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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.
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INTRODUCTION

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](image1)

![A Livable and Sustainable City](image2)

![A Prosperous City](image3)

![A Well Run City](image4)

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 Leimert Park Village Plaza 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 Leimert Park Village Plaza 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.
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ABOUT THIS EXISTING CONDITIONS REPORT

This report offers an in-depth look at livability, safety, and prosperity prior to the installation of the Leimert Park Village Plaza. 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, encompasses 43rd Street from Victoria Avenue to Vernon Avenue, Vernon Avenue between Victoria Avenue and 11th Avenue, Victoria Avenue between 43rd Street and Vernon Avenue, and the internal streets within that boundary. Observations were generally limited to those actions that occurred on the public right-of-way, including the street and sidewalk, along 43rd Place and Crenshaw Boulevard. 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
Districts 8 & 10, Councilmembers Bernard Parks & Herb Wesson, Jr

Neighborhood Council District
Empowerment Congress West Area

Business Improvement District
Leimert Park Village/ Crenshaw Corridor

Community Plan Area
West Adams - Baldwin Park - Leimert

Mobility Plan 2035
Crenshaw Blvd designations:
• Avenue I
• Pedestrian Enhanced Network
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LEIMERT PARK VILLAGE PLAZA CATCHMENT AREA

Leimert Park

Audubon Middle School
### 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>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 9 AM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 10 AM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 11 AM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 AM - 12 PM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 1 PM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 PM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3 PM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4 PM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5 PM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 6 PM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 7 PM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 8 PM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 9 PM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 PM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 PM - 7 AM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</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>46 9/23/14</td>
<td>5 11/14/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 9/27/14</td>
<td>5 TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conducted in person Conducted in-person or via telephone

Data Collection Locations

[Map of data collection locations with icons for project site, catchment area, vehicle count location, and pedestrian & bicycle count location.]
## Summary of Key Report Findings

### Patron primary travel mode to area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated by merchants</th>
<th>Stated by pedestrian survey respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car (100%)</td>
<td>Car (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian (0%)</td>
<td>Pedestrian (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle (0%)</td>
<td>Bicycle (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus (0%)</td>
<td>Bus (28%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Collisions, by mode (2007-2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1/2-mile radius around project site</th>
<th>Project catchment area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car (345)</td>
<td>Car (79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian (60)</td>
<td>Pedestrian (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle (22)</td>
<td>Bicycle (15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pedestrian survey respondents who visit the site daily, by mode:

- Car: 20
- Bicycle: 16
- Pedestrian: 13
- Bus: 4
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Summary of Key Report Findings

PROJECT SITE

Presence of women

- Census: 64%
- Pedestrian survey: 33%
- Walking - Weekend: 30%
- Walking - Weekday: 37%
- Biking - Weekend: 36%
- Biking - Weekday: 31%

Patron primary travel mode to area

- Estimated by merchants: 100%
- Stated by pedestrian survey respondents:
  - 0%

Pedestrian survey respondents who visit the site daily, by mode

- Live here: 16%
- Multiple reasons: 1320%

Top reasons for visiting area, from pedestrian surveys

- Live here: 36%
- Multiple reasons: 21%

Collisions, by mode (2007-2011)

- Project catchment area: 345
- 1/2-mile radius:
  - 60
  - 22
  - 79
  - 5
  - 15
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 Leimert Park area. In addition, data on public perception of safety were collected using on-the-street pedestrian questionnaires.

**KEY STATISTICS**

- **80%** Percent of pedestrians that reported the neighborhood was safe (see page 20 for more information on pedestrian perceptions).
- **4** Number of fatal or severe injury collisions in the project catchment area between 2007 and 2011, none of which involved pedestrians or bicyclists.
- **5** Number of pedestrian collisions in the project catchment area between 2007 and 2011.
- **15** Number of bicycle collisions in the project catchment area between 2007 and 2011.
- **79** Number of vehicular collisions in the project catchment area between 2007 and 2011.

**KEY FINDINGS**

- Within a half-mile radius of the project site, pedestrians were overrepresented in fatal or severe collisions.
- A higher percentage of speeding vehicles were observed in the southbound direction than the northbound direction, on the weekday.
WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
Between 2007 and 2011, there were five pedestrian collisions, 15 bicycle collisions, and 79 vehicular collisions reported in the project catchment area, for a total of 99 collisions.

In the half-mile radius around the project site, for the same time span, there were 22 bicycle collisions, 60 pedestrian collisions, and 345 vehicle collisions, for a total of 427 collisions reported, or an average of about 85 collisions per year.

Between 2007 and 2011, a slight increase in the total number of 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 Crenshaw Boulevard and Vernon Avenue, with 26 collisions reported. The highest concentrations of pedestrian collisions were at the intersections of Crenshaw Boulevard and 43rd Street as well as Leimert Boulevard and 43rd Street. Each experienced 3 pedestrian collisions between 2007 and 2011. There were 5 reported bicycle collisions in the project catchment area between 2007 and 2011 and none occurred at the same location.
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 by mode: percent of all KSI collisions and count</th>
<th>Total collisions by mode: percent of all collisions and count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>29% (6)</td>
<td>14% (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>5% (1)</td>
<td>5% (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>66% (14)</td>
<td>81% (345)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100% (21)</td>
<td>100% (427)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?**

Pedestrian 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 14% of all collisions, but pedestrian KSI collisions made up 29% of all KSI collisions. There were four fatal or severe injury (KSI) collisions in the project catchment area from 2007-2011, none of which involved pedestrians or bicyclists.


Speeding Vehicles by Day and Direction
LEIMERT BOULEVARD BETWEEN 11TH AVENUE AND VERNON AVENUE

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
Overall, a greater percentage of vehicles were “speeding” (driving over the posted speed limit) in the southbound direction than in the northbound direction, on the weekday. There was no directional difference in speeding patterns on the weekend.

On the weekday, a slightly higher percentage of overall vehicles (7%) were speeding than on the weekend day (5%). On the weekday and the weekend day, volumes were lower in the southbound 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 Leimert Park Village Plaza 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>Percent of survey respondents who reported arriving in the neighborhood by car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>Percent of survey respondents who reported arriving in the neighborhood on foot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82%</td>
<td>Percent of survey respondents who visit the neighborhood daily or several times a week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td>Percent of survey respondents who think the neighborhood is clean.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY FINDINGS**

- During the weekday count period, 30 times as many vehicles were counted as pedestrians and cyclists.
- During the weekend count period, 11 times as many vehicles were counted as pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Over half 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 64% female.
Primary Mode of Transportation to Neighborhood

What have we learned?

Similar amounts of pedestrians responded that they arrived to the area primarily by car (33%) as on foot (31%). An additional 27% reported primarily arriving by bus.

All of the business operators surveyed thought their patrons arrived primarily by car.

These findings reveal that business operators may incorrectly assume their customers primarily drive, when most customers use other modes more often.
**What Have We Learned?**
Frequent visits to an area suggest that it serves as a neighborhood destination. With 82% 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 (36%) said they were in the area because they live there, and the next highest percentage of survey respondents (20%) said they were in the area because they work there. Twenty-one percent were in the area for multiple reasons.

These reasons indicate that while the area does appear to have local significance, 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.
Perceptions of Neighborhood & Reason for Visit

- **Neighborhood is clean**: 53%
- **Neighborhood is safe**: 80%
- **Neighborhood is unattractive**: 17%

- **Passing through**: 6%
- **Eat/drink, meet friends, music/art, or shopping**: 17%
- **Work here**: 20%
- **Multiple reasons**: 21%
- **Live here**: 36%

*Note: Size of outline corresponds to percentage. Top percentages are each out of 100; bottom percentages all add to 100*
WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

On the weekday, a total of 11,675 vehicles were counted over a 24-hour period. Construction related to the Crenshaw light rail line was ongoing during the collection of this data, which may have resulted in atypical volumes for the corridor.

Between 7 AM and 6 PM, 8,117 vehicles were counted, compared to 151 pedestrians and 118 bicycles over the same time period.

During this time period, bicyclists and pedestrians together accounted for about 3% of all travel in the catchment area.

On the weekend day, a total of 9,242 vehicles were counted over a 24-hour period. Construction related to the Crenshaw light rail line was ongoing during the collection of this data, which may have resulted in atypical volumes for the corridor.

Between 11 AM and 6 PM, 4,274 vehicles were counted, compared to 194 pedestrians and 199 bicycles over the same time period.

During this time period, bicyclists and pedestrians together accounted for about 8% of travel in the catchment area.
Pedestrian Characteristics (SCREENLINE)

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
Over the 11 hour weekday data collection period, a total of 151 pedestrians were counted.

Over the seven hour weekend data collection period, a total of 194 pedestrians were counted.

On the weekday, about 14 pedestrians per hour were counted. On the weekend, about 28 pedestrians per hour were counted.

Between 30%-37% of observed pedestrians were female, which is similar to the percent of bicyclists observed to be female.

Between 3% and 6% of pedestrians observed were using a wheelchair, and between 6% and 11% of pedestrians observed were using a skateboard.

On the weekend day, more young and old pedestrians (16% and 8%, respectively) were observed than on the weekday.
**Bicyclist Characteristics** *(SCREENLINE)*

### WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

**Weekday**

- Wrong way: 18%
- Under 16: 4%
- Over 65: 7%
- No helmet: 12%
- Sidewalk: 13%
- Female: 31%

**Weekend**

- Wrong way: 13%
- Under 16: 7%
- Over 65: 6%
- No helmet: 14%
- Sidewalk: 6%
- Female: 36%

**On the weekday, about 11 bicyclists per hour were counted.**

**On the weekend, about 28 bicyclists per hour were counted.**

**Between 31%-36% of observed bicyclists were female, which is similar to the percent of pedestrians observed to be female.**

**Between 4%-7% of bicyclists observed were under 16, and between 6%-7% of bicyclists observed were over 65.**

**Between 12%-14% of bicyclists observed were not wearing a helmet. Between 6-13% were riding on the sidewalk, and between 13%-18% were riding in the wrong direction.**
Stationary Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Observed behaviors</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Young</th>
<th>Elder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a pair</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a group</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formally sitting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vending</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informally sitting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On mobile device</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting for transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting to cross</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panhandling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</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, lower levels of stationary behavior were observed in the Leimert Park Village Plaza project area, compared to levels of pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicle activity.

Seventeen people were observed standing or formally sitting, while three people were observed informally sitting or leaning.

Thirty-three out of 90 people observed participating in a stationary activity, or about 37%, were female. This is about the same percentage as the observed rates of female pedestrians and bicyclists.
# Physical Assets in Public Right-of-Way

**43RD PLACE BETWEEN LEIMERT BOULEVARD AND CRENSHAW 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 adjacent to the plaza space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike rack</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None adjacent to the plaza space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus shelter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None adjacent to the plaza space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public bench</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None adjacent to the plaza space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street light</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sparse lighting not at pedestrian scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None adjacent to the plaza space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>All public right-of-way trees are on the north side of 43rd Place; they are of good quality and provide great shade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting strip</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None adjacent to the plaza space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private seating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None adjacent to the plaza space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Related Key Assets

**43RD PLACE BETWEEN LEIMERT BOULEVARD AND CRENSHAW BOULEVARD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shade</td>
<td>Good shade trees in the park south of the plaza</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**

- **2-5 PM**
  Busiest time of day on weekdays as reported by business operators.

- **$5-10**
  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.

- **41**
  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 remained relatively stable.

- Over the last 10 years, business tax revenues remained relatively flat, but have begun to climb since 2011.
Busiest Times of Day

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.

**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 on the weekend and 2 PM - 5 PM during the week.
- 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.
- In Leimert Park, these responses reflect a typical residential and employment patterns, with higher lunchtime and afternoon activity.
### Spending & Frequency of Visit by Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Average amount spent per visit</th>
<th>Frequency of visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>$0-5: 8, $5-10: 8, $10-30: 5, $30+: 1</td>
<td>Daily: 16, Several times a month: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>$0-5: 3, $5-10: 0, $10-30: 2, $30+: 0</td>
<td>Daily: 4, Once a week: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>$0-5: 0, $5-10: 7, $10-30: 8, $30+: 6</td>
<td>Daily: 20, Several times a month: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$0-5: 5, $5-10: 4, $10-30: 4, $30+: 3</td>
<td>Daily: 13, Several times a week: 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Less than once a month: [ ], Once a month: [ ], Several times a month: [ ], Once a week: [ ], Several times a week: [ ], Daily: [ ]*
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>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED? (PREVIOUS PAGE)**
For all modes, people most commonly responded that they visited the area daily. Responses from pedestrians, people who drive, and people who take transit are more evenly distributed across the categories in terms of amount spent per visit.

**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 higher in 2014 than in 2005, and overall reflect an upward trend since 2011.

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.

The number of businesses paying business tax has remained relatively stable over the past 10 years, with between 39 and 45 businesses paying tax each year.
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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64%</td>
<td>Percent of residents in the area who are female according to the ACS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34%</td>
<td>Percent of residents in the area who are male according to the ACS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65%</td>
<td>Percent of residents in the area with some college, an Associates degree, a Bachelors degree, or higher, according to the ACS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Percent of residents in the area who are under 35 years old, according to the ACS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>Percent of residents in the area who are over 65 years old, according to the ACS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87%</td>
<td>Percent of residents in the area who are Black, according to the ACS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Percent of residents in the area who are two or more races, according to the ACS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Percent of residents in the area who identify as Latino or Hispanic, according to the ACS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender Split of Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pedestrian Survey</th>
<th>Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?**

According to the ACS, the community is 64% female and 36% male. However, the pedestrian survey respondents were 33% female and 67% male.
Educational Attainment

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
Over 30% of people living in this area have a Bachelor's degree or higher. An additional 35% 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 (57%) are between 18 and 64. About 22% are under 18 years old, and about 21% are over 65.

Compared to the Census’ ACS, the pedestrian survey over-represented people between 18-74 years old, and under-represented people between over 75 years old or under 18 years old.
Racial and Ethnic Distribution of Community

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
According to the ACS, the predominant racial identity of residents in this area is Black (87%), with 8% identifying as two or more races and 5% identifying as White. Additionally, 8% of residents identify as Hispanic or Latino.

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

facebook fb.com/ladotpeoplest

flickr www.flickr.com/groups/peoplest

twitter @LADOTPeopleSt

instagram @LADOTPeopleSt
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