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1. INTRODUCTION

Supporting students safely walking and bicycling to school has been identified as a community priority in Huntington Park. The City of Huntington Park has successfully pursued funding to make improvements to the streets and sidewalks to make it safer and more comfortable for students, and community members of all ages, to get around on foot or by bike. Now, the City and the community are interested in developing a robust Safe Routes to School effort. Safe Routes to School aims to create safe, convenient, and fun opportunities for students to walk, bike, and roll to and from school. Safe Routes to School initiatives include a wide variety of programs and projects, from supporting safety education programs that teach children how to walk and bicycle safely to school to creating safer street crossings and maintaining sidewalks.

The City of Huntington Park passed a Healthy Eating Active Living (HEAL) resolution in 2010, passed a Complete Streets policy in 2012, and adopted a Complete Streets plan in 2016. All these documents set out actions to improve conditions for walking and bicycling and support the City’s health and wellness initiatives. While the Complete Streets Plan and other City plans and policies suggest developing a Safe Routes to School program, a formal program or framework has not been created yet.

A. THE SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL LAUNCH PROGRAM

In spring 2019, the City of Huntington Park and community partners began participating in the Safe Routes to School Launch Program, a joint project of the Safe Routes Partnership and UC Berkeley Safe Transportation Research and Education Center (SafeTREC) designed to help start strong and sustainable Safe Routes to School programs in California communities. As part of the Safe Routes to School Launch Program, the project team gathered and analyzed data and local policies. A workshop brought together
representatives from the City of Huntington Park, Huntington Park Police, and community members to learn about Safe Routes to School and discuss strategies for developing a robust, comprehensive program.

B. ABOUT THIS RECOMMENDATIONS REPORT

This Safe Routes to School Recommendations Report is intended to guide Huntington Park in initiating a strong Safe Routes to School program that addresses local needs. The Recommendations Report was developed based on planning and input that took place at the Safe Routes to School Launch Workshop, the Safe Routes Partnership’s assessment of current conditions, community needs, and capacity in the City and community organizations, and a series of conversations with key stakeholders. Recommendations are based upon the components needed to build a successful Safe Routes to School initiative and sustainable program. The most successful Safe Routes to School initiatives incorporate the Safe Routes to School Six E’s framework: education, encouragement, engineering, enforcement, evaluation, and equity.

The Recommendations Report begins with a summary of current conditions related to walking and biking to school, including existing policies, plans, programs, and infrastructure. The second section of the Recommendations Report outlines recommended strategies and actions to be undertaken in Huntington Park during the first year of implementation (2019-2020) as well as additional longer-term actions to be considered over the next five years. Finally, a brief discussion of funding resources for implementation is provided. Additional information is provided in a number of appendices:

- Appendix A: Existing Policies and Plans
- Appendix B: Pedestrian and Bicycle Collision Data
- Appendix C: Workshop Summary

The Six E’s of Safe Routes to School

Research shows that comprehensive Safe Routes to School initiatives are effective at increasing physical activity and reducing injuries for children.\(^1\) A comprehensive approach requires embedding Safe Routes to School into many aspects of a community. The Six E’s of Safe Routes to School are a convenient way to summarize the key components of a comprehensive, integrated approach. The Six E’s of Safe Routes to School include:

- **Education** – Teaching students and community members about the broad range of transportation choices, providing them with the skills to walk and bicycle, and educating them about how to be safe from traffic, crime, and other threats while using different methods of transportation.
- **Encouragement** – Using events and activities to promote safe walking, safe bicycling, public transportation, and being physically active.
- **Engineering** – Creating physical improvements to the streetscape and built environment that make walking and bicycling more comfortable and convenient, and that also decrease the risk of injury from motor vehicles or people, increasing street safety.
- **Enforcement** – Addressing traffic dangers and crime concerns in the neighborhood around the school and along school routes through work with local law enforcement, crossing guards, and community members.
- **Evaluation** – Assessing which approaches are more or less successful, ensuring that a program or initiative is decreasing injuries and health disparities and increasing equity, and identifying unintended consequences or opportunities to improve the effectiveness of an approach for a given community.
- **Equity** – Ensuring that Safe Routes to School initiatives are benefitting all demographic groups, with particular attention to ensuring safe, healthy, and fair outcomes for low-income communities, communities of color, students of all genders, students with disabilities, and others.

---

\(^1\) McDonald, N. Impact of Safe Routes to School Programs on Walking and Biking. San Diego, CA: Active Living Research; 2015. Available at www.activelivingresearch.org
2. HUNTINGTON PARK TODAY

This section provides an overview of the current conditions in Huntington Park. It describes the current policies and plans, Safe Routes to School and related programs, existing infrastructure for walking and bicycling, and collision history in the city.

A. OVERVIEW

Currently, most students in Huntington Park are driven to school by car. A smaller number walk to school. While some students get to school on foot, families have expressed concerns about traffic safety. During the development of the 2016 Complete Streets Plan, the need for improved crossings near schools, addressing speed on key arterials, and providing separated bicycle facilities were identified as key issues by the community. While the City has begun implementing infrastructure changes, there are opportunities to advance Safe Routes to School at individual schools and across the city through partnerships, policies, and program implementation.

B. COMMUNITY HEALTH AND WELLNESS

Safe Routes to School has the potential to address health challenges related to physical inactivity for students as well as the broader community. In 2010, the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research and California Center for Public Health Advocacy found that 53 percent of Huntington Park children were overweight or obese – the highest percentage for any city in California.1 Although information on physical activity for children is not available for just Huntington Park, the 2015 Los Angeles County Health Survey indicated that less than 20 percent of children within Service Planning Area 7 (which includes Huntington Park) were getting the recommended amount of physical activity. Only 28 percent of adults in Huntington Park report meeting recommended guidelines for physical activity, lower than the Los Angeles County average of 34 percent of adults.2 Thirty percent of Huntington Park adults are obese, higher than the countywide percentage of 24 percent.3 These health disparities have prompted the City to take action through policies and planning such as the Healthy Eating Active Living (HEAL) resolution.

C. EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE FOR WALKING AND BIKING

Huntington Park encompasses approximately 3 square miles and is suburban. The topography of the city is relatively flat and the streets are laid out in a grid. There are sidewalks generally along all streets and crosswalks marked at signalized intersections. Crosswalks are present at some stop-controlled intersections and across one leg of some uncontrolled intersections. There are also mid-block pedestrian crossings with signals on Pacific Boulevard. Several streets have marked crossings that include high-visibility crosswalks and pedestrian signage. Some of these crossings include flashing signs and in-roadway pavement lights.

There are no dedicated on-street bicycle facilities (i.e., Class I bike paths, Class II bike lanes, or Class III bike routes) in Huntington Park. There are bicycle racks at some schools, parks, and the Civic Center.

---

As part of the 2016 Complete Streets Plan, community members identified the following infrastructure needs as key issues:

- Improve sidewalk and pavement quality and conditions
- More stop signs, particularly around schools
- Improve crossings, particularly near schools
- Reduce speeds along key arterials
- Make better use of space along Randolph Street
- Upgrade crosswalks and signals for pedestrians
- Address crossing/pedestrian safety issues along Gage Avenue, particularly at Miles Avenue and Pacific Avenue
- Provide separated facilities for people riding bicycles
- Improve access for people walking and riding bicycles to the Blue Line Station at Slauson Avenue

The City has received Active Transportation Program (ATP) funding to implement a number of improvements including sharrows, additional street crossing improvements, and pedestrian lighting. Projects are scheduled to commence in 2019 and be completed in 2024.

### Community Profile: City of Huntington Park

**Population:** 58,993  
**Land area:** 3 square miles  

**Race and ethnicity:**  
- White 1.6%  
- Black or African American 0.8%  
- Asian 0.6%  
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander 0.2%  
- Some other race 0.1%  
- Hispanic or Latino 96.7%

**Languages spoken at home***:**  
- Spanish 91.6%  
- Other Indo European 0.2%  
- Asian and Pacific Islander Languages 0.6%  
- Other 0.1%

**Poverty status***:**  
- General population: 28.0% living below poverty level  
- Ages <18 years old: 41.1% living below poverty level

**Schools:**  
- Total K-12 enrollment in Huntington Park: 17,327 (2018)  
- Public schools: Los Angeles Unified School District  
  - 8 elementary schools  
  - 2 middle schools  
  - 4 high schools  
  - 1 continuation school  
- Charter schools  
  - 3 elementary schools  
  - 1 K-8 school  
  - 2 middle schools  
  - 2 6-12 schools  
  - 2 high schools  
- 4 private schools

---

*2017 Five-Year American Community Survey

---

4 [https://www.scag.ca.gov/Documents/HuntingtonPark.pdf](https://www.scag.ca.gov/Documents/HuntingtonPark.pdf)
D. PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE COLLISION HISTORY

Between 2013 and 2017, there were a total of 132 bicyclists injured in 137 bicycle collisions as well as 6 pedestrian fatalities and 194 pedestrians injured in 179 pedestrian collisions in Huntington Park. None of the fatalities were school age children. Collisions involving bicycles and pedestrians were generally more likely along major roads in the city, including Slauson, Gage, Florence, and Pacific. Overall, the number of bicycle-involved collisions have declined in the last five years, but the average number of pedestrian-involved collisions has remained fairly steady.

In the bicycle-involved collisions, most of the bicyclist victims were between the age of 15 and 24 years. Collisions were most frequently in the afternoon and early evening hours (3 pm to 9 pm). The most common types of violations associated with the collisions were failing to drive/ride on the right side of the road and drivers not stopping/yielding when going through an intersection.

In the pedestrian-involved collisions, most of the pedestrian victims were between the ages of 15 and 24 years, followed closely by 5 to 14 years. The collisions tended to occur in the evening (6 pm to 9 pm). The most common type of violations associated with the collisions was drivers not stopping for pedestrians at an intersection, whether there was a marked crosswalk or not.

More information about the collisions, including citywide maps, are provided in Appendix B.

E. LOCAL POLICIES AND PLANS RELATED TO SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL

Strong and supportive policies are crucial to ensuring that Safe Routes to School efforts reach students throughout a school district and city. Long term changes in school travel require full incorporation of Safe Routes to School considerations into city and school district policies. The Safe Routes Partnership conducted a policy scan for Huntington Park, reviewing policies of the City of Huntington Park and LAUSD. City of Huntington Park has a Complete Streets policy, a Complete Streets Plan, a Bicycle Plan, and related language in its General Plan and HEAL resolution.

LAUSD has a Wellness Policy that includes some language that supports Safe Routes to School. LAUSD’s Transportation Policy also has limited language and opportunities to expand its coverage of encouraging walking and biking to school. Additionally, the LAUSD website provides background information on Safe Routes to School and encourages travel along designated safe walking routes near individual school locations.

More information about the existing policies and plans can be found in Appendix A.
F. SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PROGRAMS AND OTHER SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL-RELATED EFFORTS

While Huntington Park has identified a number of Safe Routes to School-related activities such as youth bicycle safety education programs as strategies within city policies and plans, and is implementing infrastructure improvements around schools, there have not been significant efforts to implement a broader Safe Routes to School program. According to the City’s 2016 Complete Streets Plan, the City has partnered to host annual bicycle races on Pacific Boulevard, the Department of Parks and Recreation has conducted bicycle training, and the Police Department has organized bicycle rodeos. The Complete Streets Plan suggests developing a Safe Routes to School program and creating Safe Routes Ambassadors or a Safety Education Team. A number of community organizations are actively working with youth and may be promoting physical activity, walking and bicycling in the community, but there has not been a specific focus on Safe Routes to School to date.

G. COMMUNITY WORKSHOP OVERVIEW

The community workshop held on September 21, 2019 revealed numerous findings that inform this Recommendations Report. A few key themes that came forward include:

- Safety – concerns around traffic safety are barriers to walking and biking to school, especially along major roads and near busy intersections. Lack of sufficient lighting is also a concern.
- School engagement – schools and parent groups at each school will be key partners to engage in developing and implementing a Safe Routes to School program.
- Community support – the community is generally supportive of implementing Safe Routes to School activities and there are community organizations and other potential partners that would also support efforts.

A full summary of the workshop can be found in Appendix C.

3. THE PATH TO SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL: APPROACHES AND ACTIONS

This Recommendations Report summarizes recommended strategies and actions. The Recommendations Report is structured around the Six E’s of Safe Routes to School: education, encouragement, engineering, enforcement, evaluation, and equity. In addition, the Recommendations Report includes activities related to program structure, operations, and coordination, as well as policy improvements. Recommendations denoted with an asterisk were actions discussed by workshop participants. The Recommendations Report includes activities to establish a program framework, conduct initial outreach, and start activities at one to two target schools in the first year (2019-2020) and then expansion efforts for years two to five. While the plan is structured this way, it does not preclude the community from implementing a strategy from the longer-term sections earlier if an opportunity arises.
A. PROGRAM STRUCTURE, OPERATIONS, AND COORDINATION

Establishing a formal program structure with identified responsibilities for various partners is a key component of an effective and sustainable Safe Routes to School Program. This involves determining which organization or agency will take the lead, who will be involved in making program decisions, and how coordination will occur between different groups working on different components of the program.

Recommended strategies and actions for year 1:

1. Identify an initial lead that will be responsible for initial coordination of the Safe Routes to School activities, outreaching to schools and community organizations, and coordinating volunteers or obtaining other resources as needed. This lead may be an existing City staff member, staff from a community organization, staff from a school, or a community volunteer.

2. Identify initial funding needs for Safe Routes to School programmatic activities (staffing, events, materials, etc.) and pursue grants, donations, or other funding support.

3. Outreach to school principals and parent groups to generate interest in participating in initial activities at one to two target schools. Outreach to both public schools and charter schools. Consider outreaching initially to schools that participated in the Complete Streets Plan walk audits, pop up events, or workshops.*

4. Establish a Safe Routes to School task force or committee to plan and provide input on program development. Recruit members from the City, LAUSD, individual schools, parent groups and community organizations. Meet bi-monthly or quarterly as program momentum is built. Refer to Building Momentum for Safe Routes to School for additional information on creating a taskforce, including sample materials such as an invitation letter.

Recommended strategies and actions for years 2 to 5:

5. Expand outreach and program to additional schools as interest grows.

6. Create informational materials about the program that could be distributed to community members and families to recruit additional volunteers and program champions. Include a menu of options that schools can undertake.

7. Conduct outreach on Safe Routes to School to school PTAs, community groups, etc.*

8. Schedule regular trainings for family members, school staff, and other volunteers and champions on implementing Safe Routes to School activities.

9. Include Safe Routes to School messaging and resources on the city and school district webpages. Refer to Safe Routes to School Messaging for Pros for sample webpage content. Key messages are also available in Spanish.

10. As the program expands across multiple schools, assess staffing and determine need and ability to establish a part-time or full-time paid Safe Routes to School coordinator position; explore additional funding as needed.
B. EDUCATION

Education activities include teaching students and community members about the broad range of transportation choices, providing them with the skills to walk and bicycle safely, and educating them about how to be safe from traffic, crime, and other threats while using different methods of transportation.

Recommended strategies and actions for year 1:

1. Outreach to the Police Department, Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition, and local community organizations to identify resources to conduct bike and pedestrian safety and bike skills trainings at one to two target schools. This could occur as special events during school or as an after school or weekend event.* Use materials such as the [California Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Curriculum (4th and 5th grades)](https://www.saferoutes.org/curriculum).
2. Work with school principals to develop and distribute traffic safety education materials for families that includes information related to pick-up/drop-off procedures as well as general safety at and around schools. Aim to provide information at two schools in the first year. As noted below, schools should revise their websites to include the LAUSD pedestrian routes to school maps and incorporate language educating families about walking and bicycling as a healthy way to get to school.

Recommended strategies and actions for years 2 to 5:

3. Assess resources, including staffing and equipment, that would be needed to provide ongoing bike and pedestrian education at multiple schools with the goal of providing safety and skills training for multiple grades at every school. Establish a plan to scale up educational efforts to achieve this.
4. Determine whether biking and walking skills and safety training can be integrated into curriculum.
5. Conduct community education events such as family bike nights, festivals, or bike maintenance workshops.
6. Work with high school students and/or others to create signage and public service announcements (PSAs) focused on pedestrian and bicyclist awareness and safety at and around schools.

C. ENCOURAGEMENT

Encouragement strategies generate excitement about walking and bicycling safely to school. Children, parents, teachers, school administrators, and others can all be involved in special events like International Walk to School Day and ongoing activities like walking school buses and bike trains. Encouragement strategies can often be started relatively easily with little cost and a focus on fun.

Recommended strategies and actions for year 1:

1. Assist target schools in participating in International Walk to School Day (October) and National Bike to School Day (May). Provide principals and volunteers/champions at each school with information on the range of activities that could be organized for each day.* Use online materials from the [National Center for Safe Routes to School](https://www.saferoutes.org) to promote it.
2. Survey school leaders to identify what types of competition or incentive programs would likely be successful at target schools. Programs could include frequent walker punch cards or mileage competitions.*

Recommended strategies and actions for years 2 to 6:

3. Increase Walk to School and Bike to School Day participation citywide.*
4. After participating in Walk to School or Bike to School Days, encourage students to keep walking and biking through monthly or weekly themed days.
5. Establish walking school bus and/or bike train programs at each school to support students walking or biking to school within about a half mile of the campus.* Refer to Step by Step: How to Start a Walking School Bus at Your School for information, tips, and resources. The guidebook is also available in Spanish.

D. ENGINEERING

Engineering strategies create physical improvements to the neighborhood that make walking and bicycling more comfortable, convenient, and safe.

Recommended strategies and actions for year 1:

1. Continue to identify opportunities to include Safe Routes to School improvements in existing projects and funding applications.*

2. Conduct walkability and bikeability assessments around target schools with City staff, school staff, students, and families to identify areas needing improvements such as sidewalk gaps and difficult street crossings.

3. Conduct arrival and dismissal observations at target schools with City staff, school staff, students and families to identify areas for improvement.

Recommended strategies and actions for years 2 to 5:

4. Before program expansion or at the start of program expansion to additional schools, conduct walkability and bikeability assessments.

5. Based on the walkability and bikeability assessments, identify opportunities to increase convenient access on campus for students walking and bicycling. This may include improvements on campus to provide direct access from the sidewalk to the bike racks and entry doors or opening gates to allow pedestrian and bicycle access from adjacent trails, parks, and other walkways from the neighborhoods.

6. Develop a citywide comprehensive Safe Routes to School Plan that identifies and plans for infrastructure improvements.

7. Use Measure M Local Return and other funds to implement thorough infrastructure improvements to ensure safety for children and youth walking and biking to school and other destinations.

E. ENFORCEMENT

Enforcement activities deter unsafe behaviors of drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians and encourage safe behaviors in the neighborhood around the school and along school routes. These activities can be conducted by law enforcement, in partnership with law enforcement, or may be structured to be community led.
Recommended strategies and actions for year 1:

1. Conduct focused traffic enforcement targeting behaviors that endanger students and families walking or bicycling near schools. Coordinate efforts with school as well as the school district and provide pre- and post-event communication to families and school staff.

Recommended strategies and actions for years 2-5:

2. Explore interest in developing school safety patrols where students in upper elementary grades receive traffic safety training, teach their peers, and assist with on-campus enforcement activities.
3. As part of overall school route and improvement plans, assess needs for additional adult crossing guards at intersections near schools where students and families express difficulty crossing the street.*

F. EVALUATION

Evaluation involves data collection and program tracking to assess which approaches are more or less successful, ensure that a program is meeting its objectives, and identify unintended consequences or opportunities to improve the effectiveness of an approach for the community.

Recommended strategies and actions for year 1:

1. At the target schools, conduct student travel tallies at the beginning and end of the school year, using the travel tally tool provided by the National Center for Safe Routes to School.
2. Track Safe Routes to School education and encouragement program participation at target schools. Collection information on overall participation as well as grade level/age and other demographic information. Use this information to assess program effectiveness and identify any needs for improvement.

Recommended strategies and actions for years 2 to 5:

3. Begin conducting a yearly assessment of Safe Routes to School efforts at the end of the school year. Evaluate program effectiveness, including participation by different population groups, changes in behaviors or perceptions around walking and bicycling, and school and community receptiveness to the program components.
4. Expand student travel tallies to multiple schools as they begin participating, using the travel tally tool provided by the National Center for Safe Routes to School.
5. Use mapping tools available from UC Berkeley’s TIMS program to map bicycle and pedestrian collisions near schools. Use the collision information to assess changes and identify any needs for improvements citywide or at specific locations.
6. Share program participation and evaluation results with schools and community members through newsletters or other materials.

G. EQUITY

Equity involves ensuring that Safe Routes to School initiatives are benefitting all demographic groups, with particular attention to ensuring safe, healthy, and fair outcomes for low-income communities, communities of color, and others.

Recommended strategies and actions for year 1:

1. Ensure that education and encouragement materials are provided in Spanish. Work with the schools to identify additional language needs.
Recommended strategies and actions for years 2 to 5:

2. Given limited ability to roll out a Safe Routes to School program at every school from the start, use equity measures, such as health disparities and eligibility for the free- and reduced-price lunch program, to develop a framework to prioritize schools for education and encouragement program implementation and/or infrastructure improvements.

3. Use the results of previous year’s evaluation efforts to identify gaps in participation. Develop and implement a strategy to ensure all population groups can participate in the Safe Routes to School program. This strategy may include targeted outreach or adjustments to the programs. Look particularly at students generally underrepresented in active travel; e.g., students of color, female students, and students with disabilities.

H. POLICY

Adopting Safe Routes to School policies or incorporating Safe Routes to School practices into existing city, school, and school district policies helps eliminate barriers and ensure long-term sustainability of the Safe Routes to School program. Policies help institutionalize supportive practices, broadening the reach beyond an individual school or activity to reach children and families across a community. This leads to more consistent implementation between schools and neighborhoods, creates accountability, and establishes formal relationships and responsibilities.

Recommended strategies and actions for year 1:

1. Pass a Safe Routes to School resolution. By passing a Safe Routes to School resolution, Huntington Park can commit itself to specific actions and explorations to prioritize Safe Routes to School infrastructure and initiate a meaningful Safe Routes to School program. The resolution can contain stronger or more aspirational language, striving for ambitious yet realistic steps.

2. Develop a plan to implement the suggested Safe Routes to School and related programming components described in the Complete Streets Plan.

3. Work with schools in Huntington Park to revise school websites and student/family handbooks to contain language encouraging walking and biking as the best ways to get to and from school, describe the benefits of Safe Routes to School, and note activities and events that the school is hosting in support of Safe Routes to School and opportunities for families to engage. Ensure that the LAUSD pedestrian route to school map is available on each school’s website.

Recommended strategies and actions for years 2-5:

4. Fully implement the suggested Safe Routes to School and related programming components described in the Complete Streets Plan.

5. Adopt or implement the additional policies and program suggestions set out in the Complete Streets Plan, particularly including the school siting policy and Vision Zero policy.

6. Revise the Complete Streets Plan to acknowledge that sharrows may not be a strong Complete Streets treatment, since they may not increase safety for people bicycling or increase the numbers of people bicycling; further explore and rank the strength of other design options; consider safety for different ages and abilities.

7. Revise the bicycle plan or adopt a new plan that contains a more thorough exploration of how bicycle networks feed into schools and updates the bicycle lane classifications to reflect the strong preference for protected bicycle lanes from people who ride bikes and those considering whether to ride bikes.

8. Revise the General Plan Update to provide more supportive policies and actions regarding walking, bicycling, and active transportation. Use multimodal level of service measures and conduct a
comprehensive revision to address Safe Routes to School and the policies necessary to create a community that is safe for and supportive of bicycling and walking for children or adults.

9. Continue to assess and revise all transportation and related plans and policies to acknowledge the changes in the transportation landscape caused by the emergence of shared scooters, ridehailing, and other new mobility changes; assess the effects these changes are having on children and youth traveling to school, and identify what steps may be necessary in response.

10. Work with LAUSD and other cities with schools in LAUSD to encourage stronger Safe Routes to School language in the Wellness Policy and on the website, as well as stronger support for Safe Routes to School activities outside of the City of Los Angeles.

4. POTENTIAL FUNDING RESOURCES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

The following are potential funding sources and mechanisms that may be used to implement the Safe Routes to School Recommendations Report. The list is not exhaustive as additional funding sources and innovative mechanisms may develop during the life of the plan.

A. CALIFORNIA ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

The California Active Transportation Program (ATP) consolidates federal transportation funding with state funds to provide local communities with funding for programs and projects that support active transportation. Safe Routes to School non-infrastructure programs such as traffic safety education and encouragement activities, as well as infrastructure improvements, can be funded through the program. The funding is provided through a competitive application process. There is a statewide application process as well as a regional component administered by the Southern California Association of Governments. The City of Huntington Park has been successful in securing ATP funding in past cycles for infrastructure improvements.

B. CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF TRAFFIC SAFETY

The California Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) provides grants to local and state public agencies for programs that help them enforce traffic laws, educate the public in traffic safety, and provide means of reducing fatalities, injuries, and economic losses from collisions. Funding can be used for Safe Routes to School education and encouragement programs. Historically, OTS has funded numerous bike rodeo (bike skills practice) programs around the state, often led by law enforcement agencies. Grants are awarded annually. More information can be found here: http://www.ots.ca.gov/Grants/default.asp

C. MEASURE M

In 2016, Los Angeles County passed Measure M, a half-cent countywide sales tax to enhance bus and rail operations, develop programs for students, seniors, and persons with disabilities, improve highways, expressways, and local roads, and expand opportunities for active transportation. The tax will generate an estimated $860 million each year. The City of Huntington Park will receive approximately $840,000 in local return annually. Eligible projects include: Complete Streets, green streets, active transportation, traffic control measures (including Safe Routes to School projects), and transit-oriented community investments.

D. LOCAL FOUNDATIONS, HEALTH ORGANIZATIONS, AND BUSINESSES

Local foundations, health organizations, and businesses may be sources of funding for implementing Safe Routes to School programs. The benefits of Safe Routes to School for students, families, schools, and
communities often align with foundations and organizations looking to support community health, physical activity, youth development, and neighborhood improvement. In addition, local businesses may be willing to sponsor Safe Routes to School activities and provide monetary funding, volunteers, or giveaways.

5. CONCLUSION

As Huntington Park continues to implement improvements to the streets and sidewalks to support safe walking and bicycling, the City along with community partners are poised to launch a Safe Routes to School program. Engagement with the schools around active transportation during the Complete Streets Plan development and community interest in creating an active healthy community provide foundations for implementing initial programmatic activities and developing partnerships to move a program forward. By implementing the recommended activities set out in this Recommendations Report, Huntington Park can develop a program that supports a safe and healthy community.
APPENDIX A. EXISTING POLICIES AND PLANS

A. INTRODUCTION

Strong and supportive policies are crucial to ensuring that Safe Routes to School efforts reach students throughout a school district and city. Long term changes in school travel require full incorporation of Safe Routes to School considerations into city and school district policies. The Safe Routes Partnership conducted a policy scan for Huntington Park, reviewing policies of the City of Huntington Park and the Los Angeles Unified School District. This report provides an overview of the current policy landscape for Safe Routes to School in Huntington Park and highlights promising opportunities for updating and improving commitment to Safe Routes to School.

B. CITY OF HUNTINGTON PARK

The City of Huntington Park has a variety of policies and plans that are supportive of students walking, bicycling, and using active travel modes to get to school and elsewhere. These policies, along with potential to improve them, are reviewed here.

1. Complete Streets Policy

In 2012, Huntington Park passed a Complete Streets resolution adopting a Complete Streets Policy (Policy 2012-18). The policy commits to a multimodal transportation network with a focus on connections to services, schools, parks, and other destinations. The policy contains positive language committing the city to implementing Complete Streets principles in the construction and reconstruction of streets. The policy also declares that it is the city’s policy to provide well-designed bicycle and pedestrian accommodations along all streets.

This Complete Streets policy tied for second place in the 2013 Top Ten Complete Streets Policies awarded by the National Complete Streets Coalition. The language in the policy is very strong overall, though it is not clear if it has had much effect on the implementation of projects.

2. Complete Streets Plan

In 2016, a Complete Streets Plan was developed for Huntington Park. An extensive public outreach process led to a detailed plan with a variety of options for major and minor streets throughout Huntington Park. For most streets in the proposed network, the options of accommodating bicycles through sharrows or through bicycle lanes, with or without protection, were set out.

The plan also included a chapter on options for beneficial policies and programs. Policies that are explored include a crosswalk policy, Vision Zero policy, bike parking policy, green streets policy, and first mile/last mile policy. In addition, the section discusses a “Safe Routes to School/School Siting Policy”:

A school siting policy can address both location and size of new schools within the City of Huntington Park. Neighborhood-sized schools, as opposed to mega schools on the periphery, are a key ingredient for encouraging walking and bicycling to school. In addition, pedestrian and ADA improvements should be prioritized near schools. Though the Los Angeles Unified School District controls decisions relating to schools in the City of Huntington Park, the City could adopt a formal
policy to encourage neighborhood-sized schools, and proactively work with LAUSD to implement school decisions that are in keeping with the City’s vision.

The section also contains language about a variety of education programs, including Safe Routes to School programs:

This category refers to a variety of children’s programs aimed at promoting both walking and bicycling to school and improving traffic safety around schools. The program takes a comprehensive “5 E” approach with specific engineering, education, encouragement, enforcement, and evaluation. The programs involve partnerships among school staff, parents, students, city staff, school districts, neighbors, and law enforcement. The National Center for Safe Routes to School has in-depth programming information. Integrating educational messages into a comprehensive SRTS program can be a very effective way to kick-start a citywide program. Specific education tools include:

- Pedestrian skills training for 1st and 3rd graders
- Bicycle skills training for 3rd and 5th graders
- Messaging to parents about safe driving, walking and bicycling habits
- Creating drop-off and pick-up procedures
- Incorporating information about walking and bicycling into classroom subjects such as math or science (e.g., calculate average walking speeds or distances)
- Assemblies or classroom sessions about walking and biking safety

In addition to Safe Routes to School programs, the plan also discusses Teen Transportation Safety Education:

Teens benefit from different educational messages than adults or children. Many teens also already take drivers’ education, health education, or other courses where walking, biking and transit curricula could be easily integrated. The City should work with local teen-organizations or schools to facilitate a participatory process whereby teens create educational messages. Youth Participatory Action Research (YPAR) is an effective way to assist youth to create visuals, videos, or campaigns for pedestrian safety among their peers. The California Department of Public Health has guides on YPAR and youth-led projects.

The plan contains a variety of additional content that is supportive of or commonly part of Safe Routes to School programs, including establishing a mascot for walking and having corner captains to increase safety for walking children. The plan suggests establishing walking school buses and bike trains

Establish Walking School Buses and Bicycle Trains to and from schools in Huntington Park. Walking School Buses and Bicycle Trains are organized walking and biking groups where adults “pick up” kids along a specific route to school at specific locations. This way, children are supervised during their travel to school. These programs can be organized on a weekly or daily basis, or for special events like Walk and Bike to School Day.
Strengths:

- Overall, the Huntington Park Complete Streets Plan is a very impressive and comprehensive document. It contains extensive treatment of Safe Routes to School generally, specific components of Safe Routes to School, school siting, and related issues.
- The Safe Routes to School programming components cover many or most of the key aspects of Safe Routes to School that should be readily implemented in Huntington Park.

Areas for improvement:

- There is a lot of information about Safe Routes to School, but not much in the way of recommendations regarding what is needed to implement a program or how logistically to set up a Safe Routes to School program.
- Presentation of design options for creating a Complete Streets network did not provide much context for what differences in injuries, fatalities, and mode share could be expected from the different designs, nor was there an explanation of how that would vary for children, youth, seniors, and people with disabilities. The lowest cost and simplest option, adding sharrows, was insufficiently contextualized as a fairly unconvincing Complete Street approach. Research suggests that sharrows do not necessarily increase safety or ridership for bicycles, indicating that these should probably not be considered to be a Complete Street treatment except under very limited conditions.¹

3. Bicycle Plan

The Bicycle Plan was adopted in 2014. It notes schools as key destinations, and contains a map showing school and public facility destinations (Figure 4.3 – Local Destinations). The plan contains references to the need for connections to schools periodically throughout. In addition, the plan includes linkages to schools as one of the prioritization factors in ranking projects. The plan includes generally supportive language on Safe Routes to School in the goals and objectives:

Objective 2.5 (under Safety goal): Initiate local Safe Routes to School efforts
Policy: Implement improvements that support safe bicycle travel to and from local schools.

Objective 3.1 (under Education goal): Work with local school district(s) to implement a Safe Routes to School Program within the city.
Policies: Offer bicycle skills and safety classes, and bicycle repair workshops; Develop communications materials designed to improve safety for bicyclists, pedestrians, and motorists.

The Bicycle Plan also contains a paragraph recommending a youth bicycle safety education program and suggesting that such a program could be integrated into a Safe Routes to School program.

The Bicycle Plan includes references to expired state law and would benefit from an update. Although the inclusion of schools throughout as a consideration in planning bike facilities is very positive, there are limited policy recommendations for supporting Safe Routes to School programming in schools.

Strengths:

- It is good to see recognition of Safe Routes to School in the bicycle plan, and many aspects of the bicycle plan are supportive of walking and biking to school.
- Including school access as a prioritization criterion is very positive.

Areas for Improvement:

- The Safe Routes to School programming recommendations are limited and could be revised to include a robust set of recommendations for how youth bicycling skills and safety could be incorporated into a strong Safe Routes to School program through curriculum, in-class opportunities, assemblies and events, afterschool programming, clubs and camps, youth leadership opportunities, and more.
- The actual bicycle network proposed in the plan focuses on exhausted infrastructure improvements. The proposed network could be reassessed to provide more improvements for safety and mode share.
- The Bicycle Plan would do well to explicitly list establishment of a strong Safe Routes to School program as a recommendation in the programming section.
- The Bicycle Plan did not explore necessary elements to providing safe access to schools by bicycle or other modes in detail, despite its prioritization. School travel planning would allow the Bicycle Plan to consider whether the accommodations proposed for major streets would be enough for schoolchildren, or whether the smaller access streets would require infrastructure improvements to be appropriate for safe bicycling by kids.
- In the section on enforcement, the bicycle plan should include recommendations for crossing guards and the like, rather than simply focusing law-breaking with police responses.

4. General Plan

The original Huntington Park General Plan was adopted in 1991. In 2016 an update process was initiated. On November 15, 2017, a Draft General Plan Update was made available for public comment. This policy scan includes a review of the Draft General Plan Update.

Policies of interest include:

- **Mobility & Circulation Element Policy 2**: The City of Huntington Park shall design local, collector, and residential streets to discourage their use as through traffic routes.
- **Mobility & Circulation Element Policy 16**: The City of Huntington Park shall provide for safety of pedestrians and bicycles in the planning and construction of new roadway and transit projects.
- **Mobility & Circulation Element Policy 17**: The City of Huntington Park shall maintain existing pedestrian facilities and require new development to provide pedestrian access to existing public walkways.
- **Mobility & Circulation Element Policy 18**: The City of Huntington Park shall work with adjacent jurisdictions and the MTA to develop a network of on-street bike lanes or off-street bike paths.
- **Mobility & Circulation Element Policy 19**: The City of Huntington Park shall encourage the provision of an accessible and secure area for bicycle storage at all new and existing developments.
The City uses an intersection level of service vehicle focused metric of A-F, based on the free flow of cars. The plan update relies upon the route designations from the 2014 Bicycle Plan.

**Strengths:**

- It is good to see consideration of how to design streets to discourage use as cut throughs, especially considering use of navigation technology.

**Areas for Improvement:**

- Overall, the General Plan Update provides limited support for on walking, bicycling, and active transportation. Its structure and policies are car centric, and there is little consideration of the needs of people bicycling or walking. The plan could be strengthened by addressing multimodal transportation, discussing of how walking and biking contribute to a vibrant local economy, social connectivity, or a sense of place, and addressing the high levels of bicycle and pedestrian injuries in the city.
- There is no mention of Safe Routes to School and very little discussion of how the plan can support and integrate schools into a healthy community environment.
- The plan should exchange reliance on car centric level of service standards for multimodal level of service standards that give consideration and value to all modes of transportation.
- Active transportation is not included in the basic policies setting out priorities for local streets and are treated under “alternative forms of transportation” at the back of the mobility and circulation discussion.

5. **Healthy Eating Active Living (HEAL Cities) Resolution**

In June 2010, Huntington Park adopted a Healthy Eating Active Living (HEAL) City resolution declaring Huntington Park a HEAL city (2010-37). The resolution commits the city to making every effort to plan and construct a build environment that encourages walking, bicycling, and other forms of physical activity. Although very general, this resolution puts the city on record in support of health, physical activity, and active transportation.

6. **Other Aspects of Municipal Code**

Huntington Park's Municipal Code contains other provisions that may affect walking and bicycling, including Safe Routes to School. Some examples include:

- Bike parking requirements (§9-3.808; §9-3.1404): The city’s code contains various zoning provisions relating to bike parking, including a requirement that all nonresidential uses provide adequate convenient bike parking, as well as inclusion of required secure bicycle parking as part of transportation demand management for larger facilities.
- The zoning code also permits vehicle parking requirement reductions in exchange for bicycle parking and showers or bikeway linkages to bike routes (§9-3.812).
C. POLICIES OF THE LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Huntington Park is served by the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). As the second largest school district in the nation, LAUSD is a large institution with considerable institutional inertia. LAUSD has more than 1,000 schools, of which Huntington Park’s share makes up fewer than 30. Because the policies and practices put in place by LAUSD have the potential to affect the travel habits and long-term health of Huntington Park students, their families, and the greater community, we take a close look at them here.

LAUSD has a wide range of policies, including a number supporting health, wellness, and academic achievement for students. Policies are adopted by the board of education and guide practices at the district and school level. The policies are fairly neutral. They avoid the negativity of some policies seen around the nation though could be strengthened to add in positive language that is more supportive of Safe Routes to School and addresses specific issues and policy points. Several existing policies are described below, with some suggestions regarding how they could be strengthened.

1. Website & Student Transportation

The Los Angeles Unified School District website includes information on student transportation to school. Although this information focuses on school bus transportation, the initial page for parents and students includes a link to a Pedestrian School Routes/Safe Routes to School webpage under Additional Resources.

The Safe Routes to School page highlights the designated safe walking routes to school. Maps appear to be available for every elementary and middle school. These maps show the recommended crossings to school. The webpage states:

The Safe Routes to School [sic] shows the recommended crossings to school. Safe Route to School route maps should be distributed to the students and their parents. A copy of the Safe Route to School should be posted in the main office.

Parents should instruct their children to follow the arrows shown on the map to the school location. It is recommended that parents and children become familiar with the route to school by walking it together. Obey marked crosswalks, stop signs, traffic signals and other traffic controls. Please visit the City of Los Angeles’s Safe Routes to School Program website for more information.

Pedestrian routes to school maps can be viewed by locating the school name in one of the following alphabetical lists, then clicking the PDF link just under the school name.

Strengths:

It is very positive that LAUSD has maps for all of these schools and that they are prominently available from the main transportation pages.

Areas for Improvement:

Support for Safe Routes to School could be strengthened on LAUSD’s website and transportation policy by:

- Featuring walking and bicycling as a prominent means of transportation.
- Encouraging walking and bicycling as the healthiest ways to travel to school and noting academic and attendance benefits.
- Encouraging walking and bicycling to bus stops.
- Exploring opportunities for remote drop-offs by school buses.
- Providing crossing guards at schools for arrival and dismissal.
- Assigning staff to support student active travel to school.
- Both enabling students within the City of Los Angeles to benefit from the City’s Safe Routes to School program while also ensuring that LAUSD students outside the City of Los Angeles receive equally robust services and support.

2. LAUSD’s Wellness Policy

The LAUSD Board of Education adopted a wellness policy, called the Blueprint for Wellness, in July 2017. The policy supports a healthy school environment with access to physical activity and nutrition. The wellness policy is inclusive and strives to enable a healthy environment among students, parents, teachers, administrators, and the greater community. The wellness policy requires all schools to establish school-site coordinated health committees, which have the potential to focus on Safe Routes to School. The wellness policy also encourages comprehensive school physical activity programming, supporting the integration of physical activity into the time before, at the start of, during, and after the school day.

Safe Routes to School is specifically mentioned in a few places in the wellness policy. There is discussion of the LADOT Safe Routes to School program and also of Walk to School Day in the supported in the chapter on Safe Environment. It is unclear how these activities apply to LAUSD schools not in the City of Los Angeles, and the activities spelled out in this section are all presented as optional and are not coordinated with the Safe Routes to School activities discussed in the Physical Education chapter. The Physical Education chapter includes this language:

“Safe routes to schools are defined and Walk to School Days are kicked off in the fall. All schools are encouraged to participate, but are not mandated. Students and parents are taught about walking school buses. Students and community members are taught about the safe use of bicycles, skateboards and scooters. Parents are encouraged to become active and advocate for 60 minutes of daily physical activity.”

“Schools will provide opportunities for ‘active transport’ (walking, skating, walking school buses and biking to schools) and shall encourage students to walk or bike to school when feasible. Schools should engage parents in organizing adult supervised groups to facilitate safe walking and biking. This may include assessing walking and biking access to school and exploring ways to improve access. Schools must develop an arrival and dismissal plan to ensure, where possible, safer traffic ingress and egress conditions for students in and around the school campus. Middle school physical education programs are encouraged to teach bicycle safety in their curriculum.”

Strengths:

Overall, the Safe Routes to School language in the wellness policy is fairly strong. The policy enumerates a variety of important actions that schools are instructed or encouraged to take to support different Safe Routes to School activities, including walking school buses, school route assessments, parental involvement, and bicycle safety instruction.
Areas for Improvement:

The District Wellness Policy could be more supportive of Safe Routes to School by:

- Renaming the current Physical Education chapter to be Physical Activity or Physical Education and Physical Activity, so that readers are clear that the focus is larger than PE classes.
- Creating a separate subsection within the Physical Activity chapter focused on Safe Routes to School.
- Integrating and strengthening the discussions of Safe Routes to School in the Safe Environment chapter and the PE chapter.
- Beginning with a strong statement about the health and academic benefits of walking and bicycling to school.
- Committing the district to providing an integrated menu of Safe Routes to School activities and curricular segments, supported by materials and resources, for implementation at each school.
- Providing resources for safe and accessible options for walking and biking to school.
- Providing more mandatory language or stronger recommendations.
- Encouraging walking and bicycling skills and safety education in elementary school as well as in middle school; making a bicycle fleet available to PE teachers.
- Including discussion of Safe Routes to School as a school attendance/chronic absenteeism solution in the sections on that issue. Safe Routes to School is included in an example of early intervention related to absenteeism, but not integrated into solutions – Safe Routes to School should be listed as one of the universal strategies to promote positive attendance and also integrated elsewhere.
- Including Safe Routes to School coordinators and city/county transportation professionals on the School Health Council/Committee.

C. HUNTINGTON PARK SCHOOLS

Although LAUSD is a large system that is likely to be difficult to influence, individual schools in Huntington Park have more control over their own communications and practices.

1. School Websites

Websites for Huntington Park schools contain local information. Upon review of a few of these websites, some of the sites include information about transportation referring users to the LAUSD bus service; others contain no information about transportation. None appear to contain information about walking, not even the local Safe Routes to School maps that LAUSD has developed for each school.

Areas for Improvement:

School websites could be more supportive of Safe Routes to School by:

- Addressing student travel to school.
- Noting the importance of school attendance & timeliness and connections to academic success.
- Encouraging walking and bicycling to school as the healthiest mode of getting to school.
- Confirming that bike racks are available at the school.
- Sharing the LAUSD pedestrian route to school map as well as additional information.
- Suggesting methods for families and students to form walking school buses or bike trains.
• Providing information about Safe Routes to School events and activities promoted by the school, such as Walk to School Day or Bike to School Day.
• Identifying and sharing additional methods of supporting walking and biking.
• Sharing information about safe walking and biking.

2. Student/Parent/Family Handbooks

Handbooks are another common feature of schools. We were not able to review any handbooks, but if Huntington Park schools do provide student or family handbooks, this is an important opportunity to frame walking and biking positively, be clear that walking and biking is the best way for students to get to school, and support Safe Routes to School more generally.

D. SAFE ROUTES PARTNERSHIP RECOMMENDATIONS

Key considerations from a policy perspective for Huntington Park to strengthen support for Safe Routes to School include:

• Pass a Safe Routes to School resolution. By passing a Safe Routes to School resolution, Huntington Park can commit itself to specific actions and explorations to prioritize Safe Routes to School infrastructure and initiate a meaningful Safe Routes to School program. The resolution can contain stronger or more aspirational language, striving for ambitious yet practical steps.
• Fully implement the suggested Safe Routes to School and related programming components described in the Complete Streets Plan.
• Adopt or implement the additional policies and program suggestions set out in the Complete Streets Plan, particularly including the school siting policy and Vision Zero policy.
• Revise the Complete Streets Plan to acknowledge that sharrows may not be a strong Complete Streets treatment, since they may not increase safety for people bicycling or increase the numbers of people bicycling; further explore and rank the strength of other design options; consider safety for different ages and abilities.
• Revise the bicycle plan or adopt a new plan that contains a more thorough exploration of how bicycle networks feed into schools and updates the bicycle lane classifications to reflect the strong preference for protected bicycle lanes from people who ride bikes and those considering whether to ride bikes.
• Revise the General Plan Update to provide more supportive policies and actions regarding walking, bicycling, and active transportation. Use multimodal level of service measures and conduct a comprehensive revision to address Safe Routes to School and the policies necessary to create a community that is safe for and supportive of bicycling and walking for children or adults.
• Revise many of these plans and policies to acknowledge the changes in the transportation landscape caused by the emergence of shared scooters, ridehailing, and other new mobility changes; assess the effects these changes are having on children and youth traveling to school and identify indicated measures.
• Work with LAUSD and other cities with schools in LAUSD to encourage stronger Safe Routes to School language in the Wellness Policy and on the website, as well as stronger support for Safe Routes to School activities outside of the City of Los Angeles.
• Work with schools in Huntington Park to revise school websites and student/family handbooks to contain language encouraging walking and biking as the best ways to get to and from school, describe the benefits of Safe Routes to School, and note activities and events that the school is hosting in support of Safe Routes to School and opportunities for families to engage. Ensure that the LAUSD pedestrian route to school map is available on each school’s website.
APPENDIX B. COLLISION MAPS

A. INTRODUCTION

This appendix contains additional information regarding collisions involving pedestrians and bicyclists within Huntington Park, including:

- Maps showing collisions in relation to median household income by census tract (2013-2017)
- Summaries by victim age and gender
- Collisions by time of day and day of week
- Collisions by month of year
- Type of violation
Collision Severity

- Injury (Severe) (4)
- Injury (Other Visible) (50)
- Injury (Complaint of Pain) (76)

Data Source: Statewide Integrated Traffic Record System (SWITRS) 2013-2017; 2016 and 2017 data are provisional

Date: 5/7/2019 as of March 2019

Number of Collisions (All Injury Levels)

Year

Total: 277 Collisions

5-Yr Rolling Avg
Total (All Injury Levels)

Data Source: Statewide Integrated Traffic Record System (SWITRS) 2008-2017; 2016 and 2017 data are provisional as of March 2019
Huntington Park Bicycle Victims by Age and Gender

Data Source: Statewide Integrated Traffic Record System (SWITRS) 2013-2017; 2016 and 2017 data are provisional as of March 2019
### Huntington Park Bicycle Collisions by Time of Day and Day of Week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00PM-11:59PM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:00PM-08:59PM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00PM-05:59PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noon-02:59PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00AM-11:59AM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:00AM-08:59AM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00AM-05:59AM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midnight-02:59AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**: 137

Data Source: Statewide Integrated Traffic Record System (SWITRS) 2013-2017; 2016 and 2017 data are provisional as of March 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CVC No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number of Collisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21650</td>
<td>Failure to drive/ride on right half of the roadway (with some exceptions)</td>
<td>18 (13.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21804</td>
<td>Driver failure to yield right-of-way when entering/crossing a highway</td>
<td>18 (13.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21202</td>
<td>Bicyclist failure to ride on right edge of roadway if riding below the normal speed of traffic</td>
<td>13 (9.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22107</td>
<td>Unsafe turning or moving right or left on a roadway Turning without signaling</td>
<td>12 (8.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21453</td>
<td>Failure to stop at a limit line or crosswalk at a red light Failure to yield right-of-way to pedestrian when turning on a red light</td>
<td>11 (8.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22450</td>
<td>Driver failure to stop at a limit line or crosswalk at a stop sign / (ND): Driver failure to stop for a stop sign before a limit line; otherwise, a crosswalk or intersection entrance Driver failure to stop at limit line before railroad; or, before entering</td>
<td>8 (5.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21950</td>
<td>Driver failure to yield right-of-way to pedestrians at a marked or unmarked crosswalk</td>
<td>8 (5.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21802</td>
<td>Failure to stop or yield right-of-way at a stop sign</td>
<td>5 (3.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21801</td>
<td>Driver failure to yield right-of-way when making a left turn or U-turn</td>
<td>5 (3.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21800</td>
<td>Failure to yield right-of-way at intersection, including failure to yield to vehicles already in the intersection, on a continuing highway, or on their right side in an intersection, or safely when an intersection is controlled</td>
<td>4 (2.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Statewide Integrated Traffic Record System (SWITRS) 2013-2017; 2016 and 2017 data are provisional as of March 2019

Collision Severity
- Fatal (5)
- Injury (Severe) (10)
- Injury (Other Visible) (61)
- Injury (Complaint of Pain) (96)

Data Source: Statewide Integrated Traffic Record System (SWITRS) 2013-2017; 2016 and 2017 data are provisional
Date: 5/7/2019
as of March 2019

Data Source: Statewide Integrated Traffic Record System (SWITRS) 2008-2017; 2016 and 2017 data are provisional as of March 2019.
Huntington Park Pedestrian Victims by Age and Gender

Data Source: Statewide Integrated Traffic Record System (SWITRS) 2013-2017; 2016 and 2017 data are provisional as of March 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00PM-11:59PM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:00PM-08:59PM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00PM-05:59PM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noon-02:59PM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00AM-11:59AM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:00AM-08:59AM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00AM-05:59AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midnight-02:59AM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>179</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Statewide Integrated Traffic Record System (SWITRS) 2013-2017; 2016 and 2017 data are provisional as of March 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CVC No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number of Collisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21950</td>
<td>Driver failure to yield right-of-way to pedestrians at a marked or unmarked crosswalk</td>
<td>82 (45.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21954</td>
<td>Pedestrian failure to yield right-of-way to vehicles when crossing outside of a marked or unmarked crosswalk</td>
<td>19 (10.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21453</td>
<td>Failure to stop at a limit line or crosswalk at a red light. Failure to yield right-of-way to pedestrian when turning on a red light</td>
<td>10 (5.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21955</td>
<td>Pedestrian failure to cross at crosswalks between adjacent traffic signal controlled intersections</td>
<td>10 (5.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21956</td>
<td>Pedestrian failure to walk close to the edge of the roadway when there is no sidewalk present. Pedestrian failure to walk on the left-hand edge of the roadway when outside of a business or resident district, unless crossing is not possible</td>
<td>9 (5.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21456</td>
<td>Pedestrian failure to yield right-of-way at traffic signal. Failure of pedestrian to yield right-of-way to vehicles already in intersection. Failure to obey crosswalk symbols or finish crossing before &quot;countdown&quot; ends</td>
<td>7 (3.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22350</td>
<td>Speeding on the highway / Driving at a dangerously high speed given highway conditions like weather, visibility, traffic, and highway measurements, or driving at a speed that endangers people or property</td>
<td>6 (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22106</td>
<td>Unsafe starting or backing of a vehicle on a highway</td>
<td>5 (2.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22107</td>
<td>Unsafe turning or moving right or left on a roadway. Turning without signaling</td>
<td>5 (2.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22450</td>
<td>Driver failure to stop at a limit line or crosswalk at a stop sign. Driver failure to stop for a stop sign before a limit line; otherwise, a crosswalk or intersection entrance. Driver failure to stop at limit line before railroad; or, before entering</td>
<td>3 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Statewide Integrated Traffic Record System (SWITRS) 2013-2017; 2016 and 2017 data are provisional as of March 2019
Huntington Park – SRTS Launch Program

PEDESTRIAN COLLISIONS BY MONTH (2008-2017)

Huntington Park – SRTS Launch Program

BICYCLE COLLISIONS BY MONTH (2008-2017)

- Total: 227 Collisions

APPENDIX C. WORKSHOP SUMMARY

The following are notes from the Safe Routes to School Launch workshop held in Huntington Park on September 21, 2019.

A. POST IT NOTE EXERCISE

Participants wrote down their thoughts regarding challenges for safe walking and bicycling to school in Huntington Park and ideas on opportunities to improve and support safe walking and bicycling on Post It notes.

1. Challenges
   - Working parents
   - Speeding cars
   - Traffic congestion on main streets — eg Miles, Gage, Florence
   - How will plan be implemented?
   - Distance to school
   - Safety – vehicles vs pedestrians
   - dogs at the park off leash and chasing kids
   - LAUSD busing minimum 5 miles, how to reduce

2. Opportunities
   - Walk/bike plan
   - kids walk together
   - walking school bus
   - ADA accessible ramps and sidewalks
   - Crossing guards
   - Bike/walk plan great opportunity for all to maintain a healthy body
   - Randolph trail/walkway place to walk
   - Crosswalk advance to stop line
   - Brighter/more visible flashing lights

B. BEE’S TO THE E’S IDEAS

Participants brainstormed ideas, strategies, and actions that could be taken in Huntington Park under each of the 6 E’s of Safe Routes to School.

- Lack of clarity, brilliance, more happiness on the Avenue; maybe paint the chain link fence that goes around the school; paint the [...] — paint it a happier color with more clarity, more inviting
- That they fix the sidewalks, that people driving stop using their phones while driving; that people with dogs clean up after them
- More lights at school zone especially when daylight savings ends
- More staff in after school programs
- Need more street lights
- More crossing guards
• More fixing streets
• City participation with local PTA groups to hear their concerns regarding safety
• For the engineer - when will we see the improvements from the projects already underway (evaluation)
• Talk with the children so that they are mindful to avoid accidents and to live better
• Parents work with the teachers to benefit their children
• Promote education in schools and involve parents as part of parent meetings
• Encourage parents by encouraging them with gift cards. This is a way for parents to learn the need for safe crosswalks. Take this presentation to schools.
• Give students prizes if they walk or ride bicycles
• Pedestrian lights
• Walk to School or Bike to School Day
• Grants to raffle bikes for students to use to and from school
• Apply for programs where the city collaborators with local schools and third party nonprofit groups to form walking school buses
• Funding for public safety to be present before and after school hours to deter and enforce driving and crosswalk violations
• Safe routes community block captain volunteer program to organize groups of kids to walk together
• Parent/block meetings
• More police presence at school arrival and dismissal time
• More crosswalks
• Activate the anti-gang program and avoid graffiti. Convert Randolph Street to a pedestrian corridor between Pacific and State
• Flashing lights at Gage and Stafford
• Better visibility for crosswalks similar to the ones at South Gate- Firestone and I don't remember the other street but this is where the Santa Elena church is (almost at corner of State)
• Flashing lights on Pacific and 58 where there are three schools

C. WALK AUDIT WORKSHEETS

Participants took notes about challenges and barriers to walking and bicycling to school along Miles Avenue in front of City Hall and Miles Elementary School.

1. Speeding – cars driving to work
2. Cars dropping kids at peak times
3. Lighting on crosswalks
4. Paint crosswalks for more visibility
5. Crossing guards needed

1. City hall parking lot entrance, high pedestrian traffic
2. Drop off area on Miles Ave adjacent to elementary school

1. Are the unloading zones safe in school zones
2. Emergency exit
3. Flyers were sent to principal for people to attend
4. Bike lane?
5. Redo painting on sidewalk
6. Lights on crosswalk for visibility at night

1. Widen the sidewalks on Miles where they haven’t been widened
2. School entrance on Miles and Saturn
3. Gage – slight live issue around curb
4. Lighting needs to be more visible
5. Solar paneling – more pedscale lighting

1. Busy street
2. Speeds
3. Not a lot of protection from cars
4. Needs landscape stripe
5. Broken lights

1. Miles is a N/S street between Zoe and Saturn. There is one school in between. Miles is a two lane street, 2 lanes north and 2 south.
2. Miles east side has a wide sidewalk where students can walk.
3. The parking lot of city hall is used to pick up and drop off students.

1. Impacted infrastructure
2. Heavy traffic before and after school
3. Ineffective traffic circulation
4. Heavily populated schools
5. Drivers and pedestrians violating right of way and crosswalk rules
6. Lack of drop off/pick up areas away from traffic lanes

1. Space permitting student drop off area
2. Group gathering area off school campus to remind students to walk/ride bike
3. Widening sidewalk for bikes and student/pedestrians to walk and bike ride

C. ACTION PLAN EXERCISE

The group brainstormed goals, actions, and key leaders and partners for implementing a Safe Routes to School program in Huntington Park.

Our goals for the SRTS program are:

- Students riding their bikes to school
- Bike racks with a secure cage
- Widen pavement space
- Pedestrian lighting
- Sidewalk leveling
- Repainting pavement markings
- Park lighting
Actions:
- Neighborhood watch
- County library
- Volunteer coordinator at each block
- Charter schools
- Public schools
- Monthly meeting at school for safe walking and bike riding
- Walk to school date with all schools

Key Leaders/Partners:
- Youth focused groups
- Schools
- Library
- Neighborhood watch