

**Attachment C – Public Comments and Metro's Response**

## Public Comments and Metro's Response

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
1	<p>Active Transportation Summit Discussion (March 1, 2016)</p> <p>How are the needs of seniors and persons with disabilities addressed in the ATSP?</p>	<p>The Plan identifies opportunities and strategies to improve safety and access for people who use transit, walk, and bicycle, which include seniors and persons with disabilities.</p>
2	<p>Active Transportation Summit Discussion (March 1, 2016)</p> <p>Metro needs to improve their accommodations for persons with visual impairments. Announcements on transit should be clear, calling out stops and identifying the transit line.</p>	<p>Metro currently provides such accommodations and is in compliance with all requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act. We continuously strive to improve services for our customers. We encourage customers to report malfunctioning equipment so it can be repaired. When contacting Metro, please note details like when and where, direction of travel, and, if possible, report the bus number (usually a four digit number on the outside and inside of the bus). Customers can report this information by calling 1-323-GOMETRO or fill out a comment form online at metro.net.</p>
3	<p>Active Transportation Summit Discussion (March 1, 2016)</p> <p>Safety on public transit is very important and needs more attention. What is Metro doing to improve safety?</p>	<p>Metro is in the process of modifying the way security and law enforcement personnel are deployed throughout the transit system. In the coming months, transit patrons will see that additional staffing has been added to patrol our stations, trains and buses.</p>
4	<p>Active Transportation Summit Discussion (March 1, 2016)</p> <p>There needs to be standards for crosswalks; some are fully-striped and others are just a single line across the street.</p>	<p>Crosswalk installation and markings are at the discretion of local agencies. Policies may differ regarding the striping pattern for crosswalks, implementation of uncontrolled crossings, and can be based on unique conditions or locations. Standards for these markings are developed and applied at the City level; however, Metro recognizes the importance of these pedestrian facilities and enhanced crossings are an important component of the first/last mile case studies, which are in Volume II of the ATSP.</p>
5	<p>Active Transportation Summit Discussion (March 1, 2016)</p> <p>Individuals identifying as low-income often use public transit and active transportation modes already. How is Metro addressing the built environment impact of the ATSP on low-income communities?</p>	<p>Metro has identified numerous strategies and partnership opportunities in the ATSP to improve the built environment for people who walk, bicycle, and use transit. The ATSP includes a Countywide Active Transportation Network that serves many low-income communities, including first last mile active transportation improvements to 661 transit station areas and almost 2,000 miles of Regional Active Transportation Network.</p>
6	<p>Active Transportation Summit Discussion (March 1, 2016)</p> <p>Metro should emphasize education and outreach in explaining the ATSP to decision-making stakeholders like municipalities so they can make better informed decisions concerning public health and the environment.</p>	<p>Education and outreach are key components and described in detail in the report. The ATSP includes talking points and graphics to help explain the benefits of active transportation to different stakeholders, including decision-makers. Benefits of active transportation as it relates to health and environment are described in the ATSP Report, Volume I, Chapter 2, and in Volume II, Appendix A, Benefits and Effects of Active Transportation.</p>
7	<p>Active Transportation Summit Discussion (March 1, 2016)</p> <p>Metro should improve community outreach before the planning phase to help with community buy-in and support.</p>	<p>Involvement of a wide-range of stakeholders is essential to implementation of successful active transportation projects. Specific outreach strategies are identified during each project's development process. In most instances, active transportation projects are implemented by local jurisdictions. The ATSP includes recommendations for outreaching to communities and identifies potential education and encouragement activities and programs to build community support.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
8	<p>Active Transportation Summit Discussion (March 1, 2016)</p> <p>City and county plans don't necessarily agree on specific bike accommodations for children or for residents in general. Agreement on land use and road design is lacking. Can Metro help find common ground between agencies on bike/bus, capacity improvements?</p>	<p>The ATSP identifies best practices and designs for creating a high-quality, low-stress, safe regional active transportation network for all users, including children and residents in general. Metro is in the early stages of developing a Bike/Bus Interface Study that will establish recommended infrastructure guidelines that enhance safe and efficient mobility for roadway users. Study tasks include performing in-depth technical analyses to understand effects of bicycle infrastructure on transit operations and overall roadway safety, completing a review of national and international best practices and research on bike/bus interactions, developing training guidance and safety tips for transit operators and bicyclists, and identifying appropriate design guidelines.</p>
9	<p>Active Transportation Summit Discussion (March 1, 2016)</p> <p>Will the ATSP affect areas across county borders? What interactions are expected between county borders?</p>	<p>Metro's ATSP is limited to Los Angeles County and this plan identifies a number of potential active transportation corridors that extend to these boundaries. While these plans are limited to Los Angeles County, it may affect areas beyond the county border as adjacent jurisdictions plan and implement facilities that provide active transportation facilities across regional boundaries. At these locations on the borders of the county, it is suggested that cities partner and coordinate to help create a connected and seamless system of active transportation facilities that may manifest themselves by implementing and connecting facilities in one jurisdiction, followed by a subsequent implementation phase in the adjacent jurisdiction.</p>
10	<p>Active Transportation Summit Discussion (March 1, 2016)</p> <p>How do all the Metro plans (i.e. ATSP, First/Last Mile, Complete Streets, etc.) work together?</p>	<p>The ATSP will be updated to provide an overview of these plans and their relationship.</p>
11	<p>Active Transportation Summit Discussion (March 1, 2016)</p> <p>Each of the Metro plans need to identify a reference person for questions and have a list of main contacts.</p>	<p>Individual projects and programs usually have a point of contact. During instances when that information is not apparent, stakeholders are encouraged to contact Metro's Community and Municipal Affairs staff. Contacts for these individuals are posted on Metro's website at <a href="https://www.metro.net/about/community-relations/community-and-municipal/">https://www.metro.net/about/community-relations/community-and-municipal/</a>.</p>
12	<p>Active Transportation Summit Discussion (March 1, 2016)</p> <p>Metro should make active transportation improvements a standard requirement in transportation corridor projects. For example, X% of all projects should contain certain amount dedicated to first last mile.</p>	<p>The ATSP implementation plan includes next steps for further integrating first last mile and active transportation elements into Metro corridor projects.</p>
13	<p>Active Transportation Summit Discussion (March 1, 2016)</p> <p>Many gaps still exist from the 2006 Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan (LA River being the most significant). How does the ATSP address this? Gaps need to be prioritized.</p>	<p>The ATSP includes a comprehensive approach to support local municipalities and other stakeholders get to implementation and fill those gaps to create a high-quality, low-stress regional active transportation network.</p>
14	<p>Active Transportation Summit Discussion (March 1, 2016)</p> <p>The upcoming ballot (R2) initiative should include Active Transportation components.</p>	<p>The Proposed Ballot Initiative includes a two-percent set-aside for the Regional Active Transportation Program, with approximately half of those funds allocated for projects that will be consistent with the ATSP. The ballot measure also includes 16% allocation for local return, which can be used for active transportation projects. The draft expenditure plan for the Potential Ballot Measure is currently available for public comment.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
15	<p>Active Transportation Summit Discussion (March 1, 2016)</p> <p>Is Metro considering planning design changes for bikes boarding trains? If so, has conflicts with ADA requirements been addressed (since bikes take up the same space as people)?</p>	<p>Rail car design changes that include bikes and affect ADA access/spaces involve review/approval from Metro ADA/Civil Rights Department. On new light rail vehicles, designated space for ADA and bike/ oversize items have been separated, which also include improved graphic decals for better visibility and access. Metro bike on rail rules include giving priority to passengers with access needs. Metro will continue to monitor bike boardings and address issues through future design updates.</p>
16	<p>Active Transportation Summit Discussion (March 1, 2016)</p> <p>Metro needs to have an evaluation process; regular bike plan revisits and check-ins are recommended to review status and progress on projects.</p>	<p>As part of the implementation plan for the ATSP, Metro plans to review and consider updates to the ATSP at least every five years. Additional benchmarks and monitoring will be conducted to evaluate the progress of ATSP implementation.</p>
17	<p>Active Transportation Summit Discussion (March 1, 2016)</p> <p>Funding: More funding is needed for Active Transportation projects. Is Metro increasing the amount of funding for Active Transportation projects in Call for Projects?</p>	<p>Additional funding for active transportation is recommended as part of the ATSP implementation plan. The actual amount allocated for active transportation will be determined by the Metro Board of Directors. A high level estimate of annual active transportation needs in Los Angeles County has been provided in the ATSP to inform the discussion.</p>
18	<p>Active Transportation Summit Discussion (March 1, 2016)</p> <p>Many municipalities and organizations do not have the staff resources to write or to carry out grant awards. Can Metro provide assistance?</p>	<p>The ATSP outlines opportunities and next steps for Metro to assist municipalities achieve project implementation, including grant-writing technical assistance.</p>
19	<p>ATSP Workshop Round 3 Discussion (March 1, 2016)</p> <p>Funding applications should be streamlined. Metro should coordinate with Caltrans to make applications easier.</p>	<p>Metro continues to identify opportunities to further streamline grant applications for capital grant programs administered by our agency. For grant funding that requires local jurisdictions to work directly with Caltrans, Metro encourages the local jurisdictions to directly contact applicable Caltrans staff.</p>
20	<p>Active Transportation Summit Discussion (March 1, 2016)</p> <p>Can Metro serve as application partner/administrator or provide design assistance?</p>	<p>As part of the implementation plan for the ATSP, Metro has identified a number of next steps for actively engaging with partners to provide assistance.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
21	<p>Active Transportation Summit Discussion (March 1, 2016)</p> <p>In terms of development, is it possible for a portion of the required parking to be redistributed to active transportation?</p>	<p>How Metro can address parking depends on what is meant by "Development". In terms of commercial development on Metro-owned property or near Metro transit lines, the parking requirements are set by the local municipality, generally the relevant City. Through Metro's Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Planning Grant program, the agency has provided 32 grants across the County to cities with land use regulatory control. These grants are to help cities adopt land use plans that remove regulatory barriers to transit oriented development. One such barrier is parking – reducing parking requirements can reduce the cost to develop and open up space for other transit-supportive uses. However, it is up to each City, and more importantly the stakeholders that will be engaged in the planning process, to determine if they are willing to reduce parking requirements. If by "Development" the reference is to Metro's development of the transit system, parking requirements are set during the environmental process. Metro takes into account the likely demand for park and ride facilities based on ridership projections and also looks pragmatically at where parking can be located along the transit line. (Please note that park and ride facilities are also part of a first last mile strategy). The proposed parking plan along the transit line is shared with stakeholders throughout the planning and environmental process, and once the environmental documents are certified, Metro is required to provide that level of parking. If, after operating the system, Metro finds that the parking provided is not being used at the capacity anticipated, then Metro can explore repurposing parking for other uses, which could include active transportation. These changes must be approved by the Federal Transit Administration. Metro's Parking Management Team is currently working on a Supportive Transit Parking Master Plan to develop a long-term strategic plan for Metro to develop a self-sustaining parking management program, which includes assessing every existing park and ride facility to determine if it is at capacity, if additional parking is needed, or if Metro can consider repurposing parking for other transit-supportive uses.</p>
22	<p>Maria Camacho, LA River Revitalization Corporation</p> <p>I reviewed the Draft Plan, and I would love if we can elaborate on the Rail to River project mentioned to be an example of the use of the river as an active transportation linear space that could also be seen as a Regional Network Project.</p> <p>As one of our partner nonprofits (Watershed Conservation Authority) mentioned in today's Summit comment period, gaps along the LA River bike path remain and we want to make sure those are seen as strategic opportunities to also meet Metro's regional network goals.Thanks for including my comments into the comment period.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
23	<p>Maria Camacho, LA River Revitalization Corporation</p> <p>As you know, my organization is very much pushing for attention to completing the full 51-mile bike/active recreation path along the LA River. Given the proximity of the river to 30% of major transportation stops (within 1 mile), we truly believe the river can act as a spine to our regional transportation options and become a wonderful means for active transportation space.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The LA River is included in the Regional Active Transportation Network.</p>
24a	<p>Metro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)</p> <p>A motion was made by Larry Stevens (League of California Cities – San Gabriel Valley COG) and seconded by John Walker (County of Los Angeles) to request that Metro staff convey TAC's position to the Board that first last mile and active transportation components become a standard to be considered in conjunction with design of new stations and updates to existing stations for projects that do not have a Life of Project (LOP) budget established.</p>	<p>The ATSP implementation plan has identified a number of next steps to further integrate first last mile and active transportation elements into Metro corridor projects and station improvements. The ATSP implementation plan will be updated to explicitly state "Implementation Action 4.8 Include first last mile and active transportation components as a standard in conjunction with design of new stations and updates to existing stations for projects that do not have a Life of Project (LOP) budget established."</p>
24b	<p>Nicholas de Wolff, City of Burbank Sustainability Task Force</p> <p>Kudos on a very challenging process moved forward with vigor! Looking forward to seeing the results of all your hard work manifest: a more connected, healthier, more community-oriented multimodal transportation infrastructure for the whole of LA County. It will be years in the making, but if more municipalities and agencies demonstrate the same degree of commitment and vision as has been shown by your team, it is eminently doable!</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
25	<p>Richard Parks, Sol Price Center for Social Innovation</p> <p>Looking at the maps, I am glad to see parochial schools included, however, it appears that Charter School locations may have been omitted. For example, the Global Education Academy Middle School at 1374 W 35th St, Los Angeles, CA 90007 [sic] does not appear on the map. Public charters now educate 10% of LAUSD students.</p>	<p>As the on-line portal is updated and data are refreshed, this mapping will be updated.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
26	<p>Richard Parks, Sol Price Center for Social Innovation</p> <p>Looking at the Vermont Ave. / Jefferson Blvd. station [sic] I would note the following:</p> <p>Walkshed Points of Interest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• USC does not appear to be represented with a light blue dot; the one blue dot appears at the location of the Hebrew Union College on Hoover St. – Colleges/Universities</li> <li>• USC Engemann Student Health Center (1031 W 34th St, Los Angeles, CA 90089) also hosts faculty practices for a range of medical services available to the public. – Health and Services</li> <li>• Herman Ostrow School of Dentistry of USC Patient Clinic (925 West 34th Street, Los Angeles, CA 90089-0641) – Health and Services</li> <li>• The USC Uytengsu Aquatics Center (home of the McDonalds Swim Stadium) is open to the public (1026 W 34th St, Los Angeles, CA 90089) - Recreation</li> <li>• The USC Dedeaux Field is where USC plays all of its home baseball games which are [sic] open to the public - Recreation</li> </ul>	See response to comment #25.
27	<p>Richard Parks, Sol Price Center for Social Innovation</p> <p>Bikeshed Points of Interest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All of the above</li> <li>• City of Los Angeles Rose Garden (701 State Dr, Los Angeles, CA 90037) - Recreation</li> <li>• Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County (900 Exposition Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90007) - Arts</li> <li>• California Science Center (700 Exposition Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90007) - Arts</li> <li>• California African American Museum (600 State Dr, Los Angeles, CA 90037) - Arts</li> <li>• Expo Center (3980 Bill Robertson Lane, Los Angeles, CA 90037) - Recreation</li> </ul>	See response to comment #25.



#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
28	<p>Richard Parks, Sol Price Center for Social Innovation</p> <p>Bikeshed Points of Interest (continued):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LA84 Foundation/John C. Argue Swim Stadium (3980 Bill Robertson Lane, Los Angeles, CA 90037) - Recreation</li> <li>• Ahmanson Senior Center (3990 Bill Robertson Lane, Los Angeles, CA 90037) - Services</li> <li>• USC Fisher Museum of Art (823 W Exposition Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90089) - Arts</li> <li>• USC Galen Center (3400 S Figueroa St, Los Angeles, CA 90089) - Recreation</li> <li>• Shrine Auditorium (665 W Jefferson Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90007) – Arts</li> <li>• Los Angeles Memorial Sports Arena (3939 S Figueroa St, Los Angeles, CA 90037)</li> <li>• Los Angeles Memorial Coliseum (3911 S Figueroa St, Los Angeles, CA 90037)</li> </ul>	See response to comment #25.
29	<p>Richard Parks, Sol Price Center for Social Innovation</p> <p>I hope this local perspective is helpful. Again, I so appreciate the efforts of you and your team to create a resource that will help organizations and local government apply for active transportation funding.</p>	Comment noted.
30	<p>Michael James Hayes</p> <p>First off, I sincerely appreciate Metro's dedication to an improved Los Angeles, thank you for your efforts.</p> <p>The following suggestions come from my experience visiting and studying in many of the world's greatest cities and working as a professional in architecture and design.</p>	Comment noted.

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
31	<p>Michael James Hayes</p> <p>1. Maximize opportunities around stations by catering to pedestrians rather than vehicles. To continue to provide parking at stations is to perpetuate car dependency and necessity. Stations ought to be destinations in and of themselves, not platforms surrounded by expansive (free) parking. Obviously the move to introduce paid parking at stations has been met with opposition among the vocal minority who drive, but they can't expect to benefit from suburban and urban lifestyles at the expense of the majority (those who don't require parking to ride metro) Provide a comprehensive mixture of uses (commercial, residential, retail, entertainment etc) at each station at the scale of the neighborhood which the station belongs and create inherent appeal at each station with accommodations for more frequent riders, not exclusively for daily commuting.</p>	<p>We agree on the importance of active transportation improvements around stations and seek to balance needs of multiple customers who access our stations using different modes. Metro's transit parking program is an important first last mile strategy and a key service to transit customers who must use our park and ride facilities to connect to our transit network. With a recent focus on improving parking management, it has become increasingly clear that Metro needs to look to industry best practices to maximize availability and quality of transit parking and improve the transit customer experience. Metro is currently working on a Supportive Transit Parking Master Plan to develop a long-term strategic plan for Metro to develop a self-sustaining parking management program and retain our parking resource for transit users.</p> <p>Our Parking Management Pilot Program (paid parking) will be implemented at three upcoming Expo II stations. We are working to develop the card reader and data requirements to allow the parking system to verify proof of fare payment and determine if the parker utilized transit within 96 hours. This Pilot Program will identify the extent of poaching by non-transit parkers at parking facilities along the Metro transit system. This program will utilize innovative parking solutions to provide discount incentives for transit users and minimize violations by non-transit users. The revenue generated from the program will recover a portion of the operating and maintenance cost of the parking management program.</p>
32	<p>Michael James Hayes</p> <p>2. Introduce Bus only lanes along major N/S E/W corridors that have the flexibility to accommodate emergency vehicles when necessary. At street level, the sight of buses whizzing by gridlocked traffic could be a very powerful motivator for commuters to switch to public transit or at least consider the benefits of transit.</p>	<p>Metro is introducing bus lanes in the region. We just completed the Wilshire Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project in August 2015, which includes 7.7 miles of peak period bus lanes along Wilshire Boulevard, the busiest transit corridor in the County. We are also currently conducting two BRT technical studies, one on the Vermont corridor and the other on the North Hollywood to Pasadena corridor. As part of those BRT studies, we will be looking at the feasibility of implementing dedicated bus lanes, including other bus speed improvements.</p>
33	<p>Michael James Hayes</p> <p>3. Speaking of benefits... there are many that go unnamed, increased safety aboard transit (when compared to driving), decreased cost of mobility, [average transit rider spends ~\$1,300 annually, the average car owner spends ~\$10,000 annually] increased productivity aboard transit where riders can work, text, read etc, reduced stressed etc.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The benefits of active transportation have also been highlighted in the ATSP Report, Volume I, Chapter 2, and in Appendix A to Volume II.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
34	<p>Michael James Hayes</p> <p>4. Identify underutilized bus routes near job centers and work closely with employers along route to provide a select number of preloaded TAP cards (round trip fare) to offices that can disseminate among employees. Sort of "free trial" that might expose current drivers to the benefits and convenience of transit.</p>	<p>Metro offers Annual Employer pass programs that are a low-cost, high-value benefit and help to improve employee morale, health and attendance. Employers and employees may qualify for Commuter Benefits, which will significantly reduce the cost of the employee pass and act as a business tax benefit for the employer. Additional information is available at <a href="https://www.metro.net/riding/aep/">https://www.metro.net/riding/aep/</a>.</p>
35	<p>Michael James Hayes</p> <p>5. Enforce full fare payment. I routinely see riders put a few coins in the slot and walk briskly by the driver to avoid being stopped. Perhaps equip buses with a new recording and button that plays "BEEP insufficient fare" loud enough for the bus to hear, the public shame might prevent riders from putting only \$0.22 to ride.</p>	<p>We acknowledge that fare evasion and short payments are a problem. To counter the problem, Metro buses announce the fares every time the front door opens. This was done as a reminder to customers that there is a fare and how much they have to pay. Metro Operators are instructed to quote the fare just once (to a non-paying customer) and not to escalate the situation. "Shaming" the rider could lead to verbal or physical altercations between our employees and customers, which is not desirable.</p>
36	<p>Michael James Hayes</p> <p>Overall, the LA metro is a surprisingly decent system that should be more integral to mobility in the area. I sympathize with Metros effort to dissuade drivers because most Angelenos have been engrained with driving since they were young. I've been a resident of LA for just over a year and I've introduced some life long Angelenos to the LA metro system (to their pleasant surprise). Metro is fighting an uphill battle with staunch motor enthusiasts whose driving preference is ruining Los Angeles. It might be worthwhile to target younger, millennials who's preferences might not be so devoted to driving.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
37	<p>Danny Gamboa, Empact Communities</p> <p>I may have some issues with the data on the maps from the web portal. Could I ask you to look at some of our ground truthing of these maps when we are ready to provide you with that info?</p> <p>For example The Cal Enviro screen [sic] for this area seems a bit off and while I'll check my figures, this is one of the most impacted areas in Southern California by Truck traffic and Refineries. my [sic] last check was way above this rank.</p>	<p>The mapped CalEnviroScreen data are based on the CalEnviroScreen 2.0 scores. The scores are represented on a 0-100 index, and the top 25% of scores (not scores 75-100) are shown with cross-hatching. Therefore the intensity of impact may appear lower than expected in terms of the color of the Census Tracts; rather, the cross-hatching shows the most severely impacted areas in LA County. As the online portal is updated and new data are available, this mapping will be updated.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
38	<p>Blair Miller, Pasadena Transportation Advisory Commission</p> <p>I live within the bikeshed but outside the walkshed of the Allen Gold Line Station. I live 1.1 miles from the station. I would ride my bicycle to the station every single day if there was a safe place to leave my bicycle for 11 hours every day (I am at work for 9.5 hours a day for the City of Los Angeles on a 9/80 schedule). Because of the length of my work day and family obligations before and after work, I do not have an extra 40 - 50 minutes each day to walk back and forth to the station.</p> <p>Bike racks are not a safe place to leave a bike for 11 hours a day. A determined bike thief can get through any lock, and it's hard to secure seats and lights and front tires. There are usually either 1 or 0 bikes locked to the bike racks at Allen Station when I am there in the morning. Yet there are hundreds, possibly thousands of people who are within the bike shed of Allen Station who commute via Metro.</p>	<p>Comment noted for secure bike parking request. The Gold Line Allen station has limited Metro property and is not suitable for an "attended" Bike Station. However, non- Metro property on the southwest corner of Maple and Allen, where additional bike racks are provided by City of Pasadena, will be reviewed for secure bike parking option.</p>
39	<p>Blair Miller, Pasadena Transportation Advisory Commission</p> <p>My first preference would be for a Bike Station, or for some other secured and/or attended space. My second preference would be for Bike Lockers. Please include funding for this at Allen Station and at all stations as soon as possible. <b>We are missing opportunities every day for people who would ride back and forth to the station if there was a truly safe place to leave their bicycle.</b> I am on Pasadena's Transportation Advisory Commission and I am also a leader of Pasadena's Complete Streets Coalition. I promise that there is local support for this idea, and I would be happy to help organize it.</p>	<p>See response to Comment #38.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
40	<p>Ian Pari, City of Santa Clarita</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to review Metro's Draft Active Transportation Strategic Plan. Our only comment would be to ensure that the existing and future improvements for the City of Santa Clarita are consistent with Santa Clarita's Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, which is available at this link: <a href="http://www.santa-clarita.com/home/showdocument?id=9307">http://www.santa-clarita.com/home/showdocument?id=9307</a></p> <p>Thank you again.</p>	<p>The existing and proposed bicycle facilities have been checked for consistency against the Santa Clarita Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, and all the existing and planned facilities in that document have been included in the ATSP.</p>
41	<p>Craig Hensley, City of Duarte</p> <p>One of our Councilmembers, John Fasana, noticed the the newly adopted Duarte Bike and Ped Master Plan was not included in the Draft Active Transportation Strategic Plan. I noticed that we still have time to comment on that plan and want to suggest that the Duarte plan be added. I have attached: 1) the pedestrian plan that implements the First-Mile Last-Mile goals in the area near the new Duarte/City of Hope Gold Line Station; 2) the Citywide Bicycle Master Plan.</p>	<p>The existing and planned facilities contained in these documents have been integrated into the existing and planned bicycle facilities layers of the ATSP, and Duarte's plans have been added to the list in Appendix B, ATSP Volume III.</p>
42	<p>Philip Hawkey, San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Metro's Draft Countywide ATSP. This a comprehensive document that provides a roadmap for the development of safer regional active transportation networks that provide transportation alternatives and increases access to transit. The SGVCOG appreciates the time and effort that went into developing this document, including extensive outreach to cities and subregions.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
43	<p>Philip Hawkey, San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments</p> <p>The SGVCOG would like to provide the following comments related to the draft ATSP:</p> <p>1. Integration of First/Last-Mile Improvements into All Future Light Rail Stations and Transit Hub Designs: The draft ATSP recognizes the importance of providing connectivity to transit and investing in first/last-mile improvements. However, currently, the implementation of first-last mile improvements does not begin until stations are built, limiting the opportunities and funding available to make these improvements.</p>	<p>See response to Comment #24a.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
44	<p>Philip Hawkey, San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments</p> <p>In order to better integrate first/last-mile improvements into planned stations, the SGVCOG recommends that Metro undertake the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish Active Transportation and First-Last Mile improvements as a “standard” for all capital projects that include new or remodeled stations and that do not have an approved “life of project” budget;</li> <li>• Evaluate appropriate parking standards for stations and divert excess funds from parking structures to Active Transportation and First Mile/Last Mile improvements; and</li> <li>• Conduct station area planning analysis at the earliest stage of project conception.</li> </ul>	<p>See responses to Comments #24a and 31.</p>
45	<p>Philip Hawkey, San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments</p> <p>2. Coordination with Councils of Governments (COGs): COGs can play an important role in coordinating regional projects and programs. The SGVCOG is currently working with a number of member agencies on the implementation of the SGV Regional Greenway Network and in exploring the feasibility of expanding the Countywide Bike Share program into the San Gabriel Valley. The language referencing the role of COGs in the ATSP should be strengthened, and Metro should take a more active role in engaging COGs on regional projects. COGs can play an important role in identifying, coordinating and prioritizing projects. Additionally, COGs can facilitate collaboration between cities within their subregion, manage planning efforts, serve as the lead for regional grant applications, and seek project support from member agencies.</p>	<p>Metro recognizes the key roles that COGs play and will continue to actively engage with COGs on regional projects. The ATSP has been updated to reflect this stakeholder input.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
46	<p>Philip Hawkey, San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments</p> <p>3. Explore Opportunities to Coordinate and Collaborate with Additional Stakeholders: The ATSP should highlight the potential role of school districts, water districts, and other stakeholders to identify and implement multi-benefit, multi-agency projects. This could include actively engaging and encouraging school districts to identify and implement active transportation projects and working with stakeholders to identify and implement multi-benefit corridor improvements (i.e. Complete Streets and Green Streets) in a coordinated manner.</p>	<p>The ATSP has been updated to reflect this input in Chapter 3, Volume I.</p>
47	<p>Philip Hawkey, San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments</p> <p>4. Priority Funding for Regional Active Transportation Network Projects: The regional active transportation network is intended to serve as the "backbone" for County's bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Therefore, it is critical that these projects be given priority in implementation and funding. The SGVCOG recommends assigning additional points to Regional Active Transportation Network Projects in the Call for Projects evaluation process and that Metro work with COGs and local agencies to pursue State and Federal funding for these projects. Metro should develop specific funding strategies for the Regional Networks within each respective COG sub-region.</p>	<p>Projects identified as part of the Countywide Active Transportation Network, which includes the Regional Active Transportation Network and first last mile access to 661 station area locations, will be prioritized for funding in Metro's capital grant programs. Specific guidelines and updates to funding criteria and programs will be part of the next steps to implementing the ATSP.</p>
48	<p>Philip Hawkey, San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments</p> <p>5. SGV Regional Greenway Network: One of the SGVCOG's priority active transportation projects is the development of a comprehensive SGV Regional Greenway Network, which would create a bicycle and pedestrian "superhighway" along the San Gabriel Valley's rivers, creeks and washes. While a number of the projects that comprise the SGV Greenway Network have been included in the Regional Active Transportation Network, the SGVCOG requests that Metro consider revising the selection criteria to incorporate all of component projects of the SGV Regional Greenway Network. Currently, the following projects and corridors are not included in the ATSP: Santa Anita Wash (Arcadia/Monrovia); Saw Pit Wash (Duarte/Monrovia); Arcadia Wash (El Monte/Temple City); San Dimas Wash (Glendora/San Dimas); Little Dalton Wash (Irwindale); Verdugo Wash (La Canada Flintridge); Thompson Creek (La Verne); Live Oak (La Verne); Alhambra Wash (Alhambra/Rosemead); and Rubio Wash (San Marino).</p>	<p>The methodology for identifying the ATSP Regional Active Transportation Network is outlined in Appendix H. There is a lot of overlap with the SGV Greenway network, but there will be instances when the corridors don't line up exactly due to the differences in methodology and selection criteria.</p> <p>Metro incorporated design flexibility into the implementation of the Regional Active Transportation Network, as indicated in the ATSP Report Volume I, Chapter 4, under the section entitled "The Regional Active Transportation Network" and subsection "Design Flexibility", which states that "The alignments identified are also subject to review and modification by the relevant local jurisdiction(s). The Regional Network is intended to provide local jurisdictions with a high degree of latitude to construct facilities using preferred alignments. If a locally-identified alignment diverges from the identified Regional Active Transportation Network project, it can maintain Regional Active Transportation Network status by serving the same desire line as the original Regional Active Transportation Network facility (i.e. serving the same general corridor or destinations). For instance, a jurisdiction may elect to construct a facility along a parallel urban street or off-street corridor serving the same destinations as the original Regional Network alignment. As described above, these alternative facilities may harness the full range of available facility types and design enhancements, provided that the facility meets the eligibility criteria contained in Table 4.1."</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
49	<p>Hartley Voss</p> <p>1: Changes to LA's streets are TAKING TOO LONG. Other cities are implementing much more ambitious, comprehensive and high quality active transportation plans. The timeline needs to be sped up.</p>	<p>In most instances, Metro does not control the local roadways, which are usually the responsibility of local municipalities. Through the ATSP, we have identified a comprehensive approach to support these local partners to achieve implementation of active transportation facilities.</p>
50	<p>Hartley Voss</p> <p>2: The idea that "low-hanging fruit" is valuable is wrong. The real issue is there is no safe bike lane network that connects to each other. This is because a true network like New York or Chicago or Portland or Long Beach is creating, is NOT LOW HANGING FRUIT. Hard political choices must be made, ending delays.</p>	<p>Comment noted. See response to Comment #49.</p>
51	<p>Hartley Voss</p> <p>3:PROTECTED BIKE LANES should be implemented immediately. There are plenty of places where this should be done for basic safety reasons. Spring street, Main street, 7th street for example in downtown. These are streets where bike lanes should be flipped with parking and barriers should be put between car traffic and bikes.</p>	<p>Comment noted. See response to Comment #49.</p>
52	<p>Hartley Voss</p> <p>4: Dangerous bike lanes cover Los Angeles. Not only are they unprotected, but the pavement along curbs/street edges is often so unsafe, broken and cracked a bike cannot ride in the lane. While car tires are larger and can deal with this poor type of pavement, a bike cannot. Bike lanes in the city should immediately be REPAVED so they are smooth, safe and comfortable.</p>	<p>Comment noted. See response to Comment #49.</p>
53	<p>Ron Milam, Ron Milam Consulting</p> <p>Thank you for helping develop Metro's Draft Active Transportation Plan. It looks like it's on the right track. Here are a few suggestions based on a quick review of the plan:</p> <p>1. How do we ensure funds are actually allocated for these projects? Can we allocate more of the proposed LA County transportation ballot initiative to fund active transportation, with 10% of funds raised going towards this? For Metro's role on page three, I would like to see an even more active role for Metro, actively taking the lead, committing to high levels of funding, ensuring an ambitious number of 1st/last mile projects get built, etc.</p>	<p>Comment noted. See response to Comments #14 and 49. Additional language has been added to the ATSP Report, Volume I, to discuss the potential ballot measure. The ATSP identifies a number of funding sources and opportunities to achieve implementation, including leveraging existing resources; better positioning partners for local, regional, state, and federal grant funding opportunities; involving the private sector; coordinating among multiple jurisdictions; identifying partnership opportunities among various entities; and using a Complete Streets approach to transportation planning and implementation. The ATSP assumes that multiple funding sources will be necessary to pay for the extensive active transportation needs in the County.</p>



#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
54	<p>Ron Milam, Ron Milam Consulting</p> <p>2. In the performance metrics section,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o You have several 100% increases for a potential benchmark, which is good. But to help quantify that, I suggest you also put what the new percentage rate would be assuming it goes up 100%. For example, in the percentage of trips completed by bicycle, after a 100% increase (which to me is not ambitious enough), put 2.4%. I think we need to aim for 10% of all trips made by bicycle and set the other benchmarks to be more ambitious.</li> <li>o Two other benchmarks I don't see in the plan: kids that ride to school and older riders (more vulnerable riding populations).</li> <li>o For the Collision statistics section, I'd like to see Metro Commit to a Vision Zero Goal by 2025 - 0 traffic fatalities in LA County, in partnership with the City. Including a county-wide Vision Zero campaign to promote safer and slower driving. So many drivers drive so fast that even with bicycle infrastructure, it can feel scary for people to ride.</li> <li>o In the Greenhouse Gas reductions, I think you need to put in some sort of benchmark instead of just "to be determined" Ask Climate Resolve and/or the Envirometro Coalition.</li> </ul>	<p>The benchmarks take into account performance across the county and set important targets across the region. Additionally, implementation of many of the projects that contribute to meeting these targets are not within Metro's control. As Metro collects additional data, these subgroups and targets may be reevaluated and updated.</p>
55	<p>Ron Milam, Ron Milam Consulting</p> <p>3. In section 3.4 in the implementation section, increase bike/ped funding to 10% for call for projects funding.</p>	<p>The most recent Call for Projects cycle (2015) allocated approximately 25% to the pedestrian and bicycle modal categories, which is more than the 10% mentioned by the commenter.</p>
56	<p>Ron Milam, Ron Milam Consulting</p> <p>4. While the implementation section contains lots of great possibilities and different scenarios, it's not clear to me if anything will actually get implemented. And given the rising concerns around ensuring public investments are equitable, does the plan ensure that communities with the least amount of bicycle infrastructure/lowest-income communities, closest to transit, get funds prioritized for active transportation. These are often the same communities where bicycle use is higher and injuries/deaths while biking are higher.</p>	<p>Metro has identified numerous strategies and partnership opportunities in the ATSP to improve the built environment for people who walk, bicycle, and use transit. The ATSP includes a Countywide Active Transportation Network that serves many low-income communities, including first last mile active transportation improvements to 661 transit station areas and almost 2,000 miles of Regional Active Transportation Network, which will be prioritized for funding in Metro's capital grant programs. One of the guiding principles for the development of the Regional Active Transportation Network includes improving travel conditions along routes with a history of bicycle crashes.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
57	<p>Ron Milam, Ron Milam Consulting</p> <p>5. I may have missed it, but I may have missed this, but developing a network of bicycle boulevards (quieter, residential streets that give priority to bicycling as opposed to motorized transit) would be nice to include in this.</p>	<p>This type of facility is included in the Regional Active Transportation Network, described as a "shared on-street facility" with more detail found in Volume I, page 102.</p>
58	<p>Pauline Chan, Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT)</p> <p>The City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) congratulates Metro on its effort in developing a regional Active Transportation Strategic Plan (ATSP) to support active modes of transportation. The document provides a very comprehensive overview of the need for and benefits of active transportation in the region and promises to be a valuable tool to local agencies as transportation planning and capital projects move forward.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
59	<p>Pauline Chan, LADOT</p> <p>The plan should include a discussion on Metro's existing planning documents including but not limited to the Long Range Transportation Plan, Short Range Plan, Congestion Mitigation Plan and note how the ATSP will be integrated into or with the goals of those documents</p>	<p>The ATSP has been updated to reflect this input.</p>
60	<p>Pauline Chan, LADOT</p> <p>The Long Range Transportation Plan priorities should be revised to support the ATSP and thus revise the Call for Projects funding policies to reflect ATSP's goals.</p>	<p>This will be carried out as part of the next steps for implementing the ATSP.</p>
61	<p>Pauline Chan, LADOT</p> <p>First/Last mile scope of work should be incorporated in to Metro's project planning and implementation processes agency-wide to support the goals of the ATSP.</p>	<p>See response to Comment #24a.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
62	<p>Pauline Chan, LADOT</p> <p>Steps should be taken to update Metro's grant funding and reporting processes per the ATSP. Completing grant applications, evaluating, and reporting on projects can have a significant effect on agencies' abilities to compete for funding, as the grant administration requirements are cumbersome and a challenge for many local agencies of various scales.</p>	<p>See response to Comment #19.</p>
63	<p>Pauline Chan, LADOT</p> <p>Metro should engage with local agencies to re-scope any project funded in previous Calls for Projects that may be in conflict with the ATSP.</p>	<p>Rescoping of projects in previous Call for Projects is done case by case. Project sponsors are encouraged to contact the assigned Metro project manager and modal leads to discuss changes to scope.</p>
64	<p>Pauline Chan, LADOT</p> <p>Metro should adopt policies that increase capacity of bicycle racks storage on buses from racks that serve two bicycles to racks that serve three bicycles system-wide. The current racks are vastly overprescribed and are insufficient to meet the needs of the traveling public who need first-mile last mile solutions to support active commutes. Metro should also support policies that allow bikes to be carried on board buses during off-peak or late travel times when bus ridership is lower.</p>	<p>Metro has adopted policies to support triple bike racks for 40' buses (and shorter) and led legislation for state-wide adoption. Since the Metro Orange Line operates on a dedicated right of way, Orange Line buses have been exempted from triple racks since the line first opened. Metro's current operating procedures allow bikes to be carried on board at late night during low ridership times. Folding bikes (20" wheel or smaller) are allowed on buses outside of these times. Metro is one of the nation's leaders in terms of bike on transit policies and is taking a comprehensive strategic approach for first-last mile access, including providing secure bike parking (bike hubs), bike share, etc, to complement the need for additional capacity for bikes on transit vehicles.</p>
65	<p>Pauline Chan, LADOT</p> <p><i>Walkshed Analysis Area</i> - While people on bicycles share the roadway with people driving cars, people traveling on foot mostly travel on sidewalks. Therefore, the boundaries of walksheds around transit should be based on the existing sidewalk network.</p>	<p>Two of the main purposes of the first/last mile analysis is to identify the likely catchment area for people walking and biking around a transit station and to identify the geographic boundary for which existing conditions data was collected and analyzed. There are a number of communities where people may walk in an area that does not have sidewalks by choice or necessity. Rather than limiting or excluding these areas from the catchment and analysis areas, Metro's intent is to identify these as areas that are likely to serve pedestrians due to their proximity to transit and use this to highlight the need and prioritization of addressing deficiencies, such as missing sidewalks. The point that sidewalk presence is important for pedestrian comfort and safety is well taken and this approach reflects areas that serve this activity and should be considered priorities for improvement.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
66	<p>Pauline Chan, LADOT</p> <p>Page 12: <i>Add to Countywide Transportation Goal and graphics:</i> " Establish active transportation modes as integral elements of the countywide transportation system and determine order of magnitude cost estimates for the countywide regional implementation of facilities and improvements to support active transportation as a viable mode choice.</p>	<p>Planning-level cost estimates have been developed for each corridor of the Regional Active Transportation Network and available in Appendix H of Volume III. Cost estimates for first last mile improvements for different types of station location areas are shown in Volume II Case Studies.</p>
67	<p>Pauline Chan, LADOT</p> <p>Page 15 and 36-37: Using the ATSP: It should be recognized and acknowledged that many agencies (Los Angeles, Long Beach, Santa Monica, Pasadena etc.) in the region have already "picked" the low-hanging fruits, so as not to present expectations to elected officials and the public that there are still a number of treatments that can be easily implemented.</p>	<p>Low-hanging fruits also include continuously using a Complete Streets approach, in which all transportation improvements are viewed as opportunities to create safe, more accessible public streets for all users. Local municipalities are encouraged to coordinate Complete Streets improvements with roadway repaving, re-striping, rehabilitation, renovation, and maintenance planned or underway, in addition to coordinating with private development when applicable.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
68	<p>Pauline Chan, LADOT</p> <p>Page 19: Refers to an increase of use when bike facilities are safe and easy to use. <i>Convenience</i> is also a significant factor. It is important to plan and implement bike facilities that actually serve businesses and other destinations to which users want and need to travel.</p>	Comment noted.

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
69	<p>Pauline Chan, LADOT</p> <p>Page 25-30: <i>Add to Walkshed or Bikeshed Analysis--Existing Conditions and Public Safety Considerations-determine if older, younger and/or women will walk or ride if they have the option to drive, if the area to the transit node or transit itself is uncomfortable or perceived as a vulnerable mode of travel from a public safety perspectives.</i> Public safety is a major concern for users in their mode choice and should be considered in the analysis. Walk/Bikeshed should be expanded to include major obstacles that may impede active travelers outside of the capture are, i.e., if the transit station is located on an arterial that is bisected by a freeway and associated freeway ramps are severely limited. While some of the concerns are addressed in the Case Studies Volume II, the areas should be visited much more holistically as each station will have design obstacles specific to each individual location.</p>	<p>It is recognized that personal safety and perceptions of safety impact mode choice for some users and this plan is intended to serve them, as well as those for whom a mode other than transit may not be a choice. There is no available metric or factor that can be applied to this analysis that is anticipated to accurately reflect varying conditions and perceptions around the county with respect to personal safety. The use of crime data would have major limitations and could ignore the needs of many transit patrons who use transit out of necessity, despite also having concerns over safety. The walk/bikeshed analysis is based on the street network and would therefore reflect some of the major barriers described, such as freeways without over- or underpasses. It is agreed that each location should be visited much more holistically and the varying needs and preferences of communities will best be reflected by local planning efforts, which the ATSP supports and complements.</p>
70	<p>Pauline Chan, LADOT</p> <p>Page 51-57: Add Innovation 4 --Vision Zero and High Injury Network(s) text about the City of Los Angeles' Vision Zero Initiative and High Injury Network. Vision Zero and the High Injury Network are referred to in the sub-regional projects and warrant a section in the text that is applicable regionally for prioritization of projects.</p>	<p>Metro supports the pursuit and implementation of local Vision Zero efforts. At this point, this is an innovation that is limited to a few jurisdictions and the strategies identified in one community may not suit another community; therefore, this is discussed as a sub-regional innovation.</p>
71	<p>Pauline Chan, LADOT</p> <p>Page 58-60: Cost Estimates. Comment: Define Regional Network. Limiting the cost estimates to only the walk/bikeshed areas around transit stations severely limits the network development and the ability of active travelers to actually get to the station/stops.</p>	<p>See response to Comment #66.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
72	<p>Pauline Chan, LADOT</p> <p>Page 69: Performance Metrics/Metro capital funding allocated to bicycle/pedestrian improvement: Break into several metrics by facility type and projected per mile cost to equal regional per mile benchmarks.</p>	<p>The ATSP identifies a number of funding sources and opportunities to achieve implementation, including leveraging existing resources; better positioning partners for local, regional, state, and federal grant funding opportunities; involving the private sector; coordinating among multiple jurisdictions; identifying partnership opportunities among various entities; and using a Complete Streets approach to transportation planning and implementation. The ATSP assumes that multiple funding sources will be necessary to pay for the extensive active transportation needs in the County. Setting Metro capital funding allocation targets by facility type would add additional funding and administrative constraints without necessarily helping Metro understand the overall, county-wide effects of active transportation investments. Additional refinements to the benchmarks will occur as the ATSP gets updated in the future.</p>



#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
73	<p>Pauline Chan, LADOT</p> <p>Page 77: Programs: Organize trainings on bicycle, pedestrian and roadway safety. Replace with: <i>Identify roadway safety experts in the State of California and Los Angeles County via law enforcement and subject matter experts to develop a curriculum for the implementation of roadway safety in Los Angeles County.</i></p>	<p>The ATSP has been updated to reflect this input (Volume 1, page 77).</p>
74	<p>Pauline Chan, LADOT</p> <p>Page 90: Change Class III Bicycle Route to <i>Bicycle Boulevard Neighborhood Friendly Traffic Calming measures or Corridors.</i></p>	<p>The ATSP has been updated to reflect this input (Volume 1, page 90).</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
75	<p>Pauline Chan, LADOT</p> <p>Page 100-115: Add to Regional Active Transportation Network - Los Angeles River Bikeway Design Completion. The City of Los Angeles has prioritized completion of the Los Angeles River Bicycle Path to improve regional livability by providing active transportation options with new access to transit, home, schools, jobs and retail. The project will complete the design of the Los Angeles River Bicycle Path through the Valley and prepare the project for construction. Also, include language about the need for grade-separated crossings for bike path projects and special attention to arterial intersection treatments that support, protect and prioritize walking and bicycling, especially in high-collision areas.</p>	<p>The LA River Bike Path is included in the proposed Regional Active Transportation Network.</p>
76	<p>Pauline Chan, LADOT</p> <p>The Case Studies should include secure long-term bike parking in all versions. Metro should require secure bicycle parking at new and existing stations to prevent theft and vandalism, as this is a major barrier to riding to the stations and using rail or bus transit. It should not be assumed that the installation of short-term bicycle racks in the public right-of-way is sufficient or considered secure bicycle parking. Space should be dedicated at each station specifically for secure, long-term bicycle parking.</p>	<p>For the Case Studies, some of the transit service and locations are operated by other agencies, so Metro can only offer guidance. However, Metro does require secure bike parking for Metro's new stations through design criteria for transit line development. And in a few instances, some stations have limited adjacent Metro property, where stations exist in the median only, for example. In such cases Metro provides guidance for nearby Metro properties identified for joint development to provide secure bike parking. Metro also monitors demand for bike lockers at existing stations and relocates lockers where needed.</p>
77	<p>Pauline Chan, LADOT</p> <p><b>Appendix F:</b> Performance Metrics - Collision statistic performance metric's potential benchmark should establish a goal to reduce the number of traffic fatalities in the County to zero.</p>	<p>In most instances, Metro does not control the local roadways, which are usually the responsibility of local municipalities. Therefore, achieving vision zero requires commitment from local municipalities. Through the ATSP, we have identified a comprehensive approach to support the benchmark of local municipalities with Vision Zero policies.</p>
78	<p>Pauline Chan, LADOT</p> <p>An Appendix should present public comments gathered through Metro's outreach events with accompanying responses from Metro to improve document's transparency and benefit to local jurisdictions.</p>	<p>The ATSP, Volume III, Appendix C Stakeholder Outreach Appendix has been updated to include meeting notes from the first two rounds of stakeholder workshops. The input received at these meetings informed the development of the ATSP. The third round of stakeholder workshop (Active Transportation Summit) was designed to gather feedback on the Draft ATSP. Public comments to the Draft ATSP and Metro's responses are reflected in this matrix.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
79	<p>Inez Yeung, County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works</p> <p>1. The ATSP should consider LA County Public Works' "Suggested Routes to School" (<a href="http://dpw.lacounty.gov/tnl/schoolroute/">http://dpw.lacounty.gov/tnl/schoolroute/</a>) maps and other pedestrian-related planning documents prepared by cities. These pedestrian planning documents may include pertinent information on pedestrian usage and mobility requirements.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This is an excellent resource for local municipalities to refer to when developing pedestrian improvements.</p>
80	<p>Inez Yeung, County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works</p> <p>2. The ATSP should consider Metro's "Los Angeles County Strategic Goods Movement Arterial Plan." The transportation network managed by LA County and other cities accommodates goods movement as well as trucks used in the service, utility, and construction services. The implementation of facilities intended to support active transportation may conflict with the needs of trucks for wider travel lanes, adequate intersection widths to support turning movements, and designated parking/loading zones. (<a href="http://media.metro.net/projects_studies/call_projects/images/15_Final_Report.pdf">http://media.metro.net/projects_studies/call_projects/images/15_Final_Report.pdf</a>)</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
81	<p>Inez Yeung, County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works</p> <p>3. The ATSP should consider LA County's "Traffic Signal Synchronization Program (TSSP)." The TSSP improves the mobility through signalized intersections for all vehicles including automobiles, buses, trucks, and bicycles, thereby reducing fuel consumption and air emissions. (<a href="http://dpw.lacounty.gov/traffic/tssp.cfm">http://dpw.lacounty.gov/traffic/tssp.cfm</a>)</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
82	<p>Inez Yeung, County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works</p> <p>4. Volume I Page 37: We recommend including the following language under "Helpful Tips":</p> <p>"Consider the value of active transportation within the holistic framework of sustainability. Use a rating system, such as Envision developed by the Institute for Sustainable Infrastructure, that will reward active transportation improvements and encourage other elements of sustainability. Envision provides framework of criteria and performance objectives to help project teams identify sustainable approaches during planning, design, construction and operation."</p>	<p>Comment noted. Recommending sustainability rating systems or frameworks is outside the scope of the ATSP given the broad thematic and technical goals of such frameworks.</p>
83	<p>Inez Yeung, County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works</p> <p>5. Volume I Page 60: "<i>Prioritize projects submitted for Call for Projects funding which implement projects and programs identified in the Metro Active Transportation Strategic Plan</i>"</p> <p>Local agencies should not be penalized for including bikeway facilities in the Call for Projects applications that are inconsistent with the ATSP, especially where the local agency's bicycle plan or active transportation plan proposes a different class of bikeway facility.</p>	<p>The ATSP is intended to inform Metro's capital grant programs, including the Call for Projects Program. Projects that implement the Countywide Active Transportation Network identified in the ATSP will be prioritized for funding. Specific guidelines and updates to funding criteria and programs will be part of the next steps to implementing the ATSP.</p>
84	<p>Inez Yeung, County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works</p> <p>6. Volume I Page 74: Marina Del Rey is also a County unincorporated community.</p>	<p>The ATSP has been updated to reflect this input.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
85	<p>Inez Yeung, County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works</p> <p>7. Volume I Page 82: "Update Proposition A, C, and Measure R Local Return Guidelines..."</p> <p>LA County currently maintains approximately 100 miles of Class I bikeway with a limited funding source. Under ATSP, 510 miles of Class I bikeways are proposed. Since gas tax cannot be readily used for routine maintenance of off-road facilities, we request Metro attempt to either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) add routine maintenance of Class I bikeway used mainly for transportation purposes as an eligible use of Proposition C and/or Measure R local return funds, or</li> <li>2) identify another source of funding in the ATSP for the routine maintenance of the additional Class I bikeway infrastructure proposed.</li> </ol>	<p>Specific guidelines and updates to funding criteria and programs will be part of the next steps to implementing the ATSP.</p>
86	<p>Inez Yeung, County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works</p> <p>8. Volume I Page 101: "The inclusion of sidewalks can be assumed on all on-street facilities with low-stress bikeways, such as protected bicycle lanes (Class IV) or bicycle boulevards (Class III)."</p> <p>This does not apply to all areas of LA County, i.e. rural areas with low pedestrian traffic and communities that prefer a more rural look without sidewalk.</p>	<p>The ATSP has been updated to reflect this input.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
87	<p>Inez Yeung, County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works</p> <p>9. Volume I Page 102: "Floating Bicycle Path" should be moved to the "On-Street" category based on its description.</p> <p>Please clearly define "Sub-Grade Bicycle Intersection".</p>	<p>The ATSP has been updated to reflect this input on page 102 of the ATSP Volume I.</p>
88	<p>Inez Yeung, County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works</p> <p>10. Volume I Page 103-114: The ATSP proposes bikeway facilities that are inconsistent with the Los Angeles County Bicycle Master Plan (LACBMP). Many of the proposed bikeway facilities on the maps are inconsistent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Some bikeway facilities identified in the LACBMP as Class II or III are identified in the ATSP as Class I or II.</li> <li>· The ATSP identifies bikeway projects not identified in the L ACBMP.</li> </ul>	<p>The Regional Network goes beyond the extent of currently-planned bikeways to prioritize low-stress facilities. In some cases, these are on corridors that already have proposed bikeways and the Regional Network proposes lower-stress facilities than what is currently proposed, and in some cases, they are on corridors that do not yet have proposed bikeways.</p>
89	<p>Inez Yeung, County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works</p> <p>11. Appendix B:</p> <p>Add "Unincorporated Los Angeles County Pedestrian Plans, IN PROGRESS".</p>	<p>The ATSP has been edited to reflect this input (Volume III, Appendix B).</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
90	<p>Barry Bergman, Rails-to-Trails Conservancy, Western Region</p> <p>1. On behalf of Rails-to-Trails Conservancy, I respectfully submit the following comments on the Metro Active Transportation Strategic Plan. Rails-to-Trails Conservancy is a national nonprofit organization dedicated to creating a nationwide network of trails from former rail lines and connecting corridors to build healthier places for healthier people. We have worked with many communities in Los Angeles County to support the development of trails and trail networks, and it is exciting to see Metro taking the initiative to develop a regional approach to active transportation.</p> <p>Metro is the primary planner, funder, designer, and builder of the region's transportation system. As such, Metro has a unique role in making sure that all of the elements of the transportation system - even those built and operated by other agencies - work together to provide safe, accessible, and reliable transportation options. Because Los Angeles is one of the country's largest, most populous counties, Metro has a unique opportunity to lead the nation by example by prioritizing healthy active transportation modes. People walking and biking are at the greatest risk of injury and death while traveling, and therefore deserve increased attention from the region's transportation agency to ensure that their needs are met. We commend the draft ATSP for its comprehensive approach to planning for active transportation in Los Angeles County, recognizing the respective roles of Metro and partner agencies to deliver critical transportation improvements for residents. As Metro updates its Long Range Transportation Plan and considers how to allocate the revenue from a potential additional ballot measure, it is critical for Metro to continue this comprehensive approach to ensuring that the most basic mobility needs of all Los Angeles County residents are met.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
91	<p>Barry Bergman, Rails-to-Trails Conservancy, Western Region</p> <p>2. RTC commends Metro for its identification of a Regional Active Transportation Network in the ATSP, consisting of nearly 2,000 miles of low-stress active transportation facilities, including over 500 miles of off-street facilities. We strongly support the inclusion of key trail projects that have been included in the plan, such as the San Gabriel Valley Greenway Network and the Los Angeles River Bike Path. However, while the plan specifically calls out the potential opportunities for trail corridors along waterways and utility corridors, <b>we strongly recommend highlighting the potential for additional trails that may be available through conversion of unused or abandoned rail lines as well as potential rail-with-trail projects along active rail line.</b> The Rail-to-River project is one example of how such corridors can provide key linkages in a highly developed urban environment.</p>	<p>Metro incorporated design flexibility into the implementation of the Regional Active Transportation Network, as indicated in the ATSP Report Volume I, Chapter 4, under the section entitled "The Regional Active Transportation Network" and subsection "Design Flexibility", which states that "The alignments identified are also subject to review and modification by the relevant local jurisdiction(s). The Regional Network is intended to provide local jurisdictions with a high degree of latitude to construct facilities using preferred alignments. If a locally-identified alignment diverges from the identified Regional Active Transportation Network project, it can maintain Regional Active Transportation Network status by serving the same desire line as the original Regional Active Transportation Network facility (i.e. serving the same general corridor or destinations). For instance, a jurisdiction may elect to construct a facility along a parallel urban street or off-street corridor serving the same destinations as the original Regional Network alignment. As described above, these alternative facilities may harness the full range of available facility types and design enhancements, provided that the facility meets the eligibility criteria contained in Table 4.1."</p>
92	<p>Barry Bergman, Rails-to-Trails Conservancy, Western Region</p> <p>3. We also applaud Metro for developing a plan that includes not only a list of active transportation projects, but also recommended policies to support the implementation of the plan and assistance to local jurisdictions to enhance their capacity to implement the active transportation vision. Other elements included in the plan will further bolster the likelihood of projects being implemented, such as the recommendation to implement an automated bicycle and pedestrian counter program. Developing a robust data set to document the usage and value of active transportation will provide useful performance metrics for Metro and enable projects to better compete for funding at the state level.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>



#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
93	<p>Barry Bergman, Rails-to-Trails Conservancy, Western Region</p> <p>4. To ensure that the ATSP vision is successfully implemented requires two key things: development of an implementation plan with clearly identified priorities, and the funding to complete the plan. <b>While trails and separated bikeways are included as a significant part of the regional network, the prioritization methodology needs to ensure that these projects are more than just lines on a map.</b> The ATSP highlights the need to develop a network that serves people of all ages and abilities, and trails will be an important part of making that a reality.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
94	<p>Barry Bergman, Rails-to-Trails Conservancy, Western Region</p> <p>5. The availability of funding will ultimately determine whether the vision of the ATSP is realized. The plan identifies a range of \$11.0 to \$29.5 billion needed to make all communities in Los Angeles County safe and accessible for walking and biking, with annual expenditures between \$737 million and \$1.69 billion for building a high quality network throughout the county. Considering the need for safer streets especially safe, reliable, and affordable transportation options for individuals with disabilities, older adults, and youth, it will be important that funding from the potential 2016 transportation ballot measure addresses the need identified in this plan. In addition to the sales tax measure, we encourage Metro to continue pursuing other local, regional, state, and federal funding opportunities, to align transportation investments with the needs as outlined in the draft ATSP.</p>	<p>See response to Comment #53.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
95	<p>Maria Sipin, MCM</p> <p>1. Multicultural Communities for Mobility (MCM) is pleased to provide comments on Metro's Draft Active Transportation Strategic Plan. MCM advocates for safe, equitable streets for and with low-income people of color who walk, bike and use public transit in Los Angeles. We applaud Metro's leadership in envisioning a high-quality active transportation network and would like Metro to consider the following recommendations to increase first -last mile mobility options for low-income street users:</p> <p><b>Prioritize investments in low-income communities.</b> Metro should ensure that mobility, economic, health, and safety benefits produced by active transportation are accessible to low-income communities and communities of color. Metro's accompanying Station Area Existing Conditions Maps highlights active transportation infrastructure gaps in the lower income and traditionally underserved neighborhoods of East Los Angeles, South Los Angeles and Northeast San Fernando Valley. These same neighborhoods rely on biking, walking and taking transit as their primary method of transportation yet face disproportionate rates of traffic-related injuries and fatalities and poor health and socioeconomic outcomes. Metro should recognize the unique barriers faced by underserved communities and design street improvements to address these needs. This can also mean creating criterion that will prioritize these treatments in areas of high poverty. In the future, Metro should regularly re-evaluate where infrastructure is being prioritized, in case of major geographical shifts of where low-income residents live due to displacement and an affordable housing crisis.</p>	<p>See responses to Comments #16, 47 and 56.</p>
96	<p>Maria Sipin, MCM</p> <p><b>2. Incorporate model practices that allow meaningful community engagement.</b> We urge Metro to consider how the planning process could be made more accessible to community members and community-based organizations who do not have the capacity to learn active transportation technical language and advocate for themselves in those terms. We noticed that in the draft plan, typically, only groups with active transportation policy professionals on staff are looked to as community stakeholders. While it is laudable that Metro has been open to collaboration with active transportation advocates, we would like to see a greater recognition that these groups do not represent the diversity of the region. Metro should adopt community-based planning guidelines to ensure stakeholders from underserved groups, including renters, low-income families, people of color and immigrants are included in the planning process.</p>	<p>See response to Comment #7.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
97	<p>Maria Sipin, MCM</p> <p><b>3. Develop measures to ensure community economic security.</b> We recommend adding community economic security to Metro's list of Regional Active Transportation Network Guiding Principles. Vulnerable families should benefit from the economic benefits for active transportation infrastructure highlighted in the draft plan. The focus on infrastructure investment (for example, the section entitled "If you build it...") should be accompanied by an equal focus on community security in order to ensure that Los Angeles' most vulnerable residents will be able to remain in place and have expanded mobility choices. As stated in the draft plan, "Simply put, more people choose to walk and ride their bicycles when infrastructure investment enables them to do so safely and easily." Given the region's affordability crisis, there has never been a more crucial time for ensuring that these investments do not push people further away from employment and lengthen their commutes, reducing rather than expanding their mobility choices. We recommend the Northwestern University Dukakis Center for Urban and Regional Policy's "Policy Toolkit for Equitable Transit Rich Neighborhoods" as a resource for research based strategies to mitigate unintended impacts of transportation related investments on neighborhoods.</p> <p>As an organization that works with individuals that depend on biking, walking and taking transit, we advocate for community based solutions to address real concerns around gentrification and displacement that can result from infrastructure investments. We have been developing strategies that bridge the gap between low-income street users and active transportation planning since our inception in 2008, and we hope to continue working with Metro staff and partners to ensure all communities can experience a seamless, safe, and affordable multi-modal travel experience.</p>	<p>Metro is one of the participants in the Los Angeles County Transportation Equity Technical Working Group, which is comprised of public agency staff, equity and public health focused-stakeholders and community- and university-based transportation experts. The purpose of this group is to identify, analyze, and recommend equity indicators and suggest policy definitions for social equity in the region's long-range regional transportation plans. The effects of active transportation investments at the local level can be evaluated as part of partnerships with partner organizations to inform future policies.</p>
98	<p>Chau Vu, City of Bell Gardens</p> <p>Class III Bikeway is planned along Gage Ave., Florence Ave, and Garfield Ave. per METRO Active Transportation Strategic Plan. Although the City has not formally adopted a Bike Master Plan, our Citywide Safety Enhancement study supports Class III Bikeway installation along the above roadways as well as Eastern Ave. and Florence Pl. Staff would also recommend expanding other existing bike corridors like Randolph and Firestone for connectivity. Additional community outreach &amp; studies are required for the City of Bell Gardens to solidify a bike masterplan. Staff would disagree with your terminology for a "low-stress" bike path where you have identified many arterials for Class 3 bikeways.</p>	<p>The ATSP includes planned and existing bicycle facilities that are part of an adopted planning document. The corridors mentioned in this comment are eligible for consideration in the Regional Active Transportation Network provided they are sufficiently low-stress. Class III facilities are only considered low-stress if they are implemented with substantial traffic calming elements, and/or are located on low-speed, low-volume streets.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
99	<p>David Kriske, City of Burbank</p> <p>I am writing to express the City of Burbank's support for Metro's Active Transportation Strategic Plan and to provide additional comments on the draft document and resources.</p> <p>The Plan provides many useful talking points, graphics, and other resources for cities to utilize in planning for active transportation. The existing conditions online analysis tool is a good source of data, but we would like to see what plans Metro has for maintaining the online portal and providing updated data as it becomes available in the future.</p>	<p>Further refinements and updates to the existing conditions online analysis will be carried out as part of the next steps for implementing the ATSP.</p>
100	<p>David Kriske, City of Burbank</p> <p>Map 7 of the Proposed Regional Active Transportation Network includes proposed facilities in the City of Burbank. The City wishes to correct to existing conditions to show Class II bike lanes on Victory Boulevard from Burbank Boulevard to Clybourn Avenue. The City requests Metro add the following existing or proposed Class II street segments to the Dedicated On-Street Network:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Third Street from Amherst Drive to Providencia Avenue</li> <li>• Verdugo Avenue from Glenoaks Boulevard to Front Street</li> <li>• Front Street from Verdugo Avenue to Burbank Boulevard</li> <li>• San Fernando Boulevard from Cypress Avenue to Interstate 5</li> <li>• Empire Avenue from Interstate 5 to Buena Vista Street</li> </ul>	<p>These planned and existing facilities have been incorporated into the ATSP's existing conditions, but have not been included as part of the recommended Dedicated On-Street Network. See response to Comment #91.</p>
101	<p>David Kriske, City of Burbank</p> <p>3. The plan should also acknowledge (if it doesn't already) planned Class I bike facilities that could be integrated into the Off-Street network:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Los Angeles River Bike/Ped Bridge at Bob Hope Drive</li> <li>• Downtown Bike/Ped Bridge between First Street/ Palm Avenue and the Downtown Burbank Metrolink Station</li> </ul>	<p>These facilities are not included in the Regional Active Transportation Network, but should be considered as part of the first/last mile improvements for the Metrolink station.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
102	<p>David Kriske, City of Burbank</p> <p>4. We also support the Plan's proposed implementation strategies including ways the Metro Board can better support funding for active transportation projects. We would like to see more details on City, County and Community Programs and other non-infrastructure strategies, including how non-infrastructure programs can supplement improvements recommended in the case studies, additional resources and ways Metro can fund or support these programs.</p>	<p>The ATSP has been updated to reflect this input.</p>
103	<p>David Kriske, City of Burbank</p> <p>5. Also, the Metro Potential Ballot Measure includes dedicated funding for Active Transportation Projects and references the Active Transportation Strategic Plan as a reference for funding. The Plan should clarify how the Potential Ballot Measure, if adopted, would use this Plan as funding guidance or project priority.</p>	<p>Additional language has been added to the ATSP Report, Volume I, to discuss the Potential Ballot Measure. The ATSP identifies a number of funding sources and opportunities to achieve implementation, including leveraging existing resources; better positioning partners for local, regional, state, and federal grant funding opportunities; involving the private sector; coordinating among multiple jurisdictions; identifying partnership opportunities among various entities; and using a Complete Streets approach to transportation planning and implementation. The ATSP assumes that multiple funding sources will be necessary to pay for the extensive active transportation needs in the County. Update of funding criteria and guidelines would be part of the next steps of the implementation plan for the ATSP.</p>
104	<p>Christian Vasquez, City of Beverly Hills</p> <p>1. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to provide input on the Active Transportation Strategic Plan (ATSP). Below are comments/suggestions we have regarding the plan:</p> <p>The ATSP GIS map does not show Beverly Hills' bike facilities. We have two streets with bikeways in the City. Please see the attached map. (Sent in email)</p>	<p>The existing bikeways have been updated to reflect Beverly Hills' facilities.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
105	Christian Vasquez, City of Beverly Hills  2. How does the plan address autonomous vehicles (driverless cars)?	The ATSP does not explicitly address autonomous vehicles.

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
106a	<p>Nate Hayward, City of Los Angeles, Office of Council Member Jose Huizar, Council District 14</p> <p>I would like to transmit our comments and suggested edits to the ATSP. Please see below. After each addition is rationale for why it should be added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ConnectUS streets: To help facilitate implementation of ConnectUS</li> <li>- Santa Fe Avenue between Center Street and 7th Street: Santa Fe Ave will be the major connection between the 6th St Bridge/LA River Bike Path entrance and the Regional Connector; heavy bicycle and pedestrian use is expected along this corridor. It is also on the Bicycle Lane Network.</li> <li>- Mission Rd between Cesar Chavez and 7th Street: Mission Rd is the major north/south spine just east of the LA River. The 6th St Bridge will connect to this via a bicycle/ped ramp from the bridge deck above. Additionally, protected bicycle facilities are being constructed between 6th St and 7th St. This street is on the city's Bicycle Lane Network</li> <li>- 4th Street/4th PI between Alameda St and Indiana St: 4th St/4th PI are in the ConnectUS plan in the Arts District. East of the LA River, 4th St is a major east/west thoroughfare and has multiple schools located next to it. The city anticipates making major capital improvements to Hollenbeck Lake, which is a major destination in the neighborhood.</li> <li>- Boyle Avenue between Cesar Chavez and Olympic Blvd: Boyle Avenue is another major north/south corridor in Boyle Heights. Currently, ATP projects are funded between Cesar Chavez and 4th St. Boyle Ave also runs parallel to Hollenbeck Lake and is a major access point.</li> <li>- 8th Street between Soto St and Olympic Blvd: 8th St is an east/west corridor in southern Boyle Heights. It is located next to the Wyvernwood Housing Development, a low income housing project. 8th St is frequently used by residents who need to get to Lorena on the east or Soto on the west to access major transit lines</li> </ul>	<p>There are two components to the ATSP Countywide Active Transportation Network: 1) first last mile access to 661 station area locations and 2) Regional Active Transportation Network.</p> <p>The ATSP has not identified specific first last mile access routes to each station area location, since this should be done at the local level and with applicable stakeholder input. The ATSP is developed to ensure that there is flexibility in local planning, design, and implementation that suits the context of the community. Union Station and stations along the Regional Connector, which are mentioned by the Commenter, are included in the 661 station area locations identified in the ATSP for first last mile improvements.</p> <p>Metro has incorporated design flexibility into the implementation of the Regional Active Transportation Network as well, which is reflected in the ATSP Report Volume I, Chapter 4, under the section entitled "The Regional Active Transportation Network" and subsection "Design Flexibility", which states that "The alignments identified are also subject to review and modification by the relevant local jurisdiction(s). The Regional Network is intended to provide local jurisdictions with a high degree of latitude to construct facilities using preferred alignments. If a locally-identified alignment diverges from the identified Regional Active Transportation Network project, it can maintain Regional Active Transportation Network status by serving the same desire line as the original Regional Active Transportation Network facility (i.e. serving the same general corridor or destinations). For instance, a jurisdiction may elect to construct a facility along a parallel urban street or off-street corridor serving the same destinations as the original Regional Network alignment. As described above, these alternative facilities may harness the full range of available facility types and design enhancements, provided that the facility meets the eligibility criteria contained in Table 4.1."</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
106b	<p>Nate Hayward, City of Los Angeles, Office of Council Member Jose Huizar, Council District 14</p> <p>(Continued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Olympic Blvd between Santa Fe Ave and Indiana St: Olympic Blvd is an east/west corridor in southern Boyle heights as well. It is located next to Wyvernwood and the future Sears Redevelopment Project which will add 1,000 units to the neighborhood. This street is on the city's Bicycle Enhanced Network</li> <li>- Lorena St between Olympic Blvd and Cesar Chavez: Lorena is the eastern north/south corridor in Boyle Heights. It connects Cinco Puntos in the north with the Whittier/Lorena intersection to the south.</li> <li>- Eastern Avenue between Huntington Drive &amp; Valley Blvd: Eastern Ave is the major north/south corridor in El Sereno. It has multiple schools, a senior center, a recreation center, and small businesses located along the corridor. The city will be conducting an Eastern Ave Vision Plan in conjunction with the community to make the street more bicycle/pedestrian friendly. This street is on the city's Bicycle Lane Network</li> <li>- Alhambra Ave between Valley Blvd and the city boundary with Alhambra: Alhambra Ave, like Valley Blvd to the south, parallels the Union Pacific Railroad tracks. Recently, coffee shops and art galleries have moved in adding pedestrian volume to the street. It also has a very popular playground at Lowell Ave that is a major attraction in the neighborhood. Finally, it connects to Mission Rd in Alhambra and the large shopping center on Fremont Ave</li> </ul>	See response to Comment #106a.
106c	<p>Nate Hayward, City of Los Angeles, Office of Council Member Jose Huizar, Council District 14</p> <p>(Continued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monterey Rd between Huntington Dr and the city boundary with South Pasadena: Monterey Rd is a north/south corridor that connects El Sereno with Monterey Hills, Hermon, and South Pasadena. This street is on the city's Bicycle Enhanced Network</li> <li>- Yosemite Dr between Eagle Rock Blvd and Figueroa St: Yosemite Dr is a neighborhood street in Eagle Rock that passes by the high school, a recreation center, and an elementary school. It is frequently used by cyclists and pedestrians due to the slower vehicle traffic and neighborhood feel.</li> </ul>	See response to Comment #106a.



#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
107	<p>Jessica Meaney, Investing in Place; Caro Jauregui, California Walks; Tamika Butler, Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition; Manal J. Aboelata, Prevention Institute</p> <p>1. On behalf of Investing in Place and the undersigned Los Angeles County-based organizations, we thank Metro for the opportunity to comment on the draft Active Transportation Strategic Plan (ATSP). Investing in Place works with partners across Los Angeles County to support equitable transportation investments, support great neighborhoods, and improve safety and access for all – especially for those traveling by bus, rail, walking and bicycling. We look forward to supporting Metro in their efforts to implement the ATSP and a Long Range Transportation Plan that meets the mobility needs of all.</p> <p>Metro is the primary planner, funder, designer, and builder of the region's transportation system. As such, Metro has a unique role in making sure that all of the elements of the transportation system – even those built and operated by other agencies – work together to provide safe, accessible, and reliable transportation options. Because Los Angeles is one of the country's largest, most populous counties, Metro has a unique opportunity to lead the nation by example by prioritizing healthy active transportation modes. People walking and biking are at the greatest risk of injury and death while traveling, and therefore deserve increased attention from the region's transportation agency to ensure that their needs are met.</p> <p>We commend the draft ATSP for its comprehensive approach to planning for active transportation in Los Angeles County, recognizing the respective roles of Metro and partner agencies to deliver critical transportation improvements for residents. As Metro updates its Long Range Transportation Plan and considers how to allocate the revenue from a potential additional ballot measure, it is critical for Metro to continue this comprehensive approach to ensuring that the most basic mobility needs of all Los Angeles County residents are met.</p>	Comment noted.
108	<p>Jessica Meaney, Investing in Place; Caro Jauregui, California Walks; Tamika Butler, Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition; Manal J. Aboelata, Prevention Institute</p> <p>2. Specifically, we applaud Metro's draft ATSP for addressing first and last mile implementation. The case studies, cost estimates, infographics, and cost-benefit analyses provide actionable information for local agencies seeking to improve access to bus and rail stops. These are useful tools that will help stakeholders implement this plan. With over 83% of Metro bus riders accessing transit by walking, these cost estimates can inform future Metro capital projects and retrofits for the transit and highway network. The draft ATSP's existing conditions analysis of over 660 bus stops and rail stations will help Metro plan and prioritize projects, bringing the agency one step closer to developing shovel-ready projects to improve safe access to transit and local destinations.</p>	Comment noted.

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
109	<p>Jessica Meaney, Investing in Place; Caro Jauregui, California Walks; Tamika Butler, Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition; Manal J. Aboelata, Prevention Institute</p> <p>3. Investing in Place and its partners want to underscore the need for a social equity policy definition at Metro to enable prioritization and implementation of these infrastructure needs for the stops and stations outlined in the draft ATSP. The ATSP provides a wealth of data indicators, but we see the need for Metro to define its areas of high investment based on social equity benchmarks.</p> <p>The City of Los Angeles' Safe Routes to School program can be a case study for creating a project prioritization plan that includes social equity metrics. Their plan successfully quantified the need for safe routes to over 500 schools, leveraged funding, and created a sequencing plan that was based on need, not political geographic boundaries.(For more information, please visit <a href="http://investinginplace.org/2015/10/28/cityof-lasrtsbestpracticefunding/">http://investinginplace.org/2015/10/28/cityof-lasrtsbestpracticefunding/</a> and <a href="http://saferoutes.lacity.org/">http://saferoutes.lacity.org/</a>) For implementation of its first and last mile planning, we believe Metro should follow a similar prioritization process that is methodical and prioritizes high-needs communities.</p>	<p>See responses to Comments #47 and 97.</p>

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
110	<p>Jessica Meaney, Investing in Place; Caro Jauregui, California Walks; Tamika Butler, Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition; Manal J. Aboelata, Prevention Institute</p> <p>4. To further help with defining social equity needs, Investing in Place is pleased to be working with Metro staff, researchers, and practitioners throughout the County in our Transportation Equity Technical Working Group.(For more on Investing in Place's Transportation Equity Technical Working Group, please visit <a href="http://investinginplace.org/2016/03/10/announcing-our-los-angeles-county-transportation-equity-technical-working-group/">http://investinginplace.org/2016/03/10/announcing-our-los-angeles-county-transportation-equity-technical-working-group/</a>) We are developing recommendations for the Metro Board of Directors to define social equity at the neighborhood and regional level in order to prioritize high-needs investment areas. Investing in Place and its partners aim to have these policy recommendations for the Metro Board to review this year and we welcome Metro staff input throughout the process.</p> <p>To ground our approach, Investing in Place strongly supports transportation equity definitions written by the USC Program for Environmental and Regional Equity. They write that transportation equity is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Equitable access to quality, affordable transportation options and, therefore, employment, services, amenities, and cultural destinations.</li> <li>2. Shared distribution of the benefits (e.g., jobs) and burdens (e.g., pollution) of transportation systems and investments.</li> <li>3. Partnership in the planning process that results in shared decision-making and more equitable outcomes for disadvantaged communities, while also strengthening the entire region.</li> </ol> <p>Reference:USC Program for Environmental and Regional Equity. (2013). An Agenda for Equity: A Framework For Building a Just Transportation System in Los Angeles County.  <a href="https://dornsife.usc.edu/assets/sites/242/docs/Executive_Summary_Agenda_for_Equity_PERE_A.pdf">https://dornsife.usc.edu/assets/sites/242/docs/Executive_Summary_Agenda_for_Equity_PERE_A.pdf</a></p>	Comment noted.
111	<p>Jessica Meaney, Investing in Place</p> <p>5. That said, we understand a plan is only as good as its available funding. The plan identifies a range of \$11.0 to \$29.5 billion needed to make all communities in Los Angeles County safe and accessible for walking and biking, with annual expenditures between \$737 million and \$1.69 billion for building a high-quality network throughout the county. Considering the need for safer streets – especially safe, reliable, and affordable transportation options for individuals with disabilities, older adults, and youth – we hope funding from the potential 2016 transportation ballot measure addresses the need identified in this plan.</p>	See responses to Comments #14, 49, and 53.

#	Comment (Main Points)	Metro's Response
112	<p>Jessica Meaney, Investing in Place; Caro Jauregui, California Walks; Tamika Butler, Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition; Manal J. Aboelata, Prevention Institute</p> <p>6. Overall, we believe the draft ATSP is an exemplary blueprint for building out Los Angeles County's active transportation network. Investing in Place and its partners recommend that the draft ATSP be adopted with a prioritization plan for the over 660 bus stops and rail station improvement areas. Identifying social equity benchmarks at an early stage of the first and last mile planning in the draft ATSP can help inform revenue discussions and the Long Range Transportation Plan update. We encourage Metro to continue pursuing local, regional, state, and federal funding opportunities, including the potential 2016 transportation sales tax measure, to align transportation investments with the needs as outlined in the draft ATSP.</p>	See reponses to Comments #14, 49, and 53.