LOS ANGELES CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT:

A PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PLANNER'S VIEW

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

SCRTD Planning Department Staff

Principal Author

Dan Miller

Contributors

Ben Urban
Jeff Carpenter
Martha Curtis

Editor

Martha Curtis

May 1979

TABLE OF CONTENTS

V. LOS ANGELES CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT: A PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PLANNER'S VIEW

Table of Contents
Page Two

BACKGROUND

The Los Angeles Region

Before examining the Central Business District (CBD) and its relationship to public transportation, a look at the entire Los Angeles area's relationship with transit might be of some benefit. A general look at the area's use of transit, the public transportation situation, and Southern California Rapid Transit District's position in the picture, will give a background for examination of the CBD.

Contrary to general opinion, Los Angeles is not a low-density city. It is, depending on the calculation method, either second or third in the nation in central city area population density. There is, however, a greater dispersion of commercial centers than is true of the other major American cities, which, in turn, means greater dispersion of trips; particularly those most readily attracted to public transit. Combine this situation with the existance of the most extensive street and freeway system in the nation (built almost entirely with no provision for rapid transit or expedited bus service) and the result is a lower proportion of the population regularly riding public transportation than is true in many other major American cities.

The Southern California Rapid Transit District

Public transportation carries about 4% of all trips made in the Los Angeles region. The Southern California Rapid Transit

District (SCRTD) carries about 90% of these trips, with the balance carried by several municipal operators. Two of the municipal operators (Long Beach and Santa Monica) extend considerably beyond their city boundaries. The SCRTD is the largest all-bus public transportation system in the nation. This is true in all categories, including route miles and passengers carried. It has more than twice the route miles of any other system, and, even when compared with cities having rapid transit, ranks third in the nation (behind only New York and Chicago--Philadelphia is fifth) in number of passengers carried. An average weekday sees 400,000 people boarding one or more SCRTD buses, for a total of slightly more than 1,000,000 boardings. SCRTD now has about 335,000,000 million annual boardings.* Another perspective of the impact of public transportation upon the region comes from a SCRTD comprehensive marketing survey in 1978. That survey found that in the urbanized portion of Los Angeles County, 40% of the population, 16 years or older, ride public transportation at least once a month. The breakdown for regular, moderate and infrequent riders is as follows:

Number of Trips By Public Transit Per Month	L. A. County Percent of Pop. 16 Years or Older	
	By Category	Cumulative
20+	7%	7%
4-19	11%	18%
1-3	22%	40%

*SCRTD average weekday ridership for April 1979 was 1,190,000 boardings--a 6.2% increase over Fall 1979. Due to the gas shortage, dramatic ridership increases occurred in May. Average weekday ridership for May 7-11, was 1,390,000--a 24.1% increase over Fall 1979 of 1,120,000 weekday boardings.

The Importance of Public Transportation in the Los Angeles Central Business District

While transit's importance to the entirety of the Los Angeles area might appear somewhat minor, its importance to the CBD is beyond question. There are about 1,200,000 person trips (auto, bus, taxi, and truck passengers, as well as pedestrians) entering and leaving the CBD each weekday. Twenty-five per cent (slightly more than 300,000) of these trips are made on SCRTD buses. (Municipal bus operations into the CBD raise transit's trip proportion very slightly.) Transit's 25% market share is carried in only 1.5% of the 600,000 vehicles entering and leaving the CBD daily. Transit's share increases to 35% during the weekday morning and evening peak hours, and to 50% when those persons passing through the CBD during the peak hour (peak 60 minutes) are deducted.

There are approximately six major east-west transit streets in the CBD and an equal number of major north-south transit streets. During peak periods, about 50% of all persons traveling on those major streets are on SCRTD buses. Examples of some of the percentages carried on those streets are shown below.

[TO BE INSERTED]

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE CBD TO PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

The CBD: The Focal Point of the Regional Bus Network

Public transportation is, as has been shown, very important to the CBD. The reverse is also true: the CBD is very important to the transit system. It is the focal point of the regional bus network and generates a good portion of the

total transit ridership in the region. Transit is at its best serving a concentration of trip ends such as occurs in the CBD, while the private auto is shown in its most disadvantageous light.

The effectiveness of the buses in getting to and through the CBD makes this part of the system especially attractive as an alternative to the auto as a transportation mode. Auto disincentives are built into the CBD. Whereas suburban shopping and employment centers have abundant, convenient, free parking, the CBD parking is restricted, not always close to desired destinations, and relatively expensive. And, whereas autos can move much faster than buses in the outlying areas, the CBD's crowded streets do not allow autos to maneuver around stopped buses and make the two modes much more equal. This equalization of the two modes enables buses to compete with the auto on the convenience level when the CBD is the destination point. This is important to bus operations. Another way the CBD influences the bus system is its effect on bus schedules. Since the majority of SCRTD's major lines go into or through the CBD, any traffic congestion which is greater than usual can have the effect of throwing schedules out of alignment. A major disruption in the schedules on downtown lines affects a major portion of the entire system. CBD traffic management, therefore is an important factor in SCRTD's operations.

Although the Los Angeles region is characterized by greater dispersion of commercial activity than many other U.S. cities,

the Los Angeles CBD, with an employment population of about 200,000, is by far the largest single center in the region. As indicated in the following table, a high proportion of the total regional transit ridership is generated within the downtown area.

Los Angeles Area Transit Boardings (Showing Proportions of Boardings in Various Segments)

Area	Sq. Miles	Total Boardings	Boardings Per Sq. Mile
Total Area	2,000	1,000,000**	500
CBD	3	180,000	60,000
Central City*	397	520,000	1,300
Suburban	1,600	300,000	187

*Excluding L.A. CBD

The downtown area is here defined as bounded by the Hollywood, Harbor and Santa Monica Freeways and Alameda Street. The Central City can be broadly defined as all the area within a ten mile radius of City Hall. In terms of the greatest ridership density, the area would extend about five miles on the east and eighteen miles on the west (all the way to Santa Monica). The balance of the Los Angeles area is listed as "Suburban," and includes portions served by SCRTD and various municipal operators. (Municipal operators excluded in boarding estimates.)

The average speed at which buses can operate to and through the CBD affects significantly the attractiveness of the bus service

**Total boardings for average weekday during Sept., Oct., Nov., 1978 was 1,120,000 boardings.

to the CBD. Improvements in average speed would benefit the greatest number of present and potential riders compared to any other single area of the region. Not only is there the greatest concentration of transit riding in the CBD presently, but the greatest potential increases in transit riding exist for trips to the Los Angeles downtown area. This is due to inherent advantages public transportation has in attracting higher proportions of the total trips made (trips ends) compared to all other centers in the region.

Improvements in CBD bus speed also would make public transportion more attractive for trips through the CBD between sectors or communities on opposite sides of the downtown area. Due to much faster auto speeds, transit now captures a much smaller portion of these trips. Ultimately, the best way to adequately serve both trips to, as well as through the downtown area, is by means of grade separated right-of-way for public transportation, i.e., rapid transit.

Bus Routes in the CBD

In common with other major urban public transportation systems, SCRTD's bus route network is concentrated in the central city area. There is a semblance of a grid pattern of routes within the central city area; but, in line with historical demand, bus routes converge upon the CBD in a radial pattern. The planned FY 80 bus service sector improvements will reinforce the grid pattern of routes through route extensions and by straightening out routes which now turn off major transit streets.

Of the total 210 bus lines (separately numbered bus routes), 86 lines operate into the LA CBD. Some of these 86 lines have alternative routes, thus providing even more route options for persons traveling to or through downtown Los Angeles. Of the 86 lines serving the CBD, about 60 operate as a separate express line or provide an alternate express route to the basic local route. At least some express service is operated over all of the radial freeway routes serving the LA CBD after beginning their respective routes on suburban surface streets. While some of the local routes operate through the CBD, all of the express routes terminate within the downtown and Wilshire areas. There are also two "limited" routes ending in the CBD ("Limited" buses provide expedited, limited-stop service on surface streets).

On major downtown transit streets, buses run every few minutes, even during mid-day. During peak periods, the capacity of the bus loading zones is reached on many streets. Excluding Spring St., southbound at the City Hall, and the contra-flow lane, the present maximum volume of buses occurs northbound on Hill Street, where 110 buses pass in the evening peak hour.

RECENT TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS AFFECTING THE CBD

Downtown Minibus Route

A downtown circulation route was established in 1971. Although there was frequent bus service on most CBD streets which was available for circulation trips within the downtown area, there were several reasons why the public was not using them for this purpose in any numbers.

First, the multitude of buses and the large variety of routing in the downtown area was confusing to the potential circulation trip user. Without a knowledge of all the routes downtown, the public saw the movements of the buses as unpredictable. Prospective riders also saw the regular fare as too high for the few blocks they intended to ride. The stigma the use of public transit has in the minds of some of the public also hampered use of regular bus lines for circulation purposes.

The use of a loop route (the configuration of which was posted at each special bus stop); an extremely low fare; and small, sprightly decorated, special buses not associated with the public transit image, were all important in the success of the CBD mini-bus program.

Funding for the downtown mini-bus route was provided by a special service contract with the City of Los Angeles, the County of Los Angeles and the Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency. This set a desirable precedent, SCRTD believes, for special funding for any special bus services provided by SCRTD which provide particular local benefits--such service being in addition to the comprehensive area-wide SCRTD network of bus service provided the region.

Today, despite the vicissitudes of route and fare changes, with their concomitant impacts on ridership, the mini-bus service continues in downtown Los Angeles and has acquired a measure of community interest and support which belies its

relatively small quantitative importance as a part of the downtown public transportation network.

El Monte Busway

The El Monte Busway is the closest thing yet to rail rapid transit for this region. The Busway consists of exclusive bus lanes on the San Bernardino Freeway between El Monte and the vicinity of Union Station. Service began in 1973. More than any other busway in the nation to date, this facility emulates some of the desirable aspects of rail rapid transit; it has two on-line stations, as well as a large terminal station and parking lot in El Monte. Patronage growth has been impressive, although, due in part to a series of fare increases and to the introduction of carpools using the special lanes, the growth rate has now leveled off.*

Where the exclusive, grade-separated lanes are needed most, however, is just where the buses must negotiate stop and go traffic: downtown Los Angeles. Bus routes using the Busway have four separate routes through the CBD. As an experimental attempt to remedy the weak link in the Busway system represented by the downtown surface streets, one of the routes includes a 1.2 mile long contra-flow exclusive bus lane along Spring Street.

Spring Street Contra-Flow Lane

Use of the Spring Street contra-flow exclusive bus lane commenced in 1973, as a part of the start of the operation of the Busway.

*Excluding the gas shortage induced patronage increase starting in April-May 1979.

The contra-flow lane concept has proven itself to be a workable one for downtown Los Angeles. While the lane encountered some merchant and parking lot owner opposition, the fact that it is still in use five years later testifies to its general safety record and community/business acceptance.

The contra-flow lane significantly increases the visibility of bus service, which, in turn, increases the public's awareness of transit's availability--an important attribute of rail rapid transit often missing in bus operations. Use of this lane has resulted in the transfer of several bus routes from the skid-row conditions on Main Street, thus providing a substantially improved environment for waiting passengers.

An important question is whether such a lane improves average bus speeds. It is not clear to what extent average bus speeds have been improved in this particular application, compared to operation in general mixed traffic. Service reliability probably has been improved, although the overloading of the City Hall segment (130 buses per peak hour, with no provision for bus bypass) may be negating this benefit. The Spring Street contra-flow lanes provide valuable experience for implementation of bus preferential treatment facilities and traffic management techniques within downtown Los Angeles and elsewhere in the region.

STUDIED TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS IN THE CBD

TSM: General

Various methods for improving transit in the CBD have been

studied. Serious consideration has been given to general Transportation Systems Management (TSM) applications, one-way street designations, TSM preferential treatment proposals for buses, expanded bus-on-freeway services, rapid transit, a downtown people mover, and CBD transit improvements suggested by the Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA).

The term "Transportation Systems Management," which dates back to its use in the September 1975 Federal Register, refers to efforts to obtain greater efficiency and productivity from present public transportation resources. Internal TSM can be accomplished entirely by the operating agency on its own, e.g., scheduling improvements; external TSM requires the support and/or approval of other jurisdictions, e.g., traffic management changes affecting the operation of buses on public streets. In downtown Los Angeles, most, if not all, external TSM proposals are within the purview of city departments, and ususally fall within that of the Los Angeles City Department of Transportation.

External TSM proposals within the LA CBD are concerned with increasing the average speed of buses while avoiding decreased bus route accessibility, such as, inconvenient bus stop locations. Other proposals include providing more street-side transit information, passenger shelters and general pedestrian amenities.

Bus speeds in the downtown area average approximately 8 miles per hour during the peak periods. This low speed increases

bus operating costs and, compared to the slightly higher auto speeds, clearly is not attractive to the would-be CBD transit rider. Three factors are involved in achieving faster bus speeds: reducing boarding and alighting time, avoiding signal delays, and obtaining special lanes for buses. The SCRTD's innovative and aggressive pass promotion efforts may have reduced fare collection delays to the minimum possible, short of a free fare policy. Lower bus floors or high-level, curb-side platforms (as used in rapid transit stations) would speed bus loading. However, lower bus floors, although the object of much research and development effort, are currently beyond the state of the art for heavy transit buses, and it is doubtful that either the carriers or the cities involved would accept high-level bus loading platforms in mixed traffic. (In other cities, the concept has been proposed however for CBD stops of light rail.)

Lengthening the space between bus stops is one way of speeding up buses, but this results in longer walk times for passengers. Fewer bus turning movements also result in faster times (due to less time spent waiting to turn), but may result in longer spacing between stops and this, again, brings about longer walk times. Since longer walk times are a disincentive to bus use, any lengthening of the space between bus stops as a means of speeding bus movements must be very carefully considered.

In general, bus signal preemptions to extend green time for buses can have, at best, only limited application. In the downtown

area the opportunities may be negligible, due to heavy cross traffic at almost all intersections which have heavy bus volumes. The necessity of equipping a major portion of the bus fleet with the necessary hardware for preemption is also a negating factor, compared to the benefits obtained.

Buses can be expedited with special lanes, such as the Spring Street contra-flow lane already discussed. However, throughout the CBD most of the right hand curb lanes are, in effect, presently bus-only/right-hand-turn lanes. This is true on all streets during the peak periods, and on some major transit streets it is true all day. Selective use of auto right-hand-turn prohibitions could help free the curb lane for uninterrupted bus movements. Parking and freight-loading violators have the effect of removing the entire right hand lane from use, so that, for general CBD application, it appears that the most promising action would be better enforcement of existing no parking/no stopping restrictions.

One-Way Streets

The use of one-way streets to increase the general traffic flow has significantly increased bus (and auto) speed on certain LA CBD streets. However, one-way streets significantly complicate bus route layouts and confuse the transit-riding public. This is doubly so regarding transfer to CBD bus lines for distribution trips and the use of these lines for internal circulation trips. Walking distances are increased with

one-way street bus routes for persons who could otherwise use a bus route on a two directional street which directly serves their destination.

An equally important consideration to transit regarding one-way streets is the loss of about half of all available curb space for bus loading. This impact cannot be overstressed, since the major factor in determining bus capacity is available curb space for bus stops. Additional one-way streets with mixed traffic would exacerbate this problem. As a general rule, then, transit would probably derive more benefit from foregoing the additional capacity obtained from one-way streets in favor of retention of bi-directional streets with reduced auto traffic.

There is little, if any, additional capacity that can be squeezed out of downtown surface streets for general vehicle traffic flow. In the long term, expanding the capacity of the CBD street system over present levels, in order to pump more vehicles through, may actually decrease the attractiveness of the CBD as a place to work, shop, live, or go for entertainment. Additional street capacity could be used to increase the attractiveness of bus service to, through and within the CBD. The willingness of the downtown community (primarily the business community) to forego some general vehicular flow increase in favor of improved bus flow and better pedestrian access will depend upon that community's awareness of the importance of public transportation. It must be made aware of the impact transit

now has on downtown Los Angeles and even greater impact it can have if proper improvements are made.

TSM: Major Bus Preferential Treatment Proposals

One of the major bus and pedestrian preferential treatment proposals is the Broadway Mall. The project has been put in abeyance for now, due in large part to merchant and parking lot operator opposition, as well as the uncertainties created by the passage of Proposition 13 in June 1978. Since then there have been two surveys conducted with conflicting findings as to merchant support/opposition for the project. The project concept consists of low capital cost modifications to test the feasibility of restricted or auto-free traffic control, coupled with expanded provisions for pedestrian and bus use. Were initial results favorable, more capital intensive plans would then be developed for permanent conversion. (Since high capital cost pedestrian amenities are often very important in transit malls, succeeding under these constraints could be fairly difficult.)

Major CBD transit streets, which have been identified for further study of alternative special bus and pedestrian treatments include 7th, 6th, 5th and possibly 1st Streets.

There are several possible experimental bus treatments/general traffic control techniques under consideration. Although the planned, full-scale, experimental Broadway Mall has been temporarily shelved, preferential treatments for buses and

pedestrians, as a means of stemming the flood of autos into the downtown area, will continue to be under active consideration. In some cases, where exclusive lanes or streets for buses may not be practical, reduced traffic flow, with buses continuing to operate in mixed traffic may be a possibility.

On a selected CBD street, a section of the curb lane at the end of the block might be eliminated as a moving lane in favor of wider bus passenger waiting areas, with appropriate amenities. For the mid-block section, the curb lane could be devoted to parking for deliveries and other short-term uses. Such an experiment would test the impact of significant reductions in street vehicle capacities in favor of possible benefits in the form of more room for pedestrians and bus passenger waiting areas. Buses would no longer have to weave in and out of bus loading areas, but still would be able to pass each other. This might reduce bus loading delays. The resultant impact of the overall CBD reduced vehicular capacity (while hopefully increasing the movement of people) must, of course, carefully be considered before implementation.

Another experiment, related to the Mall concept, would be to restrict through vehicle movements on a street to buses only. All other vehicles would have to turn right at the first intersection after entering, in effect creating a transit street. Provision would have to be made for the vehicles that would be diverted to parallel streets.

Expanded Bus-on-Freeway Services

As a part of the cooperative regional interagency transit planning program (Regional Transit Development Progra--RTDP), planning is underway for both short and long-term expansions to the existing bus services operated over freeways. All but one of the present express bus routes operate into and terminate in the Los Angeles CBD. Future plans call for an expanded network which would provide express services more evenly throughout the region along major transit corridors. Thus, the CBD would not be the sole focal point of the service as it is today. The largest portion of any express bus network will continue to serve the Los Angeles CBD and, as such, has the potential to significantly increase transit market share of total travel to the CBD. On downtown streets, express buses will continue to operate on a through-routed (no transfer required), self-distribution basis. Express bus passengers will be able to transfer to the downtown people mover and the starter rail line, when these facilities are built.

Downtown People Mover

The Downtown People Mover (DPM) is also a part of the current RTDP effort. It is planned as a 13-station aerial guideway, running between Union Station and the Convention Center, through the west side of the CBD. The line would improve internal circulation within the CBD and serve regional bus users and regional parkers at the two terminal stations. When the starter

rail line is built, major transfer points would develop at the locations where the two guideway lines intersect.

The DPM offers challenging joint development potentials at major sites targeted for redevelopment on the west side of the CBD.

Rapid Transit

As a part of the RTDP program, alternative analysis refinements are being completed on an initial (starter) rapid transit line for the so-called regional corridor. The rail line would extend from Union Station through the Wilshire corridor to North Hollywood. Constructed in subway, the alignment would serve the east side of the CBD, assuming the downtown people mover (DPM) is constructed on the west side. Similar to the DPM, the five CBD subway stations would provide opportunities for joint development adjacent to the stations. Construction of the starter line would permit more bold parking management strategies. These would be designed to encourage greater transit usage and less reliance on traffic management techniques designed to maximize vehicular flow capacities of surface streets as a means of improving accessibility to the downtown area.

Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency Support for General CBD Transit Improvements

In addition to the planned DPM, the Los Angeles Community

Redevelopment Agency (CRA) is actively working with SCRTD staff and other public agency staff in bringing about improved public transportation to the downtown area in the short term. Alongside SCRTD and Los Angeles City Department of Transportation staff, CRA is reviewing opportunities for bus preferential treatments on downtown streets. Among other things, the CRA is also interested in better bus information signs at bus stops and in street-side amenities which are of particular benefit to waiting transit users, but benefit all pedestrians.

The CRA, along with Los Angeles City and the SCRTD jointly fund the downtown minibus service.

A MESSAGE TO LAND USE PLANNERS

Moving People (Instead of Vehicles)

Transportation planners, and even traffic engineers, are coming to think in terms of moving people rather than moving vehicles. It appears that auto disincentives are premature as far as political acceptance is considered. Economically, they are counter productive if they place downtown areas at a competitive disadvantage with subregional centers. On the other hand, transit incentives can be pursued, which, if successful, will substantially increase accessibility through better transit, while, at the same time, maintaining a competitive position for persons who need (or think they need) to continue to use their private auto to access the downtown area.

Importance of Pedestrian and Transit-Users' Amenities

Coupled with the emphasis of transportation planners on moving people, land use planners need to focus on making downtown areas more attractive places for work, shopping, entertainment and living. An improved pedestrian environment contributes to all of these objectives and also makes transit usage more attractive.

Wider sidewalks, better street lighting (for crime prevention), better street furniture, mini parks, etc., are part of the physical improvements relating to the pedestrian environment. Even more important is the encouragement of a high level of street-side activities throughout the length of the downtown. This encourages walking, which, in itself, is a substitute for vehicular traffic. It also makes the area safer. Concentration of shops and restaurants at the street level enhances the competitive position of transit in providing access to these activities.

As an aside, it appears that the network of pedways provided for in the adopted plan for downtown Los Angeles, will have the effect of just the reverse of the above. It will divert pedestrians away from the street level in favor of attracting persons to single major office buildings reached solely by the private auto through large off-street garages built as an integral part of each major office building. Pedways, of

course, increase street capacity but at a cost of less accessibility to street activities by pedestrians.

Mixed Land Uses

For both new and older buildings, zoning and building laws need to be modified to permit mixed uses. Street-side shops with apartments above the street level are an example of such mixed use. This land use practice need not result in slum conditions, as evidenced by the many middle and upper income areas with mixed land uses in European Cities. This practice increases pedestrian movements at all hours of the day (thus making the streets safer), and also generates additional off-peak and reverse-peak transit demand.

Joint Development

As mentioned previously, the DPM presents opportunities for joint development; indeed, its format virtually requires it. Even greater opportunities, however, occur in connection with the rapid transit stations. These stations present unexcelled situations for "valve capture" strategies.

Because these stations will serve as many as 70,000 trips daily (35,000 boardings and 35,000 alightings), without the substantial adverse impacts that accompany an equal flow through auto access, the potential will exist for creating intense, vibrant pedestrian environments, with unique amenities and conveniences.

A wide variety of prospects exist when land uses are integrated into pedestrian flows of the magnitude which the stations would generate. Complementary uses can exist side-by-side in this environment which could not co-exist in the environment created when the same number of people are brought together by auto. The auto injects elements which are incompatible with a number of pedestrian amenities.

The intense, attractive pedestrian environments which are possible around the stations have enormous commercial value. The City and the transit agency should actively apply "valve capture" techniques so as to benefit from the windfalls from such development.

Large Scale Redevelopment

In order to attract commercial activity that seeks the newest office space in the region (the prestige factor), some large scale redevelopment projects may be desirable within the CBD. Without such redevelopment replacing the worst of the CBD's older buildings, the prestige office building tenants may be lost to other major subregional centers (e.g., Century City, Newport Center, etc.). However, such large scale redevelopment has, in the past, provided parking facilities and only limited transit access, thereby reinforcing the attractiveness of access by the private auto with a proportional decrease in the attractiveness of transit. Certainly this has been the case in downtown

Los Angeles, where new development has not yet had the opportunity for joint development with rapid transit and no effort was made by the developers to provide convenient access by the existing surface bus system.

Major redevelopment within the CBD has already been provided for in the expansive Bunker Hill project on the west side. This development will more than enable the LA CBD to compete for "prestige oriented" commercial tenants with the other LA regions. What L.A.'s CBD needs now is small scale, select site clearances with an emphasis on building rehabilitation. The intensity and diversity of activities, as occurs along Broadway, should be preserved and enhanced. A priority target for building rehabilitation should be Spring Street.

Containment of Skid Row

Provision of treatment facilities and of additional street amenities in the skid row area, including parks and restroom facilities, is a basic first step in reversing the decline of adjacent areas. If Spring Street is to be rehabilitated, the containment of Skid Row is imperative.

CBD Parking Management

In the downtown area, more than anywhere else in the region, transit is a realistic alternative to the private auto for a substantial proportion of the traveling public. For this

reason, parking management strategies--whose objectives are to shift trip makers from single occupant private autos to high-occupancy vehicles--have a better chance of success in the CBD than in most other areas. It is logical to start a parking management program with special emphasis on the CBD.

A fundamental concept behind parking management strategies is to allow people who choose public transportation to avoid auto costs--in this case, auto storage costs. Capital and maintenance costs for parking represent a large subsidy for the auto user. These costs are borne equally by auto and transit users--the latter group consisting of both transit-riders-by-choice and transit-dependent riders.

The basic goal of parking management strategies should be to approach parity in treatment between auto and transit modes. One approach is to cause the parker to pay directly a greater portion of the total costs of storing his vehicle while he is working, shopping, etc. For apartments, as is done now in Bunker Hill Towers for example, a surcharge could be applied to the basic apartment rental for the number of parking spaces used. This eliminates the unfair subsidy of auto storage costs by apartment households with fewer or no cars. A second approach seeks to cause the transit user to be subsidized at a level, or some fraction thereof, equivalent to the vehicle storage costs that are incurred for employee, shopper, etc., parking.

One approach to parking management strategies would seek to

reduce or eliminate building code and zoning parking requirements. An important step in removing the costs of auto storage from the non-auto user would be simply to let the dictates of the free market determine the amount of parking to be provided for employees, shoppers, business patrons, and apartment tenants. In instances where walking and transit access is poor, most building owners can be expected to continue to construct expensive parking facilities to protect their investments, even without zoning and building code parking requirements. In locations where walking and transit access is good, owners would see less of an economic need to provide extensive parking. Under such conditions, and given the rationale for parking management plans, it appears only reasonable that a property owner not be required to provide additional off-street parking.

Another approach to parking management would seek to change regulations and ordinances which require accommodations for auto access (and storage) but make no provision for requiring equal access for transit vehicles (and spaces for their layover needs). Developers should be required to provide for access according to the number of people arriving by the various modes rather than by the number of vehicles; i.e., for 50 people on one bus versus 25 people in 20 autos.

Equal Access: Auto vs. Transit

In line with the above, both transportation and land use planners should exercise a leadership role in influencing public officials and private developers as to the economic and social

benefits of providing good public transportation access to public and private facilities. Like other transit operating agencies, the SCRTD frequently encounters opposition to obtaining necessary red curb space for bus stop zones along commercial streets. Yet, for the number of actual and potential customers and employees using that bus stop, the several foregone parking places make up a meager investment compared to the costs of off-street parking, whether surface parking or multi-storied garage. Additional investments by the adjacent land owners in some improvements and amenities, such as bus turnout lanes and passenger shelters, is not only socially enlightened but economically sound in terms of dollars invested for the number of persons delivered. This is particularly true in downtown areas, where public transit usage is the highest.

Were developers who invest in improvements to upgrade access by public transit able to substitute these costs for the costs of otherwise required parking, so much greater would be the incentive to provide a more balanced access between transit and the private auto.