

Technical Comments on Draft 2016 RTP/SCS

Active Transportation Appendix

Pg. 4, column 2, bullet 2 –

Reads: “Utilitarian walkers requiring easy, attractive and safe access to retail, dining and other attractions.” Suggested edits: Utilitarian walkers requiring safe access to vital services including medical, grocery, public transit, child care, retail, and other key destinations.

Pg. 4, column 2, bullet 3

Reads: “Recreation and fitness pedestrians requiring good quality infrastructure for fast walking/jogging.” Suggested edits: Recreation and fitness pedestrians requiring safe and unobstructed quality infrastructure for unimpeded walking/jogging.

Pg 15

Discussion of LA County does not recognize adopted and current efforts by Metro, e.g.: Complete Streets Policy, First/Last Mile Strategic Plan, Bike Share, LA River Bike Path Gap Closure, etc. and forthcoming Metro Active Transportation Strategic Plan. Also several cities in the San Gabriel Valley have adopted a regional bike plan. The RTP should be updated to reflect current activities for LA County.

Pg 15

Bike lockers and secure bike rooms (self-serve and attended) currently exist for long term.

Need to better define/describe what bike parking stations are as some provide additional attended services to support bike commuters such as at El Monte, Long Beach and Santa Monica. Pasadena does not have a bike station. Also Burbank, Covina and Claremont have self-serve bike stations.

Should note to mention that bicycle lockers also have issues with maintenance and the required space and footprint they take up.

Document should also recognize education on how to properly lock a bicycle. Often time people use cable locks for locking their bike that are easily defeated. Important for people to be responsible for their own property through preventable measures.

Pg. 18

Statement “Bicycle-racks are often located within an office building’s parking garage (providing increased security over bicycle racks on public sidewalks)...” This is not necessarily true as bike racks at the street level have more “eyes” on them. Whereas, bike racks in hidden places such as parking garages can be very susceptible to theft.

Pg. 19

Include 2014 existing LA County bikeway conditions not 2012:

Facility Type as of 2014
Class 1 305.29
Class 2 835.5
Class 3 522.26
Cycle Track 4.2

Pg. 18

The 2012 National Household Travel Surveys indicated that bike trips for SCAG region were calculated at 1.9%. In the 2016 draft it indicates that the bike mode share for the CA household survey is 1.12%. This is a significant reduction; please verify that the figures are accurate.

Pg. 20

Same for Pedestrian mode share 2012 NHTS CA SCAG region indicated 19.24% and now for draft 2016 it is 16.8%. Please verify accuracy of figures and/or provide discussion on reduction/change.

Pg. 25

“...has developed a ~~bicycle to transit access plan~~ Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan (2006)...”

Pg. 28

Verify that preliminary cost estimates are carefully identified. For example, \$194 million identified for 755 miles of “Greenways” comes out to \$256,954/mile. This is a very low estimate for Class 1 and Class 4 bikeway construction costs. Bike path projects estimated for FHWA by the UNC Highway Safety Research Center in 2013 were between \$500K to \$4.2 mil/mile (pg. 12).

Pg. 28

Total estimate for active transportation needs seem low. Provide details on the underlying assumptions.

Suggest providing clear performance metrics and benchmarks to evaluate how the region is doing to meet the goals laid out in the 2016 Active Transportation Plan.

Pg. 55 (4th paragraph)

A “plan” for bike share is cited with no reference. These appear to be general statistics for bike share programs worldwide rather than assumptions made for a specific plan and should be reflected as such. Reflect information on Metro’s Countywide Bike Share Program.

Pg. 61

Regional bikeways should include those recommended by Metro’s ATSP.

Aviation and Airport Ground Access Appendix

Pg. 20, paragraph 6, last line--states that the scenarios and sensitivity tests yielded a range of airfield capacities from 82.9 to 96.6 MAP, but does not state the year(s). Please specify the year(s) for the MAP projections.

Goods Movement Appendix

Pg. 5 (Exhibit 3), the I-210 east of Glendora is not included in the Final Primary Freight Network, yet SCAG's many analyses include this stretch along I-210 to I-15 and indicate serious congestion. SCAG should address this inconsistency.

Pg. 13, under "... Drivers", the Air Quality subject should be expanded to a discussion of CO2 emissions concerns and reference SB2, etc., as developed on Page 40.

Pg. 44, there is no mention of Cap and Trade Program's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund as a funding source for the development of vehicle prototypes and infrastructure demonstrations. This should be highlighted as an opportunity for zero-emission technology research and development.

Highways & Arterials Appendix

Pg. 6 - Additional System Initiatives - Recommend adding Caltrans ATM Study on I-105 and the RIITS and IEN Data Exchange efforts.

Overall - Comment - Recommend discussing Freight Signal Priority.

Mobility and Innovations Appendix

Page 7 - First/Last Mile Strategies - Recommend discussing Ride Sourcing as a potential strategy.

Page 7 - Automated/Connected Vehicles - Recommend discussing potential impact of AV/CV on age profile of licensed drivers.

Page 9 - ITS-Roadways - Recommend adding discussion on ATM (Active Traffic Management) strategies.

Natural/Farm Lands Appendix

There is currently policy language supporting urban greening as a component of a larger natural lands strategy. We support this as consistent with Metro's Urban Greening Plan and Toolkit,

but would further request that SCAG include in “Strategies, Next Steps and Recommendations” a commitment to further integrate greening strategies into regional planning efforts.

Passenger Rail Appendix

Pg. 2, First paragraph under Metrolink--The South Perris connection will be in operation in 2016.

Pg. 2, Second paragraph under Metrolink--Metro owns 40% of the Ventura County Line within L.A. County. “Much of the track is owned by the the Member Agencies of Metrolink and/or the freight railroads.” Suggest referring to the CTCs that are Member Agencies of Metrolink as being a Member Agency.

Pg. 2, Third Paragraph--Perris Valley will begin operations in 2016. PTC will begin operations in 2016.

Pg. 4, Second paragraph--Metrolink will be operating the efficient locomotives in 2017.

Pg. 4, First paragraph under Metrolink’s history--The Ventura line started in 2002.

Pg. 4, Second paragraph under high speed rail--It has been almost 20 years for the development of HSR.

Pg. 7, In the MOU paragraph--The language should state “\$1B from Proposition 1A and other funds” That is the language in the MOU.

Pg. 9 and throughout the document--Should state that the projects are for operational efficiency. Although ultimate capacity is a benefit, operational efficiency is the key.

Under the Master Plan--SCRIP preceded the Master Plan. The Master Plan accommodates SCRIP.

Pg. 11, Under the Freight paragraph include language about the agencies owning the right of way that the freights operate on as tenant railroads.

Pg. 13, Add two projects--Bob Hope Airport/Hollywood Way Station; and Bob Hope Airport Station Pedestrian Bridge

Pg. 18, The Perris Valley Line will open for revenue service in 2016.

Pg. 24, The pedestrian bridge at the Bob Hope Airport Station is not Phase 2 of RITC. Add language about the new Bob Hope Airport/Hollywood Way Station.

Pg. 26, The Metro Orange Line is connected to SCRRA in Chatsworth.

Pg. 9, Los Angeles Union Station Master Plan, 1st bullet, add “expanded multi-modal” between “new” and “passenger concourse” and replace “the current tunnel” with “currently called the “tunnel”” (“a new expanded multimodal passenger concourse (the current tunnel currently called the “tunnel”) that would be widened)”

Pg. 9, 5th bullet add “accommodating” before “future tracks”—it should read “accommodating future tracks and platforms for the CA HSR project”;

Pg. 9, 7th bullet delete “new and” and replace with “3.25 million square feet of” It should read, “3.25 million square feet of improved retail and transit-oriented development (TOD) uses.”

Pg. 9, ADD 8th bullet: “improved pedestrian and bike network”

Pg. 12: insert “SCRIP run through tracks and to incorporate the” before larger passenger concourse and replace “has been approved” with “was developed”. It should read: “An additional component of the work is to study the effects of raising the entire platform areas in order to accommodate the SCRIP run-through tracks and to incorporate the larger passenger concourse that was developed-as part of the Union Station Master Plan...

Project List Appendix

Pg. 140, RTP ID #1TR1012, California High-Speed Rail Phase I – Env/PE, should have the Lead Agency as “California High Speed Rail Authority”. It is currently blank. The completion date is listed as 2011, and SCAG may want to update this.

Pg. 147, RTP ID # 1122005, SR-138 Loop Road – this project is not in the Metro 2009 LRTP, and the Lead Agency is listed as “TBD”. This should be clarified that the project is not a Metro-funded project.

Pg. 148, RTP ID #1C0401, “I-710” project, Lead Agency should read “Los Angeles County MTA”, as this is a project from Metro’s 2009 LRTP. Lead Agency is currently blank.

Pg. 148, RTP ID # 1M1002, “I-710 Early Action Projects”, Lead Agency should be “Los Angeles County MTA”, as this is a project from Metro’s 2009 LRTP. “Lead Agency” is currently blank. The completion year should be “2022” and it is currently “2025”.

Pg. 150, RTP ID # 1120005, Metro Green Line Extension—this is a project assumed to be funded with innovative financing, and not a constrained project in Metro’s 2009 LRTP.

Pg. 150, RTP Project # 1TR1011, West Santa Ana Branch ROW Corridor -- this is a project assumed to be funded with innovative financing, and not a constrained project in Metro's 2009 LRTP.

Pg. 154., RTP #10M08D01, this is TIP #LA0G159, and is nearly complete. This should be moved into the TIP section.

Pg. 157, RTP #UT101, Metro Purple Line Westside Subway Extension Section 3 – Century City to Westwood/VA Hospital—the completion year should be 2035 (12/31/2015), and the Project Cost is \$2,157,100 (YOE). Also, this listing is duplicative of a listing on page 158. Please correct and list only once.

Pg. 157, RTP ID # 1TR0101 (TIP # LA0G1162), Airport Metro Connector, the completion date is 07/01/2023.

Pg. 158, RTP ID #1TR1003 (EIR is TIP # LA0G642) – This appears to be a duplicate of the incorrect entry listed above on page 157. There needs to be only one “Metro Purple Line Subway Extension Section 3”, completion date of 12/31/2035 with a project cost of \$2,157,100. Please delete one of the duplicates.

Pg. 158, RTP ID #1TR1017 – please delete this project.

Pg., 158, RTP ID #1TR1020 – Please delete this project.

SCS Background Data Appendix

General – The SCS Technical Appendix provides a clear and sound description of how the 2016 RTP/SCS complies with SB 375, both from a content and process standpoint. We are confident that the Plan as presented will be approved by ARB.

Metro explicitly partners with SCAG on SCS development and implementation through the SCAG/Metro Joint Resolution and Work Program, most recently adopted by the Metro Board of Directors on May 28, 2015. The Plan and Appendix could be strengthened through further discussion of Joint Work Programs, including acknowledging completed efforts and identifying future initiatives that will advance the goals of the Plan. For example, the scenario planning exercise described in the appendix prompts preliminary steps in addressing sea level rise and other climate vulnerabilities as well as habitat protection needs. Through the plan, SCAG should describe and commit future planning activities in these areas or others.

Similarly, the Metro Board has adopted various sustainability policies acknowledging climate adaptation needs, and would suggest that sea level rise and climate vulnerabilities be explicitly included as priorities in the adopted plan, as opposed to a factor in a scenario exercise that does not influence policy and future activities.

Also, of note, the updated SCAG/Metro Joint Work Program commits a coordinated effort on deploying future planning funding, particularly from SCAG's Sustainability Planning Grant program. We would request that the Plan clearly acknowledge this commitment and further commit that future planning funding will be allocated in consultation with Metro such that priority activities are given consideration, and that local planning projects are structured appropriately for near term funding opportunities such as the Cap-and-Trade Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program, the California Active Transportation Program, and the Metro Call For Projects.

Among other items, Metro collaborates with SCAG on the development and implementation of the First/Last Mile Strategic Plan. As such, we appreciate the emphasis on first/last mile implementation (transit/active transportation integration) with the Draft RTP/SCS and the SCS Technical Appendix. The appendix could do more to acknowledge and be consistent with Metro's recent work on this subject. In particular the estimated region-wide funding need for first/last mile, as reflected in the Active Transportation Appendix is substantially lower than our own estimates for Los Angeles County alone prepared for the current Active Transportation Strategic Plan effort. We encourage SCAG to coordinate with us on this aspect of the Plan.

We appreciate the inclusion emerging transportation technologies within the scenario planning exercises, as this is consistent with Metro's policies and work products including the Countywide Sustainability Planning Policy, First/Last Mile Strategic Plan and emerging pilot projects. As a technical matter, we are unclear on why the use of ride share and ride hailing services would be reflected in a direct reduction in VMT. It would seem more supportable through data as well as more consistent with policy goals to reflect these travel choices through an assumed reduction in vehicle ownership.

Transportation Finance Appendix

Pg. 10, near bottom of page (concept also applies to page 26): New Starts: "As with the FHWA sources, fuel consumption declines by 0.9 percent (in real terms) annually." We would like to suggest it state that, "As with the FHWA sources, fuel consumption declines by 0.9 percent (in real terms) annually making it increasingly difficult for Congress to back fill with general funds."

Pg. 23, top of page: ...State Transit Assistance (STA) are included under this source (meaning Local Agency Funds for LA County). STA should be included under State sources on page 24.

General Comment Concerning Above Appendix Comments

If any comment above pertains to any section of the main documents of the Draft 2016 RTP/SCS, SCAG may also want to apply the changes beyond the appendices and into the body of the main document.

