DATE: February 11, 2016

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council

FROM: Bryan Cook, City Manager
       By: Brian Haworth, Assistant to the City Manager
       Michael Forbes, AICP, Community Development Director

SUBJECT: PROPOSED LAS TUNAS STREETSCAPE DESIGN

RECOMMENDATION:

The City Council is requested to:

1. Provide final direction on whether to move forward with the Option A streetscape design (as revised with elimination of back-end angled parking); or

2. Consider an alternate revitalization concept for Las Tunas Drive that addresses revitalization goals without making changes to its existing roadway configuration.

BACKGROUND:

1. In December 2012, Council conceptually approved a streetscape design for Las Tunas Drive that, among various degrees of change, reduced vehicular traffic lanes between Cloverly and Golden West avenues to one lane in each direction (Attachments "A" and "B"). The intent was to: (1) transform Las Tunas into a vibrant, multi-modal destination; and (2) capture construction grant funding under the 2013 Metro Call for Projects.

2. In September 2013, the preliminary streetscape design—otherwise known as Option A—received $6.9 million in Metro Call for Projects funding. Conditions of the grant required a final roadway design with bicycle lanes (as delineated in the 2011 Bicycle Master Plan); traffic calming measures via shortened crosswalk distances and curb bulb-outs; and a number of pedestrian improvements including ADA-compliant sidewalks, countdown pedestrian timers and new lighting systems.
3. In February 2015, Council was presented with traffic impact analyses for Option A and two alternate roadway designs: (1) a variation of Option A that replaced back-in angled parking with parallel parking; and (2) a configuration—commonly known as Option B—that eliminated one eastbound lane but retained the corridor's two westbound travel lanes (Attachment "C"). Findings concluded increased peak hour traffic impacts with Option A, including a 5-15% traffic diversion rate to adjacent east-west streets. Analyses for Option B revealed similar impacts, particularly to eastbound traffic, as well as a 7.5% traffic diversion rate to nearby north-south arterials. Staff was ultimately directed to further refine a streetscape design concept for Option B.

4. In June 2015, Council reviewed a revised Option B design concept that retained its proposed lane configuration, but incorporated cost saving measures like maintaining existing sidewalks and street trees where feasible. Public testimony cited concerns of increased traffic and diversion, public safety access and the inclusion of bicycle lanes. Council requested that staff, along with the Las Tunas Revitalization Standing Committee, explore additional streetscape designs.

5. In December 2015 upon the Standing Committee's review, staff presented Council with a comprehensive review of all design options to date, including a new alternative commonly known as Option C (Attachment "D"). This streetscape design retained the existing Las Tunas roadway configuration, while incorporating bike lanes and other safety enhancements required by the Metro grant. Public testimony included support of Option A, as well as opposition that cited concerns of traffic impact and public safety. Staff received Council direction to further explore next steps in finalizing a revised Option A streetscape design (replacing back-in angled parking with parallel parking) that would allow project construction in 2017.

6. In January 2016, the Standing Committee convened to refine a final recommended design for Option A (that included the removal of back-in angled parking). Public comment again indicated concerns with the streetscape design. The Standing Committee directed staff to explore another alternative—potentially outside the scope of previously presented streetscape design—for future Council consideration.

ANALYSIS:

Tonight's discussion requests the following direction:

• Does Council want to proceed with the Option A streetscape design, as revised with parallel parking; or

• Does Council want to consider an alternate revitalization concept?
Las Tunas Streetscape Designs

Three Las Tunas streetscape designs have been developed to align with local revitalization goals, as well as funding conditions of the Metro grant. Staff has determined there are no other design alternatives to present that would provide additional substantive differences from Options A, B, or C (while maintaining the bicycle lanes, which are a required component of the Metro grant).

Pursuant to Council direction in December 2015, staff has revised the Option A streetscape design by replacing back-in angled parking with traditional parallel parking. This modification would increase sidewalk width by approximately 5’ on Las Tunas between Cloverly and Golden West avenues (Attachment “E”). It would also avail the area with more public space for creative and destination-oriented activities.

Should Council desire implementation of the modified Option A streetscape design, staff will return March 15 to seek approval of a series of actions that ready the design for construction. Conversely, if Council wishes not to pursue the streetscape design, staff requests authorization to notify Metro that the project will not proceed and that the City cannot accept its grant funding.

Alternate Revitalization Concept

Per the Standing Committee’s request for an alternate revitalization proposal, staff is recommending development of a comprehensive Las Tunas revitalization strategy that addresses the following five themes. Should Council desire further exploration, staff will return with a detailed proposal later this spring.

• Mobilize stakeholders to set a vision.

As a key stakeholder, the City is in a position to engage and mobilize a set of diverse stakeholders to develop core aspirations for the future of downtown. For this to be successful, stakeholders must include Las Tunas business and property owners.

Ideally, the end product of this initial collaboration should be a realistic strategy that sets a detailed vision for downtown, including a five-year work plan of priority actions that have the greatest strategic impact. Recommendations identified in the plan should help market downtown, in addition to guiding future city budgets and services, proposed projects and future partnerships.

A stakeholder partnership should continue after strategy completion, providing input contained in this report’s other initiatives, e.g. prioritizing future infrastructure needs, exploring long-term financing models and revisiting existing downtown plans. It is desired that this partnership eventually evolve into a business improvement district...
model, whereby Las Tunas property owners or merchants can self-govern desired improvements and revitalization activities.

- **Explore financing models to fund future revitalization efforts.**

Downtowns in the San Gabriel Valley—such as Pasadena, Alhambra and Monrovia—benefited from long-running redevelopment authorities and revenue streams that allowed for comprehensive and continuous revitalization. But no such authority ever was created for downtown Temple City. While those authorities were dissolved statewide in 2011, recent legislation (AB 2) now allows cities to establish community revitalization authorities. Staff recommends further investigation into whether the downtown area would qualify for these authorities, and what are defined as eligible activities.

Las Tunas' aging infrastructure represents high future costs and a potential deterrent to private investment. Consideration should be given to a long-term financing plan that amortizes infrastructure replacement and repair costs over time, allowing available City funding for other revitalization programs. The State's iBank loan program—recently used by the City of San Gabriel to fund $3.8 million for street repairs—merits further review, as does new legislation (SB 628) that allows communities to establish enhanced infrastructure financing districts.

Finally, as outside grants can cover a portion of downtown revitalization costs, it is recommended that a matrix of funding opportunities be developed annually for capital infrastructure investments, community planning and technical assistance. Having knowledge of their funding objectives will assist in planning and packaging future infrastructure projects inclusive of a larger downtown capital improvement program.

- **Identify short- and long-term infrastructure needs.**

The planning, funding, design and construction of infrastructure improvements provide a number of end benefits. In the case of downtown, new infrastructure would further private investment, make the area “development ready,” and create a unique sense of place for Temple City residents and visitors alike.

At this time, there is no known condition assessment of the downtown infrastructure system. It is recommended that a study be completed to identify existing infrastructure demand, capacity and adequacy, as well as to determine a list of specific upgrades required in the short- and long-term. From a programmatic perspective, the assessment would inform on the prioritization, cost and funding of critical infrastructure improvements. And from a funding standpoint, study findings could assist the City with future grant applications while allowing developers to secure bank funding (particularly if its known that infrastructure work is needed in advance).
• **Establish financial incentive programs.**

Communities across the nation avail incentive programs to help revitalize their downtowns. These programs are based on unique needs, from wanting to attract certain businesses and niche markets, to ensuring that prospective developers are undeterred by the additional costs of rehabilitating a historic building.

Incentive programs generally take on three categories: occupancy, physical improvement, and development. Occupancy incentives are geared to attract targeted businesses downtown, usually in exchange for a start-up grant and/or local sales tax rebate. Businesses, as well as property owners, also may benefit from physical improvement incentives via matching grants for facades, signs and other exterior improvements—most which come with high price tags. Finally, those wanting to build or substantially rehabilitate a downtown building can receive development incentives through the deferral or waiving of permit fees, along with receiving municipal funding for certain public infrastructure improvements.

While many communities have seen financial incentives work for their downtowns, small businesses have especially found the incentives worthwhile to their bottom lines. Should Council wish to pursue this effort, staff will bring back case studies of similar programs including an analysis of their eligibility requirements, fund sources and variations of fiscal impact for potential programs.

• **Continue programming of the downtown parking strategy.**

A critical document for the downtown’s continued revitalization is the Parking Strategic Plan, adopted in 2012. The Plan carries recommendations to increase parking supply, manage parking and revise existing parking standards.

While efforts are underway to develop a new parking lot at 5800 Temple City Blvd. and possibly expand the existing municipal lot on the 5900 block of Primrose Avenue, needed is the identification of future work efforts. The availability of parking continues to be a main concern of downtown business owners, many who rely on it to serve their patrons and ultimately, their livelihood.

**CITY STRATEGIC GOAL:**

Actions contained in this report align closest with Strategic Plan goals of economic development, sustainable infrastructure and enhanced quality of life.
FISCAL IMPACT:

Direction received from tonight’s deliberations will result in various levels of fiscal impact:

- Moving forward with Option A commits the City to a $21.5 million capital improvement project, of which $7.4 million would be covered by grants: $6.9 million from Metro and $500,000 from the Air Quality Management District. The remaining $14.1 million requires funding from various City fund sources including the General Fund reserve, the Lighting and Landscaping District, and local transportation funds. Based on financial projections through FY 2017-18, the General Fund contribution is estimated at $7.3 million.

- The cost of an alternative revitalization strategy is unknown at this time. The effort would further identify required projects and programming, as well as a discussion of potential costs and funding sources.

ATTACHMENTS:

A. Option A Summary Matrix
B. Option A Streetscape Diagram
C. Option B Streetscape Diagram
D. Option C Discussion (incl. analysis of various streetscape designs)
E. Amended Option A Streetscape Rendering (removing back-in angled parking)
Note: This streetscape design was previously known as Concept Alternative 3.
### Concept Alternative 3 (3 Lanes - Angled In Core): Summary

#### Segment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment Name</th>
<th>A - Western Gateway/Rosemead Intersection</th>
<th>B - Motown</th>
<th>C - Downtown Core</th>
<th>D - Eastern Gateway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extends</td>
<td>Munson Ave (5th Gateway border) to Satura Ave</td>
<td>Satura Ave to Chelton Ave</td>
<td>Chelton Ave to Golden West Ave</td>
<td>Golden West Ave to Amelita border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. Segment Length (feet)</td>
<td>1.740</td>
<td>2.780</td>
<td>2.300</td>
<td>1.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Blocks (or Equivalent)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-way Width (feet)</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb to Curb Width (feet)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Sidewalk Width (feet)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Alternative 3

| Water Vehicle Lanes (10 feet wide typ.) | 7.1 - 3 westbound; 3 eastbound | 4.12 eastbound, 1 westbound, 1 left turn | 3.11 eastbound, 1 westbound, 1 left turn | 3.5 to 4 (More) |
| Bike Lanes (9 feet wide typ.) | 2.11 eastbound, 1 westbound | 2.11 eastbound, 1 westbound | 2.11 eastbound, 1 westbound | 2.11 eastbound, 1 westbound |
| Parking Type (ft of Lanes) | Parallel (3) | Parallel (3) except 2 blocks of angled (1) | Parallel (3) | Parallel (3) |
| On-street Parking Spans in Segment | 46.0 (ft) | 103 (ft) | 195 (ft) (27 more) | 35 (10 less - mostly east of Rowland) |
| Flexible Parking/Living Zones | None | None optional at 3 blocks down, each side | None | None (13 more optional) |
| Number of Crossovers | 5.2 new crossings | 11.1 new crossings | 10 new crossings | 1 new crossing; 29 (4 more total) |
| Bulb-out Crossovers | 4 + 1 master (Yorba-Linda) | 8 | 5 | 1 + Agnes Ave & Rowland Ave, "ped refuge" (3 total); 29 (4 more total) |
| Typical Crossover Distance | 94 feet (36 feet less) 75 feet at new Satura Ave crossover | 80 feet (25 feet less) | 65 feet | 60 feet (24 feet less) |
| Longest Distance Between Crossovers | 560 feet (Munson Ave to new bulb-out crossing - 400 feet) | 355 feet (Chelton Ave to Golden West Ave - 235 feet less) | 420 feet (Golden West Ave to new Agnes Ave, ped refuge - 600 feet less) | 420 feet (Golden West Ave to new Agnes Ave, ped refuge - 600 feet less) |
| Left Turn Restrictions | None | At 1/3 mile on Satura Ave, no left turn onto Las Tunas Drive (for improved safety at new crossovers) | At 1/3 mile on Chelton Ave, no left turn onto Las Tunas Drive | At 1/3 mile on Chelton Ave, no left turn onto Las Tunas Drive |
| Right Turn Restrictions | None | At 1/3 mile on Satura Ave, no left turn onto Las Tunas Drive | At 1/3 mile on Chelton Ave, no left turn onto Las Tunas Drive | At 1/3 mile on Chelton Ave, no left turn onto Las Tunas Drive |
| Sidewalk Trees (5 Trees/0.2 mi) | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Median Islands | 4 existing median islands | 1 crosswalk median at Hall Ave | 3 new sidewalk median islands (minimum 50 ft); 3 new sidewalk islands (maximum 100 ft) | 4 new 1-way median, 2 crossroad medians, 1 landscape median |
| Median Trees | 10 new median shade trees (minimum); remove or relocate 15 plant beds | 10 new shade trees (minimum) | 15 new shade trees (minimum) | 11 new shade trees (minimum) |
| Architectural Features | 1 - Entry Gateway Structure, 2 - painted Rosemead Blvd, Gateway structures (Yorba-Linda) | 1 - crosswalk median at Hall Ave | 16 (approx) 1 - small Downtown accent structures | 21 new trees; remove 16 trees (6 more total) |
| Open Space Features | Entry Gateway Structure, median and landscaped bulb-outs at Satura 5th/Westbound (future recreational pathways); landscaped medians as part of entry access; center bulb-outs at Rosemead, Las Tunas, and Motown | 16 new 1-way medians, 2 crossroad medians, 1 landscape median | 16 new 1-way medians, 2 crossroad medians, 1 landscape median | 16 new 1-way medians, 2 crossroad medians, 1 landscape median |

***LAS TUNAS DRIVE***
ATTACHMENT "B"
Option A Streetscape Diagram
ATTACHMENT “D”
Option C

Notes: Slides 18-59 provide analyses of various designs.
Slides 48-59 highlight Option C.
AGENDA

- Provide downtown context.
- Confirm project goals.
- Analyze three design concepts.
- Discuss a preferred design concept.
- Review next steps.
AGENDA

- Provide downtown context.
- Confirm project goals.
- Analyze three design concepts.
- Discuss a preferred design concept.
- Review next steps.

THE CHANGING FACE OF RETAIL

1950s-60s
- Few chain retailers.
- Retail is dominated by "mom and pops."
- Downtowns are the retail destination.

1970s-90s
- Freeways are fully developed.
- Retail locates towards malls, arterials and freeways.
- Downtowns have to reinvent themselves.

2000-present
- Online shopping is the "new" retail norm.
- Retail becomes an experience, a destination.
- Today's downtowns are based on experiential retail.
EVOLVING LIFESTYLES

1960-70s
SGV and TC experience a building boom.
Automobiles encourage regional commuting.
TC’s downtown becomes auto-oriented.

TODAY
SGV and TC are built-out suburbs.
Citizens no longer want far commutes.
Gen X, Gen Y and Millennials want a different kind of downtown.

LOCAL CHALLENGES
Not freeway adjacent.
Other competing destinations.
No master entity.
Small parcels, old buildings.
Absentee owners.
Are road configurations the only way to create change?
EXAMPLE:
TWO-LANE DOWNTOWNS

MONROVIA
Myrtle Ave.

CLAREMONT
Indian Hill Blvd.

EXAMPLE:
FOUR-LANE DOWNTOWNS

ALHAMBRA
Main St.

FULLERTON
Harbor Dr.
Road configurations are not the only way to create change.

Streets and sidewalks provide an asset for revitalization.

A thoughtful reuse of public right-of-way can create a more vibrant environment.
-- City will need to formalize other economic incentives.

Not having redevelopment powers prevent a grander corridor revitalization.

Infrastructure along Las Tunas will require future replacement.
-- Example: Pavement costs of $1.75M today vs. $2.35M in 2025.
AGENDA

- Provide downtown context.
- Confirm project goals.
- Analyze three design concepts.
- Discuss a preferred design concept.
- Review next steps.

REVITALIZE DOWNTOWN
Use public investment to spur private investment.

IMPROVE PUBLIC AMENITIES
Enhance the corridor’s safety, aesthetics and sense of place.

REPAIR, UPGRADE AGING INFRASTRUCTURE
Provide for new traffic signals, curbs, sidewalks, drainage, etc.

ALLOW FOR A “COMPLETE STREET”
Make the corridor usable for motorists, pedestrians and bicyclists.

TAKE ADVANTAGE OF METRO FUNDING
Leverage $6.9 million in grants toward total project costs.

GOALS AS OF JUN. 2015
AGENDA

- Provide downtown context.
- Confirm project goals.
- Analyze three design concepts.
- Discuss a preferred design concept.
- Review next steps.

CHRONOLOGY

**DEC. 2012**
Council considers three design concepts and conditionally selects a downtown corridor design of one (1) lane in each direction. (OPTION A)

**SEPT. 2013**
City is awarded $6.9M in Metro Call for Projects funding for bicycle, pedestrian and safety improvements along Las Tunas Dr.

**MAR. 2014**
City begins preparing detailed traffic impact analysis (TIA) for each of the three design concepts presented in Dec. 2012.

**FEB. 2015**
Staff presents completed TIA to Council, showing potential traffic impacts of the three design concepts
CHRONOLOGY (cont.)

JUN. 2015  
Staff presents revised design option with two (2) W/B lanes and one (1) E/B lane. (OPTION B) Concerns raised by the public focus on the eliminated E/B lane and its potential traffic impact.

SUMMER 2015  
Metro extends the City's start of construction date to FY 2016-17.

OCT. 2015  
Staff presents a new concept, OPTION C, for Standing Committee consideration and requests final direction for corridor redesign.

DESIGN OPTIONS

OPTION A  
Major transformation, one lane in each direction.

OPTION B  
Additive approach with two (2) W/B lanes, one (1) E/B lane.

OPTION C  
Retain existing lane configuration, focus on beautification.
DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

OPTION A
Major transformation, one lane in each direction.
SIDEWALK BULB-OUTS

LEFT TURN LANES

ONE (1) LANE IN EACH DIRECTION

TREE CANOPY

OPTION A

ANGLED BACK-IN PARKING

BIKE LANE

THEMATIC PARALLEL PARKING

VIEW EAST FROM CLOVERLY
AVENUE TO GOLDEN WEST

OPTION A

MOTORIST VIEW
DOWNTOWN CLOVERLY TO GOLDEN WEST

Las Trampas

View east from Cloverly Ave.
URBAN DESIGN PERSPECTIVE
Option A

PROS
- Most transformative: from arterial to pedestrian-friendly "complete street."
- Design elements aim to maximize chances for downtown success.
- Offers flexible parking/dining zones, rather than parklets.
- Angled parking creates more parking spaces; parallel parking is an option.
- Expands the regional bike network in safer fit with angled parking.

TRADE-OFFS
- Increases traffic and spillover during peak hour commutes.
- Replaces three existing left-turn pockets with mid-block crossings.
- Has the highest construction and maintenance costs of all options.
- Street reconfiguration and back-in parking requires a "learning curve."
- Road diet may impact auto-oriented commercial uses.
ENGINEERING PERSPECTIVE
Option A

**PROS**
- Offers the most transformative streetscape design.
- Provides for wider sidewalks and an expanded bikeway network.
- Allows full use of Metro funding.

**TRADE-OFFS**
- Reduces the number of street lanes and eliminates some left-turn pockets.
- Yields traffic impacts during peak travel times.
- Proposes back-in angled parking, which may be hard to maneuver.
- Results in a longer, more impactful construction schedule.
- Represents the highest construction cost.

TRAFFIC IMPACT
Option A
(one travel lane in each direction)
Further review will address E/B access for public safety vehicles.

TRAFFIC IMPACT
Option A
(one travel lane in each direction)

Areas of impacted service levels, mitigation measures required.

CONSTRUCTION
Option A

• Estimated construction duration: 22 mo.
• Most impactful; design changes street geometry and specifies new infrastructure.
• Improvements span the entire corridor.
• Construction to be done during the day to mitigate neighborhood impact.
• Could have up to three (3) construction phases.
POLICY NEXUS

Option A

- Addresses broad Bicycle Master Plan policies.
- Meets Downtown Parking Plan objectives of active transportation modes, the use of parklets, and considerations for a road diet and diagonal parking.
- Per the Downtown Specific Plan, creates a village downtown atmosphere through pedestrian enhancements and placemaking amenities.
- Encourages General Plan goals of downtown revitalization and improved pedestrian access.
- NOTE: The Traffic Calming Master Plan did not study Las Tunas.

METRO GRANT $6,907,974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSPORTATION GRANTS: RESTRICTED</th>
<th>$1,231,970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACM/Grant (Mobile Source Reduction)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTA State Grant (Bicycle Safety Improvements)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSIP Federal Grant (Road Safety Improvements)</td>
<td>$38,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFFL Federal Grant (Road Construction Funds)</td>
<td>$193,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSPORTATION TAX: RESTRICTED</th>
<th>$4,010,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prop A (Transportation Purposes)</td>
<td>$905,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop C (Transportation Purposes)</td>
<td>$1,605,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure R (Traffic Relief)</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY FUNDS: RESTRICTED</th>
<th>$2,135,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gas Tax</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting and Landscaping District (Citywide)</td>
<td>$2,135,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY FUNDS: DISCRETIONARY</th>
<th>$7,265,056</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund: Transportation Grant Match</td>
<td>$811,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund: Metro Grant Match</td>
<td>$2,551,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund: For Remaining Project Costs</td>
<td>$4,631,861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL PROJECT COST</th>
<th>$21,550,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OUTSIDE FUNDS</td>
<td>$9,139,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of project costs</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CITY FUNDS</td>
<td>$13,410,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of project costs</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Requires the most amount of match funds.
Is the most expensive option.
Least leverages City funds.
OPTION B
Additive approach with two W/B lanes, one E/B lane.
### URBAN DESIGN PERSPECTIVE
**Option B**

**PROS**
- Corner bulb-outs will be slightly more pedestrian-crossable.
- No changes to parallel parking, and no loss of any left-turn movements.
- Has significantly lower costs and impact due to fewer changes.
- Keeping existing trees require little additional water demand.
- Expands the growing regional bike network.

**TRADE-OFFS**
- E/B lane reduction will impact PM peak traffic.
- Has little transformative, revitalization and environmental benefit.
- Crosswalks remain fairly long and street will still feel auto-dominated.
- Unchanged sidewalk trees do not add shade and better aesthetics.
- No new mid-block crossings will leave existing “superblocks” as is.

### ENGINEERING PERSPECTIVE
**Option B**

**PROS**
- Creates less traffic impact than Option A.
- Provides some new infrastructure and an expanded bikeway network.
- Proposes no changes to parallel parking.
- Offers the least cost of all design options.
- Results in a shorter, less impactive construction schedule.

**TRADE-OFFS**
- Yields less infrastructure and transformation than Option A.
- Retains existing trees, supplements them with new plantings.
- Increases peak hour traffic impacts via E/B lane reduction.
- Does not allow full use of Metro funding.
TRAFFIC IMPACT
Option B
(two WIB travel lanes, one EIB travel lane)

WIB TRAFFIC
- Existing traffic lanes will remain as-is

EIB TRAFFIC
- Impacts are similar to Option A.

Further review will address E/B access for public safety vehicles.
**CONSTRUCTION**

Option B

- Estimated construction duration: 18 mo.
- Least impactive; street widening will not occur in some areas.
- Improvements will mostly be in the downtown core (Kauffman to Cloverly).
- Construction to be done during the day to mitigate neighborhood impact.
- Will have two (2) construction phases.

**POLICY NEXUS**

Option B

- Addresses broad Bicycle Master Plan policies.
- Meets Downtown Parking Plan objectives of active transportation modes and a road reconfiguration.
- Can help create a village downtown atmosphere per the Downtown Specific Plan.
- Encourages General Plan goals of downtown revitalization and improved pedestrian access.

**NOTE:** The Traffic Calming Master Plan did not study Las Tunas.
**METRO GRANT**  $4,695,652

**TRANSPORTATION GRANTS: RESTRICTED**  $1,231,970
- AQMD Grant (Mobile Source Reduction)  $500,000
- BTA State Grant (Bicycle Safety Improvements)  $0
- HSIP Federal Grant (Road Safety Improvements)  $538,470
- STPL Federal Grant (Road Construction Funds)  $193,500

**TRANSPORTATION TAX: RESTRICTED**  $4,010,000
- Prop A (Transportation Purposes)  $935,000
- Prop C (Transportation Purposes)  $1,605,000
- Measure R (Traffic: Relief)  $1,500,000

**CITY FUNDS: RESTRICTED**  $2,000,000
- Gas Tax  $0
- Lighting and Landscaping District (Citywide)  $2,000,000

**CITY FUNDS: DISCRETIONARY**  $1,313,376
- General Fund: Transportation Grant Match  $81,330
- General Fund: Metro Grant Match  $0
- General Fund: For Remaining Project Costs  $1,231,046

**TOTAL PROJECT COST**  $13,250,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Outside Funds</th>
<th>% of Project Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5,927,622</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total City Funds</th>
<th>% of Project Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$7,322,378</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPTION C**
Retain existing lane configuration, focus on beautification.
OPTION C
PEDESTRIAN VIEW
DOWNTOWN
Cloverly to Golden West

View east from Cloverly Ave.
**URBAN DESIGN PERSPECTIVE**

**Option C**

**PROS**
- Few traffic capacity changes.
- No changes to parallel parking, and loss of spaces from bulb-outs.
- Corner bulb-outs will be slightly more pedestrian-crossable.
- Replacement trees and plantings will ensure shade, greenery and ROI.
- Expands the growing regional bike network.

**TRADE-OFFS**
- Has little transformative effect on the auto-dominated streetscape.
- Bike lanes require curb demolition and narrower sidewalks on nine (9) blocks.
- Existing or narrowed sidewalk width does not promote outdoor dining.
- No new mid-block crossings will leave existing "superblocks" as is.
ENGINEERING PERSPECTIVE
Option C

PROS
- Offers flexible design and minimal traffic impact.
- Provides new infrastructure and an expanded bikeway network.
- Proposes no changes to parallel parking.
- Allows full use of Metro funding.
- Results in a shorter, less impactful construction schedule.

TRADE-OFFS
- Yields less transformation than Option A; less public space created.

TRAFFIC IMPACT
Option C
(retains two lanes of traffic in each direction)

ASSUMPTIONS
Very little traffic diversion.
Minimal to no impact on existing level of service.
Use of 10’ lanes will result in slightly lower speeds.
CONSTRUCTION
Option C

• Estimated construction duration: 22 mo.
• Not as impactive as Option A, but requires more excavation.
• Improvements stretch the entire corridor.
• Construction to be done during the day to mitigate neighborhood impact.
• Could have up to three (3) construction phases.

POLICY NEXUS
Option C

• Addresses most Bicycle Master Plan policies.
• Meets Downtown Parking Plan objectives of active transportation modes, and improved bikeability and walkability.

• Per the Downtown Specific Plan, provides for a pedestrian environment while maintaining Las Tunas as a major vehicular thoroughfare.

• Encourages current General Plan goals of downtown revitalization and improved pedestrian access.

• NOTE: The Traffic Calming Master Plan did not study Las Tunas.
### METRO GRANT

$6,907,974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSPORTATION GRANTS: RESTRICTED</th>
<th>$1,231,970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AQMD Grant (Mobile Source Reduction)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTA State Grant (Bicycle Safety Improvements)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSIP Federal Grant (Road Safety Improvements)</td>
<td>$338,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STPL Federal Grant (Road Construction Funds)</td>
<td>$193,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSPORTATION TAX: RESTRICTED</th>
<th>$4,010,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prop A (Transportation Purposes)</td>
<td>$905,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop C (Transportation Purposes)</td>
<td>$1,605,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure R (Traffic Relief)</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY FUNDS: RESTRICTED</th>
<th>$2,500,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gas Tax</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting and Landscaping District (Citywide)</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY FUNDS: DISCRETIONARY</th>
<th>$3,100,054</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund: Transportation Grant Match</td>
<td>$813,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund: Metro Grant Match</td>
<td>$2,186,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund: For Remaining Project Costs</td>
<td>$181,861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL PROJECT COST</th>
<th>$17,750,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OUTSIDE FUNDS</td>
<td>$5,139,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of project costs</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CITY FUNDS</td>
<td>$9,610,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of project costs</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COST**

Option C

- Requires less match funding than Option A.
- Yields a mid-range cost.
- Highest level of leveraged City funds.

### AGENDA

- Provide downtown context.
- Confirm project goals.
- Analyze three design concepts.
- Discuss a preferred design concept.
- Review next steps.
AGENDA

Provide downtown context.

Confirm project goals.

Analyze three design concepts.

Discuss a preferred design concept.

Review next steps.

MOVING FORWARD

- **JAN. 2016**: Council approval of design concept.

- **FEB. to DEC. 2016**: Project design and bid package preparation. Council approval to advertise bids.

- **JAN. to FEB. 2017**: Bid advertisement. Council award of construction contract.

- **MAR. 2017 to JAN. 2019**: Project construction.

*Construction needs to begin before Jun. 2017.*
Does Council need more information?

Las Tunas Downtown Revitalization
City Council Study Session

December 1, 2016
7:00 p.m
Live Oak Park Community Center
ATTACHMENT “E”
Amended Option A Streetscape Rendering

Note: This streetscape design replaces angled back-in parking with parallel parking.
ATTACHMENT “E”
Amended Option A Streetscape Rendering

Note: Renderings include motorist and pedestrian views.