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Objectives

How L.A. County developed a funding stream for active transportation projects from 2016

1. Introduction
2. Motivating force
3. Milestones
   a. Recognize omissions
   b. Cultivate common ground
   c. Meet the need
4. What resulted, so far
   a. $4 billion over 40 years
5. Lessons learned
Motivating force
CA Senate Bill 375 (2008) + Transportation Advocacy

- Enacted to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles
- Supplements Calif. AB 32 (2006)
- Tasks metropolitan planning organizations with developing a sustainable communities strategy to meet state GHG reduction targets
Timeline

Sales taxes as primary way to fund transportation investments in Los Angeles County

Before Measure M, close to 70% of funding from three existing ½-cent sales taxes
Milestones

- Recognize Omissions
- Cultivate Common Ground
- Meet The Need
Recognizing omissions

What kinds of investments will be necessary to reduce car trips to meet Calif. emission reduction goals?

- SCAG’s 2012 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
- Active transportation and public health advocates noticed the lack of a walk and/or bike needs assessment
How to incentivize walking and biking when infrastructure today is so meager and poor quality?
How to enhance and expand walk and bike infrastructure with no regionally identified need?
Should these investments serve older adults?
Should these investments serve families with children?
Should these investments serve everyone in between?
Cultivating common ground

Quantifying the financial, environmental, and public health need for more and better active transportation infrastructure

- LA County Dept. of Public Health played a key role in developing SoCal’s first active transportation funding needs assessment by extrapolating available planning-level cost data on a per capita basis
- $20 billion need for LA County
- $40 billion need for SoCal
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Cost/Unit*</th>
<th>Total*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Mile Last Mile (Stations)\textsuperscript{iii,iv,v}</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School Infrastructure (Schools)\textsuperscript{vi,vii}</td>
<td>2,116</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,058,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School Programs at All Schools (Years)\textsuperscript{viii}</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$42,320,000</td>
<td>$1,269,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Boulevards (Miles)\textsuperscript{ix}</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Bikeways (Miles)\textsuperscript{x}</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$3,150,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Encouragement Programs (Years)\textsuperscript{xi}</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$150,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Repair (Miles)\textsuperscript{xii,xiii}</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$7,500,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding Need – 30 year scenario</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$19,627,600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All estimates in 2014 dollars
Cultivating common ground

Quantifying the need with a broad range of stakeholders
39% of LA County roadway fatalities are people walking and biking.

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

34% of LA County students walk or bike to school.

1% of transportation funding is spent on walking and biking in LA County.

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

47% of trips in LA County are 3 miles or less, yet the vast majority of these trips are driven.

38% of California's greenhouse gas emissions are from transportation.
Cultivating common ground

When people walk and bike instead of drive, people can collectively ...

... reduce vehicle emissions.

... increase physical activity and lower total # of drivers who can be involved in crashes, thus lowering propensity for traffic fatalities.

... become more familiar with transit stops and stations.
Meeting the need

Quantify then meet the need with the regional transportation agency

- 2013-16: Advocates became a stakeholder in developing the funding measure, Measure M
- 2014-16: Board motion directed staff to prepare LA County active transportation financial needs assessment + strategic plan
Getting to a financial needs assessment

$11 to $30 billion over 20 years: Need for active transportation investment (estimated in 2016)
Strengthening advocate’s influence with polling

74% of Los Angeles County voters favor using LA County ballot measure funds for fixing sidewalks, including more street trees, benches, wider sidewalks, lighting, and more separation from cars.

For more on our survey: www.tinyurl.com/InvestingInPlaceSurvey
Humbled to see @metrolosangeles #Metroplan ordinance include sidewalks in 75 word summary. See the clever tradeoff.

Los Angeles County Traffic Improvement Plan.

To improve freeway traffic flow/safety; repair potholes/sidewalks; repave local streets; earthquake retrofit bridges; synchronize signals; keep senior/disabled/student fares affordable; expand rail/subway/bus systems; improve job/school/airport connections; and create jobs; shall voters authorize a Los Angeles County Traffic Improvement Plan through a ½ § sales tax and continue the existing ½ § traffic relief tax until voters decide to end it, with independent audits/oversight and all-funds controlled locally?
What resulted in a Political Win, Financial Win, and Organizing Win.
What did we win

Strong advocacy from a deep dive into Measure M’s proposed expenditures

Executive Summary

Metro is the primary planner, funder, designer, and builder of Los Angeles County's transportation system. As such, Metro has a unique role to ensure that the county’s transportation system — even those built and operated by other agencies — provide safe, accessible, and reliable transportation options. The county's fourth transportation sales tax reflects Metro’s vision that programs will fulfill this mission.

Like Measure R in 2008, the new potential ballot measure would fund Metro’s rail network, widen congested freeways, increase transit Operations, and improve streets. However, this new measure adds new categories of funding for Measure M, including state of good repair, a new bus rapid transit system, and active transportation. These additional programs are an effort to provide a transportation system that is otherwise dominated by major capital projects that do not serve the needs of all residents.
Strong Advocacy and Political Influence
What did we win ($$)

Ongoing funding stream for sidewalks, crosswalks, safe routes to school, first/last mile access to transit and bicycle lanes!

- $4 billion over 40 years (about 6-8% of the measure in next 40 years) allocated to active transportation programs and projects
  - Dedicated allocation – LA Metro
  - Subregional allocation – Subregional councils (9 total in LA County)
  - Local allocation – Cities (88 total in LA County)
## Measure M Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure M funding categories</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Projects - 3% Local Contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subregional Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%* Active Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%* Regional Rail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%* Rail Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%* Transit Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%* ADA/Senior/Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%* State of Good Repair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Return</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percent of sales tax revenue

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part of $10 billion over 40 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$430 million over 40 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City discretionary spending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lessons learned
Lessons

- Cultivate social equity champions early
- Do your own polling
- Advocacy did not end on election day, ongoing need through implementation
- UCLA study: Voters supported Measure M for partisan reasons and showed little interest in riding transit or supporting complementary transit policies (Manville, 2019)
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