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

CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS
455 N. Rexford Drive
Room 280A
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

IN-PERSON / TELEPHONIC / VIDEO CONFERENCE MEETING

Beverly Hills Liaison Meeting
https://beverlyhills-org.zoom.us/my/committee
Meeting ID: 516 191 2424
Passcode: 90210

You can also dial in by phone:
+1 669 900 9128 US
+1 833 548 0282 (Toll-Free)

One tap mobile
+16699009128,,5161912424# US
+18335480282,,5161912424# US (Toll-Free)

Monday, November 14, 2022
10:00 AM

Please be advised that pre-entry metal detector screening requirements are now in place in City Hall. Members of the public are requested to plan visits accordingly.

In the interest of maintaining appropriate social distancing, members of the public can view this meeting through live webcast at www.beverlyhills.org/live and on BH Channel 10 or Channel 35 on Spectrum Cable, and can participate in the teleconference/video conference by using the link above. Written comments may be emailed to mayorandcitycouncil@beverlyhills.org and will also be taken during the meeting when the topic is being reviewed by the Beverly Hills City Council Liaison / Traffic and Parking Commission Committee. Beverly Hills Liaison meetings will be in-person at City Hall.

AGENDA

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

2) Resolution of the Beverly Hills City Council Liaison / Traffic and Parking Commission Committee continuing to authorize public meetings to be held via teleconferencing pursuant to Government Code Section 54953(e) and making findings and determination regarding the same.
Recent legislation was adopted allowing the Beverly Hills City Council Liaison / Traffic and Parking Commission Committee to continue virtual meetings during the COVID-19 declared emergency subject to certain conditions and the proposed resolution implements the necessary requirements.

3) Transit Feasibility Study
4) Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program
5) Adjournment

Huma Ahmed
City Clerk

Posted: November 10, 2022

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 twenty-four (24) hours advance notice will help to ensure availability of services. City Hall, including Room 280A is wheelchair accessible.
STAFF REPORT

Meeting Date: November 14, 2022

To: Traffic and Parking Commission Committee

From: Shana Epstein, Secretary of the Traffic and Parking Commission Committee

Subject: A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL LIAISON / TRAFFIC AND PARKING COMMISSION COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS AUTHORIZING PUBLIC MEETINGS TO BE HELD VIA TELECONFERENCING PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54953(e) AND MAKING FINDINGS AND DETERMINATIONS REGARDING THE SAME

Attachments: 1. Proposed resolution

RECOMMENDATION

Staff and the City Attorney’s office recommend that the Council Liaison / Traffic and Parking Commission Committee adopt a resolution making the following findings so that meetings of the City Council Liaison / Traffic and Parking Commission Committee will be subject to the special Brown Act requirements for teleconference meetings: (1) the City Council Liaison / Traffic and Parking Commission Committee has reconsidered the circumstances of the COVID-19 state of emergency; (2) the state of emergency continues to directly impact the ability of the members to meet safely in person; and (3) state or local officials continue to impose or recommend measures to promote social distancing.

FISCAL IMPACT

The proposed resolution allowing the City Council Liaison / Traffic and Parking Commission Committee greater flexibility to conduct teleconference meetings is unlikely to cause a greater fiscal impact to the City as the Council Liaison / Traffic and Parking
Commission Committee has been conducting such teleconference meetings for over a year.

**INTRODUCTION**

Governor Newsom recently signed new legislation (AB 361) allowing the City Council Liaison / Traffic and Parking Commission Committee to continue virtual meetings during the COVID-19 declared emergency subject to certain conditions. These special requirements give the City greater flexibility to conduct teleconference meetings when there is a declared state of emergency and either social distancing is mandated or recommended, or an in-person meeting would present imminent risks to the health and safety of attendees.

**BACKGROUND**

On March 4, 2020, Governor Newsom proclaimed a state of emergency to exist in California due to the spread of COVID-19. The Governor subsequently issued numerous executive orders suspending or modifying state laws to facilitate the response to the emergency. Among other things, these executive orders superseded certain Brown Act requirements and established special rules to give local public agencies greater flexibility to conduct teleconference meetings. Those special rules expired on September 30, 2021.

On September 16, 2021, in anticipation of then-imminent expiration of his special rules for teleconference meetings, the Governor signed AB 361. In key part, this bill amends the Brown Act to establish special requirements for teleconference meetings if a legislative body of a local public agency holds a meeting during a proclaimed state of emergency and either state or local officials have imposed or recommended measures to promote social distancing, or the body determines, by majority vote, whether as a result of the emergency, meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees.

AB 361 builds upon Executive Order (“EO”) N-29-20, issued by the Governor on March 17, 2020, which relaxed the teleconferencing requirements of the Brown Act to facilitate virtual meetings during the COVID-19 declared emergency. EO N-29-20’s provisions concerning public meetings applied through September 30, 2021.

AB 361 authorizes local agencies to continue meeting remotely without following the Brown Act’s standard teleconferencing provisions if the meeting is held during a state of emergency proclaimed by the Governor and either of the following applies: (1) state or local officials have imposed or recommended measures to promote social distancing; or (2) the agency has already determined or is determining whether, as a result of the emergency, meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees.

EO N-29-20 required legislative bodies to make remote public meetings accessible telephonically or otherwise electronically to all members of the public seeking to observe and to address the local legislative body, and to make reasonable efforts to adhere as closely as reasonably possible to the provisions of the Brown Act. AB 361 adds new procedures and clarifies the requirements for conducting remote meetings as follows:
- **Public Comment Opportunities in Real Time:** A legislative body that meets remotely pursuant to AB 361 must allow members of the public to access the meeting via a call-in option or an internet-based service option, and the agenda for the remote meeting must provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the body in real time. Although the agency may still ask for public comments to be submitted in advance, the agency cannot require public comments to be submitted in advance of the meeting. If an agency does not provide a timed public comment period, but takes public comment separately on each agenda item, it must allow a reasonable amount of time per agenda item to allow members of the public the opportunity to provide public comment, including time to “be recognized for the purpose of providing public comment.”

- **No Action During Disruptions:** In the event of a disruption that prevents the local agency from broadcasting the remote meeting, or in the event of a disruption within the local agency’s control that prevents members of the public from offering public comments using the call-in option or internet-based service option, AB 361 prohibits the legislative body from taking any further action on items appearing on the meeting agenda until public access to the meeting via the call-in or internet-based options is restored.

- **Periodic Findings:** To continue meeting remotely pursuant to AB 361, an agency must make periodic findings that: (1) the body has reconsidered the circumstances of the declared emergency; and (2) the emergency impacts the ability of the body’s members to meet safely in person, or state or local officials continue to impose or recommend measures to promote social distancing. These findings should be made not later than 30 days after teleconferencing for the first time pursuant to AB 361, and every 30 days thereafter.

**DISCUSSION**

To continue to hold meetings under these special teleconferencing requirements, the City Council Liaison / Traffic and Parking Commission Committee needs to make two findings pursuant to Government Code Section 54953(e)(3). First, there must be a declared state of emergency and the City Council Liaison / Traffic and Parking Commission Committee must find that it has reconsidered the circumstances of such emergency. Second, the City Council Liaison / Traffic and Parking Commission Committee must find that such emergency continues to directly impact the ability of the City Council Liaison / Traffic and Parking Commission Committee members to meet in person. Alternatively, for the second finding, the City Council Liaison / Traffic and Parking Commission Committee must find that state or local officials continue to impose or recommend social distancing measures. These findings must be made within 30 days after the City Council Liaison / Traffic and Parking Commission Committee teleconferences for the first time under AB 361 and every 30 days thereafter.

The declared emergency is still in effect. Furthermore, the State of California and the County of Los Angeles have recommended measures to promote social distancing. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention continue to advise that COVID-19 spreads more easily indoors than outdoors and that people are more likely to be exposed to COVID-19 when they are closer than 6 feet apart from others for longer periods of time.
Additionally, the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health still encourages people at risk for severe illness of death from COVID-19 to take protective measures such as social distancing and, for those not yet fully vaccinated, to physically distance from others whose vaccination status is unknown. The County Health Department also continues to recommend that employers take steps to support physical distancing.

Please note that AB 361 applies to all legislative bodies. Therefore, Commissions and standing committees will need to also comply with the requirements of AB 361.

Shana Epstein  
Secretary of the City Council Liaison / Traffic  
and Parking Commission Committee  
Approved By
RESOLUTION NO. CCL-TPCC-01

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL LIAISON / TRAFFIC AND PARKING COMMISSION COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS AUTHORIZING PUBLIC MEETINGS TO BE HELD VIA TELECONFERENCING PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54953(e) AND MAKING FINDINGS AND DETERMINATIONS REGARDING THE SAME

WHEREAS, the City Council Liaison / Traffic and Parking Commission Committee is committed to public access and participation in its meetings while balancing the need to conduct public meetings in a manner that reduces the likelihood of exposure to COVID-19 and to support physical distancing during the COVID-19 pandemic; and

WHEREAS, all meetings of the City Council Liaison / Traffic and Parking Commission Committee are open and public, as required by the Ralph M. Brown Act (Cal. Gov. Code 54950 – 54963), so that any member of the public may attend, participate, and watch the Beverly Hills City Council Liaison / Traffic and Parking Commission Committee conduct its business; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Assembly Bill 361, signed by Governor Newsom and effective on September 16, 2021, legislative bodies of local agencies may hold public meetings via teleconferencing pursuant to Government Code Section 54953(e), without complying with the requirements of Government Code Section 54953(b)(3), if the legislative body complies with certain enumerated requirements in any of the following circumstances:

1. The legislative body holds a meeting during a proclaimed state of emergency, and state or local officials have imposed or recommended measures to promote social distancing.

2. The legislative body holds a meeting during a proclaimed state of emergency for the purpose of determining, by majority vote, whether as a result of the
emergency, meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees.

3. The legislative body holds a meeting during a proclaimed state of emergency and has determined, by majority vote, that, as a result of the emergency, meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees.

WHEREAS, on March 4, 2020, Governor Newsom declared a State of Emergency in response to the COVID-19 pandemic (the “Emergency”); and

WHEREAS, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention continue to advise that COVID-19 spreads more easily indoors than outdoors and that people are more likely to be exposed to COVID-19 when they are closer than 6 feet apart from others for longer periods of time; and

WHEREAS, the Los Angeles County “Responding together at Work and in the Community Order (8.23.21)” provides that all individuals and businesses are strongly encouraged to follow the Los Angeles County Public Health Department Best Practices. The Los Angeles County Public Health Department “Best Practices to Prevent COVID-19 Guidance for Businesses and Employers”, updated on September 13, 2021, recommend that employers take steps to reduce crowding indoors and to support physical distancing between employees and customers; and

WHEREAS, the Beverly Hills City Council has adopted a resolution that continues to recommend steps to reduce crowding indoors and to support physical distancing at City meetings to protect the health and safety of meeting attendees; and

WHEREAS, due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic and the need to promote social distancing to reduce the likelihood of exposure to COVID-19, the City Council Liaison / Traffic
and Parking Commission Committee intends to hold public meetings via teleconferencing pursuant to Government Code Section 54953(e).

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council Liaison / Traffic and Parking Commission Committee of the City of Beverly Hills resolves as follows:

Section 1. The Recitals provided above are true and correct and are hereby incorporated by reference.

Section 2. The City Council Liaison / Traffic and Parking Commission Committee hereby determines that, as a result of the Emergency, meeting in person presents imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees.

Section 3. The City Council Liaison / Traffic and Parking Commission Committee shall conduct its meetings pursuant to Government Code Section 54953(e).

Section 4. Staff is hereby authorized and directed to take all actions necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of this Resolution including, conducting open and public meetings in accordance with Government Code section 54953(e) and other applicable provisions of the Brown Act.

Section 5. The City has reconsidered the circumstances of the state of emergency and finds that: (i) the state of emergency continues to directly impact the ability of the members to meet safely in person, and (ii) state or local officials continue to impose or recommend measures to promote social distancing.

Section 6. The Secretary of the City Council Liaison / Traffic and Parking Commission Committee shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution and shall cause this Resolution and
his/her certification to be entered in the Book of Resolution of the City Council Liaison / Traffic and Parking Commission Committee of this City.

Adopted: November 14, 2022

JULIAN A. GOLD  
Presiding Councilmember of the City Council Liaison / Traffic and Parking Commission Committee of the City of Beverly Hills, California
CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
MEMORANDUM

TO: City Council and Traffic and Parking Commission Liaison Committee
FROM: Daren Grilley, Assistant Director/City Engineer
DATE: November 14, 2022
SUBJECT: Beverly Hills Transit Feasibility Study and Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program Update
ATTACHMENT: 1. October 6, 2022 Transit Feasibility Study Report

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the City Council and Traffic and Parking Commission Liaison Committee receive progress updates on the Transit Feasibility Study and Draft Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program (NTCP), and provide feedback and direction to staff on next steps for each of these initiatives.

INTRODUCTION
On April 20, 2021, the City Council adopted the Complete Streets Plan that includes goals and policies that will guide the City in building a safe, convenient and environmentally responsible transportation system serving multiple modes of travel, including driving, walking, cycling and transit (www.beverlyhills.org/completestreets). Goals of the Complete Streets Plan include:

- Providing First/Last Mile Connections
- Improving Transit Rider Experiences
- Increasing Transit Ridership
- Supporting Safe, Complete, Livable, Sustainable and Quality Neighborhoods

Specific policies in support of these goals include exploring a fast, reliable transit shuttle with connections to the upcoming Purple (D) Line subway stations and developing a comprehensive neighborhood traffic calming toolbox for residential neighborhoods.

This report summarizes the progress towards implementing these policies.

DISCUSSION
Transit Feasibility Study
At their March 15, 2022 study session, the City Council directed staff to begin developing a transit service plan with the Traffic and Parking Commission (TPC) as the advisory body. With the assistance of the transportation consulting firm, Kittelson & Associates, Inc., a transit needs assessment, including public surveys and outreach, was conducted between July and September 2022.

The findings of the Transit Study were presented at the October 6, 2022 TPC meeting (Attachment 1). The Commission supported the recommendation by staff and Kittelson & Associates to
develop a pilot project for City Council to consider that would consist of one fixed circulator route operating with high frequency (e.g. 15-minute headways) south of North Santa Monica Boulevard, along with demand-based Microtransit that would serve residential areas.

Staff is refining the proposed circulator route, including potential stops, which will be presented to the public for input in November-December. A detailed outline of the proposed transit pilot project will be presented to the TPC in January, followed by the City Council. If supported, an RFP would be issued with the goal of beginning operation of a 12-24 month long pilot project by June 2023.

**Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program**

At the October 7, 2021 TPC meeting staff presented 16 potential traffic calming measures to consider including in the City’s Traffic Calming Toolbox, which serves as a resource to identify traffic calming options that are applicable to address the traffic-related concerns in a specific location. The TPC supported inclusion of all measures as potential options for neighborhoods to request on their streets.

At the May 5, 2022 TPC meeting, staff presented industry best practices in NTCPs, as well as policies, procedures, and considerations from the peer cities of Hayward, Glendale, and Encinitas to inform development of a NTCP for Beverly Hills. The Commissioners provided feedback on project initiation, screening, thresholds of community support, approval, and evaluation, which staff incorporated into the Beverly Hills Draft NTCP.

The Draft NTCP, which combines the traffic calming toolbox with the recommended policies and implementation procedures, was made available for public comment from mid-September through mid-October, and presented to the TPC at their November 3, 2022 meeting (Attachment 2). Commission comments will be incorporated and the Draft NTCP will be brought to the City Council for consideration in early 2023.

**Community Outreach**

The City’s Communications team engaged in multiple layers of outreach to solicit participation in the transit survey and attendance at virtual and in-person community meetings. The outreach—described in detail starting on page 5 of Attachment 1—included newspaper ads, citywide mailings, email blasts, posted signs at transit stops, promotion at City meetings and special events, social media posts, and informational flyers at public counters and on City Dial-A-Ride shuttles.

The City released the Draft NTCP for community review September 16-October 14, 2022 via the project website [www.beverlyhills.org/trafficcalming](http://www.beverlyhills.org/trafficcalming). To get the word out, staff mailed a citywide postcard, distributed a press release, published ads in the newspapers, posted on social media, and emailed community groups. Community members were asked to provide comments via email, phone, or through a form on the website.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

The fiscal impacts for the Transit Pilot Project and the NTCP are discussed in the attached reports.
TO: Traffic and Parking Commission  
FROM: Daren Grilley, Assistant Director/City Engineer  
       Martha Eros, Transportation Planner  
DATE: October 6, 2022  
SUBJECT: Beverly Hills Transit Feasibility Study  
ATTACHMENT: 1. Draft Transit Feasibility Study and Unmet Needs Assessment and Suitability Analysis Technical Memorandum  
              2. Community Outreach Mailer  

RECOMMENDATION  
Staff recommends that the Traffic and Parking Commission review the attached draft Transit Feasibility Study and Unmet Needs Assessment and Suitability Analysis Technical Memorandum and consider the recommendation to develop a pilot program consisting of a combination of fixed route and microtransit.  

INTRODUCTION  
At their March 15, 2022 study session, the City Council directed staff to begin developing a transit service plan with the Traffic and Parking Commission (Commission) as the advisory body. At the April 7, 2022 Commission meeting, staff outlined a scope of work for a transit needs assessment analysis to identify opportunities for future transit system connections.  

The adopted 2021 Complete Streets Plan identifies first-last mile opportunities for the Metro Purple Line (Line D) subway stations in Beverly Hills, including micro transit systems. Continued support by the Commission and advocacy from the CAC spearheaded the commission of a transit feasibility study to identify appropriate transit systems/services based on current and future transit growth.  

DISCUSSION  
In June 2022, the transportation planning firm of Kittelson & Associates Inc. (Kittelson) was engaged to prepare the transit needs assessment, which will serve as the foundation for the implementation and operation of a citywide transit system.  

Fundamental first steps of the transit feasibility study include:  
- Gather stakeholder and public input  
- Understand transit needs in the community  
- Analyze existing transit services to identify gaps/unmet needs  
- Identify the goals, objectives and options of new transit service
**Community Outreach/Needs Assessment**

Two community outreach meetings were conducted in late August/early September with approximately 12 participants attending either the virtual or in-person sessions, and approximately 430 surveys were received in response to a transit survey released on June 20. A summary of the responses include:

- Approximately 28% (118 of 430) of respondents indicated that they are current or past riders of transit within the City; 43% (184) indicated no experience as transit riders and expressed an interest in using public transit in the future; 29% (124) indicated no interest in using public transportation.
- Approximately 35% (41 of 118) of those identifying as transit users rated current transit services within the City as “very good” or “good.”
- Conditions or “barriers” cited against using public transit include the following, from most significant to least significant:
  - Existing transit services take too long or do not run on time
  - Transfers are confusing, time consuming, or costly
  - Public transportation does not operate near (my) home
  - Transit stops are too far from (my) trip origin or destination
- Several travel corridors highlighted by users in the interactive mapping survey:
  - North-South Corridors: Rodeo, Beverly, Canon, Rexford Drives; Robertson Boulevard
  - East-West Corridors: Santa Monica, Olympic, Beverly Boulevards
- Frequent location types cited by users included medical facilities such as urgent cares and Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, parks, public schools, commercial/retail areas (e.g. coffee shops and restaurants), civic centers (e.g. post office, library), and religious institutions.

**Westside Transit Operators**

In addition to conducting community outreach meetings, the Kittelson team conducted individual interviews with Westside transit stakeholders, including the Cities of West Hollywood and Culver City to gather insight on local transit services serving each community, and with the Metro Westside planning group for NextGen operations and next steps. Each organization indicated transit ridership is trending toward shorter, faster trips with higher frequency.

**West Hollywood**

The City of West Hollywood operates a combination of fixed route service to supplement the Metro transit network and specialized on-demand service for individuals over 62 years and disabled persons of all ages. In June 2022, the City Council approved a staff proposal to explore a microtransit pilot project to transition away from dial-a-ride system to provide a general-public microtransit service with priority given to seniors and residents with disabilities served by the current dial-a-ride program. While trips will still be offered to qualifying populations for free, West Hollywood plans to charge non-qualifying riders a fare. Since West Hollywood shares a border and a transit contract with Beverly Hills, there is great opportunity to improve connections between the two cities.
Culver City
In 2017, the City of Culver City completed its Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Visioning Study and Recommendations report, with a vision of refocusing its mobility planning approach to include all modes of travel, including walking/pedestrians, transit, bicycles, and automobile traffic. As a result of the study, the MOVE Culver City project came to fruition with the goal of improving transit connections throughout the City’s urban core and Expo Station area, and to improve the bus transit experience to encourage more transit use.

In November 2021, Culver City introduced an electric, low-floor minibus circulator scheduled to run every 10 minutes at peak times and every 15 minutes off-peak. The intent behind the addition of the circulator to the Move Culver City pilot project, as well as the use of converted electric passenger vans instead of conventional transit buses, was to help make service more accessible and convenient for residents and reduce the stigma of riding transit. During the school year, additional circulator routes that serve Culver City Middle School and High School are now offered following advocacy and support by the Culver City Unified School District and parents.

Los Angeles County Metro
Following 400+ community outreach events over a two year period, Metro launched its countywide NextGen Plan with the goal of providing 10-minute or less headways and restructuring the bus line network to focus on local service. The four regional Metro lines operating within the Beverly Hills city limits are confined to major arterial streets. To address transit gaps, Metro launched a three-year micro-transit pilot program (similar to a shared on-demand service such as Lyft) to transport riders within 2-3 miles from major transit centers to key destinations. Currently, Metro microtransit service is operating in Westwood to address high student ridership demands.

Service Options for Consideration
Beverly Hills is well-suited for a variety of transit options, with a compact footprint, a grid pattern street network (south of Sunset Boulevard), and a mix of land uses that provides consistent all-day sources of travel demand. In all instances, it is recommended that any service be offered in the form of a limited pilot period under the administration of the City of Beverly Hills. This will offer the City the ability to explore alternatives more quickly and respond more quickly to needs that may not have been able to be considered by this study or in existence at the time of this study. Two complementary options are best suited for consideration of a City-managed transit service pilot project:

- Fixed-route transit
- Microtransit

Fixed Route
Fixed route transit operates like conventional public transportation as seen within Beverly Hills today provided by Metro, operating defined routes on defined schedules, serving defined stops. Public input received over the course of the study indicates that public interest is for fast connection into the upcoming Metro D (Purple) Line stations schedule to open in calendar year 2024 on Wilshire Boulevard at La Cienega Boulevard and Rodeo Drive. The greatest transit circulation need within the community is for north-south connectivity, as identified through community input and LA Metro peer discussions (Attachment-1, Figure 7).

Fixed-route transit propensity is greatest from Santa Monica Boulevard to the south of the city, as the intensity of commercial activity and greater relative density provides the concentration of residents and commercial points of interest that offers the greatest potential ridership base.

The residential land use patterns north of Santa Monica Boulevard are traditionally associated with lower all-day transit propensity and utilization, and it is not evident through public outreach
that there is an unmet demand in this portion of the city. To ensure citywide transit opportunities, this area may be better served by alternative service, such as microtransit (discussed below).

From the community survey and public workshop feedback in addition to lessons learned from Culver City, there is also evidence to suggest time-limited fixed route service could be effective during morning and afternoon peak-hour activity to connect parts of the city with the greatest concentrations of enrolled students to Beverly Hills High School. Additionally, exploring extended fixed-route, commute-oriented service to connect the Flats region to the upcoming Metro D Line stations as part of a pilot program may be considered for future testing.

**Microtransit**

Microtransit is an emerging technology option that offers promise for geographies/terrain more challenging for fixed-route transit or defined zones with lower densities adjacent to areas otherwise favorable for a more conventional transit service, utilizing new technologies to offer on-demand routing between more widely spaced origins and destinations using smaller transit vehicles.

Within Beverly Hills, a microtransit pilot is likely to be the most successful service strategy for portions of the city north of Santa Monica Boulevard. Depending on the limitations of any prospective partner (app) platform, it may be possible for the full portion of the city north of Santa Monica Boulevard to be served by a single microtransit zone.

As with fixed-route transit, network connectivity is critical to the success of any transit service, and limited specific connections into the regional network outside of the microtransit zone would be strongly advised, such as incorporating the future Metro D Line stations along Wilshire Boulevard as exclaves of the microtransit zone. If evidence of peak commute-oriented demand exists within the microtransit zone, it may be more efficient to instead operate peak service along a fixed route to more efficiently capture demand and reduce overall trip times.

**Next Steps**

Based on the study recommendations, staff recommends developing a pilot program consisting of a combination of fixed route and microtransit service. If the Commission supports this recommendation, or similar variation of services, staff will move forward with developing details for the following considerations:

- Route(s) and stop locations
- Operating hours
- Performance standards (service frequency, safety issues, stop amenities, etc.)
- Safety standards (in consultation with the Police Department)
- Vehicle types, passenger capacity, and power options

Staff would conduct additional outreach to get feedback on these details before returning to the Commission, tentatively in December 2022, for review and recommendation to the City Council.

**Public Outreach**

The City’s Communications team engaged in multiple layers of outreach to solicit participation in the transit survey and attendance at the virtual and in-person community meetings, including:

| Ads in BH Courier, BH Weekly, and BH Press (transit survey participation and community outreach meetings) | Beverly Hills Unified School District and PTA social media posts and partnership |
City social media posts, including a personal re-post by Councilmember Nazarian | E-blast notices to approximately 1,200 Complete Streets email subscribers

Citywide mailer announcing community meeting dates and survey information to all households and businesses | Promote on landing page of City website, calendar of events and project page (www.beverlyhills.org/transitstudy)

Post information flyers at 20 high-use Metro bus stops along Wilshire Blvd and Beverly Drive | Promoting project at City events, including the Climate Action Committee Movie Night, Concerts on Canon series, Sunday Farmers’ Market

TPC monthly updates and public comment forum | Public Works Commission presentation

CAAC Advisory Committee updates | Beverly Hills Active Adult Club (BHAAC) board presentation

Metro Purple Line monthly community outreach meeting | Posted flyers on senior Dial-A-Ride shuttles

Information flyers distributed at all city public counters | Internal City employee newsletter and emails

A total of 430 surveys were submitted as a result of the extensive public outreach. The cost of outreach efforts totaled approximately $20,000 for newspaper advertisements, citywide mailers, newspaper advertisements and social media posts.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

The preliminary estimated cost is approximately $3.5 million for a one-year pilot program with one microtransit vehicle and one circulator route as described in the study. Factors affecting the actual costs include the general operation and administrative costs by a professional transit provider, type and number of vehicles to operate an effective system with the desired number of routes and frequencies, transit stop improvements, infrastructure to support alternative fuel vehicles. Purchasing and contracts associated with the pilot program will follow City solicitation and procurement policies.

Funding is currently available to start a pilot program using local return transportation funds. Depending on the option selected and the duration of the pilot program, additional funding appropriation will be necessary for fiscal year 2023/24. Additional study will be required to understand the capital and operations funding needs and revenue options to sustain a long-term, ongoing transit system.
Kittelson & Associates, Inc. (Kittelson) is working with the City of Beverly Hills (City) to determine whether the current and future planned transit services are sufficient to support the needs of Beverly Hills residents, workers, and visitors. This memorandum summarizes the community needs expressed by the public and peer agencies during community outreach efforts including the online survey, interactive mapping exercise, and public meetings, and provides initial recommendations to direct future transit planning efforts by the City based on the results of the community needs analysis and current industry best practices.
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ONLINE SURVEY FINDINGS

The City developed a Mobility Needs Survey to understand how people who work, live, and recreate in Beverly Hills travel around the community and how they imagine doing so in the future. The survey recorded the demographics of respondents; explored their past and current experiences using public transit to travel to, from, and within Beverly hills; and solicited opinions on how to improve transit within the community – from serving new destinations to addressing commonly identified barriers to using the existing system.

The survey (Appendix A) was published online via Survey Monkey and publicized through the City’s website, two project public meetings, traditional and social media, City hosted events (such as the Farmers’ Market), flyers at high activity Metro bus stops within the city, and e-blasts. A full list of outreach distribution strategies will be summarized in the Outreach Memo.

In order to capture broader perspectives on mobility and retain the ability to solicit feedback on existing services from current riders, some survey questions were asked only of existing or interested transit riders and others only of people who responded that they did not expect to ever use public transit in the city.

The following sections explore the who, where, how, why, and why not of the public transit landscape in Beverly Hills, the answers to which provide a framework for analyzing the City’s unmet transit needs.

Existing Regional and Local Transit Use

REGIONAL TRIPS

Several transit services operate near or within Beverly Hills and provide inter-community and larger regional connectivity. These travel patterns may indicate connection opportunities for potential future local services.

Metro, LADOT, and Big Blue Bus accounted for the highest percentage of daily, several times a week, or occasional trips on the regional options listed (Figure 1). The most common frequency cited for riding any of the regional transit services was “occasionally”. ¹ “Never” accounted for over 80 percent of the frequency responses across all regional services.

¹ This question received a nearly 100 percent response rate from the over 400 survey users. “Other” write in answers included Metrolink, WeHo PickUp, and Metro bikeshare. This question was open to all respondents.
LOCAL TRIPS

Three core public transit services exist within the City and serve local trips currently. Survey users that indicated they had previously taken transit within Beverly Hills were asked which of these services they ride and how often.\^2 Respondents indicated that they use Metro overwhelmingly for most local trips (Figure 2).

\^2 Roughly ¼ of respondents (99) answered or were eligible to answer this question.
INTRA- AND INTER-COMMUNITY TRANSIT TRAVEL

Beverly Hills is part of a larger region that offers significant entertainment, recreation, and employment opportunities. Half of current transit riders indicated that they use transit for inter-community travel (outside of Beverly Hills). While the remaining half of users indicated they take transit to access local destinations, only 14 percent of those riders started their trip within Beverly Hills (Figure 3). This does not necessarily indicate that there is an insufficient market for new Beverly Hills transit services. It is possible that the riders coming from outside the community may benefit from additional local connection options to expand their greater access to Beverly Hills businesses and entertainment districts.

3 This question was asked of only current transit riders
Just over a quarter of respondents indicated that they are current or past riders of transit within the City. A combined 43 percent of respondents indicated no experience as local riders, but expressed an interest in starting in the future. The nearly three quarters of responses from existing or interested riders is a positive indication toward a market for existing or new and improved services. The strong interest in taking transit when the Purple Line opens emphasizes the importance of ensuring that safe, convenient, and comfortable connections to and from the stations (often referred to as the “first mile / last mile”) are available to translate that demand into ridership.

| Table 1 Have you used public transportation services in Beverly Hills? |
|---|---|
| **Answer Choices** | **Responses** |
| Yes, I have used public transportation in Beverly Hills | 27.7% |
| I rarely use public transportation | 0.0% |
| I have never taken public transportation in Beverly Hills and I have no interest in starting\(^1\) | 29.1% |
| I have never taken public transportation in Beverly Hills, but I am interested in starting\(^1\) | 22.8% |
| I have never taken public transportation in Beverly Hills, but I plan to start when the Metro Purple Line stations open in the City\(^1\) | 20.4% |

\(^1\)This question was open to all respondents.

\(^1\)This answer was used to determine the survey “skip logic” for follow up questions. These respondents were not asked questions specific to existing ridership behavior such as how they get to local transit stops.
To explore the scenarios in which the “I have never taken public transit in Beverly Hills” cohort would consider riding, these respondents were asked “If frequent and reliable public transportation was available where you needed to go, how often would you take it?”. Under this scenario, nearly 40 percent of users indicated a likelihood of using public transit everyday or at least once a week (Figure 4). Of the remaining 60 percent, roughly half (32 percent) indicated that they would consider transit for occasional use or to get to special events and 27 percent indicated they would still not consider transit a viable mobility option. Overall, this suggests that transit may transform a percentage of the “I have never taken public transit in Beverly Hills” cohort into riders by operating a frequent and reliable service that provides access to popular community destinations.

Figure 4 Willingness to Take Transit In Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyday</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekends only</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a month</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To special events only</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not think I will ever take public transit</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction

35 percent of users rated current transit services within the city as “very good” or “good” (Figure 5). However, the modal response was a “fair” rating. The following section explores the barriers that riders experience which may contribute to the “fair” or “poor” ratings. This question was only asked of people who indicated they had taken public transit in Beverly Hills.
Barriers to Transit

Barriers to accessing or comfortably navigating a transit network prevent people from perceiving or experiencing transit as a viable and quality way to get around. This depresses transit ridership and undermines its ability to be a competitive transportation alternative. The “I have used public transit in Beverly Hills” cohort was asked to evaluate a list of barriers for relevance to their ridership experience (on a scale of “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”) (
Figure 6). A weighted average was applied to these responses and resulted in the following barrier rankings from most significant to least:

1. Existing transit services take too long or do not run on time
2. Transfers are confusing, time consuming, or costly
3. Public transportation does not go where I need to go or serve nearby my home
4. Transit stops are too far from my common origins or destinations
5. I do not understand how to use the system

Additional barriers were provided via the write-in option. Comments highlighted difficulties accessing transit stations due to distances between the stops and the rider origin or destination; uncomfortable or unsafe connections to transit for people walking, using a wheelchair, and biking; and safety concerns while riding transit.
Destinations

Determining where people want to go is an important aspect of understanding whether the current transit system is making those connections at all – agnostic of quality of service – or where future service may be most successful. The survey asked every user to list their “[up to] top three destinations when travelling within Beverly Hills”. This question received a 61 percent response rate and asked people to answer in comment form rather than selecting from a pre-determined list. All comments were compiled (regardless of which order the destinations were listed) and mapped. In addition, responses from the live exercise conducted during the public workshops were preserved and added to the map. Figure 7 shows a concentration of destinations within and near the Golden Triangle and along Wilshire Blvd. Several travel corridors were highlighted by users:

- **North-South Corridors**
  - Rodeo Dr
  - Beverly Dr
  - Canon Dr
  - Rexford Dr
  - Robertson Blvd

- **E-W Corridors**
  - Santa Monica Blvd
  - Olympic Blvd
  - Beverly Blvd

---

4 In most instances, corridors stated in responses did not indicate corridor segments, such as north or south of a given cross street. Because of this, the full corridor was included for mapping purposes.
Frequent location types cited by users included medical facilities such as urgent cares and Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, parks, public schools, commercial/retail areas (e.g. coffee shops and restaurants), civic centers (e.g. Post office, library), and religious institutions.
Figure 7 Top Destinations Within Beverly Hills

Source: Kittelson and Associates, Inc. 2022
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These destinations are sourced from an online survey and public workshops (Summer 2022) in which users responded to the question “What are your top destinations when traveling within Beverly Hills?” Some destinations just outside the City boundary are included to acknowledge the “grey zone” for nearby inter-community connections.
Limitations

It is prudent to note the factors which may have shaped the survey response pool. While outreach occurred both online, in person, and through traditional media outlets, the survey itself was distributed exclusively online and in English. Access to the internet, language barriers, and lack of discretionary time to spend responding to a City survey or attend City events — such as the public workshop — may have resulted in under-representation of certain populations or on specific answers such as those that asked for “write-in” responses (e.g. the Destination question). To keep the survey focused on critical community feedback, demographic questions were limited. However, a comparison of age, which was collected, to 2020 American Community Survey (5 Year) data shows that the median age in Beverly Hills is 47 years old which falls within the largest responding cohort 35-49 (46 percent). Only 1 percent of people responding indicated they were under 18 (this is less than the 5 percent of the population between the age of 15-17). The Survey was distributed to Beverly Hills Unified School district social media and Parent Teacher Association channels, potentially leading to overrepresentation of guardians who participate in these forums.
Discussions with Los Angeles Metro (Metro), West Hollywood, and Culver City were organized in order to explore the successes and experiences of different transit services, models, and networks. These peer agencies were chosen based on the following criteria:

- Presence of transit services that supplement Metro lines
- Similar rider demographics and experiences to those of Beverly Hills
- Locality to Beverly Hills

The Plan Review, Existing Conditions Analysis, Peer Benchmarking memo identified additional potential peers (Huntington Beach, Laguna Beach, and Santa Monica). However, while the service of these peer cities was analyzed, the selected benchmarking conversations focused on peers with experiences operating locally to gain additional input on local considerations and coordination with relevant Los Angeles County institutions.

Key takeaways from each peer agency discussion are discussed below.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)

The project team organized a virtual discussion with Metro on Monday, August 15, 2022. The following sections summarize key topics mentioned throughout the conversation.

EXISTING SERVICE

LOCAL BUS SERVICE

The northern part of Beverly Hills is served primarily by Line 2. The central and southern parts of Beverly Hills are served by Lines 4, 20, 28, 105, 617, and 720. Currently, Lines 4, 20, and 720 carry the majority of passengers within Beverly Hills, and are among Metro’s most productive lines in the system. Most of the transit service provided is primarily along east-west corridors. Only Lines 105 and 617 partially travel along north-south corridors within the City.

Table 2 summarizes the existing Metro lines that currently serve the City of Beverly Hills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Number</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Route Description</th>
<th>Peak Frequency (minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Metro Local Line</td>
<td>East-West travel via Sunset Blvd</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Metro Local Line</td>
<td>East-West travel via Santa Monica Blvd</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Metro Local Line</td>
<td>East-West travel via Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Metro Local Line</td>
<td>East-West travel via Olympic Blvd</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Metro Local Line</td>
<td>North-South travel via La Cienega Blvd</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2018, Metro launched an effort to reimagine the bus system to better meet the needs of current and future riders through goals such as (1) doubling the number of frequent Metro bus lines and (2) providing more than 80 percent of current bus riders with 10 minute or better frequency. The NextGen Bus Plan was developed through consideration of technical data and public outreach that included over 400 meetings, events, and workshops over two years. It was approved by the Metro Board of Directors in October 2020.

Research supporting the plan showed a trend toward more people using Metro for shorter trips than longer trips. The restructuring plan sought to meet these needs with higher service frequency and a simplified network focused on local service with rebalanced bus stop spacing targeting ¼ mile between stops, and subsequently transitioning away from a comprehensive, longer-distance Rapid bus network. The NextGen Bus Plan service changes were developed to improve the speed, reliability, and accessibility of the transit system. These service changes are summarized in Table 3.

Challenges related to COVID-19, including an operator shortage, have currently disrupted Metro’s ability to operate full service, and as a result, service frequencies in Beverly Hills and across the Metro network are lower than envisioned for full implementation of the NextGen plan.
# Table 3: NextGen Service Changes Impacting Beverly Hills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Agency</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Route Name</th>
<th>High level description of NextGen service changes</th>
<th>Weekday Frequency, Pre-NextGen (minutes)</th>
<th>NextGen Weekday Service Change Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peak Hour</td>
<td>Midday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Downtown LA – Westwood via Sunset Blvd</td>
<td><strong>More Frequency, Simpler network</strong> Merges Lines 2, 302, and 200</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Downtown LA – Santa Monica via Santa Monica Blvd</td>
<td><strong>More Frequency, Simpler network</strong> Merges Lines 4 &amp; 704 on Santa Monica Blvd</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Downtown LA – Westwood/Santa Monica via Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td><strong>More Frequency, Simpler network</strong> Merges Lines 20 &amp; 720 between downtown Santa Monica and Downtown LA via Wilshire</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Century City – Downtown LA via Olympic Blvd</td>
<td><strong>More Frequency, Simpler network</strong> New high frequency line. Merges 28 &amp; 728.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>West Hollywood – Vernon via La Cienega Blvd/ Vernon Ave</td>
<td><strong>More Frequency, Simpler network</strong> New high frequency line. Merges 105 &amp; 705.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>Beverly Dr – Burton Way – Robertson Blvd Shuttle</td>
<td><strong>New Line</strong> Simplifies network with a higher frequency. E Line Culver City station to Cedars-Sinai Medical Center/Beverly Center via Robertson Blvd, west via Burton Wy and South on Beverly Dr. to Pico Blvd (replacing Lines 14 &amp;16 &amp; 17 on those streets)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>Santa Monica – Downtown LA via Wilshire Blvd</td>
<td><strong>More Frequency, Simpler network</strong> New High Freq line 20 merging 20 &amp; 720. Peak service only.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Metro, 2022
METRO MICRO

In 2020, Metro launched a three-year on-demand rideshare service pilot project called Metro Micro. They offer trips within their five service zones across Los Angeles County. The new service is designed to serve shorter local trips and uses small vehicles with seating for up to 10 passengers. Metro Micro as a concept was envisioned to form part of a family of Metro services, and service area pilot zones were designed to be incorporated into the Metro network in conjunction with the NextGen Bus Plan. The service is designed to be a fast, safe, and convenient option for quick trips around town.

Within the context of the Westside, the pilot has so far proven reasonably successful among college students in the Westwood area. Digital familiarity is viewed by Metro staff as key for microtransit and thus adoption has not been as successful among older residents. However, Metro has experienced that once passengers become familiar with how to request and use the service, they enjoy the service.

Metro Micro implementation also has not had a perceivable negative impact on fixed-route bus ridership. The following data provides a high-level summary of current pilot performance to date:

- Trip length of 2-3 miles on average
- 3 passengers per hour on average
- Operational cost of $30 per ride, which is higher than the average fixed route operational costs
- 60 percent of the rides are shared with other community members
- High trip-reject rate
- Consistent growth that may be capped by service availability

RIDERSHIP IMPACTS FROM THE OPENING OF THE E (EXPO) LINE

Given the similarity of intent and geographic location of the D (Purple) Line, its opening may trigger similar ridership trend impacts as the opening of the fully-completed E (Expo) Line. With the full opening of the E Line, parallel east-west bus lines decreased in ridership by about 25 percent. There was some increase along the north-south lines connecting to the E Line, but the bulk of the increase in ridership was seen by the municipal agencies (Culver City and Santa Monica) responsible for the majority of connecting bus service in the new portion of the service area.

LIMITATIONS OF AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR SERVICE ENHANCEMENTS

There is a prime opportunity for both Metro and Beverly Hills to work together to improve local and regional transit network connectivity around future D Line stations. Metro staff interviewed feel there can be a beneficial role for additional municipal service in these areas to meet demand. As long as these services do not conflict, Metro is supportive of the City’s effort to improve transit services. Metro staff also identified opportunities to connect the residents of Beverly Hills by providing better north-south transit service connections.

With the NextGen Bus Plan, Line 617 was planned to receive increased service frequency of up to 15 minutes; however, this target has not been met due to Metro’s ongoing operator shortage. Metro staff also identified additional Line 617 improvement opportunities, namely a reroute onto Canon Drive to provide a more direct connection to the future Purple Line station at Wilshire and Rodeo.

Metro staff also shared a concern that some riders making longer trips may find the changes introduced with the NextGen bus plan to inconvenience with multiple bus transfers. The completion of the D Line extension to Westwood and the Veterans Administration hospital will hopefully reduce this burden.
West Hollywood

The project team organized a virtual discussion with West Hollywood’s Social Services division on Thursday, August 11, 2022. The following sections summarize key topics discussed throughout the conversation.

EXISTING SERVICE

The City of West Hollywood is served by fixed route and on-demand services operated by LA Metro and the City. It also offers specialized and subsidized services to seniors (age 62+) and people with disabilities. Table 4 summarizes the existing services West Hollywood currently offers.

Table 4: Existing West Hollywood Transit Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CityLine Local</td>
<td>Free daytime shuttle (M-Sat 9AM-5:30PM) that runs every 30 minutes and serves stops throughout the City of West Hollywood. The shuttle serves all purpose intra-community trips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CityLine Commuter</td>
<td>Free rush hour and Saturday evening service connecting the City of West Hollywood and the Hollywood/Highland Metro B (Red) Line Station. The shuttle runs 15-minute frequency on weekdays 7AM-9AM and 5PM-8PM and Saturdays 5PM-8PM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PickUp</td>
<td>Launched in August 2013 as a free entertainment shuttle that ran Fri-Sat (8PM-3AM) along Santa Monica Blvd between Fairfax Ave and Doheny Drive. It operates Friday through Saturday (8PM-3AM) and on Sunday (2PM-10PM) with a frequency of 15 minutes between Robertson Blvd and La Brea Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial-A-Ride</td>
<td>Free shared-ride transportation service. Trips are scheduled by appointment only and can be scheduled up to a week in advance. Regular shuttles provide trips for grocery shopping, to UCLA Medical Center, and VA West Los Angeles. Serves anywhere within West Hollywood, UCLA, VA, Kaiser (Cadillac and Sunset) and West Hollywood social service agencies. Only available for West Hollywood residents aged 62 or older and community members with disabilities at any age. All vehicles are ADA accessible. Curb-to-curb and Door-to-door options are available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Call Transportation (Lyft/Uber)</td>
<td>Registration required service that is available on short notice, without advanced reservations. They are operating 24/7 and advertise to pick up riders within 15 minutes. Serves anywhere within the City of West Hollywood and up to a 10 mile radius from the border of the City of West Hollywood boundaries. Only available for West Hollywood residents aged 62 or older and community members with disabilities at any age. ADA accessible vehicles are available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: West Hollywood, 2022

RIDERSHIP TRENDS ACROSS SERVICES

During the pandemic, ridership across all services decreased sharply. However, ridership is presently trending slightly upward. Prior to the pandemic, the CityLine Commuter route was highly popular, representing 60 percent of West Hollywood municipal transit ridership. CityLine Commuter route ridership is
still well below pre-pandemic ridership, which City staff attribute to the shift toward working from home. CityLine Local ridership volume is also still below pre-pandemic ridership; however, it is recovering faster than CityLine Commuter given changing worksite dynamics among the conventional daytime commuter population.

Anecdotal evidence from City staff in the absence of surveys conducted since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic suggests that each service has unique demographics, which had in the past been supported by survey data. CityLine Local serves an older population, with many city seniors using the service to access community resources and grocery stores, while CityLine Commuter service users are demographically more similar to the city population as a whole.

The PickUp service is currently performing higher than pre-pandemic with approximately 2,000 trips per weekend compared to 1,700 trips. Based on 90 percent of participants of a 2019 survey, most riders are local residents, under the age of 40, and male. On Sunday, there are more older participants.

**UPCOMING OPPORTUNITIES**

As ridership increases, the City of West Hollywood will continue to find ways to improve local and regional connectivity. With the opening of the D Line extension, the City of West Hollywood would like to accommodate future demand by providing a second commuter route.

Recently, the council approved the proposal for a microtransit pilot project. The intent of this project is to transition away from Dial-A-Ride and provide a citywide, general public microtransit service with a priority for city seniors and residents with disabilities served by the current Dial-A-Ride service. While trips will still be offered to qualifying populations for free, West Hollywood plans to charge non-qualifying riders a fare.

Since the West Hollywood shares a border with Beverly Hills, City staff agree there is a great opportunity for collaboration to improve connections between the two cities, such as along Doheny Drive.

Culver City

The project team organized a virtual discussion with Culver City’s Transportation department on Wednesday, September 7, 2022. The following sections summarize key topics mentioned throughout the conversation.

**EXISTING SERVICE**

The City of Culver City provides several varieties of transit services to help residents, workers, and visitors travel around the city. Table 5 summarizes the existing Culver City transit service classifications.

**Table 5: Existing Culver City Transit Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CityBus</td>
<td>CityBus operated fixed-route service provides connections throughout Culver City and communities in Los Angeles including Century City, Marina del Ray,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 https://www.weho.org/services/social-services/community-study
and Westwood. The services interface with major destinations from UCLA to Metro C (Green) and E (Expo) Lines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CityBus Local Circulator</th>
<th>Pilot circulator routes to provide additional frequency to existing fixed-route alignments and support recent investments in dedicated transit infrastructure on key city arterial streets.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Route 1C1</strong> Culver City Downtown Circulator offers free rides between downtown and the Arts District via the Metro E Line. The circulator uses an electric, low-floor minibus and runs every 10 minutes at peak hour and 15 minutes in the off-peak. <strong>Routes 5C1 and 5C2</strong> are weekday circulators that operate when school is in session, serving Culver City Middle School and High School as well as Downtown and La Cienega Blvd. 5C1 connects the Arts District and Clarksdale to Washington Blvd while 5C2 connects Overland Ave and Fox Hills to Washington Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit</td>
<td>Free electric shuttle service (microtransit) that connects destinations between downtown Culver City, the Art District, and Hayden Tract. It operates weekdays 8AM-5PM and on weekends 10AM-8PM.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Culver City, 2022

**LESSONS LEARNED FROM E (EXPO) LINE DEVELOPMENT**

In 2005, Culver City was starting to prepare for the opening of Metro’s E (Expo) Line. The Culver City station was proposed as an intermodal transit facility with an off-street transit center in Metro’s right-of-way. During its design, the culture of Culver City was more car-oriented, thus concerns primarily involved traffic impacts of buses coming in and out of Metro’s right-of-way. Negotiations with Metro resulted in an above-grade rail station and improved integration of the bus transit center to improve intermodal connections.

After the Culver City station opened, the city experienced significant development around the station area, with the City working with developers to incorporate transit-oriented principles into new developments and support improvements to streetscape planning. However, even with enhancements to bus transit connectivity, station access by car still experienced overwhelming demand, and the 300 parking spaces that were provided were insufficient to meet the demand for parking at the station. This experience led City staff to advance the Move Culver City project to improve transit connectivity throughout Culver City’s urban core and station area and improve the bus transit experience to encourage more transit use.

**MOVE CULVER CITY INITIATIVE**

Move Culver City is implementing the vision set forth in the City’s TOD Visioning Plan (adopted in 2017) & the Bicycle and Pedestrian Action Plan to implement holistic transportation options for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders. To achieve this, the Culver City Transportation Department is looking to implement three Tactical Mobility Lane Pilot Projects through the quick-build process in three different phases:

- **Phase 1**: Tactical Mobility Lane on Washington Boulevard
- **Phase 2**: Tactical Mobility Lane on Sepulveda Boulevard
- **Phase 3**: Tactical Mobility Lane on Jefferson Boulevard

Kittelson & Associates, Inc.
These pilot projects will serve as the opportunity for Culver City to learn how the permanent infrastructure improvement would work and demonstrate the benefits of such infrastructure to maximize the use of the roadway.

CIRCULATOR INTEGRATION

In November 2021, Culver City introduced an electric, low-floor minibus circulator scheduled to run every 10 minutes at peak times and every 15 minutes off-peak. Until January 2023, the circulator will remain free and open to the public. The intent behind the addition of the circulator to the Move Culver City pilot project, as well as the use of converted electric passenger vans instead of conventional transit buses, was to help make service more accessible and convenient for residents and reduce the stigma of riding transit. During the school year, additional circulator routes that serve Culver City Middle School and High School are now offered after organizing by the school district and parents. Unlike the initial 1C1 circulator route, the school routes are not free to the public, but in practice are free for students through a subsidized transit pass program developed in coordination with the school district.

Ridership is currently lower than anticipated due to a variety of challenges, including some technology challenges with the vehicles used for service, operator shortages, and overlapping services with Metro’s Line 1. Since the 1C1 service area expanded in June 2022, ridership has grown slightly. Additional marketing and branding is planned to better publicize the circulator’s availability and benefits to the community.
PROSPECTIVE SERVICE DESIGN AND MODE SUITABILITY ANALYSIS

Beverly Hills is well-suited for a variety of transit options, with a compact footprint, a strong grid pattern, and a mix of land uses that provides consistent all-day sources of travel demand. Two complementary options are most well-suited for consideration in the form of an early pilot. Advancement of either of these two options – or a combination of both – will help to better inform actual transit needs of the community through real-world practical experience, and can be further adjusted or serve as a basis for an informed transition to a different service configuration.

The two options proposed for further consideration under this study are City-controlled fixed-route transit and City-controlled microtransit. Fixed route transit operates like conventional public transportation as seen within Beverly Hills today provided by Metro, operating along defined routes on defined schedules, serving defined stops. Microtransit is an emerging technology option that offers on-demand routing between more widely spaced origins and destinations using smaller transit vehicles.

It is recommended that any service be first offered in the form of a limited pilot period under the administration of the City of Beverly Hills. This will allow the City to explore alternatives and respond more quickly to needs that may arise.

Prospective Service Design

Based on the existing service provided within Beverly Hills, the future regional connections provided by the upcoming D Line extension, current and future demographics and land use patterns, as well as community input from public outreach and community preference surveys, a combination of one or more fixed-route circulator routes and a microtransit service area would provide the desired service throughout Beverly Hills, appropriate connections to maximize the effectiveness of the regional transit network, and provide the most effective means of reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) throughout the city. Conceptual details of each component and their respective roles in a community transit network are explored below.

Fixed-Route Circulator

The fixed-route service model uses multi-passenger vehicles operating along defined routes on defined schedules to serve passengers at defined stops without reservations. While routes can be of any length, what is commonly referred to as a “circulator” model often operates shorter routes targeted to intra-community local circulation needs, and often uses smaller vehicles. The fixed-route circulator model is recommended to be the primary service incorporated into a Beverly Hills transit pilot due to the geography served, anticipated passenger volumes, existing complementary regional transit connections, and the highest relative cost efficiency.

Fixed-route service allows for trips to be aggregated into a more efficient footprint, offering potential for reductions in vehicle miles traveled (VMT), especially if paired with other priority measures that can improve travel times to match or fall below single-occupancy vehicle travel times such as dedicated transit lanes, shared bus/bike lanes, or emerging options such as municipal high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes.

Public input received over the course of this study indicated that interest was strong throughout the community in a fast connection into the upcoming D Line stations being constructed along Wilshire...
Boulevard at La Cienega Boulevard and Rodeo Drive, which can be best achieved with a dedicated linear bus route focusing on a limited number of arterial streets. The greatest transit circulation need within the community is for north-south connectivity, as identified through community input and LA Metro peer discussions, since the regional east-west connectivity continues to be strong with the upcoming D Line and surface transportation options along Sunset, Santa Monica, Wilshire, and Olympic Boulevards.

Fixed-route transit propensity is greatest from Santa Monica Boulevard to the south of the city, as the intensity of commercial activity and greater relative density provides the concentration of residents and commercial points of interest that offers the greatest potential ridership base. The residential land use patterns north of Santa Monica Boulevard are traditionally associated with lower all-day transit propensity and utilization, and it is not evident through public outreach that there is strong unmet demand in this portion of the city, but this area may be suitable for alternative service delivery mechanisms such as microtransit to ensure citywide transit coverage.

From the community survey and public workshop feedback in addition to lessons learned from peer city benchmarking, there is also evidence to suggest other time-limited service could be effective, particularly morning and afternoon service connecting the parts of the city with the greatest concentrations of enrolled students to local schools. It is not evident that there is strong unmet demand north of Santa Monica Boulevard for all-day fixed-route service, but exploring extending a fixed-route, commute-oriented service to connect the Flats region to the upcoming D Line stations as part of a pilot program if resources are available, or if other potential pilot resources like microtransit vehicles are made available for time-limited service.

## Microtransit

Microtransit is an emerging transit mode that builds on the traditional Dial-A-Ride model by chaining individual trip requests together with on-demand routes generated through third-party software. Trips may be requested using an app similar to those used by ride-hailing services or by phone through a dispatch center. In areas where fixed-route service is less attractive due to longer distances to access service or longer trip times – generally areas of moderate to lower density – microtransit can offer a connection to the public transit network.

A key advantage of microtransit is that a broader area with lower demand can remain connected to the greater transit network using fewer resources than would be required to provide appropriate coverage with fixed-route service. Service can be deployed only as needed, and can remain available at key connection points such as the future D Line stations to capture outbound demand immediately during periods of lower utilization.

However, Microtransit can become capacity-constrained as ridership increases, and popular service at peak travel times can introduce longer wait times. Microtransit is also more resource-intensive on a per-passenger basis, as local experience through LA Metro’s Metro Micro program indicates that service efficiency is limited to approximately four passengers per service hour, while peer region experience in San Diego County with fixed-route circulators in lower-density suburban areas saw its least efficient routes averaging ten passengers per revenue hour.

Microtransit is also challenged in areas with low all-day demand but higher concentrations of demand at specific times, such as office parks or school trips, as the lower-capacity vehicles are less suited to dealing with larger levels of demand. Regular customers with routine travel needs may also find daily trip reservations and changing daily wait time variability to be an impediment to perceived service reliability.
However, microtransit also offers a way of collecting travel demand data in real-time to determine where future fixed-route service can offer capacity to meet demand that may exceed the constraints of microtransit service more effectively. Examples from an early pilot in Eugene, Oregon that replaced underperforming fixed-route service saw demand exceed supply quickly, with many microtransit riders in the pilot region making consistent trips throughout the week, and data from that pilot was used to relaunch several fixed-route lines that better matched the changes in demand observed through the microtransit pilot. Similarly, in San Diego, previous Dial-A-Ride service assets connecting business parks in the Sorrento Valley region with the North County Transit District’s Sorrento Valley COASTER commuter rail station were transitioned into fixed-route services, as MTS discovered that standing trip reservations for repeated weekday trips significantly outnumbered unreserved trips.

Within Beverly Hills, a microtransit pilot is likely to be the most successful service strategy for portions of the city north of Santa Monica Boulevard. Depending on the limitations of any prospective partner platform, which will have their own recommended criteria for service zones based on specific operating model configurations (such as whether to limit pickups to certain virtual stops), it may be possible for the full portion of the city north of Santa Monica Boulevard to be served by a single microtransit zone. As with fixed-route transit, network connectivity is critical to the success of any transit service, and limited specific connections into the regional network outside of the microtransit zone would be strongly advised, such as incorporating the future D Line stations along Wilshire Boulevard as exclaves of the microtransit zone.

If evidence of peak commute-oriented demand exists within the microtransit zone, it may be more efficient to instead operate peak service along a fixed route to more efficiently capture demand and reduce overall trip times, while transitioning back to a microtransit model outside peak commute hours. This would require the use of vehicles that would support both operating models, which will be discussed later in this memorandum.

**Prospective Service Costs**

Detailed costs will need to be developed based on an evaluation of exact route alignments using reasonable and realistic real-world travel speeds, but for purposes of high-level estimations of recommended service volumes, certain variables can be used.

Service costs are more predictable with contracted service, with most contracts offering service on a per-hour basis. Additional detailed benchmarking into costs associated with contracting should be conducted to develop a more detailed independent cost estimate, as the range of costs can vary widely depending on the responsibilities of the contractor, including to what extent any vehicle costs are associated with the contract. For simplicity in adjusting further estimations, an estimated contract rate of $100 per vehicle per hour is assumed, but additional vetting is required and is a recommended future task.

A draft circulator routing was developed, operating with a one-way distance of 5.2 miles on an alignment using Beverly Drive, Olympic Boulevard, La Cienega Boulevard, Robertson Boulevard, Burton Way, Doheny Drive, Beverly Boulevard, and Foothill Road to represent an approximate all-day circulator route. With an estimated in-service average travel speed of 12 miles per hour, including stops for passengers and traffic signals, one bus could complete one loop in under half an hour. To operate this loop bidirectionally with 15-minute frequency, four buses would be required per hour. Assuming an eighteen-hour service day and 365 days a year of service, one fixed circulator route would have a gross annual operating cost of $2,628,000. Further adjustments could be made to increase service in peak hours or to decrease service frequency much later in the evenings on weekdays when demand may be lower if included in a contract and staffing levels are feasible.
Microtransit service costs are more difficult to calculate if being operated directly, but a similar hourly cost on the part of the contractor could be reasonably expected since labor will be the primary cost driver. Providing one additional staffed bus to operate within the city for eighteen hours a day with similar cost assumptions adds another annual marginal cost of $657,000.

Similarly, a peak overlay service extending further into residential areas and connecting to Beverly Hills High School could require an additional two peak vehicles per hour for two hours a day, depending on resource availability, service design, and input from school officials and parents depending on need, and would add $68,000 per year in gross costs based on a 170-day academic calendar with similar assumptions.

It should be strongly cautioned that these are very rough, high-level cost estimates intended as a basis for order-of-magnitude level consideration for approximate budgeting purposes, and that more information with respect to service design and current real-world costs given recent inflation must be taken into consideration.

It is advised to start a new service with a “best foot forward” approach, ensuring that initial service levels upon launch are convenient and competitive to attract and retain passengers. Launching service with lower levels of investment short of the previously mentioned attractive frequent service levels and making plans to scale up service if demand increases will result in a first impression of service that is not useful enough to meet enough needs for enough people, and additional demand is less likely to materialize.

**Options Not Currently Recommended for Further Consideration**

While the urban form and demands of Beverly Hills could likely support one or more of several different transit operating models, at this time this study does not recommend immediate advancement of several concepts. Among several concepts considered but not advanced are:

- Partnerships with Los Angeles Metro to subsidize additional Metro service
- Partnerships with neighboring municipalities to share existing models of transit service
- Neighborhood Electric Vehicle (NEV) microtransit
- Transportation Network Company (TNC) subsidies
- Streetcar

**PARTNERSHIP WITH LA METRO**

A compelling option for many cities across the United States is to enter partnership arrangements with their regional transit operator, in this case LA Metro, to support additional transit service that otherwise is difficult
for Metro to feasibly support within the financial constraints under which they operate. This model would pose a low-risk alternative for Beverly Hills by supporting the operations of the regional provider already operating within City limits to increase service levels, and depending on the exact arrangements of a potential agreement, allow the City to exert stronger influence over service decisions. Challenges with this model are a lack of precedent within Los Angeles County as explored by this memorandum’s authors as of the time of this writing, particularly given Los Angeles County’s long history with standalone municipal operators supplementing regional service, as well as the considerable unknowns of acceptance of any arrangement by an outside Board of Directors and unknowns over any agency-wide regional equity considerations. While this model could prove cost-effective to the City with lower administrative burden by leveraging existing public resources, the number of remaining variables are challenging to the success of a service given a goal of entering a demonstration pilot period on a short time horizon.

PARTNERSHIP WITH NEIGHBORING MUNICIPALITIES

Similarly, entering into a contractual relationship with neighboring municipalities either directly operating (such as Culver City or Santa Monica) or contracting transit service of their own (such as West Hollywood) is also a practical and generally financially viable option. The City of Beverly Hills already offers an excellent example of this arrangement through their relationship with the City of West Hollywood for on-demand Dial-A-Ride service for qualifying residents. However, similar challenges to the above case of Metro exist in the unknowns that arise in any negotiations with outside parties. A partnership of this nature leverages economies of scale for efficient use of resources; however, due to the greater demand on timeline and resources, this is an option that is recommended for further consideration at a later date if a standalone City-led pilot proves successful.

NEV MICROTRANSIT

A service option benchmarked in other communities such as downtown Santa Monica and Huntington Beach is the prospect of a microtransit service operated by smaller neighborhood electric vehicles, or NEVs. These vehicles are lower-capacity, with up to six seats, and are speed-restricted to operate solely on lower-speed urban streets. This option has also been so far implemented within denser entertainment and retail districts where vehicular congestion is generally already high. While these vehicles are most commonly operated in partnership with third-party service providers and supported by advertising revenue to keep overall cost to municipalities or contracting business improvement districts low, their capacity limitations limit the upper range of their service efficiency on a passenger per hour basis, and often do not offer the congestion reduction goals within their service areas since they are less able to efficiently pool trips. While effective service in the Triangle is critical to the success of a prospective Beverly Hills service, and while there is viability for a microtransit pilot in other portions of the city, the existing implementation model for this service is not seen as a good match for Beverly Hills’ climate and circulation needs and goals at this time.

TNC SUBSIDIES

An option explored by several less-dense municipalities in Southern California and across the United States is entering into partnership arrangements with Transportation Network Companies (TNCs), also referred to as ride-hailing services, with major examples being the Uber and Lyft platforms. This approach itself can take several different shapes, with discounted trips throughout a defined zone, discounted trips originating or terminating in a zone but with discounts available for trips leaving the zone, or discounted trips originating or terminating at defined transit centers. This option has found qualified success in more suburban areas such as San Clemente, California and Pinellas County, Florida, but in most instances structurally relies upon demand within a given region being low enough to warrant a subsidy for an outside
service proving more cost-effective – or freeing up enough resources that can be more successfully deployed elsewhere – than investment in standalone alternatives. In addition, the finances of TNCs over the course of the COVID-19 pandemic and the changing regulatory environment in California raises concerns over the long-term sustainability of a program dependent on third-party platforms. The lower-occupancy vehicle operating model has also demonstrated negative traffic congestion impacts that are contrary to the climate and traffic goals shared by the City.

**STREETCAR**

Finally, the idea of a streetcar was considered but dismissed primarily on the basis of significant upfront capital costs relative to unproven ridership demand. Streetcars are a popular mode in the United States in downtown regions for circulation, but pose significant challenges in operations – especially in mixed-traffic environments where streetcars share their operating space with other private vehicles and can become subject to delay. Maintenance space needs also pose a significant challenge given the limited land available within city limits. Streetcars are commonly viewed as offering a degree of transit permanence to downtown regions and have proven to be a popular economic development strategy, but when passenger surveys ask transit riders and the community (including the Beverly Hills community) about priorities in transit service, usability and timeliness are more important than the specific mode. **Streetcars may have a role in the future if other transit services prove to offer consistent passenger demand along a particular alignment, but demand should first be proven through other modes with lower upfront capital costs such as fixed-route bus before consideration of more permanent investment.**

**UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS**

A thorough review of the 2020 Westside Cities Council of Governments Mobility Study, 2021 Beverly Hills Complete Streets Plan, and recent community surveys and outreach was conducted to identify the unmet transit needs in Beverly Hills. Throughout these discussions and review, several recurring themes became apparent:

- A majority of survey respondents view the current transit network’s service within Beverly Hills as “fair” or “poor”
- The existing transit network is viewed as unreliable and inconvenient
- Several destinations of interest are missing from the current network

This section will highlight the specific weaknesses referenced through this project’s outreach with respect to missing connections, as well as key community points of interest that have been identified as integral to any municipal service network.

**Gaps in Existing Transit Network**

There are currently seven primary Metro lines that the City of Beverly Hills rely on to get to their destinations: Lines 2, 4, 20/720, 28, 105, and 617. These lines are not only limited in frequency, but also limited in destinations. These lines serve the following respective corridors: Sunset Boulevard, Santa Monica Boulevard, Wilshire Boulevard, Olympic Boulevard, La Cienega Boulevard, Burton Way, and Beverly Drive. Despite strong coverage along east-west corridors with frequent crosstown service, there are little to no lines that connect these corridors together.
Only one route is designed to provide some level of intra-community circulation within Beverly Hills – Line 617, a new service that combined segments of previous routes in place prior to the NextGen bus network rollout – but the frequency levels that Metro has been able to operate given current operator shortages have left this service categorized as more of a “lifeline” service, operating once per hour per direction to ensure that service is available for those without any other option, but remaining very difficult for most current and prospective riders to incorporate into routine travel.

Bridging the transit connection gap between the northern part of the City (above Sunset Boulevard) and the southern part of the City (south of Santa Monica Boulevard) is important since the northern part of Beverly Hills offers community members access to high-quality community public space and outdoor activity areas identified as key destinations during outreach. These areas include, but are not limited to, Greystone Mansion, Will Rogers Memorial Park, The Maltz Park, Virginia Robinson Gardens, Coldwater Canyon Park, and Franklin Canyon Park.

On a smaller scale, much interest has been shared with the project team on improving circulation within the Triangle, especially among visitors that may currently be compelled to travel between parking areas to visit multiple destinations within the city. A transit solution that can help visitors arriving to Beverly Hills by car that can connect existing City parking structures near other destinations to key community destinations is considered valuable.

There has also been a desire to integrate local schools such as Beverly Hills High School into the transit network. However, this desire is unable to be met with the transit network in the City today given its location away from the major crosstown travel corridors.

The opening of the D Line stations along Wilshire Boulevard will bring an influx of demand for transit connections along this corridor. Lines 20 and 720 alone are operationally unable to meet this incoming demand, and their structure will help to carry passengers incrementally further in the same direction of travel, but will not themselves serve to meaningfully expand the reach of this new rail service. Moreover, there currently aren’t enough transit lines traveling north-south that are able to connect community members to these future stations.

It is also key to note that transit is only a part of the solution to completely bridge the gaps within the network. Non-motorized connections will be important to think through and tie into the transit network resolve first and last mile accessibility, especially with the opening of the D Line stations along Wilshire Boulevard. The Beverly Hills Complete Streets Plan has identified several nonmotorized links within the community that will be crucial in expanding the effective reach of the new rail service in addition to any added surface transit service.

Key Destinations Identified from Outreach

There are several key destinations that have been identified by the community through the online survey and the interactive mapping exercise from public meetings. The following destinations are points within the City of Beverly Hills where the community members currently go to or wishes to go to:

- Commercial and retail shops within the Business Triangle
- Community assets such as City Hall, City Public Library
- Schools including Beverly Hills High School, Beverly Vista Middle School, and Horace Mann Elementary School
- Outdoor activity areas including La Cienega Park, Roxbury Park, Greystone Mansion, Will Rogers Memorial Park, The Maltz Park, Virginia Robinson Gardens, Coldwater Canyon Park, and Franklin Canyon Park
- Grocery stores (e.g. Ralphs on Beverly Boulevard, Whole Foods Market on Crescent Drive, and Pavilions on Olympic Boulevard)

These destinations should be considered in any future route recommendation to continue to create an interconnected transportation system that allows a shift in travel from private passenger vehicles to alternative modes.
**SERVICE DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS**

**Principles of Service Design**

For any public transit system to be successful, there are several key service area and service design attributes that need to be met, namely the concentration of origins and destinations both in geographic and temporal proximity, a degree of linearity in trip patterns that can be captured by one or more routes, and for areas with multiple routes, support for use of the complete network in route design and policy.

For a new transit service to be successful with respect to ridership and cost effectiveness, it needs to achieve most or all above goals. Listed below are strategies consistent with these goals that should be prioritized in any transit network development:

- **Routes should connect areas and people with the highest transit propensity in as direct of a path as possible.** These include areas with the greatest concentrations of residents and jobs, areas with the strongest retail and economic activity, and areas of greatest network interconnectivity. Linearity is also important to ensure that service can carry riders as far as possible as quickly as possible with as few operating resources as possible, such as buses, operator labor hours, and fuel.

- **Routes should be operated with the highest practical frequency, and with a span of service to match demand.** In most urban areas with consistent all-day activity, rider expectations are increasingly supporting high service frequencies, or the time between bus arrivals at a given stop, of no more than 15 minutes. At high service frequencies of 10 minutes or better, riders feel comfortable using transit without consulting a schedule, arriving to a stop knowing that service will be available soon. As service frequencies approach 15 minutes, more riders may seek out additional information such as schedules or real-time information to plan their trips, making using transit less intuitive and less convenient. As service frequencies exceed 15 minutes, more specific planning will be required by riders, leaving these trips only suitable for those with more predictable schedules and travel behavior, such as commutes to school or work, or riders with more travel flexibility such as retirees. Span of service, or the start and end times for the service day, should also be consistent with relative activity levels, and ensure that transit remains a viable option
  - **West Hollywood has found success emerging from the COVID-19 pandemic with its PickUp service, offering a frequent circulator during evenings and weekends targeted toward the community’s peak entertainment hours.**

- **Routes should form (or contribute to) a comprehensive transit network.** Much as a city is made up of a comprehensive set of streets that connect and operate as a uniform, cohesive network, so too does a successful transit network. Ensuring that each route adds value in connecting riders between different parts of the community while also connecting to other services that can facilitate complementary connections outside the community will ensure that service investments yield the greatest possible benefit. In the case of Beverly Hills, it is imperative that any new service leverages the regional investments made by the new Purple Line stations by providing connecting service. Routes should be spaced to minimize effective overlapping and duplicative service coverage, bearing in mind that the customary walking distance to access a service corridor is generally one-quarter mile.

**Funding Sources**

State, federal, and local resources exist to support funding capital infrastructure like vehicles, bus stop amenities, and transit facilities, and to varying extents, ongoing operations. Communities throughout Los
Angeles County also benefit from local Measure M transportation funding, and municipalities have a history of trading Measure M funding allocations with other local dollars as needs arise. For example, West Hollywood purchases excess Measure M funding from other Los Angeles County communities for arranged prices in unassigned budget dollars to support its transit operations. As the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for Los Angeles County, LA Metro will be able to provide further guidance on resources to support a transit pilot and potential permanent transit operation.

An important note is that while many transit operators provide commute-specific services tailored to certain segments of the population like school students, public transit funding support from the federal and state government is conditional upon the basis that service is open to the public without discrimination and cannot be exclusive to school students or other subsets of the population.

Below are sources of potential funding to explore:

- City of Beverly Hills
  - Fare revenues
  - City General Fund support
- Los Angeles County
  - Measure M funding, including bolstering the set local allocation with additional funding swaps
- State of California
  - State Transit Assistance (STA)
  - Transit Development Act (TDA)
  - Transit and InterCity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP)
- United States Government
  - Formula Grants (to be coordinated with LA Metro)
    - 5311 Urbanized Area Grants
    - Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG)
    - Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Grant Program
  - Discretionary Grants
    - 5339(c) Low- or No-Emission Vehicle Program
    - Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity (RAISE) Grant Program

**ADA Access and Bus Stops**

Transit operations must operate with accessibility at the forefront. All public transit vehicles are required to support personal mobility devices such as wheelchairs and mobility scooters by providing wheelchair ramps or lifts, and all public transit infrastructure including bus stops and bus shelters must be fully accessible to passengers with mobility limitations. Capital funding may be required to establish new bus stops in portions of the city not currently served by transit to ensure accessibility.

In addition, fixed-route transit operation also requires the provision of complementary ADA paratransit service. It is possible that new service may be fully within the existing Access Services service area, but future analysis and detailed service planning will be required to fully determine any additional paratransit service needs.
OPERATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

Fundamentals

The operation of transit service in any form requires several key non-negotiable attributes to be delivered. These attributes must be incorporated into any model from the beginning to ensure the greatest chance for system success.

- **Passenger safety and comfort**: Service should include on-board security cameras, security at major transfer points, adequate lighting on board vehicles and at waiting areas, and operator training to ensure that all riders feel comfortable and empowered to make use of the system without reservation or concern. Early system development discussions should include input on security, including obtaining a security contractor and developing an ambassador program to provide a face for the service, or developing a relationship with the Beverly Hills Police Department for select oversight in limited circumstances. Bus stop and station areas, as well as primary travel paths to access these areas, should also be identified in conjunction with Public Works staff to ensure that illumination at night is sufficient, blind spots are limited, and that any related concerns at key bus stop locations can be addressed. Finally, vehicles and bus stop areas should be regularly maintained to ensure a continued perception of cleanliness.

- **Marketing and branding**: While fast and frequent service can be enough to attract new passengers (as well as essential to retaining riders), ensuring a successful product launch will provide the greatest chance for system success. Innovative branding to produce a mobility product that feels consistent with the character of Beverly Hills will help increase public interest and awareness in the service and could encourage skeptics to try the service. West Hollywood provides an good local example with the distinctive artistic branding of their CityLine service, which draws attention to the vehicles in operation.

- **Regional interconnectivity**: The Los Angeles region has made great strides in producing a transit landscape that combines several different regional and municipal service providers into a coherent and consistent regional user experience. Shared attributes like the TAP fare payment system and integrated public information through Metro’s transit maps help to empower riders to make use of the transit network more broadly instead of limiting trips to one familiar operator. A Beverly Hills transit service should seek to build on the model of other municipal operators like Culver City and Santa Monica in partnering with Metro to share fare payment systems (if fares are to be charged) and public information.

Contracting

Public transit service can either be contracted or operated directly by cities or transit districts. A **contracted approach would be recommended for a pilot project to reduce risk to the City by limiting assets on hand if the pilot is not continued, as contractors can also provide vehicles.**

Research has shown that there is not a clear advantage to either approach with respect to operating costs, and local governments can still take on some portions of the overall cost of building and operating a transit service while relying upon an outside contractor for administration of maintenance and operations. A hybrid setup is common in many large California transit agencies such as Foothill Transit and municipal fleets such as those operated by the City of Pasadena, with the agencies and cities taking on responsibility for real estate, facilities, and vehicle procurement to take advantage of capital funding opportunities available to government agencies, but outsourcing operations and maintenance to outside contractors.
If a Beverly Hills pilot were to continue into a permanent fixture a more detailed financial analysis would be recommended to determine the most cost-effective path forward, but given time constraints and the lack of adequate land to support an appropriately sized transit operating facility within city limits, beginning with a turn-key contract would offer the greatest flexibility and responsiveness, but may result in above-average operating costs compared to more mature operations.

# Vehicles

A wide range of vehicles could be considered for fixed-route services, while microtransit operations would benefit from a narrower range of smaller vehicles. There are vehicle types that would be appropriate for both operating models and could add additional flexibility to change the nature of a pilot program or alternate between service models in a region over the course of a day.

In either circumstance, all vehicles must provide accommodation for riders using personal mobility devices such as wheelchairs and mobility scooters, such as through a wheelchair ramp or lift. Vehicles with wheelchair ramps are preferable on routes where high volumes of mobility devices can be expected, as wheelchair lift operation is a more time-consuming process that requires the operator to exit the vehicle, introducing additional delay to service.

As well, transit operators in California are now required to meet the California Air Resources Board’s Innovative Clean Transit regulation, with non-zero-emission vehicles operated in revenue service to be fully phased out by 2035. Given the stated community environmental goals for this project, the state of current operating technology, and the need for a future transition, a transit pilot project should seek to use battery electric vehicles.

Fixed-route service along major corridors is most commonly provided using a standardized 40-foot transit bus and 60-foot articulated transit bus model, while circulator service like that operated by the Los Angeles Department of Transportation’s DASH service may use 30- and 35-foot transit buses that are more maneuverable on streets with tighter turns and with the same heavy-duty build quality rated for FTA-required 12 year, 500,000 mile minimum vehicle lifespans, but at the expense of reduced passenger capacity compared to larger vehicles. Other circulator services like West Hollywood’s CityLine make use of cutaway buses, using bus bodies placed on conventional passenger van frames. These vehicles are generally less expensive and can be somewhat more maneuverable, but are not tested to the same standards as transit buses and are rated for a shorter service lifespan. Most commercially available cutaway buses for transit use also include wheelchair lifts.

Operating costs can decrease with the use of smaller vehicles as energy efficiency will generally increase, but it should be noted that the energy cost associated with vehicle operation is a relatively small portion of overall operating costs, with most operating cost associated with labor, both in the form of drivers as well as maintenance overhead.

Microtransit service is generally operated using smaller vehicles, such as cutaway buses or large passenger vans modified to include wheelchair capabilities. A distinct advantage to the use of passenger vans, more specifically those rated to seat 10 or fewer people, is that a commercial driver’s license is not required for operation in California. However, the reduced capacity of these vehicles limits their successful use in more conventional higher-capacity applications.

It is likely that securing a cutaway van fleet for a pilot program would offer the greatest flexibility for pilot program development while likely providing appropriate capacity for a fixed-route circulator.
SERVICE PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

Transit service performance can be measured in several ways, but common metrics for urban transit system planners and administrators to track closely are passengers per revenue hour, or how many passengers are carried for every hour a vehicle operated in revenue service, and passenger subsidy, which is the overall cost of providing service on a per-passenger basis. It is recommended that performance targets be defined in advance of a pilot program to help guide evaluation of whether the program is operating sustainably and whether resources are being used to the greatest benefit of the community. For comparison, the below are fiscal year 2019 systemwide passengers per revenue hour metrics for neighboring transit operators’ fixed-route bus service as reported to the Federal Transit Administration:

- Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority: 39.0 passengers/revenue hour
- Los Angeles DASH: 28.3 passengers/revenue hour
- Culver CityBus: 27.1 passengers/revenue hour
- Santa Monica Big Blue Bus: 22.5 passengers/revenue hour
- West Hollywood CityLine: 6.0 passengers/revenue hour

However, while performance metrics can inform planners of the relative efficiency of different services, it is important to note that metrics focusing only on performance of the service in isolation can only form part of an overall analysis of the role of service in the community. To this end, the State of California has been openly considering revisions to its Transit Development Act (TDA) funding guidelines for several years to reduce an emphasis on farebox recovery, or the share of revenue contributed toward transit operations from passenger fares, noting that meeting broader community goals may require the operation of service that places less of an emphasis on absolute cost efficiency. In addition, the remaining effects of changes in travel patterns resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic make it challenging to compare service performance today to service performance prior to March 2020. Most agencies have seen declines in overall ridership levels, and consequently declines in overall service efficiency indicators.

For example, many communities and agencies have set goals toward reducing community Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), which measures overall vehicle travel volumes, and can be a metric that rises and falls in parallel with carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions and air pollutants like fine particulate matter depending on the community’s vehicle fleet mix. A strategy toward achieving this goal would be to ensure that service alternatives exist and are attractive to capture trips, which may require operating more transit vehicles in service to provide more attractive service frequency than may be most cost-efficient.

NEXT STEPS

This project sought to provide a needs assessment for the feasibility of additional transit service within the City of Beverly Hills, and has found that there are gaps in existing transit service and potential new connections that can be made to better support regional transportation investments and improve local circulation. This project has also found that this need can be practically met by the City of Beverly Hills on its own, with viable options for exploring a pilot program using contracted service.

As establishment of a pilot program is explored further, there are several additional recommended considerations to explore:

- A second community survey focused on community preferences to determine what service attributes and which potential benefits or incentives would encourage use of public transportation within Beverly Hills
- More detailed route planning to provide specific fixed-route service alignments and operating cost units to inform prospective future Requests for Information (RFIs), including any capability of operating microtransit service using a third-party platform
- Release of an RFI to explore microtransit suitability in more detail with third-party technology providers
- Early partner discussions with LA Metro to explore available finances that could support development of a standalone City transit operation, including federal, state, and county funding opportunities and whether outside funds could be available for a pilot program
- Development of a strategy to transition existing City operating assets and programs, specifically for Dial-A-Ride and trolley service, to be guided by the results of a pilot program
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The City of Beverly Hills invites you to help us identify transit destinations within the City and provide input on desired transit options to better support mobility for residents, employees, students and visitors to Beverly Hills.

All information, suggestions and ideas received will help the City identify opportunities for improvements to the current public transportation system, including potential new services to meet future community mobility needs.

The Traffic & Parking Commission will review the draft Transit Feasibility Report and receive public comment at the meeting of Thursday, October 6, 2022 (www.beverlyhills.org/TPC).

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 2022
6 PM to 8 PM
(In-Person in the Municipal Gallery and Virtual/Online)

City Hall
455 N. Rexford Drive,
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Online link will be available at: www.beverlyhills.org/TransitStudy
*Meeting will be recorded for on-demand viewing

For questions, contact: AskPW@beverlyhills.org or (310) 285-2467
Attachment 2
TO: Traffic and Parking Commission
FROM: Kevin Riley, Senior Transportation Engineer
       Jessie Holzer Carpenter, Transportation Planner
DATE: November 3, 2022
SUBJECT: Draft Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program
ATTACHMENT: 1. October 7, 2021 TPC Staff Report
               2. May 5, 2022 TPC Staff Report
               3. Draft Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program
               4. Comment Matrix

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the Traffic and Parking Commission (TPC) review and approve, or approve with amendments, the Draft Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program (NTCP).

INTRODUCTION
Traffic calming is the implementation of physical design elements and other strategies to improve community livability and safety by reducing speeding and/or cut-through vehicle traffic in residential neighborhoods. NTCPs consist of policies and procedures for residents to request specific traffic calming measures (“tools”) that can be applied in various situations.

BACKGROUND

As a first step, at the October 7, 2021 TPC meeting (Attachment 1), staff presented 16 potential traffic calming measures to consider including in the City’s Traffic Calming Toolbox, which serves as a resource to identify traffic calming options that are applicable to address the traffic-related concerns in a specific location. The TPC supported inclusion of all measures as potential options for neighborhoods to request on their streets.

At the May 5, 2022 TPC meeting (Attachment 2), staff presented industry best practices in NTCPs, as well as policies, procedures, and considerations from the peer cities of Hayward, Glendale, and Encinitas to inform development of a NTCP for Beverly Hills. The Commissioners provided feedback on project initiation, screening, thresholds of community support, approval, evaluation, which staff incorporated into the Beverly Hills Draft NTCP.

DISCUSSION
The City’s Draft NTCP (Attachment 3) consists of two main components: (1) Traffic Calming Toolbox and (2) Policies and Procedures.
Traffic Calming Toolbox

The Draft NTCP includes the City’s Traffic Calming Toolbox, previously presented to the TPC for review on October 7, 2021. The toolbox consists of 17 traffic calming tools that residents may request on their streets. The tools are divided into three tiers:

- **Tier 1**: Non-physical devices
- **Tier 2**: Speed control devices
- **Tier 3**: Volume control devices

Each tool is labeled to show how it meets the goals of the Draft NTCP, which are to manage traffic volumes, reduce excessive vehicle speeds, improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety, educate the community, and enhance neighborhood identity. Additionally, to help educate the community on which tools might be most appropriate to address their street’s unique needs, each tool has a description for what type of street it could be applied to, advantages, disadvantages, and the approximate cost.

Policies and Procedures

The Draft NTCP provides step-by-step instructions for the community to request and obtain approval for traffic calming measures on their streets. Each step is briefly described below:

- **Step 1: Project Initiation** – Project sponsor residing on the street submits initiation form to the City via the website.
- **Step 2: Project Screening** – City collects “before” data, such as speed and volumes. If data shows issues that justify the need for traffic calming, the project advances.
- **Step 3: Community Support** – City holds public meeting to discuss potential traffic calming tools and distributes survey to gauge support of residents. Tier 1, 2, and 3 tools have increasingly high thresholds of support due to the anticipated impacts to residents. If supported, the project advances.
- **Step 4: Project Approval** – Tier 1 tools are approved administratively. Tier 2 tools are approved by the TPC\(^1\). Tier 3 tools are approved by the City Council.
- **Step 5: Implementation and Evaluation** – City installs approved pilot and permanent projects and collects “after” data.

Community Outreach

The City released the Draft NTCP for community review September 16-October 14, 2022 via the project website [www.beverlyhills.org/trafficcalming](http://www.beverlyhills.org/trafficcalming). To get the word out, staff mailed a citywide postcard, distributed a press release, published ads in the newspapers, posted on social media, and emailed community groups. Community members were asked to provide comments via email, phone, or through a form on the website.

Staff received a total of 76 comments (Attachment 4). The vast majority (88%) of comments were supportive of traffic calming by generally supporting the Draft NTCP, suggesting additions to the toolbox or policies, or requesting device installations on specific streets. Specific suggestions received on the toolbox or policies are summarized below:

\(^1\) Speed Humps are listed as a Tier 2 tool, as modern speed hump designs have low impacts to residents and emergency responders, but would continue to be approved administratively, per the Municipal Code, as modern speed hump designs have low impacts to residents and emergency responders.
• The review process should not be lengthy or complicated; some projects should have more immediate approval
• Traffic calming requests and installations should be documented and periodic status reports provided
• Consider additional traffic calming tools as they become available (e.g., speed enforcement cameras)

In addition to comments on the Draft NTCP, some responses included requests for speed humps, Slow Street designation, or speed enforcement on specific streets; staff is working with those residents on their requests.

Approximately 5% of comments received were in opposition to the Draft NTCP. These commenters generally did not support traffic calming devices due to traffic impacts or aesthetics. However, it should be noted that the NTCP is a guide for resident-initiated requests for traffic calming and does not propose the installation of traffic calming devices on any specific street.

Approximately 7% of responses did not indicate support or opposition to the NTCP.

Next Steps
Staff anticipates presenting the Draft NTCP, including any amendments made by the TPC, to the City Council in early 2023 for consideration of adoption.

FISCAL IMPACT
There is no direct fiscal impact for this item. Funding for traffic calming project implementation is included in the annual budget for CIP No. 00055 – Traffic Calming/Management.
TO: Traffic and Parking Commission
FROM: Jessie Holzer, Transportation Planner
Kevin Riley, Senior Transportation Engineer
DATE: October 7, 2021
SUBJECT: Neighborhood Traffic Calming Toolbox
ATTACHMENT: A. Proposed Neighborhood Traffic Calming Toolbox

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the Traffic and Parking Commission provide feedback on proposed traffic calming measures to include in a citywide Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program.

INTRODUCTION
Traffic calming is the implementation of physical design elements and other strategies to improve community livability and safety by reducing speeding and/or cut-through vehicle traffic in residential neighborhoods. A Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program (NTCP) consists of policies, procedures, and specific traffic calming measures (“tools”) that can be applied in various situations. The traffic calming “toolbox” serves as a resource to identify traffic calming options that are applicable to address the traffic-related concerns in a specific location.

BACKGROUND

DISCUSSION
The concept of “traffic calming” is believed to have originated in the Netherlands in the 1960s. Traffic calming programs began in the United States in the late 1970s and, by the 1990s, were commonplace in many cities. Traffic calming measures are engineering tools that work to alter driver behavior to reduce vehicle speeding and minimize neighborhood cut-through traffic.

The City does not currently have a formal NTCP and only a limited number of traffic calming measures are available to Beverly Hills residents; primarily speed humps, lane narrowing, and vehicle speed feedback signs.

As a first step in developing a NTCP, a Proposed Neighborhood Traffic Calming Toolbox (Attachment A) is presented for consideration by the Traffic and Parking Commission. Feedback received from the Commission will be used to determine which elements to include in the City's Neighborhood Traffic Calming Toolbox.
It should be noted that this discussion and the proposed NTCP is focused on traffic calming on residential streets and does not apply to commercial or arterial streets. Speeding is a problem on those street classifications; however, the traffic calming measures for residential streets are typically not appropriate for use on commercial or higher volume roadways. As the Federal Highway Administration states, “speeding is a complex issue involving engineering, driving behavior, education, and enforcement.” Staff suggests that speed management strategies to address the speeding problem on arterials be the subject of a future agenda item.

**Next Steps**
Staff will return to the Commission with proposed program guidelines and policies for implementation of the NTCP (request and approval process for specific tools, community support criteria, use of pilot projects vs. permanent installations, etc.)

With Commission input on the traffic calming toolbox and implementation guidelines and policies, a draft NTCP would then be presented to the City Council for consideration.

**FISCAL IMPACT**
There is no direct fiscal impact for this item.
TO: Traffic and Parking Commission
FROM: Kevin Riley, Senior Transportation Engineer
        Jessie Holzer Carpenter, Transportation Planner
DATE: May 5, 2022
SUBJECT: Neighborhood Traffic Calming Toolbox
ATTACHMENTS: 1. Proposed Neighborhood Traffic Calming Toolbox
                2. City of Hayward Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program Application
                3. City of Glendale Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program Process
                4. City of Encinitas Neighborhood Traffic Management Program Process

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the Traffic and Parking Commission provide feedback on potential traffic calming policies and procedures to include in a citywide Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program.

INTRODUCTION
Traffic calming is the implementation of physical design elements and other strategies to improve community livability and safety by reducing speeding and/or cut-through vehicle traffic in residential neighborhoods. A traffic calming “toolbox” serves as a resource to identify traffic calming options that are applicable to address the traffic-related concerns in a specific location. In contrast, a Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program (NTCP) consists of policies and procedures for specific traffic calming measures (“tools”) that can be applied in various situations.

BACKGROUND

As a first step, at the October 7, 2021 Traffic & Parking Commission (TPC) meeting, staff presented 16 potential traffic calming measures ranging from low, moderate, and high effectiveness results and accepted feedback from Commissioners on which measures should be included in the City’s traffic calming toolbox. The TPC supported all measures as potential options for neighborhoods to request on their streets. Following toolbox development, staff reviewed industry best practices in NTCPs, as well as policies, procedures, and considerations in other California cities to inform development of a NTCP for Beverly Hills.

DISCUSSION
According to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) in their “Traffic Calming: State of the Practice” report, NTCPs that are the most successful at calming traffic are proactive, area-wide treatments because they analyze neighborhoods for holistic improvements and involve extensive coordination and consensus
building. A local example of this is the Southwest Beverly Hills traffic calming project. However, reactive spot treatments can be successful in the absence of area-wide community support for traffic calming plans (a reason that many cities focus on resident-initiated requests) when they have effective guidelines/policies in place. Effectiveness is context-sensitive depending on the unique needs of each community.

FHWA and ITE report that programs can either have general guidelines for approvals that apply to all traffic calming activity or different guidelines for specific measures. There are pros and cons to both approaches. Instituting one general policy for all measures can provide standardization, help streamline implementation, and reduce community confusion. In contrast, it can also oversimplify the process and neglect the unique considerations of each device. Communities take different approaches based on their goals for traffic calming, as described in the following section with case studies from several example cities.

Many communities experience public resistance to traffic calming measures, especially spot treatments, because of concern over potential traffic diversion onto neighboring residential streets. FHWA and ITE explain that one way to address this is by including a study of diversion in the program guidelines as part of a post-implementation evaluation. For example, cities can set limits on diverted traffic, monitor traffic levels, and take remedial actions if limits are exceeded.

Some cities have also instituted project priority ratings systems to help determine which traffic calming devices to implement first if funding for all community-requested projects is not available. Priority rating systems rank projects in order of funding priority and allow for tradeoffs among various factors, such as volumes versus speeds. Priorities can vary widely among communities depending on differing needs and desired outcomes.

FHWA and ITE describe public involvement as critical to the success of neighborhood traffic calming programs and note that measures typically require 50-70 percent approval of property owners and/or residents. They identify three issues that communities should address in determining how to obtain public approval:

- **Petitions vs. Surveys**: Petition requirements are the most common way of establishing support and are easier to administer than surveys. However, petitions are not always the best indicator of actual public sentiment.
- **Margin of Approval**: Super-majority support of respondents is likely necessary to have any confidence that the neighborhood as a whole is supportive. However, a higher approval margin requirement can decrease the ability to ensure the selection of the most worthy projects.
- **Extent of Area Polled**: Support for traffic calming measures is typically greatest on the streets being treated. Support turns to opposition as polling moves to nearby streets that may be adversely impacted by diverted traffic. Communities can apply approval requirements to a larger area, but approval can be harder to secure.

**Case Studies**

Following feedback from the October 7, 2021 TPC meeting, staff researched NCTPs from the Cities of Hayward, Glendale, and Encinitas. Documents that help summarize each City’s program are provided in Attachments 2, 3, and 4 and the full programs can be viewed at the links below:

The matrix below highlights the key similarities and differences from each City’s NTCP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hayward</th>
<th>Glendale</th>
<th>Encinitas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street type considered</strong></td>
<td>Residential and collector streets • 35-mph or less</td>
<td>Residential and collector streets • If street lies within a “residence district”</td>
<td>Residential and collector streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proactive vs. reactive approach</strong></td>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project initiation</strong></td>
<td>Complete and submit application to Public Works Department</td>
<td>Written request for traffic calming on 1 or more streets (or within an entire neighborhood) from 1 or more residents • Identification of traffic-related problems on a residential street by City staff</td>
<td>Request completed and signed by 10 residents; filed with Engineering Department • Residents from 10 households on at least 4 streets attend initial meeting and agree to be project liaisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Screening and evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Data collection and traffic-condition evaluation • Staff recommends potential design solutions (from toolbox)</td>
<td>Engineering study, including data collection and consultation with police/fire • Candidate streets must meet traffic-related thresholds</td>
<td>City collects data elements, such as vehicle speeds, traffic volumes, and collisions, to confirm traffic calming measures are needed • Assign values to data elements for project ranking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General vs. measure-specific guidelines</strong></td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>General guideline for holistic traffic calming plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prioritization and ranking</strong></td>
<td>Tier I solutions, not requiring a petition and relatively low cost, put immediately into City maintenance crew's schedule • Tier II projects (require engineering analysis) and Tier III projects (require extensive analysis, outreach, and funding) placed into priority list</td>
<td>Points assigned to primary and secondary criteria to develop ranked list • Primary criteria: Speed and collision history • Secondary criteria: School vicinity, pedestrian generators, vehicle volumes, and cut-through traffic</td>
<td>Score of 51 points from data elements required to be included in ranked list for City-funded work plan • List is submitted to Traffic Commission and City Council for approval once per year • If less than 51 points or ranked low, funding and construction to be unavailable within 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Petition vs. survey</strong></td>
<td>Petition</td>
<td>Petition</td>
<td>Petition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, the three cities focus on a reactive approach, responding to resident requests for traffic calming. The Cities must approve projects suggested by community members before they can be considered, though there is variety in how these projects are accepted and screened. All cities require an evaluation of proposed streets using data collection and analysis to confirm traffic calming measures would be effective in the suggested locations and can be included in the NTCP.

Once this is confirmed, all Cities use a petition to gauge support, which ranges between 60-75% of residents on either the street or neighborhood being studied. Generally, the Cities use one general guideline for all traffic calming measures, with exception to Glendale, which has a separate guideline for speed humps in a school or park zone. All Cities rank community supported projects to be prioritized for limited funding, but prioritization methods vary. None of the cities identify a robust process for post-project installation evaluation.

**Considerations for TPC**

When developing the City’s NTCP, there are several considerations to address to determine the most effective, context-sensitive policy for each unique community. Staff is looking for TPC feedback on the following questions:

- Should the City conduct proactive, neighborhood-level traffic calming projects in addition to reactive, block-by-block projects or should the City focus on resident-initiated requests?
- Should the City set a minimum residents threshold for application consideration? If so, how should that threshold be determined?
What types of data should be included in the project screening process?

Should the City develop general guidelines that apply to all traffic calming activity or different guidelines for specific measures?

Should the City set a minimum traffic impact threshold to accept an application into its' NTCP? If so, how should that threshold be determined?

Should the City develop a scoring system to prioritize projects and/or set minimum thresholds to accept an application into its' NTCP?

Should the City indicate community support through petitions or surveys?

Should the City indicate community support by property owners/residents on the street where the measure is proposed or include consideration from adjacent streets?

What should the margin of approval be? For example:
  - Does approval by a simple majority of property owners or residents constitute adequate support?
  - Should a super-majority be required?
  - If a super-majority is required, how large should the margin be?

Should post-project evaluation be conducted? For example:
  - Should a project be installed as part of a temporary pilot program before it is made permanent?
  - Should evaluation include additional data collection like traffic diversion?

What other considerations should be included in the development of the City’s NTCP?

Next Steps
Staff anticipates returning to the TPC in fall 2022 to present a draft NTCP outlining guidelines, policies, and procedures for the residential application process and to accept feedback from the Commission.

Community Outreach
When the draft NTCP has been prepared, it will be posted online for public review. Staff will contact representatives of neighborhood groups and use social media posts and newspaper ads to advise the community of the opportunity to review and provide feedback on the draft NTCP through online surveys, by phone or mail. To help inform Commission recommendations, feedback and survey results will be provided at a future TPC meeting. Notices of that TPC meeting will be sent to all who provide feedback. Staff will incorporate input from the TPC and community into the draft NTCP and anticipates presenting a final draft NTCP to the City Council for consideration in fall/winter 2022.

FISCAL IMPACT
There is no direct fiscal impact for this item.
1. INTRODUCTION

Thank you for taking an interest in improving traffic safety in your neighborhood. Daily traffic problems can compromise our sense of community and personal well-being, while safer and more pleasant streets can enhance our quality of life. The City of Beverly Hills Public Works Department is committed to working with residents to protect and preserve neighborhood livability through traffic calming.

Traffic calming is the implementation of physical design elements and other strategies to reduce speeding and/or cut-through vehicle traffic in residential neighborhoods (not commercial or arterial streets). Traffic calming tools work to achieve these results by altering driver behavior.

The City’s Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program is meant to serve as a resource to:

- Identify context sensitive traffic calming options that will address resident concerns
- Establish policies and procedures for approval and installation of traffic calming tools

This program implements the City’s Complete Streets Plan and Complete Streets Action Plan, adopted by the City Council in April 2021. Both documents are available on the City’s Complete Streets website: [www.beverlyhills.org/completestreets](http://www.beverlyhills.org/completestreets).

Development of the City’s Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program is based on a review of best practices, input received from the Traffic & Parking Commission, and feedback from the Beverly Hills community.
The goals of the City’s Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program are identified below. The icons associated with each goal are used on the following page to describe how each traffic calming tool can achieve the overall program goals.

**Manage Traffic Volumes**
Reduce the number of cut-through vehicles on residential streets

**Reduce Excessive Vehicle Speeds**
Slow down motorists choosing to drive faster than the posted speed limit

**Improve Pedestrian and Bicyclist Safety**
Create a more inviting and safer place to walk and bike

**Educate the Community**
Create awareness around traffic safety through targeted education and outreach

**Enhance Neighborhood Identity**
Heighten awareness of neighborhoods and enhance livability

You and your neighbors are an integral part in helping to identify traffic concerns, develop recommendations, and implement solutions. We look forward to working with you!
2. TRAFFIC CALMING TOOLBOX

The table below identifies the traffic calming tools available for residents to request on their street blocks and the following pages provide descriptions of each. Tier 1 tools are non-physical devices, Tier 2 tools are speed control devices, and Tier 3 tools are volume control devices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier Level</th>
<th>Traffic Calming Tools</th>
<th>Car</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>Ped</th>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Targeted Speed Enforcement</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Speed Feedback Signs</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Slow Streets Program</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Striped Lane Narrowing</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Educational Campaigns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Traffic Circles</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Median Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Curb Extensions</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mid-block Curb Extensions (Chokers)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Offset Curb Extensions (Chicanes)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Speed Humps</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Diagonal Diverters</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Partial Street Closure</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Full Street Closure</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Turn-Movement Restrictions</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Forced Turn Islands</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Median Barricades</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Tier 1 Tools

Tier 1 tools are non-physical devices, meaning any measure that does not require physical changes to the roadway. Non-physical devices are intended to increase drivers’ awareness of surroundings and influence driver behavior without physical devices. These devices have limited effectiveness as stand alone devices and should be used to supplement physical devices. Costs are approximate and subject to change.

### Spot Speed Enforcement

The Beverly Hills Police Department (BHPD) provides temporary spot speed enforcement via officers and/or a mobile radar trailer based on observations of need and at locations requested by the community. The length of targeted enforcement depends on current BHPD resources and availability. Targeted enforcement may also be used in conjunction with Tier 2 and Tier 3 tools to help drivers become aware of new restrictions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors for Consideration</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application</strong></td>
<td>Any street type</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Speed Limit Sign" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Advantages**            | • Inexpensive if used temporarily  
                            • Does not physically slow emergency vehicles (or buses)  
                            • Quick implementation if resources are available | ![Speed Enforcement](image) |
| **Disadvantages**         | • Expensive to maintain an increased level of enforcement  
                            • Effectiveness may be temporary | ![Speed Enforcement](image) |
| **Approximate Cost**      | Officer’s burden rate | ![Speed Enforcement](image) |
| **Goals Targeted**        | • Reduce excessive vehicle speeds  
                            • Improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety  
                            • Educate the community  
                            • Enhance neighborhood identity | ![Speed Enforcement](image) |
**Speed Feedback Signs**

Speed feedback signs measure each approaching vehicle’s speed. Real-time speeds are relayed to drivers and can either flash or stop displaying the speed when speeds exceed the limit. Speed feedback signs are typically mounted on or near speed limit signs and are common in school zones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors for Consideration</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Any street type</td>
<td>![Image of speed feedback sign]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Advantages                | • Real-time speed feedback  
                           | • Does not physically slow emergency vehicles (or buses)  
                           | • Permanent installation | |
| Disadvantages             | • May require power source  
                           | • Only effective for one direction of travel  
                           | • Long-term effectiveness uncertain  
                           | • Subject to vandalism | |
| Approximate Cost          | $5,000-10,000 per device | |
| Goals Targeted            | • Reduce excessive vehicle speeds  
                           | • Educate the community |
**Slow Streets Program**

Neighborhood Slow Streets are residential street blocks restricted to local traffic to allow for greater social distancing during the COVID-19 pandemic by using the entire street width for walking, cycling, or other modes of non-motorized transportation. Neighborhood Slow Streets are not street closures and allow local traffic access for residents and their visitors, delivery vehicles, street sweeping, trash pickup, and emergency vehicles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors for Consideration</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Residential street blocks with a 25 MPH speed limit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Advantages                | • Inexpensive  
                              • Does not physically slow emergency vehicles (or buses)  
                              • Can be a permanent installation |
| Disadvantages             | • Long-term effectiveness uncertain  
                              • Subject to vandalism |
| Approximate Cost          | $500-1,000 per block |
| Goals Targeted           | • Manage traffic volumes  
                              • Reduce excessive vehicle speeds  
                              • Improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety  
                              • Educate the community |
Striped Lane Narrowing

Lane striping (center and/or edge lines) can be used to narrow the roadway, thereby inducing drivers to lower their speeds. Narrower travel lanes support slower driving because they make drivers feel more constricted, whereas wider travel lanes encourage faster driving because they have fewer visual impediments. The additional roadway space as a result of narrowing lanes can be used to create parking lanes, bike lanes, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors for Consideration</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Striped streets</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Striped streets" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Advantages                | • Inexpensive  
  • Stripping can repurpose excess width to create bike and/or parking lanes without reducing number of travel lanes  
  • Does not physically slow emergency vehicles (or buses) | ![Examples](image2.jpg) |
| Disadvantages             | • Has not been shown to significantly reduce travel speeds  
  • Requires regular maintenance | |
| Approximate Cost          | $2-4 per linear foot | ![Cost](image3.jpg) |
| Goals Targeted            | • Reduce excessive vehicle speeds  
  • Improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety | ![Goals](image4.jpg) |
**Educational Campaigns**

Educational campaigns can be used to distribute a variety of messages to the community, such as the purpose and/or use of new traffic calming tools or a general message about how to travel safely on the road. The City conducts educational campaigns on an ongoing basis citywide, but can conduct neighborhood-level campaigns, as needed or appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors for Consideration</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Any street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Advantages                | - Materials can be updated with variable messages  
- Materials can be provided in a variety of formats to reach broad audiences |          |
| Disadvantages             | - Has not been shown to significantly change behavior  
- Printed materials can create additional waste |          |
| Approximate Cost          | Varies based on educational material |          |
| Goals Targeted            | - Educate all roadway users (motorists, pedestrians, cyclists, etc.) on rules of the road and safety tips |          |

**Safety tip:**

Whether you’re walking, biking, or driving—be aware of your surroundings. Visit beverlyhills.org/mobility for more safety tips for our community.
## Tier 2 Tools

Tier 2 tools are physical devices used for speed management. These tools can be “vertical deflection devices” that use variations in pavement height and/or alternative paving materials to physically reduce travel speeds. Vertical deflection devices are designed for travel speeds over the device of approximately 15 to 20 MPH depending on the device. Additionally, these tools can be “horizontal deflection devices” that use raised islands to eliminate straight-line paths along roadways and through intersections. Costs are approximate and subject to change.

### Traffic Circles

Traffic circles are raised islands, placed in intersections, around which traffic circulates. Stop signs or yield signs can be used as traffic controls at the approaches. Circles can prevent drivers from speeding through intersections by impeding straight-through movement and forcing drivers to slow down. The magnitude of speed reduction is dependent on spacing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors for Consideration</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application</strong></td>
<td>Streets with one travel lane in each direction</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Traffic Circle Example" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Advantages**            | • On average can achieve 11% reduction in 85th percentile speeds between slow points, 71% decrease in annual collisions, and 5% reduction in traffic volumes  
• Can have positive aesthetic value  
• Potential for stormwater capture | ![Traffic Circle Example](image) |
| **Disadvantages**         | • Requires careful design to allow passage of emergency vehicles and avoid traffic encroaching on pedestrian crosswalks | ![Traffic Circle Example](image) |
| **Approximate Cost**      | $10,000 - $75,000 per intersection (plus additional maintenance costs) | ![Traffic Circle Example](image) |
| **Goals Targeted**        | • Reduce excessive vehicle speeds  
• Improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety  
• Enhance neighborhood identity | ![Traffic Circle Example](image) |
**Median Islands**

Median islands are raised islands along the centerline of a street that narrow the travel lanes at those locations. When fitted with a gap to allow pedestrians to walk through at a crosswalk, they are often called “pedestrian refuge islands”. They can be landscaped to increase visual aesthetics. The magnitude of speed reduction is dependent on the spacing of islands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors for Consideration</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Any street with appropriate width</td>
<td>![Image of median island]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Advantages                | • On average can achieve 7% reduction in 85th percentile speeds between slow points and 10% reduction in vehicles per day  
• Can reduce traffic volumes if alternative routes are available  
• Can increase pedestrian safety  
• Potential aesthetic upgrades  
• Potential for stormwater capture | ![Image of median island] |
| Disadvantages             | • Potential loss of on-street parking  
• Some locations may not be suitable due to driveway access | ![Image of median island] |
| Approximate Cost          | $35,000 - $75,000 per device (plus additional maintenance costs) | ![Image of median island] |
| Goals Targeted            | • Manage traffic volumes  
• Reduce excessive vehicle speeds  
• Improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety  
• Enhance neighborhood identity | ![Image of median island] |
Curb Extensions

Curb extensions or “bulb-outs” narrow the travel/parking lane at intersections. They “pedestrianize” intersections by shortening the crossing distance and decreasing the curb radii; thus reducing turning vehicle speeds. The magnitude of reduction in speed is dependent on the spacing and curb radii.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors for Consideration</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Any street type, typically with a parking lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Advantages                | • On average can reduce 85th percentile speeds by 7% between slow points and vehicles per day by 10%  
• Reduces pedestrian crossing distance and exposure to vehicles  
• Through and left turn movements are easily negotiable by large vehicles  
• Can create protected on-street parking bays  
• Potential for stormwater capture | |
| Disadvantages             | • Potential loss of on-street parking at intersections  
• May require bicyclists to briefly merge with vehicle traffic | |
| Approximate Cost          | $80,000 - $180,000 per device (plus additional maintenance costs) | |
| Goals Targeted            | • Reduce excessive vehicle speeds  
• Improve pedestrian safety  
• Enhance neighborhood identity | |
Mid-block Curb Extensions (Chokers)

Chokers are curb extensions at midblock locations that narrow a street, encouraging drivers to reduce their speeds approaching the devices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors for Consideration</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Typical residential street block with on-street parking</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Advantages                | • On average can achieve reduction in 85th percentile speeds by 7% between slow points and 10% reduction in vehicles per day  
• Easily negotiable by emergency vehicles and buses  
• Can have positive aesthetic value  
• Potential for stormwater capture | ![Image](image2.jpg) |
| Disadvantages             | • May require bicyclists to briefly merge with vehicle traffic at choker location  
• Loss of on-street parking  
• Requires additional effort during street cleaning | ![Image](image3.jpg) |
| Approximate Cost          | $80,000 per set (plus additional maintenance costs) | ![Image](image4.jpg) |
| Goals Targeted            | • Reduce excessive vehicle speeds  
• Enhance neighborhood identity | ![Image](image5.jpg) |
**Offset Curb Extensions (Chicanes)**

Chicanes are realignments of otherwise straight streets to form S-shaped curves. They are often designed as a series of lateral shifts rather than as continuous curves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors for Consideration</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Neighborhood streets with one travel lane in each direction</td>
<td>![Image of a street with offset curb extensions]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Advantages                | - On average can achieve reduction in 85th percentile speeds by 6% between slow points and 15% reduction in vehicles per day  
                          - Little or no increase in noise levels  
                          - Little if any impediment to transit/bus service  
                          - Potential for stormwater capture | ![Image of a street with offset curb extensions] |
| Disadvantages             | - Loss of on-street parking at chicane location | ![Image of a street with offset curb extensions] |
| Approximate Cost          | $2,500 - $30,000 per device (plus additional maintenance costs) | ![Image of a street with offset curb extensions] |
| Goals Targeted            | - Reduce excessive vehicle speeds  
                          - Enhance neighborhood identity | ![Image of a street with offset curb extensions] |
**Speed Humps**

Speed humps are vertical deflection devices, typically 3-3.5 inches tall and 12-14 feet long, made of asphalt or preformed rubber installed across a roadway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors for Consideration</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Residential street blocks</td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Speed humps" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Advantages                | • Speed humps reduce speeds to 15–20 MPH  
                            • Potential reduction in traffic volumes  
                            • Maintains emergency response times | |
| Disadvantages             | • May not be appropriate for use near curves  
                            • Speed humps will not be considered on streets with grades steeper than 7%; traffic volumes greater than 10,000 vehicles per day; or designated evacuation, truck, or transit routes  
                            • Speed humps shall not be located adjacent to driveways or within 600 feet of a controlled intersection  
                            • Noise from vehicles slowing and accelerating  
                            • Aesthetics | |
| Approximate Cost          | $7,500-15,000 per device | |
| Goals Targeted            | • Reduce excessive vehicle speeds | |

**Tier 3 Tools**

Tier 3 tools are physical devices that can be used to control vehicle volumes by precluding particular vehicle movements. While these are highly effective traffic calming measures, they also restrict the movements of residents that live in neighborhoods where they are present. Costs are approximate and subject to change.
Diagonal Diverters

Diagonal diverters are barriers placed diagonally across an intersection, blocking through movements. Similar to half street closures (see below), they are typically staggered to create circuitous routes through neighborhoods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors for Consideration</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Any street type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Advantages                | • On average can achieve reduction in 85th percentile speeds by 4% between slow points and 35% reduction in vehicles per day  
• Able to maintain full pedestrian and bicycle access  
• Potential for stormwater capture |          |
| Disadvantages             | • Causes access issues for local residents  
• Potential delays for emergency services  
• May require reconstruction of curb corners  
• May not be feasible if impacts to drainage or other utilities |          |
| Approximate Cost          | $20,000 - $125,000 per intersection (plus additional maintenance costs)      |          |
| Goals Targeted            | • Manage traffic volumes  
• Reduce excessive vehicle speeds  
• Improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety  
• Enhance neighborhood identity |          |
Partial Street Closure

Partial closures (or half street closures) are barriers that block travel in one direction for a short distance on otherwise two-way streets. Partial closures are the most common volume control measures after full street closures. They are often used in sets to make travel through neighborhoods on grid street patterns circuitous rather than direct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors for Consideration</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Any street type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Advantages                | • On average can achieve reduction in 85th percentile speeds by 19% between slow points and 42% reduction in vehicles per day  
                           • Able to maintain full pedestrian and bicycle access  
                           • Potential for stormwater capture |          |
| Disadvantages             | • Causes access issues for local residents  
                           • Drivers can bypass the barriers by entering oncoming traffic |          |
| Approximate Cost          | $100,000 - $300,000 per intersection (plus additional maintenance costs) |          |
| Goals Targeted            | • Manage traffic volumes  
                           • Reduce excessive vehicle speeds  
                           • Improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety  
                           • Enhance neighborhood identity |          |
**Full Street Closure**

Full street closures are barriers placed across a street to close the street completely to through traffic, usually leaving only sidewalks or bikeways open. The barriers may consist of landscaped islands, walls, gates, side-by-side bollards, or any other obstructions that leave an opening smaller than the width of a passenger car. Emergency vehicles can be accommodated via removable bollards or similar devices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors for Consideration</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Any street type</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Advantages                | - On average can achieve 44% reduction in vehicles per day  
- Able to maintain pedestrian and bicycle connectivity  
- Emergency access provided in design  
- Potential for stormwater capture | ![Image](image2.png) |
| Disadvantages             | - Causes access issues for local residents  
- Diverts traffic to another street  
- May not be feasible if impacts to drainage to other utilities | ![Image](image3.png) |
| Approximate Cost          | $50,000 - $400,000 per intersection (plus additional maintenance costs) | ![Image](image4.png) |
| Goals Targeted            | - Manage traffic volumes  
- Improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety  
- Enhance neighborhood identity | ![Image](image5.png) |
**Turn-Movement Restrictions**

Turn-movement restrictions involve the use of signs to prevent undesired vehicle turning movements without the use of physical devices, such as into a residential neighborhood. The turn-movement restrictions may be full-time or limited hours, such as only during peak commute hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors for Consideration</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Any street type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can reduce cut-through traffic at specific times of day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can increase safety at intersections by prohibiting certain turning movements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Low cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Restrictions apply to resident and non-residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• May require enforcement to be effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• May divert a traffic problem to another street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Cost</td>
<td>$150 - $2,000 per intersection (plus enforcement)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals Targeted</td>
<td>• Manage traffic volumes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Forced Turn Islands**

Forced turn islands are raised islands that prohibit certain movements on approaches to an intersection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors for Consideration</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Any street type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantages</td>
<td>• On average can achieve 31% reduction in vehicles per day&lt;br&gt;• Can improve safety at an intersection by prohibiting critical turning movements&lt;br&gt;• Able to maintain pedestrian and bicycle connectivity</td>
<td>[Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantages</td>
<td>• May cause access issues for some residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Cost</td>
<td>$15,000 - $30,000 per intersection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals Targeted</td>
<td>• Manage traffic volumes&lt;br&gt;• Improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety&lt;br&gt;• Enhance neighborhood identity</td>
<td>[Image]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Median Barricades

Median barricades are narrow islands or curbs located on the centerline of a street and are intended to reduce traffic volumes. Placement is usually at intersections or mid-block locations and continue through intersections with cross streets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors for Consideration</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Any street type</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Advantages                | - Can improve safety at an intersection by prohibiting critical turning movements  
- Reduces traffic volumes  
- May improve safety through access limitations  
- Able to maintain pedestrian and bicycle connectivity  
- Emergency access provided in design | ![Image](image2.jpg) |
| Disadvantages             | - May cause access issues for some residents | ![Image](image3.jpg) |
| Approximate Cost          | $8,000 - $40,000 per intersection | ![Image](image4.jpg) |
| Goals Targeted            | - Manage traffic volumes  
- Improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety  
- Enhance neighborhood identity | ![Image](image5.jpg) |
3. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

This section provides step-by-step instructions for the community to request and obtain approval for traffic calming measures on their streets. The graphic below summarizes the steps, which are described in detail on the following pages.

**Step 1: Project Initiation**
- Project sponsor submits form.

**Step 2: Project Screening**
- City collects “before” data.
  - Data shows no issues. Project does not advance.
  - Data shows issues that justify traffic calming.

**Step 3: Community Support**
- City holds meeting to discuss potential traffic calming tools and distributes survey.
  - Survey results indicate lack of support. Project does not advance.
  - Survey results indicate support.

**Step 4: Project Approval**
- Tier 1 tools approved administratively. Tier 2 tools approved by the Traffic & Parking Commission. Tier 3 tools approved by the City Council.
  - Project is not approved.
  - Project initially approved as a temporary pilot.
  - Project approved as permanent installation.

**Step 5: Implementation and Evaluation**
- City collects “after” data.
  - If project does not achieve goals, other traffic calming tool options or project removal may be discussed.
  - Project approved as permanent installation.
Step 1: Project Initiation

The City’s Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program is resident-driven. To initiate the process to request traffic calming for one or more street blocks, a project sponsor residing on the street must complete and submit a form on the City’s website: www.beverlyhills.org/trafficcalming.

The form will be used by City staff to better understand the issues observed by the project sponsor and why they are requesting traffic calming on their street, which will inform the data collection efforts in Step 2: Project Screening. Alternative methods of submitting the form for residents without internet access can be made available upon request.

Project sponsors can make requests for traffic calming on one or multiple blocks of the same street. However, requests for traffic calming on more than one street must have a project sponsor from each street.

Step 2: Project Screening

After the City receives a completed project initiation form, staff will gather and evaluate data to determine the existing traffic conditions, identify and quantify the problem(s), and confirm the applicability of the desired traffic calming measure. Depending on the issues identified by the project sponsor, data collected could include:

- Vehicle speeds
- Traffic volumes (including trucks)
- Roadway characteristics (street geometry, curvature, grade, etc.)
- Neighborhood context (adjacent land uses, bike routes, etc.)
- Engineer’s identification of unique conditions
If a project passes the screening process, the results will be presented to the project sponsor and residents on the block(s) in a written report and at a community meeting as outlined in **Step 3: Community Support**. The report and presentation will include a discussion of considerations for potential traffic calming measures that could address the issues identified by the project sponsor.

If a project does not pass the screening process, meaning the City has determined that there is not an issue with speeding, cut-through traffic, etc. on the block(s), the results will be communicated to the project sponsor and the project will not move forward to the next step.

**Step 3: Community Support**

*Initial Community Meeting*

As noted above, the first step in determining community support for traffic calming measures is for the City to hold a meeting with the project sponsor and residents on the block(s) to review the results of data collected. The City will present options from the Traffic Calming Toolbox that could address the issues identified by the project sponsor and discuss the pros and cons of each. The City will solicit community feedback on preferences for specific tools.

*Community Survey*

Based on feedback received, the City will distribute a survey to residents residing on the block(s) to gauge support for the traffic calming tools discussed at the community meeting. The survey can be submitted to the City online, by phone, by fax, by mail, or by email.

*Thresholds of Support*

Community support will be determined by survey responses. As outlined in the table below, Tier 1, 2, and 3 tools will have increasingly high thresholds of support due to the anticipated impacts to residents.
### Traffic Calming Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Calming Tools</th>
<th>Threshold of Support</th>
<th>Approving Body</th>
<th>May Require Pilot Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier 1 Tools (Non-Physical Devices)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spot Speed Enforcement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>BHPD</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Feedback Signs</td>
<td>&gt; 50%</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow Streets Program</td>
<td>&gt; 50%</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striped Lane Narrowing</td>
<td>&gt; 50%</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Campaigns</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier 2 Tools (Speed Control Devices)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Circles</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Traffic &amp; Parking Commission</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Islands</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Traffic &amp; Parking Commission</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Extensions</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Traffic &amp; Parking Commission</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-block Curb Extensions (Chokers)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Traffic &amp; Parking Commission</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offset Curb Extensions (Chicanes)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Traffic &amp; Parking Commission</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Humps</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Administrative**</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier 3 Tools (Volume Control Devices)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagonal Diverters</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Street Closure</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Street Closure</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn-Movement Restrictions***</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced Turn Islands</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Barricades</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Some measures in Tiers 2 and 3 may require additional funding approval by City Council.

** The City has historically approved speed humps at the staff level because despite being a Tier 2 tool, modern speed hump designs have low impacts to residents and emergency responders.

*** This device is considered Tier 3 when complied with and can require increased spot enforcement.
Step 4: Project Approval

Approving Body

If it is determined that there is community support for traffic calming measures included in the survey, the project will move forward for approval. As shown in the table at left, Tier 1 tools can be approved administratively at the City staff level. Tier 2 tools (with exception to speed humps) must be approved by the Traffic & Parking Commission and Tier 3 tools must be approved by the City Council because of their increased ability to inconvenience residents and/or emergency responders, and/or divert traffic to adjacent streets.

Community Notification

The City will mail notices to all residents residing on the block(s), as well as residents on the immediately adjacent block(s), in advance of Traffic & Parking Commission and City Council meetings notifying them that the project has been agendized. At this time, residents on the immediately adjacent block(s) will have the opportunity to provide feedback on the project for consideration by the approving body. Should the Traffic & Parking Commission/City Council approve the project, the City will also mail notices to the aforementioned residents advising of project installation.

For Tier 1 tools approved administratively at the staff level, the City will mail installation notices only to residents residing on the impacted block(s) unless there are unique considerations that would justify a broader notification.

Pilot Projects

In some cases, the City will require projects to be installed as temporary pilot projects that will go through a second round of approval for permanent installation. For example, Tier 3 tools that are new to Beverly Hills may be justified as pilot projects. At the time of approval,
the approving body will determine whether the project will be installed as a pilot project or permanent installation, based on applicability outlined in the previous table, and determine the time period of the pilot project.

Pilot projects for Tier 2 tools ranging from one- to sixty-day installations are not required to be approved by the City Council because of their brief and temporary nature. Pilot projects that exceed a sixty-day installation are required to have City Council approval to install.

The purpose of pilot projects is to allow residents to experience the devices prior to approval. The City will not conduct a formal project evaluation as discussed in **Step 5: Implementation and Evaluation** until the permanent project is approved.

**Project Prioritization**

At this time, projects will be implemented in the order that they are approved. However, the City will monitor the need to establish a prioritization process based on funding availability, scope of the request, and urgent need. In some cases, projects that are approved may require a request to City Council for additional funding prior to implementation. For example, if a project is approved toward the end of the fiscal year and funds have already been allocated to other projects, installation may be postponed until the following fiscal year when more funds become available.

**Step 5: Implementation and Evaluation**

All projects that are approved and installed will undergo a post-implementation evaluation at least six months after installation is complete. Using the same criteria as identified in **Step 2: Project Screening**, the City will collect “after” data to determine if the project addresses the issues provided by the project sponsor on their project initiation form.

After data is collected and analyzed, the City will share the results with the project sponsor.
and residents on the street. If the project is determined to have not addressed the issues, the project sponsor and residents will have the opportunity to request additional traffic calming measures be installed on their street, if desired.

Case Studies

Project evaluations will be used to develop case studies for traffic calming tools on Beverly Hills streets. Case studies will be added to the Traffic Calming Toolbox to help residents understand how the tools have worked within the context of their neighborhood and/or throughout the city.

Project Removal

If the residents on the street decide that they no longer want the previously installed traffic calming device(s), they must follow the same procedure specified during the approval process to request that the device(s) be removed. Traffic calming devices must be in place at least 12 months before City consideration of removal. The City Council may require residents to participate in covering the cost of the removal and reserves the right to direct staff to remove any traffic calming measure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>All the measures in the document are excellent proposals to reduce speed and volume. One big concern is the speeding on Olympic, Wilshire, and Santa Monica Blvds. Having digital speed signs do not deter anyone from speeding as there is no penalty. Why not have speed cameras that capture speeding drivers and send them a fine with an image of the date and time? In Europe this is a widespread and highly effective system. There are even mobile van units to target specific problem areas as they pop up, as well as fixed cameras on main roads. This technology is already in place here at junctions to catch people running red lights, so it has to be an option to use for speeding drivers. Another big issue is schools, and the fact that parents drive their huge SUV's to drop off and collect kids causing a huge amount of congestion and pollution. A 20% reduction in car transport to schools would have a big impact on all traffic and streets. Schools could have incentive schemes to promote safer ways to get kids to schools, and encourage less car use. Parents think the roads are unsafe because of all the cars, but they are part of the problem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>We live on the 200 block of North Rexford. I understand that this is an arterial, and also it’s a main route for police and fire responders, so there’s not much that can be done to reduce the amount of traffic on the street. Our main concern is with those who use Rexford as a test strip for their exotic cars. They punch it from Clifton to Dayton and the noise startles pedestrians. Also, I’ve observed that many of these drivers fail to stop at stop signs, and on Crescent, roll right through red lights. I assume that some of the many cameras the city has installed are catching these drivers, but I wonder if having more motor officers stationed in the area might be helpful. What I’d really like to see are embedded spike strips that would be speed activated. Installing them within 150 feet of an intersection would give the drivers enough distance to “get up to speed” and trigger the spikes. Just an idea. At the very least, those motorists who are caught violating the city’s noise and speed ordinances should have their vehicles impounded — preferably sent to a yard in East L.A. or some other distant location. Also, it would be nice if the city would set the signals on Wilshire to allow cars to move at the legal speed without having to stop at every signalized intersection. The city of L.A. was able to do this on many of its streets years ago.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Thanks very much for creating the website (beverlyhills.org/trafficcalming); quite creative and very thoughtful!! I live at 707 North Palm; I and two other residents (Mark Freeman and David Benveniste) fought like hell to get speed humps installed in the 700 Block of Palm and we truly appreciated the help from the city; the speed humps in the 700 block have been a MAJOR success; the speed of cars have been drastically reduced and perhaps have saved a terrible tragedy from happening; we are a thru street that should have a sign on Sunset going south stating &quot;No Thru Traffic&quot;; we tried (unsuccessfully) to have speed humps put in on the 600 block (a tragedy is just waiting to happen in the 600 block); we highly encourage the use of speed humps--the new type the city has selected are great---virtually no noise and so far no complaints!! Thanks to a great staff for helping!! It seems that speed humps are the most cost effective and really do the job well; please reach out with any questions; I can be reached on my cell at 310 600-0110; many thanks!!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>- would love traffic calming - tons of cars don’t even stop at stop signs, going 30 mph right through the stop signs - wayyyyyy too much traffic on my street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>these days - not safe for kids, mine included - so many people texting and driving - understandable that palm is a cut through street from sunset to santa monica and beverly but with waze now everyone is using our neighborhood as a racetrack to get the where they need to go. - lots hot rodders - careless speeding, like 40/50 mph to the stop signs Thank you for addressing this :)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>For years we have been observing the signs, painting of the streets for example in Trousdale Estates the word stop even though there is a stop sign. Parking meters, now the possibility of electric vehicle charging stations. We noticed the other day the addition of blinking lights surrounding the stop sign with a solar charger on top, not to forget the cameras and camera systems everywhere. If you take a moment to look at your surroundings I think you will agree with us that it already looks like an amusement park or a pinball machine. We say stop. How about doing the opposite and start removing The clutter and paint. Restore Beverly Hills back To its beautiful roots. Thank you.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I am a resident of the City of Beverly Hills, and moved to Beverly Hills in March 2021 from the City of Culver City, CA. I live within the main thorough way of Burton Way. I write to the City of Beverly Hills Public Works Department to provide comments, feedback, and community support regarding the proposed Traffic Calming Program, currently under review by the City of Beverly Hills, with my concern about the Public Safety, mainly in relation to motorists speed along the streets. I have read and reviewed the Draft Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program for Public Review. I have noticed use of excessive and unsafe speeds by motorists and cut-through traffic on residential streets, mainly along the Burton Way corridor, like speeding within a race roadway above the speed limit, inciting and competing to beat each other driver, creating an unsafe and risky environment to the residents of Beverly Hills. Published data from the Average Daily Traffic (ADT) flow chart shows Burton Way with one of the highest 24-Hour Traffic Volumes (13,100 - 15,900) within the City of Beverly Hills. Also, noticed lack of observance of marked Stop Signs, specially at the cross road between Foothill Drive and Third Street, an important cross-way street within the City, creating a very unsafe and dangerous environment for many pedestrians, specially the most vulnerable, Seniors, the Elderly, Disabled, Children, Pregnant Women, and those walking with domestic animals. The disregard and violation of the traffic Stop Signs is quite constant and frequent, needs to be addressed, regulated, and enforced in order to prevent accidents, injuries, and possible loss of lives. Efforts to put prevention first should be continued and enhanced, while also addressing Public Traffic Safety issues that put the public and residents at risk. I Pray that my comments and feedback can be taken into consideration in helping prevent unsafe driving, accidents, injuries and loss of lives. Thank you.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>LOVE THE IDEA of future traffic calming devices on our streets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>I recently moved into an apartment at 226 N. Crescent Dr. It is clear to me that this stretch of Crescent Dr., the stretch between Wilshire and Santa Monica, is frequently used as a high-speed cut-through. I think that electronic enforcement of the speed limit would do much to increase the safety for all of us who live here and use this street. It would also lower the excessive noise levels on this street. It would probably pay for itself with the revenues it would raise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Hello - in response to your mailer regarding speeding, Beverly Blvd between Doheny and Santa Monica Blvd has an ongoing problem for years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Format</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>How do we get speed bumps or humps on Foothill? It has essentially become a racetrack, with pedestrians and pets at ever-increasing risk of being hit by cars driving at extremely high speeds without stopping (or often not even slowing) at the stop signs at Carmelita and Elevado. It is just a matter of time before there is a fatal accident.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>The first block of North Crescent Drive (500 block, north of Santa Monica Boulevard) is a race track; traffic comes speeds down after the second block.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>I hope you can slow things down and get rid of the speeders and drifting. Speeding on SM Blvd between Doheny and Palm is nuts. Every night all night cars are racing. And on our street, North Oakhurst, West Hollywood restaurant workers and people going to West Hollywood take up all our street parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>I live in South Camden. There is a lot of traffic on our street and cards go racing down. I noticed that other streets have a slow speed notification and I would like that same requirement on our street. It's very, very dangerous and noisy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Drivers have been making donuts in the intersection and something needs to be done. The cars driving by are loud.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Drivers avoiding Sunset during the evening peak speed down Oakhurst Drive and Elevado to get to Doheny.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>I wish to commend the City's Traffic and Parking Commission for its preparation of the thoughtful and detailed draft NTCP. Overall, it is excellent. My wife and I have lived in the City for over 39 years. During this time, we have seen a large increase in the traffic on our street, in the amount of cut-through traffic, and in the speed that vehicles travel. There are many children and elderly people who walk on our street, and we are fearful that these vehicles are going to hit someone one day. I believe that it is critical for the City to implement a comprehensive traffic calming program. The program should be targeted to the unique characteristics of each block - this is not a situation in which one size fits all. I do have concerns for any tools, such as diagonal diverters, that may create delays for emergency services, or that may materially reduce available parking for residents and their visitors. I would urge the City to first utilize less intensive tools, and then evaluate their effectiveness, before implementing these more intensive tools. Thank you for considering these comments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>I live at 442 S Roxbury Drive. People SPEED and REV THEIR ENGINES all the time on Roxbury. It is a cut thru between Olympic and Pico. Please install some speed bumps on the street!!!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>... lst... Sooo many thanks! BUT: Pls exercise your &quot;traffic calming&quot; program.. What I think????? Lived here OVER 50 years!!! Pls try to control or eliminate) THE NOISE &amp; speeding on S. Bedford DR.to Charleville Blvd Bedford Dr.......ALL HOURS!! Robberies are awful (You know) &amp; &quot;they&quot; escape from Wilshire Stores!!!...In back!!! I'm counting on YOU... Can I HELP you? M3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>I live on Reeves Dr., between Charleville and Gregory. We have parking on east side of street only. This makes for a nice wide Wide street, this encourages high speed at all hours of the day. A dog was killed about 3yrs ago, surprised there hasn't been more accidents.. Wondering if speed bumps could be installed. Also, maybe install cameras at these Corners, people don't know what a red Stop sign means! Watch at these corners, I personally have almost been hit at Least 1/2 a dozen times. Thank you for your time. And thank you for all you do!!! Bev Hills P.D. is great!!!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td>All of this is interesting and has been discussed in the past. I would suggest that all the signage in the world will not change behaviors. In fact it just signals to the world that there is a terrible problem here with traffic impacts and not a place to live, play or work. Instead, if I may, I suggest we work on implementing items that deter or mitigate bad behavior. Those are the physical barriers suggested. Anything that impeded the traffic or discourages overuse and abuse in a residential area is a win! That should be the measure of what is installed. All the rest (asking for voluntary participation or posting that a street is &quot;slow&quot; has done little to nothing as drivers are so busy speeding and running stop signs that they will never even see the signage and those kinds of drivers won't abide anyway. Thank you for the opportunity to give input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
<td>I have lived at 915 N Whittier Drive for over 46 years. Over these years the traffic has become exponentially hazardous. Cars and motorcycles gun their motors at all hours of the day and night. They race down Whittier Drive in order to make the light at the corner without a thought to the speed or danger. During the week the line of cars taking my street to Benedict and Coldwater Canyons stretches for blocks and, at times, the noise is deafening. If at all possible, I would request a review of my complaint with the intention of installing raised bumps in the middle of the road which would greatly reduce the speeding and noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
<td>I live on the corner of La Peer and Clifton and while I can't speak to other areas, the issue we're having near our area is that some people are not slowing or stopping at intersections. This makes it dangerous for both vehicles and pedestrians. In fact, in the last 3 months or so, I have witnessed 3 major collisions in my immediate area (Clifton, La Peer and Swall) and have seen some near-misses with pedestrians, especially at night. The traffic on La Peer is increased at rush hour due to the traffic lights on Wilshire and Burton, most likely by non-residents cutting through the neighborhood. I'm not sure what the solution might be to motivate people to actually stop at the intersection, but speed bumps might help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic in our city is unbearable at times, especially on Santa Monica. Why has the city okayed so many tour buses? The large ones especially. Maybe there should be certain times to be allowed. And taking away all the parking for restaurants is crazy. And the craziest proposal was the hotel okay on Beverly Dr and Rodeo. We won't be able to move in the city at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td>Any thoughts on addressing the plethora of disabled placards on cars even though the drivers are clearly not disabled? Driving around Beverly Hills, it seems like every other car is owned by a disabled person. As a physician, I know that is not the case. I know of a realtor who obtained a disabled parking permit for her bunions so that she could park wherever and show her clients houses without worrying about getting a ticket! Addressing disabled placard abuse may better control on street parking by forcing cars off the streets and into parking structures and greatly assist neighborhood traffic calming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td>We live on South Roxbury. This street is a cut-through street and many drivers speed down our street. I don't think it is a volume issue but rather a speed issue. I'd leave it to the professionals to determine the appropriate approach but we would greatly appreciate some method on our street to cut down the speeds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td>Please solve the traffic congestion at La Cienega and Wilshire. My street the 100 block of North Ladue is constantly getting cut through traffic north and south that is trying to avoid that one block from Clifton drive to Wilshire. We do not want homes on our street but need some kind of relief to make the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
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<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>traffic go in another direction. I think traffic circles on Clifton would be fine all the way to Robertson. The elimination of a left-hand turn heading north on Triller due and extending the left-hand turn for La Cienega North on Wilshire. But it really is our traffic engineers that need to solve the heavy congestion at La Cienega and Wilshire. With the new subway coming in it will be exacerbated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Everything should be done to slow down cars on our streets (and not just residential streets) to make it more pleasant and safer to walk and ride a bike. Signage, feedback signs, and enforcement make it appear that something is being done but really offer NO help and are not what are being used in places that have successfully slowed down cars (e.g. Europe) and reduced injuries and traffic fatalities significantly. The only real way to SLOW CARS DOWN is to make it physically more difficult to speed by narrowing lanes/streets, especially streets without curves. Traffic circles, curb extensions, chokers, chicane, median islands (where viable), diagonal diverters, all create environments where cars need to slow down. Not mentioned, but used in nearby LA east of us, are large planters, which are also attractive. And please don't be afraid to use metal or concrete barriers - e.g., plastic bollards do little to protect the most vulnerable streets users and are made of plastic only to protect vehicles. If our streets are dangerous and unsafe, I don't think much residential input should be required to makes modifications that are being used effectively elsewhere! THANK YOU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Report was interesting but failed to mention the areas that this may be considered for. I think each location across the city has it's own nuances and require different solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>The 500 block of North Elm drive sustains heavy traffic now due to Waze when there is traffic on SMB (which is always now). The street is just about when the traffic approaching the business district begins to build. Car make a right on to N. Elm Drive fast and loudly and then make a left turn on to Carmelita (to drive parallel to SMB). The issue has grown worse with time and many days cars are backed up on Elm making it VERY difficult to pull out of my driveway. Sometimes they shoot past me while I am in the process of backing out! I think a NO RIGHT TURN on to N. Elm during morning rush and evening rush would calm the streets. WAZE I believe is causing this problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>To Whom It May Concern; Due to the new exotic car dealership at Wilshire Blvd and N Clark Drive, speeding exotic car traffic has increased on our street. We have several families with children ranging from newborn - 17 years old living in this block who also play ball, ride scooters and bikes up and down our street. Many cars also slide through the stop sign at Clark Dr and Clifford without realizing the youth and elderly (very active retirement home on 200 block of N Clark) are frequently crossing the street. Any attention to this area is much appreciated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>I live on the 500 block of North Elm. I fully support the traffic calming plan, with a strong preference for those that are permanent and aesthetically pleasing. Well maintained medians, etc. that improve the beauty of the neighborhood is key. A lot of extra signage, temporary flashing structures, etc. are strongly disfavored. Money should be put into projects that both calm traffic and, simultaneously, increase the aesthetic appeal of our beautiful neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>I live on S. Linden Dr. between Charleville &amp; Clifton. I would like to see Tier 2 and Diagonal Diverters from Tier 3 implemented as soon as possible. Our neighborhood is experiencing speeding and running stop signs and a daily basis. Please call me is you want to discuss this further.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
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<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Reading through the draft guidelines, I support the tiers of tools and the process flow through which projects are approved. One area that I would to see as part of this proposal is a monthly or quarterly communication on what projects have been proposed, what projects have been approved, and what has been rejected. I fear that sending out mail and email for each proposed project will dilute engagement, but having a regularly-cadenced summary of the status of each project would alleviate this potential issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>I have lived on the corner of Clark Dr and Clifton Way for six years. Clifton is used a a cut through street between La Cienega and Rexford. People drive at extremely excessive speeds, especially as they try to catch a green light at robertson and clifton. As a result, there are frequent accidents at this corner, and it is very unsafe for pedestrians or bicyclists near this intersection. I think it would be very effective to install signal louvers on the traffic lights so that drivers do not see the green light until they are much closer to the intersection. This would prevent them from accelerating from blocks away, and blowing through stop signs. Alternatively, speed humps or other speed mitigation measures on Clifton would be very effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I am new to Beverly Hills thank you for inviting community feedback. I read your document. My husband was hit by a SUV while riding his bike the first month we moved here. The SUV jumped a stop sign. There is a problem. Thank you for addressing it. I will address my specific concerns (resident, long distance walker) and preferences after reviewing your document. We live on Burton Way. Cars use it as a racetrack. The Speed Humps might be a logical addition and un sequenced traffic lights. I am interested in utilizing the police camera systems to track and ticket (funding) people who speed, jump lights. This was not on your list of ideas. Speed feedback signs seem useful if actionable tracking to a license plate of the car in violation. I am a long-distance walker. The streets in BH retail areas are a disaster. Drivers believe they have the right of way over pedestrians and cyclists. People jump stop signs. A traffic light seems to be the only way to let people know they cannot do this. I realize traffic lights are expensive and not attractive. Drivers and pedestrians are in conflict over traffic light signs (walk, don’t walk, turns). In many cases both have the right of way creating safety issues. The Traffic lights need to be properly sequenced/signage so there is not a conflict of drivers making turns and pedestrian crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to get information on traffic calming measures for the above street. There are numerous cars a day that zoom up Camden Drive at unsafe speeds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drivers are avoiding the two speed bumps on South Clark Drive by using the middle pad of the bump, therefore, not helping in reducing the speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td>The City needs to help enforce/reduce vehicles that produce loud noise (i.e., loud exhaust/mufflers) on City streets, such as by putting signage that states fines for loud vehicles. The City should include studies in the draft report about how loud sounds could cause hearing problems, especially for seniors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td>We live at the south east corner of McCarty Drive and Gregory way. We get to &quot; enjoy&quot; the speed demons going east/ west on Gregory Way We feel the best solution is adding speed bumps along the street This will slow the traffic. We would like the speed bump at the alley way We do not want the traffic circle- cars will drive over them- It is not the issue of traffic - it is the speeding drivers who ignore the stop signs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td>We live on S. Lasky Dr. We have an escalating and very dangerous problem for years now with extreme speeding and extremely loud cars blasting down the street. They come usually from the north to the south. We’ve also had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td>the sudden donut shreeching group of cars at Charleville &amp; Lasky a couple times with the tire marks still visible. We are beyond angry. I've exhausted my phone calls with B.H. officials and have come to the conclusion that the police can't handle this problem. We've lived here 30 years; patrolling of police cars were wonderful and a perfect way to thwart all kinds of city problems from enforcement of driving laws and fighting crime of all kinds. THAT IS SORELY NEEDED AGAIN. Speed bumps like the kind on Durant Dr.(between Moreno Dr. &amp; Charlesville) would also be of help, but not the kind about 10 bloocks east of here that aren't asphalt but a long rubberized temporary-looking hump. PLEASE SOLVE THIS!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td>I live on Clark Drive (124) and every day (usually once or twice) cars speed up the street with loud engines/mufflers. 1 speed bump should fix that. I think the culprits live on Clark but not sure. Thanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td>I have lived in the flats of Beverly Hills for 50 years. We do not need the BH Council, or committees to start making our streets more congested and more difficult to use. Traffic has flowed through the City in the same way for all the 50 years. I have lived on Elm, Beverly, Linden, Walden and now on Roxbury. &quot;Calming&quot; is just a typical misuse of language to hide the anti-automobile attitude of a small minority of people. Please let us continue to use the streets as we have without problems since the City was founded. We have the last great community in the County of Los Angeles. A maxim of life to remember is &quot;less is more&quot;. Thank you for your consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you for taking action on this traffic issue within our neighborhood. I recently moved to South Maple Drive btw Olympic and Whitworth Dr. This street is very narrow and commonly used as a cut through. It is noisy and a safety issue. I think traffic bumps are the only things that will slow drivers down. Because the street is so narrow people see no one coming and speed up to get down the street before a car comes in the opposite direction. It is a speedway. Another idea is to close the streets that boarder Beverly Hills (other than the main boulevards) to keep BH more of a neighborhood. For example close S Maple at Whitworth before it turns into Glenville Drive, which is the street that boarders Beverly Hills. Thank you for your attention to this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cars speed down Gregory Way off of Olympic at speeds from 45-60 mph. There are slow signs on that street but speed bumps would be the only way to help slow down the speeding vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td>The section of N. Maple between Alden and Beverly Blvd is extremely dangerous. Please drive it like it is the 405 on a good day and race to make the light at Beverly Blvd and N. Maple. I can attest to that as my car was hit by a huge Tesla, in front of my building. There are people walking across the street at anytime at any random place. Some day someone is going to be hit. The other problem is the residents on the east side of Maple need to pay for parking. People randomly park to make deliveries, talk on their phones, or wait for someone, etc. and they are not ticketed And there is no ticketing for street cleaning, or visiting or overnight without permits. Its not fair. Also at least 90 percent of drivers think they are entitled and do not stop at stop signs as I have even seen our local law enforcement do.(no lights or emergency). to put it bluntly there is no more law and order in Beverly Hills. Thanks for letting me vent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you for this explanation regarding the options at hand. I am in favor of: Tier 1: Speed Feedback Signs. I believe all the other educational tools would unfortunately be ignored by drivers. Tier 2: Traffic Circles, Median Islands, Speed Humps. The break in between the Speed Humps would seem to encourage drivers to partially drive thru the break. A Speed Hump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>without the break would seem to deter speeding more effectively. Tier 3: Need more info on Diagonal Diverters, Forced Turn Islands and Median Barricades and further understand how many streets and which streets these would hypothetically be implemented. The loss of street parking and narrowing of already narrow streets is a great concern. Would strongly be in favor of beginning with speed humps and median islands and determine the effectiveness. We can build on this if necessary. At this time, not in favor of the curb extensions which will narrow already narrow streets along with a loss of street parking. I am very open to hearing feedback regarding this, if the benefits strongly out weigh the disadvantages. Thank you so much for all your efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Does not support striped lane narrowing, traffic circles, median islands, curb extensions, midblock curb extensions, offset curb extensions, speed humps, diagonal diverters, partial street closure, full street closure, turn movement restrictions, forced turn islands, or median barricades. Refer to the SWHOA’s request for traffic calming (traffic circles and turn restrictions) defeated by City Council. 60 people came to the meeting and were against it. These devices make losers on adjacent streets. If other areas want them, that’s ok, but don’t put these in the SW. That would be double jeopardy because they were already defeated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Concerns about cars racing up and down Beverly, Rodeo, and Camden Drives. You can hear their motors all the time. Speed bumps should be installed on these streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td>I live on S. Le Doux Road between Charleville and Gregory way. We have an exorbitant number of cut through traffic, including speeding cars, stop sign running on Le Doux, Gregory and Charville. There are young children on this block. It's not safe. Just backing out of my driveway is a challenge at times. I'm not sure which traffic calming would work, but there must be a solution. One or more of the solutions described in the document would be helpful. We have speed bumps, but they don't slow down the speeders. The other day a car was speeding southbound on Le Doux, ran the stop sign at Gregory, and almost had a head on collision with a northbound car on Le Doux south of Gregory Way. The intersection of Gregory way and Le Doux is offset and is very dangerous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
<td>I'm writing you, as we receive a card, we could send comments re: calming program in the neighborhood. Our problem is stated below (we are a family of 4): Just across the street there is a bodyshop/car dealership. And sometimes the tow trucks come there at a very late time to drop the damaged cars. They park across, full engine on, for like 30 minutes. And it could be at 11-12 PM. Imagine how loud it could be. We'd really want to have some sort of noise ordinance for that kind of work. Please contact me if you have any questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td>We have real problem with people speeding and running stop signs in our neighborhood. I live on N Maple across from Fandango and people race on North Maple between Alden and Beverly to hit the light. It isn't safe for people trying to get out of the driveway. There is also a problem with people running stop signs at Palm/Alden and 3rd/Oakhurst. I was almost hit while walking my dogs at the Palm/Alden stop sign. I almost had a traffic accident at both intersections. There is no regard for the fact the lives or safety of the residents who live here. I would like to see speed bumps to get people to slow down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td>I am a resident in the 200 block of South Camden Dr. There are cars speed raising on our street. I am requesting that Beverly Hills Traffic designate our street as a &quot;Slow Traffic Street&quot;. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>2nd comment! Hello I just drove on South Crescent Drive- the 100 block. There are speed bumps there- We would like to request the bumps or can be humps on McCarty Drive and along Gregory Way. It can be done! Again-no traffic circles- this will not help with the speed demons on McCarty Drive (they have the full block to speed) or Gregory Way! another block to speed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Thank you for alerting me to the Traffic Calming draft program. After reviewing it carefully, I strongly feel that the city’s money can be spent in far more productive ways. If there are a few intersections or areas where the most accidents/incidents have occurred, I can understand increased vigilance there, but otherwise, it would be nice to not feel that the city is heavy-handedly handling those who drive through it. Please put such massive funds to better use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>We live in Le Doux and it is being sued as a highway in the mornings and throughout the day. Children play on this street and it is very dangerous. Race cars choose this street as a shortcut and the neighborhood is tired of feeling like they live in a metropolitan city….please let me know what you can do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>I have lived on Young Drive for 5 years. For safety purposes, I would love to see a four-way stop at the intersection of Young Drive and S. Lasky Drive. Many vehicles regularly drive in excess of 50 MPH along S. Lasky Drive, as it is a lengthy straight-away with no stop signs between S. Moreno Drive and Charleville Blvd. In addition, many nights sports cars can be heard zooming up and down S. Lasky Drive, as if racing. And due to the angle of Young Drive in relation to S. Lasky Drive (which creates a blindspot), I have seen many close calls between vehicles traveling S. Lasky Drive and vehicles attempting to turn left from Young Drive onto S. Lasky Drive. Given the close proximity to the high school, the addition of stop signs on S. Lasky Drive (at Young Drive) might be a good idea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Questions about what the toolbox looks like and if devices were going to be installed on the street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>I would like to propose an additional upkeep measure. S Cannon, S Crescent, and a couple of other streets have a ‘No Left Turn’ onto Olympic Blvd. The signs are obscured by trees and people constantly try to make a left turn which is dangerous and holds up traffic. Also wondered if you couldn't get digital signs that show when the street cleaning has occurred. On those days parking is blocked off for the entire morning and very often the cleaning truck passes through early. It would free up parking for those who want to shop or eat in the neighborhood and would be good for local businesses. I’ve never seen one before so I doubt they exist but essentially it's a 'stop/go' sign that the driver of the cleaning truck can activate once their job is done.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The traffic between Charleville and Gregory on South Rodeo Drive, has become very dangerous. The city installed Slow Street signage which has not been effective. In fact the speed and the increased volume of traffic has become such that there is little difference between our residential street and the traffic on Olympic Blvd! It is obvious that South Rodeo has become the new shortcut to avoid the signals on South Beverly Drive going North or South. The speeding cars are also using South Rodeo to turn right on Olympic to access the Freeway. The traffic is now rolling thru the Gregory intersection without stopping. Their have been many instances of near misses concerning our neighbors with baby carriages, walking dogs, students crossing from the High School. We hope that there is some solution before a serious accident. Thank you for your attention to our concerns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Cars are passing by going very fast. This has caused her a heart condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td>In the past to gain approval for speed bumps there had to be approval of the landlord. Is this still the case or with this new program will renters be able to request speed bumps on their street?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you for considering traffic calming. I live at 132 S Maple Drive. I have lived here since 2011 and have noticed an increase in unsafe speeds and reckless indifference by drivers who cut through on my street. I have been hit once after exiting my driveway and have had many close calls. Part of the problem is that cars can park on both sides of this very narrow street. It is almost impossible for two cars going in opposite directions to safely pass while cars are parked on both sides of the street. Drivers routinely exceed the speed limit, some at almost freeway speeds. My neighbors and our building security personnel have discussed this problem and hope that something can be done before a child, an adult or a pet is horribly injured or killed by this reckless condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td>I live at 426 S Spalding Dr. and my street is regularly used as a cut through by drivers passing between Pico and Olympic. As such we regularly have cars speed down the street, I would guess about 5 times per night at dangerous speeds, and recently had a car lit on fire in the intersection of Spalding and Shirley. Additionally, Spalding Dr. is regularly used by students from BH High to walk home and used as parking by families coming to use Roxbury Park. It's not uncommon on nice days to have both sides of the street lined with cars, making speeding and cut throughs even more dangerous. I believe the Tier 1 options would be the best fit for the street, in particular the 400 block of Spalding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cars are speeding on Spalding between Charleville and Gregory - especially at night. Speed humps would reduce speeding and create a safer neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td>I live at 220 S Gale Dr and have been here for 17 years. We are next to the park and parallel to La Cienega. Commuters often cut through our road to avoid the traffic on La Cienega and some of them drive fast. Because there are cars parked on both sides of the road it is EXTREMELY difficult for residents to see oncoming traffic when we leave our parking lots. I have to look through the windows of the parked cars. I have been t-boned once and nearly hit a couple of times. We could really use a speed bump. Hamilton, the street next to us, has two. What can we do to get a speed bump here?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>