DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

RECOMMENDATION REPORT

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Date: May 28, 2015
Time: 8:30 a.m.

Place: Van Nuys City Hall, Council Chamber, 2nd Floor, 14410 Sylvan Street, Van Nuys, CA 91401

Public Hearing: Public Hearing Required
Public Hearings held on March 15, 19, 22, 29 and April 2, 5, and 12, 2014

Appeal Status: Not Applicable

PROJECT LOCATION: Citywide

Case No.: **CPC-2013-0910-GPA-SP-CA-MSC**
CEQA No.: **ENV 2013-0911-EIR**
Incidental Cases: N/A
Related Cases: N/A
Council No.: All

Applicant: Department of City Planning

PROPOSED PROJECT: **Mobility Plan 2035.** The proposed Plan is an update to the 1999 City of Los Angeles Transportation Element of the General Plan and incorporates complete street policies to guide 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 transit, walking, bicycling, driving, and carsharing. 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 concept that prioritize selected roadway potential for future 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-470-1 Street Standards Plan
5. Technical Amendments to Los Angeles Municipal Code Sections
6. Five Year Implementation Strategy

REQUESTED ACTION: 1. Pursuant to procedures set forth in Section 11.5.6 of the Municipal Code and City Charter Sections 555, amend the General Plan to update the Transportation Element by adopting the Mobility Plan 2035 (Exhibit A-1) and by adopting the attached Resolution (Exhibit A).

2. Take related actions to implement the Mobility Plan 2035, including among other actions, making amendments to the Land Use Element (35 Community Plans), adopting an ordinance to implement the new street standards and complete street principles, and adopts Complete Street Design Guidelines.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

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

2. **Approve** the staff report as the City Planning Commission Report.

3. **Approve and recommend that the City Council adopt a** resolution certifying Final Environmental Impact Report (attached as Exhibit C), including taking all of the following actions:

   a. Adopt the attached Findings of Fact (Exhibit C-2).
   b. Approve the Mitigation Monitoring Plan (Exhibit C-3).
   c. Adopt the Statement of Overriding Considerations (Exhibit C-2(Section 5))

4. **Approve** and recommend that the Mayor approve and the City Council adopt the draft Resolution (attached as Exhibit "A"), which does all of the following:
   a. Adopts the Mobility Plan 2035 (attached as Exhibit A-1)as an amendment to the Transportation Element to the General Plan of the City of Los Angeles, including adopting the Citywide Circulation System Maps as the update to the Highways and Freeways Map (see Exhibit A1 - pgs 19-24 in the MP 2035).
   b. Adopts amendments to the General Plan Land Use Element (consisting of the City's 35 community plans) to make it consistent with the Mobility Plan 2035 (including as provided in Exhibit "A-2") and do all of the following:

      i. Amend Sylmar 2015 Community Plan text to align with Mobility Plan.

      ii. Update the text of the following three pending community plans that have been approved by City Planning Commission but not yet adopted by City Council to align with complete streets nomenclature of the Mobility Plan: Granada Hills-Knollwood, San Pedro, and West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Park

      iii. Update the text of the following 31 community plans to align with complete streets nomenclature of the Mobility Plan: Arleta-Pacoima, Bel Air-Beverly Crest, Boyle Heights, Brentwood-Pacific Palisades, Canoga Park-Woodland Hills-West Hills-Winnetka, Central City , Central City North, Chatsworth-Porter Ranch, Encino-Tarzana, Harbor Gateway, Hollywood, Mission Hills-Panorama City-North Hills, North Hollywood, Northeast Los Angeles, Northridge, Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey, Reseda-West, Van Nuys, Sherman Oaks-Studio City-Toluca Lake, Silver Lake-Echo Park-Elysian Valley , South Los Angeles, Southeast Los Angeles, Sun Valley-La Tuna Canyon, Sunland-Tujunga, Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks, Venice, West Los Angeles, Westchester-Playa Del Rey, Westlake, Westwood, Wilmington-Harbor City, Wilshire.

      iv. Update community plan circulation maps to align with nomenclature and street classifications of Mobility Plan.

   c. Directs the Director of Planning to update all the land use designations and corresponding zone maps for all of the community plans to reflect the following change: Freeways shall be shown as "Public Facilities-Freeway," as provided in Exhibit "A-3".

5. **Approve** and **Recommend** the City Council **Adopt** the draft Ordinance amending the L.A.M.C. to implement the new street standards and complete street principles (attached as Exhibit D).

6. **Approve** and **Recommend** the City Council Adopt the Resolution attached as Exhibit "B" which does all of the following:

b. Adopt the NACTO Urban Street Design Guide and Urban Bikeway Design Guide as supplements to the above Guide (attached as Exhibit "B-2").

MICHAEL J. LOGRANDE
Director of Planning

Ken Bernstein, AICP
Principal City Planner

Claire Bowin, Senior City Planner

My La, City Planning Associate
(213-978-1194)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROJECT ANALYSIS

Project Summary

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.

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 an action plan that form the policy direction for achieving complete streets
- New street standards (S-470-1) that recognize the multi-modal role of streets
- Redesignation of City streets to reflect new street standards and typical 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
- Technical Revisions to the Los Angeles Municipal Code to align with the proposed Plan
- A Five-Year Implementation Strategy that prioritizes programs in the Action Plan for implementation within a defined five-year time period. The Strategy is dependent upon staff and funding availability.

The Mobility Plan is a four year culmination of gathering information, drafting documents, and revising based on input. Since the inception of the Mobility Plan in the Fall of 2011, planning staff have held hundreds of meetings with city departments, community groups, and other interested parties. The Draft Plan, Draft EIR, and accompanying documents were first released during February 2014. A recirculated Draft EIR and revised Draft Plan were released in February 2015. On November 20, 2014, planning staff presented the proposed Plan to City Planning Commission. On March 12, 2015 planning staff was asked to come back to City Planning commission with a preliminary Five Year Implementation Strategy for discussion.

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.

The General Plan is a comprehensive declaration of purposes, policies and programs that guide and establish the future form and development of the City. In Los Angeles, the General Plan is 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 General Plan consists of:

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

Changing Demographics

This plan responds to changing demographics, a younger population desiring a wider variety of safe and accessible transportation choices, a growing number of residents and employees seeking alternatives to the car, and an aging population that may need a wider variety of mobility options as well. 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. Today, many 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 driver's 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

[1] http://newsroom.aaa.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Teens-Delay-Licensing-FTS-Report.pdf

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.

Changes in demographics; increased analysis 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 solo. 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.

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. The plan also provides policy guidance on how the role of future mobility technological advancements such as car-sharing apps, can be integrated into a complete streets system. Meanwhile, the plan acknowledges the necessary and continued investments that are needed to improve the variety of safe, comfortable, and attractive transportation choices.

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

There are strong relationships among land use, transportation, and public health. A large and growing body of academic literature points to the benefits of improved urban design that can increase active transportation use, which in turn spurs community interaction, economic activity, and fosters better public health outcomes. Improved urban design, such as wider sidewalks, street trees, street lighting, better land use design, and better access to transit, increases both the utilization of active transportation modes and decreases environmental impacts.

State Legislature

Recent state legislation requires cities to help meet regional goals through their transportation systems. Collectively, the state legislature calls for cities and their transportation systems to contribute to achieving better environmental and public health standards for the region.

AB 32: Global Warming Solutions Act and SB 375: Sustainable Communities Act

[2]http://uspirg.org/sites/pirg/files/reports/A%20New%20Direction%20vUS.pdf

AB 32 calls for the reduction of statewide greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) to 1990 levels by 2020. SB 375 gives fundamental support to AB 32 to achieve regional GHG reduction targets through the coordination of transportation and land use planning. The transportation sector is the largest source of GHG and the largest consumer of energy. GHG emissions are closely correlated with Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Reducing VMT is therefore an important component of the overall strategy to reduce GHG emissions. Land use policies aimed at shortening the distance between housing, jobs, and services reduce the need to travel long distances on a daily basis and can help reach GHG reduction targets. The proposed Plan employs sustainable transportation systems as a solution to creating a livable and green city with a high quality of life.

AB 1358: Complete Streets Act

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, people with disabilities, and more. 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.

SB 743

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.

The State as a whole, and the City of Los Angeles included, is in transition with respect to the focus of transportation planning and traffic impact analysis. In the past the focus has been traffic delay-based with the objective of minimizing vehicle delay wherever possible. In the future, as directed by SB 743, the State, including the City of Los Angeles, will move to a VMT-focus, with the objective being to reduce VMT (and therefore GHG) as appropriate. Mobility Plan 2035 is a long-term plan intended to complement the VMT-focus of future transportation planning and implement the Complete Streets Act.

Existing Community Plans include policies related to decreasing delay and improving Level of Service (LOS); these policies may not be entirely compatible with reducing VMT and therefore they will be re-evalutated as Community Plans are updated. As Community Plans are updated they will need to reflect the latest RTP/SCS, the proposed Plan (once adopted), and the Complete Streets Act, as well as input from the community.

Until the OPR Guidelines implementing SB 743 are finalized and become effective, and the City's corresponding CEQA Guidelines are revised and adopted, the City will continue to weigh and implement individual projects considering both delay and VMT, and mitigating impacts for both. In the future, reducing VMT will become more of a priority, and mitigation measures that

only reduce delay may no longer be required and therefore may not be implemented. Consistent with the proposed Plan, Community Plans and private projects will be required to plan for and implement mitigation measures that reduce VMT, including aggressive Transportation Demand Management, and physical improvements that support the enhanced networks identified in the proposed Plan.

Discussion of Key Issues

Mobility Plan

Mobility Plan 2035 is a comprehensive revision of the adopted 1999 City of Los Angeles Transportation Element of the General Plan that will guide mobility decisions in the City through year 2035, coupled with supporting documents and discretionary actions to further align the City's street standards, processes and procedures with the goals of the proposed Plan. These other components to the Plan, along with the enhanced networks and implementation strategy, will be further discussed in this section.

Mobility Plan 2035 includes five overarching goals that make up the essence of the Plan and 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).

Five Goals of the Mobility Plan 2035

Goal 1. Safety First
Safety is at the foundation of a Complete Streets policy – to design and operate streets in a way that enables safe access for all users, regardless of age, ability, or transportation mode choice. Safety consistently ranks as a top priority for many in the City of Los Angeles and is an important factor in creating livable neighborhoods. People want streets to be safe, stress-free places for all ages and all modes of travel.

Goal 2. World Class Infrastructure
Infrastructure is the physical underpinning of the City's transportation system. In the City of Los Angeles, streets are our largest public asset and play a large role in defining the City's character. A well-maintained and connected network of streets, paths, bikeways, trails, and more provides Angelenos with the optimum variety of mode choices. This Plan establishes a Complete Streets Network of individual roads enhanced for a particular mode (pedestrians bicycles, transit, vehicles, trucks). It also focuses attention on the benefits of flexible design standards, needed future infrastructure improvements and funding.

Goal 3. Access for All Angelenos
Accessibility is the ability to reach destinations. Emphasizing accessibility as a goal of a transportation system produces outcomes that speak to the important connection between land use and transportation. Accessibility is the goal of a seamless world class transportation system with the end result of increasing the ease of traveling to desired destinations such as jobs, recreation, and other resources. A fair and equitable system must be accessible to all.

Goal 4. Collaboration, Communication & Informed Choices

Whether it is providing information about the cost and availability of a public parking space, the arrival of the next bus or the current speeds on a freeway, real-time technology is changing the way we think about our travel. In recent years, the advent of mobile phone applications has resulted in better management of travel decisions due to the predictability that real-time technology provides. The impact of new technologies on our day-to-day mobility demands will continue to become increasingly important in the future. New transportation network companies are using mobile technology to connect ordinary drivers with passengers needing a ride. 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 allows users of the transportation system to easily utilize a variety of modes. These new technologies are allowing people to change their everyday lifestyles with more freedom in transportation choice.

5. Clean Environments and Healthy Communities
Designing walkable neighborhoods and providing more transportation options to connect communities has the benefits of increasing a city's quality of life and decreasing vehicle miles travelled. Transportation is implicated in the health of both human beings and natural systems. Mobility directly impacts human health and wellness, both physical and mental. Active transportation modes such as bicycling and walking can significantly improve personal health and create new opportunities for social interaction, while lessening impacts on the environment.

Objectives

An objective is an aspirational measure of goal attainment. In the Mobility Plan, the objectives follow the goal and precede the policies. Meeting given objectives will depend on available funding to implement the proposed programs. Some key objectives include reducing the City's transportation fatality rate to zero, increasing the mode split of active transportation to 50%, reducing VMT and GHG, and reducing the number of unhealthy air quality days.

Policies

A policy is a clear statement that guides a specific course of action for decision-makers to achieve a desired goal. Information about the intent of the policy is described in the text following the policy. Policies have associated programs (discussed later in the Action Plan section), which are action items that when and if implemented may assist in achieving the larger goals and objectives described in this Plan. In total, the plan includes overs fifty policies. Many policies speak to the need for safe roadway design and increased accessibility for all users. Other policies support the integration of future technologies into our transportation system, as well as introduce sustainability into transportation policy.

Citywide General Plan Circulation Map

The former Highways and Freeways Maps from the 1999 Transportation Element are being updated to reflect the new nomenclature defined in the revised S-470-1 and are rebranded as the Citywide General Plan Circulation Maps. In addition to nomenclature changes, arterial streets are being redesignated to more closely reflect existing street dimensions. The Citywide General Plan Circulation System maps establish the designated street classifications for arterial streets (scenic highways, divided streets, and/or any additional modified distinctions are depicted as well). Citywide Circulation Maps would go into effect concurrent with the adoption of

the S-470-1which is anticipated to occur at the first City Planning Commission meeting following the adoption of the Mobility Plan.

Complete Streets Enhanced Networks

The proposed Plan's approach to accommodating complete streets within the City of LA is through the development of a complete streets network system. The complete street network system is comprised of three enhanced networks and an analysis of potential pedestrian districts, 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.

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. 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.

The networks are a conceptual idea based on data driven analysis of land use, transportation, community input, and other factors. The networks look at our transportation system from a citywide perspective to provide the basis for further local level transportation planning. This tiered approach of regional planning to local planning is done to create a cohesive system that first looks at the bigger picture to link all modes of transportation together before a more local level analysis of circulation can be done. Implementation of individual projects within the enhanced networks will require further environmental analysis, design development, and community collaboration.

Pedestrian Infrastructure

Pedestrian Enhanced Districts (PEDs): The Pedestrian Enhanced Districts (PEDs) map illustrates the results of initial analysis that was done to clarify where pedestrian improvements on arterial streets could be prioritized to provide better walking connections to and from major destinations. This analysis will guide decision makers in determining where to allocate improvements. The PED will be updated periodically to reflect changing conditions.

Neighborhood Enhanced Network (NEN): The NEN is a network of streets that are intended to provide comfortable and safe routes for localized travel of slower-moving modes such as walking, bicycling, or other slow speed motorized means of travel. 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, round-a-bouts, ample sidewalks and street trees. Some streets (or street segments) on the NEN may already provide a quality pedestrian and bicycle experience and will require little, if any, improvements. Other streets may require the addition of a signalized crosswalk to assist non-motorized users to cross a fast moving arterial street. Other streets also may require a more intense number of improvements to provide the desired comfort level. (See Complete Street Design Guide for an expanded list of street-calming enhancements.)

Bicycle Networks

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 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.

Bicycle Enhanced Network (BEN): The BEN is a regional network of low-stress bikeways. This network is comprised primarily of protected bicycle paths and bicycle facilities on arterials roadways with physical separation, also known as protected bikeways or cycle tracks. The protected bikeways represent a portion of the Bicycle Lane Network described below. To provide a complete network, the BEN also includes priority segments of the NEN to offer low stress bikeway options through parts of the City where opportunities to include a protected bicycle facility are limited.

Bicycle Lane Network: The Bicycle Lane Network proposes bicycle facilities on arterial roadways with striped separation. This network includes the Backbone Network identified in the 2010 Bicycle Plan, as well as additional lanes that were either installed between 2011 and 2015 or identified as needed.

Transit Network

Transit Enhanced Network: The designation of a TEN is intended to prioritize key corridors for public transportation which supplements the existing transit network. Improvements along the TEN range from Moderate to Moderate Plus to Comprehensive (as shown on the TEN map in Chapter 6 of the Mobility Plan), based on their benefits and intensity of implementation. The range of treatments and different levels of intensity are focused on improvements to service, infrastructure, and interconnectivity. Moderate enhancements typically include bus stop enhancements and increased service, with transit vehicles continuing to operate in mixed traffic. Moderate Plus enhancements include an exclusive transit lane during the peak period only, while comprehensive enhancements typically include transit vehicles operating in an all-day exclusive lane. Implementation of TEN segments will require continued coordination with transit providers as infrastructure improvements will need to align with operational improvements such as service levels and hours.

Vehicle Network

Vehicle Enhanced Network: The Vehicle Enhanced Network (VEN) consists of arterial streets that carry high volumes of vehicles that are important to regional circulation, and provide access to the freeway system. Maintaining streets for regional circulation is also important to goods movement. The streets identified on this network are intended to provide consistent travel times. Reliable corridors for vehicular movement will continue to play an important role in the ever expanding menu of mobility options, from now and into the future, as we rethink vehicular technologies such as car share and ride share.

Chapter 6 of Mobility Plan: 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 the enhanced networks, as well as, 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
- Parking/Loading Zones
- Planning + Land use
- Public Space
- Schools
- Support Features

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.

Five Year Implementation Strategy and Funding

To assist the City in focusing its resources a Five Year (2015-2020) Implementation Strategy (Strategy) has been developed. (See Exhibit F). The Five Year Implementation Strategy is not required by the Mobility Plan 2035 and was prepared by City Planning, city departments, and

other interested parties. The Five Year Strategy is being provided for informational purposes and is not intended to be adopted by the City Council.

The Strategy uses as its foundation the programs described in Chapter 6 of the Plan, outlining key programs and program level objectives that the City will strive to achieve in the first five years immediately following adoption of the Plan. Implementation is in large part contingent upon the availability of adequate funding and it is anticipated that City departments will utilize the Strategy to guide the development of future fiscal year budget requests.

The implementation of the Enhanced Networks would not automatically occur as a result of adoption of the Plan. Further design, development, and specific right-of-way treatments would be determined only after further analysis and discussion with the community and the City's leadership. The Mobility Plan will provide the framework for future community plans and specific plans that will take a closer look at the Plan's Enhanced Networks and PEDs analysis in specific areas of the City and may recommend more detailed implementation strategies to realize the Plan. In turn, more detailed land use planning may reveal the need for changes to the networks, which will be undertaken as needed to reflect these more detailed planning efforts.

Implementation of any segment of the enhanced networks requires identified funding sources and staffing. Funding is likely to change over time due to economic conditions and to fluctuations in the priorities of federal, state and regional funding agencies. The enhanced network maps identify streets where possible improvements could be prioritized when dedicated resources have been secured. The Plan identifies a citywide network of enhanced streets to make the City more competitive for local, state, and federal transportation funding dollars. This is done to ensure a long range planning process that is comprehensive and cohesive to the rest of the city and surrounding region. Alternative corridors that fulfill the same intent and need of the corridors currently included in the citywide enhanced network maps can be identified during the outreach and design phase.

In order to be more effective with our limited transportation funds this Plan and its policies are shifting the way that projects are prioritized for implementation. Future projects will be prioritized based upon outcomes such as, improving safety, public health and providing social equity and economic benefits. Prioritized project areas will receive focused attention and discussions with the surrounding communities will play a central role in identifying 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. Some programs in the Strategy 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.

New Street Classifications and Complete Street Standards

S-470-1 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-470-1 Standard Plan, which defines the City's street designation system and demonstrates standard cross sections for each type of street. The current street classifications and their corresponding

dimensions reflect the former primary focus on moving automobiles. The new expanded list of classifications and revised S-470-1 aim 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 are retained in the revised S-470-1 to ensure that federal funding and references to the City's streets in other documents remain intact.

The City Planning Commission has the authority to adopt minimum width and improvement standards it determines are necessary for the safe and adequate movement of people for all classes of public and private streets and alleys. Its action follows recommendations of the Street Standards Committee for such changes.

On February 25, 2015, the Director of Planning and Chair of the Street Standards Committee approved the new Standard Street Form No. S-470-1. Concurring with the Director's recommendation, the City Engineer, and General Manager of the Department of Transportation have signed the recommended change. These revisions have been arrived at through collaboration among the City Planning Department, Department of Transportation, and Bureau of Engineering senior level staff, working over a period of 24 months.

These standards will result in preservation of roadway width and widening of sidewalk width. In very limited and specific locations, adoption of the standards may result in a roadway widening. Such standards shall not be applicable to any street or alley for which the City Council, by ordinance, adopts specific standards. The adoption of the S-470-1 is anticipated to occur at the first City Planning Commission meeting following the adoption of the Mobility Plan.

Complete Streets Design Guide

The Complete Streets Design Guide (CSDG) is a complementary document to Mobility Plan 2035. The Plan establishes the Guide as the City's official document to influence the design and operation of streets and other public rights-of-way. Contents of the Guide include: principles for complete streets, selection and performance criteria for streets, storm-water management best practices, designated targeted operating speeds for each street classification to influence roadway design, and prototypical cross-sections.

The Guide is a living document that will frequently get updated as City departments identify and implement streets standards and experiment with different configurations to promote complete streets. The Guide is meant to be a toolkit that provides numerous examples of what is possible in the public right-of-way and provide guidance on context-sensitive design. It will help direct 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. Cities around the country have adopted these two manuals to steer the implementation of complete streets. As a

parallel action to the Mobility Plan, adopting the NACTO street design guides as City documents will provide additional support in the City's efforts to introduce complete street ideas into the design and operation of streets.

L.A.M.C. 17.05 Street Design

Section 17.05 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code 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. The intent is to maintain street design practices within the Complete Street Design Guide that are current, innovative, and respond to the variety of settings found within the City.

12.37 Highway and Collector Street Dedication and Improvement

Section 12.37 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code describes the Highway Dedication procedure that allows the Bureau of Engineering to obtain necessary public street right-of-way from private property owners to meet City Standards. It is being revised to reflect new street classifications, explain street dedication requirements, and rebrand the Highways and Freeways Maps of the General Plan as the Citywide General Plan Circulation Maps. Collectively, these amendments bring clarification to the street dedication process and align with the Mobility Plan's direction to minimize errant roadway widenings.

Summary of Plan Changes since November 2014 City Planning Commission Meeting

The following represents the extent of changes that have been made to the Mobility Plan 2035 since the most recent draft was released in February 2015 along with the Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (RDEIR). The changes were undertaken in response to: comments received during the 45 day public comment period (February 19 - April 6), technical corrections that were identified as needed to remedy either redundancies, typographical errors, or to provide greater clarity to the reader.

Below are network changes that were made in response to concerns from specific community areas:

Valley
Remove Roscoe Boulevard between Canoga Avenue and Van Nuys Boulevard from the BEN and instead substitute Parthenia as a BEN through this same segment. Due to the selection of Roscoe as a TEN corridor it would be infeasible for a protected bicycle lane to also be included.

Hollywood
Remove the portion of Sunset Boulevard between the border with the City of West Hollywood and Highland Avenue from the VEN. Due to changes in the land use patterns along Sunset Boulevard west of Highland as well as the extension of Sunset into an adjoining City where the VEN improvements are not currently being contemplated it was logical to terminate the portion of Sunset on the VEN at a location where it connected with Highland Avenue which is also on the VEN.

Remove the portion of Hollywood Boulevard between Fairfax Avenue and La Brea Boulevard from the BEN. The character of Hollywood Boulevard changes dramatically west of La Brea. The street narrows considerably from two lanes to one lane in each and the land uses change to predominantly multi-family residential uses compared to the heavily commercial character east of La Brea. The roadway constraints would inhibit the opportunity to install even a bicycle lane let alone a protected bicycle lane. Instead it will be preferred to encourage bicyclists to utilize streets on the NEN through this portion of Hollywood.

Remove the portion of Highland Avenue between Hollywood Boulevard and Melrose Avenue from the BEN and instead upgrade Orange Avenue (just west of Highland) to a Priority NEN as a preferred north/south bicycle facility. Because this segment of Highland had also been identified as a VEN corridor it would have been infeasible to accommodate a protected bicycle lane. For the purposes of long range planning Highland is still identified as a possible planned future bicycle lane.

Remove Beachwood Canyon and adjoining local streets north of Franklin from the NEN. The community felt strongly that the potential improvements identified for this corridor would be infeasible due to the steep inclines and curves.

Remove Cahuenga Boulevard between Franklin and Lankershim from the BEN but retain this segment as a potential planned bicycle lane in the long- range. Limited roadway width through the Cahuenga Pass makes the installation of a protected bicycle lane through this corridor infeasible at this time.

Mid-City
Change Sixth Street between San Vicente and Fairfax from a protected bicycle lane on the BEN to a priority NEN segment. This change reflects the narrower road configuration and single family residential uses along this stretch compared to the section east of Fairfax.

Westside
Remove Veteran Avenue from the priority NEN and remove Santa Monica Boulevard west of Westwood Boulevard off of the BEN. Veteran Avenue, due to its hilly condition north of Santa Monica Boulevard, does not provide the most comfortable bicycling experience and therefore it was determined that Prosser Avenue to the east would better serve people that bike with a quality north-south bicycle facility. The east-west segment on Santa Monica Boulevard was removed because it no longer connected.

Modify the priority NEN alignment by replacing the segment of McLaughlin Avenue south of Venice Boulevard with Inglewood Boulevard in order to provide a seamless connection to the Culver Bike path.

Street Designations
The following streets were downgraded due to improved street dimension information that identified these street segments as being narrower than previously had been believed.

South Huntington Drive- Changed from Boulevard II to Avenue III.
Sunset Boulevard/Cesar Chavez between Fountain and Mission from Boulevard II to Avenue I.
Sunset Boulevard between Swarthmore and Rustic Lane from Avenue I to Avenue II.
Fountain between La Brea and Vermont from an Avenue II to a Collector.

La Mirada between Bronson and Van Ness from Avenue III to a Collector and between Van Ness and Wilton to a Local Street

Modified Street Designations
The modified dimension for Motor Avenue between Woodbine Street and Venice Boulevard was changed from 86' Right-of-way/ 66' Roadway to 86' ROW to 62' Roadway to correct a previous typographical error. The roadway dimension today is 62' and not 66.'

Policy Changes
The following policy changes were made in response to public comment.

Policy 2.4 about the Neighborhood Enhanced Network was changed to allow speeds up to 20 mph on a NEN street compared to the original 15 mph. This aligns the street speed with NACTO recommendations.

Policy 4.15 was modified to require a public hearing for the removal of not just bicycle lanes but all bicycle facilities. This change will protect any bicycle facility from being errantly removed without full public discourse.

Text Changes
A reader's guide was added to the Plan to provide a detailed description of the role and purpose of general plans and the adoption and implementation process.

Changes to format and display of Maps
The Highways and Freeways map that originally conveyed only general information about a street's primary designation (Boulevard, Avenue) has been relabeled as the Citywide General Plan Circulation Map and regional maps have been inserted that illustrate not only the street's primary designation but also information as to whether a street segment has modified dimensions, or is also a scenic highway or a divided highway.

Both the Circulation Maps and the Network Maps are now included within the body of the Plan and are no longer a stand-alone Map Atlas.

Upgraded Appendix F.
This Appendix has been upgraded to reflect the complete list of street segments that have modified street dimensions. Modified dimensions imply that either the street's right-of-way or roadway dimensions (or both) differ from the standard dimension for that particular street designation.

Program Deletions
The following programs have been removed as they were determined to be either infeasible, redundant or unnecessary.

Bicycle Buddy Program (was C.2)
County Congestion Mitigation Fee (was F. 4)
Internal Streets Working Group (was MG. 4)
Public Hearing Process for Bicycle Facility Removal (was MG. 6- upgraded to policy)
Technology (was O.10)

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 140 public meetings throughout the city, held four "think lab" workshops, two scoping meetings, seven planning forums, an open house, partnered with GOOD Corps on launching the "LA2B" campaign, 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, neighborhood councils, and council districts.

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.

GOOD Corps LA2B Campaign:
The Mobility Plan collaborated with GOOD Corps to deliver four transportation related infographics (including an interactive video infographic) a mobility contest on what one would do on a car free day, and transit shelter ads that were displayed throughout the City.

Council Districts:
During year one of the outreach phase, project briefings were sent out to council districts to include in their monthly newsletters. All council districts took part in briefing meetings during year three on the Mobility Plan as well. In addition, planning staff meet with council district offices as requested throughout the time span of the project.

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. Neighborhood Councils were notified of major project milestones (including meeting notices or document review periods) through the list maintained by the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment.

"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. Every Neighborhood Council Representative was contacted by phone during July – August 2012 to ensure submission of the returned activity kit.

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 (TAC):
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 and how they could be addressed in a citywide policy document.

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 initial 90 day comment period (February 13, 2014 – May 13, 2014) over 250 written and spoken comments on the Plan/EIR were received from individuals, community groups, non-profits, city departments, and state agencies through email, in person at the forums, and through the online town hall. During the second comment period on the Recirculated Draft EIR (February 19, 2015 – April 6, 2015) 170 comments were received on the Plan/EIR mainly from community groups and individuals. The staff report addresses and summarizes comments made on the scope of the Plan and not on the Draft EIR/ Recirculated Draft EIR. Comments pertaining to environmental analysis issues are addressed in the Final EIR.

Summary of Comments Received During February 13, 2014 – May 13, 2014:

Bicycle Enhanced Network (BEN) & Implementation
Comment: Many comments were received regarding the Bicycle Enhanced Network (BEN) and its implementation (both for and against). Some 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. Commenters against the concept of the Bicycle Enhanced Network and its' implementation were concerned of the traffic impacts that would result in implementation of bicycle lanes and/or protected bicycle lanes. This concern is addressed in the response to comments in the Final EIR.

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 creates a prioritization structure to be strategic in implementation. 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 an option for a traffic calming tool to reach community goals such as the safe movement of school children or speed limit compliance. Long range planning and implementation is an iterative process that will require reassessment every five years as the bicycle network maps continue to be updated.

Document Language
Comment: A number of comments were received 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 broadened in the proposed Plan to emphasize the City's goal of balanced and 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 Quality
Comment: The Mobility Plan received many comments regarding air quality 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 and operations impacts related to air quality emissions and applicable plans, policies, and regulations were determined to be less than significant. The Final EIR address this concern in the response to comments section as well.

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, Councilmember 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 does not intend 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 identify corridors that were important to regional circulation and to ensure driving times are to remain reliable and

consistent on this network. 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 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 bicycle lane and would like to see the bicycle 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 to ensure that the City is meeting its requirements to plan for the movement of all road users.

Network Revisions (BEN and TEN)
Comment: The Mobility Plan received comments relating to the 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 Area Planning Commission districts.

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

A large number of comments were received 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 policy 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: Many comments were received 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 through an outreach list provided by the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment
- 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 sets broad goals and policies for our transportation system. As projects get implemented and locations get refined, 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 Angles 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 Mobility Plan 2035, as analyzed and discussed in the FEIR at Master Response 5 and 7 is not growth inducing. That is, adoption and implementation of Mobility Plan 2035 is not expected to result in increased density in the City. Additionally, as discussed in the land use analysis in the RDEIR at Section 4.2, the Mobility Plan 2035 is found to be consistent with the General Plan, including the Framework Element. Transportation policies and programs proposed by the Mobility Plan 2035 are intended to meet the infrastructure demands of our City's high use areas consistent with the General Plan, including the Framework Element. The

Proposed Plan does this, by among other things, by concentrating transportation infrastructure around commercial centers and corridors and other areas with an existing high need for transportation infrastructure.

Summary of Comments Received During February 19, 2015 – April 6, 2015:

Of the 170 comment letters received during this period, 146 were pertaining to the Hollywood area specifically.

Hollywood Specific Issues:

Fairfax Ave from Hollywood Blvd. to Melrose Ave.
Comment: A large majority of the Hollywood commenters expressed concern on this portion of Fairfax, citing that it was to be designated as a Boulevard I with a targeted operating speed of 40 mph. Commenters were concerned with the safety issues from increased speeds and asked to maintain the segment's posted speed limit of 35 mph.

Response: This portion of Fairfax is proposed to be designated as a Boulevard II, not a Boulevard I. This designation was based on its existing built-out right of way and roadway widths. The Boulevard II classification calls for a targeted operating speed of 35 mph, which is consistent with community desires. The proposed Plan has does not set posted speed limits but does have targets for operating speed and language on design speed as discussed in the Complete Street Design Guide. Targeted operating speed, design speed, and posted speed are interdependent variables that effect roadway design and speed outcomes.

Sunset Blvd. west of La Brea Ave. on Vehicle Enhanced Network (VEN)
Comment: A large majority of Hollywood commenters expressed concern with this portion of Sunset being on the VEN, due to the potential for speeding, safety issues, and increased neighborhood traffic. Many also opposed the removal of street parking on this segment and opposed the prohibition of delivery trucks for loading and unloading due to concern that these possible features of the VEN would have negative impacts to local streets.

Response: The portion of Sunset Blvd. west of Highland Ave. has been removed from the Vehicle Enhanced Network. It should be noted that the proposed Plan does not identify what particular enhancements would ultimately be implemented as that is beyond the scope of this policy document. Future VEN enhancements would be identified after additional analysis of the specific needs of the corridor, as well as discussion with the community. Options could include investments in intelligent transportation systems, access management and consolidation, parking restrictions and removal, improved signal timing, and turning restrictions to increase vehicular travel time reliability on VEN corridors. These and other ideas for the VEN are part of the kit of options to improve vehicular movement which does require making tradeoffs, as with all our transportation related decisions. The aim of the VEN is to provide consistent speeds on these corridors, not increased speeds. All traffic must still follow posted speed limits and targeted operating speeds would still apply to streets on the VEN.

Hollywood Blvd. west of La Brea on Bicycle Enhanced Network (BEN)
Comment: A large majority of Hollywood commenters expressed concern with this portion of Hollywood Blvd being on the Bicycle Enhanced Network due to the changes in roadway dimension, land use, and character on Hollywood Blvd, west of La Brea.

Response: The portion of Hollywood Blvd. west of La Brea has been removed from the Bicycle Enhanced Network.

Highland Ave on Bicycle Enhanced Network (BEN)
Comment: Council District 4 and some Hollywood area commenters expressed concern with Highland Ave being on the Bicycle Enhanced Network from Hollywood Blvd. to Rosewood Ave. due to the vehicular priorities and uses of that street segment.

Response: Highland Ave. has been removed from the Bicycle Enhanced Network. A parallel corridor on the Neighborhood Enhanced Network (NEN) was prioritized as a substitute north/south route. The parallel segment is Orange Dr. from Rosewood Ave. to Hollywood Blvd. Highland Ave. has been placed on the Bike Lane Network Map as a "planned bicycle lane" to keep it as an option to apply for transportation funding should community priorities desire so in the future.

Cahuenga Blvd West on Bicycle Enhanced Network (BEN)
Comment: Council District 4 and some Hollywood area commenters expressed concern with Cahuenga Blvd West on the Bicycle Enhanced Network going through the Cahuenga Pass area due to the vehicular priorities and uses of that street segment.

Response: Cahuenga Blvd West has been removed from the Bicycle Enhanced Network. It has been placed on the Bike Lane Network Map as a "planned bicycle lane" to keep it as an option to apply for transportation funding should community priorities desire so in the future.

Construction and Filming
Comment: A large majority of Hollywood commenters expressed concern with limiting construction and filming to night-time periods due to economic and noise impacts.

Response: The proposed Plan goals, objectives, policies, and programs make no mention of limiting construction and filming operations to night-time periods. The Final EIR addresses noise impacts and mitigations.

Pedestrian Safety
Sidewalk Design
Comment: A large majority of Hollywood commenters expressed opposition to the narrowing of sidewalks and asked not to increase roadway speed due to impacts on pedestrian safety.

Response: The proposed Plan includes Safety First as its number one goal and supports the idea of wide sidewalks. The revised Standard Plan S-470-1: Standard Street Dimensions makes wider sidewalks a new design standard for all streets. It is anticipated that wider sidewalks will result as future projects dedicate additional parcel area. Targeted operating speeds are also proposed for each street standard to ensure that streets are designed and operated at recommended speeds.

Parking as a Buffer
Comment: Commenters asked not to remove parking as part of future roadway enhancements because it provides a buffer for pedestrians.

Response: No specific design details for specific streets on the enhanced networks are being proposed at this point. The roadway design of future projects will require further refined analysis

once funding is secured to implement projects. The proposed Plan sets up a framework of problem solving tools that can be used depending on context and community goals.

Sidewalk Obstruction
Comment: Concern about pedestrian safety was raised regarding sidewalk obstruction during construction periods.

Response: The proposed Plan recognizes the issue of sidewalk obstruction during construction periods with Policy 1.6: Multi-Modal Detour Facilities, "design detour facilities to provide safe passage for all modes of travel during construction." The California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways provides guidelines for temporary traffic control to meet the requirement of having detour facilities around construction areas. Compliance with this requirement is mandatory as projects go through the permit approval process with the Public Works Department and enforcement issues can be reported to local council district offices.

Street Widening
Comment: A large majority of Hollywood commenters expressed opposition to street widening in the Hollywood area due to concerns with safety and historic residential streets that cannot support further widening. One commenter was in support of street widening.

Response: Historic residential streets are typically local streets which are beyond the purview of the Plan. However, the Plan does include Policy 2.17: "Carefully consider the overall implications (costs, character, safety, travel, infrastructure, and environment) of widening a street before requiring the widening." This policy gives new direction to the City on how to best manage street capacity for streets by taking other factors into consideration as well. Widening streets has impacts on adjacent land uses, safety impacts, and historic preservation, though, in cases where widenings may be needed given the context, they may still occur.

Since the 1999 Transportation Element, there has been growing interest in restricting streets from being widened to match their currently assigned designation. To align with this interest, as community and specific plans have been updated and/or introduced over the past years, footnotes have been added and street modifications have been made that would restrain a street from future widening. In most instances, the street retained its designation in name only, but the footnotes and modifications indicated that the street was not to be widened in the future. Streets that had been previously "modified" will retain their corresponding "modified" dimension under the new designations.

In a majority of cases, today's arterial streets have not yet been widened to reflect the full dimension envisioned by the current designation, as physical changes to the roadway are not made until adjacent parcels are redeveloped. The proposed Plan, in most cases, assigns new street designations that are more closely aligned with the streets' current dimensions and thus future dedications and/or widenings will be smaller in dimension than would be required under the current designation. Overall, roadway widenings will be minimized and sidewalk widths will be increased. Wider sidewalks will be achieved over time through the dedication process, and not by bringing the curb line in.

Beachwood Drive on the Neighborhood Enhanced Network (NEN)
Comment: 20 commenters expressed opposition to Beachwood Drive's inclusion on the Neighborhood Enhanced Network. The commenters cited safety concerns and roadway constraints if a bike lane were to be added or if there was an increased presence of pedestrians.

Some concerns stemmed from the idea that being on the Neighborhood Enhanced Network equated to having a bicycle lane. Additional concern was raised that if other "traffic calming" features were put into place, Beachwood Drive would still not be a good candidate for the NEN due to its hilly blind curves and lack of sidewalks.

Response: Due to community input from residents, this corridor was taken off the Neighborhood Enhanced Network. The NEN is comprised primarily of local and collector streets that were selected for their existing or potential role in connecting communities to local assets (schools, parks, stores). NEN corridors are not typically places where the City anticipates or encourages major development but instead they are intended to provide an alternative, local mobility option for persons who use active transportation. Improvements to streets within the NEN would occur only after additional discussion and communication with the community.

Outreach
Comment: A number of commenters from the Hollywood community felt that not enough outreach was done for the proposed Plan and more outreach was needed in the area since the Plan would affect many streets in Hollywood.

Response: As stated in the public outreach summary section, given the scale, diversity, and geographic reach of the City, the Mobility Plan team had to employ a multi-pronged outreach strategy to ensure a broad cross section of the City was represented. All Neighborhood Councils were notified of major project milestones (including meeting notices and comment periods) through the list maintained by the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment. Briefings on the proposed Plan were including in Council District newsletters during phase I of the outreach as well. For more details about outreach, please see the section on Public Participation starting on page 19.

The Mobility Plan is a citywide document that sets broad goals and policies for our transportation system. It provides a framework and toolkit to address larger transportation issues. Streets on the networks are visionary concepts that were chosen based on a variety of factors to provide a cohesive transportation system for all modes. As project ideas get implemented, locations may get refined based on targeted outreach to stakeholders, specific community concerns, current data, and best fit solutions. Implementation of specific projects depends on a commitment of funding and project staff as well as community desire.

Hollywood Community Plan
Comment: The Hollywoodland Homeowners Association asked that the Hollywood area be exempt from the Mobility Plan due to the pending Hollywood Community Plan.

Response: The Land Use Element is the only General Plan component that breaks up the city into 35 areas due to the refined context needed for land use planning. The 35 Community Plans are guided by the broad policy foundation established in the citywide elements of the General Plan, including the Transportation Element. Community Plans can then include additional policy directed suited to the specific needs of their plan area on a variety of topics including air quality, mobility, parks, and more.

Hollywood Bowl Stop Addition to Metro Red Line
Comment: Two commenters were opposed to the addition of a Hollywood Bowl stop on the Metro Red Line citing that a Hollywood Mobility Plan showed this addition in its maps.

Response: The proposed Plan is a Citywide Mobility Plan and only shows existing Red Line stations in its maps (see Transit Enhanced Network map in Chapter 6 of the Citywide Mobility Plan), it does not propose any future stops for the already-built Metro Red Line.

Other Issues

Analysis of Proposed Enhanced Networks
Comment: Concern was raised over the lack of specific detailed proposals for the enhanced networks, including the vehicle, bike, neighborhood, and transit enhanced networks. Many commenters were against specific strategies such as removal of parking or travel lanes. Commenters expressed the need for additional analysis of specific roadway interventions on specific streets and their impacts.

Response: This Plan is a part of the City's General Plan, which is a citywide policy vision document, and does not include individual project-level detail in its scope. The networks are a conceptual idea based on regional analysis of land use and transportation data, which provide the basis for further local level transportation planning. The proposed Plan establishes the idea for these network concepts as a policy. Further analysis and refinement will occur within community plans, specific plans, and project implementation.

Implementation of Enhanced Networks
Comment: Concern was raised about the implementation process of the enhanced networks. As related to the previous comment, commenters were concerned that there was not enough detailed analysis to thoughtfully implement the enhanced networks.

Response: The Mobility Plan 2035 will provide the framework for future community plans and specific plans to take a closer look at the VEN, BEN, TEN and PED networks in specific areas of the City and may recommend more-detailed implementation strategies to realize the Mobility Plan's enhanced networks concept. As the necessary details and funding become available prior to implementation of each project, additional review, including environmental review and clearance would be required for each of the proposed mobility improvements identified in the Mobility Plan. The level of environmental review and clearance required would depend on the size of the project and potential for impact. All roadway alterations that would potentially incur localized impacts would require additional analysis and environmental documentation once design details are known. Exemptions related to bicycle lanes (SB 2245) would require a traffic and safety assessment, when specific design details are known. The implementation of project-specific improvements and future land use planning will be undertaken in an iterative manner. More detailed land use planning may reveal the need for changes to the networks, which will be undertaken as needed to reflect these more detailed planning efforts

Implementation of any segment of the enhanced networks requires identified funding sources and staffing. Funding is likely to change over time due to economic conditions and to fluctuations in the priorities of federal, state and regional funding agencies. The enhanced network maps identify possible opportunities once dedicated resources have been identified. The Plan identifies a citywide network of enhanced streets to stay competitive for local, state, and federal transportation funding dollars. Parallel corridors that fulfill the same intent and need of proposed corridors in citywide enhanced network maps can be identified when projects go through the outreach and design phase.

It is anticipated that the sequencing of mobility treatments proposed as part of the Plan would be implemented depending on future circumstances which would balance both transportation infrastructure planning (as presented in the Mobility Plan) and future land use planning efforts (community plans, specific plans and occasionally individual projects).

Speeding, Collisions, and Traffic Calming
Comment: A majority of comment letters from all areas of the City expressed concern on localized issues of speeding, collisions, safety, and cut-through traffic in their neighborhoods. There was a general support for traffic calming measures as a solution to these transportation issues.

Response: The proposed Plan addresses these issues with overarching goals, measurable objectives, and policies that recognize the importance of safety and creating infrastructure that accommodates the movement of different mode users. Chapter 1 of the Plan identifies safety as the first goal and includes objectives to reduce collisions to zero and design roadways to meet targeted operating speeds. The enhanced networks and the Neighborhood Enhanced Network in particular, are a part of the traffic calming strategies that can be used to target safety concerns. The Plan lays the steps for the further outreach and analysis required to address safety issues.

Overview of the Neighborhood Enhanced Network (NEN)
Comment: There was general concern surrounding the concept of the Neighborhood Enhanced Network, particularly on what treatments make up the network and how implementation will occur.

Response: The NEN is comprised primarily of local and collector streets that were selected for their existing or potential role in connecting communities to local assets (schools, parks, stores). NEN corridors are not typically places where the City anticipates or encourages major development but instead they are intended to provide an alternative, local mobility option for persons who use active transportation. Improvements to streets within the NEN would occur only after additional discussion and communication with the community. The NEN is an aspirational concept that would be built out through an iterative process that would identify project-specific details based on public input, and would include project-specific environmental clearance. NEN streets would be selected and prioritized for improvements based upon such metrics as population and employment densities, collision history and socioeconomic need. NEN improvements identified for a specific NEN corridor would be oriented towards slowing and calming the traffic speeds and volumes to ensure that the street is safe and comfortable for people walking, bicycling or using other slow-speed forms of transportation (scooters, skateboards).

Clarification of Street Alignments on the Enhanced Networks in the Westside Area
Comment: Letters received from community groups and individuals in the Westside area were concerned that Veteran, Manning, and Tennessee Avenues are being proposed to receive bicycle lanes.

Response: Veteran Ave. has been removed from the Neighborhood Enhanced Network, while Manning Ave. is not identified on any of the proposed networks. The closest alignment to Manning is Prosser Ave. which is on the NEN. Tennessee Ave. has been retained on the NEN as it has been prioritized to receive state funding in orders to implement features that would establish it as a slower moving corridor.

Prosser and Tennessee are shown as a part of the Bicycle Enhanced Network Map (Map D1, Chapter 6 of Plan) to demonstrate gap closures to the larger network of bicycle facilities that are proposed to provide a safe, comfortable, and "low-stress" riding experience. They are coded in a different color and named in the legend of Map D1 as "Priority Neighborhood Enhanced Network." In addition, these streets are part of the NEN maps (Maps C1-C5, Chapter 6 of Plan) and prioritized due to the gap closures they provide for low stress bicycling facilities.

NEN Improvements identified for a specific NEN corridor would be oriented towards calming the traffic speeds and volumes to ensure that the street is safe and comfortable for people walking, bicycling or using other slow-speed forms of transportation (scooters, skateboards). NEN improvements would not typically eliminate a vehicular travel lane and while the improvements may slow vehicular travel the existing vehicular capacity would by and large by retained. Typically, a bicycle lane would not be included unless there was sufficient space to include it without removing a travel lane. Roadway design of street segments will be evaluated on a case by case basis. Enhanced Network alignments were chosen based on current data and citywide connectivity. Parallel streets can be considered during the outreach and design phase of a specific project.

Plan Timespan
Comment: A comment letter expressed concern with the long time period of the proposed Plan through 2035 and whether the Plan will be able to address changes that may happen over the next 20 years.

Response: The proposed Plan is a long range planning document. The Plan horizon looks out 20 years ahead due to environmental analysis purposes based on Southern California Association of Governments' Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Plan for the future of the region. This Plan's horizon year is consistent within our regional planning horizon year. In addition, long range planning and implementation is an iterative process that will require reassessment as we have future opportunities to come back every five years to stay eligible for state funding.

Bicycle Lanes
Comment: Numerous comments were received that either expressed general support or opposition to bicycle lanes.

Response: The proposed Plan addresses multi-modal transportation policies by creating a balanced vision for our City's transportation framework that plans for the circulation of all mode users. This Plan speaks to the various viewpoints contained in the City by setting a prioritization platform based on data collection and evaluation of projects that promotes larger expressed outcomes such as social equity, increasing safety, benefiting populations of vulnerable social characteristics, environmental and public health, and/or economic benefits. Bicycle infrastructure, including bicycle lanes, is one transportation planning strategy used in cities to reach larger desired outcomes expressed by a community such as safety, reducing speeds, or increasing efficiency. The Plan proposes to look at transportation modes and strategies more holistically to examine the inter-relationships that make up our transportation system including: bicycle lanes, goods movement, driving, car-sharing technologies, walking, rolling, transit, para-transit, transportation demand management strategies, and more; as a comprehensive toolkit to offer travel solutions for the variety of needs in the City.

Multi-Modal Transportation

Comment: Move LA, Community Health Councils, and a number of individuals expressed approval of the Plan's commitment to: multi-modal transportation policies; emphasis on providing a safe and equitable transportation system; targets to improve public and environmental health; and support of a balanced network system to provide the basis of a multi modal vision. Mobility hubs to enhance connectivity, first-mile last-mile solutions, future technologic advancements in transportation, and education/communication were all mentioned as features that were of particular importance.

Response: Mobility Plan 2035 contains goals, objectives, and policy statements that provide the basis for achieving a multimodal transportation system. The Plan emphasizes the importance of making all modes of travel safe and accessible. Policies such as 1.1 Roadway User Vulnerability, 1.2 Complete Streets, 1.3 Safe Routes to Schools, 1.4 Design Safe Speeds, and 1.7 Regularly Maintained Streets can be looked at to guide decisions on transportation safety matters. Policies 3.1 Access for All and 3.5 Multi-Modal Features acknowledges the importance of every mode and how their connections to each other are vital in a seamless transportation system. Policies 4.3 and 4.6 speak to equity being built into transportation decisions. In addition, the Plan contains a variety of programs that help move the City towards a multi-modal transportation system that offers users a variety of mode choices.