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ABOUT PROJECT EVALUATION

LADOT is committed to understanding and reporting on how projects impact neighborhoods, and evaluating their overall effectiveness in achieving project goals. By using established metrics that illuminate how new public spaces and street design impact the life of the street, we can track trends over time, evaluate project performance, and inform future program direction.

Methodical observations and data gathering at a site—both before and after installation—help to understand the potential impacts of an LADOT project. Pedestrian and bicycle rider counts, vehicle volumes, and speed data collected before and after installation allow us to describe changes in safety, mobility, and accessibility. Other tools—such as interviews of pedestrians, occupants of expanded pedestrian spaces, and local business operators—capture perceptions of the neighborhood and the project itself. Other data available through local, state, and federal sources—such as collision reports or sales tax receipts—are also analyzed before and after projects are installed, giving us more information to understand what may change.
GREAT STREETS FOR LOS ANGELES

Measuring Project Impact: A Citywide Priority

The Strategic Plan for the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), *Great Streets for Los Angeles*, and the Mayor’s Great Streets Initiative focus on transforming our streets, our largest public asset, to support desired outcomes including increased public safety, enhanced local culture, economic vitality and great neighborhoods.

A Safe City

A Livable and Sustainable City

A Prosperous City

A Well Run City

LADOT supports these goals by cost effectively repurposing underutilized public space into gathering places for Angelenos to come together, whether they walk, bike, drive, or take transit.

The 3340 Motor Avenue Parklet and other People St projects change streets with temporary treatments, including plazas and parklets, that lay the groundwork for permanent changes in street design. Such projects are integral to the City’s Great Streets toolbox, and facilitate implementation and evaluation of LADOT’s Strategic Plan, *Great Streets for Los Angeles*, and the City’s *Mobility Plan 2035*. 
The 3340 Motor Avenue Parklet evaluation project (both this report and the post-installation report) is an opportunity to document performance metrics that assess how innovative street design supports these Great Streets goals:

Safety
- Reported Collisions by Party Involved
- Vehicular Speed
- Wrong Way Bicycle Riding

Livability
- Walking and Bicycling Activity
- Gender Balance
- Mode of Arrival
- Nuisance Activity on the Sidewalk
- User Perception

Prosperity
- Sales Tax Revenues
- Duration of Visit
- Frequency of Visit

Governmental Efficiency
- The evaluation itself is contributing to reaching this goal

This report highlights significant and interesting findings from the above categories. Complete project data are available at data.lacity.org or upon request via peoplest@lacity.org.
ABOUT THIS EXISTING CONDITIONS REPORT

This report offers an in-depth look at livability, safety, and prosperity prior to the installation of the 3340 Motor Avenue Parklet. Primary and secondary data were collected starting in September 2014. A corresponding post-installation study (under separate cover) will be conducted in 2015 to compare the existing conditions reported in this document with those observed after the project has been in place for a year. The purpose of the evaluation is not to find a direct causal effect from the project, but rather to demonstrate how the project may contribute to changes across a variety of indicators, recognizing that additional factors contribute.

THE STUDY AREA

The catchment area for this project, shown on the next page, is Motor Avenue between National Boulevard and Woodbine Street as well as National Boulevard, Woodbine Street, and Vinton Avenue. Observations were generally limited to those actions that occurred on the public right-of-way, including the street and sidewalk, along Motor Avenue. The catchment area also includes transit access and the commercial establishments facing the street.

METHODOLOGY

Using primary data collection methods, the project evaluation team observed the ways in which people walked, rode bicycles, and drove, in order to understand the level and quality of activity in the public realm.

Secondary, contextual data were also collected to measure traffic speeds and volumes, collisions, transit use, and economic transactions.

AT A GLANCE

City Council District
District 5, Councilmember
Paul Koretz

Neighborhood Council District
Palms

Business Improvement District
None

Community Plan Area
Palms - Mar-Vista - Del Rey

Mobility Plan 2035
Motor Avenue designations:
• Avenue II
• Pedestrian Enhanced Network
## Primary Data Collection Times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Pedestrian &amp; bicyclist volume</th>
<th>Vehicle traffic volume</th>
<th>Vehicle speed survey</th>
<th>Activity scan of blockface</th>
<th>Pedestrian intercept survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 - 8 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 9 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 10 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 11 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 AM - 12 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 1 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 6 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 7 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 8 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 9 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Business operator questionnaires were also conducted as business operators were available.
### Questionnaire Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of pedestrian intercept surveys conducted</th>
<th>Number of business operator surveys conducted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61 9/30/14</td>
<td>106 11/14/14 &amp; 12/12/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 10/4/14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Conducted in person*  
*Conducted in-person or via telephone*

### Data Collection Locations

![Map of Data Collection Locations](image-url)

- Project site
- Catchment area
- Vehicle count location
- Pedestrian & bicycle count location

LADOT / People St / Pre-Installation Existing Conditions Report / 3340 Motor Avenue Parklet / 9
Summary of Key Report Findings

Patron primary travel mode to area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Estimated by merchants</th>
<th>Stated by pedestrian survey respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pedestrian survey respondents who visit the site daily, by mode

- Car: 30
- Pedestrian: 20
- Bicycle: 18
- Public transport: 3
INTRODUCTION

**Summary of Key Report Findings**

**PROJECT SITE**

- Presence of women
  - Biking - Weekend: 26%
  - Biking - Weekday: 26%
  - Walking - Weekend: 23%
  - Walking - Weekday: 31%
  - Census: 51%

- Pedestrian survey respondents who visit the site daily, by mode:
  - Weekday: 20%
  - Weekend: 30%

- Patron primary travel mode to area:
  - Estimated by merchants: 75%
  - Stated by pedestrian survey respondents: 25%

**Busiest time of day for merchants, by number of survey responses**

- Open - 12 PM: 2
- 12 PM - 2 PM: 1
- 2 PM - 5 PM: 4
- 5 PM - 7 PM: 3
- 7 PM - Close: 1

**Top reasons for visiting area, from pedestrian surveys**

- Live here: 37%
- Work here: 30%

**Presence of women**

- Census: 51%
- Pedestrian survey: 31%
- Walking - Weekend: 23%
- Walking - Weekday: 26%
- Biking - Weekend: 30%
- Biking - Weekday: 26%
Safety

Safety data are assembled from a variety of sources. Collision data are drawn from the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) between 2007 and 2011, a service of the California Highway Patrol which reflects all reported collisions in California. Traffic counts were also collected, providing data on the volume and speed of vehicles traveling through the Motor Avenue corridor. In addition, data on public perception of safety were collected using on-the-street pedestrian questionnaires.

**KEY STATISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>93%</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of pedestrians that reported the neighborhood was safe (see page 20 for more information on pedestrian perceptions).</td>
<td>Number of fatal or severe injury collisions in the project catchment area between 2007 and 2011.</td>
<td>Number of pedestrian collisions in the project catchment area between 2007 and 2011.</td>
<td>Number of bicycle collisions in the project catchment area between 2007 and 2011.</td>
<td>Number of vehicular collisions in the project catchment area between 2007 and 2011.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY FINDINGS**

Within a half-mile radius of the project site, pedestrians and bicyclists were overrepresented in fatal or severe collisions. A higher percentage of speeding vehicles were observed in the northbound direction than the southbound direction.
Collision Summary (2007 - 2011)

Project catchment area

Half-mile radius around study area

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
Between 2007 and 2011, there was one pedestrian collision, two bicycle collisions, and 12 vehicular collisions reported along Motor Avenue in the project catchment area, for a total of 15 collisions.

In the half-mile radius around the project site, for the same time span, there were 22 bicycle collisions, 35 pedestrian collisions, and 166 vehicle collisions, for a total of 223 collisions reported, or an average of about 85 collisions per year.

Between 2007 and 2008, a slight decrease in the total number of reported collisions was observed. Overall, between 2007 and 2011, an increase in reported collisions was observed.
**Collision Locations (2007 - 2011)**

**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?**
Between 2007 and 2011, the highest concentration of vehicular collisions in the project catchment area was at the intersection of National Boulevard and Motor Avenue, with 8 collisions reported.

Over the same time period, the catchment area experienced 1 pedestrian collision at Motor Avenue and Woodbine Street and 2 bicycle collisions, one at National Boulevard and Motor Avenue and the other at Motor Avenue and Woodbine Street.
Collisions by Mode and Severity
HALF-MILE RADIUS AROUND PROJECT SITE (2007-2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Killed or severely injured (KSI) collisions</th>
<th>Total collisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>43% (3)</td>
<td>16% (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>14% (1)</td>
<td>10% (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>43% (3)</td>
<td>74% (166)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100% (7)</td>
<td>100% (223)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
Pedestrian and bicycle collisions resulting in a fatality or severe injury (KSI) are overrepresented as a subset of all KSI collisions, when compared to the overall rates of pedestrian and bicycle collisions as a subset of all collisions. Within a half mile from the project site, pedestrian collisions made up 16% and bicycle collisions made up 10% of all collisions, but pedestrian KSI collisions made up 43% and bicycle collisions made up 14% of all KSI collisions. There were no fatal or severe injury (KSI) collisions in the project catchment area from 2007-2011.
Speeding Vehicles by Day and Direction
MOTOR AVENUE BETWEEN NATIONAL BOULEVARD AND WOODBINE ST

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
Overall, a greater percentage of vehicles were “speeding” (driving over the posted speed limit) in the northbound direction than in the southbound direction. On the weekend day, 3% of all vehicles were observed to be speeding. On the week day, 2% of all vehicles were observed to be speeding.

On both the weekend day and the weekday, volumes were lower in the northbound direction, suggesting that lower volumes could correspond to excess capacity and be inversely correlated with higher speeds. (See page 23 for more information about vehicle volumes.)
Livability

Data on livability in the area around the 3340 Motor Avenue Parklet were collected from on-the-street pedestrian questionnaires and business operator questionnaires. They offer a view into perceptions of the area, local quality of life, transportation patterns, behavior patterns, and the role the neighborhood plays in the lives of visitors and residents.

**KEY STATISTICS**

- **45%** Percent of survey respondents who reported arriving in the neighborhood by car.
- **24%** Percent of survey respondents who reported arriving in the neighborhood by bus.
- **84%** Percent of survey respondents who visit the neighborhood daily or several times a week.
- **87%** Percent of survey respondents who think the neighborhood is clean.

**KEY FINDINGS**

- During the weekday count period, 23 times as many vehicles were counted as pedestrians and cyclists.
- During the weekend count period, 16 times as many vehicles were counted as pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Less than one third of the people observed bicycling or walking were female. According to the US Census, the area within a half-mile radius of the project site is 51% female.
WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

More pedestrians (45%) responded that they arrived to the area primarily by car than by any other mode. An equal number responded that they arrived by foot or by bus (24%). Seventy-five percent of the business operators surveyed thought their patrons arrived primarily by car, and 25% thought their patrons arrived primarily on foot. These findings reveal that business operators may incorrectly assume their customers primarily drive, when most customers may use other modes more often.
**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?**

Frequent visits to an area suggest that it serves as a neighborhood destination.

With 84% of survey respondents visiting the area at least several times a week, this location appears to serve as a local destination.

The highest percentage of survey respondents (37%) said they were in the area because they live there, and the next highest percentage of survey respondents (30%) said they were in the area because they work there.

These reasons indicate that frequency of visits appears to most closely be correlated with living in the area or working in the area. Page 20 illustrates the full set of survey responses to the reason for visiting the area, and other pedestrian perceptions.

---

**Frequency of Visits to Neighborhood**

- **70%** Daily
- **13%** Several times a week
- **7%** Once a week
- **4%** Several times a month
- **3%** Once a month
- **3%** Less than once a month
Perceptions of Neighborhood & Reason for Visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood is clean</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood is safe</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood is unattractive</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Visit</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passing through</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple reasons</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat/drink, meet friends, music/art, or shopping</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work here</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live here</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Size of outline corresponds to percentage. Top percentages are each out of 100; bottom percentages all add to 100.
**Multimodal Volumes (WEEKDAY & WEEKEND)**

**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?**

On the weekday, a total of 14,254 vehicles were counted over a 24-hour period.

Between 7 AM and 6 PM, 10,059 vehicles were counted, compared to 202 pedestrians and 235 bicycles over the same time period.

During this time period, bicyclists and pedestrians together accounted for about 4% of all travel in the catchment area.

On the weekend day, a total of 9,604 vehicles were counted over a 24-hour period.

Between 11 AM and 6 PM, 4,930 vehicles were counted, compared to 137 pedestrians and 170 bicycles over the same time period.

During this time period, bicyclists and pedestrians together accounted for about 6% of travel in the catchment area.
Pedestrian Characteristics (SCREENLINE)

**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?**

Over the 11 hour weekday data collection period, a total of 202 pedestrians were counted. Over the seven hour weekend data collection period, a total of 137 pedestrians were counted.

On the weekday, about 18 pedestrians per hour were counted. On the weekend, about 20 pedestrians per hour were counted.

Between 23%-26% of observed pedestrians were female, which is slightly lower than the percentage of female bicyclists observed.

Between 1% and 2% of pedestrians observed were using a wheelchair, and between 13% and 16% of pedestrians observed were using a skateboard.

Between 2%-4% of pedestrians were observed to be under 16, and between 1%-2% of pedestrians were observed to be over 65.
## Bicyclist Characteristics (SCREENLINE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weekday</th>
<th>Weekend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wrong way</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 16</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No helmet</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

- **Over the 11 hour weekday data collection period, a total of 235 bicyclists were counted.**

- **Over the seven hour weekend data collection period, a total of 170 bicyclists were counted.**

On the weekday, about 21 bicyclists per hour were counted. On the weekend, about 24 bicyclists per hour were counted.

Between 26%-30% of observed bicyclists were female, which is slightly higher than the percentage of female pedestrians observed.

Between 1%-2% of bicyclists were observed to be under 16, and between 0%-3% of bicyclists were observed to be over 65.

Between 9%-13% of bicyclists observed were not wearing a helmet. Between 3%-4% were riding on the sidewalk, and between 1%-6% were riding in the wrong direction.
Stationary Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed behaviors</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a pair</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formally sitting</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting for transit</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting to cross</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On mobile device</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panhandling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed characteristics</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informally sitting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaning</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vending</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a group</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed characteristics</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

High levels of people engaging in stationary activities can indicate that a public space feels comfortable, safe, and desirable to the people who use it.

Overall, low levels of stationary behavior were observed in the Motor Avenue project area, compared to overall levels of pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicle activity.

Twelve people were observed standing, sitting formally, or waiting for transit. In contrast, no one was observed informally sitting or leaning.

Sixteen out of 22 people observed participating in a stationary activity, or about 73%, were female. This is a much higher percentage than the observed rates of female pedestrians and bicyclists.
# Physical Assets in Public Right-of-Way

**MOTOR AVENUE BETWEEN NATIONAL BOULEVARD AND VENICE BOULEVARD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike corral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None in the catchment area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike rack</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inverted U-racks all in good condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus shelter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Bus stops do not have shelters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public bench</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Good condition; no shade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street light</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Area generally provides sparse lighting with none at pedestrian scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Good condition and none have lids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Many of the trees are immature and provide little shade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting strip</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None in the catchment area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private seating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Limited seating near local restaurants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Related Key Assets

**MOTOR AVENUE BETWEEN NATIONAL BOULEVARD AND VENICE BOULEVARD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shade</td>
<td>Very little shade provided by trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>The sidewalks are generally adequate quality and width</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prosperity

Data relating to the prosperity of the area are assembled from three sources: business questionnaires, pedestrian questionnaires, and sales tax receipts. The questionnaires provide insight into merchants’ and customers’ behaviors and perceptions. The tax data provide a quantitative complement to the insights gained through the questionnaires.

**KEY STATISTICS**

- **12-2 PM**  
  Busiest time of day on weekdays as reported by business operators.

- **$10-30**  
  Average amount of money spent per visit to the area by people who arrived on foot.

- **60+ MINS**  
  Most common length of stay per visit for all travel modes.

- **36 🏡**  
  Number of active businesses in the study area in 2014.

**KEY FINDINGS**

- Overall, people who reach the area in car tend to visit most frequently.

- Over the last 10 years, the number of businesses in the area has decreased slightly.

- Over the last 10 years, business tax revenues have risen at times but generally declined.
WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

The most common response from business operators to the question “When are your two busiest times of day?” was 12 PM - 2 PM during the week and 2 PM - 5 PM for the weekend.

The busiest time of day for businesses may correspond to the busiest time of day overall, and may relate to the type of commercial activity that is most common in the area.

On Motor Avenue, these responses reflect typical residential and employment patterns, with lunchtime activity during the week and afternoon activity on the weekend.

Note: Opening and closing times are approximate. Number of weekday and weekend responses differs because some businesses are closed on weekends. Pedestrian activity is based on counts described on page 23.
Spending & Frequency of Visit by Mode

### Average Amount Spent per Visit

**Pedestrian**

- $0-5: 1
- $5-10: 2
- $10-30: 13
- $30+: 2

**Bicycle**

- $0-5: 0
- $5-10: 1
- $10-30: 2
- $30+: 1

**Vehicle**

- $0-5: 4
- $5-10: 12
- $10-30: 21
- $30+: 9

**Transit**

- $0-5: 8
- $5-10: 4
- $10-30: 7
- $30+: 2

### Frequency of Visits

**Pedestrian**

- Less than once a month: 0
- Once a month: 0
- Several times a month: 0
- Once a week: 0
- Several times a week: 0
- Daily: 3

**Bicycle**

- Less than once a month: 0
- Once a month: 0
- Several times a month: 0
- Once a week: 0
- Several times a week: 0
- Daily: 3

**Vehicle**

- Less than once a month: 0
- Once a month: 0
- Several times a month: 0
- Once a week: 0
- Several times a week: 0
- Daily: 3

**Transit**

- Less than once a month: 3
- Once a month: 0
- Several times a month: 1
- Once a week: 3
- Several times a week: 1
- Daily: 18
Duration of Stay by Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>0-10</th>
<th>10-30</th>
<th>30-60</th>
<th>60+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?**

*For all modes, people most commonly responded that they visited the area daily. For pedestrians, bicyclists, and people who drove, more people responded that they spent $10-$30 than any other category. For transit riders, more people responded spending $0-$5 than any other category.*

**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED? (ABOVE)**

*Fewer survey respondents used a bicycle as their primary mode of access to the area. Therefore the small sample may not be representative of bicyclist spending patterns.*

*The most common length of stay for all modes was one hour or more.*
WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
The City of Los Angeles collects a business tax for most businesses in the city based on “tax measures”—typically retail/wholesale sales or payments for services received. Tax data were aggregated across all businesses in the study area to protect confidentiality, and reflect overall economic vitality in the area.

Business tax measures were lower in 2014 than in 2005, and generally reflect a decrease since 2008.

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
The number of businesses paying business tax is relatively representative of the total number of businesses in the area; the data do not include businesses that are not required to pay the tax or businesses that evade taxation.

Over the last 10 years, the number of businesses in the area has trended slightly downward, with between 33 and 43 businesses paying business tax each year. In 2014 there were fewer businesses paying business tax than in 2005.
Context

Demographic information was assembled from the US Census American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates from 2008-2012 (ACS). In addition, demographic information was collected as part of the pedestrian surveys. This section presents findings from both sources, to demonstrate the differences between ACS data and primary data collected by the People St project team.

The differences between ACS data and pedestrian survey data are likely related to the fact that the pedestrian survey captured people who do not live in the area, and are therefore not reflected in the ACS, but who were in the area for work, shopping, or other purposes on the day the surveys were collected.

**KEY STATISTICS**

- **51%** Percent of residents in the area who are female according to the ACS.
- **49%** Percent of residents in the area who are male according to the ACS.
- **81%** Percent of residents in the area with some college, an Associates degree, a Bachelors degree, or higher, according to the ACS.
- **57%** Percent of residents in the area who are under 35 years old, according to the ACS.
- **7%** Percent of residents in the area who are over 65 years old, according to the ACS.
- **60%** Percent of residents in the area who are White, according to the ACS.
- **23%** Percent of residents in the area who are Asian, according to the ACS.
- **22%** Percent of residents in the area who identify as Latino or Hispanic, according to the ACS.
WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
According to the ACS, the community is 51% female and 49% male. However, the pedestrian survey respondents were 31% female and 69% male.
Educational Attainment

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
Over 58% of people living in this area have a Bachelor’s degree or higher. An additional 23% have an Associate’s degree or some college.
**Age Distribution of Community**

**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?**
According to the ACS, the majority of residents in this area (77%) are between 18 and 64. About 15% are under 18 years old, and about 7% are over 65.

Compared to the Census’ ACS, the pedestrian survey over-represented people between 25-64 years old, and under-represented people between over 65 years old or under 24 years old.
WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
According to the ACS, the predominant racial identity of residents in this area is White (60%), with 23% identifying as Asian and 10% identifying as Black. Additionally, 22% of residents identify as Hispanic or Latino.

Compared to the ACS, the pedestrian survey slightly over-represented White respondents and respondents identifying as Latino or Hispanic.
For information on People St
visit peoplest.lacity.org
e-mail peoplest@lacity.org

fb.com/ladotpeoplest
www.flickr.com/groups/peoplest
@LADOTPeopleSt
@LADOTPeopleSt
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