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Consultant Team
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UCLA

Topic and data collection and analysis leadership and stakeholder engagement co-leadership

STUDIO-MLA

Topic expert: open space

Estolano LeSar Advisors

Topic expert: housing and economy and workforce development

SE support

Liberty Hill

Stakeholder engagement co-leadership

raimi+ associates

Topic expert: health and wellbeing

Fehr+Peers

Topic expert: transportation

Topic expert: air quality

Advisors
The Chief Sustainability Office provides comprehensive and coordinated policy support and guidance for the Board of Supervisors, County departments, the unincorporated areas, and the region to make our communities healthier, more liveable, economically stronger, more equitable, more resilient, and more sustainable.
The Plan
The County’s Aims

The plan should be:

• Aspirational, Comprehensive, Long-Term, Regional, Actionable

The task:

• Develop a comprehensive framework for County and City sustainability initiatives
• Serve as template for local cities when preparing sustainability/climate action plans
• Prepare the region to be competitive for funding
The County's Sphere of Influence

- **Support**
  - **Influence**
    - **Direct Control**
      - County operations
      - Unincorporated areas
    - Regional Agencies
  - State Policy and Programs
Countywide Sustainability Plan Framework

- Water
- Energy
- Climate
- Air Quality
- Land Use and Transportation
- Open Space, Recreation and Habitat/Biodiversity
- Resource Recovery and Waste Management
- Public Health and Well-Being
- Economy and Workforce Development
- Housing

Equity & Resilience woven throughout
Organizing Principles

Nurturing Healthy Communities
Cultivating a Just Economy
Fostering a Healthy Relationship with the Environment
Making It Happen
Stakeholder Process and Today’s Agenda
Stakeholder Engagement
Equity Statement

**Equity**

**Goal**
Reduce disparities across geographies due to race, class, gender, and other social differences

**Strategy**
Commit resources to include those often left out of policy and planning discussions

**Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distributional</th>
<th>Actions that repair current and historical imbalances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>Participatory decisionmaking with vulnerable communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>Strategies securing future benefits for at-risk populations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stakeholder Engagement Plan

- UCLA: Environmental NGOs, Public Sector, Private Sector
- Liberty Hill Foundation: Equity-Focused NGOs
- Estolano LeSar Advisors: Public Sector, Private Sector
- County of Los Angeles: Internal Stakeholders

NGO SECTOR
PUBLIC SECTOR
PRIVATE SECTOR
Stakeholder Engagement Timeline

Prepare Stakeholder Engagement Plan

Prepared Stakeholder Engagement Plan

NGO, Public, and Private Sector Workshops

Prepare Discussion Draft

Sustainability Summits

Summary Report

Plan Finalization

PREPARE
Spring 2018

LEARN
Summer-Fall 2018

CREATE
Winter 2018-Spring 2019

FINALIZE
Summer 2019
Today’s Team Leaders

Stakeholder Engagement

• UCLA: Laurel Hunt & Ari Simon
• Liberty Hill: Michele Prichard & Ben Russak
• Estolano LeSar Advisors: Richard France

Data & Analysis and Topic Teams

• UCLA: Jaimee Lederman
• BuroHappold: Christopher Rhie
Today’s Agenda

10:10 Welcome
   - Welcome (Kristen Torres Pawling)
   - Workshop Overview (Michele Prichard)
   - Our County Transportation Opportunities (Jaimee Lederman)

10:40 Cross-Cutting Topic Sessions

12:00 Reconvene and Report Back

12:30 Lunch Break

1:15 Focus Groups

3:00 Dot Voting on Strategies

3:15 Wrap Up and Evaluation (Gary Gero and Michele Prichard)
Key Terms

Vision
A core value or values at the heart of the plan – the “why”

Goals
Broad, aspirational statement of what we want to achieve

Strategies
Approach or approaches that we take to achieve a goal (strategies may support multiple goals)

Actions
Specific policy, program, or tool we take to achieve a strategy

PERFORMANCE MONITORING

Indicators
Quantitative measures used to assess performance on a regular basis

Targets
Levels of performance that are sustainable
Key Terms

**Vision**
A core value or values at the heart of the plan – the “why”

**Goals**
Broad, aspirational statement of what we want to achieve

**Strategies**
Approach or approaches that we take to achieve a goal (strategies may support multiple goals)

Today’s Focus
LA County Transportation Overview
What We Know About How We Travel

- In 2015, 3.5% more people reported driving alone and 2.4% fewer people reported carpooling compared to 2005.
- Public transit use increased from 2005 to 2011, but decreased from 2011 to 2015.
- Key driver of this trend is increased access to vehicles by lower income residents.

Commuter Travel Time by Mode

- The mean commute time in 2015 was 31 minutes, which was about a 3% increase from the 2013 mean commute of 30.0 minutes.
- Average commute time by public transportation greatly exceeds the commute time for other modes, a figure that is in line with other major urbanized areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workers 16 years and over</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Drove Alone</th>
<th>Carpoled</th>
<th>Public Transportation (excl. taxicab)</th>
<th>Walked</th>
<th>Taxicab, motorcycle, bicycle, or other means:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-19 minutes</td>
<td>4,454,851</td>
<td>3,489,716</td>
<td>426,493</td>
<td>287,562</td>
<td>133,636</td>
<td>117,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-59 minutes</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or more minutes</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean travel time to work (min)</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Private and freight vehicle travel accounted for 33.5% of L.A. County’s GHG emissions in 2010 and is rising.

Regional truck vehicle miles traveled (VMT) are estimated to increase by over 80% by 2035, relative to a 2008 baseline, growing from 6.8% of total VMT in 2008 to 10% by 2035.
Electric Vehicles

Number of Electric Vehicles (EVs) per 1,000 Households by Census Tract in LA County as of 2015

EVs per 1,000 Households

- 64 - 136
- 35 - 64
- 14 - 35
- 6 - 14
- 0 - 6

Transportation Costs

- For a typical household in the Los Angeles/Long Beach/Anaheim area, with an annual income of $60,252 and 1.28 commuters per household, transportation costs accounted for $12,292 annually in 2016.
- Generally, transportation costs increase as housing costs decrease.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Metropolitan Region</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transit Ridership is Decreasing

- Passenger trips decreased by 3.4% since reaching a peak of 642.8 million passenger trips in 2007.
- Rail ridership steady
- Bus ridership
  - Metro: declined 12% between 2008-2015
  - Municipal Operators: declined 8% between 2008-2015

Annual Passenger Trips in LA County (2005-2014)

Access to Transit: Rail

- Approximately 40% of jobs in L.A. County are within a half-mile of Metro rail, BRT, or Metrolink stations.
Access to Transit: Bus

- The local bus network carrying the majority of daily transit trips, but only 41% of County residents live within a quarter-mile of high-frequency bus stops.
New Transportation Investment

- Local return funds go directly to municipalities for flexible spending
- SB1 - 12 cent per gallon gas tax increase will provide $52 billion statewide over the next decade

Measure M Expenditure Plan ($133.6 B over 30 years)

Source: Measure M Ordinance
Planned Projects

Source: http://theplan.metro.net/#objectives
Transit Oriented Communities

- Increase in housing near transit
- 12,200 housing units added within ½ mile of stations between 2009 and 2015
- 25% of all multi-family units built in 2008 and 2015 were within ½ mile of transit

Transit Oriented Communities

REVISION. http://revision.lewis.ucla.edu/ (joint project between UCLA Lewis Center and SCAG)
Active Transportation and Safety

- In 2015, 3% of L.A. County commuters walked to work, and less than 1% of residents commuted regularly by bicycle, although the absolute number of cyclists (47,075) was nearly double that of 2005 (25,477).

Congestion

- Congestion costs the L.A. metropolitan region economy $13.3 billion in lost productivity in 2014 or $1,711 for each peak hour commuter

- Congestion is reflective of a healthy economy

Traffic Density in Greater Los Angeles

Source: Cal Enviroscreen 3.0
Freight Impacts on Air Quality

- The San Pedro Bay Ports Clean Truck program, led to a 97% decrease in diesel particulate matter from trucks and a 91% decrease in sulfur oxides from 2005 to today.

- The I-710 goods movement corridor is home to communities that are made up of 90% people of color and have some of the County’s lowest human development scores.

Source: https://www.metro.net/projects/i-710-corridor-project/
New Mobility: Promises and Challenges

• Ride Hailing
  • During each month in fall 2016, L.A. County customers hauled an average 2.1 million Lyft trips per month.

• Bike and Scooter Sharing
  • Governance challenges to integrate

• Autonomous Vehicles
  • Unknown impacts, but will likely require policy interventions

The Role of the County in Transportation

- While the County is not a major transit provider, the five County Supervisors make up a portion of Metro’s 13-member Board of Directors. Given the limits of its direct control, the County primarily seeks to influence and support regional initiatives in order to achieve its sustainability goals.

- The County of Los Angeles has relatively little direct control over the region’s transportation system.
  - The Department of Public Works manages roadways in unincorporated areas and operates the Unincorporated County of Los Angeles Transit Services.
  - The County of Los Angeles has limited influence over the region’s ports.
## A Sampling of Local and Regional Transportation Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td><strong>SB 375 (2008)</strong> CARB sets regional targets for GHG emissions reductions percent change in per capita passenger vehicle emissions relative to 2005. As of October, the targets for the Southern California Association of Governments will be -8% by 2020 and -19% by 2035.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td><strong>SB 535 (2012)</strong> Under the bill, polluters pay into a Greenhouse Gas Reduction fund that distributes millions of dollars to projects in cleaner freight, affordable housing near transit, and public transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td><strong>SB 743 (2013)</strong> Creates exemptions from the California Environmental Quality Act for projects in areas served by transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td><strong>Executive Order B-32-15</strong> Directed State departments to create the California Sustainable Freight Action Plan, “that establishes clear targets to improve freight efficiency, transition to zero-emission technologies, and increase competitiveness of California’s freight system.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td><strong>AB 73 / SB 540 (2017)</strong> AB 73 provides incentives for local governments incentives to create housing on infill sites near public transportation; the new developments will be approved through a streamlined review process and are not subject to project-specific legal challenges under CEQA. SB 540 rewards developers who agree to construct buildings where 30% of units will be sold or rented to moderate-income households, 15% to lower income households, and 5% to very low-income households, representing a legal tool for fostering more dense development in transit corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td><strong>Executive Order B-48-18</strong> Governor Jerry Brown set a target of 5 million zero-emission vehicles on the road by 2030.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td><strong>SB 166 (2017)</strong> Prohibits cities and counties from approving projects that aim to reduce residential density.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td><strong>Measure JJJ</strong> Provides incentives for affordable housing in Transit-Oriented Communities, which guidelines identify as those located within ½ mile of major transit stops. Developments closer to transit stops receive increased incentives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td><strong>Santa Monica Electric Vehicle Action Plan</strong> Triple the number of EV Charging stations from 89 in 2017 to 300 by 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goals

A. Enhance communities and lives through mobility and equitable access to jobs and economic opportunity

B. Provide high-quality mobility options that enable people to spend less time traveling

C. Improve transportation-related health and safety outcomes

D. Decarbonize freight corridors

E. Reduce energy consumption and carbon emissions by transportation sector

F. Improve transportation system reliability, user experience, and resiliency

G. Amplify regional efforts to achieve a sustainable transportation system
lacounty.gov/sustainabilityplan
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