

### Advocating for Better Transportation Options and Stronger Communities in Los Angeles County

### Presentation to AHOC Making the Case for funding Active Transportation – April 13, 2017



### About Investing in Place and who we serve:



# What problems are we trying to address?

19% of all trips in LA County are made by walking and biking

# 39% of LA

County roadway fatalities are people walking and biking

1% of transportation funding is spent on walking

23% of children in LA County are obese, at least in part due to low levels of physical activity and biking in LA County

38% of California's greenhouse gas emissions are from transportation 34% of LA

County students walk or bike to school

47% of trips in LA County are 3 miles or less, yet the vast majority of these trips are driven **Problem #1: Many dangerous streets for all of us — especially most vulnerable, like youth, older adults, and individuals with disabilities.** 

**NEWS** 

# PARAMOUNT HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT, COUSIN KILLED IN HIT-AND-RUN

# 24-Year-Old Man Dies After Being Struck in Boyle Heights Hit-and-Run

POSTED 4:46 AM, FEBRUARY 15, 2016, BY TRACY BLOOM AND MELISSA PAMER, UPDATED AT 02:24PM, FEBRUARY 16, 2016

Students Rally Around Teacher Critically Injured in Santa Ana Hit-and-Run

NEWS

PEDESTRIAN DECAPITATED IN PALMS HIT-AND-RUN CRASH; SUSPECT SOUGHT

#### Problem #2: Huge region, many decision makers, diverse interests understanding where key funding decisions happen

Los Angeles County Subregions



# How transportation decisions are made, and key decision points for changes:



Problem #3: We have too many undesirable and uncomfortable streets, dangerous sidewalks, and lack of bus stops = public health and mobility crisis for many.









### What have we accomplished?

Influencing, shaping, and passing a game-changing transportation ballot measure called *Measure M*.



Working with community partners and elected leaders, we helped pass *Measure M* on November 8, 2016, which would dedicate over \$4 billion to walking and biking projects, safe routes to school, and complete streets across Los Angeles County.



#### Funding for Walking, Biking, Safe Routes to School, and Complete Streets in LA County's Measure M (2016)

Funding	Notes
\$338.5 million	Includes both walking and biking improvements and complete streets
\$1,280 million	Includes \$365 million earmarked for LA River, \$250 million for Safe Routes to School, and \$450 million for Great Streets
TBD	Expenditure plan does not designate a funding amount for active transportation in the Gateway Cities
\$32 million	Includes first and last mile improvements
\$264 million	
\$65 million	Earmarked for LA River and San Fernando Bike Plan
\$429 million	Includes greenways, complete streets, and first and last mile improvements
\$293.5 million	Includes broad eligibility for local transportation improvements, including neighborhood electric vehicles, walking, biking, and technology
\$361 million	Includes first and last mile improvements
\$857.5 million	
\$3,900 million (\$3.9 billion)	Total of all subregional programs
	\$338.5 million \$1,280 million TBD \$32 million \$264 million \$65 million \$429 million \$293.5 million \$361 million \$857.5 million

# How'd we collaborate together to move policy?

In our "advocacy toolkit," what tools were effective?

### Advocacy Tool #1: Putting research to action



# Changing the conversation from anecdotes to complete data

Table 1 Distribution by Mode within Trip Length Categories in LA County.

Means of Travel	Distance not Reported	Less than 1 mile	1-2 miles	2-3 miles	3 miles and greater	Distribution by Mode
Private Vehicle	57.0%	36.2%	75.8%	87.7%	91.8%	74.8%
Shared Ride	40.1%	21.4%	44.6%	50.0%	47.6%	41.1%
Drive Alone	16.9%	14.7%	31.3%	37.7%	44.3%	33.8%
Walk	8.4%	59.1%	17.1%	6.6%	1.3%	17.6%
Any Transit	28.2%	2.1%	2.6%	4.0%	5.0%	5.0%
Bike	1.5%	2.1%	3.1%	1.1%	0.7%	1.4%
Other	5.0%	0.6%	1.4%	0.6%	1.2%	1.2%
All	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

1) Any Transit includes public and private buses, subway, Metrolink and Amtrak, shuttle bus, ferries, and dial-a-ride

# Changing the conversation from anecdotes to complete data

Usual Mode of Travel to School	National	Statewide	LA County
Private Vehicle	43.6%	53.7%	51.0%
School Bus	37.1%	13.1%	7.7%
Walk	10.7%	24.3%	32.3%
Any Transit	2.1%	2.7%	3.8%
Bike	1.0%	2.0%	1.1%
Travel Mode not Reported*	5.5%	4.2%	4.0%

\*Includes home-schooled and don't know/refused

Note the sample sizes: 372 reported private vehicle, 139 reported walk, 37 reported school bus, 16 reported transit and only 5 children in the LA County sample reported biking to school.

'Any Transit' includes public and private buses, subway, Metrolink and Amtrak, shuttle bus, ferries, and dial-a-ride

### Through our research developing funding need estimates

#### Table 1: Estimated Active Transportation Funding Need for Los Angeles County

Category	Quantity	Cost/Unit*	Total*
First Mile Last Mile (Stations) <sup>iii,iv,v</sup>	500	\$5,000,000	\$2,500,000,000
Safe Routes to School Infrastructure (Schools) <sup>vi,vii</sup>	2,116	\$500,000	\$1,058,000,000
Safe Routes to School Programs at All Schools (Years) <sup>viii</sup>	30	\$42,320,000	\$1,269,600,000
Great Boulevards (Miles) <sup>ix</sup>	400	\$10,000,000	\$4,000,000,000
Regional Bikeways (Miles) <sup>x</sup>	4,200	\$750,000	\$3,150,000,000
Education & Encouragement Programs (Years) <sup>xi</sup>	30	\$5,000,000	\$150,000,000
Sidewalk Repair (Miles) <sup>xii,xiii</sup>	10,000	\$750,000	\$7,500,000,000
Total Funding Need – 30 year scenario			\$19,627,600,000
		*All estimates in 2014 dollars	

### Advocacy Tool #2: Organize, Convene, Communicate, Repeat





### Advocacy Tool #2: Spokesperson trainings

## Advocacy Tool #3: Key Policies and Plans Adopted

- City of Los Angeles Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan (2012)
  - Prioritizing need out 500 schools, creating the top 50 schools to be addressed first due to safety & collision data, income levels, students who lived close to their school
- Metro (County level) First and Last Mile Plan (2014)
- Metro (County level) Complete Streets Policy (2014)
- Metro (County level) Active Transportation Strategic Plan (2016)
  - Guides future investments, Set funding goals \$\$
- City of Los Angeles Vision Zero Action Plan (2017)
  - Creation of High Injury Network prioritization

## Advocacy Tool #4: Using polling results to drive messaging and advocacy.



**Investing in Place** @InvestinPlace



Humbled to see @metrolosangeles #Metroplan ordinance include sidewalks in 75 word summary. See the clever tradeoff

1 Los Angeles County Traffic Improvement Plan. 2 To improve freeway traffic flow/safety; repair potholes/sidewalks; repave local streets; 3 earthquake retrofit bridges; synchronize signals; keep senior/disabled/student fares 4 affordable; expand rail/subway/bus systems; improve job/school/airport connections; and 5 create jobs; shall voters authorize a Los Angeles County Traffic Improvement Plan 6 through a  $\frac{1}{2} \phi$  sales tax and continue the existing  $\frac{1}{2} \phi$  traffic relief tax until voters decide 7 to end it, with independent audits/oversight and all-funds controlled locally? 8

6

RETWEETS 5

•

LIKES 6



9:28 AM - 23 Jun 2016

## Advocacy Tool #5: Building unlikely partnerships — and strengthening trust over time.





### Advocacy Tool #6: Having fun and celebrating small victories!







## What we're working on now: Measure M Guidelines and Implementation Program



### Metro's newly formed Policy Advisory Council

What we're working on now: Defining equity in our County Long Range Transportation Plan

**INVESTING** *in* **PLACE** Los Angeles County Transportation Equity Technical Work Group Policy Brief #1 September 8, 2016

#### Transportation Equity Technical Work Group Policy Brief #1

To: Investing in Place Network

Date: September 8, 2016

Coordinated by: John Guevarra and Jessica Meaney, Investing in Place

Contacts: john@investinginplace.org and jessica@investinginplace.org

Authors and Editors: Los Angeles County Transportation Equity Technical Work Group, which includes Carla Blackmar (Public Health Alliance of Southern California), Eric Bruins (Bruins Policy Solutions), Tamika Butler (Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition), Vanessa Carter (USC Program for Environmental and Regional Equity), John Guevarra (Investing in Place), Laura Muraida (Strategic Concepts in Organizing and Policy Education), Megan McClaire (Advancement Project California), Jessica Meaney (Investing in Place), Jessica Medina (SCOPE), Jonathan Nomachi (Advancement Project California), Andres Ramirez (SCOPE), and Madeline Wander (USC PERE) What we're working on now: Building bridges with housing policy partners to support development without displacement (advocacy tool #5)



## Thank you! www.investinginplace.org





