2012 RTP/SCS PUBLIC OUTREACH WORKSHOPS

Workshop Agenda

Images courtesy of Metro © 2011 LACMTA

August 16, 2011, 3:00PM-6:00PM
SCAG Main Office, 12th Fl Boardroom
818 West 7th Street, Los Angeles, CA

3:00 PM	**Welcome and Introductions** *Ed P. Reyes, Councilmember, City of Los Angeles*
3:10 PM	**VIDEO: The 2012 Regional Transportation Plan**
3:20 PM	**Introduction to the Day's Agenda** *SCAG Staff*
3:30 PM	**DRAFT Scenarios for Southern California's Future** *SCAG Staff*
4:05 PM	**Small Group Breakout Discussion**
4:45 PM	**Keypad Polling of Scenario Strategies**
5:15 PM	**Next Steps** *SCAG Staff*

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS
818 West 7th Street, 12th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90017 | Tel: (213) 236-1800 | Fax: (213) 236-1961 | www.scag.ca.gov

printed on recycled paper 2347.07.2011

2012 RTP/SCS
PUBLIC OUTREACH WORKSHOP

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Timeline

2012 RTP Development Timeline
Develop Financial Plan
Perform Transportation Needs Assessment
Develop Transportation Alternatives
Evaluate Transportation Alternatives
Develop Draft RTP
Develop Draft SCS
Develop Draft PEIR
Prepare Final RTP/SCS/PEIR
OCT '10
NOV '10
DEC '10
JAN '11
FEB '11
MAR '11
APR '11
MAY '11
JUN '11
JUL '11
AUG '11
SEP '11
OCT '11
NOV '11
DEC '11
JAN '12
APR '12
Hold Data Gathering Planning Sessions
May '11-Jun '11
PEIR Scoping Process
Jul '11-Aug '11
Hold Transportation Strategy Workshops
Jul '11-Aug '11
Hold Public Outreach Workshops
Oct '11-Nov '11
Hold SCS Workshops with Elected Officials
Release Draft RTP/SCS/PEIR
Dec '11-Jan '12
Draft RTP/SCS/PEIR Comment Period
Hold Public Hearings
Adopt Final RTP/SCS/PEIR

Where we've been

RTP Objectives: what should the plan work to accomplish?

1. What Mobility / Accessibility objectives should we strive for?
2. Environmental, Health and Community objectives?
3. Which Modes of Travel?
4. Fiscal and Economic objectives?
5. Safety outcomes?
6. Environmental Justice outcomes?
7. Other objectives?

Group Discussion

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS



Scenarios for Southern California

Scenarios explore transportation and land development questions…

1. Should we grow up or out?
2. What type of homes should we build?
3. Invest more in roads or public transportation?
4. Bedroom communities, job centers, a balance?



…to understand how different futures might shape our lives, economy, and environment



Today's Activities

1. Overview of the 2012 RTP Process
2. Discuss objectives that you feel the RTP should meet
3. Identify regional issues that matter most to you
4. Provide input on scenarios for addressing growth and transportation

Scenarios Snapshot



Greenfield vs. Infill / Reuse

New Development 2008-2035

Greenfield vs. Infill / Reuse

New Development 2008-2035

1 2 3 4

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Development Proportions

New Growth 2008-2035

Standard Suburban	Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban
Mixed-Use Walkable	Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented
Urban Infill	Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill

Standard

Standard

Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban

Mixed Use Walkable

Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented

Urban

Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Source: www.skyscrapercity.com, Los Angeles County, CA.

Standard

Standard

Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban

Mixed Use Walkable

Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented

Urban

Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Standard

Standard	Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban
Mixed Use Walkable	Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented
Urban	Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill



Mixed-Use Walkable

Standard

Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban

Mixed Use Walkable

Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented

Urban

Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVE

Mixed-Use Walkable

Standard

Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban

Mixed Use Walkable

Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented

Urban

Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill

Lorenzo – Santa Monica

Metrolink Station – Claremont

Downtown Torrance – Torrance

Town Center – Valencia

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Mixed-Use Walkable

Urban

Standard

Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban

Mixed Use Walkable

Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented

Urban

Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill

5550 Wilshire – Los Angeles

Atlantic Square-Monterey Park

Paseo Colorado – Pasadena

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Urban

Standard

Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban

Mixed Use Walkable

Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented

Urban

Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Urban

Standard

Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban

Mixed Use Walkable

Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented

Urban

Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Development Proportions

New Growth 2008-2035



SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Housing Product Mix

New Housing Units 2008-2035

Where is the long-term housing market headed?

Housing Demand Projections for Southern California: 2010 - 2035

Our Aging Population

SCAG Region, 2010 to 2035



Seniors

Over ½ the demand for new homes

In 2040 73% of all households will be without children

Note: Percentages do not add to 100% due to rounding

Source: SCAG, Local Input/General Plan Growth Forecast, March 2010

SCAG Housing Demand 2035



Source: AC Nelson. The Shape of Metropolitan California in the 21st Century: Outlook to 2020 and 2035

SCAG Planning Bottom Line 2035



Source: AC Nelson. The Shape of Metropolitan California in the 21st Century: Outlook to 2020 and 2035

Housing Product Mix

New Housing Units 2008-2035



Anticipated Demand

1 | 2 | 3 | 4

Housing Product Mix

All Housing Units in 2035 (Existing + New)



Existing (2008)

1

2

3

4

Transportation Investments



Types of Transportation Investments

1. **Bus Rapid Transit**
2. **Light and Heavy Rail**
3. **High Speed Rail**
4. **<u>Highway Expansion:</u>**
   1. Lanes
   2. Carpool / Hot Lanes
   3. Interchange Improvements
5. **Local Arterial Improvements**
6. **Transportation System Preservation**
7. **Truck Ways**
8. **Freight Rail Improvements**
9. **<u>Operation and Maintenance:</u>**
   - Highway and Arterials
   - Transit
10. **Bike and Pedestrian Facilities**
11. **Transportation Demand Management Investments**
12. **Transportation System Management Investments**

Types of Transportation Investments

Build 2035 Fixed-Guideway Transit Network (2008 RTP)

20%

Regional transit ridership growth since 2000

Images courtesy of Metro © 2012 LACMTA

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Types of Transportation Investments

Existing Rapid and Express Bus Network (2008)

Buses still carry the majority of transit trips

86%

and boardings continue to grow

We need to continue investing in these strategies

Image courtesy of Metro © 2012 LACMTA

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Types of Transportation Investments

Existing Bikeways

43%

of our population has access to a bikeway

(access defined as ½ mile from a bikeway)

We need to expand our bike network to improve accessibility



SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Types of Transportation Investments

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)

1%
reduction in vehicle miles traveled

54 million
fewer gallons of gasoline each year

Scenarios Snapshot



1

2

3

4

How The Scenarios Compare

Land Consumed

Square Miles

Land Consumed

Square Miles

Local Infrastructure Costs

Capital & Operations & Maintenance Costs for New Growth, 2008-2035

Includes capital costs and general fund O&M expenditures for local roads, wastewater and sanitary sewer, water supply, and parks & recreation

Local Infrastructure Costs

Capital & Operations & Maintenance Costs for New Growth, 2008-2035



Includes capital costs and general fund O&M expenditures for local roads, wastewater and sanitary sewer, water supply, and parks & recreation

Vehicle Miles Traveled

Annual per household, 2035

Vehicle Miles Traveled

Annual per household, 2035



Fuel Consumption

Billions of Gallons, 2035

Fuel Consumption

Billions of Gallons, Annual, 2035



Fuel and Auto Operating Costs

Per Household Auto-Related Costs, Annual, 2035 (2009 Dollars)

Fuel and Auto Operating Costs

Per Household Auto-Related Costs, Annual, 2035 (2009 Dollars)



Household Costs

Annual Costs for Transportation, Building Energy, and Water, 2035

Household Costs

Annual Costs for Transportation, Building Energy, and Water, 2035



Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Annual Emissions from Buildings and Auto Transportation, 2035

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Annual Emissions from Buildings and Auto Transportation, 2035



Building Energy Use

Trillion BTU, 2035

Building Energy Use

Trillion BTU, Annual, 2035



Building Energy Use

Trillion BTU, Annual, 2035

Equivalent to powering XX homes in Southern California for a year



Water Consumption

Acre Feet (Annual in 2035)

Water Consumption

Acre Feet (Annual in 2035)



Respiratory Health Impacts

Cost reduction from status quo due to health incidents, Annual in 2035

Respiratory Health Impacts

Cost reduction from status quo due to health incidents, Annual in 2035

Gateway Cities Sustainable Communities Strategy

Gateway Cities Council of Governments

Gateway Cities Subregional SCS

Subregional COG's have the option to prepare their own SCS

GCCOG SB 375 evaluation and White Paper concluded in 2009

Gateway Cities chose SCS delegation in January 2010:

- Dense land use and transit patterns in Gateway Cities
- Relatively low vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita
- Ability to determine our own strategies in line with cities' plans
- Many pieces of SCS already exist in COG studies, reports, and programs over the last decade

Gateway Cities SCS funded through assessment of cities

Gateway Cities SCS Development Timeline and Process



How Results Were Quantified

Five Components of SCS

- Local Transportation Strategies
- Travel Demand Management Strategies
- Land Use/Sustainability Tool – city General Plans
- Regional Projects, including Measure R
- Interactions between land use and transit regional projects

GHG Reductions from Transportation Measures
Submitted Transportation Project Locations

Summary of Results
Daily GHG Reduction Per Capita in Gateway Cities

Reduction relative to 2005 per capita emissions

	2020	2035
SCAG Regional Target	8%	13%
Gateway Cities Estimate	8.5%	15%

Results from Evaluating GHG Reductions
Regional Projects within Gateway Cities Subregion

1. I-710 Arterial Hwy Improvements
2. I-710 TSM/TDM
3. I-5 (I-605 to county line)
4. SR-91/I-605/I-405 Arterial Highway Improvements
5. BNSF Grade Separation
6. I-110 Harbor Transitway HOV conversion to HOT lanes
7. I-710 Freight Corridor
8. Signal synchronization of major arterials (re: I-710)
9. ITS Integration Plan
10. California High Speed Rail
11. Goldline Eastside Extension
12. OLDA Project
13. Regional Connector
14. Green Line Extension to LAX
15. I-5 (between I-605 to I-710)
16. I-5 Arterial Highway Improvements
17. I-605 Hot Spots

For Further Information

Gateway Cities COG Web Site for SB 375 and the SCS:

www.gatewaycog.org/sb375.html

COG Staff Contact:

Nancy Pfeffer, Director of Regional Planning

nancy@networkpa.net

562-901-2037

Objectives for the Regional Transportation Plan

Group Discussion

RTP Objectives: what should the plan work to accomplish?

1. What Mobility / Accessibility objectives should we strive for?
2. Environmental, Health and Community objectives?
3. Which Modes of Travel?
4. Fiscal and Economic objectives?
5. Safety outcomes?
6. Environmental Justice outcomes?
7. Other objectives?

Group Discussion

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Group Worksheet

2012 RTP Potential Objectives for the 2012 RTP

Mobility

1. Reduce the need to travel long distances
2. Reduce commute times
3. Keep drivers at or near the posted speed limit, reduce congestion
4. Make commutes more predictable and reliable
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____

Environmental, Health and Community Impacts

8. Reduce demand for fossil-fuels
9. Reduce air pollutant emissions for better public health
10. Reduce demand for development at the edge of the region
11. Encourage revitalization of existing communities and infrastructure
12. _____
13. _____
14. _____
15. _____

Modes of Travel

16. Create more travel choices in more places: driving, riding, walking, biking
17. Enable more people to ride public transportation
18. Enable more people to walk and bike for daily needs
19. Serve more parts of the region with high capacity roadways
20. _____
21. _____
22. _____

Fiscal and Economic Considerations

23. Help our economy thrive and be resilient (e.g., despite energy price spikes)
24. Keep governmental transportation expenditures low
25. Minimize household transportation expenditures (how much it costs me to get around)
26. Prioritize the most cost effective transportation investments
27. Improve the movement of freight through the region
28. _____
29. _____
30. _____

Safety

31. Improve safety for people who walk, take transit, or bike
32. Improve safety for drivers
33. _____
34. _____

Environmental Justice

35. Help all residents, not only drivers, get around
36. Avoid disproportionate impacts on lower income communities
37. _____
38. _____

Other

39. _____
40. _____
41. _____
42. _____
43. _____

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Group Discussion Steps

1. Add to an initial list of objectives for the RTP
2. Individually, place a large dot next to your top priority objective

3. Discuss as a group
4. Individually, place 6 small dots based on your priority objectives



5. Identify your group's overall priorities to be shared

Ground Rules

1. **Be respectful of each other**'s right to be heard
2. **Focus on related topics** to the regional transportation plan
3. Your **facilitator is neutral**
4. Feel free to also **record your personal ideas** on comment cards

Keypad Polling

Have you ever lied to your mother?

14%	1.	Never…Honest!
5%	2.	Only once and I paid for it dearly.
6%	3.	Only a couple of times.
10%	4.	Yes, but I was young and candy was involved.
30%	5.	I prefer to call it a “stretching of the truth”
16%	6.	Only when it was in her best interest.
2%	7.	Yes, but my brother/sister made me do it!
17%	8.	Too many times to count!

A few preliminary questions…

II. Which part of the region do you live in?

0%	1. Coachella Valley
7%	2. Orange County
0%	3. Ventura County
3%	4. Western Riverside
3%	5. South Bay Cities
1%	6. San Bernardino County
11%	7. San Gabriel Valley
7%	8. Westside Cities
4%	9. Gateway Cities
63%	10. Los Angeles City

III. Which part of the region do you work/go to school?

0%	1.	Coachella Valley
3%	2.	Orange County
0%	3.	Ventura County
1%	4.	Western Riverside
0%	5.	South Bay Cities
0%	6.	San Bernardino County
14%	7.	San Gabriel Valley
1%	8.	Westside Cities
7%	9.	Gateway Cities
73%	10.	Los Angeles City

IV. What is the first most important priority in Southern California?

30%	1.	Economy
14%	2.	Environment
10%	3.	Housing
5%	4.	Infrastructure
8%	5.	Public Health
15%	6.	Social Equity
18%	7.	Transportation

V. What is the second most important priority in Southern California?



VI. Which statement best describes your daily commute?

42%	1. I primarily drive alone.
14%	2. I primarily walk or bike to common destinations.
10%	3. I primarily carpool.
30%	4. I primarily use public transportation.
4%	5. I do not commute.

VII. Which statement describes your access to transportation options?

26% 1. I drive; little access to transit

35% 2. I have some access to transit but choose to drive

39% 3. I have adequate access to transit and do not drive

VIII. What is the biggest barrier to using public transportation?

11%	1.	Does not stop near my home.
17%	2.	Does not go where I need.
42%	3.	Does not come frequently enough or run late enough.
3%	4.	Too crowded, I do not enjoy riding.
4%	5.	Too expensive for my budget.
24%	6.	None of the above..

Transportation Investments

Investment in Roads and Transit

FY2007 to 2036

Public Transportation



Highways

Source: 2008 RTP

IX. The RTP should invest most of its money into roads and highways.



X. The RTP should invest in a mix of transportation options, including road, highway, rail transit, express bus and bicycle/pedestrian.

42%	1. Strongly Agree
25%	2. Agree
10%	3. Neither Agree nor Disagree
13%	4. Disagree
10%	5. Strongly Disagree

XI. The RTP should invest most of its money into rail transit, express bus and bicycle/pedestrian.

45%	1. Strongly Agree
18%	2. Agree
11%	3. Neither Agree nor Disagree
15%	4. Disagree
10%	5. Strongly Disagree

Driving Distances in Southern California



SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Traffic improvements can be difficult to sustain…



SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Two Approaches to Improve Mobility

(the time it takes to get from A to B)

- Create faster ways to get from A to B…



- Bring A closer to B…



SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Spectrum of Strategies for Mobility

Adding Supply

- New cross town routes
- New lanes
- Carpool lanes
- Telecommuting
- Development near transit
- Walkable communities
- New homes in job centers

Reducing Demand

XII. The RTP should focus relatively more on expanding ways to travel more quickly, or reduce distances traveled?

13%	1.	Expand Mobility (expand roads and transit)
48%	2.	Balance between 1 and 3
39%	3.	Focus most on reducing distances traveled

Bicycling in Southern California

Source: Southern California Association of Governments, Year 2000 Post-Census Regional Travel Survey: Final Report of Survey Results, page 21. Published Fall 2003. Numbers may not add due to rounding.

Balancing Jobs With Housing?

Balancing Jobs and Housing?



Opportunities to Work Near Where We Live



Residents that work in home county

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Growth's Impacts Vary By Location



County by County Driving Distances

XIII. Encourage more employment growth in or near residential communities.



XIV. Encourage more residential growth in or near employment centers.

Housing Choices?

The Impacts of New Housing

New Homes by Housing Type

2010 to 2035







XV. To accommodate the region's future population, new housing development and housing types in the coming decades should be primarily…

1%	1.	Large Lot Detached
13%	2.	Small Lot Detached
30%	3.	Townhouse
56%	4.	Multi-Family Development

Transit Oriented Development?

Today, 47% of households live where they can choose to bike to high capacity transit

About 8% live a short walk from transit

Coordinating Growth with Transit

- Following same household, after moving next to transit…
  - 10 fewer miles driven
  - 25% lower commute expenses



XVI. Future development of employment centers and commercial areas should mostly occur in:

3%	1.	Standard Suburban Areas
9%	2.	Part Standard, Part Mixed Use Walkable
10%	3.	Mixed Use Walkable
63%	4.	Part Mixed Use Walkable, Part Urban
15%	5.	Urban Areas

XVII. Future development of residential areas should mostly occur in:

3%	1.	Standard Suburban Areas
18%	2.	Part Standard, Part Mixed Use Walkable
16%	3.	Mixed Use Walkable
54%	4.	Part Mixed Use Walkable, Part Urban
9%	5.	Urban Areas

Scenario Next Steps

- Concepts will be refined and further tested
- The most effective and supported ideas will become a draft combined scenario
- A preferred scenario, or Sustainable Communities Strategy, will be integrated with the 2012 RTP



Stay Involved in the 2012 Plan

Present: July - August 2011	Public Outreach Workshops
Fall 2011	Workshops with Local Elected Officials
December 2011	Release of Draft Plan
December 2011 - January 2012	Public Hearings
April 2012	Adoption

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

THANK YOU!

2012 RTP/SCS
PUBLIC OUTREACH WORKSHOP

PRIORITIES FOR THE 2012 RTP/SCS

Group discussion results within Los Angeles County

		Los Angeles County													
		West Covina		*Los Angeles*		*Santa Clarita*		*Carson*		*Santa Monica*			**Total All Votes**	Primary	Secondary
	Potential Objectives for the 2012 RTP	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary				
Mobility	Reduce the need to travel long distances		5	3	12	1		2	9		8	*Note: Shorter distance; offer more choices in mode*	**40**	6	34
	Reduce commute times		3	1	10	2		3	4		2	*Note: Bigger priority that reducing the need to travel long distances and other/all types of trips*	**25**	6	19
	Keep drives at or near the posted speed limit, reduce congestion					3		1	2			*Note: Remove first part "Keep drives at or near the posted speed limit"; Elaborate; What does this mean?; How to reduce congestion when increasing density?; Separate "reduce congestion" from first part*	6	4	2
	Make commutes more predictable and reliable		2	3	8				2		2		**17**	3	14
Additional Mobility Objectives	*Encourage connectivity in the existing and future freeway, transit and bikeway systems*	2	8										**10**	2	8
	Better communicate transportation obstacles and options (incident management and travel info)												0	0	0
	Consider ADA requirements		1										1	0	1
	More contiguous travel abilities (bottlenecks, intermittent HOV lanes), including bike facilities		2										2	0	2
	Preservation of current infrastructure (existing roads, bridges, etc.)		4										4	0	4
	Connectivity of transportation corridors (first mile/last mile); Improve support services and infrastructure of transportation networks	2	7										9	2	7
	Facilitate public transportation at reduced costs (DASH)			3	5								8	3	5
	Reduce rapid transit/Increase local transit				7								7	0	7
	Reduce diesel truck traffic (congestion and health impacts)				5								5	0	5
	Last mile transportation options												0	0	0
	Respect and work with communities where projects are going to be built				4								4	0	4
	Include first mile/last mile connection				4								4	0	4
	Reduce time for connection between transit providers												0	0	0
	Work with major employers and schools (including public transit) to reduce VMT (i.e. Stanford University); 4-day work week				3								3	0	3
	Enhance through "bump" effect- civility				1								1	0	1
	Improve safety for bikes and peds (25% bike deaths in LA County)				2								2	0	2

PRIORITIES FOR THE 2012 RTP/SCS

Group discussion results within Los Angeles County

	Los Angeles County												
	West Covina		*Los Angeles*		*Santa Clarita*		*Carson*		*Santa Monica*				
Potential Objectives for the 2012 RTP	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary		**Total All Votes**	Primary	Secondary
Providing for interregional and intercounty travel (all modes)				2								2	0	2
Road/freeway maintenance and preservation			1	2								3	1	2
Improve transit connectivity			1	1								2	1	1
Provide access to physically-challenged users												0	0	0
Make transit affordable				2								2	0	2
Increase bus service- routes and frequency				2								2	0	2
Prioritize core existing transit riders												0	0	0
Increase transit for non-current riders												0	0	0
Promote TDM vs. capacity increases				3								3	0	3
More bus only lanes												0	0	0
Focus on non-motorized for short distances			1	2								3	1	2
Total trips, not just commutes				2								2	0	2
Synchronization of traffic signals/highway ramps; Travel demand management												0	0	0
Design communities for active living				3								3	0	3
Provide more incentives for HOV travel												0	0	0
Provide alternative transportation routes												0	0	0
Provide connectivity to/from outlying areas to the LA Basin					1	3						4	1	3
Ensure higher density developments are being served by efficient transportation systems (served by rail stations)						4						4	0	4
Better coordination and communication between all public transport systems						7						7	0	7
Reduce single trips- Encourage multiservice destinations								4				4	0	4
Reduce impacts from goods movement												0	0	0
Discourage peak hour trips												0	0	0
Improve mobility for all trips							1	2				3	1	2
Increase reliability for freight and services												0	0	0
Improve accessibility to employment and education centers								2				2	0	2
Improve transit headways								2				2	0	2
Telecommuting (and also Intelligent Transportation System)								3				3	0	3
Improve efficiencies of existing systems (e.g. transit systems transfers)										1		1	0	1
Address the "first mile/last mile" issue										1		1	0	1
Promote greater jobs/housing balance and fit									1	6		7	1	6
Promote local public transit/reduce cost of transportation										3		3	0	3
Enhance connectivity between transportation modes										1		1	0	1

PRIORITIES FOR THE 2012 RTP/SCS

Group discussion results within Los Angeles County

		Los Angeles County													
		West Covina		*Los Angeles*		*Santa Clarita*		*Carson*		*Santa Monica*					
	Potential Objectives for the 2012 RTP	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary		**Total All Votes**	Primary	Secondary
	Explore affordable parking options (larger parking structures/park and ride/short term parking for walkability/respect all users)									1	2		3	1	2
	Increase infrastructure that allows people to use alternative transportation (bike lanes, additional bike infrastructure)										3		3	0	3
	Increase multi-modal infrastructure (bus, rail, bike)										1		1	0	1
	Reduce congestion through alternatives										1		1	0	1
	Keep drives at or near speed limit												0	0	0
	Mobility measures for multiple modes- change mindset (i.e. how we measure mobility)										4		4	0	4
													0	0	0
Environmental, Health and Community Impacts						1							1	1	0
	Reduce demand for fossil-fuels	1	2		15		4	6	11		2	*Note: Add "alternative work schedule"; cleaner transportation vehicles*	**41**	7	34
	Reduce air pollutant emissions for better public health	2	13	6	18		3	5	15		3	*Note: Include "localized emissions"; encourage healthy lifestyle through land use and transportation choices; Convert existing city/municipal fleets to alternative fuels*	**65**	13	52
	Reduce demand for development at the edge of the region		3	1	9				4		3		**20**	1	19
	Encourage revitalization of existing communities and infrastructure	2	13	2	21		2	2	13	4	5	*Note: Preserve local redevelopment funding streams*	**64**	10	54
Additional Environmental, Health and Community Impacts Objectives	*Identify and preserve valuable characteristics in each community*	3	4										7	3	4
	Raise fuel tax to pay for transit		1										1	0	1
	Resource conservation through infill development		3										3	0	3
	Water conservation through infill development												0	0	0
	Public parks and open space as a community asset (public health, active living, etc.)		4										4	0	4
	Local access to locally-sourced food and products (goods movement)												0	0	0
	Preserve local agricultural land												0	0	0

PRIORITIES FOR THE 2012 RTP/SCS

Group discussion results within Los Angeles County

	Los Angeles County												
	West Covina		*Los Angeles*		*Santa Clarita*		*Carson*		*Santa Monica*				
Potential Objectives for the 2012 RTP	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary		**Total All Votes**	Primary	Secondary
Preserve and increase affordable housing (gentrification issues) to avoid displacement around transit			1	6								7	1	6
Reduce pollution from goods movement (freight; electrification, alternate routes/alternate times)												0	0	0
Provide restrooms and trash cans at transit stops												0	0	0
Protect existing low income commuities and small businesses from being displaced				6								6	0	6
Maintain and increase affordable housing and disclose covenants				3								3	0	3
Restoration and preservation of natural habitats												0	0	0
Encourage open space and recreation spaces				2								2	0	2
Decrease obesity with access to healthy foods- increased activity				4								4	0	4
Support greening of transit areas- connections												0	0	0
Increase affordable housing around transit			1	2								3	1	2
Greenfield preservation			1	1								2	1	1
Wildlife protection				1								1	0	1
Reduce noise pollution				1								1	0	1
Avoid water scarcity												0	0	0
Improve health through active transportation				1								1	0	1
Improve local schools to fix jobs-housing balance												0	0	0
Zoning for mixed-use												0	0	0
Address gentrification/stop displacement of low income, people of color			1	1								2	1	1
Factor in affordable housing with transit				1								1	0	1
Alameda Corridor East should be below grade- original proposal				1								1	0	1
Promote active transportation- health and emissions			2	5								7	2	5
Protect or add parks/open space and provide access												0	0	0
Increase alternative tech (battery)				1								1	0	1
Incentivize programs for cleaner tech												0	0	0
Expand to include other aspects of health including walkability				2								2	0	2
Plan location of schools in relation to communities			1									1	1	0
Plan location of services with relation to communities			1	1								2	1	1
Consider public health spending in terms of active transportation funding				1								1	0	1
Encourage quality of place; have open space to balance density (parks, greenspace, Complete Streets concept)					1	4						5	1	4
Make healthy communities design a priority; focus on connectivity between uses within communities, including social infrastructure						4						4	0	4

PRIORITIES FOR THE 2012 RTP/SCS

Group discussion results within Los Angeles County

	Los Angeles County												
	West Covina		*Los Angeles*		*Santa Clarita*		*Carson*		*Santa Monica*				
	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary		**Total All Votes**	Primary	Secondary
Potential Objectives for the 2012 RTP														
Be aware that TODs that are in close proximity to high traffic areas may cause public health issues						3						3	0	3
Increase opportunities to get open and public space via public transit						3						3	0	3
Dual use of public transportation land (i.e. flood management); seasonal and recreation						2						2	0	2
Reduce noise and vibration impacts of public transportation/construction/operation								1				1	0	1
Improve aesthetics of of regular transportation infrastructure								1				1	0	1
Support active transportation/lifestyles												0	0	0
Affordable housing							1	1				2	1	1
Alternative fuel infrastructure								3				3	0	3
Encourage telecommuting												0	0	0
New lanes for alternatively fueled vehicles												0	0	0
Promote walkable communities- expand local destinations							2	1				3	2	1
Safe Routes to School- continue funding/emphasis												0	0	0
Motivate cities to provide open space for adults and children for active recreation								2				2	0	2
Avoid putting parks in contaminated areas								4				4	0	4
Promote physical activity								4				4	0	4
Enforce adequate parking or restrict auto ownership in older areas								2				2	0	2
Implement vehicle use rationing												0	0	0
Improve affordable housing for very, very low-income							5					5	5	0
Provide more public spaces										4		4	0	4
Encourage healthy transportation choices									1	1		2	1	1
Refurbish, not replace low-income housing										1		1	0	1
Increase livability and efficiency of existing urban forms									1	1		2	1	1
Encourage open space and community gardens												0	0	0
Encourage quality of life (community events)/Environmental justice issue/providing a level-playing field for all										1		1	0	1
Review current transportation corridors (spec. 405 freeway) that are lacking services and infrastructure									1			1	1	0
Review current incentives and bonuses of current transportation system (services are often cut/reduced with no accountability)												0	0	0
Preserve single-family housing communities										2		2	0	2
												0	0	0
Modes of Travel												0	0	0

PRIORITIES FOR THE 2012 RTP/SCS

Group discussion results within Los Angeles County

		Los Angeles County													
		West Covina		*Los Angeles*		*Santa Clarita*		*Carson*		*Santa Monica*					
	Potential Objectives for the 2012 RTP	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary		**Total All Votes**	Primary	Secondary
	Create more travel choices in more places: driving, riding, walking, biking	6	14	10	18	1	7	3	8	4	11	*Note: More modes for different trip lengths*	**82**	24	58
	Enable more people to ride public transportation	1	8	1	9	2	8		8		7	*Note: Ensuring access for all income levels; better and more frequent connections; Add "park and ride"; target population far away*	**44**	4	40
	Enable more people to walk and bike for daily needs		2	5	18	1	6	1	7	8	13	*Note: Add "encourage"*	**61**	15	46
	Serve more parts of the region with high capacity roadways	1	2		1				2			*Note: Add "fixed route"; "High capacity roadways" defined as toll lanes, carpool; In Santa Monica, this objective did not sit well with a few participants*	6	1	5
Additional Modes of Travel Objectives	*Promote toll roads*												0	0	0
	Better utilize existing capacity through contra-flow lane management												0	0	0
	Consider congestion charges in Downtown LA, use funds for transit		1										1	0	1
	Increase funding for transit												0	0	0
	More flexible roadways (peak time rush hour traffic)		2										2	0	2
	Promote zero-emission vehicles with infrastructure and education		2										2	0	2
	NEV vehicle support for senior population												0	0	0
	Incentivize transit				3								3	0	3
	Make other modes (transit) more attractive to take- clean, safe, pleasant travel												0	0	0
	More dependable bus lines to aid in land use planning and development (more proactive, less reactive bus planning not based on existing ridership but on projected demand)			1	1								2	1	1
	Prioritize transit investments near job centers				2								2	0	2
	Connectivity between existing modes												0	0	0
	Ensure affordability to all income levels				2								2	0	2
	Improve and enhance existing transit options(road conditions and services; longer/later hours												0	0	0
	Shift people from cars to other modes thru incentives				1								1	0	1
	Tax incentives rather than disincentives for transit (credit for doing good)			1									1	1	0
	Shuttles/trolleys for local communities												0	0	0
	Increase access (connect to first/last mile)				3								3	0	3

PRIORITIES FOR THE 2012 RTP/SCS

Group discussion results within Los Angeles County

	Los Angeles County												
	West Covina		*Los Angeles*		*Santa Clarita*		*Carson*		*Santa Monica*				
Potential Objectives for the 2012 RTP	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary		**Total All Votes**	Primary	Secondary
Add more transportation technologies				2								2	0	2
Serve more parts of the region with high capacity transit				2								2	0	2
Improve technology for telecommuting				1								1	0	1
Create integrated system across all modes			1	6								7	1	6
Create a regional bikeway backbone			1									1	1	0
Promote development of electric vehicle technology				2								2	0	2
Make a "red car" line that is separated from surface traffic- either above grade or priority				1								1	0	1
Integration of modes			1	2								3	1	2
More bike parking												0	0	0
Community design (i.e. bus shelters, etc.)				3								3	0	3
Enable more people to ride the bus			2	3								5	2	3
Ensuring affordability of transit				3								3	0	3
Broaden the modes of travel to meet the different needs of employment (i.e. vanpools for agricultural workers)				3								3	0	3
More bus routes				2								2	0	2
More frequency				2								2	0	2
Establish jitneys or flex services			1	2								3	1	2
Provide increased access through land use planning						3						3	0	3
Intermodal connection with other transportation modes (i.e. airports)						3						3	0	3
Provide more rail opportunities throughout the region						6						6	0	6
Expansion of light rail					1	3						4	1	3
Increase first mile/last mile opportunities to increase transit use								6				6	0	6
Maintenance of existing system								1				1	0	1
Better intermodal transportation connections							1	4				5	1	4
Partner w/subregions for bike master plans- coordinate bike plans amongst neighboring cities												0	0	0
Close HOV gaps												0	0	0
Electric vehicles NEVs												0	0	0
Enable carpool access for SOV going to work												0	0	0
"Complete Streets" for the regional transportation system accommodating all users, esp. bikes									1	4		5	1	4
Recognize and provide adequate infrastructure for bicycles as a prominent form of transportation									1			1	1	0
Encourage more transit-oriented development around transit stations and corridors, with affordable housing									2	2		4	2	2
Encourage parity among modes									1	1		2	1	1
Provide easy access to subway stops (entrance/exits)												0	0	0
Fast and happy rails												0	0	0

PRIORITIES FOR THE 2012 RTP/SCS

Group discussion results within Los Angeles County

		Los Angeles County												
		West Covina		*Los Angeles*		*Santa Clarita*		*Carson*		*Santa Monica*				
	Potential Objectives for the 2012 RTP	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary		**Total All Votes**	Primary	Secondary
	Bike sharing and infrastructure and rental- expand biking opportunities												0	0	0
	Convenient, clean, and attractive public transit for middle-class												0	0	0
	Separate bikeways; Narrower streets for vehicles and wider sidewalks												0	0	0
													0	0	0
Fiscal and Economic Considerations													0	0	0
	Help our economy thrive and be resilient (e.g., despite enery price spikes)	3	17	3	8	3	6	2	7		3		**52**	11	41
	Keep governmental transportation expenditures low		2		1		5		2			*Note: Remove "low"; more efficient transportation investments/cost-effective; Change to "Optimize governmental transportation expenditures"*	**10**	0	10
	Minimize household transportation expenditures (how much it costs me to get around)		1		7		1		1		2		**12**	0	12
	Prioritize the most cost effective transportation investments	1	4		8		2	1	4	1	6		**27**	3	24
	Improve the movement of freight through the region		5		10	1	5		3		4	*Note: Add "movement of people"; create jobs, enhance economic development; Add "dedicated truck lanes"*	**28**	1	27
Additional Fiscal and Economic Considerations Objectives	*Ensure that environmental effects are considered in cost/benefit analysis*		5										5	0	5
	Encourage neighborhood business	1	1										2	1	1
	Encourage employment growth in or near resdiential areas and vice versa		1										1	0	1
	Reduce the need to travel extensively												0	0	0
	Reduce tax burden/Balanced and efficient use of funds/spending locally		2										2	0	2
	Increase financial resources for transportation		1										1	0	1
	Facilitate the increase of local business around transit and TOD				3								3	0	3
	Do not add transit and highway infrastructure that cannot be maintained (to avoid cutting existing services)				1								1	0	1

PRIORITIES FOR THE 2012 RTP/SCS

Group discussion results within Los Angeles County

	Los Angeles County												
	West Covina		*Los Angeles*		*Santa Clarita*		*Carson*		*Santa Monica*				
Potential Objectives for the 2012 RTP	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary		**Total All Votes**	Primary	Secondary
Attract businesses with incentives (CEQA exemptions)- Job creation			1	4								5	1	4
Incentivize development near transit areas (high density bonus)			1	4								5	1	4
Balance types of housing and jobs				3								3	0	3
Encourage ridership by providing affordable housing near transit				6								6	0	6
Fund improvements equitably												0	0	0
Some opposition to VMT tax												0	0	0
Embed true cost of VMT												0	0	0
Encourage modes that create productive people				1								1	0	1
Locate jobs near transit and transit near jobs				3								3	0	3
Add incentives to those buildings in older areas with old infrastructure				1								1	0	1
Balance freight movement with commuter traffic												0	0	0
Job access/Facilitating access to jobs				3								3	0	3
Unbundle parking costs				1								1	0	1
Support greening of the economy				2								2	0	2
Jobs housing fit				1								1	0	1
Consider alternative revenue sources- less reliance on gas tax				1								1	0	1
Greater education regarding tax commuter benefits			1									1	1	0
Housing affordability for all			1	5								6	1	5
Focus invenstments on completing existing areas instead of new communities												0	0	0
Increase funding for public education												0	0	0
Improve economic vision for Coachella region				4								4	0	4
Linking different centers, general connectivity						2						2	0	2
Encourage jobs/housing balance (more jobs where there is a lot of housing and vice versa)					3	8						**11**	3	8
Encourage job creation trhough transportation incentives, infrastructure and services						3						3	0	3
Consider a VMT incentives (reward people, don't penalize them)					1	2						3	1	2
Localized production and consumption								2				2	0	2
Maintain existing transportation infrastructure								5				5	0	5
Encourage movement of freight with clean technology								2				2	0	2
New funding sources for alternative fuels												0	0	0
Stable funding sources for transportation												0	0	0
More accessible costs for transit for families								3				3	0	3
Reduce costs of parking in commercial areas								3				3	0	3
Reduce housing and transportation costs										1		1	0	1

PRIORITIES FOR THE 2012 RTP/SCS

Group discussion results within Los Angeles County

		Los Angeles County													
		West Covina		*Los Angeles*		*Santa Clarita*		*Carson*		*Santa Monica*					
	Potential Objectives for the 2012 RTP	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary		**Total All Votes**	Primary	Secondary
	Financing/funding mechanisms that recognize and support the real costs of the transportation system										3		3	0	3
	Encourage employers to hire local residents or inventivize living closer to work through housing credits										1		1	0	1
	Enhance convenience and availability of low-cost transportation modes										1		1	0	1
	Include transportation costs in determining housing affordability										2		2	0	2
	Provide safe and convenient parking structures for the economic growth of businesses										3		3	0	3
	Consider land banking for affordable housing									1	2		3	1	2
	Higher priority to alternative modes										1		1	0	1
	Weight investment in under-developed travel modes higher than well-developed modes										1		1	0	1
													0	0	0
Safety													0	0	0
	Improve safety for people who walk, take transit, or bike		7	6	23		6		10	1	12	*Note: Reduce serious injuries and deaths (by x%/year); For all users and modes, including drivers*	**65**	7	58
	Improve safety for drivers				1			1	3				5	1	4
Additional Safety Objectives	*Plan for users of all ages and abilities (languages)*				2								2	0	2
	Improve community connectivity affected by past infrastructure investments				4								4	0	4
	Improve safety at highway rail crossings by increasing facilities maintenance			1	1								2	1	1
	Mitigate local impacts of freight/rail movement												0	0	0
	First come/first serve- no HOT lanes that primarily benefit upper income												0	0	0
	HOT lanes should exist to fund other modes												0	0	0
	Prioritize bike/ped safety				1								1	0	1
	Dedicated truck lanes						1						1	0	1
	Encourage Safe Routes to School												0	0	0
	Improve public safety for passengers on transit- security; reduce crime; better safety perception for riders								4				4	0	4
	Promote safe space for recreation								3				3	0	3
	Improve safety design of bike lanes								1				1	0	1
	Provide more education and enforcement for bike lanes								4				4	0	4
	Enforce rights of cyclists							1					1	1	0
	Consideration of safety issues by demographics, esp. age (e.g. Safe Routes to School)												0	0	0

PRIORITIES FOR THE 2012 RTP/SCS

Group discussion results within Los Angeles County

		Los Angeles County													
		West Covina		*Los Angeles*		*Santa Clarita*		*Carson*		*Santa Monica*					
	Potential Objectives for the 2012 RTP	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary		**Total All Votes**	Primary	Secondary
	Reform school bus systems, specifically coordinating with private and public transportation patterns										2		2	0	2
	Provide lighted/safe parking structures for bikes/cars										1		1	0	1
	Provide safety measures and frequency of service and infrastructure at transit stops										1		1	0	1
	Bike safety and security at major transportation stops and hubs												0	0	0
	Design streets for 5 to 100 years old- everybody feels safe										3		3	0	3
	Streetscape more pedestrian oriented/friendly												0	0	0
													0	0	0
Environmental Justice													0	0	0
	Help all residents, not only drivers, get around		2	1	11				2		2		**18**	1	17
	Avoid disproportionate impacts on lower income communities		1	2	25			1	10		7	*Note: Add "reduce" and "communities of color"*	**46**	3	43
Additional Environmental Justice Objectives	*Avoid displacing families in urban areas- keep communities family/kid-friendly*				1								1	0	1
	More greenspace												0	0	0
	Maintain healthy, local food supply; protecting land locally												0	0	0
	Encourage cleaner transportation technology												0	0	0
	Reduce disruption and segregation of communities				2								2	0	2
	Equitable funding across jurisdictions												0	0	0
	Encourage economically integrated communities			1	4								5	1	4
	Direct transportation benefits to low-income communities				1								1	0	1
	Balance quality of infrastructure around sub-regions				3								3	0	3
	Improve bottom-up infrastructure (walking and biking) before new modes (NEV)				4								4	0	4
	Disclosure isues on high density developments; need to solicit more feedback from the community												0	0	0
	Mitigate environmental justice impacts								1				1	0	1
	Inclusionary policies for low-income populations								1				1	0	1
	Bikeable/walkable communities												0	0	0
	Promote community benefits plan and displacement assistance for renters								4				4	0	4
	Increase public awareness of transportation options										3		3	0	3
	Subsidize car shares for lower income communities										2		2	0	2
	Subsidize mode shares for lower income communities												0	0	0
	Reduce health and economic disparity via transportation and housing investment										1		1	0	1

PRIORITIES FOR THE 2012 RTP/SCS

Group discussion results within Los Angeles County

		Los Angeles County												
		West Covina		*Los Angeles*		*Santa Clarita*		*Carson*		*Santa Monica*				
	Potential Objectives for the 2012 RTP	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary		**Total All Votes**	Primary	Secondary
													0	0	0
Other	*Land use strategies*												0	0	0
	Housing policies-mix	2	8										**10**	2	8
	Work with local cities in TOD planning and development												0	0	0
	Restore state redevelopment		1										1	0	1
	Fair burden of cost to mitigate new and existing development congestion management		1										1	0	1
	Don't be afraid of eminent domain												0	0	0
	Incentivize parking structure vs. surface parking												0	0	0
	Jobs-Housing balance- matching the right housing mix with the right jobs	2	2										4	2	2
	Land use link to transportation/Appropriate to geographic area	1	4										5	1	4
	Transit/alternative modes of travel linkages between job centers and housing		2										2	0	2
	Providing more housing choices through a person's lifetime/Ensure geographic distribution		1										1	0	1
	Affordable housing/variety of price points		1										1	0	1
	Consider aging population/seniors in future housing mix												0	0	0
	Encourage and promote education about transit		1										1	0	1
	Job type and housing type balance		4										4	0	4
	Evaluate the efficacy of existing legistlations on fair share housing distribution		2										2	0	2
	Increase affordable housing options for low income groups around TOD sites			1	6								7	1	6
	Prevent displacement of residents			2	4								6	2	4
	Housing affordability (especially near TODs and active transit areas) throughout all of Southern California				1								1	0	1
	Actively counteract displacement (low income and disp impacted)				6								6	0	6
	Direct transportation investments to community disp. Impacted				2								2	0	2
	Livable communities/Land use				2								2	0	2
	Coordinate transportation and development as it is being built				1								1	0	1
	Performance measure in objectives (measurable, coherent and achievable)				2								2	0	2
	Feasible implementation				1								1	0	1
	Smart Rail Technology				1								1	0	1
	Concentrate new developments around transit				3								3	0	3
	Make the objectives language more specific												0	0	0
	Regional pot of $ to incentivize good projects				3								3	0	3

PRIORITIES FOR THE 2012 RTP/SCS

Group discussion results within Los Angeles County

	Los Angeles County												
	West Covina		*Los Angeles*		*Santa Clarita*		*Carson*		*Santa Monica*				
Potential Objectives for the 2012 RTP	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary		**Total All Votes**	Primary	Secondary
Increase affordable housing around transit-oriented development			2	2								4	2	2
Provide a better match between wages and housing opportunities				1								1	0	1
Create activity nodes that are walkable/bikeable/transit-friendly			1	4								5	1	4
Expand on-demand options			1	2								3	1	2
Connect job/housing to transit				1								1	0	1
Look at energy as a criteria			1	2								3	1	2
Look at water as a criteria				1								1	0	1
Look at food as a criteria				1								1	0	1
Integrated transportation and land use				2								2	0	2
Minimize need for new infrastructure												0	0	0
Social and economic justice (greater focus)				5								5	0	5
Greater community input				1								1	0	1
Encourage shift of cargo from truck to rail				2								2	0	2
Unified fare structure (transit)				1								1	0	1
Improve public education and communication regrading the objectives of RTP				5								5	0	5
Develop a process for zoning changes and establishing an urban growth boudary			1	1								2	1	1
Include a range of housing opportunities (what is the demand?); Recognize where it is appropriate					2	6						8	2	6
Focus on programs that offer incentives and not overregulate						5						5	0	5
Provide a range of housing choices/mix that are in close proximity to each other						2						2	0	2
Reliable and frequent public transport to airports (light rail too) and BRT dedicated bus lane					1	2						3	1	2
Relationship between high density, affordable housing and corridors						5						5	0	5
More creative use of existing infrastructure for more modes- multipurpose												0	0	0
Parking policy- encourage alternative modes						2						2	0	2
Better match of wages and housing cost (affordability)								1				1	0	1
Create open space								1				1	0	1
Preserve open space								2				2	0	2
Evaluate local parking standards								5				5	0	5
Senior citizen transportation- meet needs of demand								3				3	0	3
CEQA streamlining to allow projects to be implemented faster and thus create jobs									1	4		5	1	4

PRIORITIES FOR THE 2012 RTP/SCS

Group discussion results within Los Angeles County

	Los Angeles County												
	West Covina		*Los Angeles*		*Santa Clarita*		*Carson*		*Santa Monica*				
Potential Objectives for the 2012 RTP	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary		**Total All Votes**	Primary	Secondary
Increased/improved interagency collaboration to ensure affordable housing in "smart growth/TOD" development										1		1	0	1
Incentivize home/house sharing by removing existing barriers to co-housing										1		1	0	1
Identify and support policies to encourage car-sharing										3		3	0	3
Increased public education and outreach about planning challenges and issues										5		5	0	5
Parking policy reforms									1	6		7	1	6
Encourage transportation development that is conducive to the community												0	0	0
Consider policies that have multiple benefits or co-benefits										2		2	0	2
Consider centralized ombudsman office for transportation coordination									1	6		7	1	6
Provide accessibility (Complete Streets) for all users; This can affect all other objectives/categories									1	3		4	1	3
Encourage a change in perception of alternative modes of transportation/Better PR "make it sexy"										10		**10**	0	10
Improve transit system information										1		1	0	1
Non-auto zones and communities										1		1	0	1
Education about travel time expectation										2		2	0	2
Enhance local access to daily destinations/smart land planning										1		1	0	1
Balance between public parks and open spaces to higher density housing									2	2		4	2	2
Stop funding to highway expansion including HOV and transfer funding from highway to alternative modes									1	6		7	1	6

Public Comments Received

Los Angeles Workshop

Tuesday, August 16, 2011

Comment
How can SCAG expect people to understand your different scenarios if you don't also put need for housing by income level/affordability, or put demographic information, including current and projected (by class and race) due to displacement from your scenarios. As a region, your model needs to take into account increased GHG emissions (and household cost) for scenarios displacing people from inner city to suburbs/sprawl. Factor in whether the person leaving the City was taking transit and is now driving.
Very well done presentation.
Please get translator's head sets to do instantaneous translation from English to Spanish (don't separate out Spanish speakers or other non-English speakers)
Overall an interesting workshop - smaller groups would have been good for better conversations but totally get that today was a bigger meeting.
In the RTP please better integrate bike/ped into the full plan instead of just being a separate chapter/appendix
Please integrate social justice/equity issues/concerns into all elements of RTP/SCS.
Small group discussion was not very robust. Difficult to hear some of the members and the discussion seemed a little unfocused.
Some of the polling questions lacked options that may have been a better fit for some people.
I am working on my PhD at USC in energy and sustainability. I believe you are underestimating how high the future price of oil/gasoline will go in just 10 years.
Scenario outcomes (types): where did they come from? There are many other quality of life indicators (e.g., housing costs, access to green space, economic redevelopment) - there must be SOME trade-offs if we choose scenario 4 - what are the trade-offs??
Is there any consideration of more flexible zoning to allow "in-law" units on large lots?
Is there any consideration for "Dedicated" bus lanes to reduce congestion?
RTP should invest in repair/replace/upgrade to existing infrastructure.
I don't understand what is "standard suburban". Does it include both large and small lots? If so, then the 2 columns for neighborhood design and housing options don't make mathematical sense.
What is the relation between the growth numbers on the chart and the final mix in 2035?
Confusing choices
Spanish transltation could have been done in same room with headsets and had a more integrated workshop
Diverse time and location (near Metro - good) and post 5pm.
Confusing wording. Type of residential and type of employment has to be clarified. Also, explore these additional options for this question: income and types of jobs differences, including low-income residents and low-wage jobs.
What does "multi-family" mean? Housing types should be more explicit about affordability. Also, explore this additional question about anti-displacement measures.

Public Comments Received

Comment
Need more nonaffiliated members of the public and make people speaking for themselves as part of the group. Need more participation from diverse groups - would like to see more Hispanics/blacks to participate and get their input.
The concept of “improving freight movement” must be expanded beyond simply increasing throughput/volume. Zero emission strategies, cleaner technologies, and improve efficiencies must be central to any freight transportation plan.
Increase the quantity of presentations in the communities with most transportation needs, and therefore communicate to more members of the community this process and opportunity to participate and design their community in a way that will benefit them.
Invite agencies that have never participated but who are impacted by the transportation system; for example, hospitals, food banks, colleges, shelters, etc.
Be more conscientious in the process of designing the Transportation Regional Plan toward the community.
Invite the regional transportation agencies in our community, Sunline, because it is important for them to know what the community wants to see in their community in the transportation plan.
I would like to know why, if the project is for the community, the time and place is not accessible to the community? There should be more publicity for these workshops since a great portion of the community is not aware of these workshops. And if they are aware they do not want to participate because they don’t speak English. If you want a project that really functions for the community, be equal in everything including the workshops.
If we really want the community to participate, these workshops must be held at a time the community can participate – workshops after 5:00 pm and in other place where people can get to. (Palm Desert does not work for our community.)
Use publicity so that our community can be aware and attend these workshops on very important topics.