Beverly Hills City Council Liaison / Traffic & Parking Commission Committee will conduct a Special Meeting, at the following time and place, and will address the agenda listed below:

CITY HALL
455 North Rexford Drive
4th Floor Conference Room A
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Wednesday, June 12, 2019
4:30 PM

AGENDA

1) Public Comment
Members of the public will be given the opportunity to directly address the Committee on any item listed on the agenda.

2) Complete Streets
   a. Discussion of Complete Streets Plan and Next Steps

3) Shared Mobility Systems and Devices
   a. Discussion of Shared Mobility Devices in Neighboring Jurisdictions, proposals from vendors and next steps

4) Beverly Hills Bike Share
   a. Update on program and discussion of extending agreement

5) Adjournment

Lourdes Sy-Rodriguez, Assistant City Clerk

Posted: June 7, 2019

A DETAILED LIAISON AGENDA PACKET IS AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW IN THE LIBRARY AND CITY CLERK'S OFFICE.

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Beverly Hills will make reasonable efforts to accommodate persons with disabilities. If you require special assistance, please call (310) 285-1014 (voice) or (310) 285-6881 (TTY). Providing at least forty-eight (48) hours’ advance notice will help to ensure availability of services. City Hall, including Conference Room 4A, is wheelchair accessible.
MEMORANDUM
CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS

TO: City Council and Traffic and Parking Commission Liaison Committee
FROM: Aaron Kunz, Deputy Director of Transportation
        Jessie Holzer, Transportation Planner
DATE: June 12, 2019
SUBJECT: Complete Streets Plan
ATTACHMENTS: 1. Responses to Comments on the Draft Plan
               2. Draft Implementation Plan
               3. Proposed “Year One” Projects

Introduction
This report provides (1) an update on the status of the Draft Beverly Hills Complete Streets Plan prior to presenting the project at City Council and (2) a description of the implementation phase of the project, including a list of proposed “year one” projects. The implementation phase would begin after City Council adoption of the plan. Before presenting to City Council, staff seeks Liaison Committee comments on:

• Are there any comments on the proposed Tier 1, 2, and 3 assignments?
• Are there any comments on the proposed “year one” projects?
• Is the plan ready to be considered at City Council in July?

Background
As part of the fiscal year 2016/2017 City Council Priority Exercise, the City Council identified the preparation of a Bicycle Mobility Plan as the first step in developing a citywide mobility plan. On May 4, 2017, the City Council/Traffic and Parking Commission Liaison Committee supported expanding the scope of the Bicycle Mobility Plan to a “complete streets” approach that includes a comprehensive analysis of pedestrian, bicycle, and street networks, and emerging transportation modes and technologies, such as automated vehicles.

Staff released a Request for Proposals (RFP) in 2017 for a Complete Streets Plan that asked for:

• An analysis of existing street conditions for all transportation modes, including related policies and plans
• Documentation of best practices the City can use to inform designs during plan implementation
• Research on emerging transportation trends so the City may proactively prepare for changes
• Community workshops, interactive engagement events, and an online survey
• Recommended corridors for bicycle, pedestrian, and transit enhancements
• Recommendations for first/last mile connections to the future Metro Purple Line stations
• An action plan for implementing plan recommendations
The Draft Beverly Hills Complete Streets Plan includes:

- Values and goals for the City’s transportation network, such as enhancing safety and harnessing the power of data
- Existing policies that the plan must be coordinated with, such as the City’s Municipal Code and General Plan
- Existing street conditions for all transportation modes, such as bikeway types and bus stop demand
- A summary of infrastructure best practices that could be applied in Beverly Hills, such as strategies for implementing bikeways in constrained rights-of-way
- A compilation of emerging transportation technologies, such as hydrogen fuel-cell electric vehicles and connected vehicle infrastructure
- A summary of outreach efforts that informed the plan recommendations
- Recommended infrastructure, policies, and programs
- An implementation plan that prioritizes plan recommendations into three tiers

Once completed, the Beverly Hills Complete Streets plan will:

- Provide a Council-approved work plan for transportation planning
- Identify a network of streets that prioritize each mode (rather than prioritizing every mode on every street in Beverly Hills, which is not feasible in constrained rights-of-way)
- Emphasize active transportation improvements
- Prioritize preparing for the future Wilshire/La Cienega and Wilshire/Rodeo Metro Purple Line subway stations through recommended first/last mile connections and policies
- Highlight programs to increase accessibility and attract new users
- Recommend policies to incorporate into streetscape and street repair projects
- Provide guidance on preparing for autonomous vehicles and other emerging mobility options through technology upgrades
- Bring the City up to current best practices
- Increase eligibility for grant funding

**Community and Commission Feedback**

Staff released the Draft Complete Streets Plan for public review on April 10, 2019 and accepted comments through May 17, 2019. A total of 2,097 unique users visited the project website since it launched, 660 of which visited the website to view the Draft Plan during the public comment period. 28 unique individuals provided 268 total comments or “liked” comments. Staff is currently reviewing the comments received to update the plan as appropriate before presenting to the City Council. Draft responses are included in Attachment 1 and will be included as an appendix to the plan.

On May 8, 2019 at a special evening meeting of the Traffic and Parking Commission, approximately 10 people attended and provided comment. Overall, the majority of speakers and plan reviewers were pleased that the City is developing a Complete Streets Plan, but said that the Draft Plan lacked project specifics.

At the May 8, 2019 special meeting, the Commission discussed that the Draft Plan was a good guiding framework for how the City should conduct transportation planning in the future. They generally agreed with the speakers and emphasized design details would be determined during the implementation phase of the project with neighborhood-level community input. The Commission suggested the plan be described in more detail how the pedestrian environment can be improved.
before it is present to City Council; staff will revise accordingly. The Commission voted 5-0 to recommend that the City Council adopt the Complete Streets Plan.

**Plan Implementation**

Council adoption of the plan would approve the implementation plan, which prioritizes the installation of Tier 1 (short-term), Tier 2 (medium-term), and Tier 3 (long-term) projects. The three tiers are described below and included in Attachment 2.

- **Tier 1**: Projects identified as a City Council priority, that provide a first/last mile connection to the Metro Purple Line, have defined timelines, or have received external funding
- **Tier 2**: Projects with less critical timelines or depend on implementation of Tier 1 projects
- **Tier 3**: Require a longer planning or coordination period or are less critical in terms of addressing pressing safety enhancement concerns

Staff anticipates working on a subset of Tier 1 projects during the first year after plan adoption, which are included in Attachment 3. These projects are accounted for in the FY 2019/20 budget. If priorities for “year one” projects change, it may require a reallocation of resources.

As noted above, staff has heard concerns about a lack of detail in recommendations. Because it is city-wide and long-range, the plan will not provide specific design details and will require subsequent analysis to determine details with neighborhood-level community input before installation. The plan also identifies priorities to study since detailed analysis, especially civil design, can be costly. This is in large part because there are many design options to consider (with varying levels of tradeoffs that may change over time), which depend on neighborhood or sub-neighborhood support and may be more appropriate for certain parts of the city over others.

Staff anticipates providing annual updates to Council and quarterly updates to the Traffic and Parking Commission on the status of plan implementation, and revisiting the implementation plan after the subway opens (approximately five years) to update it, as needed. Staff proposes the annual Council updates occur in January/February to prepare for the upcoming year budget process with the first one in 2020.

To assist with implementation, staff plans to track grant funding sources (which have been provided by the project consultant) and apply for projects that meet the eligibility requirements for each opportunity. Typically, funding agencies are more likely to approve grants for “shovel ready” projects that are identified in an approved mobility plan, have a feasible design, can be proven effective through data collection and/or best practices, and have community support. This is so funds are not deobligated due to opposition or unsurpassable design challenges, which can reflect poorly on an applicant in future cycles.

**Next Steps**

Staff is currently reviewing the comments received to update the plan as appropriate before presenting to the City Council. Staff anticipates presenting a revised Final Draft Plan to the City Council for adoption in July, which would begin the implementation phase of the project. Before presenting to City Council, staff seeks Liaison Committee comments on:

- Are there any comments on the proposed Tier 1, 2, and 3 assignments?
- Are there any comments on the proposed “year one” projects?
- Is the plan ready to be considered at City Council in July?
ATTACHMENT 1
Driving through the city, I see countless close encounters with bicycles. This is why I believe all bike lanes should be protected. Whether that is with Bollards or planter boxes, all bike lines should be protected.

Why does Olympic and Wilshire not have bike lanes? These streets are extremely busy and protected bike lanes would increase the safety of cyclists. In addition, the utilization of "islands" for bus stops allows for bikes to have a clear path while not impeding bus services.

Painted Bike Lanes are great, however they should be as close to the curb as possible. As such, I recommend that the parking and bike lines are flipped. To further protect cyclists, I also recommend the use of bollards between the parking and the bike lane.

Crosswalks that do not have stop-lights, should either have push-to-cross lights or the flashing lights near the high school. In addition, all crosswalks near schools and parks that do not have stop lights should have push-to-cross lights or those flashing lights like the one's near the high school.

The bike lanes on Sunset Blvd. should utilize the center median. That is a natural barrier that would minimize the interaction with vehicles. To mitigate accidents with vehicles, there should be a cutout to turn (to cross the would-be bike lane) and there should be a turn in signal in which if a bike is sensed the turn signal turns red to allow bikes a safe passage.

This program could be expanded to look at bus stops. If bus stops had an "island" form, bikes would never have to interact with busy streets.

The city should see the possibility of building parking beneath Reeves Park. The structure can encroach underneath the adjacent street to provide more parking. This would provide half a block walk to the Purple Line Station. In addition, the park would not be destroyed as you could place it on top of the parking structure. In addition, the city should look to buy the property from METRO (at Gale & Wilshire - behind the old Car Dealer and across from the Saban Theatre) and look to build a structure beneath ground. This would provide a short walk to the station. Like the Reeves Park, the city would be smart to implement another park here, providing green space to the Wilshire/La Cienega area.

While many of your residents can afford this, those who traverse through to get to/from work cannot. Roads are for everyone and this is a bad idea. Do not give Beverly Hills a bad image.

I do not believe a bus lane would assist in alleviating traffic. Rather, if busses had an "island" where they can pick passengers up from, it would eliminate the consistent turning in-and-out of traffic to pick up passengers. In addition, with bus "islands" parking would become available on the streets without interfering with traffic.

Instead of parking meters, utilize pay stations with space numbers painted onto the curbs. This will create a cleaner look for our streets and lower the cost to collect coins from meters. To increase pedestrian safety, I recommend the use of "Driver Feedback Signs" (Signs that utilize radar to determine speed and signal slow down to drivers), "Optical Speed Bars," and "Speed Cushions." The advantage of speed cushions is that emergency vehicles are able to drive through them without slowing down, whereas normal vehicles cannot.

This is what I meant by "bus islands"?

I think all existing and new mid-block crossings need to have warning lights (rapid flash beacons, hybrid beacons, half signals) to alert drivers to slow down or stop. Signage and crosswalk striping are not enough.

There is this awkward intersection near the library (Rexford Dr./Clifton Way/Foothill Rd.) Lighting is poor, so pedestrians are not very visible at night. This area also needs crosswalk stripping to help vehicles pay attention to pedestrians.

I would love to see Beverly Hills take part in CicLAvia.

Beverly Hills has probably some of most aggressive drivers in the greater LA area, especially those driving their fancy sports cars. Many drivers are distracted. I think motorists absolutely need to be educated and re-educated about traffic laws and safe driving practices. Traffic laws also need to be better enforced by law enforcement. Drivers have cut me off as I am crossing the street countless times. Many drivers do the "California rolling stop" and don't stop for pedestrians or cyclists.

At night, many crosswalk signs don't respond to the "push-to-walk" button, unless there is a car also waiting to cross the intersection, for example Dohey Dr./Gregory Way; Dohey Dr./Charleville Blvd. Need to fix this...

I think a major factor forgotten in this plan is the bus busses/lanes that are causing major traffic throughout the city. They drive 5-10 miles throughout the city in both residential and commercial areas, and also stop in the middle of the road therefore blocking traffic: they are major sources of congestion and pointless, unnecessary traffic. Additionally, there is already limited enough parking for single vehicle cars: please don't take all of that away from us, most of it seems to be becoming valet parking at this point. Finally, the ride-sharing pickup/drop offs are certainly causing more traffic in areas throughout the city, but please don't give too much of our parking to ride-shares and tourist vans. Maybe combine them with taxi stands or loading zone areas. It has become a headache to live and work in this city.

Will the traffic lights throughout the city be re-evaluated as well? There are numerous lights throughout the city that do not 'line up,' causing traffic to be pointlessly stopped i.e. at Burton Way and Foothill. Additionally, streets such as Beverly Drive and Crescent Drive have traffic lights that are activated by pedestrians and turn red, but all the other lights on the street are green and traffic is virtually halted. There are for example 10 traffic lights going down Beverly Drive, but one will randomly turn red so the other green lights after are pointless, because no cars are allowed to go (i.e. stopped at the one random red light), therefore, causing more traffic. If the lights were timed better (including ones activated by pedestrians to match the timing of surrounding traffic lights) it could help relieve some traffic in the city.

The bike lanes on Sunset Blvd. should utilize the center median. That is a natural barrier that would minimize the interaction with vehicles. To mitigate accidents with vehicles, there should be a cutout to turn (to cross the would-be bike lane) and there should be a turn in signal in which if a bike is sensed the turn signal turns red to allow bikes a safe passage.

This program could be expanded to look at bus stops. If bus stops had an "island" form, bikes would never have to interact with busy streets.

The city should see the possibility of building parking beneath Reeves Park. The structure can encroach underneath the adjacent street to provide more parking. This would provide half a block walk to the Purple Line Station. In addition, the park would not be destroyed as you could place it on top of the parking structure.

In addition, the city should look to buy the property from METRO (at Gale & Wilshire - behind the old Car Dealer and across from the Saban Theatre) and look to build a structure beneath ground. This would provide a short walk to the station. Like the Reeves Park, the city would be smart to implement another park here, providing green space to the Wilshire/La Cienega area.

While many of your residents can afford this, those who traverse through to get to/from work cannot. Roads are for everyone and this is a bad idea. Do not give Beverly Hills a bad image.

I do not believe a bus lane would assist in alleviating traffic. Rather, if busses had an "island" where they can pick passengers up from, it would eliminate the consistent turning in-and-out of traffic to pick up passengers. In addition, with bus "islands" parking would become available on the streets without interfering with traffic.

Instead of parking meters, utilize pay stations with space numbers painted onto the curbs. This will create a cleaner look for our streets and lower the cost to collect coins from meters. To increase pedestrian safety, I recommend the use of "Driver Feedback Signs" (Signs that utilize radar to determine speed and signal slow down to drivers), "Optical Speed Bars," and "Speed Cushions." The advantage of speed cushions is that emergency vehicles are able to drive through them without slowing down, whereas normal vehicles cannot.

This is what I meant by "bus islands"?

I think all existing and new mid-block crossings need to have warning lights (rapid flash beacons, hybrid beacons, half signals) to alert drivers to slow down or stop. Signage and crosswalk striping are not enough.

There is this awkward intersection near the library (Rexford Dr./Clifton Way/Foothill Rd.) Lighting is poor, so pedestrians are not very visible at night. This area also needs crosswalk striping to help vehicles pay attention to pedestrians.

I would love to see Beverly Hills take part in CicLAvia.

Beverly Hills has probably some of most aggressive drivers in the greater LA area, especially those driving their fancy sports cars. Many drivers are distracted. I think motorists absolutely need to be educated and re-educated about traffic laws and safe driving best practices. Traffic laws also need to be better enforced by law enforcement. Drivers have cut me off as I am crossing the street countless times. Many drivers do the "California rolling stop" and don't stop for pedestrians or cyclists.

At night, many crosswalk signals don't respond to the "push-to-walk" button, unless there is a car also waiting to cross the intersection, for example Dohey Dr./Gregory Way; Dohey Dr./Charleville Blvd. Need to fix this...

I think a major factor forgotten in this plan is the bus busses/lanes that are causing major traffic throughout the city. They drive 5-10 miles throughout the city in both residential and commercial areas, and also stop in the middle of the road therefore blocking traffic: they are major sources of congestion and pointless, unnecessary traffic. Additionally, there is already limited enough parking for single vehicle cars: please don't take all of that away from us, most of it seems to be becoming valet parking at this point. Finally, the ride-sharing pickup/drop offs are certainly causing more traffic in areas throughout the city, but please don't give too much of our parking to ride-shares and tourist vans. Maybe combine them with taxi stands or loading zone areas. It has become a headache to live and work in this city.

Will the traffic lights throughout the city be re-evaluated as well? There are numerous lights throughout the city that do not 'line up,' causing traffic to be pointlessly stopped i.e. at Burton Way and Foothill. Additionally, streets such as Beverly Drive and Crescent Drive have traffic lights that are activated by pedestrians and turn red, but all the other lights on the street are green and traffic is virtually halted. There are for example 10 traffic lights going down Beverly Drive, but one will randomly turn red so the other green lights after are pointless, because no cars are allowed to go (i.e. stopped at the one random red light), therefore, causing more traffic. If the lights were timed better (including ones activated by pedestrians to match the timing of surrounding traffic lights) it could help relieve some traffic in the city.
THAN THAT!

You need bike only lanes and protected bike lanes to lure more people out of their cars. The number #1 reason people in BH do not cycle is that it's not safe on each side of the street and have the bike lane be between the curb and the front of the parked cars. Especially with the diagonal parking spaces on Beverly Dr, this needs to be protected to be effective. You could push out the existing parking spaces on the street.

You think it's great you've closed this off to cars, please make a crosswalk and a pass through for cyclists to be able to use this very quiet and peaceful street.

It's currently not legal and very difficult to cross from the east side of Civic Center Dr across Beverly Bl to the west side of Civic Center Dr. While I allocate space to protect the lanes you've already built. Especially going West -> East, it can get harrowing with cars (and many tourists) not paying attention and trying to make a right into the golden triangle not looking out for cyclists despite the lane.

Beverly Hills is ranked #90 (of 372 cities) in the state of California in terms of bike friendliness. WE CAN DO BETTER THAN THAT!

You need bike only lanes and protected bike lanes to lure more people out of their cars. The number #1 reason people in BH do not cycle is that they do not feel safe doing so. Beverly Hills is ranked #90 of 372 cities in the state of California in terms of bike friendliness. WE CAN DO BETTER THAN THAT!
Every street in Beverly Hills is wide enough to accommodate both bi-directional travel lanes AND bicycle lanes. It is a question of priorities.

Of course we can also reallocate travel lanes for other purposes such as bicycle lanes and protected bicycle lanes. In some cases keeping parking...
Prioritizing bicyclists as the roadway users is a VALUE that is noted in both the circulation element of the general plan and the 2009 Sustainable City Plan. The objectives: to reduce emissions; reduce congestion; and promote community health. Any street or corridor can be made low-stress, or substantially lower-stress, with the proper infrastructure. This plan seems to prioritize EXISTING relatively low-stress facilities; moreover any designation as Class II or Class III makes no distinction between the suitability of a facility for a specific situation. Any apparent stress today for bicyclists should suggest a class II or IV – marked lanes or protected lanes – for the bikeways infrastructure map. Class III is NOT infrastructure.

The 1977 plan did a much better job of suggesting the value of those destinations by making notes in a citywide bicycle network. How is it that schools don't get special treatment in this plan? Why was the school district not brought into the process as a KEY stakeholder if we want kids to ride to school?

The city north of Wilshire is NOT appropriate for bicycle lanes. Beverly is the primary N/S corridor. Crescent is the neighborhood retail corridor. Canon is a road to nowhere on either end. Plus the Canon/Wilshire intersection, should it reopen, is among the worst stress for riders and pedestrians given the oblique angle of the intersection and the traffic light spacing. Appropriate for Class IV and nothing else given the city-acknowledged hazards of the corridor (not least excessive speed) which has resulted in some intersection redesigns. If designated for Class IV we should also see some innovative intersection treatments near Will Rogers park: bike signals & bike boxes at the very least.

Bayside Way lanes was always low-hanging fruit, but the execution (and faded striping) leaves much to be desired. Yes improve it, but don't count it as a real step forward. It is among the lowest-hanging fruit still.

Reconfigure it. Residents along Burton will benefit from having traffic at speed farther from the curb. The city's rack-on-request program was a cynical gesture that planted perhaps 30-35 racks. And was structured only so business owners could request – and veto – a rack. A worst-practice case study. By all means: more racks and bike corrals, such as at the market on Crescent where the eastbound street crosses. On the NW corner is perfect. Low-hanging fruit.

We have seen active traffic enforcement PLUMMET in a decade. The best cure for ped safety on high-speed corridors is lower speed through engineered treatments or enforcement. Next, high-visibility crosswalks and signals that give peds lead time at EVERY intersection in our designated ped zone.

Already in our designated pedestrian zone and SHAMEFULLY ignored by our transportation planners and engineers. Just look at those faded, old crosswalks. We have a preponderence of older walkers, and this is among the most crowded few blocks in the city. SHAME.

Another key pedestrian corridor that has been shamefully ignored. Consequently, nobody likes to walk there. Shop owners don't want to locate there (no foot traffic). Yet we scratch our heads and form small business task forces to figure out the problem. YES on ped corridor designation.

It is a testament to our city's ambivalence to the complete streets process that we've haggled over south SM Boulevard realignment instead of waiting a year to see what the plan says. Another key ped corridor YES.

YES. If our intersections look like they do today after three years post CS implementation, we have failed. We need curb realignments at Wilshire/Crescent and also South SM/Crescent. Square off the latter.

Every intersection on South Beverly or any ped district should be considered seriously for scrambles. Today, it is a free-for-all at the pedestrians’ expense. Another problem today: Ped signals aren't green sometimes unless the button is pushed. Ped signals in our city range from 5 seconds to 20+ seconds for the SAME crossing distance. SHAME.

Who cares. Make them safe and visible.

Yes. The blue-ribbon committee was notable in that probably half those folks said they didn't want bus shelters at all because they cater to the homeless. We are better people than that, right? Or at least we want to treat our service people better, right?

Our alley proximate to the future station at Reeves can be repurposed – and should be. What a waste of public space they are today. This is low-hanging fruit. If they are not used for bike-ped station access and perhaps ride share we will have failed.

"I have consistently used every modality available to me for the past 15 years. While I'm glad to see this document address improvements across all modalities, nothing prevents me from walking, driving or taking a bus across our city today. However, even as a very competent cyclist, I can't comfortably bike through it. It's one of the most dangerous parts of LA I ever bike through. Other than Santa Monica Blvd--something we had to spend over three years fighting for the obvious--the lanes we do have are bridges to nowhere. It should not be lost in reviewing this process and this document that we have consistently punted for four decades the need to develop a holistic bike network. Punting any further is total failure and an embarrassment to our community. " - Kory Klem

Look at Japan for excellent examples of automated bike parking. The big promise is in automated car parking, but bike parking is a manageable demonstration project to start.

"Shows participants' ambivalence about the automobile today. We can make a policy change so that we're not planning foremost for traffic throughput. That should have never been a guiding objective. Let those folks take air taxis.

No change required. Pedestrian scrambles and signal upgrades are included as recommendations in the plan.

No change required. No change required. Recommendations for more bike parking is included in the plan.

No change required. These are recommendations in the plan.

No change required. This is a recommendation in the plan.

No change required. This is a recommendation in the plan.

Response pending additional information

No change suggested

No change suggested

No change required. This is a recommendation in the plan.

No change required. This is a recommendation in the plan.

No change suggested

No change required.

No change required. Pedestrian scrambles and signal upgrades are included as recommendations in the plan.

No change required. This is a recommendation in the plan.

No change suggested

No change required.

No change required. This is a recommendation in the plan.
This feels always in the future. "The city will..." "Implementation is in progress..." We’ve seen a decade of rising injuries and declining enrollment without EVER analyzing crashes and where/why they happen. Flying blind.

It is another sign of our city’s ambivalence about the CS process that southwest traffic calming preceded in advance of the plan. Ridiculous. And the proposed ‘pilot’ will tell us nothing about what should be in that toolbox. Speaking of which, didn’t we have a calming toolbox 20 years ago?

The city should prioritize MAKING our high-stress corridors lower-stress. Focusing on low-stress corridors is the low-hanging fruit. Every major street should be low-stress. Now, what tools and improvements do we need to get there?

The reason you’re able to recommend nearly every street is that they’re all obviously wide enough for even Class IV if folks led to prioritize other modalities. We don’t need 52 miles of lanes. We need less than 10, including: 1. A Southerly East-West route. Olympic will never happen and it’s a death trap with a sidewalk not to the west. Gregory is ideal. 2. When you look at the accident data and marry that with the construction mitigation along with first/last mile, Charleville is redundant as it’s so close to Wilshire, the perfect mid-City route. 3. We need to Doheny (Pico-to-Santa Monica). It’s the perfect connector. 4. Split the triangle North-South. This could even be temporary until something larger (Beverly) was executed in a subsequent phase.

We should discount the 4-day TDM workweek for employees that have it, and instead incentivize non-motor travel to work using that extra off-day. Only employees that do not commute by car should be eligible.

NYC provides a model: every new commercial building must provide bike parking and allow bikes to be brought in through the lobby, if I recall.

Perhaps the most important change in how we police streets for safety. Today there is depressingly low rates of enforcement. While red-light cameras work overtime, police and community are together in coffee and bagel shops. One look at the trends should ring the fire alarm. If we can’t police the worst excesses – speed, u-turns, pedestrian intimidation etc – at least we should know exactly where the harm happens in near real-time. Why has it taken this long? Any why has this suggested NEVER come from BHPD?

My question is, if crashes are down that much, why are crash injuries so much more than before?

Wilshire / La Cienega is SCREAMING for a scramble. That intersection is enormous, one I’ve walked a lot. Bring more visibility to it and allow people to cross at an angle. (Think Shibuya in Tokyo.)

This is the biggest LOL in the whole plan. City staff have historically shown zero interest in what the community has to say outside of some mandated process (CS being one example). The City Hall attitude is often ‘shelter in place’ rather than ‘reach out and touch someone’ for better ideas. It’s not in the city hall DNA.

Even if we hold our ground with lower density, we know what’s happening around us. We’re flanked by it. More industry (tech) has moved west, so the through traffic will only increase. We’re two decades behind other Westside COG cities, yet we sit in the middle of all them and should be doing transportation and multimodal better than all of them.

City of West Hollywood on Monday is finalizing a $500k grant from metro for a CicLAvia and pocketing $100,000 of that for local expenses. Because they 1) saw the value of a CS plan early; and 2) because they care about multimodal. Discuss.

Call it a pilot if you want, but just implement it already. It is totally crazy the ordinary every conflict between motorists that erupts on South Beverly, let alone the patent danger to those on a bike or a scooter.

We had a small business task force some years ago that simply would not consider the concept. We’ll see if the current SBTF cares any more about it. The farthest we got in BH was a lot of money shoveled into a hold for the Chamber’s shop local program. It could have been better spent on BFRD.

Our Rec & Parks commissioners (except for Bilak) showed ZERO interest in bike routes to parks; zero interest to allow bikes in parks; and zero interest in complete streets as a concept or process.

We’ve GOT to find some parity with the rest of the world here. I was completely blindsided by last summer’s “emergency ordinance”, despite bringing these scooters up to staff, liaison meeting and Mayor’s tech group. Again, I probably have covered more mile on more modalities than anyone in the community over the past 15 years. We need to pull our head out of the sand on this. It’s the greatest solution I’ve found to date.

Yes. We should discourage city employees from commuting from Valencia and Westlake Village by reducing any transportation related benefit and give that to those who commute here actively, or by transit, or better yet choose to live here (where our interests can really align).

YES. Beverly Hills may not have actively opposed it, but only because we didn’t have to. The NIMBYs in Condo Canyon did it for us. Implement it here phase 1 if possible while construction is underway on Metro. Just go here now and you’re all set: http://www.beverlyhills.org/opendata/ TPC (which has got to be renamed “Transportation”) should have this for a more developed version of this up with BHPD each meeting to discuss each month as well as trends.

Not sure what this means, but I’d like to feel good riding or scootering into town AND save myself $15 for not driving. YES on pricing.

Seems like the top three priorities for implementation come not from the community, nor from a values-driven plan, but from the predispositions of five elected representatives. And it seems like the two key implementation choices (notably excluding bicycle infrastructure) were made by just two councilmembers in a TPC liaison meeting.

Schools got no priority in this plan, as is evidenced by the lack of recommended bicycle network that would connect schools (and parks, etc). There is no discussion of schools or low-stress routes to reach them. The district was not involved as a stakeholder. One boardmember saw a copy of the plan a day before the last TPC meeting where input was taken.

The City recommends installing more than 10 miles of bikeways to accommodate the varying needs of bicyclists traveling within and through Beverly Hills, and to create a geographically accessible bikeway network. No change required; these recommendations for specific bikeways are in the plan.

Every school and park touches at least one recommended bikeway to prioritize student bicycle travel. The schools and district offices were notified about workshops, and information about the release of the Draft Plan and Draft Plan Feedback Workshop was included in the school newsletters to encourage parent and staff participation. No change required.
While it is obvious this document was meant to simply check a box for future funding purposes, it also notably lacked any "big ideas". Those familiar with the wonderful aesthetics of our city who also have seen what true multimodal cities look like because of the heavy use of bikes and scooters know that a potential problem lurks, particularly around the metro stops. Why not look into a best-of-breed sustainable bike locker/filling cabinet like they have in Japan and Europe? They technology continues to advance nicely, and it will prevent an eyesore around the stations and in the city center.

This is the most disappointing aspect of the document: an implementation plan that does not commit to timely implementation. Not only is there no year 1, year 2, etc. -- we see that so-called Tier 1 can stretch to Five years. Truly! We are 10 years behind our muni neighbors. At this rate, after five years of Tier 1, and with these identified priorities, we'll be 20 years behind our neighbors.

If pressing safety is an organizing principle -- and it should be -- we would see a real commitment to real infrastructure in this plan. AND WE DON'T.

Sharrows is not infrastructure. Moreno should be prioritized for a Class II lane because it is the direct connection to both the HS and Rosbury park. It is wide with parking on one side already. It is a relatively dense area. It connects to SM Blvd lanes. Hello!

Why doesn’t the plan recommend either Gregory or Charleville? And why the hedging on class II OR class III? These generalities do not a bike network make, and they won't get us to streets that FEEL safe for those who could choose to ride but won’t.

Again, class II OR class III, and the implementation schedule is not choosing a preferred route. In fact, doesn’t the plan variously label Beverly as both class II and Class II OR class III? Looks like hedging on the heavy lift route.

Tier 2: Let’s not get distracted by theater. We need infrastructure in Tier 1.

I enjoyed the walk audit that was part of this process, but we sadly we split up as a group and it only covered two corridors. But yet it *WAS* valuable. An amazing thing happens when you become intimately involved with using something: You are better informed to solve the user problem that surrounds it. Even if one bikes on Sunday mornings, that doesn’t prepare that person to understand where the real infrastructure problems occur. It’s purely academic. Pair that with political opposition and you have our Mayberry-like community that prides itself on health, safety and the environment, but is two decades behind other Westside cities when it comes to biking. I love the ban on tobacco products, but what about the thing that will statistically kill or injure us more (autos)? If we don’t build out a protected network in Phase I (2020), this process is a shameful, abject failure that will reverberate for a generation.

The only reasons not to improve Robertson for peds in tier 1 is 1) LA drags its feet on the LA side; or 2) we are waiting on a streetscape plan in conjunction with the SE task force. Not clear how this needs ped improvements. Better crosswalks perhaps and signage.

The most significant improvement bikeway in the plan, but hedged as class II or III in some places and class II in another. Maybe a lift for year one but it can’t wait 5 years out for tier 2 or more for tier 3.

The only reasons not to improve Robertson for peds in tier 1 is 1) LA drags its feet on the LA side; or 2) we are waiting on a streetscape plan in conjunction with the SE task force.

Why are these tier 3? Some time indeterminate? Isn’t this what the CS plan is for?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Suggested Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change required. Enhancing safety is listed as the first value in the plan.</td>
<td>0 123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Commissions do not implement projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather than let our small business task force kick this concept to the curb, and rather than shovel more money to the chamber, which doesn’t much care about non-member small retailers, hand it over to LACBC or contract with another nonprofit to stand up this program.</td>
<td>0 123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. The City can consider working with a nonprofit for implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These seem to be different concepts. If we are talking about private entities providing public plazas in exchange for some zoning consideration, I’d ask how it’s worked in the past -- and how many of those ‘plazas’ are actually perceived by the public to be ‘public.’ An inventory would be a good start before we go down the plaza road.</td>
<td>0 123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps Bedford is an appropriate pilot program area, but not ten years out in Tier 3. TODAY. The advantage of Bedford is that it is wide and one-way, making a lane-loss less significant. Doctors will love a bump-up in street parking capacity.</td>
<td>0 123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>Response pending additional information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica bakes into their plans values like safety and livability and those plans are NOT shelfware. Look at the commitment that city has made to ped and bike infrastructure. We’re 15 years behind SM. We know our officials have seen it: our CDD director lives there and presumably enjoys the ped- and bike-friendly innovations.</td>
<td>0 123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. These are values identified in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety, safety, safety. In the BH CS plan process, safety was not even identified as a primary value. “We’ll let the community decide the values.” WRONG. Safety is a professional responsibility of those who design our streets. It should have been THE primary value expressed in the first sentence of the CS RFP.</td>
<td>0 123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Enhancing safety is listed as the first value in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bicycle Task Force -- what an innovation. Imagine if we had something like that in BH where those who actually experience the city on two feet and two (or 4) wheels actually have a say in the infrastructure, policies and programs. Here we are 10 years behind WeHo.</td>
<td>0 123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another opportunity to learn from our northeast neighbor: make enforcement a priority. I haven’t checked their citation stats but officials have certainly prioritized ped safety.</td>
<td>0 123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>Response pending additional information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH residents may crouch about half-baked traffic calming measures as proposed for the SW area, but there is no need to fear the unknown: they can take a bike ride to WeHo and see REAL traffic diverters in action. And see how quiet those blocks are. Here we are 20 or more years behind WeHo.</td>
<td>0 123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This one corridor that criers out for class II lanes, not a “class II or class III’’ cop out. I want to ride EB on our SM BL lanes and peel off onto a high-visibility green lane on Beverly Bl. Work it out with WeHo because this route is a major E/W that connects to the region’s largest employer, Cedars and LA to beyond.</td>
<td>0 123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>Response pending additional information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be no opportunity left behind when it comes to connecting with a neighbor city’s infrastructure. How long ago has LA stripped a lane to Roxbury Park on Roxbury? And we haven’t met that lane with one of our own? All of these are important and thankfully NSM BL is done already.</td>
<td>0 123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A better pilot is Roxbury Park: lower volumes, less-harried drivers.</td>
<td>0 123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>Response pending additional information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety as a value should have been prioritized by officials at the RFP stage. We don’t need the community to identify it as a guiding value: it is a transportation official’s professional responsibility.</td>
<td>0 123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Enhancing safety is listed as the first value in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 1977 plan (cynically re-adopted in 2010) actually did a much better job of opening the imagination to a citywide bike network than does this draft plan. You can see it at a glance on the old plan map; in this document’s spaghetti of “proposed bikeways,” where nearly every street is a candidate, one can’t even make out what it could look like.</td>
<td>0 123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>Response pending additional information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift the northside route from Carmelita to Elevado and there you have an excellent citywide bicycle network and all we are asking for. Call it DONE. Make it tier one.</td>
<td>0 123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. The City recommends installing a geographically broad network of bikeways to accommodate the varying needs of bicyclists traveling within and through Beverly Hills. The plan recommends either Class II or III to acknowledge that the exact design will require a discussion of tradeoffs with the community because most streets in Beverly Hills will require repurposing of either parking or vehicle travel lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need a crosstown route on Charleston or Gregory that is class II and NOT class III. A facility that will encourage those who would bike but choose not to bike: inexperienced riders; women primarily; and children with approval of parents. Class III will not get us there.</td>
<td>0 123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. The plan recommends either Class II or III to acknowledge that the exact design will require a discussion of tradeoffs with the community because most streets in Beverly Hills will require repurposing of either parking or vehicle travel lanes. To use Charleston and Gregory as an example, design options could include removing all parking on one street to provide protected bike lanes, removing one lane of parking on each street to provide a one-way bike lane couplet on each street, removing no parking and providing a heavily traffic calmed bike boulevard on one or both streets, removing the centerline on one or both streets and installing advisory bike lanes, etc. These are not decisions that the City can make without talking to the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III on South Beverly is a straight-up cop-out. This road is a danger zone: excessive speeding; motorist disputes; illegal maneuvers; disregard of cyclists and pedestrians. And it is our ‘Main Street.’</td>
<td>0 123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. A class III is not recommended on South Beverly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHELFWARE. Never heard a city official ever reference it.</td>
<td>0 123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proof that irony is not dead!</td>
<td>0 123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation in name only. In all other respects this corridor is kicked to the curb: faded old-style crosswalks; no enforcement; hazardous to use a crosswalk.</td>
<td>0 123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle racks is not the same as secure bicycle parking to an employee, say, who parks all day. “Secure” means secure. This BHMC section should specify secure, indoor bicycle parking period. And changing rooms. Above 200,000 square feet showers too.</td>
<td>0 123</td>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Exploring a bike parking ordinance is a recommendation in this plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Draft Plan Sub-comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Created</th>
<th>COBH Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By replacing many of the 4-way stops with roundabouts, this could become a beautiful and effective neighborhood greenway.</td>
<td>04-24-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Traffic circles are included as a recommendation in this plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to see all of the intersections on Olympic without traffic signals be made RIGHT TURN ONLY, particularly during the hours when on-street parking is prohibited. There are signals every few blocks, so this would not be inconvenient to residents after they become familiar with the restriction. (I think very few residents are stupid enough to try to cross or turn left on busy Olympic.) This will be safer for drivers and passengers, students driving to BHHS, bike riders, bus passengers, users of the 2 big parks on Olympic, and will serve to generally even the traffic flow.</td>
<td>04-24-2019</td>
<td>No change required. The City's traffic engineering team can investigate this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The name “indicator” and the illuminated light are a bit misleading as to the primary purpose of these devices. If I understand correctly, they are more part of a more accurate sensor system that will ensure traffic signals take into account the presence of a bicycle at an intersection.</td>
<td>04-24-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree, although there is also a center median along Burton Way that could also be used as a bike lane.</td>
<td>04-16-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Due to issues with accessing a center-running bike path, that is not included as a recommendation in this plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure if this person is referencing the Rexford/Clifton and Crescent/Clifton intersection but both are extremely confusing. If light-up crossing indicators should be utilized anywhere it should be here.</td>
<td>04-15-2019</td>
<td>No change required. The City is in the process of evaluating options to improve the Rexford/Clifton intersection for pedestrians, including striping and ADA upgrades. A traffic signal will be installed at the Clifton/Crescent intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This would reduce the amount of overall space on streets significantly which we can’t afford. There’s already too much traffic. If we’d consider this why don’t we just have bike on sidewalks.</td>
<td>04-15-2019</td>
<td>No change required. During the outreach process, the community and Traffic and Parking Commission did not recommend permitting bike riding on the sidewalk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many streets south of Wilshire (especially N/S direction) are too narrow to accommodate the proposed bike-lanes, with two-way traffic, and parking. On those streets (light blue broken line) bikers will be at a high risk of being hit. Bikers won’t feel safe, and drivers will be more uptight. In order to protect the bikers and help smooth vehicle movements and retain existing parking, these streets should be turned into One-Way streets. Example: downtown Los Angeles. While it would require “driving around the block” it’s worth it for added safety and a calmer driving experience. Please consider.</td>
<td>04-13-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Design details would be determined during implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To guarantee safety of bicycles at the end of the trail (meaning when BH ends and LA or West Hollywood begins), I recommend bicycle only signals to allow them to cross into the bike lanes without the worry of being hit by vehicles.</td>
<td>04-11-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Design details would be determined during implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The entrance to the Gale Parking Lot should be on Wilshire to mitigate traffic to the residents. I would like to suggest that this idea be utilized for other medians such as the one on Burton Way.</td>
<td>04-11-2019</td>
<td>Response pending additional information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would also like to add that Charlivelle and Gregory Way are heavily travelled streets that I believe are too narrow for bikes. I believe it would be better to have “Bike Route” arrows pointing bikes towards Wilshire or Olympic which should have Bike Routes.</td>
<td>04-11-2019</td>
<td>Response pending additional information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need many more bike lanes around town. Cyclists need a place to lock their bikes once they arrive at their destination. Since this is Beverly Hills, bike racks ought to be more than just functional, they should be artistic and fun. The car parking lots around the city also could have areas for bike parking. As more people arrive using car ride services like Uber and Lyft, the demand for parking spaces for cars ought to diminish.</td>
<td>04-11-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Design details would be determined during implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 720 Rapid Bus on Wilshire is the most utilized bus route in the So Cal Metro system-more than 30,000 riders per day. That there is not a bus-only lane during rush hour (7-9 AM, 4-7 PM) through Beverly Hills is a real deterrent to a faster bus commute. A full bus keeps 40-50 cars off the road and these transit users should be rewarded with a ride that is as fast as possible. They are not adding to congestion nor are they contributing to global warming. Speedy and reliable mass transit is the best way to encourage people to get out of their cars.</td>
<td>05-01-2019</td>
<td>No change required. Additional bike parking is recommended in this plan. Bike parking can be requested through the City’s request a rack program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III bike lanes are not really bike lanes. They will accommodate existing riders but will not encourage new cyclists. If you want to encourage new riders, they need to feel safe in protected lanes, or at a minimum, wide bike only lanes. If you are serious about getting people out of their cars, you need to make cycling safe and fun. That means you may need to get rid of a lane for cars –gasp!</td>
<td>05-01-2019</td>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just wanted to add - a protected lane on Beverly Dr. would be a great first/fast mile option for purple line riders.</td>
<td>04-26-2019</td>
<td>No change required. All bike lane projects will be evaluated to determine the level of separation from vehicle traffic that can be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To second Gabe’s comment, flipping the paint is the easiest think you can do to protect cyclists even more without taking away from cars. One side is the curb, and the other side is the passenger side of the parked car. It lowers your risk of getting doored as well, as it’s more common for a drivers side door to open than a passengers side door.</td>
<td>04-26-2019</td>
<td>No change required. All bike lane projects will be evaluated to determine the level of separation from vehicle traffic that can be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs that tell cyclists they are detected are really useful; otherwise, the cyclist usually has to dismount, cross over, and push the beg button.</td>
<td>04-26-2019</td>
<td>No change required. This is included as a recommendation in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I cycle west (I live near Melrose and Santa Monica) I always get up to where the bike lane starts on SM Bl in West Hollywood, and then take that through Beverly Hills. I also often take the bike lane on Wilshire that begins just after the LA Country Club. Getting from where SM and Wilshire meet in BH to the bike lane on the other side of the LACC is difficult. I often go on the south sidewalk near the Waldorf Astoria and Hilton, and then past the gas station and country club, then eventually cross back onto Wilshire to get on the bike lane. Please put a protected lane from the SM/Wilshire intersection to the BH border on Wilshire, and perhaps work with CDS and LA to extend the configuration just a few short blocks to the existing bike lane on Wilshire. This is a huge gap between the two cities.</td>
<td>04-26-2019</td>
<td>Wilshire Boulevard is recommended to be prioritized for the transit/vehicle network. Consideration of a bus lane pilot is recommended. This could include a bike/bus lane. Details would be determined during implementation. No change required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I used to live on Drexel and would bike frequently with my wife and our kids into Beverly Hills. What we usually did - and it sucked - was go slightly to the south at San Vicente and when the coast was clear, bike to the existing left turn/u turn lane, and use that to get onto Clifton Way. It was harrowing. We need a safe crosswalk through the median, following the desire lines of what people (cyclists and pedestrians) are already doing, albeit pretty unsafe. Streets are too narrow as is when cars are parked on both sides of the street.

You have so much room on Olympic Bl, and it's far less dense than Wilshire Bl. A protected East/West lane (perhaps a two way protected lane on only one side of the street) would go a long way - SM Bl covers a northern East/West bike lane (although I also strongly believe there is room to protect this as well without negatively impacting traffic), and Olympic would be the perfect southern East/West bike option.

I agree, we need a crosswalk where Gregory Way ends - while there is one just north of it, it's incongruent, and often I find myself fighting North Southbound traffic to cross at Gregory Way and Robertson when going West to East, versus taking the time to ride on the sidewalk and cross at the existing crosswalk.

I've biked this many times and I agree with Scott's comment that going from Burton Way to Crescent (where, of course, one could go north to your existing bike lane and/or the SM Bl bike lane) is a harrowing experience. If you're already planning on protecting Burton Way, please end that protection at Crescent and protect Crescent from Little SM to Big SM, where then the cyclist can transition to either go North or East/West in a safe way.

I strongly believe that protected bike lanes (Class IV) are what's needed - a couple of good east/west corridors, and a couple of good north/south corridors.

Beverly Hills has the luxury of a good amount of space on most roads. Additionally, you can set an example around the world for the best multi-modal infrastructure. Sharrows and paint simply don't cut it.

We need many more bike racks around town. Cyclists need a place to lock their bikes once they arrive at their destination. Since this is Beverly Hills, bike racks ought to be more than just functional, they should be artistic and fun. The car parking lots around the city also could have areas for bike parking. As more people arrive using car ride services like Uber and Lyft, the demand for parking spaces for cars ought to diminish.

The 720 Rapid Bus on Wilshire is the most utilized bus route in the So Cal Metro system-more than 30,000 riders per day. That there is not a bus-only lane during rush hour (7-9 AM, 4-7 PM) through Beverly Hills is a real deterrent to a faster bus commute. A full bus keeps 40-50 cars off the road and these transit users should be rewarded with a ride that is as fast as possible. They are not adding to congestion nor are they contributing to global warming. Speedy and reliable mass transit is the best way to encourage people to get out of their cars.

West Hollywood does a good job with this, especially along Santa Monica Boulevard. With their new crossings, it feels much safer as a pedestrian to cross Santa Monica Boulevard. I hope that Beverly Hills will do more of this.

Our public schools are one of our community's greatest assets. We ought to encourage our kids to ride bikes to school as a healthy, pro-environment, and fun option. Charleville could be an excellent street to have protected bike lanes. Located between Olympic and Wilshire, it would connect the high school, BV, and Horace Mann. This would decrease the car trips going in and out of our schools. Our city is safe, our weather is great, and the south part of Beverly Hills is flat-it's off to a cycling paradise. Safe bike routes could be one more reason to go to our neighborhood schools!

A bus-only lane during peak traffic times (7-9 AM, 4-7 PM) will encourage some people to take the bus instead of driving. Fifty people in a bus takes up a lot less space than fifty people sitting alone in a car.

Roads are not free they take valuable urban space. And with our horrible congestion we all "pay" the price of wasted time in traffic. Congestion pricing would encourage people to use other modes of transit (walking, cycling, public transit) encourage people to try other routes, and/or encourage people to travel at other times when congestion is not such a problem.

Can we please get diagonal crossing for Beverly/Dayton, Beverly/Brighton and Beverly/5 Santa Monica?

@Michael - Doheny is wide enough to have bike lanes installed. However, I do not see bike lanes being installed on Charleville or Gregory as those 2 streets are too narrow as is when cars are parked on both sides of the street.
I am disappointed that there are not more specific deliverables. For instance in these Tier 1 projects, there is a big difference between Class II and Class III Bike ways. What is the vision? I would rather see a very specific and visionary plan on fewer routes than something so vague.

05-17-2019
No change required. A bicycle master plan is broad in nature. The plan recommends either Class II or III to acknowledge that the exact design will require a discussion of tradeoffs with the community because most streets in Beverly Hills will require repurposing of either parking or vehicle travel lanes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All new signals should include a leading interval for walkers. Additionally, none of the signals should require a “push to walk” button...that only discourages walking. Numerous times I arrive a few seconds too late to activate the signal and am required to wait through an additional lengthy cycle to cross. Let’s give ALL road users equal opportunity, not prioritize cars alone.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change required. The plan recommends either Class II or III to acknowledge that the exact design will require a discussion of tradeoffs with the community because most streets in Beverly Hills will require repurposing of either parking or vehicle travel lanes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The DAY we agreed to striping I emailed Romel (Executive Director) and Tish (board memeber) about proposing an event. They’re booked out almost two years. We need to chance our tune on bikes and become part of one of the best days LA has each time this event is held.

05-17-2019
No change required. The City’s traffic engineering team can investigate this issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>While I love my “Civil City” sticker, it hasn’t been as handy as I would have hoped in fending off potential accidents with motorists. This starts at the top. Despite the bright green lanes staring us in the face, it was only after Mr. Elliot and I prodded staff about the lanes’ exclusion from the press release, that they were added as a feature of North Santa Monica’s reconstruction. We were then promised a bike event that got punked to the spring. When I pressed staff in the March TPC meeting, nothing came back. Even the Bike to Work event wasn’t marketed, much less to the existing local bike community and advocates. We’re anti-bike, and it shows in every single touchpoint.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change suggested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I believe it was in Public Session #2 where Mr. Lower showed the increased rise of accidents compared to neighboring cities. Yet I could not find that graph in any public materials. Wouldn’t be a bad idea to cite that in this document.

05-17-2019
Response pending additional information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additionally, it’s one of the most dangerous corridors to drive given the parallel parking. I’ve had multiple friends hit there over the years.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05-17-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response pending additional information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have consistently used every modality available to me for the past 15 years. While I’m glad to see this document address improvements across all modalities, nothing prevents me from walking, driving or taking a bus across our city today. However, even as a very competent cyclist, I can’t comfortably bike through it. It’s one of the most dangerous parts of LA I ever bike through. Other than Santa Monica Blvd—something we had to spend over three years fighting for the obvious—the lanes we do have are bridges to nowhere. It should not be lost in reviewing this process and this document that we have consistently punted for four decades the need to develop a holistic bike network. Punting any further is total failure and an embarrassment to our community.

05-17-2019
No change suggested
ATTACHMENT 2
Draft Implementation Plan

The following tables show the Tier 1, 2, and 3 projects included in the Draft Plan released on April 10, 2019.

### Tier 1 Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>MODE</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New*</td>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>Install green-backed sharrows and wayfinding signage on South Santa Monica Boulevard-Roxbury Drive between Moreno Drive and North Santa Monica Boulevard to close gap in the bikeway network between planned bike lanes in Los Angeles and existing green bike lanes in Beverly Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New*</td>
<td>Bicycle, Transit</td>
<td>La Cienega Subway Connection bike routes/boulevards: Class II or III bikeways on Clifton Way, Le Doux Road, Charleville Boulevard, and Gregory Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New*</td>
<td>Bicycle, Transit</td>
<td>Rodeo Subway Connection bike routes/boulevards (after monitoring of Canon Closure): Class II or III bikeways on Reeves Drive, Crescent Drive, Canon Drive, and Beverly Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New*</td>
<td>Pedestrian, Bicycle, Transit</td>
<td>Implement projects identified in Metro’s First/Last Mile Plan for the Wilshire/Rodeo Purple Line Station, which will build upon conceptual recommendations in the Complete Streets Plan and recommend more detailed design changes around the station, including passenger loading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New*</td>
<td>Bicycle, Transit</td>
<td>Treatments to reduce bus/bicycle conflicts and add physical separation between bicyclists and motorists/transit vehicles, such as floating bus islands, on Burton Way from Rexford Drive to eastern City limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New*</td>
<td>Transit, Vehicle</td>
<td>Implement a curbside management pilot program to address passenger loading around Metro stations, test shared use mobility zones, and/or digitized curb zones, and prepare for the deployment of autonomous vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New*</td>
<td>Pedestrian, Bicycle, Transit</td>
<td>Develop a Wilshire Boulevard Streetscape Plan, including design guidelines, for streetscape amenities as first/last mile connections to the Metro Purple Line stations; produce construction drawings for enhancements adjacent to the stations to tie into ongoing Metro construction activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New*</td>
<td>Pedestrian, Transit</td>
<td>Implement standard and enhanced citywide bus stop improvements building upon recommendations in the Wilshire Boulevard Streetscape Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New*</td>
<td>Pedestrian, Bicycle</td>
<td>Implement Bicycle and Pedestrian Awareness Campaign (grant funding anticipated to be available in FY 2018/19 or FY 2019/20) to educate and encourage Beverly Hills residents and businesses on safe biking and walking, such as through media and training courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New*</td>
<td>Vehicle, Transit</td>
<td>Conduct an autonomous vehicle demonstration project to explore options for an autonomous shuttle to/from the Metro Purple Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New*</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>Pedestrian enhancements, including midblock crossings, pedestrian refuge islands, flashing beacons, curb extensions, and continental crosswalks, on Bedford Drive, Camden Drive, South Beverly Drive, and Robertson Boulevard (grant funding anticipated to be available in FY 2019/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Pedestrian, Bicycle, Transit, Vehicle</td>
<td>Establish data governance to better inform decision making and analyze project results; develop a biannual traffic safety report (after BHPD purchases new software and signal upgrades are completed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Pedestrian, Bicycle, Transit</td>
<td>Conceptual design and guidelines for streetscape amenities and pedestrian enhancements along South Santa Monica Boulevard-Burton Way for project construction upon completion of subway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>Prioritize the implementation of low-stress bikeways that have the fewest conflicts with motor vehicles; prioritize ongoing and future capital improvement projects that make biking, walking, and taking transit competitive with driving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued</td>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>Continue the implementation of citywide signal upgrades to prepare for advancement in technologies, such as connected and autonomous vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued</td>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>Continue development, implementation, and evaluation of a Southwest Traffic Calming pilot project to reduce cut-through traffic and vehicle speeds, and inform a citywide traffic calming program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tier 2 Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>MODE</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>Neighborhood Connections bike routes/boulevards: Class II or III bikeways on Camden Drive, Crescent Drive, Doheny Drive, Elm Drive, La Peer Drive, Lasky Drive, Robertson Boulevard, Spalding Drive, and Whitworth Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>Enhancements to key routes to the Metro Purple Line stations, like Crescent Drive and La Cienega Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Bicycle, Transit</td>
<td>The City should consider additional policies and programs to improve first/last mile, such as integrating TAP into bikeshare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Vehicle, Transit</td>
<td>Implement autonomous shuttle to/from the Metro Purple Line, based on demonstration project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Vehicle, Transit</td>
<td>Establish a car share program as a first/last mile strategy and to reduce the need for resident car ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Pedestrian, Bicycle, Transit</td>
<td>Promote the City as a role model by encouraging employees to commute by single-occupancy vehicles less often, such as by providing subsidized transit passes and purchasing a fleet of electric cars for site visits to minimize reliance on personal vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Pedestrian, Bicycle, Transit</td>
<td>Encourage City and community participation in Rideshare Week to reduce single-occupancy commuting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Pedestrian, Bicycle</td>
<td>Apply for a grant to host an Open Streets event, like CicLAvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>Institute an electric vehicle program to expand charging stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>Narrow the median on Sunset Boulevard to address vehicle turning movement conflicts and add protected bike lanes (or buffered bike lanes if protected are not feasible) from Whittier Drive to Cinthia Street (grant funding anticipated to be available in FY 2019/20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Tier 3 Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>MODE</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>North of Santa Monica Boulevard: Class II or III bikeways on Carmelita Avenue, Elevado Avenue,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palm Drive, Beverly Boulevard, Roxbury Drive, Whittier Drive, Cinthia Street, and Doheny Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>Downtown: Class II or III bikeways on Brighton Way, Camden Drive, Civic Center, Dayton Way,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moreno Drive, Rexford Drive, and South Santa Monica Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>Bike lanes on Beverly Drive from Sunset Boulevard to Whitworth Drive, and Crescent Drive from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica Boulevard to Wilshire Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>Enhancements to streets in the Business Triangle without recent upgrades, including Linden Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Roxbury Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>Enhancements to major or commercial corridors: Doheny Drive, Robertson Boulevard, and Olympic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>Enhancements to Moreno Drive-Spalding Dr to improve access to the high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Implement bus route improvements to enhance transit service, such as bus bulbs (curb extensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for loading), prohibiting ride hailing activity on major transit corridors, flexible curb zones,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Pedestrian, Bicycle, Transit</td>
<td>Develop a transportation demand management (TDM) ordinance to guide how infrastructure is used and minimize single-occupancy vehicle trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>Consider updating parking policies to reduce requirements for mixed-use developments and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>those with adequate TDM programs, expand the parking supply through shared-use agreements, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>adopting a bike parking ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>Initiate a parklet and plaza pilot program to expand sidewalks and public space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Pedestrian, Transit</td>
<td>Organize a Safe Routes for Seniors program to help older adults safely and conveniently travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>without vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Pedestrian, Bicycle</td>
<td>Organize a Safe Routes to Parks program to increase access to parks and greenspaces in the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>Implement bike friendly business districts that support people who travel on bikes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>Establish a bike valet program at large public events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Bicycle, Vehicle</td>
<td>Consider a reverse angled parking pilot program to educate the community on the benefits and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>determine appropriate locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Consider a pilot program to extend the Wilshire Boulevard bus lanes into Beverly Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>Consider partnering with regional agencies that may pursue congestion pricing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Year One Deliverables</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian enhancements on Bedford Drive, Camden Drive, South Beverly Drive, and Robertson Boulevard</td>
<td>• Design of (1) curb extensions, flashing beacons, and continental crosswalk on 400 block of N. Bedford, (2) curb extensions, flashing beacons, and continental crosswalk on 400 block of North Camden, (3) curb extensions at existing midblock crosswalk on 200 block of S. Beverly Drive, (4) median refuge islands with flashing beacons at existing crosswalk at Wilshire/Palm intersection, and (5) curb extensions, flashing beacons, and continental crosswalk at Robertson/Chalmers intersection • Environmental review • Execute full funding agreement with Metro • Bid project • Award contract • Begin construction</td>
<td>• Letter of No Prejudice received from Metro in April allowing use of local match prior to execution of funding agreement • Design in progress using local match funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design analysis for treatments to reduce bus/bicycle conflicts and add physical separation between bicyclists and motorists/transit vehicles on Burton Way from Rexford Drive to eastern City limits</td>
<td>• Existing conditions analysis to document street design and operations • Feasibility analysis for potential design options • Targeted neighborhood and stakeholder outreach to discuss tradeoffs • Conceptual design for floating bus islands at bus stops (if determined feasible) and other enhancements • Agency coordination (Metro, BHFD, etc.)</td>
<td>• Agreement signed with Toole Design Group • Initiated existing conditions analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Year One Deliverables</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Design analysis for a bike route/boulevard network (Class II or III) connecting to the La Cienega subway station | • Existing conditions analysis to document street design and operations  
• Feasibility analysis for potential design options  
• Targeted neighborhood and stakeholder outreach to discuss tradeoffs  
• Begin conceptual design for Clifton Way, Le Doux Road, Charleville Boulevard, and Gregory Way | New project |
| Install green-backed sharrows and wayfinding signage on South Santa Monica Boulevard-Roxbury Drive between Moreno Drive and North Santa Monica Boulevard to close the gap in the bikeway network between planned bike lanes on Santa Monica Boulevard in Los Angeles (anticipated installation in 2019) and the existing green bike lanes on North Santa Monica Boulevard in Beverly Hills | • Installation of green-backed sharrows and wayfinding signage | • Design completed  
• Anticipated completion in 2019, pending City of Los Angeles bike lane installation |
| Continue the implementation of citywide signal upgrades to prepare for advancement in technologies, such as connected and autonomous vehicles | • Installation of signal upgrades at 41 intersections | • Council consideration of agreement on June 18th |
| Develop a Wilshire Boulevard – La Cienega Boulevard Streetscape Plan for first/last mile connections to the Metro Purple Line stations | • Community outreach  
• Existing conditions analysis  
• Produce streetscape design standards (such as bus shelters and seating)  
• Conceptual streetscape amenity placement  
• Construction drawings for enhancements adjacent to the stations to tie into | • RFP issued in June, submissions due in mid-July |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Year One Deliverables</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Year One Deliverables</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ongoing Metro construction activities (if needed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mobility hub plan for the Gale property (current Gale staging yard) as a first/last mile connection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement SCAG grant-funded Bicycle and Pedestrian Awareness Campaign to educate and encourage Beverly Hills residents and businesses on safe biking and walking, such as through media and training courses</td>
<td>Scope of work development by SCAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Execute full funding agreement with SCAG</td>
<td>Funding anticipated to be available in FY 2019/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bid project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Award contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Begin campaign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinate with Metro to complete their First/Last Mile Plan for the Wilshire/Rodeo Purple Line Station</td>
<td>Initial plan recommendations completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community outreach for high-level plan recommendations</td>
<td>Outlet at the Farmer’s Market on June 2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Complete plan</td>
<td>Outreach at the Chamber on June 13th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Begin conceptual design for priority projects</td>
<td>Anticipated plan completion in fall 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase of new software to analyze collisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• RFP issued by BHPD</td>
<td>New project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Purchase software</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Begin staff training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM
CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS

TO: City Council and Traffic and Parking Commission Liaison Committee
FROM: Aaron Kunz, Deputy Director of Transportation
       Martha Eros, Transportation Planner
       Christian Vasquez, Transportation Planning Analyst
DATE: June 12, 2019
SUBJECT: Shared Mobility Systems and Devices
ATTACHMENTS: 1. Comparison Table of Westside Cities Shared Mobility Programs
               2. Spin Plan
               3. Bird Plan
               4. Lime Plan

Introduction
This memorandum provides options for a potential shared mobility devices\(^1\) pilot program for the City. Staff seeks the City Council and Traffic and Parking Commission (TPC) Liaison Committee (Liaisons) direction on:

- Should a shared mobility pilot program be initiated in the City?
- If so, should the City negotiate a limited term operating agreement with a specific vendor(s), or issue a request for proposal (RFP) to competitively select a vendor?
- Continue with the existing ordinance prohibiting shared mobility devices?

If the City pursues a shared mobility pilot program, staff recommends the City contract with one shared mobility vendor, as opposed to multiple vendors, for effective management.

The shared mobility industry is changing rapidly as more and more companies with different vehicle types, designs, and technologies are joining the market. Currently, regulating shared mobility systems has been inconsistent among local jurisdictions ranging, from banning the devices to developing pilot permit programs.

Plans from three vendors--Spin, Bird and Lime--are attached. Each vendor has confirmed attendance at the June 12\(^{th}\) Liaison meeting and, at the Liaisons’ direction, will be prepared to provide a brief presentation or answer questions about their respective service and operations.

Background
On July 24, 2018, the City Council adopted an urgency ordinance prohibiting the use, placement, parking, and/or the offering (i.e., rental or sale of service) of use of shared mobility devices to address safety hazards posed by the proliferation of unregulated shared mobility devices being illegally operated on the sidewalk and abandoned haphazardly on public and private property. On

\(^{1}\) Shared Mobility Device: “any wheeled device, other than an automobile or motorcycle, that is powered by a motor; is accessed via an on-demand portal, whether a smartphone application, membership card, or similar method; is operated by a private entity that owns, manages, and maintains devices for shared use by members of the public; and is available to members of the public in unstaffed, self-service locations, except for those locations which are designated by the City.” (Beverly Hills Municipal Code 7-6-2)
December 11, 2018, the City Council approved an ordinance extending the prohibition of shared mobility devices in the City through January 18, 2020.

Approximately 2,415 shared mobility devices have been impounded by the Beverly Hills Police Department (BHPD) from July 2018 to March 2019. Scooter vendors have incrementally collected their devices on a weekly basis, with approximately 270 remaining in impound to date. The release fee for each device is $123; no storage or tow fees are applied.

Three e-scooter companies, Spin, Bird, and Lime, reached out to the City expressing interest to provide information about their systems. Spin presented a plan to the City Council Shared Mobility Ad Hoc Committee (then Mayor Gold and Councilmember Bosse) on February 4, 2019. The Ad Hoc Committee recommended forwarding Spin’s plan to the full City Council for review.

On March 12, 2019, Bird met with the City Council Shared Mobility Ad Hoc Committee to provide information and respond to questions. Bird submitted an operation and parking plan for consideration. Lime met with City staff on June 4, 2019 to provide information and respond to questions, and also submitted a plan for consideration.

Clevr, a shared mobility company with three-wheel e-scooters, recently reached out to City staff expressing interest to demonstrate their technology. Staff has not had an opportunity to reach out to Clevr, nor to research the new vehicle type.

**Discussion**

During the past year, neighboring jurisdictions (Santa Monica, West Hollywood, Culver City, and Los Angeles) have taken action to regulate shared mobility systems and devices. Each city has its own unique approach to regulate operations within its jurisdiction, and data and revenue sharing methodologies.

**Santa Monica**

On March 6, 2018, the City of Santa Monica passed an emergency ordinance regulating shared mobility systems, including imposing an impound fee for devices that pose an immediate hazard or obstruct vehicle or pedestrian access.

Following approximately five months of evaluation, the Santa Monica City Council approved a 16-month Shared Mobility Pilot Program, which began on September 17, 2018, and permitted up to four private shared mobility system operators (2 electric scooter and 2 electric bike operators) to provide services in the public right-of-way. A selection committee initially recommended the selection of two operators, Jump and Lyft. Bird and Lime temporarily deactivated their scooters and asked riders to protest the committee’s recommendation. After consideration of the selection committee’s rankings, public comments and applicant materials, the City added Bird and Lime to participate in the pilot program. Below are the allocated devices for each operator:

- Bird (750 scooters)
- Lime (750 scooters)
- Jump (250 scooters, 500 bikes)
- Lyft (250 scooters, 500 bikes)

---

Santa Monica has a dynamic capping system that would allow operators to adjust the number of total devices, pending City approval, to meet demand when needed. Santa Monica also requires operators to provide insurance and liability, education regarding helmets/safety rules to users, and anonymized weekly data reports.

Santa Monica requires operators to pay an Operator Fee of $20,000 per year, a Per Device Fee of $130 per year, and a daily Public Right-of-Way use fee of $1 per device per day. Santa Monica does not have revenue sharing agreements with the operators.

Santa Monica painted dedicated “Shared Mobility Parking Zones” on sidewalks and installed in-street shared mobility parking corrals throughout the City for dockless scooters or bikes. Santa Monica also allows shared mobility devices to be parked in the “furniture zone,” or section of the sidewalk between the curb and pedestrian through zone (i.e., areas where bus benches or light poles are usually located), as long as sidewalks, curb ramps, ADA access or doorways are not blocked.

West Hollywood

On June 18, 2018, the City of West Hollywood passed an ordinance prohibiting the use of shared on-demand personal mobility devices (e.g., scooters, dockless bicycles) in the City. The ordinance granted the City authority to impound the devices effective August 16, 2018.

On March 18, 2019, the West Hollywood City Council approved ending the City’s bike share program (“WeHo Pedals”), and directed staff to develop an 18-month pilot program to permit one private company to operate a limited number of shared mobility devices, specifically dockless electric bikes in West Hollywood. Scooters are not be included in the pilot program. West Hollywood issued an RFP in May 2019 and plans to select a vendor in June 2019.

Culver City

On July 9, 2018, the City of Culver City Council approved an interim operating agreement (IOA) with Bird, and authorized the City Manager to negotiate an agreement with Lime. Each company was permitted to deploy 200 scooters in the city through March 2019. On April 8, 2019, the Culver City Council extended the existing IOA through June 2019. The IOA requires each company to provide appropriate liability insurance, safety education/outreach, and weekly data reports. Additionally, Culver City requires revenue sharing ($1 per day per scooter) from each operator.

Culver City allows shared mobility devices to be parked on the furniture zone of sidewalks, beside a bike rack, or areas specifically designated for bike parking, as long as they do not block driveways or ADA access.

Los Angeles

On September 2018, the Los Angeles City Council approved a shared mobility pilot program, starting with a 120-day conditional permit phase, followed by a one year permit period. The City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) reviewed applications from shared mobility companies, and issued conditional use permits to Bird, Lime, Lyft, Spin, Razor, and Wheels. Each company was allowed to operate up to 3,000 vehicles (scooters and bikes) under the conditional use permit.

3 City of West Hollywood March 18, 2019 City Council report. Dockless electric bike: “low-speed pedal-assisted electrical bicycle that is equipped with a motor that provides assistance only when the rider is pedaling, and that ceases to provide assistance when the bicycle reaches the speed of 20 miles per hour.”
LADOT received applications from 11 shared mobility companies for the one-year permit in February 2019, and awarded the following companies with a one-year permit:

- Spin (10,500 scooters)
- Bird (6,500 scooters)
- Lime (5,500 scooters)
- Lyft (4,000 scooters)
- Sherpa (670 scooters)
- Bolt (500 scooters)
- Jump (2,750 e-bikes, 2,750 scooters)
- Wheels (3,000 e-bikes)

LADOT requires shared mobility operators to pay a $5,000 Permit Application Fee plus a Conditional Permit Vehicle Fee of $32.50 per vehicle. LADOT does not have revenue sharing agreements with the operators.

LADOT requires shared mobility companies to provide appropriate liability insurance, education/community engagement plan, and real-time usage data (e.g., trip origin, duration, parking verification) that is compatible with the LADOT Mobility Data Specification (MDS). MDS provides data standards that would allow different municipalities to compare and analyze mobility data.

Scooter Parking

A common concern with shared mobility devices is improper parking. Residents have complained about e-scooters blocking the sidewalk or right-of-way. Staff researched potential solutions to improper parking by shared mobility devices.

In April 2019, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) released a midpoint evaluation of their 12-month Powered Scooter Share Pilot Program with two companies: Scoot and Skip. One key finding in SFMTA’s midpoint evaluation was adding a “lock-to” (retractable steel wire with a lock latch) device to scooters to address issues with sidewalk clearance; “lock-to” devices allow scooters to be secured to bike racks.

SFMTA modified their permit requirements for fleet size increases. The City will only allow the scooter companies to increase their permitted fleet size if they install “lock-to” devices on 100% of their fleet.

A number of startup companies have developed e-scooter docking stations. Similar to the Beverly Hills Bike Share system, scooter docking stations require placement on the public right-of-way. Challenges for placement of docking stations include: opposition by adjacent property owners, lack of public right-of-way, and/or conflict with existing sidewalk furniture.

A company called Swiftmile recently unveiled a solar-powered e-scooter docking station that also charges the scooters. In March 2019, Lyft launched a docking system pilot program during a weekend festival event in Downtown Austin, Texas.
Next Steps
Staff seeks the Liaison Committee’s direction on:

- Whether or not a shared mobility pilot program be initiated in the City
- If so, should the City negotiate a limited term operating agreement with a specific vendor(s), or issue a request for proposal (RFP) to competitively select a vendor?

Pending the Liaison Committee’s direction, staff plans to provide a report on shared mobility systems and devices for full City Council review at a future Study Session.
ATTACHMENT 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Santa Monica</th>
<th>Culver City</th>
<th>West Hollywood</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scooters</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dockless E-bikes</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (pending)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program</strong></td>
<td>16-month pilot (launched 9/17/18)</td>
<td>9-month pilot period (launched 7/9/18); extended through June 2019</td>
<td>18-month pilot program (estimated launch: July/August 2019)</td>
<td>Pilot program (launched 10/1/19): 120-day conditional permit phase, 1-year permit phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selection Process</strong></td>
<td>Request for Proposals</td>
<td>Interim operating agreements</td>
<td>Request for Applications</td>
<td>Request for Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Companies Operating</strong></td>
<td>• Jump (250 scooters, 500 bikes) • Lyft (250 scooters, 500 bikes) • Bird (750 scooters) • Lime (750 scooters)</td>
<td>• Bird (200 scooters) • Lime (200 scooters)</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>• Lime (5,500 scooters) • Spin (10,500 scooters) • Bird (6,500 scooters) • Wheels (3,000 e-bikes) • Jump (1,000 scooters, 2,000 e-bikes) • Lyft (3,000 scooters) • Sherpa (670 scooters) • Bolt (500 scooters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Devices Allowed</strong></td>
<td>• Up to 750 devices per company • Companies may add to number of total devices to meet demand (pending City approval)</td>
<td>200 devices per company</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Up to 3,000 devices per company; additional devices may be added in disadvantaged communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fees/Revenue</strong></td>
<td>• Operation Fee: $20,000 per year • Per Device Fee: $130 per year • Daily Public Right-of-Way Use Fee: $1 per device per day</td>
<td>$1 per day per scooter</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>• Permit Application Fee: $5,000 • Conditional Permit Vehicle Fee: $32.50 per vehicle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Beverly Hills City Council,

Spin is a leader in the shared mobility industry, and we are committed to working closely with cities in which we operate. This means we never launch without a city’s permission, a unique approach that we call our Partnership Promise. When we partner with cities, we work diligently to meet shared goals around safety, organization, responsiveness, and equitable service.

Over the past eight months, our team has worked closely with the City staff and community stakeholders to craft a responsible pilot program that would allow the City to implement shared electric scooters in a controlled, responsible manner with a trusted partner. Feedback provided by members of the City Council, the Transportation Planning & Traffic Engineering Division, the Beverly Hills Police Department, and the Chamber of Commerce helped us to design a program that reflects the needs of the Beverly Hills community.

We believe our proposed one-year pilot with Spin as the exclusive scooter provider is the best option for the City for many reasons:

- Spin’s partnership-first approach informs every aspect of our business, and confirms Spin’s commitment to work closely with the City to ensure the scooter system benefits the community.
- A single vendor will allow for a true partnership and avoid creating a competitive environment.
- We believe the City of Beverly Hills is sending the right message to disruptors, mandating that vendors work with the City before deploying their service unannounced.

The following pages provide more background on our company, product, parking management tools, and our proposed pilot program designed specifically for Beverly Hills. Please do not hesitate to reach out with questions, recommended edits, or ideas you have for our potential partnership.

Electric scooters are proving to be a great tool for reducing traffic congestion by replacing car trips, creating new connections to transit and boosting tourism - all of which can improve the well-being and sustainability of a city. Furthermore, Spin is the right partner for the City of Beverly Hills - in fact, Spin is the only company compliant with the current ban on scooters in Beverly Hills as our system is the only one that slows the scooters down to a halt and requires the user to park outside of Beverly Hills. We’re excited by the opportunity to bring those benefits to Beverly Hills and look forward to discussing our proposal with you.

Sincerely,

Kyle Rowe
Head of Government Partnerships
kyle@spin.pm
206.965.5258
About

Spin operates electric scooters in cities and campuses nationwide, bringing sustainable last-mile mobility solutions to diverse communities. Recognized for its consistent cooperation and collaboration with cities, Spin partners closely with transportation planners, mobility experts, community groups, and university administrators to bring dockless mobility options to streets in a responsible and carefully orchestrated manner.

Backed by Ford and based in San Francisco, Spin is a diverse team of engineers, designers, urban planners, policymakers, lawyers, marketers and operators with experience from Y Combinator, Lyft, Uber, local and federal government, and the transportation advocacy world. Spin was known for launching the first stationless mobility program in Seattle, and has since expanded to become the exclusive electric scooter partner in mid-sized cities like Coral Gables, Florida and Lexington, Kentucky, as well as one of the few permitted scooter operators in large cities like Los Angeles, Miami, Baltimore, Denver, Detroit, and Washington, D.C. The team embeds in cities and neighborhoods to understand their specific transportation needs, and hires locally from the community.

Product Overview

*Scooter Specifications*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max Speed</td>
<td>15mph (24 kmh) - Default</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>30 lbs (13.6 kg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Range</td>
<td>28 miles (45 km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brakes / Shocks</td>
<td>Front electronic &amp; rear manual brakes (disc &amp; anti-lock), front shock absorber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>White LED front light, red LED rear light, ambient lighting beneath carriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery / Electrical</td>
<td>Swappable batteries, internal &amp; tamper-resistant wiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>QR code, Bluetooth, GPS, Cell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarm / Signal</td>
<td>Anti-theft warning system, front handle bell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parking Management

All Beverly Hills customers will be required to read educational screens about parking rules and etiquette. Additionally, Spin has many tools available to ensure parking compliance remains high throughout the pilot:

- **Geofencing** - Spin can geofence certain areas out of the service area, prohibiting users from ending their trip in the geofenced area.
- **Trip End Process** - When each user ends a trip, they are required to take a photo of the scooter confirming they parked appropriately.
- **Parking Rating Screen** - When each user unlocks a Spin scooter they are asked to rate the previous user’s parking behavior with a thumbs-up or thumbs-down (see the screenshot to the right). Spin can use this data to target users who consistently park poorly for reminders and, if necessary, fees. Additionally, Spin can share geospatial data on parking compliance with the City to inform infrastructure and signage improvements.
- **User Rebalancing** - Spin has built technology to gamify the system and use fare incentives to encourage users to repark or rebalance the fleet.
- **Operations** - Should it be necessary, Spin’s customer support team is available 24/7 to receive calls regarding mis-parked scooters and notify our operations team.

Sample Educational Screens
Proposed Pilot

Spin proposes a one-year pilot to evaluate the benefits and impacts of scooter-sharing in Beverly Hills.

Spin proposes the following Service Area and Deployment Areas. Customers will be able to start and end a trip anywhere in the Service Area, but Spin will only actively deploy scooters in the Deployment Areas. Please let us know if there are areas we should exclude from the Service Area or if there are additional areas we should deploy scooters.
Additional Program Elements

- Helmet Giveaway Program - Spin will provide a helmet to any Beverly Hills customer that requests one at no cost
  - Additionally, users wearing a helmet can post a selfie with a Spin scooter on Instagram and tag #ridespin + @citybh for a chance at promotional giveaways
- Ambassador Engagement & Enforcement Plan - Spin Ambassadors will roam the Golden Triangle and other retail focusing on:
  - Customer engagement & education
  - Actively re-parking and tidying
  - Enforcement of sidewalk riding and improper parking
  - Re-enforcement of good behavior with free Spin rides and perks from local partners
  - Data collection on parking behavior and sidewalk riding
- Enforcement Plan
  - Sidewalk Riding
    - 1st incident - warning + education
    - 2nd incident - suspend account for 1 week
    - 3rd incident - suspend account for the remainder of the pilot
  - Improper Parking
    - 1st incident - warning + education
    - 2nd incident - warning + education
    - Additional incidents - $10 relocation fee
- Communications Plan - In addition to the education screens that are required for first-time users, Spin will send these reminders to all Beverly Hills customers by email and through push notifications in the mobile app:
  - Week 1 - parking and riding rules reminder
  - Week 3 - helmet reminder + helmet giveaway program
  - Week 5 - parking and riding rules reminder
  - Week 7 - helmet selfie program announcement*
  - Monthly - parking and riding rules reminder
- Investing in Safety - To support Beverly Hills’ safety and transportation investments, Spin will share $0.10 with the City of Beverly Hills for every scooter trip taken.
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Beverly Hills/Bird Partnership:

Bird Beverly Hills Pilot Proposal:

- Build a tailored pilot program starting with 100 Bird scooters and scaling based on demand.
- Establish a multimodal transportation network with a focus on safety and where to ride & park.
- Bird will create geospeed zones of where the City wants no riding or reduced speed.
- Reduce car trips, congestion and vehicle-produced greenhouse gas emissions.
Responsible riding in Beverly Hills

**Rider Education**
We will educate riders on expected behaviors of the community during onboarding and before and after every ride.

**Policies and Enforcement**
We require all riders to scan their license to verify they’re 18+ and disable scooters during late night riding. We can have operating hours determined by the city.

**Technical Guardrails**
We have technology to assist with desired rider behaviors—such as geo-fenced areas to stop or slow riding, such as Golden Triangle or Rodeo Drive.
Walking around Beverly Hills, Bird offers the below operating configurations. These are recommendations from our observations and conversations with people who live and work in Beverly Hills. These can all be adjusted based on Council and staff suggestions.

LOCAL RULES

- Please use Santa Monica Blvd when passing through Beverly Hills.
- Ride in bike lanes (where available) and to the right of the road.
- Park in the designated spots surrounding the Golden Triangle area and explore the area on foot. Scooter speeds are reduced in this area.
- Riding is not permitted in The Flats, or on sidewalks.
Beverly Hills Parking Solution

- Mutually identified parking locations (Bird has sent list of proposed nest locations)
- In-App education and instruction to nearby parking (Exclusive Offering for Beverly Hills).
- Offer Riders incentives to park in desired locations
- Can pair with real-world reference points including bike racks, parking mats, stencils, signage or other.
Beverly Hills Unique Parking Solution

Require Riders to Park at Approved Parking Locations

Bird Parking

Block Parking/Riding from specific areas (Rodeo Dr., Beverly Gardens Park)
Beverly Hills Parking Solution - Details
Listening and Engaging with Beverly Hills Community

Community Mode

Anyone in Beverly Hills can report an issue including a damaged vehicle, poor parking and unsafe riding. These reports help identify when additional education or further action is needed.

24/7 Support

We are also available for anyone in the community 24/7 via phone and email to help anyone in the community. Integrate complaints on City website to come directly to Bird.

Bird Watchers

Bird will dedicate 3 full time Bird Watchers to Beverly Hills during the pilot program. These local employees are dedicated to engaging with the community to educate them on safe riding practices, moving Birds that are parked improperly, and ensuring everything is in order.
Beverly Hills Community and BHPD Engagement to Promote Safety

- Provide rider education in collaboration with BHPD and give out free helmets at Beverly Hills farmers market.

- Bird will continue collaborating with the Beverly Hills chamber and CVB to identify businesses and hotels that want scooters parked on their property and provide them with free helmets.

- Work in close partnership with the Beverly Hills Next Committee to identify key groups to engage with during a pilot program.

- Work with BHPD to promote a PSA paid for by Bird.

- Promote rules of the road in local newspapers (BH Courier) and media outlets. Metro education campaign rolling out at end of June.
Sharing Data

Insights to inform and educate overall operations. Assisting in City Planning.
API Endpoints - vehicle status and trip data.
Aggregated and categorized complaints and reports.
In collaboration with Beverly Hills, Bird is dedicated to upholding and prioritizing the following responsibilities:

- Community Engagement
- Beverly Hills PD Collaboration
- Safety
- Fleet Management
- Customer Service
- Data Sharing
Bird Learnings

Available in more than 125 cities around the world, our operations team is fully-committed to providing support to communities, spanning: City officials, riders, chargers, mechanics, and residents
Attachment 4
Making Connections in Beverly Hills

Subsidy-Free, sustainable transportation solutions
Who We Are / Our Year In Review

LIME IS ACTIVE IN OVER

100 CITIES ON FIVE CONTINENTS AROUND THE WORLD
Los Angeles Metro Area, CA

From Watts to Santa Monica, Lime is helping people avoid traffic in a city known worldwide for car congestion. Two in five riders in Los Angeles report using Lime to replace travel by car, a mode shift statistic that ranks near the top of the list worldwide.

Notable numbers:

- 4+ million scooter rides
- 980,000+ riders
- Modeshift is real: **40% of Lime riders in LA reported replacing a trip by automobile** (personal car, carshare, or taxi/rideshare) during their most recent trip
- **30% of Lime riders in LA reported commuting to/from work or school during their most recent trip**
- **35% of Lime riders in LA reported traveling to/from dining or entertainment during their most recent trip**
01
Who We Are / The People

Karla Owunwanne
Community Affairs Manager, LA

Sam Dreiman
Director, Strategic Development

Rachel Wasser
General Manager, LA
Offering the best shared scooter on the market -- safest, most comfortable and durable

More Durable
- Durable material and composition (30% heavier than avg. other models)
- Extended battery life (by 20%) and range (up to 30 miles)

Better Rider Experience
- 2.8" Color display screen to communicate safe riding tips and proper parking etiquette
- Wifi-enhanced technique for better GPS Accuracy
- LED status light visible from afar
What Sets Us Apart / Gen 3 Scooter

- **Headlight**
  Keeps the road ahead illuminated

- **Battery Moved From Stem**
  Tip over will not cause impact to the battery housing

- **All-Aluminum Frame**
  Stronger materials ensure that critical points never fail

- **Mountain Bike Suspension**
  Reduces shock from bumps on the road

- **10-Inch Tires**
  Allows the rider to cruise through potholes without falling

- **Dashboard Screen + LED Bar**
  Notifies rider of important safety and legal information like no parking or reduced speed zones

- **Reflectors + Lights**
  Reflectors on all 4 sides and tail brake lights make the rider visible at night

- **Dual Braking System**
  Shortens stopping distance and ensures vehicle is arrested regardless of the rider’s muscle memory

- **Baseboard Battery**
  Lowers center of gravity to make tip overs less likely

Dimensions:
- 1205 mm
- 1165 mm

Dual Operations Model --
the best of both worlds

100+ full-time internal operations staff
along with 1000+ active juicers

Lime’s internal Ops team (100+ full-time staff)
We manage our smart mobility fleet 24/7 (rebalance, patrol, fix, charge, deploy, retrieve, support etc.).

Our juicer community (1000+ active juicers)
Our juicers support Lime on deployment and charging tasks using our technology, which enables us to scale.

100% in-house daily fleet maintenance
Our internal operations team covers all maintenance and routine checks of equipment to ensure quality.

Customer Service
We maintain 24-hour customer service and respond to urgent issues within 2 hours during regular business hours.

What Sets Us Apart / Smart Parking

Our Approach to Smart Parking

Geo-fence
Beverly Hills is currently geofenced as a no-park zone; users are unable to end their rides within City limits

In-app instructions
When a rider opens the Lime app in Beverly Hills, they are greeted with an in-app message notifying them that riding AND parking in the City is prohibited

Educating Riders
All riders must complete in-app onboarding before they are allowed to ride
Our Approach to Smart Parking

Gamified parking reinforces good parking behavior and crowdsources the marking of “bad” parking jobs

Incentives
reward riders for parking properly

Partner with cities to develop more scooter-friendly parking, such as corrales

Picture requirement for all riders before they are allowed to end their ride
Fully Committed to Sustainability

In October of 2018, Lime launched our Lime Green initiative to encompass the full range of our sustainability efforts.

This included establishing the industry’s first 100% carbon-free electric fleet, the creation of an internal Head of Sustainability, and the addition of former EPA Administrator and “climate czar”, Carol Browner, as Sustainability Advisor.

Through our partnership with NativeEnergy, Lime is proud to be investing in new renewable energy projects as we lead the way forward in smart, sustainable micro mobility.
Our Approach to Safety & Education

Respect The Ride Campaign

Lime’s global safety initiative promotes education and responsible ridership. Launched in the US on November 5th, the Respect The Ride pledge was signed over 75,000 times in its first 5 days alone.

As the campaign has expanded into Europe and beyond, we’re moving forward with our commitment to distribute 250,000 free helmets to micro mobility riders around the world.
Our Approach to Safety & Education

Respect The Ride Pledge:

- Ride responsibly at all times
- Wear a helmet while riding
- Abide by all traffic laws & speed limits
- Ride only within designated areas such as streets and bike lanes, never the sidewalk
- Park properly out of the way of pedestrian walkways or service ramps
- Be aware of automobiles and pedestrians, and fellow riders

Education & Awareness Events

Lime hosts Education & Awareness events to connect with the community. Our team answers questions and addresses concerns, in addition to the following:

- Helmet giveaways
- Promo codes for first time riders
- Demo rides/ rider tutorials
Data transparency is a core component of Lime’s approach to building trusted partnerships; we recently partnered with transportation data platform Remix to provide standardized data to LADOT.

- Mobility Data Specification (MDS) feed gives the City visibility into current fleet.
- Retrospective reporting on trip activity, safety, customer service, and operational metrics.
- Data dashboard with insights available to track, visualize, and download fleet activity.

Build Smarter Cities
Lime Access
Financial Aid Eligible

We believe in a mobility solution that is shared, affordable, and accessible

Lime Access members (those who receive local, state, or federal funding) receive a 50% discount on all Lime-S electric scooter rides

Our PayNearMe partnership allows riders to use cash to purchase their rides and a text-to-unlock feature means SMS can be used to unlock a scooter.
Investing in Beverly Hills / City References

Kyle Kozar  
Bike Coordinator, Mobility Division  
City of Santa Monica  
E-mail: kyle.kozar@smgov.net  
Phone: 310-458-2201 x 5769

John Larsen  
PE Director, Transportation Division  
City of Salt Lake  
E-mail: jon.larsen@slcgov.com  
Phone: 801-535-6630

Meredith Soniat  
Active Transportation Coordinator  
City of Tacoma  
E-mail: msoniat@cityoftacoma.org  
Phone: 253.591.5380
MEMORANDUM

CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS

TO: City Council and Traffic and Parking Commission Liaison Committee
FROM: Aaron Kunz, Deputy Director of Transportation
       Martha Eros, Transportation Planner
       Christian Vasquez, Transportation Planning Analyst
DATE: June 12, 2019
SUBJECT: Beverly Hills Bike Share
ATTACHMENTS: None

Introduction

This memorandum provides an update on the Beverly Hills Bike Share Program, which celebrated its third anniversary on May 10, 2019. The City’s agreement with the current bike share operator, Cyclehop, LLC (Cyclehop), expires on August 4, 2019. The City may extend the contract for two (2) two-year option periods.

Staff seeks the City Council and Traffic and Parking Commission Liaison Committee (Liaison Committee) direction on extending the bike share agreement with Cyclehop for an additional two years to continue operating the City’s bike share program.

Background

In May 2016, the City of Beverly Hills was the second city in Los Angeles County to implement a bike share program with a fleet of 50 smart bicycles and 10 bike share stations.

Prior to launching the bike share program, City staff and Cyclehop evaluated more than 30 potential bike share station locations citywide. The City was able to install 10 bike share stations despite facing challenges, such as opposition by adjacent property owners, lack of public right-of-way, and conflict with existing sidewalk furniture.

City staff has been working with Cyclehop’s marketing team to promote the bike share program at various City events (e.g., Earth Day, Bike to Work Day Pit Stop, National Night Out) and on social media. Cyclehop’s marketing team also reached out to various hotels in the City to promote the program. Furthermore, the City continues to offer a free helmet program to Beverly Hills Bike Share members in partnership with the Conference and Visitors Bureau.

In April 2019, Beverly Hills Bike Share joined the City of Santa Monica, City of West Hollywood, and the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) to launch the regional bike share network, Bike Share Connect. This integrated the Beverly Hills, Santa Monica, West Hollywood and UCLA bike share systems into a combined service area, gave users equal access to all bikes throughout the service area, and improved the user experience by allowing users to travel between jurisdictions without incurring additional fees.
Discussion

With the launch of Bike Share Connect, all member accounts from the multiple bike share systems were merged. Bike Share Connect started with 94,753 members in April 2018, and membership increased to 113,059 in April 2019.

Bike share activity in the Beverly Hills has been decreasing in general. Potential factors to the decline in ridership are the proliferation of other shared mobility devices in 2018 and inclement weather in Fall/Winter 2018. Below is a chart showing the number of trips in Beverly Hills from January 2017 to April 2019:

The City purchased the Beverly Hills bike share equipment with AB2766 Air Quality Management District and Measure-R transportation funds in the amount of $150,274. The monthly operations cost to maintain the system is $186 per bike, for a total of annual operating cost of $109,500 for the 50 bike system. The annual operation cost is funded with Measure R transportation funds. Below is a table summarizing the annual operation costs and revenue of the City’s bike share system:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beverly Hills Bike Share Operation Cost and Revenue:</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018*</th>
<th>2019 (Jan-May)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operation Cost</td>
<td>109,500.00</td>
<td>109,500.00</td>
<td>45,625.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue**</td>
<td>20,146.88</td>
<td>20,602.32</td>
<td>11,219.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy</td>
<td>89,353.12</td>
<td>88,897.68</td>
<td>34,405.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Beverly Hills Bike Share became a part of Bike Share Connect in April 2018

** Revenue generated from memberships, per-minute trip charges, and fees.
Neighboring Cities

In November 2018, the City of Santa Monica renewed their contract with Cyclehop an additional two years (expires November 2020) to coincide with Santa Monica’s 5-year Hulu sponsorship contract that expires in November 2020.

On March 18, 2019, the West Hollywood City Council approved ending the City’s bike share program ("WeHo Pedals"), and developing an 18-month pilot program to permit one private company to operate a limited number of dockless electric bikes or “e-bikes” in West Hollywood. West Hollywood issued an RFP from dockless electric bike companies in May 2019, and plans to select a vendor in June 2019. Bike Share Connect (Beverly Hills, Santa Monica, UCLA) bikes would continue to be allowed to operate and park in West Hollywood.

Cyclehop

Cyclehop is proposing to upgrade the Beverly Hills Bike Share equipment and technology at no cost to the City in August 2019. Upgrades include replacing bike controller keypads/screens, changing the u-bar locks to integrated locking cables, and updating the firmware on each bike for better network connectivity.

Next Steps

The current agreement with Cyclehop allows for two (2) two-year option periods. If the City decides to extend the agreement with Cyclehop, a standard provision in the agreement with Cyclehop includes a Termination Clause whereby the City may terminate services for convenience (i.e., without cause) with a 30-day written notice, or for cause (i.e., failure to perform, breach of contract) with a 30-day written notice to remedy the violation(s) within a stated timeline agreed by both parties.

Staff seeks the Liaison Committee’s recommendation on extending the bike share agreement with Cyclehop for an additional two years to operate the City’s bike share program. Staff will forward the Liaison Committee’s recommendation along with consideration of an extension to the Cyclehop agreement at the July 16, 2019 City Council meeting.

---

1 Dockless electric bike: “low-speed pedal-assisted electrical bicycle that is equipped with a motor that provides assistance only when the rider is pedaling, and that ceases to provide assistance when the bicycle reaches the speed of 20 miles per hour” (City of West Hollywood March 18, 2019 City Council report)