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PROPOSED PROJECT: Mobility Plan 2035. The proposed Plan is a revision of the adopted 1999 City of Los Angeles Transportation Element of the General Plan and incorporates complete street policies and guides mobility decisions in the City through 2035. The Plan lays the policy foundation to design streets that meet multiple purposes and implement a full range of mobility options including bicycling, carpooling, driving, transit, and walking. The Plan and its accompanying supporting documents include:

1. Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Programs that support a balanced transportation system
2. Enhanced Complete Street Networks that prioritize selected roadways for pedestrian, bicycle, transit, or vehicle enhancements
3. A Complete Street Design Guide that serves as a living document to guide City departments in identifying and implementing street standards and experimental design configurations that promote complete streets.
4. Revisions to the S-470 street standard classifications.
5. Amendment to LAMC Section 17.05 - Design Standards.

REQUESTED ACTION:
1. Pursuant to procedures set forth in Section 11.5.6 of the Municipal Code and City Charter Sections 555 and 558, amend the General Plan to incorporate the proposed Plan, and recommend adoption of the attached Resolution (Exhibit A) and the proposed Mobility Plan 2035 (Exhibit B).

2. Pursuant to procedures set forth in Section 11.5.6 of the Municipal Code and City Charter Sections 555 and 558, amend the Highways and Freeways Map of the Transportation Element of the General plan to reclassify arterials with new nomenclature as established in the new Street Standard Plan S-470.
RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

1. Conduct a public hearing on the Proposed Plan, as modified in this staff report.

2. Approve the staff report as the Commission Report.

3. Approve and recommend that the Mayor approve and the City Council adopt the attached Mobility Plan 2035 as an update to the General Plan of the City of Los Angeles, as modified.

4. Authorize the Director of Planning to present the resolution (Exhibit A) and Plan (Exhibit B) to the Mayor and City Council, in accordance with Sections 555 and 558 and the City Charter.

5. Amend the Highways and Freeways Map (Exhibit B: Mobility Atlas) of the Transportation Element of the General Plan to designate streets to new street standards.

6. Instruct the Department of City Planning to finalize the necessary street designation changes to be presented to City Council, and make other technical corrections as necessary.

7. Find that the City Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the Draft Environmental Impact Report ENV 2013-0911-EIR (Exhibit C) in its determination approving the Proposed Plan and transmit the Final EIR to the City Council for certification.

8. Approve and Recommend that the City Council Adopt the attached Findings, and direct staff to prepare additional environmental findings for City Council consideration.

9. Recommend that the Mayor recommend approval and the City Council adopt the attached Complete Street Design Guide as guidance for implementing complete streets (Exhibit D).

10. Recommend that the Mayor’s recommend approval and the City Council adopt the NACTO Urban Street Design Guide and Urban Bikeway Design Guide as additional guidance for implementing complete streets (Exhibit E and F).

11. Adopt proposed amendments to LAMC 17.05 Design Standards (Exhibit G).

12. Adopt the S-470 as the City’s Street Standards Plan and direct the General Manager of DOT, City Engineer of BOE, and Director of Planning to affix their signatures (Exhibit H).

13. Approve and recommend that the City Council adopt the ordinance repealing past arterial street designations (Exhibit I).

14. Authorize the Director of Planning to update the arterial designations and corresponding maps for all the community plans to reflect the nomenclature in Exhibit J.
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PROJECT ANALYSIS

Project Summary

The proposed Mobility Plan 2035 establishes broad goals that set the foundation for a world-class transportation system that balances the needs of all road users. The corresponding objectives, policies, and programs direct the City towards achieving “complete streets” as mandated by California State Legislature through AB 1358, The Complete Streets Act, which requires local jurisdictions to:

“plan for a balanced, multimodal transportation network that meets the needs of all users of streets, roads, and highways, defined to include motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, children, persons with disabilities, seniors, movers of commercial goods, and users of public transportation, in a manner that is suitable to the rural, suburban or urban context.”

The proposed Plan sets the stage for making holistic long-term transportation decisions using a defined set of criteria (such as safety, equity, access, health, environmental, economic) that take into consideration the multiple functions that streets must serve from mobility, to public meeting spaces, retail and dining destinations, physical activity, stormwater infiltration and much more. Complete Streets lead to a more livable city with attractive corridors and mobility options for all types of mode users. The proposed policy components necessary to further the City’s transformation to a multi-modal/complete street system include:

- Mobility Plan goals, enhanced complete street networks, and action plan that form the policy direction for achieving complete streets
- New street standards that recognize the multi-modal role of streets
- Redesignation of City streets to reflect new street standards and existing street widths
- A Complete Streets Design Guide for the City of Los Angeles that provides guidance on complete street infrastructure
- The adoption of NACTO’s Urban Street and Bikeway Design Guides as reference tools for major cities to implement complete streets
- Revisions to the LAMC 17.05 Design Standards that gives authority to the Street Standards Committee to revise the Complete Street Design Guide and promote the balance of modes and safety in street design.

Mobility Plan

The Mobility Plan 2035 is an element of the City of Los Angeles’ General Plan. It updates the City’s 1999 Transportation Element and integrates and updates the 2010 Bicycle Plan. The proposed Plan incorporates “complete streets” principles and lays the policy framework to address both mobility issues and prioritization of transportation infrastructure improvements. It also incorporates other recent state legislation such as the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act (SB 375) and the Global Warming Solutions Act (AB 32), to leverage sustainable transportation systems as a solution to creating a livable and green city with a high quality of life.

Mobility Plan 2035 includes five goals that highlight the City’s mobility priorities. Each of the goals contains objectives (targets used to help measure the progress of the Plan) and multiple policies (broad strategies that guide the City’s achievement of the Plan’s goals). In total, the plan includes overs fifty distinct policies. Policies have associated programs, which are action items that when and if implemented may assist in achieving the goals and objectives described in this Plan.
Goals:
1. Safety First
2. World Class Infrastructure
3. Access for All Angelenos
4. Informed Choices
5. Clean Environments for a Healthy Community

Complete Street Networks
The proposed Plan’s approach to accommodating complete streets within the City of LA is through the development of networks that layer roadway systems which prioritize a certain mode within each layer. While each street will still accommodate all modes, layering networks serves to emphasize a particular mode on a particular street as part of a larger system. The complete street network system comprises of Pedestrian Enhanced Districts (PEDs) and four enhanced networks, that work together to support pedestrian, bicycle, transit, goods movement, and vehicle travel. As cities are dynamic places, where trends and patterns can change, it is envisioned that the complete street system will be modified over time as needed.

Pedestrian Enhanced Districts (PEDs)
PED areas are usually found in locations with higher traffic volumes that include intense retail and/or employment activities. PED areas are typically focused on a relatively defined geographical area such as an intersection or series of connected intersections at arterial streets. Every trip, regardless of mode, includes walking, and pedestrians are the most vulnerable roadway users. Pedestrian Enhanced Districts (PEDs) establish areas where improvements for pedestrians are prioritized relative to improvements for other roadway users. Pedestrian Enhanced Districts may be located near schools, transit stations, areas of high pedestrian activity, areas with high collision frequency, or other placemaking opportunities. Additional pedestrian safety and enhancements, such as increasing sidewalk widths and improved pedestrian crossing and safety treatments will also be considered. Whereas NEN (described below) streets are typically located on neighborhood serving streets, PEDs are focused on improving pedestrian infrastructure on arterial streets. Pedestrian needs are also closely linked to the Transit Enhanced Network (described later) because of the conditions encountered walking to or from transit services as well as waiting at stops and stations.

Neighborhood Enhanced Network (NEN)
The Neighborhood Network established in the 2010 Bicycle Plan is a network of approximately 800 miles of local streets identified to be comfortable for bicycling and is recognized in the proposed Mobility Plan as a network that can also serve local neighborhood pedestrian activity. To align the terminology of the Neighborhood Network with the other networks being established in the Mobility Plan the network is being re-branded as the Neighborhood Enhanced Network (NEN). The NEN provides a network of slow, locally serving streets that connect communities to schools, retail, parks and open space, health care and employment opportunities. Streets on the NEN are typically local and/or collector streets with one lane in each direction that are enhanced with street calming that can include, but are not limited to: bump outs, roundabouts, ample sidewalks and street trees. NEN streets are intended to provide a safe and convenient place to walk, roll, skate, scooter, bike and stroll. Some streets (or street segments) on the NEN may already provide a quality pedestrian and bicycle experience and will require little, if any, improvements. Others may require the addition of a signalized crosswalk to assist non-motorized users to cross a fast moving arterial street. And others may require a more intense number of improvements to provide the desired comfort level. (See Complete Streets Design Guide for an expanded list of street calming...
enhancements). A portion of the NEN, that complements gaps in the protected bicycle lane network described in the BEN below, has been highlighted in the NEN maps.

Bicycle Enhanced Network
The Bicycle Enhanced Network (BEN) is a proposed system of bikeways dedicated to the movement of bicycles. It is comprised of: bicycle lanes (approx. 700 miles), bicycle paths (approx. 150 miles) and protected bicycle lanes (approx. 300 miles and largely a subset of the bicycle lane streets). The BEN blends together the former Backbone Network (bicycle lanes) and Green Network (bicycle paths) established in the 2010 Bicycle Plan along with the addition of protected bicycle lanes (a sub-group of lanes upgraded from the Backbone Network) to provide a network of bikeways for all types of riders.

Transit Enhanced Network
The Transit Enhanced Network (TEN) consists of approximately 300 miles of streets that complement the region’s existing and planned rail and busway system and will improve existing and future bus service on a select group of arterial streets by prioritizing improvements for transit riders relative to improvements for other roadway users. The Transit Enhanced streets aim to provide reliable and frequent transit service that is convenient and safe; increase transit mode share; reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips; and integrate transit infrastructure investments with the identity of the surrounding street. As conditions change, additional corridors may need to be added or improvements upgraded beyond what was originally considered. The implementation of the TEN will be inherently intertwined with the region’s bus providers including, but not limited to, the City’s own Department of Transportation, Metro, Big Blue Bus, Culver City Bus and Foothill Transit.

Vehicle Enhanced Network
The Vehicle Enhanced Network (VEN) consists of approximately 80 miles of streets that call out the importance of assisting the through movement of traffic to and from the freeway system. These arterial streets carry high volumes of vehicles and are important to regional circulation of vehicles.

Action Plan
The Action Plan identifies a list of programs that, if and when implemented, could assist in carrying out the Plan’s policies. The set of programs encompasses amendments to existing plans, ordinances, development standards and design guidelines; capital investments/projects; coordination of economic development/development review processes; and interagency/interjurisdictional coordination. The Action Plan describes each of the implementation programs and identifies the City agencies responsible for implementation. Each program includes reference to the pertinent policies that it implements. The programs are organized into the following 15 categories:

- Communication
- Data + Analysis
- Education
- Enforcement
- Engineering
- Funding
- Legislation
- Maintenance
- Management
- Operations
Program implementation is in large part contingent upon the availability of adequate funding. Funding is likely to change over time due to economic conditions and to fluctuations in the priorities of federal, state and regional funding agencies. None of the programs included in the Action Plan can be implemented unless specific funding is made available. It is important to emphasize that none of the programs described in the Action Plan represent a mandatory duty or other official obligation on the part of the City. Since, priorities and perspectives continually evolve, the program strategies the City may pursue are subject to change and the City may do so without formally amending the Mobility Plan.

New Street Classifications and Complete Street Standards
S-470 Streets Standard Plan
In response to the State’s Complete Street mandate the City is in the process of amending its street classifications and standard street dimensions. The current classifications are described in the Transportation Element and the dimensions are formally articulated in the S-470 Standard Plan, which defines the City’s street designation system and demonstrates standard cross sections for each type of street. Last adopted in 1999, the street classifications and their corresponding dimensions reflect the former primary focus on moving automobiles. The new expanded list of classifications and revised S-470 aims to acknowledge the multi-modal role and objectives of complete streets. While the naming conventions have been updated to reflect designations that are more inclusive of other modes, references to the old designation nomenclature will still be linked to ensure that federal funding and references to the City’s streets in other documents remains intact.

Highways and Freeways Map
The former Highways and Freeways Map from the 1999 Transportation Element is being updated to reflect the new nomenclature defined in the revised S-470. In addition to nomenclature changes, arterial streets are being redesignated to more closely reflect their existing street dimensions as they stand today. To accomplish this, one proposed action includes an ordinance to repeal previous street designations, in several specific plans, in order to align them with the new nomenclature.

Complete Streets Design Guide
The Complete Streets Design Guide, a complementary document to Mobility Plan 2035 establishes selection and performance criteria, guiding principles for complete streets, stormwater management, street targeted operating design speeds, prototypical cross-sections, and street design standards that will continually evolve to guide planners, city engineers, and urban designers in determining the application of specific street improvements within the roadway and overall right-of-way.

NACTO Urban Street and Bikeway Design Guides
The National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) “facilitates the exchange of transportation ideas, insights and best practices among large cities, while fostering a cooperative approach to key issues facing cities and metropolitan areas,” as described by the organization. Their two street design guides aid large cities in implementing complete streets
strategies by providing design guidance on transportation infrastructure. These two guides draw on the experience of transportation practitioners throughout the nation.

**L.A.M.C. 17.05 Street Design**

Section 17.05 is found in Chapter 1, Article 7, of the Los Angeles Municipal Code. It creates a Street Standards Committee whose duty it is to recommend to the Commission minimum width and design standards for all classes of public and private streets and alleys. Section 17.05 is being revised to reflect the City's emphasis on safety and balancing modes in our future transportation system and provide authority to the Committee to modify the Complete Streets Design Guide.
Background

The State of California and the Los Angeles City Charter require that Los Angeles create and adopt a general plan. The City’s General Plan is the constitution for all future development and as such is the heart and foundation of the City’s long-range planning vision for potential growth. The State requires that each jurisdiction’s general plan include seven mandatory elements: Land Use, Circulation, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Safety, and Noise, but communities may also include additional elements that are tailored to meet specific needs and concerns. While State law requires that the various plans be internally consistent, cities are free to select a distinct name for each element and are permitted to combine and/or disaggregate the individual components of the elements in a manner that is practical for the jurisdiction.

In Los Angeles, the General Plan is a comprehensive declaration of purposes, policies and programs that guide and establish the future form and development of the City. Approved by the Planning Commission and the Mayor, and adopted by the City Council, the General Plan serves as a basis for decisions that affect all aspects of our everyday lives from where we live and work to how we move about. It is both a strategic and long term document, broad in scope and specific in nature. It is implemented by decisions that direct the allocation of public resources and by decisions that shape private development. The City of LA official General Plan description consists of:

- Framework Element
- Land Use Element - divided into 35 community plans
- Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles
- Housing
- Transportation
- Infrastructure Systems
- Noise
- Air Quality
- Conservation
- Open Space
- Safety
- Public Facilities and Services

The proposed Plan is being prepared in compliance with the 2008 Complete Streets Act (Assembly Bill 1358), which mandates that the circulation element of the General Plan be modified to plan for a balanced, multimodal transportation network that meets the needs of all users of streets, roads, and highways, defined to include motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, children, persons with disabilities, seniors, movers of commercial goods, and users of public transportation, in a manner that is suitable to the rural, suburban, or urban context of the general plan. Compliance with the Complete Streets Act is expected to result in increased options for mobility; less greenhouse gas emissions; more walkable communities; and fewer travel barriers for active transportation and those who cannot drive such as children or people with disabilities. Complete streets play an important role for those who would choose not to drive if they had an alternative as well as for those who do not have the option of driving. The Complete Streets Act specifically encourages an increase in non-driving modes of travel. The Plan is also consistent with SCAG’s 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS).

Changes in demographics; increased awareness of the relationship among transportation, land use and health; technological innovations; and an embrace of streets as public places are influencing shifts in how the City of Los Angeles will plan for the mobility of its people. Trends in
younger populations show a desire for safe and accessible active transportation options, while a growing older population cohort can benefit from mobility alternatives to driving. A large and growing body of academic literature points to the benefits of improved urban design that increases more walking and bicycling, which in turn spurs community interaction and economic activity, and fosters better health outcomes. Technology improvements offer virtual alternatives to travel, new transportation-sharing options, and better information that enables real-time decisions about the best way to travel. Finally, streets increasingly serve not only to facilitate movement but also to provide places to gather, sit, watch, and interact.

The proposed Plan acknowledges the necessary and continued investments that are needed to maintain Los Angeles’ roadways in light of the many travelers for whom the automobile is the only viable form of transportation. Meanwhile, the plan acknowledges the necessary and continued investments that are needed to improve the variety of safe, comfortable, and attractive transportation choices for those who cannot or desire not to use a car every day.

LADOT’s Strategic Plan
During Fall 2014, LADOT released a strategic plan calling out the Department’s goals and specific strategies to reach those goals. The Strategic Plan was intentionally written to be in line with the goals, objectives, policies, and programs called out in the Mobility Plan. The Strategic Plan also calls out short, mid, and long term actions items that the department will develop to make sure the City’s transportation system is meeting its newly defined operational standards.
Discussion of Key Issues

Implementation
In order to be more effective with our limited transportation funds this Plan is shifting the way that projects are prioritized for implementation. Future projects will be prioritized based upon need and their effectiveness in improving safety, public health and providing social equity and economic benefits. Prioritized project areas will receive focused attention and discussions with the surrounding communities to identify potential “complete street” solutions. The Complete Street Design Guide can provide a platform for the street design process and describes a “complete streets” infrastructure that can first be implemented through pilot projects and eventually as standard actions after extensive evaluation. The Plan will also get implemented through the program list called out in the Action Plan. Some programs in the Action Plan are currently being implemented through LADOT, Metro, and other city agencies as well as by mechanisms already in place. Other programs need sources of funding and staff before implementation is possible.

State Legislature
Recent state legislation requires cities to help meet regional goals through their transportation systems:

- AB 32: Global Warming Solutions Act: achieve 1990 GHG levels by 2020
- SB 375: Sustainable Communities Act: achieve regional GHG reduction targets, in accordance with AB 32, through regional transportation process
- AB 1358: Complete Streets Act: Cities must include Complete Streets policies in their General Plans and plan for a “balanced, multimodal transportation network that meets the needs of all users.”
- SB 743: Changes the way cities measure project impacts by encouraging projects to reduce their GHG emissions through measuring vehicle miles traveled (VMT) versus the current priority of reducing queuing at intersections (LOS) through roadway widening as a mitigation.

Collectively, the state legislature calls for cities and their transportation systems to contribute to achieving better environmental and public health standards for the region.

Balancing Roadways
Balancing the needs of different users is important to achieving complete streets. The Mobility Plan relies on a network approach to help manage potential conflicts amongst various uses. Instead of trying to make every street great for every mode, the Plan looks at the system at a higher level and identifies layered networks that emphasize a particular mode of travel by emphasizing access and mobility for one or more modes. This can allow for streets with dedicated bus travel lanes, safer movement for bicycling, pedestrian segments with priority signalization, or wide lanes and turning radii for goods movement. In instances where corridors are selected as important to more than one mode of travel, design solutions should be formulated that can balance the needs of various modes. The design process for balancing roadways will be gradual, and the Complete Street Design Guide can be looked to for continually updated solutions.

Streets as our largest public asset
In today’s cities, streets not only facilitate movement but also provide “places” to gather, congregate, sit, watch, and interact. This expanded definition has fundamentally changed our relationship with streets and will factor into future transportation discussions. The success of
opens street events coupled with the desire for improved sidewalks and more public gathering spaces speaks to the community's increasing interest in using their streets for more than just transportation. Streets are the City’s public face, the places that connect us to work, entertainment, shopping, recreation, and each other. Complete street policies help describe a new vision for how we think about streets.

Land Use, Transportation, Public Health
The relationship between the built environment, health, and transportation is important to call out. Improved urban design (wider sidewalks, street trees, street lighting, parking design, less parking, and better access to transit) increases both the utilization of active transportation modes and spurs community interaction, which in turn can improve the health of an area’s residents and decrease environmental impacts.

Changing Demographics
This plan responds to changing demographics, a younger population desiring safe and accessible active transportation options (bike, walk, transit), a growing number of residents and employees seeking alternatives to the car, and an aging population that may need to rely more and more on transportation alternatives to the automobile. In 2030, senior citizens will make up one fifth of LA County’s population. This older population (as well as children and the disabled) will benefit from longer pedestrian crossing times, shorter street crossing distances, wider, shaded sidewalks, street benches, and separated bicycle facilities. In droves today’s teens are delaying getting their drivers’ license. According to a 2012 AAA survey, 56% of respondents did not get their license within one year of being age-eligible and only 54 percent had acquired their license before turning 18 years old.¹ When they do get their drivers’ license they are driving fewer miles than previous generations did at the same age. Young people between the ages of 16 and 34 drove 23 percent fewer miles on average in 2009 than did the same age group in 2001.² Fewer of today’s households have two cars as more are deciding (for financial and/or environmental reasons) to get by with one car or none at all.

Technology and the Sharing Economy
Technology is altering the way we think about travel and our relationship with streets. Technology can permit us to attend a meeting remotely thereby reducing a trip. New transportation network companies are using mobile technology to connect ordinary drivers with passengers needing a ride. Car sharing companies provide easy, temporary access to a rental car. Both of these new options offer a convenient and cost-effective alternative to buying and owning a car. Increasingly, technology informs us about real-time travel options so that tomorrow’s trip decisions can be aided by information as to the cost, length of trip, health benefits, departure and arrival time of multiple transportation options. Technology is already allowing people to be aware of all the transportation options out there and encourages users of the transportation system to be car light. The advent of the sharing economy is allowing people to change their everyday lifestyles with more freedom in transportation choice.

Integration and Update to the 2010 Bicycle Plan
The Bicycle Plan has been updated to reflect changing contexts and public input received since the 2010 Bicycle Plan was adopted on March 1, 2011. The 2010 Bicycle Plan, in its entirety, has been incorporated into the various chapters of the Mobility Plan and is no longer a stand-alone chapter devoted to a single mode. Instead its inclusion within a broader plan reflects the

² http://uspirg.org/sites/pirg/files/reports/A%20New%20Direction%20vUS.pdf
City’s commitment to a holistic and balanced complete street approach that acknowledges the role of multiple modes (pedestrians, bicycles, transit, and vehicles) within a larger system. The Technical Design Handbook has been incorporated into the Complete Streets Design Guide, including sections on design needs, bicycle paths, bicycle lanes, bicycle routes and neighborhood friendly streets, network gaps, signalized intersections, bicycle parking, bikeway signage, non-standard treatments, and street sections. The 2010 Bicycle Plan established a network of bicycle paths, lanes, and bicycle friendly streets. The Mobility Plan builds upon this network by adding protected bicycle lanes as a complement to the menu of potential bikeways. While the previous bicycle plan established mileage goals as part of its implementation strategy the Mobility Plan instead focuses on implementing projects in areas of need and that meet prioritization factors such as safety, equity, and/or health.

Integration of Chapter 6, “Smart Investments”, into other chapters

The Draft Mobility Plan version released in February 2014 included a Chapter Six focused on “Smart Investments” using this Plan to guide future funding priorities. Based on the development of policies that establish how prioritization of transportation projects should occur, the policies in the Draft Mobility Plan’s Chapter Six have been integrated into policies 2.13 and 4.6 to reflect the idea that investment decisions should be driven by priorities as called out in the Plan: safety, public health, equity, access, social benefits, and/or economic benefits. Programs in the Action Plan describe further funding strategies that the City may to pursue obtain additional resources.
FINDINGS

General Plan/Charter Findings

1. In accordance with Charter Section 556, the proposed Mobility Plan (Exhibit B) conforms to the purposes, intent, and provisions of the General Plan. The Mobility Plan update is consistent with, and helps to further accomplish goals, objectives, and policies contained in portions of the General Plan, including the Citywide General Plan Framework Element. The General Plan Framework establishes the standards, goals, policies, objectives, programs, terms, definitions, and direction to guide the update of citywide elements, land use/community plans and the establishment of specific plans. An analysis of the conformance of the Mobility Plan to the Framework Element and Community Plans was performed as part of the CEQA analysis and is available in Exhibit C. The analysis demonstrates that the Mobility Plan is consistent with the Los Angeles Citywide General Plan Framework as well as the Community Plans.

2. In accordance with Charter Section 558 (b)(2), the proposed Mobility Plan (Exhibit B) conforms with the public necessity, convenience, and general welfare as the Plan is intended to provide safe and viable mode choices to Angelenos and improve public and environmental health.

3. In accordance with Charter Section 558 (b)(2), the proposed Mobility Plan (Exhibit B) will have no adverse impact on the General Plan or any other plans being created by the Department of City Planning. The proposed Mobility Plan will complement the Framework Element, Land Use Plans, Specific Plans, and will be internally consistent with all other General Plan Elements. An analysis has demonstrated that the Mobility Plan goals, objectives, policies and programs are consistent with and carry out the objectives of the Framework Element of the General Plan, which sets for the City’s strategy for long-range growth.

CEQA Analysis

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15082, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Draft EIR was issued on April 4, 2013 by the City for a 30-day public review period. Information, data, and observations resulting from received comment letters are included throughout the Draft EIR, where relevant. Two public scoping meetings were held on April 16 & April 22, 2013. The purpose of the scoping meetings was to provide early consultation for the public to express their concerns about the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project, and acquire information and make recommendations on issues to be addressed in the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR has been prepared in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines, as amended to date. Specifically, this document evaluates the environmental effects that could result from implementation of the proposed project. The following topic areas were addressed in the Draft EIR:

- Transportation and Traffic
- Land Use
- Air Quality
- Greenhouse Gases
- Noise and Vibration
- Biological Resources
- Cumulative Impacts
- Alternatives
The Draft EIR was circulated for a 90-day review period beginning on February 13, 2014, with a closing date of May 13, 2014. Section 15088 of the CEQA Guidelines requires the lead agency (DCP) to evaluate comments on environmental issues received from public agencies and interested parties who review the Draft EIR and provide written responses. Throughout the environmental phase of plan development, the lead agency received written comments on the Draft EIR from public agencies, groups and individuals. Responses to all comments received during the comment period will be included in the Final EIR. The Final EIR is currently being prepared and will be considered by the City Council prior to adoption.
PUBLIC HEARING AND COMMUNICATIONS

Public Participation

The Mobility Plan is a citywide document and community outreach for a city as large and spread out as Los Angeles is no easy undertaking. A strategic approach was used to engage stakeholders on this large citywide issue. The Department’s public participation strategies were enhanced with the use of a project website, online town hall, Task Force, and Technical Advisory Committee. General Plans require a shared effort from a broad cross-section of stakeholders. Community participation and feedback have been critical to forming the direction of the Mobility Plan 2035. An open public dialogue has been integral to each step of the planning process, from visioning and analyzing to goal and policy formulation.

Since the inception of the Mobility Plan in the Fall of 2011, project staff have participated in over 90 community meetings throughout the city, held four “think lab” workshops, two scoping meetings, maintained a project website for easy access to materials, implemented an online town hall to hear from those unable to go to traditional meetings, and worked with various agencies, nonprofits, and community groups, including neighborhood councils.

Project Website:
LA2B.org has been the main source of information for the Mobility Plan, providing regular updates on the status of the plan. From the website, the public has been able to download important documents released during the process and become more informed about the analysis behind each step by reading blog posts. Website visitors can read about the project, learn how to get involved, and contact planning staff online to give their comments.

Online Town Hall:
As an experimental effort and new way of expanding the number and diversity of stakeholders, the Mobility Plan contracted the services of MindMixer and introduced an online town hall through ideas.la2b.org. This online format provided an opportunity for community members to share thoughts and opinions about the streets of Los Angeles.

The virtual town hall has allowed for a wider range of citizens to participate outside of traditional workshops and focus groups. The largest participant group was in the 25-45 age range. In addition, participants represented 79 of the 108 (73%) zip codes associated with the City of Los Angeles as well as additional participants from Culver City, Long Beach, Pasadena, Santa Monica, and the South Bay. The online format also allowed staff to identify geographical areas where there was limited participation and focus additional outreach efforts in those communities.

Participants were surveyed periodically throughout the plan using the online town hall. During the beginning stages in Fall 2011, open-ended questions such as, “how do you want to move in the future?” were asked to gather the basis for broad vision statements. In the later phases of the Plan, a survey on the prioritization of the proposed programs list was conducted during the Summer 2013. The results indicated that the majority of commenters expressed the need for improved connections (between modes and networks), favored improvements to existing infrastructure, and strongly supported programs that focus on user safety, performance analysis, and expanding access to multi-modal networks. Although each category in the Action Plan Series received its fair share of support, programs in the engineering category were by far the most viewed on the online town hall and received over 150 comments.
Neighborhood Councils:
To ensure widespread distribution of information, materials were disseminated at the Council District and Neighborhood Council levels. The Mobility Plan Team worked with the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment and Council staff to reach out to the community on a citywide scale.

“Great Streets, Great Neighborhood” Activity Kit:
To obtain participation on an overarching citywide scale, an activity kit was sent to over 100 Neighborhood Councils and civic organizations. This pen-and-paper activity, with a one fourth response rate, was meant to supplement the dialogue of the online town hall and included a series of brief exercises to help give input toward the development of the proposed goals, objectives, policies, and programs of the Mobility Plan.

Task Force:
The Mobility Task Force was put into place to guide this citywide effort and community-wide discussion. The Task Force played a pivotal role in assisting the City to generate significant engagement and input for the plan. Over 50 organizations were invited, including, community groups, nonprofits, major transit providers, and civic, business, and environmental transportation leaders throughout the City. The Task Force met six times during key phases of the project to provide input and guidance on plan development.

Technical Advisory Committee:
The TAC consisted of representatives from city departments and other relevant government organizations that have a stake in transportation. The TAC met monthly from 2011 to 2013 to review transportation issues and opportunities within the City of LA.

Public Workshops:
In early 2012, the Departments of City Planning and Transportation held community workshops in different neighborhoods across the City: Van Nuys, the Miracle Mile, Downtown, and Pacoima. These “Think Labs” encouraged participants to explore L.A.’s existing mobility system through a gallery of maps that conveyed key information about the City’s streets and demographics. Community members also shared ideas that complemented those submitted onto LA2B’s online Town Hall.

Scoping Meetings:
The environmental analysis of the plan required a scoping period to receive input from the public and other agencies on what should be studied in the Environmental Impact Report. Two scoping meetings held in the spring of 2013 focused the analysis around the potential impacts and benefits of the proposed enhanced networks.

Community Planning Forums and Staff Level Public Hearings:
The Proposed Mobility Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report were both released February 2014 for a 90 day public comment period. Over 300 participants attended a series of seven community planning forums and staff-level public hearings were held at each forum. Resources were pooled together with The Plan for A Healthy Los Angles and re:code LA to expand the Plan’s reach to a broader audience and allow contributors to participate at one location in three related long range planning efforts being led by City Planning.
Summary of Public Hearing Testimony and Communications

During the 90 day comment period, over 100 comment letters were received from individuals, community groups, non-profits, city departments, and state agencies. In addition, hundreds of comments were made in person at the forums, either written or spoken, as well as through our online town hall: ideas.la2b.org. The staff report addresses and summarizes comments made on the Plan and not on the Draft EIR. Comments pertaining to the environmental analysis in the Draft EIR will be addressed in the Final EIR, which will be released at a later date.

Bicycle Enhanced Network (BEN) & Implementation

Comment: The Mobility Plan received a substantial amount of comments regarding the Bicycle Enhanced Network (BEN) and its implementation. Many of these commenters were in support of the BEN network but were concerned by the lack of an implementation plan. These commenters presented concern over the fact that many implementation plans/ideas that were present in the 2010 Bicycle Plan are no longer present in the Mobility Plan. The commenters also expressed concern over what percentage of the BEN network would ultimately be implemented and the time frame in which it will be implemented. Several commenters spoke of streamlining the implementation and approval process by having it coincide with routine road maintenance work. Several commenters supported the implementation of sharrows, with one comment against that particular feature.

Response: The commitment to create safer streets for bicycling in LA has not been lost in the Mobility Plan, but strengthened. The Plan builds upon the bike plan framework and goes a step further by proposing fully protected bicycle lanes. The Mobility Plan has the benefit of assessing the last three years of Bike Plan implementation and as a result implementation strategies have been re-evaluated. The Bike Plan’s yearly mileage objectives created an ad-hoc network of pieces that were installed to meet a number. The Mobility Plan calls for engaging other departments and the community to come up with a project that can be supported by all cross sections of stakeholders. This new implementation strategy hopes to look at traffic calming features more holistically with community needs in mind. Bicycle infrastructure will be a part of the conversation as a traffic calming tool to reach community goals such as the safe movement of school children or speed reduction.

Document Language

Comment: The proposed Plan received a number of comments regarding the weak language present in the Plan. Of the comments received, many were focused on bicycle related topics. A majority of these commenters expressed concern with the fact that the Mobility Plan did not incorporate many of the goals/elements present in the 2010 Bicycle Plan. Many of these commenters wanted more specific goals and stronger language regarding bicycle safety and implementation. Many commenters expressed concerns that the language relating to pedestrian improvements is too vague or could be strengthened. Several other commenters stated that the plan in general uses language that is too vague and non-committal.

Response: The Proposed Plan contains all of the same elements that the Bicycle Plan did, but reorganized and broadened to incorporate all modes of transportation and emphasize the idea of complete streets. The Mobility Plan still incorporates the three major goals of the former Bicycle Plan, stressing the importance of bicycling as a mode of transportation in the larger system, the need to expand and plan for the variety of bike users, and equity in project implementation. Many of the policies were strengthened in the proposed Plan to emphasize the City’s goal of complete streets.
Transportation Equity

Comment: The Mobility Plan received some comments relating to equity. Of these, commenters focused on bicycle related elements. These commenters were almost split 50/50 between positive and negative support for bicycle infrastructure. Those in support believed that bicyclists are not being treated equally and that policies should be put in place which gives bicyclists equal priorities. The other commenters believed that it is irresponsible to allocate a lot of resources to bicycle elements, as bicycle riders are a small percentage of overall commuters. Several commenters argued that the plan must consider senior citizens and other users who are reliant on their vehicles and would not be able to use the bicycle infrastructure.

Some commenters spoke of active-transportation elements. These commenters emphasized the importance of active transportation in improving an individual's health. The commenters stressed that active transportation should be given greater emphasis and that improvements should be focused in low income/minority neighborhoods. Several commenters stated that the historical emphasis on automobile use creates inequalities and that public transportation should be emphasized more.

Response: The idea of complete streets is about bringing balance to the way we design, operate, and fund transportation projections. Its definition inherently brings equity to the balancing act of different mode priorities and street infrastructure objectives. The plan proposes a series of networks that plan for more than one mode in mind. The development of the multimodal networks was data-driven and research was undertaken into transportation policies and practices used in other cities. Cities across the world and cities right next door to Los Angeles have seen increases in bicycling, walking, and transit when infrastructure supports the safe movement of it. Bicycling infrastructure does not prohibit the movement of other roadway users.

The Mobility Plan does not favor one mode over the other. It stresses that all modes are important to a world class transportation system and should be planned for to give residents and tourists viable options to move around. The balancing act of modal priorities and objectives will be decided during implementation of projects, but the Mobility Plan lays out policies that bring all types of road users to the table.

The Plan does provide a policy for prioritization of projects that speaks to equity. Policy 4.3 was released in the draft version and policy 4.6 was added to integrate equity into decisions related to implementing this Plan.

Air Pollution

Comment: The Mobility Plan received many comments regarding air pollution in the Los Angeles area. One concern revolved around the creation of additional air pollution derived from the reduction of driving/parking lanes. The concern was that increasing bicycle/BRT lanes would take away a parking/driving lane and create more traffic, which in turn would create more air pollution as cars are idling. Several other commenters stated that they believe that adding bicycle lanes would not create more air pollution and that individuals citing these claims simply do not want to see bicycle lanes implemented.

Another air pollution concern revolved around goods movement, the harbor area and truck routes. Commenters stated that truck corridors should be identified and that the Port should work to reduce air pollution coming from shipping vessels and trucks. There were several
commenters stating concern that the Harbor area and low-income communities are disproportionately affected by air pollution due to goods movement.

Response: Bus and bike lanes are cited as an effective transportation measure recognized at the State level to reduce GHG emissions in order to help the LA region meet GHG reduction goals. As more planning and infrastructure is put into other modes, mode shifts gradually occur as people become more informed about transportation options. There have been many peer-reviewed academic studies published in transportation and public health journals around the world that reinforce this idea. The DEIR analyzes the air quality impacts of the Plan in Chapter 4.3 of the DEIR. Construction impacts related to air quality emissions and applicable plans, policies, and regulations were determined to be less than significant.

The Port of LA has integrated green technologies into their vehicles and strives to hit reduction targets as stated in their long-range plans. Low-income communities are at a disproportionate risk due to their location next to major goods movement routes, facilities, and terminals. The Mobility Plan reinforces the Port of LA’s reduction targets with similar objectives and policies and includes policy 4.3 to look to when considering the impacts that can arise when modifications to our transportation system occur.

Olympic/Pico Corridors and the Vehicle Enhanced Network
Comment: The Mobility Plan received many comments from residents in the South Carthay Circle area expressing concern that the proposed Plan intended to turn Olympic and Pico into one-way couplets. A majority expressed concern about the implementation of parking restrictions along VEN streets, Council member Paul Koretz, 5th District, expressed concern over peak period parking restrictions along Pico and around the South Carthay Neighborhood. Commenters were also concerned that on-street parking restrictions could harm local businesses, specifically along Pico. Several commenters believed that reducing parking and increasing speeds along Pico Blvd. would increase vehicle speeds and turn Pico into a “freeway”. Two commenters were in support of the idea of a Pico/Olympic couplet, however. There were also comments relating to the broader idea of the VEN. Many expressed concern in calling out a vehicle enhanced network as a priority while a few were in support of the VEN but wanted to ensure that its intention was to maintain a balanced system.

Response: The Plan lays out no intention to turn Pico and Olympic into one-way couplets. Pico Blvd. is not on the VEN network, while Olympic Blvd is. The VEN was created to provide reliable access to the adjacent freeway system. The VEN network calls out streets important to the regional circulation of vehicles. Safety is still first and foremost in this Plan and policies express that the movement of one mode will not compromise the safety of other modes.

Parking (Bicycles)
Comment: The Mobility Plan received a number of comments regarding bicycle storage. A majority of commenters expressed concern with the lack of bicycle parking that is currently present throughout the city and wish to see more. A few commenters wanted the Mobility Plan to discuss bicycle parking minimums in addition to greater bicycle access within office buildings.

Response: The Mobility Plan acknowledges through its policies and programs the importance of supporting infrastructure for bicycling. Through LADOT’s bikeway website, a process is in place to request bicycle parking. The implementation of bike parking depends on funding and staffing of the I bikeways unit at LADOT. Implementation of other types of bicycle storage such as
bicycle access in office buildings requires an ordinance and is identified as a program of this plan.

**Westwood Bicycle Lane**

Comment: The Mobility Plan received many comments specifically regarding the proposed Westwood Blvd. protected bicycle lane. A majority of the commenters believed that adding a bicycle lane would create detrimental traffic for the neighborhood and local businesses. The commenters stated that Westwood Blvd. is already clogged with traffic and that by taking away a driving/parking lane (for a bike lane), it would create additional traffic for local residents. Commenters also stated that the addition of the Expo Line at Westwood Blvd. would only exacerbate these problems if a bike lane was implemented. Councilmember Paul Koretz, 5th District, expressed concern over the Westwood Bike lane and would like to see the bike lane implemented on another street. A majority of commenters expressed concern and disapproval of the Westwood Blvd. bike lane and its effects on the surrounding neighborhood. The main concern was that cars would begin driving through the residential streets. There were a few suggestions that the bike lane should be moved from Westwood Blvd. to residential streets or Sepulveda. A number of commenters expressed support for a bike lane on Westwood.

Response: The many viewpoints about the roadway configuration of Westwood point to the challenges that lay head for implementing “complete street” improvements. While the Plan sets out a vision for potential future configurations, further design discussions and improvements will rely on additional conversations with multiple participants. In consideration of the multiple transportation demands of Westwood Blvd, now and in the future, with the opening of Exposition Phase II, the Plan proposes to include Westwood on the Transit Enhanced Network while retaining short portions of Westwood on the Bicycle Enhanced Network. Remaining portions of Westwood would retain their existing bicycle lanes. Recognizing that all bicyclists may not be comfortable riding on the portions of Westwood without a protected bicycle lane, streets parallel to Westwood on the Neighborhood Enhanced Network could provide an option for bicyclists who desire a calmer bicycling environment.

**Complete Streets**

Comment: The Mobility Plan received many comments relating to “Complete Streets”. Of the comments received a majority of commenters support implementing “Complete Street” elements while some expressed concern about moving away from the City’s current priority of moving cars.

Response: Complete streets are the fundamental idea behind the update to the Transportation Element. The Mobility Plan lays out goals, policies, and programs to base City decisions on that will lead to the gradual implementation of this Plan. The Plan reinforces the principle that a balanced transportation system which adds choices to our transportation system is key to world class infrastructure. A pivotal policy shift in the City of LA will take time. Complete street policies do not prohibit the movement of vehicles; such policies only facilitate additions of other modes to the transportation framework.

**Network Revisions (BEN and TEN)**

Comment: The Mobility Plan received comments relating to BEN/Bicycle routes. These commenters reflected the different routes that individuals believed should be included in the BEN. Examples include a bike lane down Santa Monica Blvd., bike lanes supplementing the Crenshaw Line, and a major increase in bike infrastructure in the Central and South APC.
The Mobility Plan also received comments regarding public transit routes. Several of these commenters were advocating for more rail in the San Fernando Valley. Other route suggestions included the Sepulveda Pass Project and a Harbor Subdivision Line.

Response: Changes to the bicycle and transit enhanced networks have been made in this revision of the proposed Plan based on comments from the public, council offices, and other City and regional departments. These revisions reflect roadway constraints and opportunities that were expressed during the comment period. It is important to note, however, that while the BEN establishes an overall vision of a connected network based on destinations, collisions, connecting gaps, etc, future conditions may warrant parallel corridors be considered as an alternative. Revisions to the TEN may also be required as ridership data changes or funding opportunities arise.

Crosswalks
Comment: The Mobility Plan received comments regarding crosswalks. A majority of these commenters were in support of more crosswalks and wanted all legs of an intersection to be striped with crosswalks. Several commenters also called for more curb bulb-outs and a greater use of continental crosswalks.

Response: The Plan supports the enhancement of our pedestrian infrastructure citing safety as the first consideration of pedestrian movement. The Complete Street Manual describes pedestrian infrastructure in context and supports the implementation of crosswalks on all legs. Curb bulb-outs are also described in the Manual as being supportive of pedestrian safety. Continental crosswalks are now the standard treatment for crosswalks and LADOT is in the process of restriping all crosswalks in the City as funding allows.

Safety
Comment: The Mobility Plan received many comments regarding safety topics. Of the comments, many were related to Bicycle safety. The majority of these commenters stated that bicyclists must be given a safety way to travel along the streets. In addition, the commenters stated that bicycle safety should be taken into account whenever road repair work is being done. A majority of the commenters similarly believe that a greater emphasis must be placed on pedestrian and bicycle safety. Several commenters argue that bicycle lanes must be separated from automobile lanes for safety purposes.

The Mobility Plan received some comments specifying a need to prioritize safety around school zones. In addition to these comments the Mobility Plan received comments relating to safety along the City’s highways and streets. Several of these commenters were concerned with vehicle speeds, specifically vehicles traveling at higher speeds through local neighborhoods.

The Mobility Plan received comments regarding pedestrian safety. The commenters were largely concerned with the lack of safety designs for pedestrians, specifically where they intersect with vehicles and buses.

The Mobility Plan received many comments regarding the topic of safety in general. Several of these commenters were concerned that the Mobility Plan did not stress the idea of safer streets enough in the document. Similarly, several of these commenters believed that all modes of transportation should be given equal rights and safety measures.
Response: The Mobility Plan’s number one goal for the City’s transportation system is Safety First. This aligns with the number one goal of LADOT. In this version of the proposed Plan, the collision objective in chapter one was changed to Vision Zero because any city should strive to reduce transportation related deaths as much as possible – to zero. To support Vision Zero, there are policies and programs in the Plan that support LADOT’s Safe Routes to School program currently being implemented. To reduce bicycle collisions, a network of fully protected bicycle lanes is being proposed in this Plan. In addition, the Complete Streets Design Guide calls out target operating speeds for the City’s different street classifications to ensure the safety of other road users and ensure that are streets are being designed to perform safely.

Health
Comment: The Mobility Plan received many comments regarding health related issues. Two of these commenters spoke of the relationship between access to healthy food and transportation. The commenters spoke of the increased health benefits of having access to healthier food options. Four commenters expressed concern with the detrimental health effects due to goods movement, particularly due to air pollution. The plan also received three comments in support of increasing access to public transportation in addition to other active transportation modes to increase health.

Response: The Plan makes the nexus between transportation and public health with Goal Four: Clean Environments and Healthy Communities. A healthy transportation system supports the makings of a healthy city. Healthy food access is addressed in the City’s new Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles. Policies that support safer and easier walking and biking environments to access different parts of our city are addressed in the Mobility Plan.

Funding
The Mobility Plan received a large number of comments regarding funding issues. Of these, many comments were related to Bicycle Funding. A majority of these commenters expressed concern with future funding of the BEN network. These commenters believe that the BEN network requires a greater percentage of funding, and that those funding levels should remain constant. There were a few commenters against funding the BEN.

The Mobility Plan also received comments regarding active transportation funding. A majority of these commenters were in support of increasing active transportation funds. Several commenters argued that active transportation projects receive funding disproportionate to their actual ridership levels.

The Plan received comments regarding “Green Street” funding. All of these commenters believe that funding for “Green Streets” should be increased. The Mobility Plan received comments relating to Public Transportation funding. Several commenters were concerned with the low staff levels currently allocated for implementing public transportation projects. Several commenters believe that Measure R funds need to be properly allocated for the balancing of transportation projects.

Response: The Mobility Plan sets the framework to allocate funding based on objectives listed in Chapter Two and Policies 2.13 and 4.6. The Plan’s objectives and policies seek to increase funding of active transportation projects that have multiple benefits for different modes and outcome objectives such as public health and the environment.
Metrics, Project Evaluation, and Performance
Comment: The Mobility Plan received many comments regarding mobility-related metrics and standards. Of the comments received, many were related to active transportation. The commenters were in favor of the Mobility Plan’s active transportation policies, but were concerned with the lack of metrics and evaluation related to when projects are implemented. Another concern was the regularity with which the metrics would be applied and evaluated. In addition to these comments the Mobility Plan received comments regarding public transportation metrics. Similarly, these commenters wanted to see more performance reports on our current and future transit systems. Commenters were in favor of more regular reporting to determine if implemented projects in place are successful. A few commenters wanted to use more prioritization metrics and evaluation to determine future implementation of public transportation and bicycle routes.

Response: Evaluation of projects after implementation is a policy identified in the Mobility Plan: Policy 4.7 - evaluate performance of new transportation strategies through the collection and analysis of data. The Mobility Plan supports project evaluation as data collection, analysis, and monitoring are instrumental to the smart investment in, and development of, programs and strategies that will improve the Citywide transportation system.

Outreach
Comment: The Mobility Plan received some comments regarding outreach. Of these comments, some were regarding improving multi-lingual outreach. The Mobility Plan received some comments regarding outreach in general. These commenters expressed that there was not enough outreach done throughout communities. There were several commenters concerned with reaching younger communities.

Response: Given the scale, diversity, and geographic reach of the City, the Mobility Plan team employed a multi-pronged outreach strategy (For more details about outreach, please see the section on Public Participation starting on page 13):

- The 98 Neighborhood Councils were engaged
- An online town hall (ideas.la2b.org) was used to connect those traditionally not involved in public meetings
- A task force was convened to receive guidance from community groups, nonprofits, academic institutions, and other city and regional departments
- To maximize opportunities to reach a larger segment of the population, Mobility Plan staff presented at major outreach events that convened a cross-section of stakeholder groups
- Seven community planning forums were held citywide to capture a large audience. At each of these meetings, Spanish translation was available, as well as Korean, Chinese, Armenian, and other targeted languages for specific areas. Requests for translation needs were noticed in the meeting flyers.
- Outreach to younger communities were a component to the seven regional planning forums as there was a youth planning activity going on that invited local schools and youth programs to participate.

The Mobility Plan is a citywide document that set broad goals and policies for our transportation system. As projects get implemented, a more targeted approach will be used to identify specific community concerns and translation can be made available into the particular dominant language in the area.
Circulation Element Requirements
Comment: The Plan received a comment on why only Complete Streets were being addressed in the update of this plan and why not the other components to the Circulation Element of the General Plan were not included.

Response: The State requires that each jurisdiction’s general plan include seven mandatory elements: Land Use, Circulation, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Safety, and Noise, but communities may also include additional elements that are tailored to meet specific needs and concerns. While State law requires that the various plans be internally consistent, cities are free to select a distinct name for each element and are permitted to combine and/or disaggregate the individual components of the elements in a manner that is practical for the jurisdiction. The City of LA disaggregates the Circulation Element into three elements: Transportation, Infrastructure Systems, and Public Facilities and Services. The City of Los Angeles is a mega city with 34 city departments that oversee various circulation components. The Office of Planning and Research in the State of California states in General Plan formulation guidelines that a City can plan and divide circulation element components as it sees fit, as long as planning is occurring. The Mobility Plan covers the same components as the previous 1999 Transportation Plan did. Other components continue to be covered by the long range planning efforts of the Port of LA, LADWP, and Public Works.

Consistency with the Framework Element and General Plan
Comment: A few commenters were concerned that the proposed Mobility Plan was inconsistent with the other General Plan components, including the Framework Element. A commenter expressed concern that transportation infrastructure projects proposed in Mobility Plan 2035 were intended to increase density without regard to the necessary planning of other infrastructure components relating to the development of land use.

Response: The Framework is intended to offer “a strategy for long-term growth which sets a citywide context to guide the update of the community plan and citywide elements.” The Framework is not intended to cause population or employment growth to occur but, rather, to plan for and accommodate changes in population and employment that may occur in the future. The Framework calls out for protecting our single family neighborhoods by concentrating growth (should it occur) to specific corridors so that our single family areas stay intact. The Proposed Plan is consistent with this framework for growth in that it concentrates transportation infrastructure around commercial centers and corridors and other areas with already high need for transportation infrastructure. The DEIR of the Plan calls out related transportation policies in the Framework and Community Plans and makes the consistency connection with each to the Mobility Plan. Transportation policies and programs proposed by the Mobility Plan are intended to meet the infrastructure demands of our City’s high use areas. As stated in the response to the previous comment above on Circulation Element requirements, infrastructure planning for other Circulation Element components are under the purview of the Port of LA, Public Works (Bureau of Sanitation), LAPD, LAFD, LADWP to ensure that the City can provide the necessary resources as development occurs.
EXHIBIT A: Proposed Resolution
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RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Transportation Element of the General Plan was adopted by the City Council in 1999; and

WHEREAS, the Highways and Freeways Map of the Transportation Element of the General Plan was adopted by the City Council in 1999 and periodically updated to reclassify selected streets; and

WHEREAS, the Mobility Plan 2035 updates the Transportation Element to reflect complete street principles and other strategies to support streets as public places for the safe utilization of all modes of transportation (e.g. pedestrians, bicyclists, transit goods movement, vehicles); and;

WHEREAS, the City’s street designations are being updated to establish a total of five arterial classifications with corresponding dimensions that more closely reflect existing street dimensions; and

WHEREAS, the Highways and Freeways Map of the Mobility Plan updates the Highways and Freeways Map to assign each arterial street to one of the new arterial classifications; and

WHEREAS, the Hearing Officer, as a representative of the City Planning Commission held seven public hearings on the proposed Plan on March 15th, 19th, 22nd, and 29th and April 2nd, 5th and 12th, 2014; and

WHEREAS, a notice of public hearing was published in the Los Angeles Times on February 13, 2014, and distributed through the Council Offices, in accordance with Section 12.32-C4 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code; and

WHEREAS, the City Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on November 20, 2014; and

WHEREAS, evidence, both written and oral, was duly presented to and considered by the City Planning Commission at the aforesaid public hearing, including but not limited to a staff report, exhibits, appendices, and public testimony; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the City Charter and ordinance provisions, the Mayor and the City Planning Commission have transmitted their recommendations.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Transportation Element of the General Plan be amended as the Mobility Plan 2035.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Highways and Freeways Map be updated to assign each arterial street to one of the new arterial classifications.
EXHIBIT B: Proposed Mobility Plan 2035

CPC-2013-0190-GPA-SP-CA-MSC

For consideration by the City Planning Commission
November 20, 2014
See links for proposed Mobility Plan 2035 and Map Atlas:


EXHIBIT C:
Draft Environmental Impact Report

CPC-2013-0190-GPA-SP-CA-MSC

For consideration by the City Planning Commission
November 20, 2014
See link for Draft Environmental Impact Report (ENV 2013-0911-EIR) released February 2014:
http://planning.lacity.org/EIR/MobilityPlan/DEIR/index.html
EXHIBIT D:
Complete Streets Design Guide

CPC-2013-0190-GPA-SP-CA-MSC

For consideration by the City Planning Commission
November 20, 2014
See link for Complete Street Design Guide:

https://losangeles2b.files.wordpress.com/2012/12/complete-street-design-guide-nov-20144.pdf
EXHIBIT E: NACTO Urban Street Design Guide
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For consideration by the City Planning Commission
November 20, 2014
Please see: http://nacto.org/usdg
EXHIBIT F:  
NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide
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For consideration by the City Planning Commission
November 20, 2014
Please see: http://nacto.org/cities-for-cycling/design-guide/
EXHIBIT G:
Proposed Amendments to LAMC 17.05 Design Standards
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For consideration by the City Planning Commission
November 20, 2014
ORDINANCE NO. _____________

An ordinance amending Subsections A, B, D, E, F and G of Section 17.05 Design Standards of the Los Angeles Municipal Code in order to redefine the role of the Street Standards Committee, modify the timeframe in which new street standards become effective, and refine several street design standards.

THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES
DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Subsections A and B of Section 17.05 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code are hereby amended to read:

SEC.17.05. DESIGN STANDARDS.

A. Street Standards Committee. There is hereby created a Street Standards Committee (Committee) to be composed of the Director of Planning, as Chairman, the City Engineer and the General Manager of the Department of Transportation.

It shall be the duty of this committee to:

1. recommend to the Commission minimum width and improvement standards for all classes of public and private streets and alleys. The Commission shall adopt such minimum width and improvement standards as it determines are necessary for the safe and adequate movement of pedestrians, bicyclists, transit service and vehicular traffic, increased retention and detention of stormwater, installation of necessary utilities and reasonable and proper access to abutting property.

Said standards shall not, however, be applicable to any street or alley for which the City Council, by ordinance, adopts specific standards.

2. Modify the Complete Street Design Guide (CSDG) on an as-needed basis to align the CSDM with current and innovative street design practice.

B. Adoption Of Standards. All such standards adopted by the Commission shall remain in effect for at least one year. A public hearing shall be conducted by the Commission prior to the approval of any change in such standards. No such change will become effective until 180 days after adoption by the Commission.

No change in such standards after the approval of the Tentative Map shall be imposed as a condition to the recording of a Final Map of a subdivision within the prescribed 18 month period. New or changed standards shall not be required to be met as a condition of permitting a one year extension of time if substantial grading operations have been completed before such extension is requested.
Section 2. Subsections D.6 and D.7 of Section 17.05 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code are hereby amended to read:

D. Streets.

6. Intersections. Street intersections shall be as near right angle as possible. No jogs shall be allowed in the continuity of an major or secondary highwayarterial street. Jogs in a minor or local-non-arterial street where crossing major or secondary highwaysan arterial street shall be held to a minimum. Multiple intersections of more than four approaches should be avoided. In hillside areas special conditions may be required.

7. Cul-de-sac Streets. Where C ul–de–sac streets should be avoided except in locations where physical constraints (river, railroad infrastructure) prohibit the continuation of the street or where historic development patterns need to be taken into consideration. Where cul-de-sac streets are approved, they shall be terminated by a turning area conforming to the latest standards approved by the Commission. Where feasible, existing cul-de-sacs should be modified, and new cul-de-sacs should be designed to include a passageway for bikes and pedestrians to provide connectivity to the surrounding area.

Section 3. Subsections E, F and G of Section 17.05 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code are hereby amended to read:

E. Alleys.
1. Alleys shall be not less than 20 feet in width. Alley serving industrial zones shall be 30 feet wide, unless otherwise approved by the Advisory Agency. All dead-end alleys shall be provided with adequate turning areas. Whenever practicable alleys shall be required at the rear of all lots which are in residential zones and which front an major or secondary highwayarterial street; alleys may also be required at the rear of lots in commercial and industrial zones.

2. Alley Intersections. Where two alleys intersect, a triangular corner cut-off of not less than ten feet along each alley line shall be provided.

F. Pedestrian Walks. If it is determined by the Advisory Agency that inner-block pedestrian walks are necessary for the public health, safety or welfare, they shall be dedicated to a width of not less than 40-12 feet.

G. Blocks. Residential and Industrial Blocks shall not exceed 1,700 feet in length, except in hilly areas. Commercial blocks shall not exceed 800 feet in length except in locations where the prevailing (within ½ mile) block length is less than 800' the new block shall not exceed the average prevailing block length. The number of intersections of local streets with major and secondary highways shall be kept at a minimum.
Section 4. The City Clerk shall certify to the passage of this ordinance and have it published in accordance with Council policy, either in a daily newspaper circulated in the City of Los Angeles or by posting for ten days in three public places in the City of Los Angeles: one copy on the bulletin board located at the Main Street entrance to the Los Angeles City Hall; one copy on the bulletin board located at the Main Street entrance to the Los Angeles City Hall East; and one copy on the bulletin board located at the Temple Street entrance to the Los Angeles County Hall of Records.

I hereby certify that this ordinance was passed by the Council of the City of Los Angeles, by a majority vote of all of its members, at its meeting of ___________________________.

HOLLY L. WOLCOTT, City Clerk

By_________________________________
Deputy

Approved____________________________

Approved as to Form and Legality

MICHAEL FEUER, City Attorney

By______________________________
KENNETH T. FONG
Deputy City Attorney

Date______________________________
EXHIBIT H: Street Standard Plans - S-470
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Standard Street Conditions

1. City Council may, by ordinance, adopt specific standards for individual streets that differ from these official standard street dimensions. Community Plans and Specific Plans should be reviewed for footnotes, instructions and/or modified street dimensions that would require standards different than those indicated on this Standard Plan.

2. For additional guidance as to the use of the roadway and sidewalk area please refer to the Complete Street Manual.

3. For discretionary projects requiring action from the Department of City Planning (Planning), Planning shall include specific information as to the design and utilization of the sidewalk area.

4. All streets, with the exception of hillside streets, may incorporate approved green street standard plans to expand stormwater detention and retention capacities when determined feasible by the Bureau of Sanitation.

5. Where a designated arterial crosses another designated arterial street and then changes in designation to a street of lesser standard width, the arterial shall be tapered in a Standard Flare Section on both sides, as illustrated below, to meet the width of the lesser designation and provide an orderly transition.

6. Private street development should conform to the standard public street dimensions shown on this street, where appropriate. Variations may be approved on a case-by-case basis by the decision maker.

7. Hillside Collector Streets. In hillside areas where topography or other environmental considerations, documented to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, would render full street improvements infeasible, the roadway width may be reduced to no less than 32 feet, provided that parking is limited to one side only.

8. Fifty-foot curb radii (instead of the standard 35’ curb radii) shall be provided for cul-de-sacs in industrial areas. See cul-de-sac illustration for further design standards.

9. Alleys shall be a minimum of 20’ in width and intersections and/or dead-end terminus shall be designed to conform to the Alley illustrations included herein.

10. Where sidewalk is constructed on the fill or low side of a hillside street, a berm may be required on private property.

11. For intersections of streets, the following dedications shall apply:
   a. Intersections of arterial streets with any other street: 15’ x 15” cut corner or 20’ curved corner radius.
   b. Intersections on non-arterial and/or hillside streets: 10’ x 10’ cut corner or 15’ curved corner radius.
ARTERIAL STREETS

Boulevard I (Major Highway Class I)

Boulevard II (Major Highway Class II)

Avenue I (Secondary Highway)

Avenue II (Secondary Highway)

Avenue III (Secondary Highway)
OTHER PUBLIC RIGHTS-OF-WAY

Hillside Collector

3' Berm on Private Property

Access Roadway
Limited to private streets only that access no more than four dwelling units and are a maximum of 300' in length

Hillside Local

One-Way Service Road

Hillside Limited

Bi-Directional Service Road

Shared Street

Pedestrian Walkway
Skid Draining

Pedestrian Walkway
Center Draining

Stormwater Greenway

Public Stairway

Tread and riser dimensions shall remain constant throughout the stairway.
Treads shall be 11" min - 12" max.
Risers shall be 6" min - 7" max.
Stairway width between railings shall be no less than 3' wide.
Right of way shall have a minimum vertical rise of 12" before a bending.
Landing shall have a minimum length of 4' and must have at least the same width as the steps.
All stairways with 3 or more steps shall include a handrail on both sides (refer to S-463-2).
Between flights of steps, tamplate shall be continuous across landing.
Also refer to S-463-9 "Concrete Stairway".

Image not drawn to Scale
**Transitional Extensions**

Standard Flare Section
(Plan View)

Cul-De-Sac
(Plan View)

May Be Unsymmetrical

Note: For fire truck clearance, no obstruction taller than 6" shall be permitted within 3 ft. of the curb. On-street parking shall be prohibited.

**Alleys**
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Standard Street Dimensions

10. Hillside Collector Streets. In hillside areas where topography or other environmental considerations, documented to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, would render full street improvements infeasible, the roadway width may be reduced to no less than 32 feet, provided that parking is limited to one side only.

11. Non-arterial streets in rural areas of the City need not include a curb, gutter and sidewalk nor provide parkway and/or pedestrian street lighting as long as an equestrian trail and/or segregated pedestrian path of travel is provided in a clearly marked trail outside of the roadway but within the right-of-way.

12. Streets shall be designed and managed to maintain identified Targeted Operating Speeds (TOS).

13. Fifty-foot curb radii (instead of the standard 35' curb radii) shall be provided for cul-de-sacs in industrial areas. See cul-de-sac illustration for further design standards.

14. Alleys shall be a minimum of 20' in width and intersections and/or dead-end terminus shall be designed to conform with the Alley illustrations included herein.

15. Sidewalk width may be reduced where DCP makes a determination that 1) the existing building street wall is historic and should be maintained or 2) the parcel depth would be reduced to less than 125 feet, 3) other circumstances, to be documented, justify a reduction in the sidewalk width.

16. Parkway area, or portions of the sidewalk width devoted to tree wells on Arterial and Non-Arterial Streets, shall be no less than five feet in width as long as a minimum walkway portion is maintained as per the American Disabilities Act. An exception is made for portions of the sidewalk utilized for transit boarding and alighting, corners and outdoor dining.

17. The parkway area(s) shall be maintained by the adjoining property owner, except that the City shall be responsible for the maintenance of any established trees located in the parkway.

18. Street trees and landscaping shall be included in all sidewalks. In accordance with special order S018-0372, dated March 27, 1972.

19. An additional parkway area may be provided between the walkway and the property line, or building face.

20. Where sidewalk is constructed on the fill or low side of a hillside street, a berm may be required on private property.

21. An easement, in lieu of dedication, may be obtained, at the discretion of the adjoining property owner, for that portion of the sidewalk in excess of 10' in order to bring the sidewalk width into compliance with the respective sidewalk standard.
EXHIBIT I:
Proposed Repeal of Former Street Designations
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ORDINANCE NO. _____________

WHEREAS the City’s street designations are being updated to establish a total of five arterial classifications with corresponding dimensions that more closely reflect existing street dimensions; and

WHEREAS the Highways and Freeways Map of the Transportation Element of the General Plan is being updated to assign each arterial street to one of the new arterial classifications; and

WHEREAS it is the intent of the City to align all streets to the new nomenclature; and

WHEREAS previous street designations adopted by ordinance used the current street designation nomenclature which differs from the new classifications; and

WHEREAS the Highways and Freeways Map will reflect the re-designation of all arterial streets in the City to the new nomenclature;

THEREFORE:

THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES
DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Sec. 1. Those portions of any and all ordinances and/or specific plans that established street designations for any arterial street or arterial street segment are hereby repealed.
Sec. 2. The City Clerk shall certify to the passage of this ordinance and have it published in accordance with Council policy, either in a daily newspaper circulated in the City of Los Angeles or by posting for ten days in three public places in the City of Los Angeles: one copy on the bulletin board located at the Main Street entrance to the Los Angeles City Hall; one copy on the bulletin board located at the Main Street entrance to the Los Angeles City Hall East; and one copy on the bulletin board located at the Temple Street entrance to the Los Angeles County Hall of Records.

I hereby certify that this ordinance was passed by the Council of the City of Los Angeles, **by a majority vote** of all of its members, at its meeting of ____________________________.

HOLLY L. WOLCOTT, City Clerk

By________________________________________

Deputy

Approved______________________________

______________________________

Mayor

Approved as to Form and Legality

MICHAEL FEUER, City Attorney

By________________________________________

KENNETH T. FONG
Deputy City Attorney

Date______________________________
EXHIBIT J: Proposed Public Facilities and Freeways Nomenclature
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The Land Use Designations and Corresponding Zone Maps for all of the community plans are updated to reflect the following change:

Freeways shall be shown as “Public Facilities-Freeway”