local residential streets and collector streets with high volumes of pedestrian or bicycle traffic.

---

Speed Table or Raised Crosswalk
A raised, rounded surface placed across the width of the roadway at a mid-block location. Similar to speed humps, but wider with a flat top that raises the entire wheelbase of a vehicle.

**Benefits**
Slows vehicle speeds at mid-block locations and increases safety for pedestrians and bicyclists.

**Design Considerations**
Usually 22 feet long with a height of 3-3.5 inches. Portions along the curb may need to be slotted accommodate drainage. Requires proper signage alerting drivers of their location.

**Possible Locations**
Best applied to collector streets with high volumes of pedestrian or bicycle traffic. Can double as a raised mid-block crosswalk.
Raised Intersection
A flat-topped, elevated area with slanted edges that covers an entire intersection.

**Benefits**
- Slows vehicle crossing speeds and encouraging motorists to yield to pedestrians at the crosswalk without encroaching. Does not impact curbside parking.

**Design Considerations**
- Usually flush with the sidewalk though sometimes given a ridge for visually impaired pedestrians. ADA-compliant ramps and detector strips are required.

**Possible Locations**
- Best suited for areas with high volumes of pedestrians and where other raised traffic calming measures would impact curbside parking. Should not be used at intersections along major transit or emergency vehicle routes.

Source: NACTO

Neighborhood Traffic Circle
A raised island in the center of an unsignalized intersection that forces drivers to maneuver around it rather than proceed straight. Alternatively known as a “mini-roundabout”.

**Benefits**
- Slows vehicle crossing speeds and improves safety at intersections for pedestrians. Replaces the need for two or four-way stop controls.

**Design Considerations**
- At least 15 feet of clearance should be provided between the widest point of the traffic circle and the corner of the intersection to provide adequate ROW for emergency vehicles.
- Crosswalks and shared lane markings for bicycles should be clearly marked and signage should provide advance warning of the traffic circle for motorists.

**Possible Locations**
- Best applied at minor intersections in residential areas where speeding is a common issue.

Source: Google Maps view of Laurel Avenue/Norton Avenue in West Hollywood
Roadway Reconfiguration – Lane Narrowing

Any treatment that narrows the width of the vehicle travel lane, be it widening sidewalks and/or the planting strip, curb extensions, or inclusion of bicycle facilities.

**Benefits**
- Narrower travel lanes help promote reduced vehicle speeds without deterring emergency or transit vehicles, making collisions less severe and improving safety for motorists and pedestrians.

**Design Considerations**
- Lane widths of 10 feet are appropriate in urban areas. Multi-lane roads should have a wider outside or curbside lane where transit or freight vehicles may be present. Changes may need to be made to accommodate curves and bicycle infrastructure.

**Possible Locations**
- Best applied in constrained urban settings and residential areas.

Source: Town of Braintree, MA

Example of Lane Narrowing to Accommodate Bike Lanes
**Roadway Closure**

The closure, either partial or full, of a street to through traffic using a physical barrier. A half-closure uses a curb extension to prevent through traffic in one lane only while a full closure uses a cul-de-sac to completely close the street to through traffic.

**Benefits**

Effective at reducing traffic volumes on particular streets without impeding pedestrian movements.

**Design Considerations**

May create traffic diversion through adjacent neighborhoods and thus should be carefully implemented with consideration of impacts on neighborhood residents.

Partial closures need to be implemented carefully so that vehicles meant to be stopped don’t circumvent the barrier.

**Possible Locations**

Best applied on local neighborhood streets where excessive through traffic is an issue.

---

**Diagonal Diverter**

Diagonally-placed barriers that block through access for vehicles across four-legged intersections, but still allow for turning movements.

**Benefits**

Effective at reducing traffic volume on particular streets without impeding pedestrian movements.

**Design Considerations**

Should be staggered to create circuitous routes through a street network. Impacts on local traffic such as neighborhood residents must be considered.

Barriers can be made traversable to allow unimpeded access for emergency vehicles and bicyclists.

**Possible Locations**

Best applied on local neighborhood streets where excessive through traffic is an issue.
**Forced Turn Barriers**

Traffic islands or curb extensions design to prevent certain vehicle turning movements at intersections or that force traffic into specific patterns. Alternatively referred to as “pork chops”.

**Benefits**
- Helps reduce traffic volumes by preventing turning movements.
- Can improve safety for motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians by reducing or eliminating conflicts associated with those turning movements.

**Design Considerations**
- Should be clearly visible and designed so that drivers are not maneuvering around them to make illegal maneuvers. Care should be taken that a traffic problem is not simply shifted from one street to another. Impacts on emergency vehicles should be taken into consideration.

**Possible Locations**
- Best applied on local neighborhood streets where excessive through traffic is an issue.

**Extended Median Barrier**

Raised islands that follow the path of the centerline of a street through the intersection to prohibit opposing through or turning traffic at cross streets.

**Benefits**
- Helps reduce traffic volumes at intersecting streets and improves safety by reducing or eliminating conflicts at intersections.

**Design Considerations**
- Impacts on traffic on local cross streets as well as to emergency vehicles should be taken into consideration.

**Possible Locations**
- Best applied at intersections where local neighborhood streets intersect with higher-volume collector streets.

Source: Los Angeles County Department of Public Works

Source: FHWA Safety - USDOT
Turn Restriction/Prohibition Signage

Signs that restrict or prohibit certain turning movements at designated intersections. It can be during certain times of day or always.

**Benefits**
- May reduce traffic volumes at intersecting streets and possibly improve safety by reducing or eliminating conflicts at intersections. Low cost infrastructure, but potential high cost enforcement.

**Design Considerations**
- Enforcement should be used to ensure compliance and reduce violation rates. If used to create circuitous routes, impacts on local residents should be taken into consideration.

**Possible Locations**
- Most effective during specific peak hours.
- Can be used to control through-traffic on a variety of street types.
- Turn restrictions may be applied during peak hours at:
  - Olympic Boulevard
  - Wilshire Boulevard

Source: MUTCD

Speed Legend

Numbers painted on the roadway that display the speed limit.

**Benefits**
- Increase awareness among motorists of a roadway’s respective speed limit.
- Inexpensive and of no deterrence to emergency vehicles.

**Design Considerations**
- Should follow MUTCD guidelines.

**Possible Locations**
- Best used in areas where speed limit sign posts may not be readily visible, on entry to local neighborhood streets, or areas where there is a reduction in speed limit.

Source: FHWA - USDOT
**Traffic Signal Coordination**

Implement major arterial traffic signal coordination based on traffic demand to improve operations. Advanced traffic controllers can accommodate time of day plans and/or adaptive signal timing based on real time demands at the intersection. Vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists can be counted and provided optimized traffic signal green times.

**Benefits & Recommendations**

The City of Beverly Hills has already initiated a Capital Improvement Project (CIP) to upgrade traffic signal control equipment that can be more traffic responsive. It is recommended to deploy additional technology for Roadside Units (RSUs) with Dedicated Short Range Communications (DSRC), and/or 5G cell sites, to enable roadway infrastructure communications with Connected (not yet Autonomous) Vehicles that are expected to have significant market penetration over the next five years. This would facilitate Vehicle-to-Infrastructure (V2I) communications for applications such as construction zone/reduced speed zone ahead warnings, pedestrian in crosswalk warnings, and many others. Although no Crash Reduction Factors (CRFs) are available for V2I deployment, due to their ongoing pilot deployment research in the cities of New York and Tampa Bay, literature suggests up to an 80 percent reduction in crashes when the entire vehicle fleet is connected. The City may consider related measures for traffic signals, such as enhancing their visibility with the addition of reflective borders. With the implementation of retroreflective signage. In addition, smart signs are compatible with traditional signage.

**Possible Locations**

Citywide.

**CURBSIDE MANAGEMENT**

As Mobility-as-a-Service providers evolve and autonomous vehicles become more ubiquitous, constraints on curbsides will become more acute, particularly at key transit nodes that generate demand for pick-ups and drop-offs. The strategies below provide recommendations for enhanced future management of curbsides near transit stops.

- **Prioritize transit operations with bus bulbs on Wilshire and Santa Monica Boulevards:** Passenger pick-up/drop-off activity is likely to increase along high-frequency transit corridors like Wilshire and Santa Monica Boulevards due to the continued growth of ride-hailing and the opening of the Metro Purple Line Extension. This growth in passenger loading activity will increase the frequency of conflicts at the curbside between ride-hail vehicles and buses if unaddressed, impacting bus travel times and reliability and increasing congestion. Leverage the curbside to prioritize transit operations by creating bus bulbs (where feasible), or curb extensions that displace other curbside uses at strategically located bus stops, which reduce bus travel times by allowing them to board/alight passengers without leaving the general travel lane. When placed at near side or far side bus stops, bus bulbs also offer pedestrians the benefit of safer, shorter crossing distances on these busy arterials.

- **Use designated passenger loading zones to redirect pick-up/drop-offs from the most congested intersections:** Passenger pick-up/drop-off areas (drop zones) should be close to transit station entrances as possible, but within a separately designated length of curb or from where transit stops are located, in order to reduce delay for transit vehicles and minimize conflicts with boarding/alighting passengers. Drop zone locations should not require passengers to cross more than one street or be located closer than 20’ to crosswalk approaches. Sidewalks adjacent to pick-up/drop-off zones should
maintain a minimum width to ensure a clear path of travel (6’) plus an additional 6’. Curb regulations should not allow parking durations greater than three minutes to encourage healthy turnover of curb space.

- **Delineate Shared Use Mobility Zones:** Separate drop zone curb space should be designated for taxis, ride-hailing, and microtransit services with signage, curb paint, and geo-fencing denoting the space as a Shared Use Mobility (SUM) Zone. Through geo-fencing integration with ride-hailing applications, each time a ride is requested, both drivers and passengers would be shown the location of the nearest Shared Use Mobility (SUM) Zone in which pick-ups and drop-offs can legally occur.

- **Ideally, passenger loading zones should be located a single right-turn around the corner from the most congested intersections along Santa Monica and Wilshire Boulevards:** Turning off of the main street to stop would reduce congestion on these corridors and allow more space along the curb to be dedicated to other uses. Where bike traffic is heaviest, right turn SUM zones may not be preferable, however.

- **Prohibit ride-hailing activity on the most transit- and bike-oriented corridors, during peak times:** Many of the most popular corridors for TNCs are also cities’ most important transit and bike corridors, a conflict in which cities must act to preserve the priority of the highest-occupancy modes. Cities should consider prohibiting ride-hail pick-ups/drop-offs on the most transit-and-bike-oriented corridors during peak hours to maximize transit performance and reduce conflicts with people biking. Otherwise, TNCs will send as many vehicles as possible onto the street to capture riders first, a self-defeating situation which is likely to be exacerbated by the presence of zero-occupant vehicles, when fleets ultimately become autonomous.

- **Use flexible curb zones to reduce double-parking and accommodate multiple uses at different times of day:** Cities can deter double parking by creating effective freight and delivery zones by working with adjacent businesses to address their needs. One approach is to use curbside flex zones that operate according to different regulations, and for different curb users, at different times of day. During mid-day, late-night hours, and early morning hours, the zone could be used for commercial loading, while during the AM and PM peaks the zone would be reserved for passenger pick-up/drop-off or short-term on-street parking. It is recommended that the City initiate conversations with adjacent businesses along selected street segments to understand their curb space needs by hour of day for deliveries, patron parking, and shared use mobility zones.
Pedestrian Wayfinding

Directs users to points of interest, enhances placemaking and acts as a conduit to transition between modes.

**Benefits & Recommendations**
- Provides the opportunity to enforce holistic branding or establish placemaking for a specific area or neighborhood.
- Directs visitors to key points of interest and facilitates access to local businesses.
- Directs pedestrians to and from other modes.

**Design Considerations:**
- Wayfinding should indicate direction and travel times in easily understood units, such as blocks or approximate walking time.
- Signage should be placed in the street furniture/curb zone and not interfere with pedestrian paths of travel.

**Possible Locations**
- Business Triangle
- Proposed Pedestrian Enhancement Streets
- Transit Priority Streets
Bicycle Wayfinding

Gives riders information that allows them to make informed decisions about which streets to ride. By following wayfinding, the bicycle rider arrives via the most comfortable and direct routes and by using improved crossings of major roadways.

**Benefits & Recommendations**

- **Confirmation signs**: Lets riders know that they are continuing along the designated bikeway—their intended path of travel.
- **Turn signs**: Alerts riders where to turn to continue on the designated bikeway. These signs are often paired with pavement markings to further prevent bicycle riders from missing turns.
- **Decision signs**: Placed at the intersection of one or more bikeways. Decision signs include directional cues to key destinations, giving riders the information to select the best possible route to reach their intended destination.

**Design Considerations:**

- **Confirmation signs**: Place every ¼ to ½ mile on off-street facilities and every 2 to 3 blocks along bicycle facilities, unless another type of sign is used (e.g., within 150 ft of a turn or decision sign). Should be placed soon after turns to confirm destination(s). Pavement markings can also act as confirmation that a bicyclist is on a preferred route.
- **Turn signs**: Place near-side of intersections where bike routes turn (e.g., where the street ceases to be a bicycle route or does not go through). Pavement markings can also indicate the need to turn to the bicyclist.
- **Decision signs**: Place near-side of intersections in advance of a junction with another bicycle route or along a route to indicate a nearby destination. (MUTCD)

**Possible Locations**

- Burton Way, Santa Monica Blvd, San Vicente Blvd
- All proposed Class II corridors
Transit Wayfinding
Gives users information to make informed decisions about transit choices and facilitates access to and from stop locations.

Benefits & Recommendations
Guides riders to stops, connects them to transit transfers and other modes, and provides information about key destinations.
Helps riders choose travel options and update them with real-time info to better inform travel decisions.
Makes users aware of transit alternatives.
Helps to establish distinctions between types of service, such as local and rapid, and allows for distinctive branding and placemaking.

Design Considerations:
Place at regular intervals, especially at confusing areas and at decision points, where potential riders choose a transit route and travel path to access transit.
Name of stops, stations, and destinations should reinforce brand and be recognizable. At locations with multiple lines or stops, name of a specific geographic element can be used.
Place in visible and predictable locations such as eye-level or overhead.
Distinctions among frequency are more useful to passengers than distinctions among modes. On maps, provide distinct thicker lines or bolder colors for frequent services.
Include tactile or audible cues, providing directional guidance at decision points and signs confirming the route taken, especially in confusing or difficult-to-navigate areas.
(NACTO Transit Street Design Guide)

Possible Locations
Santa Monica Blvd, San Vicente Blvd, Robertson Blvd, La Cienega Blvd
Transit Priority Streets
Parking Wayfinding
Clear and effective parking wayfinding improves overall user experience while improving management of the parking system and reducing conflicts with other modes.

Benefits & Recommendations
- Improves user experience and reduces stress related to parking.
- Reduces vehicle circulation and conflicts with other modes by reducing cruising for available parking.
- Directs users to underutilized facilities and alleviates pressure on highest demand spaces.

Design Considerations:
- Real-time availability should be displayed on signage for key parking facilities and direct users to alternate facilities when constraints arise.
- Consider holistic branding to emphasize parking’s role in the overall transportation system and placemaking.
- Create full-bleed signage to enhance visibility.

Possible Locations
- Corridors leading to all public parking facilities.
The following pages summarize the community outreach events conducted to inform the Complete Streets Plan, as well as comments received on public drafts of the plan.

**WORKSHOP HIGHLIGHTS**

**SUMMARY:**
Approximately 40 community members, several Council and Commission members, and City staff from multiple departments attended the first workshop for the Beverly Hills Complete Streets Plan on Monday, March 12, 2018.

**BEVERLY HILLS PRESENT/FUTURE:** Meeting facilitators asked participants to select a word to describe Beverly Hills streets in the present and in the future. The most common words selected by participants to describe the present suggest an emphasis on cars, such as “congested,” “speeding,” and “traffic.” The most common word selected by participants to describe the future was, “safe.”

**VALUES AND GOALS:**
Values—Safety (25%), Quality of Life (22%), and Traffic (18%) rose to the top as most important for event participants.
Goals—Several common themes emerged when participants were asked to prioritize Plan goals:
- Expand bicycle infrastructure
- Reduce collisions and employ traffic calming measures
- Improve wayfinding / signage
- Improve and prioritize pedestrian spaces
- Expand transit routes, increase frequency / speed, connect to active transportation
- Increase street trees and plantings
- Educate all roadway users

Additionally, participants expressed a desire for design recommendations that will promote/maintain the City’s “village” atmosphere; to consider diverse user groups including tourists, visitors, and businesses; and to facilitate the need for coordination with adjacent cities during Plan implementation.

**NEXT STEPS:** The values and goals for the Plan will reflect feedback received from this event, as well as feedback received from the online survey currently being conducted (www.beverlyhills.org/completestreetsSURVEY). Additional events are planned to gather further public input throughout the development of the Plan, including a walk audit, pop up event at the City’s Earth Day Celebration, and two additional workshops. Visit the project website (www.beverlyhills.org/completestreets) to stay up to date on event dates and details. Updates on this project will also be shared in monthly Traffic and Parking Commission (TPC) meetings. For the latest TPC meeting schedule, please visit: http://www.beverlyhills.org/citygovernment/commissions/trafficandparkingcommission/
EARTH DAY POP-UP HIGHLIGHTS

EVENT SUMMARY:
Approximately 40-60 community members, stopped by the Beverly Hills Complete Streets Plan booth at the City’s Earth Day event on Saturday, April 15, 2018. Participants were engaged in two main activities: 1) a sticker voting activity to identify the complete streets design strategies they most want to see in the City, and 2) a mapping exercise in which participants were asked to identify corridors, areas, and intersections in the City they would like to see this Plan improve. All participants were either Beverly Hills residents, workers, or those who visit the City regularly from adjacent neighborhoods. Consultant staff, City staff, and Health & Safety Commissioner Lisa Schwartz were on hand to answer questions and engage with participants. See response summary on page 2.

SURVEY UPDATE:
186 survey responses have been collected as of 4/24/2018. The survey platform (Survey Monkey), captures respondent’s IP addresses to ensure each response is unique. To date, the survey has been advertised on the project’s website, at all project events, and social media.

NEXT STEPS: The project team is preparing for three additional events to gather public input:

1) May 30th Workshop: This event will focus on gathering input on the draft maps identifying corridors and intersections this Plan proposes to improve. Recommended plan improvements have been informed by previous planning studies completed to date by the City, the existing conditions and best practice analysis being conducted by the Consultant team as part of this project, and feedback received from community members at the March 12th and April 15th events.

2) June 9th Complete Streets Walk Audit: Consultant team members and City staff are currently planning this event, which will consist of a walking tour of two half-mile corridor segments. This will be followed by group mapping exercises to document patterns of behavior observed on the walk, and to identify other areas of the City where participants have observed issues they want addressed through this Plan.

3) August 22nd Workshop: This workshop will summarize how community feedback has shaped plan recommendations and will present the Plan draft for a round of community input.

Visit the project website (www.beverlyhills.org/completestreets) to stay up to date on event dates and details. Updates on this project will also be shared in monthly Traffic and Parking Commission (TPC) meetings. For the latest TPC meeting schedule, please visit: www.beverlyhills.org/TPC
EARTH DAY POP-UP RESPONSE SUMMARY

“How would you improve mobility?” - 58 comments recorded

Vote for your top 3 priority Complete Streets elements - 44 participants
SUMMARY:
Approximately 20 community members attended the second workshop for the Beverly Hills Complete Streets Plan on Wednesday, May 30th, in addition to Council and Commission Members, and Beverly Hills staff from a cross section of departments. The focus of the workshop was to identify priority corridors and to make network recommendations that will be used to guide the Plan.

AREAS OF CONCERN:
Participants reviewed maps addressing modes of travel including transit, vehicular, bike, and pedestrian. There were 48 specific comments provided, with the bike and pedestrian maps comprising 71% of the total responses. In some cases, maps elicited feedback for different modes of transportation. When this happened, the comments were likely to be related to bikes or pedestrians.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:
Participants had the most feedback on Bike (31%) and Pedestrian (29%) network maps. Vehicular (25%) and Transit (15%) maps received fewer comments. Comments were most frequently related to Bike network connectivity (15%), and Crossing Improvement, Safety Concern, and Traffic Calming each representing 10%.
Several common themes emerged throughout the workshop:
- Support of interest in a shuttle route
- Desire for improved crosswalks
- Challenging biking conditions at Crescent and Wilshire, Sunset Blvd., and Rodeo Dr.
- Improved bike amenities including green lanes, protected lanes, and bike parking
- A need for enhanced pedestrian safety along Gregory Way, Olympic, and Beverly
- Use of traffic calming measures on Wilshire and Olympic

NEXT STEPS:
Community feedback will be incorporated into the network maps for each modality. Additional events are planned that will continue to solicit feedback and public input throughout the plan development, including a June 9th Walk Audit, an August 22nd Workshop, and monthly Traffic and Parking Commission meetings.
WALK AUDIT HIGHLIGHTS

SUMMARY:
Approximately 25 community members attended a walk audit for the Beverly Hills Complete Streets Plan on Saturday, June 9th, in addition to Commissioners and City staff from a cross-section of departments. Participants were split into groups to conduct a 90-minute walk audit, followed by tabletop exercises focused on how to re-design each corridor. The first group walked from Crescent Drive to Wilshire Boulevard while the second group traveled along South Santa Monica Boulevard. Participants were then asked to identify safety concerns for pedestrians, bicyclists, vehicles, and transit along their route and to offer suggestions for improvement.

ROUTE 1: CRESCENT DRIVE TO WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
Participants were most concerned with vehicular speeding and conflicts between vehicles and cyclists/pedestrians at intersections. They also noted the introduction of the Purple Line and how that would impact pedestrian travel as well as a need for rideshare drop-off areas. Additionally, they addressed the need to enhance parking options along this route.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
Participants desired design solutions to slow traffic. The intersection of Crescent and South Santa Monica was the area of greatest concern. Suggestions included:

- Reducing the turn radius
- Adding a second turn lane
- Enhancing visibility of speed limit signs
- Introducing scramble crossings

Another theme was the desire to indicate shared-use zones for bikes, scooters, and pedestrians. Participants were interested in the potential for a pedestrian overpass to encourage more pedestrian traffic. Finally, along Crescent, they recommended adding digital parking occupancy signage and to remove permit parking on the east side.
ROUTE 2: SOUTH SANTA MONICA BOULEVARD
Participants were most concerned with vehicular speeding along South Santa Monica Boulevard. Additionally, they identified narrow sidewalks as inhibiting pedestrian activity for the restaurants and small businesses located on the North side of the street.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
Participants were most concerned with the traffic infractions along this route among vehicles and cyclists, though they did not offer many suggestions for improvement other than enforcement of existing rules (ex. no right turn on red).

They were excited about the scramble crossings and suggested additional data be collected a few months after introduction in order to understand the impact. They were supportive of the partial road diet and eager to see it implemented on a larger stretch of the corridor.

They also noted that utility boxes make the sidewalk more narrow, inhibiting outdoor patio space for area businesses. In addition to business concerns, they noted that wheelchairs and strollers have a hard time navigating this area.

NEXT STEPS:
Community feedback will be incorporated into the network maps for each modality. Additional events are planned that will continue to solicit feedback and public input throughout the plan development, including an August 22nd Workshop, and monthly Traffic and Parking Commission meetings.
SUMMARY:
Approximately 25 community members attended Workshop 3 for the Beverly Hills Complete Streets Plan on Wednesday, August 22nd, in addition to Traffic & Parking Commissioners and Beverly Hills staff from a cross-section of departments. Iteris delivered a presentation summarizing draft plan progress, which included an overview of the city-wide network maps for the 4 modalities: walking, biking, transit, and vehicles. Following a brief Q & A session, participants were invited to circulate around the room to absorb information on the boards, segmented by each modality. A summary of comments for each is below. Overall, the materials were well-received by participants. Some minor comments were recorded and will be considered as Iteris works towards finalizing maps.

PEDESTRIAN:
Participants expressed an interest in intersection improvements at Rexford and Charleville, as well as a pedestrian crossover bridge at La Cienega between Olympic and Gregory. Some felt that adding trees on Olympic, Wilshire, Robertson would improve the aesthetics of the parkways. Lastly, community members were interested in future planning efforts to assess building set-backs to allow for wider sidewalks for outdoor dining.

BIKE:
Several community members indicated parking protected bike lanes would be preferred to reverse angle parking, expressing concerns about driver confusion. Participants expressed interest in a Class III bike lane on Gregory Way, and Class II or Class III bike lane on Doheny between Santa Monica Boulevard and Beverly. The community members also suggested reduced fare for the bikeshare program and bicycle training classes that would encourage more people to bike safely in Beverly Hills.

TRANSIT:
Community members are enthusiastic about improvements to transit stop amenities, including more benches, shaded areas, and trash bins. They also commented on the need for higher capacity buses, bus lanes, and north/south routes in Beverly Hills, which falls outside the scope of this project.
VEHICLES:
Participants were concerned that additional pedestrian lights and signage could lead to confusion among drivers and they suggested consistent interventions whenever possible. Left-turn restrictions overall were positively received. They suggested more parking structures at the light-rail station near La Cienega and Wilshire, as well as adding a “kiss and ride” drop-off area.

NEXT STEPS:
Community feedback will be incorporated into the network maps for each modality as Iteris moves forward to delivering a draft plan in the fall. Additional opportunities for public input will be provided by the comments features on the website, and at monthly Traffic and Parking Commission meetings where this project has a standing agenda item.
DRAFT PLAN COMMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Likes</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Created</th>
<th>COBH Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>Driving through the city, I see countless close encounters with bicycles. This is why I believe all bike lanes should be protected. Whether that is with Bollards or planter boxes, all bike lines should be protected.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>04-11-2019</td>
<td>No change required. All bike lane projects will be evaluated to determine the level of separation from vehicle traffic that can be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>Why does Olympic and Wilshire not have bike lanes? These streets are extremely busy and protected bike lanes would increase the safety of bicycles. In addition, the utilization of “islands” for bus stops allows for bikes to have a clear path while not impeding bus services.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>04-11-2019</td>
<td>Wilshire and Olympic Boulevards are recommended to be prioritized for the vehicle/transit network due to traffic volumes, speeds, truck traffic, and geometric design. Parallel streets are recommended to be prioritized for bicycle travel. Bus islands are included as a recommendation in this plan. No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>Painted Bike Lanes are great, however they should be as close to the curb as possible. As such, I recommend that the parking and bike lines are flipped. To further protect bicycles, I also recommend the use of bollards between the parking and the bike lane.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>04-11-2019</td>
<td>No change required. All bike lane projects will be evaluated to determine the level of separation from vehicle traffic that can be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>Crosswalks that do not have stop-lights, should either have push-to-cross lights or the flashing lights near the high school. In addition, all crosswalks near schools and parks that do not have stop-lights should have push-to-cross lights or those flashing lights like the one's near the high school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>04-11-2019</td>
<td>No change required. The City’s crosswalk policy that will be approved as part of the plan dictates that marked crosswalks at non-signalized intersections will not be approved/installed without additional treatments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>The bike lanes on Sunset Blvd. should utilize the center median. That is a natural barrier that would minimize the interaction with vehicles. To mitigate accidents with vehicles, there should be a cutout to turn (to cross the would-be bike lane) and there should be a turn signal in which if a bike is sensed the turn signal turns red to allow bikes a safe passage.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>04-11-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested. This design suggestion can be evaluated during implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>This program could be expanded to look at bus stops. If bus stops had an “island” form, bikes would never have to interact with busy streets.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>04-11-2019</td>
<td>No change required. This recommendation is included in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>The city should see about the possibility of building parking beneath Reeves Park. The structure can encroach underneath the adjacent street to provide more parking. This would provide half a block walk to the Purple Line Station. In addition, the park would not be destroyed as you could place it on top of the parking structure. In addition, the city should look to buy the property from METRO (at Gale &amp; Wilshire - behind the old Car Dealer and across from the Saban Theatre) and look to build a structure beneath ground. This would provide a short walk to the station. Like the Reeves Park, the city would be smart to implement another park here, providing green space to the Wilshire/La Cienega area.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>04-11-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Building parking at Reeves Park is outside the scope of this plan. The City has purchased the Gale Staging Yard site and will be releasing an RFP for a mobility hub study of the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Programs</td>
<td>While many of your residents can afford this, those who traverse through to get to/from work cannot. Roads are for everyone and this is a bad idea. Do not give Beverly Hills a bad image.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>04-11-2019</td>
<td>No change required. The City would not pursue this project, but would consider supporting a regional program depending on the recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>I do not believe a bus lane would assist in alleviating traffic. Rather, if busses had an “island” where they can pick passengers up from, it would eliminate the consistent turning in-and-out of traffic to pick up passengers. In addition, with bus “islands” parking would become available on the streets without interfering with traffic.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>04-11-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Bus islands are included as a recommendation in this plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>Instead of parking meters, utilize pay stations with space numbers painted onto the curbs. This will create a cleaner look for our streets and lower the cost to collect coins from meters. To increase pedestrian safety, I recommend the use of “Driver Feedback Signs” (Signs that utilize radar to determine speed and signal slow down to drivers). “Optical Speed Bars,” and “Speed Cushions.” The advantage of speed cushions is that emergency vehicles are able to drive through them without slowing down, whereas normal vehicles cannot.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>04-11-2019</td>
<td>No change required. The City does not plan to convert meters to paystations at this time. Speed feedback signs are included as a recommendation in this plan. Speed lumps are included as a recommendation in this plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Likes</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Created</td>
<td>COBH Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>This is what I meant by &quot;bus islands&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>04-11-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Please state data source</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>04-11-2019</td>
<td>Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Please state data source</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>04-11-2019</td>
<td>Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>should read &quot;brake pedal&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>04-11-2019</td>
<td>Revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>I think all existing and new mid-block crossings need to have warning lights (rapid flash beacons, hybrid beacons, half signals) to alert drivers to slow down or stop. Signage and crosswalk striping are not enough.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>04-12-2019</td>
<td>No change required. The City's crosswalk policy that will be approved as part of the plan dictates that marked crosswalks at non-signalized intersections will not be approved/installed without additional treatments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>There is this awkward intersection near the library (Rexford Dr./Clifton Way/Foothill Rd.) Lighting is poor, so pedestrians are not very visible at night. This area also needs crosswalk striping to help vehicles pay attention to pedestrians.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>04-12-2019</td>
<td>No change required. The City is in the process of evaluating options to improve this intersection for pedestrians, including striping and ADA upgrades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Programs</td>
<td>I would love to see Beverly Hills take part in CicLAvia.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>04-12-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Programs</td>
<td>Beverly Hills has probably some of most aggressive drivers in the greater LA area, especially those driving their fancy sports cars. Many drivers are distracted. I think motorists absolutely need to be educated and re-educated about traffic laws and safe driving best practices. Traffic laws also need to be better enforced by law enforcement. Drivers have cut me off as I am crossing the street countless times. Many drivers do the &quot;California rolling stop&quot; and don't stop for pedestrians or cyclists.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>04-12-2019</td>
<td>No change required. The City can explore traffic law education as part of the grant-funded Awareness Campaign when it kicks off.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>At night, many crosswalk signals don't respond to the &quot;push-to-walk&quot; button, unless there is a car also waiting to cross the intersection, for example Doheny Dr./Gregory Way; Doheny Dr./Charleville Blvd. Need to fix this...</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>04-12-2019</td>
<td>No change required. The City's traffic engineering team can investigate this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Programs</td>
<td>I think a major factor forgotten in this plan is the tour buses/vans that are causing major traffic throughout the city. They drive 5-10 miles throughout the city in both residential and commercial areas, and also stop in the middle of the road therefore blocking traffic-the major sources of congestion and pointless, unnecessary traffic. Additionally, there is already limited enough parking for single-vehicle cars-please don't take all of that away from us, most of it seems to be becoming valet parking at this point. Finally, the ride-sharing pickup/drop offs are certainly causing more traffic in areas throughout the city, but please don't give too much of our parking to ride-shares and tourist vans. Maybe combine them with taxi stands or loading zone areas. It has become a headache to live and work in this city.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>04-15-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Curbside management will be addressed as part of this plan. The City evaluates tour bus loading outside of this plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Programs</td>
<td>Will the traffic lights throughout the city be re-evaluated as well? There are numerous lights throughout the city that do not 'line up,' causing traffic to be pointless stopped i.e. at Burton Way and Foothill. Additionally, streets such as Beverly Drive and Crescent Drive have traffic lights that are activated by pedestrians and turn red, but all the other lights on the street are green and traffic is virtually halted. There are for example 10 traffic lights going down Beverly Drive, but one will randomly turn red so the other green lights after are pointless, because no cars are allowed to go (i.e. stopped at the one random red light), therefore, causing more traffic. If the lights were timed better (including ones activated by pedestrians to match the timing of surrounding traffic lights)-it could help relieve some traffic in the city.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>04-15-2019</td>
<td>No change required. The City is in the process of updating the traffic signal system. Specific observations will be referred to the City's traffic engineer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>Not sure what the value of a bikeway is in &quot;lower-speed&quot; residential streets. If you visit this intersection for example you'll see you can easily bike the street with little to no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>04-15-2019</td>
<td>Lower-speed residential streets provide a lower stress place to ride. Some residential streets may need less infrastructure than others to increase level of bicycling comfort. Design details will be explored during implementation. No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Likes</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Created</td>
<td>COBH Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>We don't need more distractions in our streets and intersections.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>04-15-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>The biggest complaint I actually have is valets near and around Canon. They have no regard for anyone and are always blocking driving lanes. Additionally any initiative that takes away parking spots in the city should not be considered. I understand if future technology might mean less parking used but let’s actually consider that when it’s proven. There are more people moving to LA and only a limited amount of land for spots.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>04-15-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Valet operations are out of scope of this plan. Some changes in this plan may result in parking removal to accommodate other modes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>The only legal way for East bound bike riders on Gregory to cross Robertson is if they get off their bikes and walk them north about 200’ to the crosswalk.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>04-16-2019</td>
<td>Olympic Boulevard is recommended to be prioritized for the vehicle/transit network due to traffic volumes, speeds, truck traffic, and geometric design. Parallel streets are recommended to be prioritized for bicycle travel. Bikeways are not recommended on Olympic Boulevard on adjacent cities. No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>Why no Bike Lane (or Protected Bike Lane) along Olympic Blvd?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>04-16-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Pedestrian scrambles are recommended as part of this plan. Specific intersections can be evaluated during implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>Any thoughts about converting more busy intersections to a scramble/diagonal crosswalk? Would Wilshire/Rodeo qualify?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>04-16-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Programs</td>
<td>The studies do show that reverse angled parking is the safest, but it takes some getting used to. Perhaps try in a limited area such as Linden within the triangle. Also there are several overly wide streets such as Bedford and Camden which would be perfect streets to limit the lanes and add angled parking (may need to be the conventional type). This would calm the traffic AND increase available meters.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>04-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>Charleville is a residential street with 4-way stop signs at almost every intersection. And each block is relatively short. Constant stop &amp; go takes a lot of energy from a cyclist. This is not the best way to encourage people to use bicycles. On major streets, such as Wilshire or Olympic, at least we have a 50/50 chance of getting green lights at some intersections and not having to completely stop at every block. As a cyclist, I would love to see a bike lane on Olympic Blvd.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>04-24-2019</td>
<td>Olympic Boulevard is recommended to be prioritized for the vehicle/transit network due to traffic volumes, speeds, truck traffic, and geometric design. Parallel streets are recommended to be prioritized for bicycle travel. Bikeways are not recommended on Olympic Boulevard on adjacent cities. No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Programs</td>
<td>Why doesn’t Wilshire have a dedicated bus/bike lane during rush hour, which would be in line with the section of Wilshire Blvd. to the east of Beverly Hills?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>04-24-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Consideration of a Wilshire Blvd Bus Lane pilot is a recommendation in this plan. Details of bike/bus lane design would be determined during implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>Please reconfigure intersection to allow pedestrians and cyclists to cross from Clifton Way in Beverly Hills to Drexel in Los Angeles.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>04-24-2019</td>
<td>An intersection crossing treatment has been added to the Recommended Bikeways Map at this intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>It’s very important to the network to bridge the bike lanes between Burton Way and Crescent Drive. If parking is added back to South Santa Monica Blvd to the southwest, then the road could go down to one vehicle lane in each direction here to allow for a bike lane connection to Crescent or Canon.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>04-24-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Design details for the recommended bikeway on South Santa Monica Blvd would be determined during implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>San Vicente is a key street in a future regional bike network. Beverly Hills need to figure out how to at least put standard bike lanes on southbound San Vicente.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>04-24-2019</td>
<td>This has been added to the Recommended Bikeways Map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Programs</td>
<td>Wilshire between Santa Monica Boulevard and the Los Angeles city line is a key gap in the regional bike network. East of Santa Monica Boulevard, Wilshire has 2 vehicle lanes in each direction. Please extend that configuration to the west, keeping the number of</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>04-24-2019</td>
<td>No change required. A Wilshire Blvd Bus Lane pilot is a recommendation in this plan. Details of bike/bus lane design would be determined during implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Likes</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Created</td>
<td>COBH Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Infrastructure should be installed to match that on the other side of the street. Between La Cienega and Wilshire Blvds. Please correct this error in the map. A Class II Bike Route is recommended to be prioritized for the vehicle/transit network due to traffic volumes, speeds, truck traffic, and geometric design. Parallel streets are recommended to be prioritized for bicycle travel. Bikeways are not recommended on Olympic Boulevard on adjacent cities.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>04-24-2019</td>
<td>No change required. All bike lane projects will be evaluated to determine the level of separation from vehicle traffic that can be provided. Olympic Boulevard is recommended to be prioritized for the vehicle/transit network due to traffic volumes, speeds, truck traffic, and geometric design. Parallel streets are recommended to be prioritized for bicycle travel. Bikeways are not recommended on Olympic Boulevard on adjacent cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Infrastructure Consider a one way protected lane couplet on Brighton and Dayton. No change required. Brighton is a recommended bikeway in this plan. Design details would be determined during implementation, including whether or not this could include a one-way couplet with Dayton, contra flow lanes, or sharrows.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>04-24-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Brighton is a recommended bikeway in this plan. Design details would be determined during implementation, including whether or not this could include a one-way couplet with Dayton, contra flow lanes, or sharrows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Infrastructure Please work with private property owner to build a publicly accessible sidewalk on the south side of Santa Monica Boulevard between Beverly and Canon. Private property is out of the scope of this plan.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>04-24-2019</td>
<td>Private property is out of the scope of this plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Infrastructure Doheny would be a great candidate for a north/south Class IV bike lane, from SM Bl to Whitworth. You don’t have very many north/south safe corridors here. IMHO, “bike routes” are worthless in making less confident riders feel safe. Bike Lanes are better, but if you really want to set an example for the world and make this great (and embrace Vision Zero), please focus on Class IV.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>04-26-2019</td>
<td>No change required. All bike lane projects will be evaluated to determine the level of separation from vehicle traffic that can be provided. A bikeway on Doheny Drive is included as a recommendation in this plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Infrastructure Whittier could be your western north/south bike lane (hopefully Class IV) and if you protect Sunset (which I think is great, BTW) then you have a great link here between Sunset, SM Bl's bike lane - with great connections to LA's system - as well as further south down Moreno and Spalding to Olympic (I still think Olympic needs a Class IV bike lane)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>04-26-2019</td>
<td>No change required. All bike lane projects will be evaluated to determine the level of separation from vehicle traffic that can be provided. Olympic Boulevard is recommended to be prioritized for the vehicle/transit network due to traffic volumes, speeds, truck traffic, and geometric design. Parallel streets are recommended to be prioritized for bicycle travel. Bikeways are not recommended on Olympic Boulevard on adjacent cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Infrastructure You have a <em>ton</em> of space on the old bridle trails (which is beautiful BTW), while the green bike lanes are great and appreciated, could you please allocate space to protect the lanes you've already built. Especially going West -&gt; East, it can get harrowing with cars (and many tourists) not paying attention and trying to make a right into the golden triangle not looking out for cyclists despite the lane.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>04-26-2019</td>
<td>No change required. City Council recently approved and the City installed the current design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Infrastructure It's currently not legal and very difficult to cross from the east side of Civic Center Dr across Beverly Bl to the west side of Civic Center Dr. While I think it's great you've closed this off to cars, please make a crosswalk and a pass through for cyclists to be able to use this very quiet and peaceful street.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>04-26-2019</td>
<td>An intersection crossing treatment has been added to the Recommended Bikeways Map at this intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Infrastructure Especially with the diagonal parking spaces on Beverly Dr, this needs to be protected to be effective. You could push out the existing parking spaces on each side of the street and have the bike lane be between the curb and the front of the parked cars.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>04-26-2019</td>
<td>No change required. All bike lane projects will be evaluated to determine the level of separation from vehicle traffic that can be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Infrastructure You need bike only lanes and protected bike lanes to lure more people out of their cars. The number #1 reason people in BH do not cycle is that they do not feel safe doing so. Beverly Hills is ranked #90 (of 372 cities) in the state of California in terms of bike friendliness. WE CAN DO BETTER THAN THAT!</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>04-29-2019</td>
<td>No change required. All bike lane projects will be evaluated to determine the level of separation from vehicle traffic that can be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Infrastructure Olympic Blvd. is the major east-west route into the high school and Century City in the southern portion of our city. We need dedicated, protected bike lanes to move people to these two common destinations. Get rid of the left turn only lanes for cars which are empty 99% of the time, even during rush hour, and use this space to create protected bike lanes on this major east-west corridor. Bike lanes would also create a buffer between the traffic and pedestrians on the sidewalks. Much of the time it feels like walking along a highway.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>04-29-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Olympic Boulevard is recommended to be prioritized for the vehicle/transit network due to traffic volumes, speeds, truck traffic, and geometric design. Parallel streets are recommended to be prioritized for bicycle travel. Bikeways are not recommended on Olympic Boulevard on adjacent cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Infrastructure There is no existing Class II Bike Route on the west (Beverly Hills) side of San Vicente Blvd. between La Cienega and Wilshire Blvds. Please correct this error in the map. A Class II should be installed to match that on the other side of the street.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>04-30-2019</td>
<td>This has been added to the Recommended Bikeways Map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
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<td>Likes</td>
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<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Whittier Dr. has the advantage of a traffic signal at Wilshire Blvd., which allows for easy access to Santa Monica Blvd. from Sunset Blvd. and Elevado Ave.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>04-30-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Shouldn’t this be Phyllis Street? (city limit with West Hollywood)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>04-30-2019</td>
<td>There is no bikeway proposed on Phillis St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Beverly Hills needs to provide far more bus benches and shelters than is currently the case. They should reference the “smart” shelters currently being installed in West Hollywood (live arrival updates, WiFi, enhanced lighting, etc.).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>04-30-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Smart shelters are included as a recommendation in this plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>This perfect spot to try performance pricing parking. This is where the meters allow flexible parking rates, and are set to 85% occupancy. This decreases car congestion since this allows for 1-2 open spaces per block. Now people that want to park short term and close to the businesses will always find a space. Less circling the block looking for a parking space. Increased revenue can be used to enhance the blocks these spaces serve. Now the street will be more pleasant for ALL users: walkers cars and cyclists!!</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>05-02-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Bedford is shown in the plan as an example for curbside management, which could include variable parking rates. Design details would be determined during implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>The present plan deserved a lot of praise. I want to add a suggestion that could make it even better. The plan takes much of its urgency and motivation from the health benefits that accrue when more people feel confident to use our streets actively. The test of this principle occurs when you arrive at your doctor’s office and can find no decent bicycle parking. Or when you read the social media output of a local hospital that uses the word “cyclist” to refer to a cyclist. Policies are needed that emphasize the special responsibility of health providers to join the healthy transportation bandwagon in Beverly Hills.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>04-26-2019</td>
<td>No change required. The City does not have jurisdiction over private healthcare providers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>Camden and Bedford are two good examples of overly wide streets that encourage speeding. Three wide lanes are not necessary. Two narrower lanes would allow space for creativity. This could be used for angled meter parking, a bike lane or wider sidewalks. The test of this principle occurs when you arrive at your doctor’s office and can find no decent bicycle parking. Or when you read the social media output of a local hospital that uses the word “cyclist” to refer to a cyclist. Policies are needed that emphasize the special responsibility of health providers to join the healthy transportation bandwagon in Beverly Hills.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>05-07-2019</td>
<td>No change required. All bike lane projects will be evaluated to determine the level of separation from vehicle traffic that can be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>I am glad to see that 97% of people surveyed are pedestrians who like to walk in Beverly Hills - more than any other modality. And I'm glad that pedestrian improvements are discussed in the plan. But I'm disappointed that pedestrian projects seem to get shunted aside in the “Next Steps” timeline of projects. Many needed pedestrian improvements are pushed into Tier 3 - and it sounds like those would not actually happen for many years. I encourage you to “put your money where your mouth is,” and move pedestrian improvements forward. The 97% of us would benefit from it! Thank you.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>05-08-2019</td>
<td>Pedestrian projects are now clearly outlined in the Action Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Likes</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Created</td>
<td>COBH Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>I'm glad to see pedestrian improvements called for on Robertson and La Cienega. Making these streets more pedestrian-friendly will also encourage more street life and business on these corridors - which I know has been a goal for Beverly Hills. Right now walking on these streets can feel a bit desolate - but many of these blocks have good bones, and could be lively stretches with the right improvements (and a few new restaurants and cafes).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>05-08-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>I read in the Courier this week that the Traffic and Parking Commission &quot;reluctantly&quot; sent the Complete Streets plan to the City Council. This was because the plan was full of generalities and buzz phrases but short on details and actual recommendations. Why did the Commission forward the plan? If it was so bad, why didn’t they return it to the subcontractor for revision? If we have not yet paid their invoice I suggest we do not.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>05-13-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Can we add more bike share stations? Below are a few suggestions: Robertson/Gregory Wilshire/La Cienega Wilshire/Robertson Wilshire/Roxbury S Santa Monica/Moore Olymipic/Beverly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>05-15-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Bike share to be evaluated along with consideration of shared mobility devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>The sidewalk material should be overhauled citywide -- the city should install DECORATIVE PAVERS / ENHANCED SIDEWALKS (as it's done all over the world, including most U.S. cities). The updated guideline (to require pavers) should be included in your new &quot;Complete Streets&quot; plan. In order to attract walkability and pedestrian-friendly environment, pavers are a Must!</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>05-16-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Developing streetscape guidelines and standards for commercial streets is included in the tiered implementation plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>The complete streets plan provides the document the city needs to qualify for Metro grants. No network, policy or program is provided. #shelfware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. All bike lane projects will be evaluated to determine the level of separation from vehicle traffic that can be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>More Protected Bike LANES!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Nearly every central-area corridor is identified for a 'conceptual enhancement.' Few are recommended.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. The corridors identified are those that are recommended for enhancement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Of course we can also reallocate travel lanes for other purposes such as bicycle lanes and protected bicycle lanes. In some cases keeping parking but eliminating a 2nd travel lane -- like south Beverly Drive -- would calm traffic. Note: the term 'road diet' appears nowhere in this draft plan!</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested. Roadway reconfiguration is discussed specifically in Appendices Best Practices and Design Guidance as an option for expanding bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Roadway reconfiguration is also discussed as a strategy for implementing bikeways in constrained areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>EVERY street in Beverly Hills is wide enough to accommodate both bi-directional travel lanes AND bicycle lanes. It is a question of priorities.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Prioritizing bicyclists as the roadway users is a VALUE that is noted in both the circulation element of the general plan and the 2009 Sustainable City Plan. The objectives: to reduce emissions; reduce congestion; and promote community health.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Any street or corridor can be made low-stress, or substantially lower-stress, with the proper infrastructure. This plan seems to prioritize EXISTING relatively low-stress streets for facilities; moreover any designation as Class II OR class III makes no distinction between the suitability of a facility for a specific situation. Any apparent stress today for bicyclists should suggest a class II or IV -- marked lanes or protected lanes -- for the bikeways infrastructure map. Class III is NOT infrastructure.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>All bike lane projects will be evaluated to determine the level of separation from vehicle traffic that can be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Likes</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Created</td>
<td>COBH Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>The 1977 plan did a much better job of suggesting the value of those destinations by making them notes in a citywide bicycle network. How is it that schools don't get special treatment in this plan? Why was the school district not brought into the process as a KEY stakeholder if we want kids to ride to school?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>Most schools touches at least one recommended bikeway to prioritize student bicycle travel. The schools and district offices were noticed about workshops, and information about the release of the Draft Plan and Draft Plan Feedback Workshop was included in the school newsletters to encourage parent and staff participation. There is now goals/policies that specifically include connections to schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Both are excellent N/S Class II choices. Beverly in particular will benefit from lanes adjacent to the sidewalk and reverse angled parking. We NEED to lose a travel lane because excessive speed, U-turns, etc. go completely unenforced.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>There is no excuse NOT to stripe class II lanes on Crescent south of SM Blvd as this is the city-owned commercial district. Community destinations (market, hardware, P.O.) and in/out conflicts at three parking garages make it essential for every road user to understand riders are present and have a dedicated space.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested. Crescent is included as a recommendation in this plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Canon north of Wilshire is NOT appropriate for bicycle lanes. Beverly is the primary N/S corridor. Crescent is the neighborhood retail corridor. Canon is a road to nowhere on either end. Plus the Canon/Wilshire intersection, should it reopen, is among the most high-stress for riders and pedestrians given the oblique angle of the intersection and the traffic light spacing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>Canon is being considered for bicycle lanes because it may provide access to the Metro station via the North Portal, currently being studied. The Canon/Wilshire intersection is also identified as in need of an intersection crossing treatment. No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Appropriate for Class IV and nothing else given the city-acknowledged hazards of the corridor (not least excessive speed) which has resulted in some intersection redesigns. If designated for Class IV we should also see some innovate intersection treatments near Will Rogers park: bike signals &amp; bike boxes at the very least.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. These are recommendations in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Burton Way lanes was always low-hanging fruit, but the execution (and faded striping) leaves much to be desired. Yes improve it, but don't count it as a real step forward. It is among the lowest-hanging fruit still.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. This is a recommendation in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Reconfigure it. Residents along Burton will benefit from having traffic at speed farther from the curb.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. This is a recommendation in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>The city's rack-on-request program was a cynical gesture that planted perhaps 30-35 racks. And was structured only so business owners could request -- and veto -- a rack. A worst-practice case study. By all means: more racks and bike corrals, such as at the market on Crescent where the eastbound street crosses. On the NW corner is perfect. Low-hanging fruit.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Recommendations for more bike parking is included in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>We have seen active traffic enforcement PLUMMET in a decade. The best cure for ped safety on high-speed corridors is lower speed though engineered treatments or enforcement. Next, high-viz crosswalks and signals that give pedz lead time at EVERY intersection in our designated ped zone.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. These are recommendations in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Already in our designated pedestrian zone and SHAMEFULLY ignored by our transportation planners and engineers. Just look at those faded, old crosswalks. We have a preponderance of older walkers, and this is among the most crowded few blocks in the city. SHAME.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Another key pedestrian corridor that has been shamefully ignored. Consequently, nobody likes to walk there. Shop owners don't want to locate there (no foot traffic). Yet we scratch our heads and form small business task forces to figure out the problem. YES on ped corridor designation.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Likes</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Created</td>
<td>COBH Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>It is a testament to our city’s ambivalence to the complete streets process that we’ve haggled over south SM boulevard realignment instead of waiting a year to see what the plan says. Another key ped corridor YES.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. This is a recommendation in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>YES. If our intersections look like they do today after three years post CS implementation, we have failed. We need curb realignments at Wilshire/Crescent and also South SM/Crescent. Square off the latter.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. This is a recommendation in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>See Pottsville, PA. Looks just like South Beverly before/after implementation. Drivers will get the hang of it: it’s like parallel parking for dummies.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. This is a recommendation in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>Every intersection on South Bev or any ped district should be considered seriously for scrambles. Today, it is a free-for-all at the pedestrians’ expense. Another problem today: Ped signals aren’t green sometimes unless the button is pushed. Ped signals in our city range from 5 seconds to 20+ seconds for the SAME crossing distance. SHAME.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Pedestrian scrambles and signal upgrades are included as recommendations in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Who cares. Make them safe and visible.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>Yes. The blue-ribbon committee was notable in that probably half those folks said they didn’t want bus shelters at all because they cater to the homeless. We are better people than that, right? Or at least we want to treat our service people better, right?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>Our alleys proximate to the future station at Reeves can be repurposed – and should be. What a waste of public space they are today. This is low-hanging fruit. If they are not used for bike-ped station access and perhaps rideshare we will have failed.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Options for drop-off/pick-up and station access will be evaluated as part of the Metro First/Last Mile Strategic Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>&quot;I have consistently used every modality available to me for the past 15 years. While I’m glad to see this document address improvements across all modalities, nothing prevents me from walking, driving or using a bus across our city today. However, even as a very competent cyclist, I can’t comfortably bike through it. It’s one of the most dangerous parts of LA I ever bike through. Other than Santa Monica Blvd—something we had to spend over three years fighting for the obvious—the lanes we do have are bridges to nowhere. It should not be lost in reviewing this process and this document that we have consistently punted for four decades the need to develop a holistic bike network. Punting any further is total failure and an embarrassment to our community.&quot; - Kory Klem</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>Look at Japan for excellent examples of automated bike parking. The big promise is in automated car parking, but bike parking is a manageable demonstration project to start.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Shows participants' ambivalence about the automobile today. We can make a policy change so that we’re not planning foremost for traffic throughput. That should have never been a guiding objective. Let those folks take air taxis.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. This plan recommends upgrading all modes to best practice mobility standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>The city has some of the widest blocks in LA. DTLA just added a 2-way bike lane on Main. DTLA is rather built out. It will NEVER GET EASIER TO ADD THESE CORRIDORS THAT ARE 40 YEARS OVERDUE. We love the Mayberry comparison, but Mayberry is only really open to cars and peds (ish).</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>This feels always in the future. &quot;The city will...&quot; &quot;Implementation is in progress...&quot; We've seen a decade of rising injuries and declining enforcement without EVER analyzing crashes and where/why they happen. Flying blind.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>It is another sign of our city’s ambivalence about the CS process that southwest traffic calming preceded in advance of the plan. Ridiculous. And the proposed ‘pilot’ will tell us nothing about what should be in that toolbox. Speaking of which, didn’t we have a calming toolbox 20 years ago?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Likes</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Created</td>
<td>COBH Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>The city should prioritize MAXING our high-stress corridors lower-stress. Focusing on low-stress corridors is the low-hanging fruit. Every major street should be low-stress. Now, what tools and improvements do we need to get there?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. “Prioritize Implementation of Low Stress Bikeways” is a recommended policy in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>The reason you're able to recommend nearly every street is that they're all obviously wide enough for even Class IV if folks led to prioritized other modalities. We don't need 52 miles of lanes. We need less than 10, including: 1. A Southerly East-West route. Olympic will never happen and it's a death trap with a sizable hill to the west. Gregory is ideal. 2. When you look at the accident data and marry that with the construction mitigation along with first/last mile, Charleville is redundant as it's so close to Wilshire, the perfect mid-City route. 3. We need to Doheny (Pico-to-Santa Monica). It's the perfect connector. 4. Split the triangle North-South. This could even be temporary until something larger (Beverly) was executed in a subsequent phase.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>The City recommends installing more than 10 miles of bikeways to accommodate the varying needs of bicyclists traveling within and through Beverly Hills, and to create a geographically accessible bikeway network. No change required, these recommendations for specific bikeways are in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>We should discontinue the 4-day TDM workweek for employees that have it, and instead incentivize non-motor travel to work using that extra off-day. Only employees that do not commute by car should be eligible.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Encouraging/incentivizing City employee commuting by non-motorized transportation is a recommendation in this plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>NYC provides a model: every new commercial building must provide bike parking and allow bikes to be brought in through the lobby, if I recall.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Exploring a bike parking ordinance is a recommendation in this plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Perhaps the most important change in how we police streets for safety. Today there is depressingly low rates of enforcement. While red-light cameras work overtime, police and community are together in coffee and bagel shops. One look at the trends should ring the fire alarm. If we can't police the worst excesses -- speed, U-turns, pedestrian intimidation etc -- at least we should know exactly where the harm happens in near real-time. Why has it taken this long? Any why has this suggested NEVER come from BHPD?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>My question is, if crashes are down that much, why are crash injuries so many more than before?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Wilshire / La Cienega is SCREAMING for a scramble. That intersection is enormous, one I've walked a lot. Bring more visibility to it and allow people to cross at an angle. (Think Shibuya in Tokyo.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Pedestrian scramble locations will be evaluated during implementation, and in this location as part of the Wilshire - La Cienega Streetscape Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>The ridiculous 'civil city' program is exhibit A in why these schemes don't work well in BH. Theater won't get us to safer road-user behavior.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>This is the biggest LOL in the whole plan. City staff have historically shown zero interest in what the community has to say outside of some mandated process (CS being one example). The City Hall attitude is often 'shelter in place' rather than 'reach out and touch someone' for better ideas. It's not in the City Hall DNA.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Even if we hold our ground with lower density, we know what's happening around us. We're flanked by it. More industry (tech) has moved west, so the through traffic will only increase. We're two decades behind other Westside COG cities, yet we sit in the middle of all them and should be doing transportation and multimodal better than all of them.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>City of West Hollywood on Monday is finalizing a $500K grant from metro for a CicLAvia and pocketing $100,000 of that for local expenses. Because they 1) saw the value of a CS plan early; and 2) because they care about multimodal. Discuss.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Applying for an open streets event grant is a recommendation in this plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>Call it a pilot if you want, but just implement it already. It is totally crazy the ordinary every conflict between motorists that erupts on South Beverly, let along the patent danger to those on a bike or a scooter.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Recommended Programs

- **Category:** Infrastructure
- **Comment:** We had a small business task force some years ago that simply would not consider the concept. We'll see if the current SBTF cares any more about it. The farthest we got in BH was a lot of money shoveled into a hold for the Chamber's shop local program. It could have been better spent on BFBD.
- **Likes:** 0
- **Page:** 118
- **Created:** 05-17-2019
- **COBH Response:** No change suggested

- **Category:** Recommended Programs
- **Comment:** Our Rec & Parks commissioners (except for Bilak) showed ZERO interest in bike routes to parks; zero interest to allow bikes in parks; and zero interest in complete streets as a concept or process.
- **Likes:** 0
- **Page:** 119
- **Created:** 05-17-2019
- **COBH Response:** No change suggested

- **Category:** Recommended Policies
- **Comment:** We've GOT to find some parity with the rest of the world here. I was completely blindsided by last summer's "emergency ordinance", despite bringing these scooters up to staff, liaison meeting and Mayor's tech group. Again, I probably have covered more mile on more modalities than anyone in the community over the past 15 years. We need to pull our head out of the sand on this. It's the greatest solution I've found to date.
- **Likes:** 0
- **Page:** 110
- **Created:** 05-17-2019
- **COBH Response:** No change suggested

- **Category:** Recommended Policies
- **Comment:** Yes. We should discourage city employees from commuting from Valencia and Westlake Village by reducing any transportation related benefit and give that to those who commute here actively, or by transit, or better yet choose to live here (where our interests can really align).
- **Likes:** 0
- **Page:** 119
- **Created:** 05-17-2019
- **COBH Response:** No change required. The City does not have jurisdiction over where employees live.

- **Category:** Recommended Programs
- **Comment:** YES. Beverly Hills may not have actively opposed it, but only because we didn't have to. The NIMBYs in Condo Canyon did it for us. Implement it here phase I if possible while construction is underway on Metro.
- **Likes:** 0
- **Page:** 119
- **Created:** 05-17-2019
- **COBH Response:** No change suggested

- **Category:** Recommended Programs
- **Comment:** Just go here now and you’re all set: http://www.beverlyhills.org/opendata/ TPC (which has got to be renamed “Transportation”) should have this (or a more developed version of this) up with BHPO each meeting to discuss each month as well as trends.
- **Likes:** 0
- **Page:** 114
- **Created:** 05-17-2019
- **COBH Response:** No response required. Expanding data governance is a recommendation in this plan.

- **Category:** Recommended Programs
- **Comment:** Not sure what this means, but I'd like to feel good riding or scootering into town AND save myself $15 for not driving. YES on pricing.
- **Likes:** 0
- **Page:** 119
- **Created:** 05-17-2019
- **COBH Response:** No change suggested

- **Category:** Implementation Plan
- **Comment:** Seems like the top three priorities for implementation come not from the community, nor from a values-driven plan, but from the predispositions of five elected representatives. And it seems like the two key implementation choices (notably excluding bicycle infrastructure) were made by just two councilmembers in a TPC liaison meeting.
- **Likes:** 0
- **Page:** 120
- **Created:** 05-17-2019
- **COBH Response:** No change suggested

- **Category:** Recommended Infrastructure
- **Comment:** Schools get no priority in this plan, as is evidenced by the lack of a recommended bicycle network that would connect schools (and parks, etc.). There is no discussion of schools or low-stress routes to reach them. The district was not involved as a stakeholder. One boardmember saw a copy of the plan a day before the last TPC meeting where input was taken.
- **Likes:** 0
- **Page:** 120
- **Created:** 05-17-2019
- **COBH Response:** Most schools and parks touch at least one recommended bikeway to prioritize student bicycle travel. The schools and district offices were noticed about workshops, and information about the release of the Draft Plan and Draft Plan Feedback Workshop was included in the school newsletters to encourage parent and staff participation. There are now goals/policies that include connections to schools.

- **Category:** Recommended Infrastructure
- **Comment:** While it is obvious this document was meant to simply check a box for future funding purposes, it also notably lacked any "big ideas". Those familiar with the wonderful aesthetics of our city who also have seen what true multimodal cities look like because of the heavy use of bikes and scooters know that a potential problem lurks, particularly around the metro stops. Why not look into a best cabinet like they have in Japan and Europe? They technology continues to advance nicely, and it will prevent an eyesore around the stations and in the city center.
- **Likes:** 0
- **Page:** 116
- **Created:** 05-17-2019
- **COBH Response:** Providing a Secure Bike Parking Area at the Metro stations is a recommendation in this plan. Designs and vendors would be evaluated during implementation. There is now a policy recommending automated bike parking.

- **Category:** Implementation Plan
- **Comment:** This is the most disappointing aspect of the document: an implementation plan that does not commit to timely implementation. Not only is there no year 1, year two, etc... we see that so-called Tier 1 can stretch to FIVE years. Really? We are 10 years behind our muni neighbors. At this rate, after five years of tier 1, and with these identified priorities, we’ll be 20 years behind our neighbors.
- **Likes:** 0
- **Page:** 121
- **Created:** 05-17-2019
- **COBH Response:** The Action Plan now prioritizes projects in the first six years after plan adoption, but the lifetime of the plan is longer.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Likes</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Created</th>
<th>COBH Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan</td>
<td>If pressing safety is an organizing principle -- and it should be -- we would see a real commitment to real infrastructure in this plan. AND WE DON'T.</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. The plan includes an implementation plan which prioritizes infrastructure installation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>Sharrows is not infrastructure. Moreno should be prioritized for a Class II lane because it is the direct connection to both the HS and Roxbury park. It is wide with parking on one side already. It is a relatively dense area. It connects to SM Blvd lanes. Hello!</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>Moreno is now recommended for bike lanes. The exact design will be determined during implementation with neighborhood-level outreach and a discussion of options/tradeoffs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>Why doesn't the plan recommend either Gregory or Charleville? And why the hedging on class II OR class III? These generalities do not a bike network make, and they won't get us to streets that FEEL safe for those who could choose to ride but won't.</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>The plan recommends both Gregory and Charleville because a facility could be split between the two to minimize impacts (parking loss) to the corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>Again, class II OR class III, and the implementation schedule is not choosing a preferred route. In fact, doesn't the plan variously label Beverly as both class II and Class II OR class III? Looks like hedging on the heavy-lift route.</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>Beverly is proposed as Class II and Class IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan</td>
<td>Tier 3. Let's not get distracted by theater. We need infrastructure in Tier 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>The Action Plan no longer uses tiers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>I enjoyed the walk audit that was part of this process, but we sadly we split up as a group and it only covered two corridors. But yet it <em>WAS</em> valuable. An amazing thing happens when you become intimately involved with using something: You are better informed to solve the user problem that surrounds it. Even if one bikes on Sunday mornings, that doesn't prepare that person to understand where the real infrastructure problems occur. It's purely academic. Pair that with political opposition and you have our Mayberry-like community that prides itself on health, safety and the environment, but is two decades behind other Westside cities when it comes to biking. I love the ban on tobacco products, but what about the thing that will statistically kill or injure us more (autos)? If we don't build out a protected network in Phase I (2020), this process is a shameful, abject failure that will reverberate for a generation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan</td>
<td>make this not only tier one but YEAR ONE. Implementation should distinguish between class II and class III priorities so we have some idea what a network could look like.</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>The bike map has been changed to distinguish between Class II and Class III now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Programs</td>
<td>Bad news: there are other role model cities ahead of us. Good news: we can still create better policies. No employee should receive any employee benefit that encourages single-occupant car travel to work. No car allowance, no mileage, no use of personal car for city business.</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Updating commuter benefits is a recommendation in this plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Programs</td>
<td>Every week should be rideshare week, like every month should be bike month in Beverly Hills. Transportation efficiency, congestion reduction, and emissions reduction needs no holiday.</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Rideshare Week and Bike Month are regional and national programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Programs</td>
<td>West Hollywood got $500k from Metro for open streets. If we don't have a grant app waiting to go out the day Metro blesses our plan, shame on us. Maybe that grant app is the one thing we can do in-house.</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>While we're at it, make Whittier/Sunset a pro-bike intersection with bike signals. Whittier is 'proposed' for class I or II. The N/S route touches a park and a school and links hillside neighborhoods with the SM Blvd lanes westbound. It should be class II right out of the gate: YEAR ONE.</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>An intersection crossing treatment has been added to the Recommended Bikeways Map at this intersection. The City proposes prioritizing installation of bikeways to Metro stations, which also link neighborhoods, schools, parks, and existing bikeways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>Let's commit to at least two, maybe three, crosstown routes. I suggest Elevado: best connection to North Doheny/Sunset and through the Hilton property (mandate an easement in the new project's plan review) to the SM Blvd WB lanes. Commit to YEAR ONE class II.</td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>The Action Plan now includes specific projects to be completed in the first 18 months after plan adoption, with future priority streets to be determined with community input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Likes</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Created</td>
<td>COBH Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan</td>
<td>Moreno is a no-brainer for class II YEAR ONE. Connects the HS, Roxbury park, and SM Blvd lanes.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>The Action Plan now includes specific projects to be completed in the first 18 months after plan adoption, with future priority streets to be determined with community input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan</td>
<td>The single most important proposed bikeway in the plan, but hedged as class II or III in some places and class II in another. Maybe a lift for year one but it can't wait 5 years out for tier 2 or more for tier 3.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>The Action Plan now includes specific projects to be completed in the first 18 months after plan adoption, with future priority streets to be determined with community input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan</td>
<td>The only reasons not to improve Robertson for pedis in tier 1 is 1) LA drags its feet on the LA side; or 2) we are waiting on a streetscape plan in conjunction with the SE task force.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Programs</td>
<td>Not clear how this needs ped improvements. Better crosswalks perhaps and signage.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan</td>
<td>Why are these tier 3? Some time indeterminate? Isn't this what the CS plan is for?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Rec &amp; Parks completely turned their back on complete streets and routes to parks. Except for commissioner Bilak, commissioners turned their backs on bikes in parks and de-listed as a priority anything bike-related, including the subcommittee. The commissioners have apparently taken no interest in complete streets. This item should be implemented not by Rec and Parks but by TPC.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>Commissions do not implement projects. The plan now identifies this commission as a potential partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Programs</td>
<td>Rather than let our small business task force kick this concept to the curb, and rather than shovel more money to the chamber, which doesn't much care about non-member small retailers, hand it over to LACBC or contract with another nonprofit to stand up this program.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>The plan now identifies potential partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Programs</td>
<td>These seem to be different concepts. If we are talking about private entities providing public plazas in exchange for some zoning consideration, I'd ask how it's worked in the past -- and how many of those 'plazas' are actually perceived by the public to be 'public.' An inventory would be a good start before we go down the plaza road.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan</td>
<td>Perhaps Bedford is an appropriate pilot program area, but not ten years out in Tier 3. TODAY: The advantage of Bedford is that it is wide and one-way, making a lane-loss less significant. Doctors will love a bump-up in street parking capacity.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>The Action Plan no longer uses tiers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Santa Monica bakes into their plans values like safety and livability and those plans are NOT shelfware. Look at the commitment that city has made to ped and bike infrastructure. We’re 15 years behind SM. We know our officials have seen it: our CDD director lives there and presumably enjoys the ped- and bike-friendly innovations.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. These are values identified in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Safety, safety, safety. In the BH CS plan process, safety was not even identified as a primary value. &quot;We'll let the community decide the values.&quot; WRONG. Safety is a professional responsibility of those who design our streets. It should have been THE primary value expressed in the first sentence of the CS RFP.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Enhancing safety is listed as a value in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>The Bicycle Task Force -- what an innovation. Imagine if we had something like that in BH where those who actually experience the city on two feet and two (or 4) wheels actually have a say in the infrastructure, policies and programs. Here we are 10 years behind WeHo.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Another opportunity to learn from our northeast neighbor: make enforcement a priority. I haven't checked their citation stats but officials have certainly prioritized ped safety.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>BH residents may crow about half-baked traffic calming measures as proposed for the SW area, but there is no need to fear the unknown: they can take a bike ride to WeHo and see REAL traffic diverters in action. And see how quiet those blocks are. Here we are 20 or more years behind WeHo.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Likes</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Created</td>
<td>COBH Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>This is one corridor that cries out for class II lanes, not a &quot;class II or class III&quot; cop out. I want to ride EB on our SM BL lanes and peel off onto a high-viz green lane on Beverly Bl. Work it out with WeHo because this route is a major E/W that connects to the region's largest employer, Cedars and LA beyond.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>Beverly Blvd as a Class II and IV is now a recommendation in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>There should be no opportunity left behind when it comes to connecting with a neighbor city's infrastructure. How long ago has LA striped a lane to Roxbury Park on Roxbury? And we haven't met that lane with one of our own? All of these are important and thankfully NSM BL is done already.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>A better pilot is Roxbury park: lower volumes, less-harried drivers.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. The pilot location would be determined during plan implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>Safety as a value should have been prioritized by officials at the RFP stage. We don't need the community to identify it as a guiding value: it is a transportation official's professional responsibility.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Enhancing safety is listed as a value in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>The 1977 plan (cynically re-adopted in 2010) actually did a much better job of opening the imagination to a citywide bike network than does this draft plan. You can see it at a glance on the old plan map; in this document's spaghetti of &quot;proposed bikeways,&quot; where nearly every street is a candidate, one can't even make out what it could look like.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. The City recommends installing a geographically broad network of bikeways to accommodate the varying needs of bicyclists traveling within and through Beverly Hills. The plan recommends either Class II or III to acknowledge that the exact design will require a discussion of tradeoffs with the community because most streets in Beverly Hills will require repurposing of either parking or vehicle travel lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Shift the northside route from Carmelita to Elevado and there you have an excellent citywide bicycle network and all we are asking for. Call it DONE. Make it tier one.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>Carmelita has been removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>We need a crosstown route on Charleville or Gregory that is class II and NOT class III. A facility that will encourage those who would bike but choose not to bike: inexperienced riders; women primarily; and children with approval of parents. Class III will not get us there.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>Charleville and Gregory are now both listed as Class IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Class III on South Beverly is a straight-up cop-out. This road is a danger zone: excessive speeding; motorist disputes; illegal maneuvers; disregard of cyclists and pedestrians. And it is our 'Main Street.'</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. A class III is not recommended on South Beverly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>SHELFWARE. Never heard a city official ever reference it.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Proof that irony is not dead!</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Designation in name only. In all other respects this corridor is kicked to the curb: faded old-style crosswalks; no enforcement; hazardous to use a crosswalk.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Bicycle racks is not the same as secure bicycle parking to an employee, say, who parks all day. 'Secure' means secure. This BHMC section should specify secure, indoor bicycle parking period. And changing rooms. Above 200,000 square feet showers too.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Exploring a bike parking ordinance is a recommendation in this plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## DRAFT PLAN SUB-COMMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Created</th>
<th>COBH Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>By replacing many of the 4-way stops with roundabouts, this could become a beautiful and effective neighborhood greenway.</td>
<td>04-24-19</td>
<td>No change required. Traffic circles are included as a recommendation in this plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>I would like to see all of the intersections on Olympic without traffic signals be made RIGHT TURN ONLY, particularly during the hours during when on-street parking is prohibited. There are signals every few blocks, so this would not be inconvenient to residents after they become familiar with the restriction. (I think very few residents are stupid enough to try to cross or turn left on busy Olympic.) This will be safer for drivers and passengers, students driving to BHHS, bike riders, bus passengers, users of the 2 big parks on Olympic, and will serve to generally even the traffic flow.</td>
<td>04-24-19</td>
<td>No change required. The City’s traffic engineering team can investigate this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>The name “indicator” and the illuminated light are a bit misleading as to the primary purpose of these devices. If I understand correctly, they are more part of a more accurate sensor system that will ensure traffic signals take into account the presence of a bicycle at an intersection.</td>
<td>04-24-19</td>
<td>No change suggested. Design details would be determined during implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>I agree, although there is also a center median along Burton Way that could also be used as a bike lane.</td>
<td>04-16-19</td>
<td>No change required. Due to issues with accessing a center-running bike path, that is not included as a recommendation in this plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Not sure if this person is referencing the Rexford/Clifton and Crescent/Clifton intersection but both are extremely confusing. If light-up crossing indicators should be utilized anywhere it should be here.</td>
<td>04-15-19</td>
<td>No change required. The City is in the process of evaluating options to improve the Rexford/Clifton intersection for pedestrians, including striping and ADA upgrades. A traffic signal will be installed at the Clifton/Crescent intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>This would reduce the amount of overall space on streets significantly which we can't afford. There's already too much traffic. If we’d consider this why don’t we just have biker on sidewalks.</td>
<td>04-15-19</td>
<td>No change required. During the outreach process, the community and Traffic and Parking Commission did not recommend permitting bike riding on the sidewalk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>Many streets south of Wilshire (especially N/S direction) are too narrow to accommodate the proposed bike-lanes, with two-way traffic, and parking. On those streets (light blue broken line) bikers will be at a high risk of being hit. Bikers won’t feel safe, and drivers will be more uptight. In order to protect the bikers and smooth vehicle movements and retain existing parking, these streets should be turned into One-Way streets. Example: downtown Los Angeles. While it would require “driving around the block” it’s worth it for added safety and a calmer driving experience. Please consider.</td>
<td>04-13-19</td>
<td>No change required. Design details would be determined during implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>To guarantee safety of bicycles at the end of the trail (meaning when BH ends and LA or West Hollywood begins), I recommend bicycle only signals to allow them to cross into the bike lanes without the worry of being hit by vehicles.</td>
<td>04-11-19</td>
<td>No change required. Design details would be determined during implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>The entrance to the Gale Parking Lot should be on Wilshire to mitigate traffic to the residents.</td>
<td>04-11-19</td>
<td>North Gale at Wilshire is closed daily to minimize impacts to residents as a result of station construction. The study for the proposed mobility hub on this property will consider circulation impacts. No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>I would like to suggest that this idea be utilized for other medians such as the one on Burton Way.</td>
<td>04-11-19</td>
<td>No change required. Design details would be determined during implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>I would also like to add that Charlively and Gregory Way are heavily travelled streets that I believe are too narrow for bikes. I believe it would be better to have “Bike Route” arrows pointing bikes towards Wilshire or Olympic which should have Bike Routes.</td>
<td>04-11-19</td>
<td>No change required. Design details would be determined during implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>We need many more bike racks around town. Cyclists need a place to lock their bikes once they arrive at their destination. Since this is Beverly Hills, bike racks ought to be more than just functional, they should be artistic and fun. The car parking lots around the city also could have areas for bike parking. As more people arrive using car ride services like Uber and Lyft, the demand for parking spaces for cars ought to diminish.</td>
<td>05-01-19</td>
<td>No change required. Additional bike parking is recommended in this plan. Bike parking can be requested through the City's request a rack program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Created</td>
<td>COBH Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Programs</td>
<td>The 720 Rapid Bus on Wilshire is the most utilized bus route in the So Cal Metro system—more than 30,000 riders per day. That there is not a bus-only lane during rush hour (7-9 AM, 4-7 PM) through Beverly Hills is a real deterrent to a faster bus commute. A full bus keeps 40-50 cars off the road and these transit users should be rewarded with a ride that is as fast as possible. They are not adding to congestion nor are they contributing to global warming. Speedy and reliable mass transit is the best way to encourage people to get out of their cars.</td>
<td>05-01-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>Class III bike lanes are not really bike lanes. They will accommodate existing riders but will not encourage new cyclists. If you want to encourage new riders, they need to feel safe in protected lanes, or at a minimum, wide bike only lanes. If you are serious about getting people out of their cars, you need to make cycling safe and fun. That means you may need to get rid of a lane for cars -- gasp!</td>
<td>05-01-2019</td>
<td>No change required. All bike lane projects will be evaluated to determine the level of separation from vehicle traffic that can be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>Just wanted to add - a protected late on Beverly Dr. would be a great first/last mile option for purple line riders.</td>
<td>04-26-2019</td>
<td>This has been added as a recommendation in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>To second Gabe’s comment, flipping the paint is the easiest thing you can do to protect cyclists even more without taking away from cars. One side is the curb, and the other side is the passenger side of the parked car. It lowers your risk of getting door’ed as well, as it’s more common for a drivers side door to open than a passengers side door.</td>
<td>04-26-2019</td>
<td>No change required. All bike lane projects will be evaluated to determine the level of separation from vehicle traffic that can be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>Signs that tell cyclists they are detected are really useful; otherwise, the cyclist usually has to dismount, cross over, and push the beg button.</td>
<td>04-26-2019</td>
<td>No change required. This is included as a recommendation in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>When I cycle west (I live near Melrose and Santa Monica) I always get up to where the bike lane starts on SM Bl in West Hollywood, and then take that through Beverly Hills. I also often take the bike lane on Wilshire that begins just after the LA Country Club. Getting from where SM and Wilshire meet in BH to the bike lane on the other side of the LACC is difficult. I often go on the south sidewalk near the Waldorf Astoria and Hilton, and then past the gas station and country club, then eventually cross back onto Wilshire to get on the bike lane. Please put a protected lane from the SM/Wilshire intersection to the BH border on Wilshire, and perhaps work with CD5 and LA to extend the configuration just a few short blocks to the existing bike lane on Wilshire. This is a huge gap between the two cities.</td>
<td>04-26-2019</td>
<td>Wilshire Boulevard is recommended to be prioritized for the transit/vehicle network. Consideration of a bus lane pilot is recommended. This could include a bike/bus lane. Details would be determined during implementation. No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>I used to live on Drexel and would bike frequently with my wife and our kids into Beverly Hills. What we usually did - and it sucked - was go slightly to the south at San Vicente and when the coast was clear, bike to the existing left turn/u turn lane, and use that to get onto Clifton Way. It was harrowing. We need a safe crosswalk through the median, following the desire lines of what people (cyclists and pedestrians) are already doing, albeit pretty unsafely.</td>
<td>04-26-2019</td>
<td>An intersection crossing treatment has been added to the Recommended Bikeways Map at this intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>You have so much room on Olympic Bl, and it’s far less dense than Wilshire Bl. A protected East/West lane (perhaps a two way protected lane on only one side of the street) would go a long way - SM Bl covers a northern East/West bike lane (although I also strongly believe there is room to protect this as well without negatively impacting traffic), and Olympic would be the perfect Southern East/West bike option.</td>
<td>04-26-2019</td>
<td>Olympic Boulevard is recommended to be prioritized for the vehicle/transit network due to traffic volumes, speeds, truck traffic, and geometric design. Parallel streets are recommended to be prioritized for bicycle travel. Bikeways are not recommended on Olympic Boulevard on adjacent cities. No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>I agree, we need a crosswalk where Gregory Way ends - while there is one just north of it, it’s incongruent, and often I find myself fighting North and Southbound traffic to cross at Gregory Way and Robertson when going West to East, versus taking the time to ride on the sidewalk and cross at the existing crosswalk.</td>
<td>04-26-2019</td>
<td>An intersection crossing treatment has been added to the Recommended Bikeways Map at this intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Created</td>
<td>COBH Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>I've biked this many times and I agree with Scott's comment that going from Burton Way to Crescent (where, of course, one could go north to your existing bike lane and/or the SM Bl bike lane) is a harrowing experience. If you’re already planning on protecting Burton Way, please end that protection at Crescent and protect Crescent from Little SM to Big SM, where then the cyclist can transition to either go North or East/West in a safe way.</td>
<td>04-26-2019</td>
<td>No change required. All bike lane projects will be evaluated to determine the level of separation from vehicle traffic that can be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>I strongly believe that protected bike lanes (Class IV) are what's needed - a couple of good east/west corridors, and a couple of good north/south corridors. Beverly Hills has the luxury of a good amount of space on most roads. Additionally, you can set an example around the world for the best multi-modal infrastructure. Sharrow and paint simply don’t cut it.</td>
<td>04-26-2019</td>
<td>More Class IV streets have been added to the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Under the heading “Bicycle Friendly Medical Providers” programs &amp; planning guidelines should be outlined which may - set a higher standard of bike parking at medical offices &amp; hospitals - set reporting requirements for staff &amp; visitor trips arriving at medical providers using active modes and to offer annual rewards to offices which have the highest percentage of non-car trips - assist medical offices in developing appointment reminders which include transit connections and active modes - Encourage hospitals to provide IRS required community benefits in the area of healthy transportation by offering safe cycling education - Provide design assistance or conduct artistic design competition for a custom bike rack design which emphasizes, in worlds and design, the bicycle as a health-bringer “The BH Chief Medical Officer asserts that cycling is good for your health” - Working with local hospitals and health providers to develop healthy transportation plans around their premises (2 of 2)</td>
<td>04-26-2019</td>
<td>No change required. The City does not have jurisdiction over private healthcare providers. Exploring a bike parking ordinance is a recommendation in this plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>We need many more bike racks around town. Cyclists need a place to lock their bikes once they arrive at their destination. Since this is Beverly Hills, bike racks ought to be more than just functional, they should be artistic and fun. The car parking lots around the city also could have areas for bike parking. As more people arrive using car ride services like Uber and Lyft, the demand for parking spaces for cars ought to diminish.</td>
<td>05-01-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Adding bike parking is a recommendation in this plan. Bike racks can also be requested through the City’s request a rack program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Programs</td>
<td>The 720 Rapid Bus on Wilshire is the most utilized bus route in the So Cal Metro system—more than 30,000 riders per day. That is not a bus-only lane during rush hour (7-9 AM, 4-7 PM) through Beverly Hills is a real deterrent to a faster bus commute. A full bus keeps 40-50 cars off the road and these transit users should be rewarded with a ride that is as fast as possible. They are not adding to congestion nor are they contributing to global warming. Speedy and reliable mass transit is the best way to encourage people to get out of their cars.</td>
<td>05-01-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>Class III bike lanes are not really bike lanes. They will accommodate existing riders but will not encourage new cyclists. If you want to encourage new riders, they need to feel safe in protected lanes, or at a minimum, wide bike only lanes. If you are serious about getting people out of their cars, you need to make cycling safe and fun. That means you may need to get rid of a lane for cars -- gasp!</td>
<td>05-01-2019</td>
<td>No change required. All bike lane projects will be evaluated to determine the level of separation from vehicle traffic that can be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>West Hollywood does a good job with this, especially along Santa Monica Boulevard. With their new crossings, it feels much safer as a pedestrian to cross Santa Monica Boulevard. I hope that Beverly Hills will do more of this.</td>
<td>05-08-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>Our public schools are one of our community’s greatest assets. We ought to encourage our students to ride bikes to school as a healthy, pro-environment, and fun option. Charleville could be an excellent street to have protected bike lanes. Located between Olympic and Wilshire, it would connect the high school, BV, and Horace Mann. This would decrease the car trips going in and out of our schools. Our city is safe, our weather is great, and the south part of Beverly Hills is flat—it ought to a cycling paradise. Safe bike routes could be one more reason to go to our neighborhood schools!</td>
<td>05-08-2019</td>
<td>No change required. All bike lane projects will be evaluated to determine the level of separation from vehicle traffic that can be provided. A bikeway on Charleville is included as a recommendation in this plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Created</td>
<td>COBH Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Programs</td>
<td>A bus-only lane during peak traffic times (7-9 AM, 4-7 PM) will encourage some people to take the bus instead of driving. Fifty people in a bus takes up a lot less space than fifty people sitting alone in a car.</td>
<td>05-09-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Programs</td>
<td>Roads are not free—they take valuable urban space. And with our horrible congestion we all &quot;pay&quot; the price of wasted time in traffic. Congestion pricing would encourage people to use other modes of transit (walking, cycling, public transit) encourage people to try other routes, and/or encourage people to travel at other times when congestion is not such a problem.</td>
<td>05-09-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>Can we please get diagonal crossing for Beverly/Dayton, Beverly/Brighton and Beverly/S Santa Monica?</td>
<td>05-14-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Pedestrian scrambles are recommended as part of this plan. Specific intersections can be evaluated during implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>@Michael - Doheny is wide enough to have bike lanes installed. However, I do not see bike lanes being installed on Charleville or Gregory as those 2 streets are too narrow as is when cars are parked on both sides of the street.</td>
<td>05-15-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan</td>
<td>I am disappointed that there are not more specific deliverables. For instance in these Tier 1 projects, there is a big difference between Class II and Class III Bike ways. What is the vision? I would rather see a very specific and visionary plan on fewer routes than something sovagae.</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>More details have been added to the Action Plan for short-term priority projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>All new signals should include a leading interval for walkers. Additionally, none of the signals should require a &quot;push to walk&quot; button...that only discourages walking. Numerous times I arrive a few seconds too late to activate the signal and am required to wait through an additional lengthy cycle to cross. Let's give ALL road users equal opportunity, not prioritize cars alone.</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. The City's traffic engineering team can investigate this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>The DAY we agreed to striping I emailed Romel (Executive Director) and Tish (board memeber) about proposing an event. They've booked out almost two years. We need to chance our tune on bikes and become part of one of the best days LA has each time this event is held.</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>While I love my &quot;Civil City&quot; sticker, it hasn’t been as handy as I would have hoped in fending off potential accidents with motorists. This starts at the top. Despite the bright green lanes staring us in the face, it was only after Mr. Elliot and I prodded staff about the lanes' exclusion from the press release, that they were added as a feature of North Santa Monica's reconstruction. We were then promised a bike event that got punted to the spring. When I pressed staff in the March TPC meeting, nothing came back. Even the Bike to Work event wasn’t marketed, much less to the existing local bike community and advocates. We're anit-bike, and it shows in every single touchpoint.</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>I believe it was in Public Session #2 where Mr. Lower showed the increased rise of accidents compared to neighboring cities. Yet I could not find that graph in any public materials. Wouldn't be a bad idea to cite that in this document.</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>Additionally, it's one of the most dangerous corridors to drive given the parallel parking. I've had multiple friends hit there over the years.</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Infrastructure</td>
<td>I have consistently used every modality available to me for the past 15 years. While I'm glad to see this document address improvements across all modalities, nothing prevents me from walking, driving or taking a bus across our city today. However, even as a very competent cyclist, I can't comfortably bike through it. It's one of the most dangerous parts of LA I ever bike through. Other than Santa Monica Blvd--something we had to spend over three years fighting for the obvious--the lanes we do have are bridges to nowhere. It should not be lost in reviewing this process and this document that we have consistently punted for four decades the need to develop a holistic bike network. Punting any further is total failure and an embarrassment to our community.</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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