Attachment A

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

G Line (Orange) Sepulveda Station First/Last Mile Plan

Metro

FEBRUARY 2021

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

The First/Last Mile (FLM) Plan (Plan) for the G Line (Orange) Sepulveda Station analyzed FLM connections for the bus rapid transit station by executing Metro's FLM planning methodology. This Plan responds to FLM policy (Board Motion 14.1, May 2016). The Plan identifies pedestrian-focused and bike/rolling mode-focused (bicycle, scooter, skateboard, etc.) projects that improve access to the station along specified routes called the Pathway. The pedestrian projects are located within the 1/2-mile radius of the station and bike projects are within the 3-mile radius of the station. The Plan was developed over approximately a year from Fall 2019 to Fall 2020.

The impetus for this Plan is the Metro G Line (Orange) Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Improvements Project (Project), which will improve operating speeds, capacity and safety of the G Line (Orange) by grade separations on major streets, minor street closures, better signal priority technology, electronic bus connectivity and a four-quadrant gating system. As part of the Project, the Sepulveda Station will be rebuilt as an elevated station.

Key findings
Several key findings emerged through the development of the Plan. For more details on each of these findings, refer to the Supporting Documents.

The observations collected during walk audits documented both strengths and barriers in the ½-mile radius around the station. From this data, a few key findings emerged as described below. Results from the walk audits are described in more detail in the Walk Audit Summary included in the Supporting Documents.

> Key strengths
  - Some streets in residential areas had sidewalks with shade from street trees.
  - Multiple locations have well-marked crosswalks.

> Key barriers
  - Lack of shade for people walking and waiting for the local bus.
  - In places sidewalks are narrow or missing on some streets.
  - Vehicle speeds contribute to feeling unsafe while walking or riding a bicycle or other wheeled device (as reported by walk audit and survey participants).

Community input is critical to identifying FLM projects that have community support. Due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, the team deployed an all-virtual approach to community engagement and participation. The Participants provided numerous comments that have informed the recommendations in the Plan, including:

> The highest priority improvements are pedestrian and bike lighting, new or improved sidewalks, and landscaping and shade.
> The highest priority locations for improvements are the intersection of Sepulveda Blvd and the G Line, Sepulveda Blvd, and Victory Blvd.
> A strong desire for safety improvements especially at intersections and near local bus stops.

First/Last Mile Process

A brief summary of the steps and timeline specific to the G Line (Orange) Sepulveda Station FLM Plan is presented in Figure 1. This methodology originated in the First Last Mile Strategic Plan (2014) and mirrors other past FLM plans (https://www.metro.net/projects/first-last/).



Figure 1: First/last mile methodology and timeline for the G Line Sepulveda Station

What's in the Plan

The Plan is composed of the following documents described below. The core document presents the results of the planning work: 1) First/Last Mile Toolkit, 2) Pathway Maps with Projects, 3) Project Scoring Matrices, and 4) Cost Estimation. Supporting documentation follows that memorializes the FLM steps and process from Fig. 1.

Core Document

- **First/Last Mile Toolkit**
  The First/Last Mile Toolkit summarizes the types of pedestrian and bike projects found in the Plan. Eleven (11) pedestrian projects and six (6) bike project types were recommended in the Sepulveda Station study area. The FLM Toolkit improvements are accompanied by a short description, example photo, and improvement icon which is used to associate the improvement throughout the Plan.

- **Pathway Maps with Projects**
  A Pathway Map displays the Pathway Network (key corridors where pedestrian and bike connections to the station are focused) and project ideas along the Pathway Network. For the Sepulveda Station, two pathway maps were created—one for walking projects and one for bike projects.

- **Project Scoring Matrices**

This matrix accompanies the Pathway Maps and lists all project ideas. The projects are scored based on the methodology described in the "Project Scoring Methodology" in the Supporting Documents section. Projects are grouped and ranked by segment of the Pathway Network. Utilizing the same methodology as recent FLM plans, prioritization criteria includes safety, comfort, community input, and connectivity. The matrices also include direct cost information by project and segment.

- **Cost Estimation**
  This document presents Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) cost estimates including the construction costs, soft costs, contingency, and escalation. Cost estimates are provided for individual projects and grouped by Pathway Network segment. Cost assumptions are provided separately in a supporting document.

Supporting Documents

- **Walk Audit Summary**
  Crucial to understanding walking and biking conditions, walk audits are used to collect data around the station. This document summarizes the walk audits conducted by the technical team.

- **Community Engagement Summary**
  As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, the project team piloted an all-virtual community engagement approach. This document summarizes the results of an online, map-based survey and key lessons learned from this process.

- **Cost Assumptions Summary**
  This document summarizes the underlying cost assumptions for each project type and is divided into walking and wheel improvements.

- **Project Scoring Methodology Summary**
  Similar to recent FLM Plans, the methodology to score and rank walk projects includes four weighted criteria: safety, comfort, community input, and connectivity. The methodology to score and rank the wheel projects included three weighted criteria: safety and comfort, community input, and connectivity. These approaches utilized data collected through the FLM process. The results of scoring FLM projects can be found in the Project Scoring Matrices (Core Documents).

- **Local Jurisdiction Coordination Summary**
  FLM improvements are typically located on city-controlled local streets. As such, a critical component of an FLM plan is coordination with and review by local jurisdictions. The Sepulveda Station is in City of Los Angeles. This document summarizes the points of contact and coordination with city staff, elected officials, and other external agencies.

Core Document

- Introduction & First/Last Mile Toolkit
- Pathway Maps with Projects
- Project Scoring Matrices
- Cost Estimation

Introduction

This Plan documents the results of the planning process and presents the First/Last Mile (FLM) improvements recommended for the Metro G Line (Orange) Sepulveda Station First/Last Mile Plan. The Plan identifies pedestrian-focused and bike/rolling mode-focused (bicycle, scooter, skateboard, etc.) projects that improve access to the station along specified routes called the Pathway. The pedestrian projects are located within the 1/2-mile radius of the station and bike projects are within the 3-mile radius of the station. Recommendations are further divided by either a corridor improvement or spot improvement. The Plan was developed through a technical and community-driven process, which included walk audits and an interactive, map-based survey. Projects were scored to determine their level of priority. The Plan has been reviewed by staff from the City of Los Angeles, Caltrans, and Metro. The Core Documents for this Plan include:

- First/Last Mile Toolkit
- Pathways Maps
- Project Scoring Matrices
- Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) Cost Estimates

These four elements are described in more detail below.

First/Last Mile Toolkit
The First/Last Mile Toolkit summarizes the types of pedestrian and bike projects found in the Plan. Eleven (11) pedestrian projects and six (6) bike project types were recommended in the Sepulveda Station study area. The FLM Toolkit improvements are accompanied by a short description, example photo, and improvement icon which is used to associate the improvement throughout the Plan.

Pathway Maps with Projects
The Pathway Maps identify the spot or corridor in which improvements are recommended. The first pathway map depicts the proposed “Pedestrian Pathway Improvements”, while the second pathway map depicts the proposed “Bike Pathway Improvements” within the one half-mile radius of the Sepulveda Station. Both maps show the existing and planned future location of the Sepulveda Station, as well as arterial and collector pathways within the half-mile street network in relation to the Metro G Line (Orange). Projects for pedestrians are chosen from the list of project types in the FLM Toolkit and are organized under the headers of “Proposed Improvements”. Projects for bikes are organized by whether they are existing facilities, planned facilities, or newly proposed through this Plan.

Project Scoring Matrices
The Project Scoring Matrices are organized by pathway network segment, noted as an arterial or collector pathway, and listed in order by their total score. Individual project elements, whether they are corridor-level or spot improvements are presented together under each pathway network segment. The objective of this presentation is to highlight that different individual projects should be considered at the corridor level, and funding and implementation should consider the objective to implement multiple individual projects together as part of a package of corridor-level improvements. The matrices provide total scores by pathway network segment, which were calculated from safety, comfort, community input, and connectivity factors. The matrices show the total scores for each of these factors. Please see Section VIII Project Scoring Methodology for the methodology used to score safety, comfort, community

input, and connectivity for each improvement, as well as the individual breakdown of scores to achieve the total factor scores that appear in Section III.

Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) Cost Estimates

Following the Metro Cost Estimating format, rough order of magnitude (ROM) cost estimates were developed for the proposed pedestrian and bike projects listed in the Project Scoring Matrices. The projects are given a base cost and are multiplied by its quantity to determine a cost estimate for each individual project and corridor within the half-mile area of Sepulveda Station. The cost estimates also include line item costs (referred to as an "Allowance") for "Wayfinding Signs" and "Wayfinding Sign Maintenance", which can be applied throughout the station area. Note that projects at intersections, such as "New or Improved Crosswalks", are only listed once between the two corridors to avoid duplicating costs. After corridor costs are summed to determine total pedestrian and bike project costs, the estimates are then augmented to include contingency, construction management, inspection, final design and project management allocations. Following the cost estimates by corridor, unit cost and cost estimates by project are also provided.

The cost estimates reflect 2020 costs, which are subject to inflation and escalation depending on the actual year of construction. To account for this, the final estimate accounts for projected inflation for Year 2027.

The costs shown in this section are based upon the latest estimates for constructing similar projects in the City of Los Angeles as confirmed by Metro. These cost assumptions are found in Section VII Cost Assumptions Summary.

First/Last Mile Toolkit

Projects for Pedestrians



Pedestrian & Bike Lighting
Person-scaled lighting for comfort and safety

New or improved sidewalk
Construction of new sidewalks or widening or upgrades to existing sidewalks

ADA Access Ramps
Facilitates street crossings for mobility devices

New or Improved Crosswalks
Installation of new or upgraded crosswalks

Street Furniture
Public benches, trash receptacles, and other amenities

Bulb-outs at Corners
Shortens crossing distance and slows traffic at intersections

Traffic Calming
Measures to reduce traffic speeds, including speed humps, chokers, and other treatments

Landscaping & Shade
Plantings that provide shade and improve the walking environment

Bus Stop Improvements
Enhanced shelter, bench, and other amenities

Wayfinding Signs
Helps to improve navigation to transit stations

Pick-Up/Drop-Off
A zone for passenger loading and unloading at transit stations

Projects for Bicyclists

Bike Lane, Route or Facility: Class I Off-street Path
Off-Street paved right-of-way dedicated for bicyclists

Bike Lane, Route or Facility: Class IV Protected Lanes
On-street bicycle facility with physical separation from adjacent traffic

Bike Lane, Route or Facility: Class II Striped Lanes
On-street bicycle facility identified through striping

Bike Lane, Route or Facility: Class III Bike-friendly Street
Lower volume and speed street designated for shared use with vehicles

Bike-friendly Intersection
Intersection improvements intended to enhance bicycle movement and safety

Bike Parking
Secure and convenient bicycle storage

Metro

Sepulveda Station

Pedestrian Pathway Improvements

N

Source: IBI Group

Legend

- Metro Station + Entrance
- Metro G Line (Orange)
- Pathway Arterial
- Pathway Collector
- Bus Stop

Proposed Improvements

- Corridor Improvement
- Spot Improvement
  Location-specific Idea
- Bus Stop Improvements
- Pedestrian & Bike Lighting
- Traffic Calming
- New or Improved Sidewalks
- New or Improved Crosswalks
- Landscaping & Shade
- Pick-up/Drop-off
- Bulb-outs at Corners
- Relocated Bus Stop

Metro

Sepulveda Station

Bike Pathway Improvements

N

Source: IBI Group

Legend

- Metro Station + Entrance
- Metro G Line (Orange)
- Pathway Arterial
- Pathway Collector
- Bus Stop

Existing Bicycle Facilities

- Class I Off-street Path
- Class III Bike-friendly Street

Bicycle Facilities on Local Plans

- Class II Striped Lanes
- Class III Bike-friendly Street

Note: Planned bike lane on Sepulveda Bl extends north beyond a three-mile radius north of Roscoe Bl, and south to the existing bike lane on Sepulveda Bl near I-405 Fwy.

Proposed Bicycle Facilities

- Class II Striped Lanes
- Class IV Protected Lanes

Proposed Improvements

- Corridor Improvement
- Spot Improvement
  Location-specific Idea
- Bicycle Parking
- Bicycle-friendly Intersection
- Pedestrian & Bike Lighting
- Bike Lane, Route or Facility
- Relocated Bus Stop

Note: In accordance with the Mobility Plan 2035 Settlement Agreement, Class IV Protected Lanes on Sepulveda Blvd. would require additional community and stakeholder engagement if prioritized for future phase development.

Metro

Projects for Pedestrians

Project Icon	Type	Cross Street/ Limits	Project Origins	Safety	Comfort	Community Input	Connectivity	Total Score	Total Cost
Projects on Sepulveda Blvd. (Pathway Arterial)									**$1,925,600**
	New or Improved Crosswalks	at Victory Blvd., Erwin St., Orange Line Busway, Oxnard St., and Hatteras St.	Walk Audit / Online Survey	25	18	25	12.5	**80.5**	$18,400
	Bus Stop Improvements	at Victory Blvd., Erwin St., Orange Line Busway, Oxnard St., and Hatteras St.	Walk Audit / Online Survey						$456,000
	Bulb-Outs at Corners	at Victory Blvd., Erwin St., Orange Line Busway, Oxnard St., and Hatteras St.	City Comment						$608,500
	New or Improved Sidewalks	from a half-mile north of proposed station to a half-mile south of proposed station	Walk Audit / Online Survey						$468,000
	Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	from Erwin St. to Orange Line Busway	Walk Audit / Online Survey						$171,700
	Landscaping & Shade	from a half-mile north of proposed station to a half-mile south of proposed station	Walk Audit / Online Survey						$203,000
Projects on Metro G Line (Orange) Busway									**$890,650**
	New or Improved Crosswalks	at Sepulveda Blvd.	Walk Audit / Online Survey	16	18	21.4	12.5	**67.9**	$1,150
	Pick-up/Drop-off	near existing station	Online Survey						*Planned
	Bus Stop Improvements	at Sepulveda Blvd.	Walk Audit / Online Survey						*Planned
	Bulb-Outs at Corners	at Sepulveda Blvd.	City Comment						$121,700
	Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	from Haskell Ave. to a half-mile east of proposed station	Walk Audit / Online Survey						$727,200
	Landscaping & Shade	from existing station to Sepulveda Blvd.	Walk Audit / Online Survey						$40,600

The portions of Sepulveda Blvd. and Victory Blvd. within the study area are part of the City of LA's High Injury Network (HIN). Roadway design decisions and safety countermeasures should be co-designed with LADOT's Vision Zero Division.

**Planned: The cost for this item is included in the Sepulveda Station Design Plans*

Projects for Pedestrians

Project Icon	Type	Cross Street/ Limits	Project Origins	Safety	Comfort	Community Input	Connectivity	Total Score	Total Cost
Projects on Victory Blvd. (Pathway Arterial)									**$588,010**
	New or Improved Crosswalks	at Orion Ave. and Sepulveda Blvd.	Walk Audit	23	8	17.4	12.5	**60.9**	$5,750
	Bus Stop Improvements	at Orion Ave. and Sepulveda Blvd.	Walk Audit						$91,200
	Bulb-Outs at Corners	at Sepulveda Blvd.	City Comment						$121,700
	New or Improved Sidewalks	from Blucher Ave. to Peach Ave.	Walk Audit						$248,160
	Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	from Sepulveda Blvd. to Columbus Ave.	Walk Audit						$121,200
Projects on Erwin St. (Pathway Collector)									**$561,630**
	New or Improved Crosswalks	at Sepulveda Blvd. and Noble Ave.	Walk Audit	21	18	18.9	2.5	**60.4**	$8,050
	Bus Stop Improvements	at Sepulveda Blvd.	Walk Audit						$91,200
	Bulb-Outs at Corners	at Sepulveda Blvd.	City Comment						$121,700
	New or Improved Sidewalks	from Blucher Ave. to Peach Ave. and Halbrent Ave. to Columbus Ave.	Walk Audit						$198,880
	Traffic Calming	from Columbus Ave. to Noble Ave.	Walk Audit						$20,000
	Landscaping & Shade	from Sepulveda Ave. to Noble Ave.	City Comment						$121,800

The portions of Sepulveda Blvd. and Victory Blvd. within the study area are part of the City of LA's High Injury Network (HIN). Roadway design decisions and safety countermeasures should be co-designed with LADOT's Vision Zero Division.

**Planned: The cost for this item is included in the Sepulveda Station Design Plans*

Projects for Pedestrians

Project Icon	Type	Cross Street/ Limits	Project Origins	Safety	Comfort	Community Input	Connectivity	Total Score	Total Cost
Projects on Oxnard St. (Pathway Collector)									**$519,100**
	New or Improved Crosswalks	at Sepulveda Blvd.	Walk Audit	16	8	13.4	0	**37.4**	$4,600
	Bus Stop Improvements	at Sepulveda Blvd.	Walk Audit						$91,200
	Bulb-Outs at Corners	at Sepulveda Blvd.	City Comment						$121,700
	New or Improved Sidewalks	from west extent to beyond Lemona Ave.	Walk Audit						$301,600
Projects on Hatteras St. (Pathway Collector)									**$537,820**
	New or Improved Crosswalks	at Sepulveda Blvd.	Walk Audit	16	8	13.3	0	**37.3**	$4,600
	Bus Stop Improvements	at Sepulveda Blvd.	Walk Audit						$91,200
	Bulb-Outs at Corners	at Sepulveda Blvd.	City Comment						$121,700
	New or Improved Sidewalks	from Sepulveda Blvd. to Noble Ave.	Walk Audit						$320,320
Projects on Orion Ave. (Pathway Collector)									**$266,750**
	New or Improved Crosswalks	at Sepulveda Blvd.	Walk Audit	11	8	11.6	0	**30.6**	$1,150
	Bus Stop Improvements	at Sepulveda Blvd.	Walk Audit						$45,600
	Bulb-Outs at Corners	at Sepulveda Blvd.	City Comment						$220,000
Projects on Noble Ave. (Pathway Collector)									**$153,450**
	New or Improved Crosswalks	at Erwin St.	Walk Audit	16	0	11.3	2.5	**29.8**	$3,450
	New or Improved Sidewalks	from Oxnard St. to Hatteras St.	Walk Audit						$130,000
	Traffic Calming	from Domino St. to Delano St.	Walk Audit						$20,000

**Planned: The cost for this item is included in the Sepulveda Station Design Plans*

Projects for Pedestrians

Project Icon	Type	Cross Street/ Limits	Project Origins	Safety	Comfort	Community Input	Connectivity	Total Score	Total Cost
Projects on Haskell Ave. (Pathway Collector)									**$505,000**
	Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	from Victory Blvd. to existing station	Walk Audit	6	0	4.1	2.5	**12.6**	$505,000
Projects on Halbrent Ave. (Pathway Collector)									**$65,520**
	New or Improved Sidewalks	from Victory Blvd. to Erwin St.	Walk Audit	6	0	3.9	0	**9.9**	$65,520
Projects on Califa St. (Pathway Collector)									**$79,200**
	New or Improved Sidewalks	from Halbrent Ave. to Noble Ave.	Walk Audit	5	0	3.9	0	**8.9**	$79,200
Projects on Columbus Ave. (Pathway Collector)									**$221,760**
	New or Improved Sidewalks	from Victory Blvd. to Erwin St.	Online Survey	5	0	2	0	**7**	$221,760
Allowances									**$30,000**
	Wayfinding Signs	Throughout station area	Walk Audit / Online Survey	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$25,000
	Wayfinding Sign Maintenance	Throughout station area	Walk Audit / Online Survey	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$5,000

**Planned: The cost for this item is included in the Sepulveda Station Design Plans*

Projects for Bicyclists

Project Icon	Type	Cross Street/ Limits	Project Origins	Safety and Comfort	Community Input	Connectivity	Total Score	Total Cost
Projects on Sepulveda Blvd. (Pathway Arterial)								**$507,050**
	Bicycle Parking	at G Line (Orange) Busway	Online Survey	50	15.7	15	**80.7**	*Planned
	Bicycle-friendly Intersection	at G Line (Orange) Busway	Walk Audit / Online Survey					$50,750
	Bicycle Lane, Route or Facility (Class IV Protected Lanes)	from a half-mile north of proposed station to a half-mile south of proposed station	Online Survey					$456,300
Projects on Metro G Line (Orange) Busway								**$91,350**
	Bicycle Parking	at Sepulveda Blvd.	Online Survey	31	18.8	15	**64.8**	*Planned
	Bicycle-friendly Intersection	at Sepulveda Blvd.	Walk Audit / Online Survey					$50,750
	Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	from Haskell Ave. to a half-mile east of proposed station	Walk Audit / Online Survey					$40,600
Projects on Victory Blvd. (Pathway Arterial)								**$49,400**
	Bicycle Lane, Route or Facility (Class II Striped Lanes)	from beyond Orion Ave. to beyond Noble Ave.	Online Survey	15	4	9	**28**	$49,400
Projects on Hatteras St. (Pathway Collector)								**$7,200**
	Bicycle Lane, Route or Facility (Class III Bike-friendly Street)	from Sepulveda Blvd. to beyond Lemona Ave.	ESFV Light Rail Transit First/Last Mile Plan	8	3.2	4	**15.2**	$7,200
Projects on Noble Blvd. (Pathway Collector)								**$1,200**
	Bicycle Lane, Route or Facility (Class III Bike-friendly Street)	from Hatteras Ave. heading southbound	ESFV Light Rail Transit First/Last Mile Plan	6	3.1	2	**11.1**	$1,200
Projects on Friar St. (Pathway Collector)								**$2,400**
	Bicycle Lane, Route or Facility (Class III Bike-friendly Street)	from Columbus Ave. to beyond Noble Ave.	ESFV Light Rail Transit First/Last Mile Plan	5	2.9	0	**7.9**	$2,400

The portions of Sepulveda Blvd. and Victory Blvd. within the study area are part of the City of LA's High Injury Network (HIN). Roadway design decisions and safety countermeasures should be co-designed with LADOT's Vision Zero Division.

Class IV Protected Lanes on Sepulveda Blvd. would require additional community and stakeholder engagement if prioritized for future phase development.

**Planned: The cost for this item is included in the Sepulveda Station Design Plans*

Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) Cost Estimate
2021-01-25
Metro G Line (Orange)
Sepulveda Station

Item Description		QTY	Unit	Amount	
				Unit Cost	Amount
FTA SCC 10-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS					
Metro Estimating Parametric					
Projects for Pedestrians			1 Ls	$ 5,393,790.00	
Projects for Bicyclists			1 Ls	$ 567,250.00	
Metro Factor	$	5,961,040.00		5%	$ 298,052.00
FTA SCC 10-50 Construction Sub-Total					**$ 6,259,092.00**
FTA SCC 80 SOFT COSTS					
EIR/EIS Planning	$	6,259,092.00		2.0%	$ 125,181.84
Design Production Files	$	6,259,092.00		0.5%	$ 31,295.46
Preliminary Engineering	$	6,259,092.00		4.8%	$ 300,436.42
Final Design Services	$	6,259,092.00		8.1%	$ 506,986.45
Project Management for Design and Construction	$	6,259,092.00		9.8%	$ 613,391.02
Constuction Administration and Mangement	$	6,259,092.00		4.8%	$ 300,436.42
Professional Liability & Other Non-Construction Insurance	$	6,259,092.00		0.003%	$ 187.77
Legal, Permits, Review Fees by Other Agencies, Cities, and etc.	$	6,259,092.00		3.7%	$ 231,586.40
FTA SCC 80 Soft Cost Sub-Total				33.7%	$ 2,109,501.78
Project Cost Sub-Total					**$ 8,368,593.78**
FTA SCC 90 PROJECT CONTINGENCY					
Unallocated	$	8,368,593.78		10.0%	$ 836,859.38
Project Cost					**$ 9,205,453.15**
ESCALATION					
2027 Cost	$	9,205,453.15		9.80%	$ 902,134.41
Total					**$ 10,107,587.56**

Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) Cost Estimate
2021-01-25
Metro G Line (Orange)
Sepulveda Station
Projects for Pedestrians

Corridor		Subtotal
	Sepulveda Boulevard	**$ 1,925,600**
	Metro G Line (Orange) Busway	**$ 768,950**
	Victory Boulevard	**$ 461,710**
	Erwin Street	**$ 344,130**
	Oxnard Street	**$ 301,600**
	Hatteras Street	**$ 320,320**
	Orion Avenue	**$ 220,000**
	Noble Avenue	**$ 150,000**
	Haskell Avenue	**$ 505,000**
	Halbrent Avenue	**$ 65,520**
	Califa Street	**$ 79,200**
	Columbus Avenue	**$ 221,760**
Allowances		
	Wayfinding Signs	**$ 25,000**
	Wayfinding Sign Maintenance	**$ 5,000**
IMPROVEMENTS SUBTOTAL		**$ 5,393,790**

Metro G Line (Orange) Cost Estimates
Sepulveda Station - Pedestrian

Location: **Sepulveda Boulevard**
Limits: From a half-mile north of the proposed station to a half-mile south of the proposed station

Prepared by: IBI Group
Date: 2021-01-25

FTA SCC 10-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Item Description	QTY	Unit	Amount	
			Unit Cost	Amount
New or Improved Crosswalks	16.0	LEG	$ 1,150	$ 18,400
Bus Stop Improvements	10.0	EA	$ 45,600	$ 456,000
Improved Sidewalks	36000.0	SF	$ 13	$ 468,000
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	17.0	EA	$ 10,100	$ 171,700
Landscaping & Shade	5.0	BLOCK	$ 40,600	$ 203,000
Bulb-Outs at Corners	5.0	EA	$ 121,700	$ 608,500
PROJECT SUB-TOTAL				$ 1,925,600.00

Metro G Line (Orange) Cost Estimates
Sepulveda Station - Pedestrian

Location: **Metro G Line (Orange) Busway**
Limits: Haskell Avenue to half-mile east of the proposed station

Prepared by: IBI Group
Date: 2021-01-25

FTA SCC 10-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Item Description	QTY	Unit	Amount	
			Unit Cost	Amount
New or Improved Crosswalks	1.0	LEG	$ 1,150	$ 1,150
Pick-up/Drop-off	2.0	EA	*Included in Planned Station Design	
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	72.0	EA	$ 10,100	$ 727,200
Landscaping & Shade	1.0	BLOCK	$ 40,600	$ 40,600
PROJECT SUB-TOTAL				$ 768,950.00

Metro G Line (Orange) Cost Estimates
Sepulveda Station - Pedestrian

Location: **Victory Boulevard**
Limits: Blucher Avenue to Noble Avenue

Prepared by: IBI Group
Date: 2021-01-25

FTA SCC 10-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Item Description	QTY	Unit	Amount	
			Unit Cost	Amount
New or Improved Crosswalks	1.0	LEG	$ 1,150	$ 1,150
Bus Stop Improvements	2.0	EA	$ 45,600	$ 91,200
New Sidewalks	5640.0	SF	$ 44	$ 248,160
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	12.0	EA	$ 10,100	$ 121,200
PROJECT SUB-TOTAL				$ 461,710.00

Metro G Line (Orange) Cost Estimates
Sepulveda Station - Pedestrian

Location: **Erwin Street**
Limits: From Blucher Avenue to Noble Avenue

Prepared by: IBI Group
Date: 2021-01-25

FTA SCC 10-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Item Description	QTY	Unit	Amount	
			Unit Cost	Amount
New or Improved Crosswalks	3.0	LEG	$ 1,150	$ 3,450
New Sidewalks	4520.0	SF	$ 44	$ 198,880
Traffic Calming	2.0	EA	$ 10,000	$ 20,000
Landscaping & Shade	3.0	BLOCK	$ 40,600	$ 121,800
PROJECT SUB-TOTAL				$ 344,130.00

Metro G Line (Orange) Cost Estimates
Sepulveda Station - Pedestrian

Location: **Oxnard Street**
Limits: From west extent to beyond Lemona Avenue

Prepared by: IBI Group
Date: 2021-01-25

FTA SCC 10-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Item Description	QTY	Unit	Amount	
			Unit Cost	Amount
Improved Sidewalks	23200.0	SF	$ 13	$ 301,600
PROJECT SUB-TOTAL				$ 301,600.00

Metro G Line (Orange) Cost Estimates
Sepulveda Station - Pedestrian

Location: **Hatteras Street**
Limits: From Sepulveda Boulevard to Noble Avenue

Prepared by: IBI Group
Date: 2021-01-25

FTA SCC 10-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Item Description	QTY	Unit	Amount	
			Unit Cost	Amount
New or Improved Sidewalks	7280.0	SF	$ 44	$ 320,320
PROJECT SUB-TOTAL				$ 320,320.00

Metro G Line (Orange) Cost Estimates
Sepulveda Station - Pedestrian

Location: **Orion Avenue**
Limits: From Victory Boulevard to Erwin Street

Prepared by: IBI Group
Date: 2021-01-25

FTA SCC 10-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Item Description	QTY	Unit	Amount	
			Unit Cost	Amount
New or Improved Sidewalks	5000.0	SF	$ 44	$ 220,000
PROJECT SUB-TOTAL				$ 220,000.00

Metro G Line (Orange) Cost Estimates
Sepulveda Station - Pedestrian

Location: **Noble Avenue**
Limits: From Victory Boulevard to Hatteras Street

Prepared by: IBI Group
Date: 2021-01-25

FTA SCC 10-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Item Description	QTY	Unit	Amount	
			Unit Cost	Amount
Improved Sidewalks	10000.0	SF	$ 13	$ 130,000
Traffic Calming	2.0	EA	$ 10,000	$ 20,000
PROJECT SUB-TOTAL				$ 150,000.00

Metro G Line (Orange) Cost Estimates
Sepulveda Station - Pedestrian

Location: **Haskell Avenue**
Limits: From Victory Boulevard to the existing station

Prepared by: IBI Group
Date: 2021-01-25

FTA SCC 10-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Item Description	QTY	Unit	Amount	
			Unit Cost	Amount
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	50.0	EA	$ 10,100	$ 505,000
PROJECT SUB-TOTAL				$ 505,000.00

Metro G Line (Orange) Cost Estimates
Sepulveda Station - Pedestrian

Location: **Halbrent Avenue**
Limits: From Victory Boulevard to Erwin Street

Prepared by: IBI Group
Date: 2021-01-25

FTA SCC 10-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Item Description	QTY	Unit	Amount	
			Unit Cost	Amount
Improved Sidewalks	5040.0	SF	$ 13	$ 65,520
PROJECT SUB-TOTAL				$ 65,520.00

Metro G Line (Orange) Cost Estimates
Sepulveda Station - Pedestrian

Location: **Califa Street**
Limits: From Halbrent Avenue to Noble Avenue

Prepared by: IBI Group
Date: 2021-01-25

FTA SCC 10-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Item Description	QTY	Unit	Amount	
			Unit Cost	Amount
New Sidewalks	1800.0	SF	$ 44	$ 79,200
PROJECT SUB-TOTAL				$ 79,200.00

Metro G Line (Orange) Cost Estimates
Sepulveda Station - Pedestrian

Location: **Columbus Avenue**
Limits: From Victory Boulevard to Erwin Street

Prepared by: IBI Group
Date: 2021-01-25

FTA SCC 10-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Item Description	QTY	Unit	Amount	
			Unit Cost	Amount
New Sidewalks	5040.0	SF	$ 44	$ 221,760
PROJECT SUB-TOTAL				$ 221,760.00

Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) Cost Estimate
2021-01-25
Metro G Line (Orange)
Sepulveda Station
Projects for Bicyclists

Corridor	Subtotal
Sepulveda Boulevard	**$ 507,050.00**
Metro G Line (Orange) Busway	**$ -**
Victory Boulevard	**$ 49,400.00**
Hatteras Street	**$ 7,200.00**
Noble Avenue	**$ 1,200.00**
Friar Street	**$ 2,400.00**
IMPROVEMENTS SUBTOTAL	**$ 567,250.00**

Metro G Line (Orange) Cost Estimates
Sepulveda Station - Bicyclist

Prepared by: IBI Group
Date: 2021-01-25

Location: **Sepulveda Boulevard**
Limits: From a half-mile north of the proposed station to a half-mile south of the proposed station

FTA SCC 10-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Item Description	QTY	Unit	Amount	
			Unit Cost	Amount
Bicycle-friendly Intersection	0.5	EA	$ 101,500	$ 50,750.00
Class IV Projected Lanes - Striped Buffer	1.0	MILE	$ 456,300	$ 456,300.00
PROJECT SUB-TOTAL				$ 507,050.00

Metro G Line (Orange) Cost Estimates
Sepulveda Station - Bicyclist

Location: **Metro G Line (Orange) Busway**
Limits: Haskell Avenue to half-mile east of the proposed station

Prepared by: IBI Group
Date: 2021-01-25

FTA SCC 10-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Item Description	QTY	Unit	Amount	
			Unit Cost	Amount
Bicycle Parking	12.0	EA	*Included in Planned Station Design	
PROJECT SUB-TOTAL				$ -

Metro G Line (Orange) Cost Estimates

Location: **Victory Boulevard**
Limits: Blucher Avenue to Noble Avenue

Prepared by: IBI Group
Date: 2021-01-25

FTA SCC 10-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Item Description	QTY	Unit	Amount	
			Unit Cost	Amount
Class II Striped Lanes	0.7	EA	$ 76,000	$ 49,400
PROJECT SUB-TOTAL				$ 49,400.00

Metro G Line (Orange) Cost Estimates

Location: **Hatteras Street**
Limits: Sepulveda Boulevard to Lemona Avenue

Prepared by: IBI Group
Date: 2021-01-25

FTA SCC 10-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Item Description	QTY	Unit	Amount	
			Unit Cost	Amount
Class III Bike-friendly Street	12.0	EA	$ 600	$ 7,200
PROJECT SUB-TOTAL				$ 7,200.00

Metro G Line (Orange) Cost Estimates

Location: **Noble Avenue**
Limits: Hatteras Street heading southbound

Prepared by: IBI Group
Date: 2021-01-25

FTA SCC 10-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Item Description	QTY	Unit	Amount	
			Unit Cost	Amount
Class III Bike-friendly Street	2.0	EA	$ 600	$ 1,200
PROJECT SUB-TOTAL				$ 1,200.00

Metro G Line (Orange) Cost Estimates

Location: **Friar Street**
Limits: Columbus Avenue to beyond Noble Avenue

Prepared by: IBI Group
Date: 2021-01-25

FTA SCC 10-50 CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Item Description	QTY	Unit	Amount	
			Unit Cost	Amount
Class III Bike-friendly Street	4.0	EA	$ 600	$ 2,400
PROJECT SUB-TOTAL				$ 2,400.00

Supporting Documents

- Walk Audit Summary
- Community Engagement Summary
- Cost Assumptions Summary
- Project Scoring Methodology Summary
- Local Jurisdiction Coordination Summary

Metro G Line (Orange)

First/Last Mile Planning
Sepulveda Station Walk Audit Summary - Final

Contents

1 Introduction

In order to inform first/last mile recommendations for the Sepulveda G Line (Orange) station, the technical team performed walk audits of the streets adjacent to the station area. The purpose of this memorandum is to document the results of the walk audits to prepare for the community outreach process, as well as inform the Pathway Network recommendations.

1.1 Walk Audit Approach

Consistent with Metro's approach for first/last mile walk audits, two technical audits were conducted for the Sepulveda Station—one during the afternoon/early evening of November 18, 2019, and one during the morning of November 19, 2019. The evening walk audit was included to ensure the team captured data related to pedestrian lighting conditions. In addition to the consultant team, members of the walk audit groups included representatives from Metro and the City of Los Angeles.

The team divided the 1/2-mile station area into quadrants and assigned groups to cover each different quadrant. Interstate 405 is a major barrier in the 1/2-mile walking distance to the west of the station. Figure 1 below shows that a significant portion of the 1/2-mile walk shed is cut off by I-405, specifically the southwest quadrant; because of that, the walk audits focused on surveying conditions in quadrants 1 through 3. Figure 1 also shows the half mile radius area surrounding the station and the three distinct quadrants that were audited. The team will consider how to address connectivity from the station to the Sepulveda Basin Recreation Area, located west of I-405 as part of the pathway network development.

Figure 1: Station area divided in quadrants

Each group was provided with a map of the one of the quadrants and survey questions related to safety, aesthetics, accessibility, and transfers. The teams were divided to provide diversity among different agencies and technical backgrounds. Groups were encouraged to select their own path to walk within their assigned quadrant and note their observations on the map. Whereas some of the teams consolidated their comments on a single survey, other teams completed two surveys. Participants were invited to record observations in three primary categories: Strengths, Barriers and Observed Behaviors. After finishing the walk audit, the teams completed the survey to capture their overall impressions of the quadrant they walked. Photos of existing conditions taken by participants were compiled and categorized by quadrant and walk audit period.

1.2 Existing Conditions Analysis Methodology

In order to establish a baseline for the Walk Audit report, the technical team assessed existing infrastructure conditions and gathered the following:

- Identification of bicycle access routes based on existing and planned bicycle facilities.
- Inventory of existing sidewalks, crosswalks, pedestrian signals, wayfinding, lighting and curb ramps.
- Physical roadway characteristics, sidewalk widths and pavement/sidewalk quality.
- Operational roadway characteristics, including arterials (roads that provide the fastest method of travel) and collectors (roads that connect neighborhood streets with arterials).
- Street classification and bicycle facility classification.
- Traffic signage (posted speed limit, parking restrictions, school zones, etc.).
- Roadway Average Daily Traffic counts, posted speeds, and roadway grade.

The existing conditions analysis results are presented in Section 2. Following completion of the walk audits and surveys, the technical team compiled and mapped the locations of comments recorded by participants and are presented in Section 3.1. Results from the Walk Audit Surveys were compiled into a spreadsheet and are presented in Section 3.2. Taken together, each component informs the Key Takeaways presented in Section 3.3, and will inform the Pathway Network recommendations for the project.

2 Existing Conditions

2.1 Vehicle and Roadway Facilities

The technical team compiled information on vehicle and roadway facilities using a combination of the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering NavigateLA mapping tool and Google Street View. A table illustrating street information such as number of lanes, presence of medians, posted speed limits, parking restrictions, school zones, and roadway grades is contained in Appendix A.

2.2 Pedestrian Facilities and Road Types

Figure 2 on the following page illustrates the observed conditions related to pedestrian facilities and roads, including signalized and unsignalized crosswalks, areas where sidewalks are missing, City of Los Angeles roadway classifications, and the Average Daily Traffic (ADT) counts for the major streets.

Figure 2: Pedestrian Facilities and Road Types

2.3 Bicycle Facilities

Figure 3 illustrates the existing and proposed bicycle facilities located in and adjacent to the project study area including bike lanes (shared-used paths (Class I), striped lanes (Class II), wheel-friendly streets (Class III) and protected lanes (Class IV)) It also illustrates the Metro Proposed Active Transportation Strategic Plan routes for the area.



Figure 3: Existing and Planned Bicycle Facilities

3 Walk Audit Results

3.1 Barriers, Strengths, and Observed Behaviors

Each walk audit team classified their notes into one of the three categories described below. The technical team grouped similar comments into single subcategories to streamline comments for comprehension and legibility on the map (Figure 4).

3.1.1 Barriers (B)

Barriers include items such as lack of sidewalks, bus stops needing improvement, and other items that detract from a pleasant pedestrian, cyclist and transit rider experience.

Number	Category
B1	Bus stop improvements needed
B2	Sidewalk Obstruction
B3	Crosswalk improvements needed
B4	Inactive street
B5	Landscape maintenance needed
B6	Lighting improvements needed
B7	No bike lane
B8	No crosswalk
B9	No sidewalk
B10	Wayfinding needed
B11	Traffic safety concerns (e.g. poorly marked crosswalks, high traffic volumes)
B12	Personal Safety concern (e.g. isolated spaces, poor visibility)
B13	Lack of shade
B14	Sidewalk improvements needed

3.1.2 Strengths (S)

Strengths include items such as traffic calming elements, landscaping, shade (from infrastructures or landscaping), and other amenities that contribute to a pleasant pedestrian or bicycling experience.

Number	Category
S1	Presence of a bus stop (offers multimodal options)
S2	Crosswalks

Number	Category
S3	Landscaping
S4	Lighting
S5	On-street parking (provides a buffer for pedestrians from adjacent street traffic)
S6	Shade
S7	Sidewalks
S8	Traffic calming
S9	Wayfinding

3.1.3 Observed Behaviors (O)

Observed behaviors may include activities, behaviors, or other observations by walk audit participants that contributes to a safe and comfortable environment for pedestrians and bicyclists, or to the contrary, an environment perceived as unsafe. For example, the presence of joggers can suggest this is an area where other people and supportive streetscape amenities are present. The presence of street vendors offers “eyes on the street” and suggests this is a pedestrian-friendly, safe area.

However, certain behaviors suggest there are potential conflicts between users of the road. For example, high vehicular speeds can give pedestrians a feeling of danger, especially at intersections. Cars blocking intersections also suggests this is an area where pedestrian and cyclists are not welcomed.

This category also includes general observations that can influence the character of a space. For instance, certain land uses can create either a welcoming or inhospitable environment. Industrial land uses often feature large building footprints, blank walls with few windows, and a general lack of street activity—creating a feeling of isolation for pedestrians nearby. Mixed-use or residential areas, on the other hand, are more often associated with human-scale environments.

Number	Category
O1	Bicyclist on sidewalk
O2	Car blocking intersection
O3	High vehicular speeds
O4	Industrial area
O5	Jogger observed
O6	Midblock jaywalker
O7	Low vehicular speeds
O8	Residential area
O9	Street vendors
O10	Heavy truck traffic

The combined B, S, and O comments are displayed visually on the Walk Audits Map (Figure 4) below.



Figure 4: Walk Audit Summary

3.2 Walk Audit Survey Results

Participants completed a survey about how they perceived conditions overall in their quadrant. They rated experiential aspects of the area they walked from 1 to 5 with 5 being the most positive, thereby quantifying qualitative data. The technical team then analyzed the scores for each question and each quadrant to create qualitative evaluations of the station area and to inform broad characterizations of the environment.

The survey questions were divided into four categories:

1) **Safety** – evaluations of lighting, security, pedestrian and bike infrastructure, and signage.

2) **Aesthetics** – evaluations of street design characteristics, landscaping, pedestrian amenities, and the presence or absence of litter and noise pollution.

3) **Accessibility** – evaluations of sidewalks, crosswalks, curbs and curb ramps, wayfinding signage, and bicycle infrastructure.

4) **Transfers** – evaluations of intermodal transfer amenities and infrastructure.

The analysis of the responses indicates the following characterizations of the station area:

- The lowest-ranking scores were in categories related to security/police presence, safety buffers for cyclists, driver behavior, sense of place, and quality of signage/navigation. Ten of the questions averaged between 1.0 and 2.0—a large number with responses in the strongly disagree to disagree range.

- Nearly half of the total number of questions received a score between 2.0 and 3.0, indicating that the greatest number of responses were somewhere between disagree and neutral.

- The highest-ranking scores were evaluations of the station area, quality of parking and drop-off areas, and shaded seating and waiting areas for stops. Six questions ranked 3.0 or higher.

- The average scores for the four main categories (safety, aesthetics, accessibility, and transfers) ranged between 2.2 and 2.6 out of 5. On all four categories, survey respondents rated the project study area negatively overall.

- The highest-scoring question by far related to the quality of parking and the pick-up/drop-off facilities. If this question were excluded from the average of the Accessibility category, its average score would fall from 2.56 to 1.93. This aligns with overall observations that the project study area is highly auto-centric, and although the station works well to serve park-and-ride and drop-off riders, first/last mile improvements to support active transportation are needed.

- The team that surveyed Quadrant 1 during the evening session gave the highest cumulative score. This team’s route included the least amount of travel

on major streets and was largely confined to the Metro G Line (Orange) bike path and residential streets. The team that surveyed the same quadrant during the day walked a much greater distance along Victory Boulevard and gave a significantly lower score.

- The lowest scores were provided by evaluators of Quadrant 2. The routes taken by these groups included significant portions of Sepulveda Boulevard and Victory Boulevard. Their evaluations support City of Los Angeles traffic data, which lists both on the High Injury Network as streets with a high concentration of severe injuries and deaths, with an emphasis on those involving people walking and biking.

- Quadrant 3 was the only section that scored higher during the evening session than during the daytime session. The daytime group consistently provided a lower ranking on pedestrian amenities, perhaps due to route choice or the amount of traffic experienced during daytime. The table below summarizes the scoring for each category by quadrant and is followed both by general observations and key takeaways from the survey.

	Question / Category	Quadrant 1			Quadrant 2			Quadrant 3		Average Score	Average score by section
		11/18 (AM)	11/18 (AM)	11/19 (PM)	11/18 (AM)	11/18 (AM)	11/19 (PM)	11/18 (AM)	11/19 (PM)		
Safety	1.1 - Adequate lighting	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.0	**2.22**
	1.2 - Eyes-on-the-street	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	2.4	
	1.3 - Presence of security/police	1	2	1	1	2	4	1	1	1.6	
	1.4 - Well maintained public realm	3	2	4	4	4	2	3	2	3.0	
	1.5 - Safety buffer for bikes	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1.3	
	1.6 - Safety buffer for pedestrians	3	1	3	2	2	2	3	2	2.3	
	1.7 - People-friendly traffic speeds and manners	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.4	
	1.8 - Clear safety signage	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	1	1.6	
	1.9 - Station area feels safe	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	3.5	
Aesthetics	2.1 - Sense of place	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1.4	**2.21**
	2.2 - Pleasant landscaping	4	3	1	2	3	3	2	3	2.6	
	2.3 - Strategically placed pedestrian amenities	2	1	3	3	3	1	3	1	2.1	
	2.4 - Pedestrian unfriendly elements are limited	2.5	1	3	2	2	2	3	2	2.2	
	2.5 - Pleasant experience	3	2	2	2	3	3	4	3	2.8	
Accessibility	3.1 - High quality sidewalks	4	3	2	2	2	2	2	2.5	2.4	**2.56**
	3.2 - Clear, safe crossings	4	1	4	2	2	2	5	3	2.9	
	3.3 - Operating and sufficient bicycle facilities	3	3	1	1	1	2	2	1	1.8	
	3.4 - High quality signage	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1.1	
	3.5 - Streamlined parking and drop-off	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4.4	

	Question / Category	Quadrant 1			Quadrant 2			Quadrant 3		Average Score	Average score by section
		11/18 (AM)	11/18 (AM)	11/19 (PM)	11/18 (AM)	11/18 (AM)	11/19 (PM)	11/18 (AM)	11/19 (PM)		
	3.6 - Curbs and curb ramps are provided	2	2	3	3	3	2	5	3	2.9	
	3.7 - Navigating the public realm	1	1	2	3	3	5	2	3	2.5	
Transfers	4.1 - Clear transit transfer signage	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1.3	
	4.2 - Real-time information	4	5	2	3	3	3	2	4	3.3	
	4.3 - Shaded seating and waiting areas	5	5	3	2	2	3	4	3	3.4	**2.30**
	4.4 - Reduced distances for travelers	3	2	2	1	1	3	1	2	1.9	
	4.5 - Seamless transfers	2	2	1	1	1	3	1	3	1.8	
	Total Score	69.5	59	56	54	57	66	64	58.5		

Table 1: Walk Audit Survey Quantitative Results

3.3 Key Takeaways

The walk audit survey, photos, and compilation of barriers, strengths, and observed behaviors covered the majority of walk and wheeled routes in the project study area. Taken together, the data informed key takeaways in a number of areas.

Auto-centricity

The sections of Sepulveda Boulevard and Victory Boulevard in the study area are both listed on Los Angeles Department of Transportation's High-Injury Network as streets with a high concentration of severe injuries and deaths, with an emphasis on those involved people walking and bicycling. Audit participants noticed high vehicular speeds and turning movements, aggressive driver behavior, and areas of potential conflict due to land use and street designs that prioritize drivers. Crosswalks at major intersections had faded or missing paint and do not adequately call attention to the potential for pedestrians crossing. Sidewalks at major intersections had limited buffer zones that forced pedestrians to wait in close proximity to turning cars, and green right-turn arrows at signals prioritized auto throughput.

Sidewalks and Accessibility

Several neighborhood streets were missing sidewalks. Sidewalks along major streets had cracked or uneven sidewalks that, in numerous locations, did not appear to meet ADA standards, creating walking and rolling hazards. Curb cuts were missing at some locations, while others were broken or poorly maintained.

Bus Stops

Passenger amenities varied. Some bus stops included benches and trash receptacles, while others included bus shelters. Very few provided shade. Several bus stops on Victory Boulevard west of Sepulveda offered no amenities beyond a bus stop sign.

Driving Behavior

Survey respondents reported feeling unsafe crossing the street even at major intersections due to high vehicular speeds, drivers blocking sidewalks as they turned out of properties, and aggressive turning movements.

Lighting and Safety

Stretches of the G Line Busway Bike Path had lighting that was either nonoperational or failed to fully illuminate the path. Some neighborhood streets and portions of major arterials lacked adequate lighting for pedestrians to see and be seen by drivers at night. Some streets featured long stretches where buildings did not have street-facing windows thereby lacking a sense of "eyes on the street" and perception of safety.

Cycling and Micromobility Infrastructure

Except for the G Line (Orange) Busway Bike Path and station area, there were no facilities such as bike lanes for bicycles, e-scooters, or other micromobility devices. Cyclists were forced to either ride on the sidewalk or share the roadway with cars traveling at speeds greater than 40 miles per hour. There was also very limited wayfinding signage informing riders of the bike path.

3.4 Select Photos

The following photos capture a portion of the observations gathered during the walk audits.

Figure 5: Chainlink fence behind office park cuts off the neighborhood from the main street and reduces walkability (Intersection of Hatteras Street and Califa Street).

Figure 6: High volumes of vehicular traffic on Oxnard Street to access Interstate 405.

Figure 7: Broken curb ramp and faded crosswalk at Whitman Avenue and Victory Boulevard.



Figure 8: Disconnected / missing sidewalks on Columbus Avenue.

Figure 9: Faded and missing crosswalk striping at the intersection of Sepulveda Boulevard and Victory Boulevard.



Figure 10: Right-turn arrows prioritize the movement of cars at intersections, where pedestrians are not prioritized.

Figure 11: Poorly lit bus stop at the northwest corner of Sepulveda Boulevard and Victory Boulevard.

Figure 12: A family with young children using the crosswalk at Sepulveda Boulevard and Victory Boulevard.

4 Next Steps

The Sepulveda G Line (Orange) walk audits gathered a variety of information pertaining to existing conditions in the project study area. The team identified areas where improvements to sidewalks, crosswalks, and curb cuts could contribute to a safer and a more enjoyable place to walk and roll to transit. Improvements to bicycle facilities and lighting could also help create an environment that feels safer for all users of the street. Results from the walk audit and survey will inform the draft Pathway Network and recommendations that will be developed in subsequent tasks and presented to the public during the community engagement process.

Appendix A: Roadway Characteristics

Number	Segment	Start	End	Roadway Width	Travel Lanes	Travel Lane Width	North or Westbound Turning Lanes	South or Eastbound Turning Lanes	Center Median	On-Street Parking	Parking Restrictions	Speed Limit	Grade	Roadway Quality	North or Westbound Sidewalk Width	North or Westbound Sidewalk Quality	South or Eastbound Sidewalk Width	South or Eastbound Sidewalk Quality	School Zone
1	Victory Blvd	I-405	Blucher Ave	80 feet	6	10 feet	None	1 Left	Striped	No	No Parking	40	Low to None	Good	6 feet	Fair	5 feet	Fair	No
2	Victory Blvd	Blucher Ave	Firmament Ave	80 feet	6	10 feet	None	1 Left	Striped	No	No Parking	40	Low to None	Fair	7 feet	Good	None	None	No
3	Victory Blvd	Firmament Ave	Orion Ave	80 feet	6	10 feet	None	1 Left	Striped	No	No Parking	40	Low to None	Poor	5 feet	Good	None	None	No
4	Victory Blvd	Orion Ave	Langdon Ave	80 feet	6	10 feet	None	1 Left	Striped	No	No Parking	40	Low to None	Poor	5 feet	Good	None	None	No
5	Victory Blvd	Langdon Ave	Peach Ave	80 feet	6	10 feet	None	1 Left	Striped	No	No Parking	40	Low to None	Poor	5 feet	Good	None	None	No
6	Victory Blvd	Peach Ave	Sepulveda Blvd	80 feet	6	10 feet	None	1 Left, 1 Right	Striped	No	No Parking	40	Low to None	Poor	12 feet	Fair	12 feet	Good	No
7	Victory Blvd	Sepulveda Blvd	Halbrent Ave	80 feet	6	10 feet	1 Left, 1 Right	None	Striped	No	No Parking	40	Low to None	Good	10 feet	Good	12 feet	Good	No
8	Victory Blvd	Halbrent Ave	Columbus Ave	80 feet	6	10 feet	1 Left	None	Striped	Westbound Only	No Stopping 7AM to 9AM and 4PM to 7PM	40	Low to None	Good	5 feet	Good	5 feet	Good	No
9	Victory Blvd	Columbus Ave	Half Mile Mark	80 feet	6	10 feet	None	None	Striped	Westbound Only	No Stopping 7AM to 9AM and 4PM to 7PM	40	Low to None	Good	5 feet	Good	5 feet	Good	No
10	Sepulveda Blvd	Half Mile Mark	Victory Blvd	80 feet	6	10 feet	None	2 Left, 1 Right	Striped	Southbound Only	2 Hour Parking 8AM to 6PM	40	Low to None	Poor	10 feet	Good	8 feet	Good	No
11	Sepulveda Blvd	Victory Blvd	Erwin St	80 feet	6	10 feet	2 Left	1 Left	Striped	Yes	1 Hour Parking 8AM to 6PM Northbound; 2 Hour Parking 8AM to 6PM Southbound	40	Low to None	Good	Varies	Fair	10 feet	Good	No
12	Sepulveda Blvd	Erwin St	Costco Dr	80 feet	6	10 feet	1 Left	1 Left	Striped	Yes	1 Hour Parking 8AM to 6PM	40	Low to None	Good	Varies	Good	10 feet	Good	No
12	Sepulveda Blvd	Costco Dr	Orange Line Busway	80 feet	6	10 feet	1 Left	1 Bus Only Left	Striped	No	No Parking	40	Low to None	Good	10 feet	Good	10 feet	Fair	No
13	Sepulveda Blvd	Orange Line Busway	Oxnard St	80 feet	6	10 feet	1 Left	1 Left	Striped	Yes	1 Hour Parking 8AM to 6PM	40	Low to None	Good	8 feet	Good	10 feet	Good	No
14	Sepulveda Blvd	Oxnard St	Hatteras St	80 feet	6	10 feet	1 Left	1 Left	Striped	Yes	None	40	Low to None	Good	Varies	Good	Varies	Good	No
15	Sepulveda Blvd	Hatteras St	Half Mile Mark	80 feet	6	10 feet	1 Left	None	Striped	Yes	2 Hour Parking 8AM to 6PM	40	Low to None	Good	10 feet	Good	10 feet	Good	No
16	Oxnard St	West End	Sepulveda Blvd	40 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Yes	None	40	Low to None	Good	5 feet	Fair	Varies	Fair	No
17	Oxnard St	Sepulveda Blvd	Noble Ave	56 feet	4	10 feet	1 Left	None	Striped	Yes	None	40	Low to None	Poor	10 feet	Poor	10 feet	Fair	No
18	Oxnard St	Noble Ave	Half Mile Mark	56 feet	4	10 feet	None	None	Striped	Yes	None	40	Low to None	Fair	10 feet	Poor	10 feet	Fair	No
19	Erwin St	Blucher Ave	Orion Ave	36 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Yes	Tuesday 8AM to 10AM Westbound; Monday 8AM to 10AM Eastbound	25	Low to None	Good	None	None	7 feet	Good	No
20	Erwin St	Orion Ave	Langdon Ave	36 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Yes	Tuesday 8AM to 10AM Westbound; Monday 8AM to 10AM Eastbound	25	Low to None	Fair	None	None	7 feet	Good	No
21	Erwin St	Langdon Ave	Peach Ave	36 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Westbound Only	Tuesday 8AM to 10AM Westbound	25	Low to None	Good	None	None	7 feet	Good	No
22	Erwin St	Peach Ave	Sepulveda Blvd	36 feet	2	None	1 Left	1 Left	None	No	No Parking	25	Low to None	Fair	12 feet	Fair	12 feet	Good	No
23	Erwin St	Sepulveda Blvd	Halbrent Ave	40 feet	2	None	1 Left	None	None	Yes	1 Hour Parking 8AM to 6PM	25	Low to None	Good	7 feet	Good	8 feet	Good	No
24	Erwin St	Halbrent Ave	Columbus Ave	40 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Eastbound Only	2 Hour Parking 8AM to 6PM	25	Low to None	Good	None	None	10 feet	Good	No
25	Erwin St	Columbus Ave	Noble Ave	40 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Yes	1 Hour Parking 8 AM to 6PM Eastbound; 8AM to 10AM Monday Westbound	25	Low to None	Good	12 feet	Fair	7 feet	Good	Yes
26	Blucher Ave	Victory Blvd	Erwin St	36 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Yes	Tuesday 8AM to 10AM Northbound; Monday 8AM to 10AM Southbound	25	Low to None	Good	5 feet	Good	5 feet	Good	No
27	Orion Ave	Victory Blvd	Erwin St	36 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Yes	None	25	Low to None	Good	None	None	None	None	No
28	Langdon Ave	Victory Blvd	Erwin St	36 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Yes	Tuesday 8AM to 10AM Northbound; Monday 8AM to 10AM Southbound	25	Low to None	Fair	None	None	None	None	No
29	Peach Ave	Victory Blvd	Erwin St	36 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Yes	Monday 8AM to 10AM Northbound; Tuesday 8AM to 10AM Southbound	25	Low to None	Poor	None	None	None	None	No
30	Halbrent Ave	Victory Blvd	Erwin St	36 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Yes	Tuesday 8AM to 10AM Northbound; Monday 8AM to 10AM Southbound	25	Low to None	Good	None	None	5 feet	Fair	No
31	Columbus Ave	Victory Blvd	Erwin St	36 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Yes	Monday 8AM to 10AM Northbound; Tuesday 8AM to 10AM Southbound	25	Low to None	Fair/ Poor	None	None	None	None	No
32	Friar St	Blucher Ave	Sylvan St	36 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Yes	Tuesday 8AM to 10AM Westbound; Monday 8AM to 10AM Eastbound	25	Low to None	Good	5 feet	Good	5 feet	Good	No
33	Friar St	Columbus Ave	Half Mile Mark	36 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Yes	Tuesday 8AM to 10AM Westbound; Monday 8AM to 10AM Eastbound	25	Low to None	Fair	None	None	None	None	No
34	Sylvan St	Blucher Ave	Friar St	36 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Yes	Monday 8AM to 10AM Westbound; Tuesday 8AM to 10AM Eastbound	25	Low to None	Fair	5 feet	Good	5 feet	Good	No

Appendix A: Roadway Characteristics

35	Sylvan St	Columbus Ave	Noble Ave	36 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Yes	Monday 8AM to 10AM Westbound; Tuesday 8AM to 10AM Eastbound	25	Low to None	Good	None	None	None	None	No
36	Domino St	Columbus Ave	Noble Ave	36 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Yes	Tuesday 8AM to 10AM Westbound; Monday 8AM to 10AM Eastbound	25	Low to None	Good	None	None	None	None	Yes
37	Noble Ave	Half Mile Mark	Delano St	40 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Yes	Tuesday 8AM to 10AM Northbound; Monday 8AM to 10AM Southbound	25	Low to None	Good	5 feet	Good	5 feet	Good	Yes
38	Noble Ave	Oxnard St	Califa St	40 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Yes	None	25	Low to None	Good	None	None	5 feet	Fair	No
39	Noble Ave	Califa St	Half Mile Mark	40 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Yes	2 Hour Parking 8AM to 6PM	25	Low to None	Good	5 feet	Good	None	None	No
40	Califa St	Halbrent Ave	Columbus Ave	36 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Yes	2 Hour Parking 8AM to 6PM Eastbound; Tuesday 8AM to 10PM Westbound	25	Low to None	Good	None	None	None	None	No
	Califa St	Columbus Ave	Half Mile Mark	36 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Yes	2 Hour Parking 8AM to 6PM Eastbound; 8PM to 6AM Westbound	25	Low to None	Good	Varies	Fair	None	None	No
41	Halbrent Ave	Califa St	Half Mile Mark	36 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Yes	Monday 8AM to 10AM Northbound; Tuesday 8AM to 10AM Southbound	25	Low to None	Good	None	None	5 feet	Good	No
42	Columbus Ave	Califa St	Half Mile Mark	36 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Yes	Tuesday 8AM to 10AM Northbound; Monday 8AM to 10AM Southbound	25	Low to None	Good	None	None	None	None	No
43	Burnet Ave	Califa St	Half Mile Mark	36 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Yes	Monday 8AM to 10AM Northbound; Tuesday 8AM to 10AM Southbound	25	Low to None	Good	None	None	None	None	No
44	Hatteras St	West End	Sepulveda Blvd	40 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Yes	No Parking 9PM to 6AM	25	Low to None	Fair	10 feet	Good	5 feet	Good	No
45	Hatteras St	Sepulveda Blvd	Halbrent Ave	40 feet	2	None	None	None	None	No	No Parking	30	Low to None	Fair	10 feet	Good	None	None	No
46	Hatteras St	Halbrent Ave	Burnet Ave	40 feet	2	None	None	None	None	Yes	Monday 8AM to 10AM Westbound; Tuesday 8AM to 10AM Eastbound	30	Low to None	Good	None	None	None	None	No

Metro G Line (Orange)

First/Last Mile Planning
Community Engagement Summary

Contents

Table of Figures

1 Introduction

The First/Last Mile (FLM) Plan (Plan) for the Metro G Line (Orange) Sepulveda station analyzed FLM connections for the bus rapid transit (BRT) station by executing Metro's FLM planning methodology. As part of the G Line BRT Improvements Project, the Sepulveda station will be rebuilt and relocated as an elevated station near Sepulveda Bl.

This report summarizes the results of an online survey and engagement activities specific to and in support of the FLM planning effort associated with the G Line (Orange) Sepulveda station. The online survey was conducted as an effort to learn more about the experience of walking and biking to and from the Sepulveda station. This FLM planning effort included participation from Metro Countywide Planning & Development, Metro Community Relations, Metro Marketing, Metro Program Management, and consultant IBI Group.

The report is organized into five sections: 1) this introduction, 2) a description of the community engagement efforts, 3) a summary of the survey results, 4) a review of the online survey application, and 5) lessons learned. The last section is critical to Metro and other public agencies as innovative, meaningful ways are sought to engage communities in midst of the COVID-19 pandemic. Community input received through the online survey and summarized in this report will be used to inform the development of FLM project types and accompanying locations near the Metro G Line (Orange) Sepulveda station.

2 Community Engagement Summary

2.1 Objectives

Metro's FLM program has established how robust community engagement is a foundational element of the FLM planning process. In the context of FLM planning, there are three (3) key objectives for robust community engagement. The first key objective is to receive input from transit riders, especially those who walk, bike, or roll themselves to and from Metro stations. Metro riders are the core beneficiaries of FLM improvements and understanding their unique challenges and concerns regarding station access is essential for developing safe, convenient, and easier ways to access Metro stations. Further, transit riders provide the experiential knowledge critical for developing FLM project types and accompanying locations.

The second key objective is to receive input from the local community – residents, commuters, employers, neighborhood organizations – within the FLM planning area. Metro's FLM program defines the FLM planning area as a half (0.5) mile radial distance from stations for pedestrians and a three (3) mile radial distance from stations for bicyclists. Metro has a direct interest in improving pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure near Metro stations as nearby communities represent potentially new or more frequent transit riders, who would be more inclined to ride Metro if there are high-quality FLM infrastructure investments near stations.

The third key objective is to craft engagement formats that offer a creative, tactile, and "gamified" experience to encourage participation and provide the highly detailed, fine-grained data required for FLM planning. Engagement activities should seek to collect data that reflects the FLM improvement types and accompanying locations desired by community members, as well as destinations and key places of interest to which community members travel. Additionally, inquires about travel patterns provide an opportunity to check for discrepancies with the Draft Pathway Network. Interactive engagement activities serve two purposes: to collect data and feedback to inform the development of FLM project types and locations and 2) to foster general awareness of FLM issues to communities.

2.2 Initial Plan

The community engagement plan developed for the Plan initially proposed two in-person events along with intercept surveys as the primary method for soliciting input and understanding priorities from the community. The first of the events was to be a weekday pop-up event at the Sepulveda station and the second as a weekend community event at a nearby recreational facility. The latter was to feature a fun bike rodeo, led by a community-based organization, to educate parents and children about bike safety.

The in-person community engagement events were to include an interactive activity where participants were provided colorful FLM project type icons and asked to place the icons on draft Pathway Network map. This interactive activity would have allowed many to share their FLM priorities and provide a comfortable environment for the community to have one-on-one dialog with the project team.

The intercept survey was intended to take place during weekday commute hours of 6:30 a.m. – 9:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. – 7 p.m. The surveys were to contain 5-8 questions and be produced in both English and Spanish. Both the intercept survey and the in-person events were scheduled to occur in April 2020.

2.3 Impact of COVID-19

The COVID-19 pandemic and the State and County's Safer at Home orders enacted in March 2020 precluded Metro and the project team's ability to move forward with in-person community engagement events. In light of these challenges, Metro elected to conduct an online survey to ensure safety and compliance with State and County directives, while also providing the community and transit riders an interactive opportunity to provide meaningfully input to inform the development of project ideas for the FLM plan.

2.4 Online Engagement

Metro selected an interactive, map-based online survey application, Maptionnaire, as the main method for soliciting input from the community to inform the development of FLM project types and locations. Maptionnaire is an online survey application utilizing map-based tools to design questionnaires, collect data, and convey information. In addition to familiar question types, Maptionnaire provides respondents with an interactive, "gamified" experience with questions to identify their FLM challenges or ideas on a map. On the backend, Maptionnaire provides an automatic analysis of questionnaire data with detailed charts, maps, and GIS data for further analysis.

The Metro G Line (Orange) Sepulveda Station First/Last Mile Survey was live for 30 days, from August 26, 2020, to September 25, 2020. Over 500 responses were recorded. Participation was incentivized using a raffle for Metro-themed prize packages. The survey was promoted through a variety of methods including social media posts, E-blasts, and more as described below:

- Announcements to Neighborhood Councils, Service Councils, and Chambers of Commerce
- Posts on agency blogs (Source/El Pasajero)
- Posts on agency social media sites, such as Facebook, Instagram, Twitter
- E-blasts to a stakeholder distribution list (over 1,500 stakeholder email addresses)
- Requesting City of LA staff promote the survey with their stakeholders
- Updating the project website
- Updating the project fact sheet
- Research local community-based and faith-based organizations to request their assistance with survey promotion
- Notification of the survey on Nextdoor
- A-frame advertisements at the Sepulveda Station with a QR code link to the survey (Figure 1)

Figure 1: A-frame advertisement with QR Code at the G Line Sepulveda Station

Engaging the public online rather than in-person has both benefits and limitations. One limitation is the difficultly knowing whether online engagement efforts is eliciting input from the target audience. Online engagement methods tend to elicit input from those with broadband internet access, technological literacy, and English-speaking households. In this way, online community engagement poses significant challenges to social equity. On the other hand, there are many benefits of online engagement, including time and cost savings, an increased number of participants, and, in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, safety. For these reasons, it is important to consider how online community engagement tools can supplement traditional community engagement efforts in the future. Section 5 describes the lessons learned from conducting online community engagement, which can be applied to future FLM plans to improve the community engagement process and outcomes.

3 Survey Results

The Metro G Line (Orange) Sepulveda Station FLM survey questions were designed to understand current access and safety issues as well as identify community priorities for future investment near the Sepulveda station. Questions about travel patterns and behaviors provided an opportunity to check for discrepancies with the Draft Pathway Network. While demographic questions were incorporated to gain insight into who participated in the survey and if the survey reached the target audience.

3.1 Demographics

The following charts present demographic data for survey respondents including age, gender, race, household income, and zip codes of respondents' residences. Discrepancies in total responses among questions can be attributed to two factors: 1) demographic questions not requiring a response and 2) how Maptionnaire collects and records survey responses, as responses were recorded for each question answered individually.

3.1.1 Age

The majority survey respondents were over the age of 25, while young adults and youth (under 25) were underrepresented. 19% of respondents were 65+, 14% were 55-64, 17% were 45-54, 19% were 35-44, 24% were 25-34, and 6% were 18-24. 0% of respondents were under the age of 18. These numbers are relatively consistent with Metro G Line riders in terms of ridership by age according to Metro's On-Board Customer Satisfaction Survey from Fall 2019: 6% are 65+, 17% 50-64, 18% 35-49, 17% 25-34, 33% 18-24, and 10% under 18.



Figure 2: Age of Respondents

3.1.2 Gender

Approximately 65% of respondents identified as a man, 30% as a woman, and 5% as either transgender, non-binary, or preferred not to answer. This is not representative of gender distributions for Metro G Line riders overall according to Metro's On-Board Customer Satisfaction Survey from 2019 where 54% of G Line riders identify as a man while 45% identify as a woman. Just over 1% of G Line riders identified as non-binary ("transgender" and "prefer not to answer" were not recorded in this data).



Figure 3: Gender of Respondents

3.1.3 Race and Ethnicity

Approximately 57% of respondents identified as White/Caucasian, 19% as Hispanic/Latino, 10% as Asian, Asian Indian or Pacific Islander, 6% as Black or African American, and 8% as either American Indian or Alaskan Native, Other, or declined to state. This is not necessarily reflective of Metro G Line ridership numbers by race according to Metro's General On-Board Customer Satisfaction Survey from 2019, where 54% of riders identify as Latino, 17% as white, 12% as Asian, 11% as African American/Black, and 5% as Native American, Other, or Refused. The respondent breakdown is though somewhat more reflective of the Sepulveda Station area (within 2 miles), as shown in Census data, wherein 49% of residents are white, 40% Hispanic or Latino, 6% Asian, 4% Black or African American, and 1% Other.



Figure 4: Race and Ethnicity of Respondents

3.1.4 Household Income

The most common household income represented is between $50,000 and $74,999 at 18%. This is followed by the category “decline to state” at 16%. Next are the categories $75,000-$99,999 and $100,000-$149,000 each at 13%. These are followed by $150,000-$199,999 and $25,000-$49,999 each at 12%. Next is the category “less than $25,000” at 10%, and finally “$200,000 or more” falls at 6% of respondents. This is somewhat consistent with the household income in the general study area.

According to the 2018 ACS Income Survey of zip codes surrounding Sepulveda Station, the $50,000-$74,999 bracket represents 15% of residents, the $75,000-$99,999 represents 11%, the $100,000-$149,000 represents 14%, the $150,000-$199,999 represents 7%, the $25,000-$49,999 represents 21%, “less than $25,000” represents 18%, and “$200,000 or more” represents 14%. In general, the respondents of the Metro survey seem to fall more toward the mid-range, with the ACS having a greater number of “less than $25,999” and between $25,000-49,999 individuals, as well as a greater number of “$200,000 or more” individuals.



Figure 5: Household Income of Respondents

3.1.5 Location of Respondents

The most common zip codes identified by respondents are those adjacent to Sepulveda Station: 91411, 91401, and 91403. The least common within Los Angeles County are those that lie further on the periphery, as far South as Long Beach, as far West as Thousand Oaks, as far North as the San Gabriel Mountains, and as far East as West Covina. There are also five outliers from zip codes outside of Los Angeles County, as noted on the map. While the zip codes adjacent to Sepulveda Station each have a higher number of respondents than those on the periphery, only 9% of respondents total live within a half-mile of the station, and 30% within a mile. Though the number of respondents per zip code beyond a mile outside of the station each have low numbers of respondents, overall, 70% of respondents live beyond the one-mile radius mark.



Figure 6: Respondents by Zip Code

Respondents were asked to point out the closest intersection to their home. For those who responded to this question and lived within the study area, 10 lived within a half-mile radius of Sepulveda station, while 9 lived within a mile-radius of the station.



Figure 7: Location of Residence within Study Area

3.1.6 Summary

Overall, the most common demographic characteristics of survey respondents by category are:

- **Age:** 47 (approximated average)
- **Gender:** Man (66% of respondents)
- **Race:** White (57% of respondents)
- **Household Income**: $79,000 (approximated average)

In terms of household locations, residences were distributed throughout LA County. However, the greatest concentration of respondents was in three zip codes surrounding the station. Discrepancies between demographics of survey respondents and individuals with relationships with the station that would have been reached with in-person outreach efforts may be due to the fact that the survey was a completely online effort rather than an in-person one due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

3.2 Rider Behavior

To get a better understanding of respondents' relationship to the Sepulveda station, the survey asked questions about people's regular travel habits. These include how often they use public transit, how often they ride the G Line, how often they use Sepulveda station, the reasons they ride the G Line, and how they connect to and transfer from the G Line. The survey also asked respondents to note on a map the key destinations they frequent near the station, as well as their typical route to the station.

3.2.1 Frequency of Public Transit Use

The most common rider frequency of public transit in LA County is daily, at 33%. Next most common is weekly at 21%, followed by monthly at 20%, rarely at 17%, and never at 8%. Because COVID-19 has caused a plummet in public transit ridership nation-wide, this question refers to ridership prior to the pandemic to get a more accurate measure of typical behavior.



Figure 8: Frequency of Public Transit Use

The most common rider frequency of the Metro G Line is rarely, at 33%. Next most common is weekly, at 22% followed by monthly at 20%. Next is daily at 14%, and last is never at 13%.



Figure 9: Frequency of Orange Line Use

The most common user frequency of the Metro G Line Sepulveda Station is rarely, at 42%. Next most common is never, at 18%. Next is monthly at 16%, weekly at 15%, and daily at 10%.



Figure 10: Frequency of Sepulveda Station Use

3.2.2 Relationship to Study Area

The most common relationships to the study area are “I shop here” and “I live here”, each at 25% of responses. The next most common is “Other.” Categories within “Other” responses are shown the chart below. Less common is “I transfer to another Metro bus here” at 14%, “I work here” at 10%. Least common is “I/My children go to school here” at 3%.



Figure 11: Relationship to Van Nuys/Sherman Oaks Area

The most common “other” relationship to the study area was none, where respondents stated that they did not live, work, or visit the service area whatsoever. Next most common was visiting family and friends. Many people noted that they never stop in the area but that they are familiar with it from passing through. A significant number of respondents visit the area for either fun or exercise as well as a few other activities. Finally, some respondents noted that they park at the Sepulveda station.



Figure 12: "Other" Relationship to Van Nuys/Sherman Oaks Area

To understand how current and potential riders may use the station area, participants were asked to note key destinations in the general Sepulveda Station Area. Specifically, they were asked “what are some nearby destinations you visit or are likely to visit?” Participants were told to mark these destinations on the map along with a brief description. Over 650 destinations were indicated, a summary of which is shown below. 43% of key destinations lie within a half-mile radius of Sepulveda Station, 55% within one mile, 84% within three miles, and 16% beyond three miles.



Figure 13: Key Destinations in Sepulveda Station Area

3.2.3 Transportation to Study Area

The most common mode of transportation to get to and from Sepulveda station is by bus, at 23%. Next most common is driving alone at 19%, walking at 18%, biking at 14%, getting dropped off/picked up at 9%, rideshare at 6%, other at 5% (most of these responses were people who do not use the station), carpooling at 3%, and e-scooter at 2%. While 28% (driving alone, getting dropped off, rideshare) of respondents use a private vehicle to get to and from the station, 72% use alternative modes.



Figure 14: Mode of Transportation to Sepulveda Station

Out of the respondents who use Sepulveda Station as a transfer point, 59% use Metro Rapid 734, 25% use Metro Local 234 (both from West Los Angeles to San Fernando), and 16% use Metro Rapid 788 (from Westwood to Arleta).



Figure 15: Bus Lines Used to Transfer to Sepulveda Station

To understand the streets and paths most used to get to Sepulveda Station, participants were asked to note their routes to and from the station. The most used routes in the West-East directions include the Orange Line Busway, Victory Boulevard (an arterial street) and Burbank Boulevard (a collector street). The most used routes in the North-South direction include Sepulveda Boulevard (an arterial street), the 405 San Diego Freeway/Haskell Avenue (a collector street), and Woodley Avenue (a collector street). There is also significant usage of the Sepulveda Basin Recreational Area bike paths to the West of the station, as well as throughout the small streets and parking lots just East of the station.



Figure 16: Routes to Sepulveda Station

3.2.4 Summary

The most common responses to questions regarding frequency of use of public transit, the G Line, and Sepulveda Station were “rarely” and “never,” and a significant number of respondents indicated that they have no relationship to the study area whatsoever. This may indicate that the survey does not reflect opinions and feedback from the station’s core users. However, for most respondents with a relationship to the area, uses were pretty diverse, with living and shopping being the most common and school and work being the least common. People also used a diverse range of modes to get to and from the station, with bus, driving alone, and walking being the most common.

3.3 Issues

To get a better understanding of current barriers to access within and around Sepulveda Station, participants were asked “What issues make it difficult to reach the station by walking or biking, and where are they?” Participants were then directed to use color-coded pins to mark areas they found difficult, unsafe, or unpleasant near the station. The following chart shows an overview of numbers of barriers recorded by category. Maps of each response category provide a more in-depth understanding of the exact locations of different types of barriers.

The category with the greatest number of responses is issues with bike lanes, with speeding as a close second. The categories with the least responses are barriers to those with accessibility challenges and crossings which are spaced too far apart/long blocks.



Figure 17: Barriers to Access to Sepulveda Station by Category

3.3.1 Listed Issues

This section of the questionnaire asked participants to note on the map where each type of issue was located. This section received less responses than previous sections, ranging between 27 and 94 responses per category, with an average of 53 responses.

The “there are no bike lanes or they need maintenance” category received the most responses at 94. The highest concentrations of bike lane issues identified is along Sepulveda Boulevard, within and beyond the study area. There is also a significant number of issues reported on Victory Boulevard and Burbank Boulevard, and fewer on Oxnard Street and the Orange Line Busway. A significant number of issues on peripheral streets are also noted.



Figure 18: There Are No Bike Lanes or They Need Maintenance

Speeding received the second-highest number of responses at 87. Most respondents indicated that speeding barriers fall along Sepulveda Boulevard, with the highest concentration right near the station. Some incidents of speeding are also recorded right next to the station on Bulcher Avenue.



Figure 19: Speeding

Lack of shade received a relatively high number of responses at 71. Most issues with shade are along Sepulveda Boulevard and the Orange Line Busway, as well as on Victory Boulevard and Oxnard Street.



Figure 20: Not Enough Shade While Walking or Bicycling

Having to cross too many lanes and street width received about 54 responses. Many responses indicate that Sepulveda is an overly wide street, with the majority of markings located near Sepulveda Station at the Orange Line Busway intersection. Responses were also concentrated on Sepulveda at Burbank Boulevard to the South and Victory Boulevard to the North.



Figure 21: People Have to Cross too Many Lanes/Wide Streets

The number of responses related to time allocated to cross the street is mid-range at 53. Most recorded crossing time barriers fall right near the station, crossing Sepulveda Boulevard and the Orange Line Busway. There is also a concentration of responses in this category at the intersection of Sepulveda and Victory Boulevard.



Figure 22: People Are Not Given Enough Time to Cross the Street

The number of responses related to lack of bus shelter and seating is mid-range at 52. Every bus stop in the study area, as well as some on its periphery were indicated as lacking seating or shelter. The greatest concentration of responses is at the Orange Line stops and Metro 234 and 734 stops along Sepulveda Boulevard, and especially those located at the intersection of Sepulveda Boulevard and Orange Line Busway.

Figure 22: Bus stop does not have enough seating or shelter

The number of responses related to insufficient lighting is on the lower end at 34. The highest concentrations of issues with lighting are along the Orange Line Busway, and specifically at the bus stop area. There is also a significant number of responses along various parts of Sepulveda Boulevard. However, concerns related to safety was listed in the “Issues not listed” category which will be discussed further.



Figure 23: Not enough lighting for people walking or biking

The missing, broken or narrow sidewalk category received a relatively low number of responses at 34. Most issues with sidewalks were recorded on Sepulveda Boulevard and Columbus Avenue. However, concerns related to this issue were noted in the “Issues not listed” category which will be discussed further.



Figure 25: Missing, Broken, or Narrow Sidewalks

This accessibility for people with disability category received a relatively low number of responses at 32. Responses indicate that the greatest barriers to those with accessibility challenges lie at the intersection of Sepulveda Boulevard and Orange Line Busway, an intersection that was also noted as having a variety of issues regarding crossing time, wide streets, long blocks, and sidewalk issues. There is also a collection of points along Columbus Avenue, previously noted to have sidewalks in poor condition.

Figure 26: People with Accessibility Challenges Have Difficulties

The number of responses related to distance between crossings was the lowest out of all categories at 27. The greatest concentration of crossing issues is across Sepulveda Boulevard. Reponses indicate that the lack of opportunities to cross Sepulveda are particularly troublesome between Victory Boulevard and the Orange Line Busway, as well as between Oxnard Street and Burbank Boulevard.

Figure 27: Crossings are Spaced too Far Apart/Long Blocks

3.3.2 Issues not Listed

To capture current issues as fully as possible, the questionnaire also provided participants the option of adding any issues that were not listed in the section above to an interactive map along with a comment. The issues not listed are shown in the map on the following page, which is followed by a table containing a comment for each point. There were 43 responses in this section, and these were broken down into themes. Common themes of responses include Barriers for Pedestrians, Barriers for Cyclists, Barriers for Transit Riders, People Experiencing Homelessness, Safety, Cleanliness, Comfort, and Other.

Most unlisted issues are concentrated right by the new station area at the intersection of Sepulveda Boulevard and the Orange Line Busway, with lesser concentrations along Sepulveda and the Orange Line Busway. Some of the issues listed here fall into previous categories such as speeding and bike path improvements, but there are also many responses that were not listed.

One issue emphasized here is that of people experiencing homelessness: both regarding individuals who are homeless and physical encampments. While some respondents think it has a negative impact on the public realm generally, others feel that homelessness is a direct health and/or safety issue. Safety was also discussed in terms of women and the elderly being particularly vulnerable populations, especially at night.

Finally, a common issue is the distance between the station and the street. Many individuals indicated that they miss connections because the walk is too far, and also that the walk is often strenuous and uncomfortable, especially considering the lack of shade, which is a problem for respondents on their way to work, among others. This specific issue will be addressed with the relocation of the station at the intersection of Sepulveda Boulevard.



Figure 28: Issues Not Listed

ID	Categories	Issue Not Listed
1	Barriers for Transit Riders / Safety	People have to walk to Wardlow station from Long Beach Blvd if they take a bus. If you do have to walk from a bus stop which is far away, you have to cross the freeway entrance to the 405 South, which can be very dangerous.
2	People Experiencing Homelessness	Homeless
3	Barriers for Transit Riders / Barriers for Pedestrians	Current station is a long walk-- many people and myself have missed connections to local/rapid buses
4	Barriers for Pedestrians	Parking lot and access for visitors who drive, and who then want to walk to the Sepulveda Dam or park.
5	Cleanliness / Comfort	Sidewalks broken or trashy and not well kept up - unpleasant to walk along Sepulveda as not enough shade.
6	Barriers for Pedestrians	“Frontage” road forces pedestrians to cross Clark and Weddington in unmarked crosswalks and at intersections where cars/drivers do not stop.
7	Other	Bus needs to be replaced with a light rail train
8	Barriers for Cyclists	If you had protected bike lanes along Sepulveda or Woodley, I would use those to get to the orange line station from my house.
9	People Experiencing Homelessness	Homeless encampments
10	Other	Ability to handle large inflow of cars into park and ride lot through this intersection. If the Orange line converted into an extension of the red line, and didn’t make people switch trains at two terminal stations next to each other, if the Red line.
11	People Experiencing Homelessness	Often site of homeless encampments along ancillary roadway to station parking
12	Barriers for Transit Riders	Yes-the Sepulveda Orange Line station is horrible for bus riders. Okay if you drive there because you step from your car to the bus. But terrible when you transfer from a bus on Sepulveda. You walk a long way down a path that has fences on both sides.
13	Barriers for Pedestrians	Too far of walk in business attire.
14	Barriers for Cyclists	LA is not a safe place to bike. Always in danger of being hit by a car.
15	People Experiencing Homelessness / Safety	We heard about the LAHSA's plan moving 41 homeless vehicles to this parking lot. This is such a horrible idea and could affect badly the cleanness, safety of area. Also, it could affect the health of people who are using bike lane or walking to station.
16	Comfort	Provide bicycle repair station or co-op
17	People Experiencing Homelessness	The homeless encampments along the bike path have made it unsafe. there is high number of transients intoxicated and have chased me down a few times.
18	People Experiencing Homelessness	Homeless encampments under the bridge. the take up the whole space for biking/walking
19	People Experiencing Homelessness	Homeless living/sleeping/blocking sidewalks

ID	Categories	Issue Not Listed
20	People Experiencing Homelessness / Safety	Safety and dirty. Women need to think about assaults and the homeless and shady people. Plus only the homeless are riding bikes AND surprised more people aren't killed by not understanding that bikes need to follow vehicle laws.
21	People Experiencing Homelessness	The homeless and garbage. I used to run that route every day. I stopped because repeatedly i came across homeless shooting heroin in the center of the pathway. Gangs selling drugs. 818 spray painted everywhere. My wife was too afraid to come with me.
22	Barriers for Transit Riders / Barriers for Pedestrians	Not enough frequency for connection bus from Calabasas to Orange Line station at Canoga Park and it stops early in the evening.
23	Safety	Safety
24	Barriers for Transit Riders	788 bus stop is too far from Orange Line station
25	Safety	Violent people.
26	Safety	There are sometimes people smoking marijuana at the bench near the parking lot where bikes are stored.
27	Barriers for Cyclists / Barriers for Pedestrians	Bicycles, scooters, and similar vehicles that have MOTORS are a constant hazard on sidewalks, crosswalks, and BIKE PATHS. E-bikes, motorized vehicles of all types, should be restricted to regular city streets or Sharrows.
28	People Experiencing Homelessness	Homeless and their encampments.
29	Safety	Too risky for elderly citizens to walk a long way between station and the bus that goes to Sylmar (northbound) or Sherman Oaks Galleria, the Skirball, the Getty, or UCLA (southbound)
30	Comfort	No shade, too hot
31	Barriers for Cyclists	I'm 71 and could ride my bike downhill but the return would require me biking uphill approximately 970' elevation from Ventura Blvd. to my house.
32	People Experiencing Homelessness / Barriers for Pedestrians / Barriers for Cyclists	Bike/walking paths are overrun with encampments of addict homeless that the city does nothing substantive to remove.
33	Barriers for Pedestrians / Barriers to Cyclists	The streets to get to the stations are not pedestrian or bicycle friendly.
34	People Experiencing Homelessness	Too many homeless and junkies
35	Safety	Two issues: not enough clear markers for vision impaired. Also there are some issues with unpleasant and dangerous people - need more law enforcement patrolling
36	Barriers for Pedestrians	Too far
37	Barriers for Transit Riders	Needs easy transfer between G Line and local bus.

ID	Categories	Issue Not Listed
38	People Experiencing Homelessness / Safety	There are a huge number of homeless encampments both east and west of this location. many women i know will not use transport or cycle in this area as they have been accosted and harassed and generally don't feel safe. at night it's worse
39	Safety / People Experiencing Homelessness	Victory Blvd does not have enough lights on the north side of the street and there are homeless encampments on the south side.
40	Barriers for Cyclists / Barriers for Pedestrians	Bicycles go by very fast and sometimes just barely miss the pedestrians getting off the metro to walk to the parking lot.
41	Other	No safety concerns but live in hills -driving is the only option
42	Barriers for Pedestrians	The station is too far from the street
43	Barriers for Pedestrians	Needing to cross the bike lanes to/from the Station access

3.4 Improvement Priorities and Ideas

The online survey offered respondents the opportunity to share their ideas on how to improve the station. Participants were asked about their priorities in general, opinions on the importance of certain improvements, and what improvements they would make if possible. The survey first asked participants about their priorities near Sepulveda Station in general as well as their priorities for the G Line Bike Path specifically. It also asked participants to point out any specific improvement ideas they had with an interactive map.

3.4.1 Improvement Priorities Near Sepulveda Station

To help better understand respondents' priorities in the Sepulveda Station area, participants were asked to rank the importance of each potential type of improvement and were asked "Which improvements would you prioritize near the Sepulveda Station of the Metro G Line (Orange)?" Participants were invited to rank each improvement with a score of 1 to 5, 5 being the most important. The following charts show priority levels by improvement type, and the final table provides a summary of average rank for each category. This part of the questionnaire received fewer responses than some other questions, with an average of 144 responses per category.

Pedestrian and bicycle lighting were ranked as an extremely high priority, 61% of respondents ranking it as a 5, 32% a 4, 3% a 2, and 2% 3 and 1.



Figure 29: Priority of Pedestrian & Bicycle Lighting

New or improved sidewalks were rated as very high priorities, with 61% of respondents rating it a 5, 29% a 4, 5% a 2, 4% a 1, and 2% a 3.

Figure 30: Priority of New or Improved Sidewalks

Landscaping and shade were ranked as high priorities, with 59% of respondents ranking it a 5, 28% a 4, 6% a 2, 5% a 1, and 2% a 3.



Figure 31: Priority of Landscaping & Shade

Bike lanes or bike route improvements were ranked as high priorities, with 50% of respondents rating it a 5, 27% rating a 4, 12% rating a 1, 8% rating a 2, and 3% rating a 3.



Figure 32: Priority of Bike Lanes or Routes

Bus stop improvements were ranked as a moderately high priority, with 53% of respondents rating it a 5, 33% a 4, 8% a 1, 5% a 2, and 1% a 3.



Figure 33: Priority of Bus Stop Improvements

Bike-friendly intersections were ranked as a high priority, with 49% rating it a 5, 32% rating a 4, 10% rating a 2, 8% rating a 1, and 1% rating a 3.



Figure 34: Priority of Bike-friendly Intersections

Drop-off, Pick-up, & Rideshare were ranked as moderately high priorities, with 43% of respondents rating it a 5, 28% a 4, 17% a 2, 11% a 1, and 2% a 3.



Figure 35: Priority of Drop-off, Pick-up, & Rideshare

Wayfinding improvements were ranked as a moderately high priority, with 35% of respondents rating it a 5, 31% rating a 4, 18% rating a 2, 12% rating a 1, and 4% rating a 3.



Figure 36: Priority of Wayfinding Signs

Slower speeds were ranked as moderately high of a priority, with 41% of respondents raking it a 5, 26% a 4, 18% a 1, 15% a 2, and 0% a 3.



Figure 37: Priority of Slower Speeds

Bike Hub and Bike Parking were ranked as moderately high priorities, with 31% of respondents ranking it a 5, 36% a 4, 19% a 2, 11% a 1, and 3% a 3.



Figure 38: Priority of Bike Hub and Bike Parking

Street furniture was ranked as a moderately high priority, with 37% of respondents ranking it a 5, 31% a 4, 17% a 2, 12% a 1, and 4% a 3.

Figure 39: Priority of Street Furniture

New or improved crosswalks were rated as high priorities, with 53% of respondents ranking it at a 5, 36% a 4, 6% a 2, 4% a 1, and 1% a 3.



Figure 40: Priority of New or Improved Crosswalks

Overall, no categories scored “neutrally important” or below, with the minimum score being a 3.6. The categories that seem to be of the highest priority are lighting, improved sidewalks, and improved landscaping and shade. However, the maximum difference among average scores is only 0.9, meaning that no single category is starkly more prioritized than any other. It seems that users of Sepulveda Station overall designate every listed category as a significant priority.

Category	Average Score
Pedestrian & Bicycle Lighting	4.5
New or Improved Sidewalks	4.4
Landscaping & Shade	4.3
Bike Lanes or Routes	4.2
Bus Stop Improvements	4.2
Bike-friendly Intersections	4
Drop-off, Pick-up, & Rideshare	3.7
Wayfinding Signs	3.6
Slower Speeds	3.6
Bike Hub and Bike Parking	3.6
Street Furniture	3.6
New or Improved Crosswalks	3.6

Figure 41: Priorities Summary Table

3.4.2 Improvement Priorities for G Line Bike Path

To get an understanding of bicyclists’ priorities along the G Line (Orange) bike path, participants were first asked whether they use the bike path, and regardless of their answer to this question, which improvements should be made to the existing path. The question states “Which of the following improvements should be considered for the street level G Line (Orange) bike path at the Sepulveda and Van Nuys Stations? Select up to three.” These questions received 210 and 456 responses, respectively.

62% of respondents already use the bike path, and 38% do not. They were not asked why they do or do not use the bike path.



Figure 42: Current Use of G Line Bike Path

For the second question, participants were allowed to select three out of five options. The most common was lighting at 27%, followed by landscaping and shade at 22%, connections to other bike lanes or routes at 21%, enhanced crossings at 20%, and wayfinding signs at 10%. The top four choices are fairly close together in scores, while wayfinding signs seems to be of less importance.



Figure 43: Improvements to G Line Bike Path

Overall, more respondents did not use the bike path than those who did. Regardless of whether they use the bike path currently, the top priority among respondents is lighting along the path. This could be explained by the fact that it is a multi-use path, with high numbers of people walking along it. The least important improvement is wayfinding signs, although a significant number of responses (50) indicate that this is still important.

3.4.3 Improvement Ideas

To build on ideas for improvements already presented in this survey and in Metro's plans, respondents were asked to be creative and note their "big (or little)" ideas for station improvements. They located their ideas for improvements on a map, designating the type of improvement and explaining it through a comment.

The "type" of improvement idea varied significantly, with the most common being either other or not identified. The most common improvement ideas following the other category fall under bike lanes/routes, lighting, and landscaping and shade, which is consistent with the previous section in which respondents listed the top three improvements they would like to see.



Figure 44: Improvement Ideas by Type

Most improvement ideas are clustered at the intersection of Sepulveda Boulevard and the Orange Line Busway, as well as along the busway going west. Improvement ideas cover many of the topics previously mentioned in this report and indicate the need for better safety measures both in terms of speeding/problematic intersections and in terms of perceived safety while walking and waiting for the bus. Respondents also indicated a desire for an enhanced public realm, with street furniture, landscaping, and even cafes by the station.



Figure 45: My Improvement Idea

ID	Improvement Category	Improvement Idea
1	Bike-friendly Intersections	Elevated bike path through intersection
2	Bike-friendly Intersections	Bike/pedestrian crossings coming out of the park without having to go up to a busy Victory Orange Line stop
3	Bike Lanes or Routes	Extend the bike lane west to improve access to the Canoga Station. Because of traffic and unsafe bike lanes, it is challenging to cycle to the Canoga Station from the Valley Circle area. We do it, but it can be harrowing.
4	Bike Lanes or Routes	Implement City of LA's existing plan for LA River Path--protected bike lanes on Sepulveda from Orange Line to Hatteras; and significant traffic calming on (1) Hatteras from Sepulveda to Noble and (2) Noble from Hatteras to the LA River/Valleyheart
5	Bike Lanes or Routes	Need public transit to get to the Westside parallel to the 405!
6	Bike Lanes or Routes	Better/additional route under 405
7	Bike Lanes or Routes	Better/wider path surface
8	Bus Stop Improvements	Northbound Sepulveda bus stop needs bus shelter here. Standing in the sun is not very inviting. Thank you.
9	Bus Stop Improvements	Bus Rapid Transit on Nordhoff to accommodate the people to CSUN
10	Drop-off, Pick-up, & Rideshare	Better connectivity between CSUN and the orange line and the new rail line.
11	Drop-off, Pick-up, & Rideshare	Designated space for pedestrian pick-ups via private car or hailing services.
12	Landscaping & Shade	Cafe - indoor/outdoor seating - shaded with trees and plantings Some small retail shops
13	Landscaping & Shade	No comment
14	Landscaping & Shade	Have lighting all around the station to create a safer space especially at night so pedestrians feel safer at night
15	Landscaping & Shade	No comment
16	New or Improved Crosswalks	Grade separated bus way crossings (I know, fantasy)! Orange Line converted to light rail.
17	New or Improved Crosswalks	Better lighting and slower speeds would be grand
18	New or Improved Crosswalks	Widen sidewalks across 405 Freeway and make them ADA-compliant.
19	Pedestrian & Bicycle Lighting	Separate incoming traffic from the victory entrance and pedestrians crossing the parking lot to the platforms better. The sudden quick turn combined with people running to catch the bus are dangerous
20	Pedestrian & Bicycle Lighting	Better safety in this area. Clear landscaping and add lighting so it can be seen from Victory
21	Pedestrian & Bicycle Lighting	As a young woman, I have never felt safe walking the pathway at night to and from the Sepulveda Station. I feel that it is too far from the main road and secluded. If the walk can be shorter that would be tremendously helpful!

ID	Improvement Category	Improvement Idea
22	Pedestrian & Bicycle Lighting	No comment
23	Slower Speeds	The nearest east-west street south of the Sepulveda G Line station, Burbank is a major street next to the Sepulveda Dam and flood plain. A freeway exit is situated on the western side of the intersection and usually has higher speeds carried over
24	Slower Speeds	Many drivers tend to use the bus way parking lot as a cut-through. Although speed bumps have been installed by the entrance and exits, driver still tend to speed where the speed bumps aren't located. Also many drivers tend to run through the stop
25	Slower Speeds	Speed bumps
26	Street Furniture	I don't know if this would be considered “street furniture” but if there is enough space, small vendors should be allowed to set up under the bus station. They would add more eyes on the street in a place that tends to be choke
27	Street Furniture	No comment
28	Not Identified	Connect East and west stations
29	Not Identified	Widen Sepulveda Blvd. to decrease gridlock during rush hours in the area between Oxnard and the proposed elevated walkway.
30	Not Identified	Increasing pedestrian and bicycle/scooter/skateboard access to the streets and areas leading to the station
31	Not Identified	Connection to Metro Westside Subway Line in Westwood by rail
32	Not Identified	LAX Flyaway at this location
33	Not Identified	It is isolated and feels unsafe to walk along the bike path between Victory and the Sepulveda station.
34	Not Identified	There are a lot of homeless encampments in this are that make it feel unsafe to walk, especially in the winter when it is dark by time I got home from work.

4 Looking Forward

The exclusive use of an online engagement tool was a relatively new experience for Metro, as community engagement activities are typically focused on in-person outreach with online tools as secondary, supportive tools. As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, the project team relied exclusively on online engagement to collect community feedback. The use of the Maptionnaire application was also a first experience for Metro. This process highlighted some key takeaways and lessons learned that will be useful for future engagement efforts.

4.1 Challenges and Benefits of Online Community Engagement

The online community engagement strategy deployed for the Plan presented challenges and benefits that can serve as useful lessons for the design of future community engagement activities. Key takeaways from this experience include:

- Developing the survey was simple and, once launched, required little maintenance over the five weeks during which it was live. In comparison, in-person engagement often requires substantial physical and human resources to organize, which makes it challenging to hold an event for longer than a few hours at a time. In-person engagement events can also be vulnerable to unpredictable events such as inclement weather, equipment malfunction, or issues related to the event venue. This experience has shown how online community engagement efforts can offer a relatively simple and resilient alternative or complement to in-person activities.

- The level of details provided by the tool was significant, allowing the team to locate the exact location where challenges and opportunities are present. This is similar to in-person engagement efforts where participants are invited to add to a physical map and directly point out where they would like to see changes and what these changes should be.

- The survey collected a significant amount of responses, perhaps higher than the number of in-person interactions that could have taken place during the planned in-person activities. However, many respondents did not have the kind of relationship with the station or the larger study area as one would find through in-person engagement activities. This limited their ability to provide site-specific ideas and feedback. Considering one of the main objectives of FLM community engagement efforts is to received input from the perspective of transit riders for a specific station, this is one of the main drawbacks of this approach. However, refinement of the tool and results matrix also allows planners to weed out these outliers and focus primarily on direct users.

- The survey is asynchronous, meaning that individual participants respond in their own time and can only relate to their own lived experience. There are benefits to this approach, as the input collected is not influenced by bias or influence of others. However, there are also advantages to having synchronous engagement where participants get to discuss with one another and learn from different perspectives. The asynchronous engagement could be supplemented by a live (either virtual or in-person) event to benefit from both approaches.

4.1.1 Participants' review of the tool

Metro received one public comment on the survey which mentioned that the Maptionnaire tool did not work for them. They mentioned that the tutorial offered on Maptionnaire made it too complicated, and that Metro should keep surveys simpler. This comment also mentioned the problem of speeding, saying that "the best thing you can do is support efforts to get drivers to slow down. The danger to pedestrians and bicyclists – your customers – is primarily caused by irresponsible drivers." The feedback aligns with some of the issues outlined in Section 3.3, where speeding was noted as a big problem.

4.2 Usefulness of Feedback Collected

The information collected through the online engagement will be used to develop the final pathway network and project recommendations for the Sepulveda station. The concerns and ideas listed will help inform which project improvements should be recommended, and specifically identify the level of priority that should be applied to each project.

4.3 Lessons Learned

The COVID-19 pandemic has altered the way we live, work, and interact with one another. In a short time, the pandemic has impacted the ability for planners and policymakers to meaningfully engage the public in the planning process. Due to the State and County's COVID-19 Safer at Home Orders and subsequent social distancing protocols, many in-person community engagement events have either been placed on a temporary hold, cancelled, or transitioned to virtual formats. As we navigate uncertain times, what is abundantly clear is that we cannot afford to cancel or pause every project simply because we cannot engage or interact with the public in-person.

Robust community engagement is a foundational element of the FLM planning process. In-person community engagement, such as pop-ups at well-attended local events, best serves the data collection process and provides the granular data required for developing FLM project ideas and locations. However, due to current social distancing requirements, in-person community engagement events were no longer feasible. To overcome this hurdle, the project team piloted use of Maptionnaire, an interactive, map-based survey application to gather community input and inform the development of FLM project ideas for the Plan.

The following section includes lessons learned from the virtual community engagement process for the G Line (Orange) Sepulveda Station First/Last Mile Plan. These lessons learned can be applied to future FLM plans to improve the community engagement process and outcomes.

4.3.1 Design Effective Surveys

Survey design is one of the most important components of successful online community engagement. Surveys should be designed to provide the level of detail required for your project, however they also must be engaging, easy to understand, and short enough to be mindful of the respondent's time. The G Line (Orange) Sepulveda Station FLM Survey provided clear instructions with step-by-step video tutorials, featured interactive questions where respondents marked their answers on a map (Figure 46), and averaged less than 15 minutes to complete.



Figure 46: Interactive question from the G Line Sepulveda Station FLM survey

The other crucial component to effective survey design is consideration for mobile device users. As the percentage of internet access via smartphone or tablet devices has surpassed that of desktop devices, virtual community engagement formats must be compatible across most devices and user interfaces. The challenge with community engagement for FLM planning is the need to convey complex and detailed information to the public in a streamlined, efficient, and easy to understand format on a small screen.

4.3.2 Determine your Target Audience

FLM plan development requires local and experiential knowledge due to the highly detailed and fine-grained nature of FLM project types and locations. In order to receive this type of input to inform the development of the FLM plan, survey promotion must target specific audiences. For Metro's FLM program, the target audience is transit riders, especially those who walk, bike, or roll themselves to and from Metro stations. In the case of the G Line (Orange) Sepulveda Station, the project team determined the target audience should more or less match the demographics of G Line riders and the community near the Sepulveda Station.

4.3.3 Partner with Community-Based Organizations

Metro's FLM program has an established history of partnering with and embedding community-based organizations (CBO) directly into the FLM planning process. The role CBOs play in the FLM planning process varies case-by-case; however, they are vital to the development of project ideas and serve as a conduit between Metro and community members. This relationship also aligns with Metro's Equity Platform and the four pillars to: Define and Measure; Listen and Learn; Focus and Deliver; and Train and Grow. Due to challenges related to the COVID-19 pandemic, Metro did not

partner with a CBO during the community engagement process for the G Line (Orange) Sepulveda Station FLM Plan. While the methods deployed to promote the FLM survey proved effective at encouraging a high level of participation from the public, there is debate as to whether the target audience was successfully engaged. The vital role CBOs play in the FLM planning process cannot be overlooked in the future.

4.3.4 Reach your Target Audience

Once the target audience is established, promoting a survey to this audience is critical. For FLM, local and experiential knowledge from transit riders and the nearby community are essential for FLM project idea development. In pre-pandemic times, CBOs played a crucial role in connecting Metro to the target audience. In the case of the G Line (Orange) Sepulveda Station FLM Plan, the original approach for community engagement included one weekday pop-up event at the station and one weekend event at a nearby recreation center in partnership with a CBO. As a consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic and social distancing requirements, in-person engagement events and the partnership with the CBO were not feasible. As the in-person community engagement events transitioned to a virtual format, the project team created a survey promotional strategy to reflect the need for localized community input as describe in Section 2.4.

An important promotional strategy to continue is advertisements with QR codes linking to a survey and strategically placed near within the study area once a survey is launched. The project team placed A-frame signs near the Sepulveda station platform and along the G Line Bike Path to encourage participation from transit riders and nearby communities. Advertisements with QR codes could also be posted in nearby businesses, community centers, on transit vehicles, and as part of a leafleting campaign to households within the study area.

Encouraging participation through targeted social media advertisements is another strategy to continue. Social media sites, such as Facebook, have the ability to deploy advertisements to specific audiences. There are multiple ways to target advertisements, however location-based promotion, such as within a specific city or postal code, or interest-based promotion, such as people interested in public transit, is ideal for FLM planning.

4.3.5 Set Clear, Attainable Performance Metrics

Establishing clear, attainable performance metrics early in the survey development process is important for measuring the success of a survey. For FLM, survey performance metrics should include quantitative and qualitative metrics to measure if the target audience is being reached and if the results provide a clear path to FLM project ideas, locations, and community priorities. During the survey development process, a best practice is to include questions in the survey to measure a desired outcome.

To measure if a survey is reaching the target audience, incorporating demographic questions in a survey can be a useful way to compare with the demographics of a control group, such as the demographics of a nearby neighborhood. In this case, the control group is set to the demographics of Metro G Line riders (2019 Metro On-Board Customer Satisfaction Survey Data) and the demographics of the community within the half-mile radius of the Sepulveda Station (U.S. Census Data) and then compared with the demographic data from the G Line (Orange) Sepulveda Station FLM Survey results as shown below.



Figure 47: Race or Ethnicity Performance Metric



Figure 48: Income Performance Metric

*Sepulveda Station Area is a calculation of U.S. Census tract data within and intersecting the half-mile radius of the station

**AIAN = American Indian & Alaskan Native

During the survey development process, questions should be included that provide a clear, direct path to FLM project ideas, locations, and community priorities. For the G Line Sepulveda Station FLM survey, there were several opportunities for respondents to prioritize FLM project types and propose their own project ideas.

4.3.6 Incentivize Participation

An incentive is money or a gift to provide to survey respondents in exchange for completing a survey. Incentives vary depending on a number of factors, but generally can be offered as way to increase response rates and thank respondents for their time. There are two main forms of incentives: monetary and non-monetary. Monetary incentives include cash, checks, gift cards, and coupons. Non-monetary incentives are items to show appreciation, such as an iPad, pen, or reusable water bottle. Prior research and experience have shown that monetary incentives are more effective at increasing response rates than non-monetary incentives. However, higher value non-monetary incentives, such as an iPad, are more effective at increasing response rates than less lower value non-monetary incentives, such as a pen or reusable water bottle. Non-monetary incentives should always have universal appeal to the target audience. For the G Line Sepulveda Station FLM survey, the project team gifted a Metro Prize Package to three survey respondents. The prize package includes several Metro-branded items, including a pen, water bottle, coffee mug, drawstring bag, lanyard, and, as this was an active transportation-related survey, a bike helmet.

MOTT MACDONALD

IBI

Metro G Line (Orange)

First/Last Mile Plan
Cost Assumptions Summary

Contents

1 Cost Assumptions

This memorandum summarizes the project elements and unit cost assumptions used in the development of conceptual-level cost estimates associated with the implementation of proposed improvements for the Metro G Line (Orange) Sepulveda Station First/Last Mile Plan. Cost estimates were developed from estimates on previous similar Metro projects, with escalation factored in. Each individual improvement shown below is presented by unit type, its associated unit cost, and additional comments for the projected cost per unit. Cost estimates for improvements at the Sepulveda Boulevard Station are proposed by street, found in the Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) Cost Estimates Memo. Utility work is not included in these cost estimates.

1.1 Proposed Walking Improvements

Improvements	Unit	Cost	Comments
Bulb-Outs at Corners	Each	$121,700	$30,425 per corner
Bus Stop Improvements	Each	$45,600	Includes platform area, benches, trash receptacle, info/signage, and shelter
Landscaping & Shade	Block	$40,600	Assumes tree spacing of 40 feet
New or Improved Crosswalks	Leg	$1,150	Assumes only striping improvements need be made. $250,000 for a HAWK beacon, $507,000 for a full signal at 4-leg intersection
New or Improved Sidewalks	Square Foot	$44 for new; $13 for improved	Assumes concrete sidewalk extension with curb, not including crowning of the street
Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	Each (both sides of the street)	$10,100	Assumes one pedestrian lighting post per 50 feet
Street Furniture	Each	$3,100	Assumes on bench and one trash receptacle every 200 feet
Traffic Calming	Each	$10,000	Assumes demolition and construction of existing pavement section for a single speed hump

1.2 Proposed Bicycling Improvements

Improvements	Unit	Cost	Comments
Bicycle Friendly-Intersection	Each	$101,500	Includes green striping paint at intersection approach and within intersection, raised curb islands within intersection
Class II Striped Lanes	Mile	$76,000	Signage and striping only. No pavement reconstruction.
Class III Bike-Friendly Street	Each	$600	Sharrow marking and signage at beginning of each block and then at 250-foot spacing intervals between blocks
Class IV Protected Lanes – Striped Buffer	Mile	$456,300	Assumes asphalt is existing, and includes a 3-foot buffer, bike lane symbols, and vertical markers every 3 feet

MOTT MACDONALD

IBI

Metro G Line (Orange)

First/Last Mile Plan
Project Scoring Methodology Summary

Contents

1 Pedestrian Project Scoring

The design team reviewed project prioritization methods from Purple Line Extension Sections 2 & 3 Planning project, and developed a scoring system consistent with this project, but modified slightly to be appropriate for the Metro G Line (Orange) Sepulveda Station FLM project. Some key differences are in the approach to gathering and scoring community input. Due to COVID-19 restrictions, community engagement was conducted through an online survey instead of through in-person events, resulting in changes to the form of community input received when compared to the Purple Line First/Last Mile project. Details regarding the refinement of scoring are provided later in this memo.

For the purposes of scoring, individual pedestrian improvements were grouped by corridor or pathway segments to provide for a more complete walking environment, as opposed to separating small improvements, such as landscaping and sidewalk enhancements, and diluting their potential streetscape benefits. By focusing on more comprehensive streetscape improvements, the benefits are more likely to be noticeable and have a greater positive impact on Metro customers connecting with the transit system.
The scoring system will convey project prioritization from a technical standpoint and the projects themselves would be subject to coordination with local jurisdictions, available funding, and Metro Board direction.

1.1 Pedestrian Scoring Criteria and Methodology

The projects will be scored based on four categories: Safety, Comfort, Community Input, and Connectivity. Safety and Comfort are both weighted at 30 points, in order to identify projects that make the transit system safe and comfortable to use for transit users of all ages and abilities. Community Input is weighted at 25 points, so that project prioritization is reflective of community needs. Connectivity is weighted at 15 points and is given less weight than other categories, since all pedestrian projects being proposed are meant to increase connectivity to the transit system. The maximum score a project could earn is 100 points. The weighting of categories and specific criteria are described in the following sections.



1.1.1 Safety (30 points max)

Improvement Type:
Includes proposed safety improvements on a pathway segment leading to a station and could earn up to 25 points.

Pedestrian/bike lighting	5 points
Bulb-outs	5 points
New or improved crosswalks	5 points
New or improved sidewalks	5 points
Residential traffic calming	5 points

SWITRS Collision Data:
Pedestrian patterns and destinations are expected to change with the opening of the future Metro G Line (Orange) station, so Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) collision data is given less weight than the safety improvements proposed on a street leading to the station. The total number of pedestrian/motor vehicle collisions that occur on streets on which the project would be located could earn up to 5 points

Greater than ten (10) collisions	5 points
Six (6) to ten (10) collisions	3 points
One (1) to five (5) collisions	1 point
No collisions	0 points

1.1.2 Comfort (30 points maximum)

Pathways that include projects that make walking more comfortable and easier to navigate to/from a station, or to an adjacent station and likely used by Metro customers transferring to/from the Metro G Line (Orange) could earn up to 30 points. Wayfinding signage was excluded from this section as it is already included in Allowances.

Landscaping and shade	10 points
Bus stop enhancement	8 points
Street furniture	6 points

1.1.3 Community Input (25 points maximum)

Community input for the Metro G Line (Orange) Sepulveda Station First/Last Mile Plan was solicited through walk audits and an online map-based survey. This engagement approach differed from the one employed for the Purple Line Extension Section 2 & 3 First/Last Mile Plan, which featured walk audits, in-person pop-up community engagement events, and a survey. The primary reason behind this difference was conditions resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic, which precluded the team from conducting in-person pop-up events to support the planning effort.

In place of the in-person pop-up events, Metro selected a map-based online survey tool to collect community input regarding the location and type of first/last mile improvements transit users and community members would like to see planned for the Metro G Line (Orange) Sepulveda Station. The previous community input scoring methodology utilized for the Purple Line Extension First/Last Mile Plan could award a proposed First/Last Mile pathway corridor a score of up to 25 points. The corridor's score was based on whether the corridor and specific project needs were identified as part of the walk audits and online survey, as well as the number of votes a corridor and specific project needs received as part of the pop-ups.

To address the absence of the pop-up event voting, the community input scoring methodology for the Metro G Line (Orange) Sepulveda Station is proposed to be modified to account for the form of input received through the online map-based survey. Under this proposal, projects identified through walk audits earn 5 points (which is consistent with the Purple Line methodology). In the online survey, respondents were asked to prioritize first/last mile project types on a scale of 1 to 5. The average prioritization score from this survey question is proposed to be used to determine the improvement's priority in the Sepulveda Station area, and is uniform for any location, regardless of corridor.

Additionally in the survey, respondents were provided with the opportunity to identify spot improvements where specific first/last mile projects should be proposed. The number of identified spot improvements for any category on any corridor are summed. The summed count is then divided by the single greatest identified spot improvement per any corridor as a baseline on how popular an improvement is. For example, the greatest number of pedestrian spot improvements identified were 'New or Improved Crosswalks' on Sepulveda Boulevard (identified 76 times), so this project type was given a score of 5. The greatest number of bicycle spot improvements identified were 'Bicycle Lane, Route, or Facilities' on Sepulveda Boulevard (identified 26 times), so this project type was also given a score of 5. Other spot improvements per corridor were scaled from 0 to 5 accordingly.

All accrued points from the walk audit, improvement priority, and spot improvements are summed per corridor to create a 'Community Input Score', and then are scaled from 0 to 25 based upon the highest summed corridor. This is consistent with the approach used on the Purple Line, which is illustrated in the equation below:



From Walk Audits	Maximum 5 points
From Improvement Priority (Survey)	Maximum 5 points
From Identified Spot Improvements (Survey)	Maximum 5 points

In the approach, the highest performing corridor receives the maximum number of community input points (25). All other corridors receive an equivalent ratio of points based upon community input performance.

For pedestrian improvements, projects on Sepulveda Boulevard performs the best, scoring all 25 points. For bicyclist improvements, projects on the Metro G Line (Orange) Busway received the maximum number of community input points.

The potential 25 points that can be accrued through Community Input are part of a larger scoring methodology up to 100 maximum points, which includes other factors such as safety, comfort and connectivity.

1.1.4 Connectivity (15 points maximum)

This category recognizes the importance of providing pathways with the most direct connections to a station. Considering that all Metro customers must use a primary street, such as Sepulveda Boulevard, to reach a station entrance, projects located on a primary street will receive a maximum of 10 points. Another important connectivity aspect includes connections to major destinations. This criterion could earn 2.5 points. Major destinations were identified, mapped, and categorized as either open space, art, attraction, education, public, and shopping.

Primary Street	10 points
Connects to Major Destination	2.5 points

2 Bicyclist Project Scoring

Similar project prioritization methodology from the Purple Line Extension Section 2 & 3 First Last Mile Plan was reviewed to develop a scoring system appropriate for the Metro G Line (Orange) Sepulveda Station Plan. Major differences in scoring include the nature of the bicyclist projects that are being proposed, such as bicycle-friendly intersections and parking amenities, the connectivity aspects and characteristics of the proposed projects, and the way community input was gathered. The scoring system will convey project prioritization from a technical standpoint and the projects themselves would be subject to coordination with local jurisdictions, available funding, and Metro Board direction.

2.1 Bicyclist Scoring Criteria and Methodology

Three criteria will be used for scoring wheel projects: Safety and Comfort, Community Input, and Connectivity.

"Safety and comfort" were given the greatest weight and are considered to be inseparable when planning for bike access to stations as explained in the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) "Designing for All Ages & Abilities: Contextual Guidance for High-Comfort Bicycle Facilities" (December 2017). Community Input received the second highest weight. Connectivity was given less weight than other the other categories, since all bicyclist projects being proposed are meant to increase connectivity to the transit system and bicycle network. The maximum score a project could earn is 100 points. The weighting of categories and specific criteria are as follows:



2.1.1 Safety and Comfort (60 points maximum)

SWITRS Collision Data (10 points maximum):
The number of bicycle-motor vehicles collisions per data from SWITRS on a street segment during the past five years that would potentially be reduced by implementing a project on that street segment could earn up to 10 points.

Greater than five (5) collisions	10 points
Four (4) or five (5) collisions	5 points
Two (2) or three (3) collisions	3 points
One (1) collision	1 point
No collisions	0 points

NACTO Guidelines (20 points maximum):

The extent to which a project conforms to NACTO guidance for safety and comfort could earn up to 20 points.

Project would meet NACTO Contextual Guidance for All Ages & Abilities Bikeways, that is Class I; Class IV; Class II on street with 1 lane each way, ≤25 mph after calming and ≤3,000 ADT; Class III on street with ≤20 mph after calming and ≤2,000 ADT	20 points
Class III with ≤20 mph after calming and ≤5,000 ADT	10 points
Class II on street with 1 lane each way, ≤30 mph and ≤20,000 ADT	10 points
Class III with 1 lane each way, ≤25 mph after calming and ≤8,000 ADT	5 points
Class II on street with 2 lanes each way and ≤35 mph	5 points

Controlled Crossings (10 points maximum):

Vital component to assure bicyclists and other wheeled customers can navigate a safe pathway to their station. If all the project's pathway arterial street crossings would be controlled, they could earn up to 10 points.

Has controlled crossings	10 points
Does not have controlled crossings	0 points

Bicycle Amenities (20 points maximum):

Important support facilities that promote the use of bicycles and other wheeled modes of transportation through the safest and most secure amenities could earn up to 20 points.

Bicycle hub /parking (racks, lockers)	10 points
Bicycle friendly intersection	10 points

2.1.2 Community Input (25 points maximum)

The bicyclist community input scoring methodology is identical to the pedestrian community input score methodology. Please see section 1.1.3 for more detail on community input scoring for bicyclist improvement projects.

2.1.3 Connectivity (15 points maximum)

This score recognizes the importance of completing the pathway network leading to a station. Projects that provide more direct connections to the station and to existing/planned bicycle network earn the highest number of points and could be up to a total of 15 points. Connections to major destination were assessed by mapping major destinations such as regional parks, universities, civic centers, regional hospitals, schools, etc.

If bicycle corridor is on a primary street	5 points
If bicycle corridor connects to the station	5 points
If bicycle corridor will connect to an existing facility	3 points
If bicycle corridor will connect to a planned facility	2 points
If bicycle corridor will connect to a major destination	2 points

Projects for Pedestrians																
			Safety (30 points max)			Comfort (30 points max)		Community Input (25 points max)					Connectivity (15 points max)			Total
Project Icon	Type	Cross Street/ Limits	Improvement (25 points max)	SWITRS (5 points max)	Points	Improvement (30 points max)	Points	Walk Audit (5 points max)	Improvement Priority (5 points max)	Spot Improvement (5 points max)	Community Input Score	Points	Primary Street (10 points max)	Connects to a major destination (2.5 points max)	Points	**Score (100 points max)**
Projects on Sepulveda Blvd. (Pathway Arterial)																
	New or Improved Crosswalks	at Victory Blvd., Erwin St., Orange Line Busway, Oxnard St., and Hatteras St.	5	5	25	0	18	5	4.3	5	60.3	25	10	2.5	12.5	**80.5**
	Bus Stop Improvements	at Victory Blvd., Erwin St., Orange Line Busway, Oxnard St., and Hatteras St.	0			8		5	4.2	2.3						
	Bulb-Outs at Corners	at Victory Blvd., Erwin St., Orange Line Busway, Oxnard St., and Hatteras St.	5			0		0	3.6	0						
	New or Improved Sidewalks	from a half-mile north of proposed station to a half-mile south of proposed station	5			0		5	4.4	0.7						
	Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	from Erwin St. to Orange Line Busway	5			0		5	4.5	0.5						
	Landscaping & Shade	from a half-mile north of proposed station to a half-mile south of proposed station	0			10		5	4.3	1.5						
Projects on Metro G Line (Orange) Busway																
	New or Improved Crosswalks	at Sepulveda Blvd.	5	1	16	0	18	5	4.3	2.8	51.7	21.4	10	2.5	12.5	**67.9**
	Pick-up/Drop-off	near existing station	0			0		0	3.7	0						
	Bus Stop Improvements	at Sepulveda Blvd.	0			8		5	4.2	1.8						
	Bulb-Outs at Corners	at Sepulveda Blvd.	5			0		0	3.6	0						
	Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	from Haskell Ave. to a half-mile east of proposed station	5			0		5	4.5	1						
	Landscaping & Shade	from existing station to Sepulveda Blvd.	0			10		5	4.3	1.5						
Projects on Victory Blvd. (Pathway Arterial)																
	New or Improved Crosswalks	at Orion Ave. and Sepulveda Blvd.	5	3	23	0	8	5	4.3	0.6	41.9	17.4	10	2.5	12.5	**60.9**
	Bus Stop Improvements	at Orion Ave. and Sepulveda Blvd.	0			8		5	4.2	0.3						
	Bulb-Outs at Corners	at Sepulveda Blvd.	5			0		0	3.6	0						
	New or Improved Sidewalks	from Blucher Ave. to Peach Ave.	5			0		5	4.4	0						
	Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	from Sepulveda Blvd. to Columbus Ave.	5			0		5	4.5	0						
Projects on Erwin St. (Pathway Collector)																
	New or Improved Crosswalks	at Sepulveda Blvd. and Noble Ave.	5	1	21	0	18	5	4.3	0.5	45.5	18.9	0	2.5	2.5	**60.4**
	Bus Stop Improvements	at Sepulveda Blvd.	0			8		5	4.2	0.1						
	Bulb-Outs at Corners	at Sepulveda Blvd.	5			0		0	3.6	0						
	New or Improved Sidewalks	from Blucher Ave. to Peach Ave. and Halbrent Ave. to Columbus Ave.	5			0		5	4.4	0.3						
	Traffic Calming	from Columbus Ave. to Noble Ave.	5			0		5	3.6	0.1						
	Landscaping & Shade	from Sepulveda Ave. to Noble Ave.	0			10		0	4.3	0.1						

The portions of Sepulveda Blvd. and Victory Blvd. within the study area are part of the City of LA's High Injury Network (HIN). Roadway design decisions and safety countermeasures should be co-designed with LADOT's Vision Zero Division.

Projects for Pedestrians (continued)																
Project Icon	Type	Cross Street/ Limits	Safety (30 points max)			Comfort (30 points max)		Community Input (25 points max)					Connectivity (15 points max)			Total
			Improvement (25 points max)	SWITRS (5 points max)	Points	Improvement (30 points max)	Points	Walk Audit (5 points max)	Improvement Priority (5 points max)	Spot Improvement (5 points max)	Community Input Score	Points	Primary Street (10 points max)	Connects to a major destination (2.5 points max)	Points	**Score (100 points max)**
Projects on Oxnard St. (Pathway Collector)																
	New or Improved Crosswalks	at Sepulveda Blvd.	5	1	16	0	8	5	4.3	0.4	32.4	13.4	0	0	0	**37.4**
	Bus Stop Improvements	at Sepulveda Blvd.	0			8		5	4.2	0.2						
	Bulb-Outs at Corners	at Sepulveda Blvd.	5			0		0	3.6	0						
	New or Improved Sidewalks	from west extent to beyond Lemona Ave.	5			0		5	4.4	0.3						
Projects on Hatteras St. (Pathway Collector)																
	New or Improved Crosswalks	at Sepulveda Blvd.	5	1	16	0	8	5	4.3	0.3	32.2	13.3	0	0	0	**37.3**
	Bus Stop Improvements	at Sepulveda Blvd.	0			8		5	4.2	0.3						
	Bulb-Outs at Corners	at Sepulveda Blvd.	5			0		0	3.6	0						
	New or Improved Sidewalks	from Sepulveda Blvd. to Noble Ave.	5			0		5	4.4	0.1						
Projects on Orion Ave. (Pathway Collector)																
	New or Improved Crosswalks	at Victory Blvd.	5	1	11	0	8	5	4.3	0.1	28	11.6	0	0	0	**30.6**
	Bus Stop Improvements	at Victory Blvd.	0			8		5	4.2	0						
	New or Improved Sidewalks	from Victory Blvd. to Erwin St.	5			0		5	4.4	0						
Projects on Noble Ave. (Pathway Collector)																
	New or Improved Crosswalks	at Erwin St.	5	1	16	0	0	5	4.3	0	27.3	11.3	0	2.5	2.5	**29.8**
	New or Improved Sidewalks	from Oxnard St. to Hatteras St.	5			0		5	4.4	0						
	Traffic Calming	from Domino St. to Delano St.	5			0		5	3.6	0						
Projects on Haskell Ave. (Pathway Collector)																
	Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	from Victory Blvd. to existing station	5	1	6	0	0	5	4.5	0.4	9.9	4.1	0	2.5	2.5	**12.6**
Projects on Halbrent Ave. (Pathway Collector)																
	New or Improved Sidewalks	from Victory Blvd. to Erwin St.	5	1	6	0	0	5	4.4	0.1	9.5	3.9	0	0	0	**9.9**
Projects on Califa St. (Pathway Collector)																
	New or Improved Sidewalks	from Halbrent Ave. to Noble Ave.	5	0	5	0	0	5	4.4	0	9.4	3.9	0	0	0	**8.9**
Projects on Columbus Ave. (Pathway Collector)																
	New or Improved Sidewalks	from Victory Blvd. to Erwin St.	5	0	5	0	0	0	4.4	0.4	4.8	2	0	0	0	**7**
Allowances																
	Wayfinding Signs															
	Wayfinding Sign Maintenance															

Projects for Bicyclists																	
			Safety and Comfort (60 points max)					Community Input (25 points max)					Connectivity (15 points max)					Total
Project Icon	Type	Cross Street/ Limits	SWITRS (10 points max)	NACTO Guidance (20 points max)	Controlled Crossings (10 points max)	Bicycle Amenities (20 points max)	Points	Walk Audit (5 points max)	Improvement Priority (5 points max)	Spot Improvement (5 points max)	Community Input Score	Points	Primary Street (5 points max)	Connects to the Station (5 points max)	Connects to the bicycle network (3 points max)	Connects to a major destination (2 points max)	Points	**Score (100 points max)**
Projects on Sepulveda Blvd. (Pathway Arterial)																		
	Bicycle Parking	at G Line (Orange) Busway	10	20	0	10	50	0	3.6	0	21.6	15.7	5	5	3	2	15	**80.7**
	Bicycle-friendly Intersection	at G Line (Orange) Busway				10		5	4	0								
	Bicycle Lane, Route or Facility (Class IV Protected Lanes)	from a half-mile north of proposed station to a half-mile south of proposed station				0		0	4	5								
Projects on Metro G Line (Orange) Busway																		
	Bicycle Parking	at Sepulveda Blvd.	1	0	10	10	31	0	3.6	0	25.8	18.8	5	5	3	2	15	**64.8**
	Bicycle-friendly Intersection	at Sepulveda Blvd.				10		5	4	0								
	Pedestrian & Bike Lighting	from Haskell Ave. to a half-mile east of proposed station				0		5	4.5	3.7								
Projects on Victory Blvd. (Pathway Arterial)																		
	Bicycle Lane, Route or Facility (Class II Striped Lanes)	from beyond Orion Ave. to beyond Noble Ave.	10	5	0	0	15	0	4	1.5	5.5	4	5	0	2	2	9	**28**
Projects on Hatteras St. (Pathway Collector)																		
	Bicycle Lane, Route or Facility (Class III Bike-friendly Street)	from Sepulveda Blvd. to beyond Lemona Ave.	3	5	0	0	8	0	4	0.4	4.4	3.2	0	0	2	2	4	**15.2**
Projects on Noble Blvd. (Pathway Collector)																		
	Bicycle Lane, Route or Facility (Class III Bike-friendly Street)	from Hatteras Ave. heading southbound	1	5	0	0	6	0	4	0.2	4.2	3.1	0	0	2	0	2	**11.1**
Projects on Friar St. (Pathway Collector)																		
	Bicycle Lane, Route or Facility (Class III Bike-friendly Street)	from Columbus Ave. to beyond Noble Ave.	0	5	0	0	5	0	4	0.0	4.0	2.9	0	0	0	0	0	**7.9**

The portions of Sepulveda Blvd. and Victory Blvd. within the study area are part of the City of LA's High Injury Network (HIN). Roadway design decisions and safety countermeasures should be co-designed with LADOT's Vision Zero Division.

Class IV Protected Lanes on Sepulveda Blvd. would require additional community and stakeholder engagement if prioritized for future phase development.

Local Jurisdiction Coordination Summary

Coordination with local jurisdictions on project types and locations is essential to the FLM process; FLM projects mainly fall within city-controlled right-of-way and improving safe and convenient access to stations is a shared goal. The G Line (Orange) Sepulveda Station is located within the City of Los Angeles. The station spans two Council Districts: Council District 4, Councilmember Nithya Raman and Council District 6, Councilwoman Nury Martinez.

FLM projects are intended to comprehensively improve walking and biking connections by addressing safety, accessibility, and comfort. Because of this multi-faceted approach, FLM projects often span multiple departments or bureaus within a city as well as elected officials.

For the City of Los Angeles, the project team met with multiple Council Districts, departments, and bureaus including:

- Council District 4 staff
- Council District 6 staff
- Bureau of Engineering (BOE)
- Bureau of Street Services (BSS)
- Department of Transportation (DOT)
- Department of City Planning (DCP)

The project team also met with staff from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 7 as Interstate 405 is within the study area.

The objectives of these meetings were to introduce the FLM planning effort, provide agencies an opportunity to discuss existing FLM needs and challenges, seek alignment on Plan recommendations and projects, and request their review of the Plan. Note that this FLM Plan precedes the completion of FLM Guidelines (anticipated mid-2021), which may describe applicable next steps for this Plan.

The comments received on Plan are provided in Appendix A.

APPENDIX A: MASTER COMMENT MATRIX FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS
PATHWAY MAPS WITH PROJECT SCORING AND COST COMMENTS

Comment #	Reviewer	Reviewer Affiliation	Reviewer Comment Date	Document Section Title	Document Page #	Comments	Closest Intersection or Project Number	Response
1	Miles Orr	LACP - OLTNP	12/14/2020	Sepulveda Station Projects for Pedestrians	1	Victory Boulevard should be considered for further pedestrian improvements. Perhaps a crosswalk or traffic calming improvements at Columbus or Halbrent as cars often make tough left turns and pedestrians can be seen jaywalking here instead of going to crosswalks at Victory or Noble.	Victory Boulevard and Halbrent Avenue, Victory Boulevard and Columbus Avenue	We were concerned about the proximity of the traffic signals on Victory at Sepulveda and Noble. If another signal or HAWK signal were to be added on Victory at Columbus, there may be challenges with traffic operations along Victory with 3 closely-spaced signals. Therefore, we have not identified a siganlized crossing on Victory in these locations.
2	Miles Orr	LACP - OLTNP	12/14/2020	Sepulveda Station Projects for Pedestrians	1	Along Sepulveda Boulevard, landscaping and shade and pedestrian and bike lighting should be a high prioritization. LACP will be incentivizing more housing and commercial development along Sepulveda Boulevard and it will be important to ensure that the public realm is a comfortable experience throughout the day.	Project Numbers 11 and 12	Projects on Sepulveda received the highest total score in the scoring matrix for prioritization. The prioritization is for all projects for a corridor, not for individual projects.
3	Miles Orr	LACP - OLTNP	12/14/2020	Sepulveda Station Pathway Network Maps	1	Erwin Street offers access to a park as well as a school. Additional landscaping and shade and improved sidewalks, partiularly on the northern side of the street, would go a long way toward improving connectivity in the area.	Between the intersection of Erwin Street and Victory to the intersection of Erwin Street and Noble Avenue	Landscaping and Shade on Erwin between Sepulveda and Noble has been added to all documents for the FLM study.
4	Isaiah Ross	LACP	12/15/2020	Cost Assumptions Memo	1	The memo shows an allocation of $45,600 for bus stop improvements to include platform area, benches, trash receptacles, and info./signage. As part of this budget, it will be helpful to include shade structures and better designed bus shelters to maximize safety, particularly for the bus shelters that are located close to intersections and on busy streets. This could include the installation of safety bollards and other design features for safety, especially if located close to the street or an intersection. Based on feedback that we've heard from the community in our outreach, there is a need for more shade structures and tree canopy as well.		Shade structures are included as a bus stop improvement. The cost estimate assumption has been revised to reflect that.
5	Isaiah Ross	LACP	12/15/2020	Cost Assumptions Memo	1	Landscaping & Shade: The proposal includes tree spacing at 40 feet per block. What tree species or variety will be planted and what size trees will be installed? It would be ideal to plant trees that will provide a canopy for shade, especially if they will be planted at 40 feet apart. Will landscaping include more than tree installation? There may be opportunities to also plant shrubs, annuals, perenials, grasses in the public right-of-way to create more attractive, walkable areas. This will also reduce the amount of hardscape/impermeable surfaces that exist in the valley, which has a lot of heatislands.		The cost estimate covers landscaping as well as trees. The specific types of trees, will be considered in the design phase.
6	Isaiah Ross	LACP	12/15/2020	Cost Assumptions Memo	1	There may be opportunities to coordinate with StreetsLA on the sidewalk improvements and street furniture efforts. StreetsLA has a Sidewalk Repair Program and will release an RFP for new street furniture, a program that will prioritize ridership, disadvantaged communities, and high heat index.		Comment noted. We will keep this comment in mind if implementation occurs.

APPENDIX A: MASTER COMMENT MATRIX FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS
PATHWAY MAPS WITH PROJECT SCORING AND COST COMMENTS

Comment #	Reviewer	Reviewer Affiliation	Reviewer Comment Date	Document Section Title	Document Page #	Comments	Closest Intersection or Project Number	Response
7	Isaiah Ross	LACP	12/15/2020	Sepulveda Station Pathway Network Maps	1	Consider locating the bus stops that are closest to the intersections, further away from the intersections. Sepulveda down to Victory Boulevard is in the High Injury Network. A few of the bus stops at the intersection of Sepulveda and Victory are too close to the intersection. Buses that stop within the intersection may contribute to car collisions and it may not be safe for the pedestrians.	Victory & Sepulveda	This will be taken into consideration during the design phase.
8	Isaiah Ross	LACP	12/15/2020			Any pathways and intersections that are in the High Injury Network should be prioritized in this plan. Also proposed improvements along arterial roads or commercial corridors in lieu of local, residential streets should be prioritized in this plan.		The length of Sepulveda and Victory within the study area are in the High Injury Network. Text will be added to reflect that these corridors will be prioritized. For the existing prioritization matrix, projects on Sepulveda are ranked 1st, and Victory are ranked 3rd.
9	Isaiah Ross	LACP	12/15/2020			For this project area, In the new or improved crosswalk areas, I would like to see more pedestrian medians installed on those wide streets and intersections to allow the pedestrian to focus on just 2-3 lanes to cross at a time and to calm the traffic down while pedestrians are crossing the street. Sepulveda and Victory Boulevard are very wide streets and not easy to cross.		This will be taken into consideration during the design phase.
10	Isaiah Ross	LACP	12/15/2020			If this has not been completed already as part of this project area, I would suggest doing an analysis or find data for the causes of traffic collisions at intersections in this area and include improvements at the intersections to address this issue. Van Nuys along Sepulveda and Sherman Way has the most dangerous intersections in Los Angeles. There is a lot of data and news articles that highlight this issue.		We will look at SWITRS collision data to determine the cause of collisions in the last 5 reported years within the study area. The data will be presented in the Existing Conditions Report.
11	Lynell Washington	OLTNP - LACP	12/15/2020	Projects for Pedestrian	G Line Sepulveda Station Project List	Roadways/Crosswalks & Sidewalks. Sepulveda Boulevard is a vibrant corridor that facilitates safe, efficient multimodal transportation. After the completion of the Sepulveda Station, all of the roads and sidewalks leading to the station that are newly re-paved and/or re-surfaced should looks consistent with existing roadwork, without a patchwork appearance. The following pedestrian improvement strategies are recommended, as feasible; Wider sidewalks - Crosswalk ADA ramps - Curb extensions - Median refuge islands in proximity to the Sepulveda Station		This will be taken into consideration during the design phase.

APPENDIX A: MASTER COMMENT MATRIX FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS
PATHWAY MAPS WITH PROJECT SCORING AND COST COMMENTS

Comment #	Reviewer	Reviewer Affiliation	Reviewer Comment Date	Document Section Title	Document Page #	Comments	Closest Intersection or Project Number	Response
12	Lynell Washington	OLTNP - LACP	12/15/2020	Projects for Pedestrian	G Line Sepulveda Station Project List	Trees and Landscaping. METRO should plant a lush and sustainable urban canopy that provides ample shade and abundant beauty, while cleaning the air. Plant durable, aesthetically-pleasing and [drought-tolerant/sustainable] trees that will not break up our sidewalks and become maintenance nightmares (along Sepulveda Blvd.and along major perpendicular arterials that lead to the Sepulveda Station) All planting should be in conjunction with the Council District and various responsible agencies and departments within the City of Los Angeles responsible for tree selection and landscaping.		This will be taken into consideration during the design phase.
13	Lynell Washington	OLTNP - LACP	12/15/2020	Projects for Pedestrian	G Line Sepulveda Station Project List	Street Furniture, Signage and Façade. Sepulveda Boulevard is a vibrant, yet pedestrian challenged commercial and residential corridor. Façades are clean, inviting and designed to encourage high volume vehicular traffic. There is no street furniture. Effective and ornamental pedestrian lighting can create a safe and attractive space.		This will be taken into consideration during the design phase.
14	Tomas Carranza	LADOT	12/22/2020	N/A	N/A	Page 2: LADOT's cost estimate for a High Intensity Activated Crosswalk System (HAWK) is $250,000 based on recent expenditures. Metro's cost may be underestimated.		The cost for a HAWK has been updated to $250,000 in the cost assumptions. A HAWK is not applied in the ROM costs.
15	Tomas Carranza	LADOT	12/22/2020	N/A	N/A	Update references from the Purple Line to G Line and Wilshire Blvd. to Sepulveda Blvd.		All instances on Purple Line have been updated to Orange Line. All instances of Wilshire have been updated to the appropriate street.
16	Tomas Carranza	LADOT	12/22/2020	N/A	N/A	Page 3: The SWITRS scoring metric may not fully capture safety concerns for Los Angeles. Scoring the projects on Sepulveda as 10 points, even if it includes bike parking, may not fully capture the safety benefits of all the elements in the toolkit. Bicycle infrastructure, like bicycle lanes, have been demonstrated to have a higher safety benefit as compared to bicycle parking and should be weighted as such. The LADOT Vision Zero Safety Countermeasures demonstrate effectiveness of various tools available for improving safety in the public right-of-way. The toolkit can be found at: https://ladotlivablestreets.org/content-landing/Vision-Zero-Safety-Toolkit		For the Bicyclist Project Scoring, the SWITRS column gives priority based upon number of collisions regardless of infrastructure. The bike infrastructure proposed to reduce the rate of collisions will consider the LADOT Vision Zero Safety Countermeasures. Existing bicycle infrastructure is factored in among other factors in the scoring methodology.

APPENDIX A: MASTER COMMENT MATRIX FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS
PATHWAY MAPS WITH PROJECT SCORING AND COST COMMENTS

Comment #	Reviewer	Reviewer Affiliation	Reviewer Comment Date	Document Section Title	Document Page #	Comments	Closest Intersection or Project Number	Response
17	Tomas Carranza	LADOT	12/22/2020	N/A	N/A	In accordance with the Mobility Plan 2035 Settlement Agreement, any project that proposes lane reconfigurations must follow mandatory outreach protocols. The details of the settlement can be found here. According to our data, the traffic demands on Sepulveda Blvd qualify it as a low-volume project. Should the proposed bicycle projects involve any lane reconfiguration, Metro and LADOT must inform the project area City Council office(s), local neighborhood councils, and other identified stakeholders. Furthermore, the project lead must provide a website that allows stakeholders to submit feedback on the project, and distribute a project fact sheet to interested stakeholders. LADOT has experience conducting outreach that follows the process outlined in the settlement during the unprecedented times of the pandemic on several projects, and can collaborate with Metro on future outreach efforts for projects in the public right-of-way.		Comment noted. Will include a caveat to the Class IV Protected Lanes on Sepulveda Bl. that this project would require additional community and stakeholder engagement if prioritized for future phase development.
18	Tomas Carranza	LADOT	12/22/2020	N/A	N/A	In addition to the outreach requirements described in the Mobility Plan 2035 Settlement Agreement, LADOT also requires analysis of roadway reconfiguration projects pursuant to the Lane Reconfiguration Guidelines prior to any final decision on the project. The analysis requirements for lane reconfigurations for corridors that exceed LADOT's volume threshold must follow the assessment procedures for transportation projects as described in Section 3.3 of LADOT's Transportation Assessment Guidelines. You may need to consult LADOT's Transportation Planning Bureau for further guidance of the analysis methodology and timing.		Comment noted.
19	Tomas Carranza	LADOT	12/22/2020	N/A	N/A	LADOT's Mobility Investment Program (MIP) aims to establish project delivery best practices, identify funding opportunities, improve project engagement and evaluation, enhance inter-agency collaboration, and establish short and long-term capital improvement plans. The LADOT MIP does not contain overlapping funded projects in the area.		Comment noted.

APPENDIX A: MASTER COMMENT MATRIX FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS
PATHWAY MAPS WITH PROJECT SCORING AND COST COMMENTS

Comment #	Reviewer	Reviewer Affiliation	Reviewer Comment Date	Document Section Title	Document Page #	Comments	Closest Intersection or Project Number	Response
20	Tomas Carranza	LADOT	12/22/2020	N/A	N/A	The City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan 2035 is the adopted Transportation Element of the City's General Plan. The Mobility Plan established network hierarchies for designated streets in the City. Sepulveda Blvd is on the Mobility Plan Transit Enhanced Network, prioritizing the corridor for improvements to transit service, as is underway through Metro's NextGen program. Sepulveda Blvd is also designated a Tier 3 priority on the Mobility Plan's Bicycle Network, prioritizing the corridor for improvements such as bicycle lanes and supportive infrastructure. Future planning around roadway design should consider the priorities of the Mobility Plan 2035. If first/last mile plans deviate from the General Plan, those decisions should be discussed with City staff and disclosed as part of the environmental review process.		Will consider the priorities of the Mobility Plan 2035 when recommending roadway design elements and will attempt to avoid deviating from the Mobility Plan 2035.
21	Tomas Carranza	LADOT	12/22/2020	N/A	N/A	This segment of Sepulveda Blvd. is part of the City's High Injury Network (HIN), on which the majority of Los Angeles' traffic injuries and deaths are concentrated. Roadway design decisions and safety countermeasures should be co-designed with LADOT's Vision Zero Division.		Comment noted for future coordination if implementation of FLM Plan-identified projects occurs.
22	Cuong Trinh	Caltrans - Active Transportation and Complete Streets	12/30/2020			On scoring methodology, pedestrian lighting may also be considered a comfort element worth scoring, in addition to scoring for safety		While pedestrian lighting may also be considered a comfort element, it is best to leave the methodology as it stands to avoid doubling/skewing points given for lighting.
23	Cuong Trinh	Caltrans - Active Transportation and Complete Streets	12/30/2020			Design standards for future projects to include additional lighting to be erected within any bridge structures/ underpasses (whether it be Metro transit structures such as above ground stations or Caltrans bridge structures) as it appears that existing lighting fixtures are evenly spaced apart, whether it be in the open or beneath I-405 structure.		Comment noted for future project phases if implementation occurs.
24	Cuong Trinh	Caltrans - Active Transportation and Complete Streets	12/30/2020			Design standards for lighting at pedestrian crossings to be located at opposing curb ramps, as well as potential of notification systems, such as RRFB or in-pavement beacons at non-controlled crossings. There doesn't appear to be a light installed on both curbs where the Class 1 bicycle and pedestrian path crosses Haskell Ave., just south of Victory Blvd.		Comment noted for future project phases if implementation occurs.

APPENDIX A: MASTER COMMENT MATRIX FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS
PATHWAY MAPS WITH PROJECT SCORING AND COST COMMENTS

Comment #	Reviewer	Reviewer Affiliation	Reviewer Comment Date	Document Section Title	Document Page #	Comments	Closest Intersection or Project Number	Response
25	Cuong Trinh	Caltrans - Active Transportation and Complete Streets	12/30/2020			Design standards for placement and type of speed bumps/ humps/ mumps across all Metro parking lots and access roads, so that those using wheeled devices including bicyclists, scooters and wheelchair users can easily mount (avoiding trip hazard of current rubberized bumps due to lack of transition) or travel around these without having to ride alongside the curb, while still effective for slowing of vehicles		Comment noted for future project phases if implementation occurs.
26	Cuong Trinh	Caltrans - Active Transportation and Complete Streets	12/30/2020			Design standards for curb or greater paint (contrast) separation Class 1 bicycle and pedestrian path, street and lighting fixtures. On pathway network, this applies to path running alongside Haskell Ave. to avoid unintentional roadway intrusion by wheeled users or collision into fixed objects. Also consider paint striping for edge and directional travel on paths, to raise awareness of fixed and moving objects, between pedestrians (and those using other mobility devices) and bicycle, scooter and wheelchair users		Comment noted for future project phases if implementation occurs.
27	Cuong Trinh	Caltrans - Active Transportation and Complete Streets	12/30/2020			On pathway network, suggestion to access parcel adjacent to the station (where LA Fitness is located) via cut-thru path. This may increase comfort of bicyclists and pedestrians traveling east, as they wouldn't be walking next to a busy street (or between a busway and an access road) to access other locations on both sides of Sepulveda Blvd., including LA Fitness, Pep Boys, Costco, restaurants, etc. This specific suggestion would improve connectivity to adjacent land uses and decrease traveling distance by 300' for bicyclists and pedestrians (and up to 500' to the entrance of LA Fitness)		The cut-thru path recommended is on the north side of the LA Fitness Parcel continuing west to connect the access road and existing parking lot. This would allow bicylcists and pedestrians going eastbound to avoid the Sepulveda/Orange Line Busway intersection. This pathway will be considered to see if a cut-though is feasbile through the private LA Fitness parking lot.
28	Cuong Trinh	Caltrans - Active Transportation and Complete Streets	12/30/2020			On pathway network, suggestion to incorporate access points into various portions of Woodley Park/ Sepulveda Basin Wildlife Reserve, so that bicycle and pedestrian path users wouldn't need to travel as far as Woodley Ave.		Access points from the Orange Line Busway or bike path into Woodley Park or otherwise may not be fasible before Woodley Ave due to the existing military grounds and Water Reclamation Plant, and interstate directly in between. This area is also outside the half-mile study radius.
29	Cuong Trinh	Caltrans - Active Transportation and Complete Streets	12/30/2020			Enhancements to pedestrian protection (such as improved fencing) along transit corridors. As for the case of Haskell Ave., to avoid congregation of individuals along the freeway/ ramp embankments or near/ within drainage structures or basins.		This will be considered in the design phase.

APPENDIX A: MASTER COMMENT MATRIX FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS
PATHWAY MAPS WITH PROJECT SCORING AND COST COMMENTS

Comment #	Reviewer	Reviewer Affiliation	Reviewer Comment Date	Document Section Title	Document Page #	Comments	Closest Intersection or Project Number	Response
30	Cuong Trinh	Caltrans - Active Transportation and Complete Streets	12/30/2020			Maintenance agreements in place with appropriate jurisdictions to improve perception of safety/ comfort (i.e. graffiti, trash, shopping cart removal)		Comment noted for future project phases if implementation occurs.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA

Seleta J. Reynolds
GENERAL MANAGER

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
100 South Main Street, 10th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 972-8470
FAX (213) 972-8410

ERIC GARCETTI
MAYOR

December 22, 2020

Christopher Moorman
Project Manager
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transit Authority
One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop 99-22-6
Los Angeles, California 90012

METRO G (ORANGE) LINE SEPULVEDA STATION FIRST/LAST MILE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT

Dear Mr. Moorman:

LADOT appreciates the opportunity to review the Metro G (Orange) Line First/Last Mile Plan. Our comments are captured below. Please reach out to my staff Rubina Ghazarian (rubina.ghazarian@lacity.org) and Alexander Wilkstrom (alexander.wikstrom@lacity.org) should you have any follow up questions.

Suggested Revisions

- Page 2: LADOT's cost estimate for a High Intensity Activated Crosswalk System (HAWK) is $250,000 based on recent expenditures. Metro's cost may be underestimated.
- Update references from the Purple Line to G Line and Wilshire Blvd. to Sepulveda Blvd.
- Page 3: The SWITRS scoring metric may not fully capture safety concerns for Los Angeles. Scoring the projects on Sepulveda as 10 points, even if it includes bike parking, may not fully capture the safety benefits of all the elements in the toolkit. Bicycle infrastructure, like bicycle lanes, have been demonstrated to have a higher safety benefit as compared to bicycle parking and should be weighted as such. The LADOT Vision Zero Safety Countermeasures demonstrate effectiveness of various tools available for improving safety in the public right-of-way. The toolkit can be found at: https://ladotlivablestreets.org/content-landing/Vision-Zero-Safety-Toolkit

Analysis and Outreach Requirements to Reach Final Project Decision

- In accordance with the Mobility Plan 2035 Settlement Agreement, any project that proposes lane reconfigurations must follow mandatory outreach protocols. The details of the settlement can be found here. According to our data, the traffic demands on Sepulveda Blvd qualify it as a

low-volume project. Should the proposed bicycle projects involve any lane reconfiguration, Metro and LADOT must inform the project area City Council office(s), local neighborhood councils, and other identified stakeholders. Furthermore, the project lead must provide a website that allows stakeholders to submit feedback on the project, and distribute a project fact sheet to interested stakeholders. LADOT has experience conducting outreach that follows the process outlined in the settlement during the unprecedented times of the pandemic on several projects, and can collaborate with Metro on future outreach efforts for projects in the public right-of-way.

- In addition to the outreach requirements described in the Mobility Plan 2035 Settlement Agreement, LADOT also requires analysis of roadway reconfiguration projects pursuant to the Lane Reconfiguration Guidelines prior to any final decision on the project. The analysis requirements for lane reconfigurations for corridors that exceed LADOT's volume threshold must follow the assessment procedures for transportation projects as described in Section 3.3 of LADOT's Transportation Assessment Guidelines. You may need to consult LADOT's Transportation Planning Bureau for further guidance of the analysis methodology and timing.

Alignment with LADOT's Mobility Investment Program

- LADOT's Mobility Investment Program (MIP) aims to establish project delivery best practices, identify funding opportunities, improve project engagement and evaluation, enhance inter-agency collaboration, and establish short and long-term capital improvement plans. The LADOT MIP does not contain overlapping funded projects in the area.
- The City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan 2035 is the adopted Transportation Element of the City's General Plan. The Mobility Plan established network hierarchies for designated streets in the City. Sepulveda Blvd is on the Mobility Plan Transit Enhanced Network, prioritizing the corridor for improvements to transit service, as is underway through Metro's NextGen program. Sepulveda Blvd is also designated a Tier 3 priority on the Mobility Plan's Bicycle Network, prioritizing the corridor for improvements such as bicycle lanes and supportive infrastructure. Future planning around roadway design should consider the priorities of the Mobility Plan 2035. If first/last mile plans deviate from the General Plan, those decisions should be discussed with City staff and disclosed as part of the environmental review process.
- This segment of Sepulveda Blvd. is part of the City's High Injury Network (HIN), on which the majority of Los Angeles' traffic injuries and deaths are concentrated. Roadway design decisions and safety countermeasures should be co-designed with LADOT's Vision Zero Division.

Sincerely,

Tomas Carranza

Tomas Carranza
Principal Transportation Engineer

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

213.922.9200 Tel
213.922.5259 Fax
metro.net

Metro