NOHO PLAZA PRE-INSTALLATION
EXISTING CONDITIONS REPORT TEAM

Principal Investigators
Miguel Núñez and Chelsea Richer,
Fehr & Peers

Research Design & Methodology
Robin Abad Ocubillo, Parklet Studies

Research Project Coordination
Valerie Watson, LADOT;
Jeremy Klop, Fehr & Peers

Primary Data Collection
Kevin Deal and Juan Castro,
National Data & Surveying Services;
Fehr & Peers

Secondary Data Collection
Michael Samuelson and
Jeremiah LaRose, Fehr & Peers

Information Architecture
Michael Manalo, Consultant to LADOT;
Jacqui Swartz, LADOT (formerly Fehr & Peers)

Graphic Production
Cullen McCormick, Fehr & Peers
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.
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

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 NoHo 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 NoHo 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.
ABOUT THIS EXISTING CONDITIONS REPORT

This report offers an in-depth look at livability, safety, and prosperity prior to the installation of the NoHo 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 other than the project itself may also contribute.

THE STUDY AREA

The catchment area for this project, shown on the next page, is Lankershim Boulevard between Weddington Street and Magnolia Boulevard, as well as the adjacent block faces along Weddington Street, Bakman Avenue, Magnolia Boulevard, and Blakeslee Avenue. Observations were generally limited to those actions that occurred on the public right-of-way, including the street and sidewalk, along Lankershim 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
District 2, Councilmember
Paul Krekorian

Neighborhood Council District
Mid-Town North Hollywood

Business Improvement District
NoHo BID

Community Plan Area
North Hollywood - Valley Village

Mobility Plan 2035
Lankershim Boulevard designations:
• Boulevard II
• Moderate Plus Transit Enhanced Network
• Pedestrian Enhanced Network
• Bicycle Enhanced Network
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North Hollywood Catchment Area
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## 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>11 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Weekday vs. Weekend

- **Weekday**: Green
- **Weekend**: Blue

**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>
</table>
| 36  
9/17/14                                        | 11  
10/24/14 & 10/29/14                          |
| 33  
9/20/14                                        |                                             |
| 69 TOTAL                                         | 11 TOTAL                                    |

Conducted in person

Conducted in-person or via telephone

Data Collection Locations
Collisions, by mode (1/2-mile radius around project site, 2007-2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>All collisions</th>
<th>Severe collisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pedestrian survey respondents who visit the site daily, by mode

- Live here: 29
- Eat/drink, meet friends, music/art, or shopping: 9
- Shopping: 2
- Art: 1
### 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>64%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biking</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Presence of women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Pedestrian survey</th>
<th>Walking - Weekend</th>
<th>Walking - Weekday</th>
<th>Biking - Weekend</th>
<th>Biking - Weekday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Collisions, by mode (1/2-mile radius around project site, 2007-2011)

- All collisions: 302
- Severe collisions: 54

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

- Live here: 43%
- Eat/drink, meet friends, music/art, or shopping: 34%
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 Lankershim Boulevard corridor. In addition, data on public perception of safety were collected using on-the-street pedestrian questionnaires.

**KEY STATISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>81%</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>61</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 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 were overrepresented in fatal or severe collisions. A higher percentage of speeding vehicles were observed in the northbound direction than the southbound direction along Lankershim Boulevard between Weddington Street and Magnolia Boulevard.
Collision Summary (2007 - 2011)

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
Between 2007 and 2011, there were eight pedestrian collisions, eight bicycle collisions, and 61 vehicular collisions reported in the project catchment area, for a total of 77 collisions.

In the half-mile radius around the project site, for the same time span, there were 71 bicycle collisions, 54 pedestrian collisions, and 302 vehicle collisions, for a total of 427 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.
WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
Between 2007 and 2011, the highest concentration of vehicular collisions in the project catchment area was at the intersection of Lankershim and Magnolia Boulevards, with 30 collisions reported.

Pedestrian collisions were more dispersed; however, the intersections of Magnolia Boulevard and Klump Avenue as well as Magnolia Boulevard and Lankershim Boulevard each experienced two pedestrian collisions between 2007 and 2011.

The highest concentration of bicycle collisions was at the intersection of Magnolia Boulevard and Bakman Avenue, where 3 bicycle collisions were recorded between 2007 and 2011.
Collisions by Mode and Severity
HALF-MILE RADIUS AROUND PROJECT SITE (2007-2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Vehicle</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Killed or severely injured (KSI)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collisions by mode: percent of all KSI collisions and count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total collisions by mode: percent of all collisions and count</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>427</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 13% and bicycle collisions made up 17% of all collisions, but pedestrian KSI collisions made up 32% and bicycle collisions made up 21% of all KSI collisions. There were no fatal or severe injury (KSI) collisions in the project catchment area from 2007-2011.
**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 both the weekend day and the weekday, approximately 95% of vehicles were found to be compliant with the speed limit. On 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.)

However, on the weekend day, volumes were slightly lower in the southbound direction, which indicates that vehicle volumes and speeds are not always inversely correlated.
Livability

Data on livability in the area around the NoHo 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

- **49%** Percent of survey respondents who reported arriving in the neighborhood on foot.
- **39%** Percent of survey respondents who reported arriving in the neighborhood by car.
- **72%** Percent of survey respondents who visit the neighborhood daily or several times a week.
- **84%** Percent of survey respondents who think the neighborhood is clean.

KEY FINDINGS

- During the weekday count period, almost 50 times as many vehicles were counted as pedestrians and cyclists.
- During the weekend count period, over 30 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 45% female.
Primary Mode of Transportation to Neighborhood

Note: Width of line indicates percentage.

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
More pedestrians (49%) responded that they arrived to the area primarily on foot than by any other mode. Ten percent reported primarily arriving by transit.

Over 60% of the business operators surveyed thought their patrons arrived primarily by car, and less than 40% 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.
**Frequency of Visits to Neighborhood**

**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?**

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

With 72% 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 (43%) said they were in the area because they live there, and the next highest percentage of survey respondents (34%) said they were in the area to eat, drink, shop, or meet friends.

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 recreating 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood is clean</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood is safe</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood is unattractive</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passing through</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work here</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple reasons</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat/drink, meet friends, music/art, or shopping</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live here</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></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 25,396 vehicles were counted over a 24-hour period.

Between 7 AM and 6 PM, 16,681 vehicles were counted, compared to 149 pedestrians and 197 bicycles over the same time period.

During this time period, bicyclists and pedestrians together accounted for about 2% of all travel in the catchment area.

On the weekend day, a total of 22,527 vehicles were counted over a 24-hour period.

Between 11 AM and 6 PM, 9,920 vehicles were counted, compared to 151 pedestrians and 154 bicycles over the same time period.

During this time period, bicyclists and pedestrians together accounted for about 3% of travel in the catchment area.
Pedestrian Characteristics (SCREENLINE)

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

Over the 11 hour weekday data collection period, a total of 149 pedestrians were counted on Lankershim Blvd between Weddington St and Magnolia Blvd.

Over the seven hour weekend data collection period, a total of 151 pedestrians were counted.

On the weekday, about 14 pedestrians per hour were counted. On the weekend, about 22 pedestrians per hour were counted.

Between 55%-58% of observed pedestrians were female, which is similar to the percent of bicyclists observed to be female.

Between 1% and 3% of pedestrians observed were using a wheelchair, and between 1% and 2% of pedestrians observed were using a skateboard.

Low levels of young or old pedestrians were observed on both the weekend day and the weekday.
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>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 16</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No helmet</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?**

Over the 11 hour weekday data collection period, a total of 197 bicyclists were counted on Lankershim Blvd between Weddington St and Magnolia Blvd.

Over the seven hour weekend data collection period, a total of 154 bicyclists were counted.

On the weekday, about 18 bicyclists per hour were counted. On the weekend, about 22 bicyclists per hour were counted.

Between 51%-59% of observed bicyclists were female, which is similar to the percent of pedestrians observed to be female.

On the weekend day, more young and old cyclists (9% and 5%, respectively) were observed than on the weekday.

Between 2-4% of bicyclists observed were not wearing a helmet. Between 0-1% were riding on the sidewalk, and between 1-3% were riding in the wrong direction.
**Physical Assets in Public Right-of-Way**  
**LANKERSHIM BOULEVARD BETWEEN WEDDINGTON STREET AND MAGNOLIA BOULEVARD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike corral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Six racks (about 12 spaces) for bicycles in good condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike rack</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>All inverted U-racks in good condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus shelter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Generally good condition and various amenities including shade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public bench</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Generally good condition, two without shade and one with shade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street light</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Variety of street lighting not at pedestrian scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Most do not have trash lids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Generally mature trees providing adequate to good shade on the corridor</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>1</td>
<td>Available with eight chairs and three tables outside café</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Related Key Assets

**LANKERSHIM BOULEVARD BETWEEN WEDDINGTON STREET AND MAGNolia BOULEVARD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shade</td>
<td>Some sidewalk trees/shade on private property, while others on sidewalks within the catchment area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>The sidewalks are generally adequate quality and width; some locations have narrower “pinch points”</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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>5-7 PM</strong></th>
<th><strong>$10-30</strong></th>
<th><strong>60+ MINS</strong></th>
<th><strong>101</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Busiest time of day on weekends and weekdays as reported by business operators.</td>
<td>Average amount of money spent per visit to the area by people who arrived on foot.</td>
<td>Most common length of stay per visit for all travel modes.</td>
<td>Number of active businesses in the study area in 2014.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY FINDINGS**

- Overall, people who reach the area on foot tend to visit most frequently.
- Over the last 10 years, the number of businesses in the area has risen.
- Over the last 10 years, business tax revenues have generally increased, but also declined during certain periods.
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?

Based on the business operator questionnaire, 5 PM - 7 PM was the most common response to “When are your two busiest times of day?” for both weekends and weekdays.

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 North Hollywood, these responses reflect a typical residential and recreational pattern, with a lot of evening activity after people get home from work.
Spending & Frequency of Visit by Mode

Frequency of visits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Less than once a month</th>
<th>Once a month</th>
<th>Several times a month</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>Several times a week</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average amount spent per visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>$0-5</th>
<th>$5-10</th>
<th>$10-30</th>
<th>$30+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?**

Overall, people who reach the area on foot tend to visit most frequently. Most pedestrians and people who drive to the area reported spending $10 or more on each visit. People who arrive by transit are more evenly distributed across the categories both in terms of frequency of visit and in terms of amount spent per visit.

**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?**

In addition to providing information on how survey respondents arrived to the area, respondents also shared information on the length of their stay. Eighty eight percent of respondents arrived on foot or by car and 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, indicating increases in annual revenues with the exception of 2007 to 2008, 2011 to 2012 and 2013 to 2014.

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
The number of businesses paying business tax provides insight to 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 climbed from about 70 to just over 100.
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>Statistic</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Percent of residents in the area who are female according to the ACS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>Percent of residents in the area who are male according to the ACS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72%</td>
<td>Percent of residents in the area with some college, an Associates degree, a Bachelors degree, or higher, according to the ACS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58%</td>
<td>Percent of residents in the area who are under 35 years old, according to the ACS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Percent of residents in the area who are over 65 years old, according to the ACS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73%</td>
<td>Percent of residents in the area who are White, according to the ACS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Percent of residents in the area who are Asian, according to the ACS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Percent of residents in the area who identify as Latino or Hispanic, according to the ACS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender Split of Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Survey</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?**
According to the ACS, the community is 45% female and 55% male. However, the pedestrian survey respondents were 35% female and 65% male.
Educational Attainment

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
Over 40% of people living in this area have a Bachelor's degree or higher. An additional 8% have an Associate's degree or some college.
**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?**

According to the ACS, the majority of residents in this area (82%) are between 18 and 64. About 13% are under 18 years old, and about 5% are over 65.

Compared to the Census’ ACS, the pedestrian survey over-represented people between 35-64 years old, and under-represented people between over 65 years old or under 18 years old.
WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
According to the ACS, the predominant racial identity of residents in this area is White (73%), with 11% identifying as Asian and 10% identifying as Black. Additionally, 35% of residents identify as Hispanic or Latino.

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

fb.com/ladotpeoples
www.flickr.com/groups/peoples
@LADOTPeopleSt
@LADOTPeopleSt
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