# CICLAVIA RESEARCH & EVALUATION GROUP

**PROGRESS REPORT #1** 

## SCOPE

This document summarizes the studies and preliminary analyses done on CicLAvia in October and December 2014, by UCLA. The contents are draft synopses of the studies, and should not be distributed nor cited.

## CONTENTS

SCOPE	1
SUMMARY OF EVALUATION METHODS & FINDINGS	2
INTRODUCTION	4
HEART OF LA AND SOUTH LA STUDIES	4
Participant Counts	4
Physical Activity Study	11
Frequency Data	15
Local Business Study	21
Crime Statistics Analysis	25
Social Elements Study	28
Political Sensitivity Study	
Local Transportation Data Analysis	
PUBLICITY	
RESEARCH GROUP SUSTAINABILITY	
SELECTED REFERENCES	

## SUMMARY OF EVALUATION METHODS & FINDINGS

The evaluation research team from the UCLA Fielding School of Public Health in partnership with researchers from RAND conducted a seven-component assessment of the October 5, 2014 Heart of L.A. and December 7, 2014 South L.A. CicLAvia events. The team looked at both objective measures, including traffic counts, business receipts and crime reports, and subjective measures from participant surveys and key informant interviews. These measures were designed to assess the multi-faceted ways that CicLAvia affects participants and communities hosting CicLAvia events, and to capture how CicLAvia events might catalyze community change that persists after each event.

Included in assessments of each event were:

## 1. Participant Counts

A sub-contractor specializing in traffic and crowd counts fixed cameras at multiple locations along routes then counted bicyclists and pedestrians at different times during events. Depending on assumptions, estimates for the Heart of L.A. CicLAvia in October showed between 18,000- 30,000 participants. Data for the South L.A. event is still being analyzed.

## 2. Physical Activity Study

This study examined the potential of CicLAvia to provide an opportunity for physical activity for community residents. Using estimates of the number of bicyclists and pedestrians, along with assumptions about the intensity and duration of physical activity for each activity, we estimated the total amount of physical activity at each event. Each event provided about 240,000 METS of physical activity, more than 10 times the amount of physical activity that 43.6 acres of local parks would generate in one week.

## 3. Local Business Study

Does CicLAvia help or hurt businesses long CicLAvia routes? Are different businesses affected differently? A sample of business along CicLAvia routes were asked to share daily receipts from the days of CicLAvia and from the Sundays before and after CicLAvia? This snapshot of business activity shows that:

- Business impacts varied greatly across events, most likely reflecting different mixes of businesses in each neighborhood, especially auto-centric business and development vs. walk-up formats. Among sampled businesses, sales increased by about 20% at the Wilshire CicLAvia, increased by about 2% at the Heart of L.A. CicLAvia and declined by 40% during the South L.A. CicLAvia.
- The change in sales receipts, on average, varies greatly by business type. The Heart of LA route sample contained three full-service grocery stores, a business category that was not found in other route samples. It appears full-service grocery stores experience a more marked decline, compared to other business types.
- Businesses that actively engage with the event (e.g. special outside seating, promotional decorations, bike racks, etc.) are more likely to profit from the event. At the Heart of L.A. CicLAvia businesses that actively engaged with the event experienced a 45% increase in sales on average, while the businesses that were not actively engaging experienced a 4% decrease in sales, on average.

## 4. Crime Statistics Analysis

This study uses empirical data (LAPD Crime Reports) to examine anecdotes from the police department that crime rates drop sharply during CicLAvia events. Using LAPD crime report data we compared the rate of reported crimes

during CicLAvia events to rates on other Sundays, comparing crime rates in areas adjacent to CicLAvia routes to rates in nearby areas but which were not immediately adjacent to routes. Combining data from all three 2014 CicLAvias (Wilshire, Heart of L.A. and South L.A.), the analysis shows a 40% drop in violent crime (e.g. assault, battery, forcible rape, homicide) during CicLAvia events in areas adjacent to CicLAvia routes compared to nearby areas on other Sundays. The analysis did not show any change in rates of property crime despite an influx of people. The Wilshire and Heart of L.A. events each had a single report of a stolen bicycle. No bicycles were reported stolen during the South L.A. even.

## 5. Social Elements Study

A 2-page survey was distributed to CicLAvia participants at hubs during each event. These paper/pencil surveys provide a rich source of data on participant demographics, distance and mode traveled from home to CicLAvia, reasons for participating in CicLAvia and perceptions of the event and bike/ped conditions in their home neighborhoods. At the Heart of L.A. CicLAvia 1,439 surveys were completed. At the South L.A. CicLAvia 1,217 surveys were completed.

Some highlights from the surveys of participants at the Heart of L.A. and South L.A. CicLAvias:

- 1st time participants: 42% of the respondents at the Heart of L.A. CicLAvia and 27% of the South L.A. CicLAvia respondents said that the event was their first CicLAvia. Percentage of 1st time participants was higher among women than men (34% vs. 28%) and among African Americans compared to participants of other races/ethnicities (40% vs. 28%-33%)
- Without CicLAvia many participants would have spent their day at home: About 40% of participants at both events say they would have stayed home if they hadn't come to CicLAvia. About 1/3 of Whites and nearly half of African-Americans, Asians and Latinos said that they would be staying at home if not at CicLAvia. Younger participants were more likely than older participants to say they would have stayed at home if not participating in CicLAvia. About 16% of participants at both events said they would have been sedentary if they were not at CicLAvia.
- Exploring the city was the number one reason respondents cited for participating in CicLAvia, followed by exercise and just to have fun. People living closer to the event were more likely than others to report that they were participating in order to give their kids a chance to get outside. Participants saying that their reason for participating was to give their kids a chance to get out or that they just "happened upon the event" tend to live somewhat closer to the event (10.7 vs. 12.3 miles).

## 6. Political Sensitivity Study

We designed an on-line questionnaire to assess the perceptions and attitudes of local stakeholders who affect local transportation policies, including CBOs, advocacy groups and public agencies. The survey was administered before and after the Heart of LA and South LA CicLAvias to identify effects on attitudes and support for open streets events with the aim of improving CicLAvia outreach, understanding its impact on decision-makers, and contributing to burgeoning literature on open streets events in the U.S. We received twenty-four responses to the survey. We found inconsistencies in understanding of open streets and in suggestions made by survey-takers as to how to improve CicLAvia.

## 7. Local Transportation Data Analysis

We are waiting for METRO to release the data to us.

## INTRODUCTION

An urban phenomenon is sweeping the Americas, transforming dangerous, pollution-ridden, urban roadways into vibrant public spaces that promote health and community prosperity. This phenomenon, generically referred to as "open streets events" in North America and ciclóvias in Latin America, is capturing the imagination of urban visionaries across the globe, gaining traction in Europe and parts of Africa. While organized differently in every city, open streets events everywhere result in similar effects: getting urbanites outdoors, getting them to be more physically active, and engaging one another in their own, and in new, communities and social networks. Ciclóvias originated in Latin America more than fifty years ago, and thus much of their documented effects stem from that region.<sup>1</sup> While open streets events have been occurring in the U.S. and North America, they only gained popularity and widespread adoption starting in 2007, and very little research has been done to date.<sup>11</sup> Despite their remarkable popularity in North America, open streets events can face many hurdles to getting started and staying sustainable. Even once initiated, open streets organizers must continually show positive results to maintain civic consent. In recent years, open streets organizers, academic researchers and local governments alike have realized the importance of studying this urban phenomenon more carefully in the North American context. Since public health benefits are a key "selling point" for open streets events, improved understanding of how open streets events affect the public's health and the role of other factors in helping realize potential health benefits will be instrumental in getting securing sustained funding, other resources and policy support from local governments, businesses and the non-profit sector.

## HEART OF LA AND SOUTH LA STUDIES

The sections below describe the individual studies conducted in October and December 2014. These are preliminary analyses and should not be distributed nor cited.

## PARTICIPANT COUNTS

These were coordinated by Deborah Cohen at RAND Corporation.

## CiClavia event: Heart of LA, October 5, 2014, Hours: 9-4pm

Results (	(crude estimation.	, in	thousand)
		,	

# bikers (1,000)	# non-bikers (walkers/skaters/etc.) (1,000)	Total N (1,000)	Total MVPA time (1,000 person hours)	Setting
17.6	0.8	18.4	38.1	conservative: conservative estimates of # avg passes, regular speed (6mph/2mph)
25.2	1.2	26.3	54.3	Slightly conservative: conservative estimates of # avg passes, slower speed (4mph/1.5mph)
27.9	1.4	29.4	60.6	Normal: regular estimates of # avg passes, regular speed (6mph/2mph)

December counts still being calculated.







Bikers Direction= SB



**Bikers Direction= NB** 



Bikers Direction= SB





East LA

CicLAvia Research & Evaluation Group

East LA

Progress Report #1



Peds and other Direction= NB



Peds and other Direction= SB







Peds and other Direction= SB





Peds and other Direction= NB



Peds and other Direction= SB



Peds and other Direction= NB



Peds and other Direction= SB





Peds and other Direction= WB



Peds and other Direction= WB













Peds and other Direction= EB



Peds and other Direction= EB













Peds and other Direction= WB



Peds and other Direction= EB







Peds and other Direction= EB



## PHYSICAL ACTIVITY STUDY

Our purpose was to assess participation and physical activity during the event. *Objectives:* 

- 1) To estimate the number of participants
- 2) To estimate the person hours spent in moderate to vigorous physical activity (MVPA)
- 3) To assess the cost-effectiveness of investments in CicLAvia

The write up below refers only to April 2014 CicLAvia on Wilshire Blvd. More detailed write up and data on October 2014, December 2014 are forthcoming.

*Methods:* In order to count the participants, we placed video cameras in 14 locations, half east bound and half westbound at 1-mile intervals along the CicLAvia route which was approximately a straight-line street segment with no branches (See Figure 1). The video images were processed by National Data and Surveying Services (NDS) who counted all persons passing by the cameras in 5 minute intervals categorizing each person as a cyclist, pedestrian, or "other," which included skaters or people in wheelchairs and children in strollers. Procedures include spot reliability checks and recounts. The camera covered only the street areas; persons on the sidewalks were excluded. There were no videotapes taken of the pedestrian areas at either end of the route.

We invited CicLAvia participants to complete a self-administered questionnaire that asked participants' gender, age group, race/ethnicity, and zip code of residence. It also asked how they got to the CicLAvia, frequency of previous participation, the number of people they came with, whether they came with children, how long they were staying at CicLAvia, what they would have done if they were not at CicLAvia, and the frequency and duration of physical activity in which they usually engaged per week. A final question asked the type of transportation they usually relied on to get around the city.

The surveys were available in both English and Spanish at check in stations at 5 major hubs along the route. Volunteer data collectors approached participants with a clipboard asking adults>18 to complete the survey. The RAND IRB ruled the study exempt from HSPC review given the anonymous nature of the surveys and the observation of public activities.

*Results:* A total of 1,085 individuals responded to the surveys. Fewer than 2% of the surveys were completed in Spanish. 45% of respondents were female. Compared to the population in the City of Los Angeles, there were more Asians (16% at CicLAvia vs 11% in the city; fewer African Americans (8% vs 10%) fewer white (42% vs 50%). Hispanic ethnicity was reported by 31% vs. 49% in the city. However 27% declined to report race and 62% did not report ethnicity.

Travel to CicLAvia was reported as by car from 38%, bicycle 29% and mass transit 22%. Over 81% said they planned to bike around CicLAvia and 14% planned to walk. First-time participation in CicLAvia occurred for 37% of respondents. Fewer than 12 % came alone, and 26% came with one other person but 29% said they came with 5 or more persons. 70% did not bring children but 30% did-- a median of 2 children. The average planned duration of staying at the event was just over 3 hours. Only two percent of respondents reported durations of stay less than one hour.

About 40% of individuals said that if they were not at CicLAvia they would have been physically active elsewhere. Nearly 18% said they would have been sedentary, while 27% said they would have stayed home. The remaining either marked more than one response (8%) or checked "Other" (7%).

On average, respondents said they engaged in physical activity 4 times per week, just over half an hour each time. But 50% of respondents did not meet the national guidelines of 150 minutes per week. The majority (68%) reported usually relying on cars for travel around Los Angeles, 8% said they relied on bicycles and 9% relied primarily on mass transit.

#### Differences among population subgroups

Female respondents reported that they had participated in previous CicLAvias less often than males (1.5 vs. 2.0; p <.0001), as did respondents younger than 40 vs those over age 40 (1.6 vs. 2.0; p<.002). First time participants planned to stay a shorter amount of time than those who had participated previously (176 min vs. 194 minutes, p < .0001) and came with fewer people than those who had previously participated at CicLAvia. Hispanic respondents were younger than non-Hispanics (38.4 vs 43.2 yrs; p < .0001), came with more people (2.8 vs 2.3, p < .0001), and, on average, brought more children (2.1 vs 1.7; p < .0001). Males were much more likely than females to report that they used bicycles to get around Los Angeles (12% vs 4%; p < .0001).

### Number of Participants

The total number that passed by and were counted independently by all the cameras included 303,070 cyclists, 5122 pedestrians, and 3866 were either skating or engaged in other active transport. Under different speed and duration assumptions, a biking participant was expected to pass 6-9 surveillance cameras, and a non-biking participant was expected to pass 3-6 cameras. Table 1 shows estimates based upon different assumptions about participant speed. Estimates based on the slower speed settings may be closer to the truth. Along the main route there were a number of street intersections where the flow was frequently stopped by traffic controllers. The average speed of the whole crowd may not be as high as 6 mph as in some settings. Thus, the event may have seen roughly 40,000 participants along the route accumulating roughly 70,000 hours in MVPA, equivalent to about 240,000 MET hours. These estimates do not include pedestrians who remained on sidewalks and at the beginning and end of the route since they may not have been captured by the cameras.

Figure 2 shows the plots of counts of people passing each check point versus time shows a clear trend with a gradual increase of bikers between 9am and 12pm and then gradual decrease until 3pm. These plots suggest that a more sparse temporal sampling scheme (e.g., counting every other 5 minutes or even sparser) is likely to be sufficient. On the other hand, since there were relatively few cameras (only 7 in each direction), it is difficult to estimate the spatial distribution of the participants across the entire route at any given time.

Figures 3a and 3b are maps of the zip codes from which participants reported coming. In addition to coming from Southern California, participants surveyed also reported 15 zip codes from out of state (Figure 3b). These included: Oregon, Texas, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Missouri, Montana, Iowa, Arkansas, Idaho, Virginia, Georgia and Florida.

To understand the magnitude of participation at CicLAvia, the maximum capacity of a 6 mile route allowing the more ideal cycling speed of 10mph, if the street is fully occupied, is 19,000 bicyclists at the same time (assuming each biker needs 100 sq. ft. at 10mph,<sup>13</sup> and the whole street surface is 6 miles long by 60 feet wide). Therefore, not accounting for the possibility that people may have left CicLavia at a frequency less than an average of three hours, the maximum capacity of CicLAvia would have been 48,000 bicyclists.

### Park Use in Los Angeles City Parks

A recent study estimated the amount of weekly physical activity that occurs in Los Angeles City's 222 neighborhood parks and recreation centers (2,162 acres) based upon systematic observations of 83 parks over the past 12 years.<sup>12</sup> On average there are 1.1 million hours of use during a clement week and 404,000 visitors, who spend 378,000 hours in MVPA. Thus, the use per acre per week is 187 visitors generating 175 hours of MVPA. Given that the CicLAvia route measures about 43.6 acres, the comparable use of a neighborhood parks would amount to about 8150 visitors and 7623 hours of MVPA or 34,300 MET hours/week (assuming 14 hours of useable time per day and 4.5 METs per hour of MVPA). Roughly speaking, one 14 hour Sunday in a comparable space in local neighborhood parks generates less than 3% of the METs expended in CicLAvia in seven hours. CicLAvia attracted 5 times as many people, expending more than 30 times as much energy in MVPA, because the majority were active most of the time they were at the CicLAvia.

### Cost of CicLAvia and Costs per MET

CicLAvia's net cost (after receiving income from private sources and excluding government funding) was approximately \$190,000. These were calculated as the difference between income and expenses. Income included a total of about \$467,000 in donations and grants and \$33,600 from selling CicLAvia merchandise and fees collected from food trucks. Expenses included nearly \$20,000 for supplies and materials, \$72,000 for development, \$300,000 for programming, \$119,000 for administration, and \$86,000 for marketing. The City of LA spent approximately \$149,000 to cover the costs for safety, security and management, making the net cost for the event \$339,000. Given the estimated 240,000 METs expended at CicLAvia, the cost per MET would be \$1.41. This is roughly equivalent to a cost of \$1.41 for bicycling for 17 minutes or walking on the route for 20 minutes.

### Discussion

Compared to other published evaluations of Ciclovía events, attendance at the Los Angeles CicLAvia was as high, or significantly higher than in other American cities, with possibly New York City as the exception. <sup>5.14</sup> Compared to the giant Ciclovía events estimated for Bogota and Cali, with 3-10 times more miles of roadway available, attendance at CicLAvia was somewhat lower per mile.<sup>5</sup> However, estimates for attendance at all other ciclovías have not been aided by the use of surveillance cameras, and are possibly inflated.

Comparisons within the same city are possibly more relevant. The number of participants attracted to CicLAvia geometrically exceed number of users of existing local parks of similar dimensions. Furthermore, CicLAvia participants come from miles away and from across the country. The large turnout from local and non-local residents is a sign that this is a very unique opportunity, worthy of significant effort to attend. It also demonstrates demand for such opportunities. The experience of a CicLAvia of riding on wide paved streets otherwise occupied by cars cannot be replicated by existing parks, since none have the kinds of scenery and views that can be safely experienced by bicycle. Except for narrow bike paths along the beach or river, linear bike paths that are exclusive for bikes are not available in Los Angeles.

Cities routinely maintain parks for leisure activity, so the comparison between park use and attendance at the CicLAvia provides a tangible benchmark. Without parks providing events that are novel and heavily marketed, physical activity there is substantially lower than at CicLAvia. In today's world, electronic media dominates leisure time activity, <sup>15</sup> and extraordinary efforts may be needed to counter the draw of sedentary activities that are often perceived as more exciting than physical activity.

Because there were many who did not report race/ethnicity it is somewhat difficult to compare participants to the general population. In a multi-cultural heterogeneous environment, where there are many mixed families, race/ethnicity may be a sensitive issue. Overall, depending on the background of those who declined to report, it is possible that the participants were fairly representative of the LA population.

Our cost-effectiveness analysis focused on the cost to the city for sponsoring the event. Many localities financially support leisure activities (e.g. fireworks, motor parades, holiday extravaganzas, etc) where most participants are no more than spectators and the event has no benefit to health. Physical inactivity is responsible for 10% of all deaths, yet governments typically do not directly dedicate resources for its promotion. It makes sense for future municipal discretionary funds for entertainment to be preferentially directed toward activities that yield benefits beyond the short-term.

The evaluation has several limitations. First, the survey respondents represent a convenience sample, and applying their responses to the estimation of total participation may not be appropriate. Second, the cameras were in limited locations and cannot account for the heterogeneity of the route. At one end of the route where there was a steep hill, for most of the day participants were required to get off their bicycles and walk, so their speeds were likely much slower than the estimates used, resulting in our estimated number likely to be lower than what actually occurred. Third, we did not evaluate any physical activity gained traveling to and from the event. We also did not count people on sidewalks. Although it did not appear that there were many participants on the sidewalks along the route, at either end, there were thousands who came to take advantage of entertainment, food, and

information booths that were stationed there. Furthermore, at five stations along the route there were multiple food trucks with long lines. We underestimated participants who spent larger amounts of time in these locations.

### Conclusion

Although conducting a scientific count of the number of users is helpful for planning, the success of the CicLAvia is obvious to any observer, given the multitude of users among who half did not already meet the national physical activity guidelines, and the obvious joy and pleasure of the participants. The response suggests that there is good reason to expand the event to longer routes, to increase the reach and capacity of the event, as well as to hold them more frequently. Even though the event needs government support and is relatively expensive, it is a civic activity that has health benefits to participants. More frequent events would potentially lower the cost for each event, improving the overall cost-effectiveness.

CicLAvia generated substantially more moderate physical activity than the equivalent space in parks. Thus, at a population level, it is likely to be more health-promoting than present alternatives for leisure activity accessible to the urban population and, in particular, groups that have been disproportionately affected by chronic diseases.

## FREQUENCY DATA

		Wilshire	"Heart of LA"	"South LA"
		Boulevard	Downtown	USC
Question	Response cat.	4/6/2014	10/5/2014	12/7/2014
Event Distance		6 miles	10 miles	6 miles
Number of Surveys		1,085	1,439	1,217
1) What is your gender?				
	Male	54.73%	54.21%	54.85%
	Female	45.27%	45.79%	45.15%
2) What is your age group?				
	Mean ->	42	37	41
	18-29	27.91%	34.27%	24.08%
	30-39	16.84%	27.52%	26.83%
	40-49	20.74%	18.37%	20.58%
	50-59	23.63%	13.58%	18.17%
	60-69	8.37%	5.49%	8.42%
	70-79	2.14%	0.63%	1.67%
	80+	0.37%	0.14%	0.25%
3) What is your race and ethnicity?				
	<u>Race:</u>			
	White	41.94%	36.69%	37.14%
	African Am	7.83%	4.86%	15.37%
	Asian	15.94%	15.29%	10.19%
	Other /multi	7.01%	7.85%	9.29%
	Missing	27.28%	35.30%	28.02%
	<u>Ethnicity:</u>			
	Hispanic	30.88%	40.51%	32.05%
	Non-Hispanic	7.19%	6.74%	6.82%
	Missing	61.94%	52.74%	61.13%
Cross of Race x Ethnicity (cell %, column sums to 100)	Ethnicity Missing			
	White	35.21%	27.38%	30.57%
	African Am	6.82%	4.52%	15.05%
	Asian	14.93%	14.11%	8.87%
	Other / multi	4.34%	5.49%	6.25%
	Missing	0.65%	1.25%	1.40%
	<u>Ethnicity Hispanic</u>			
	White	2.95%	4.52%	2.38%
	African American	0.37%	0.14%	0.66%
	Asian	0.00%	0.35%	0.25%
	Other / multi	1.75%	2.16%	2.39%
	Missing	25.81%	33.36%	26.38%
	Ethnicity Non-			

		Wilshire	"Heart of LA"	"South LA"
		Boulevard	Downtown	USC
Question	Response cat.	4/6/2014	10/5/2014	12/7/2014
	<u>Hispanic</u>		. = = = = (	
	White	3.78%	4.79%	4.19%
	African American	0.65%	0.21%	0.66%
	Asian	1.01%	0.83%	1.07%
	Other / multi	0.94%	0.21%	0.66%
	Missing	0.83%	0.69%	0.25%
4) what is the highest level of education you have received?				
	< HSD		5.48%	3.51%
	HSD/GED		10.01%	8.78%
	Some College		23.99%	20.65%
	College Grad		36.74%	36.54%
	Graduate Degree		23.78%	30.52%
5) What is your 5-digit zip code?				
6)How will you get around CicLAvia today?				
	Bicycle	81.78%	77.95%	80.33%
	Walk/jog	13.78%		
	Walk		13.43%	11.75%
	Skate	1.11%	1.08%	0.75%
(	Other / Multiple	3.33%	7.55%	7.17%
7) Not including today, how many times have you				
participated in CicLAvia before?	mean (top code 5)	1.8	1.8	2.3
	None	36.94%	35.16%	26.72%
	1 time	16.20%	19.37%	17.34%
	2 times	13.15%	11.99%	11.45%
	3 times	11.11%	11.99%	9.38%
	4 times	7.70%	9.94%	9.29%
	5 or more times	14.81%	11.55%	25.81%
8) How many people did you come with today?				
	mean (top code 5)	2.4	2.2	2.3
	None	11.72%	14.78%	14.52%
	1	26.01%	28.36%	24.56%
	2	18.45%	19.80%	17.68%
	3	15.22%	13.28%	15.68%
	4	8.58%	9.08%	10.04%
	5+	20.02%	14.70%	17.51%

9) How many of these are children under age 18?				
	mean (top code 5)	0.5	0.5	0.5
	None	72.94%	75.63%	75.58%
	1	12.86%	11.93%	11.02%
	2	9.02%	5.85%	5.89%
	3	2.40%	2.81%	3.93%
	4	0.96%	1.93%	1.11%
	5+	1.82%	1.85%	2.48%
10) In what capacity are you participating (check all)				~
	Individual		30.12%	34.05%
	w/ family/friends		65.20%	62.38%
	Volunteer		4.25%	2.74%
	Organization		4.90%	6.31%
	loh		3.67%	1.66%
			5.0773	210070
11) How long are you staying at the CicLAvia today?				
	mean minutes ->	187.5	194.5	173.8
	< 30 min	0.55%	2.12%	1.51%
	30 min - 1 hour	2.31%	2.26%	3.60%
	1-2 hours	16.53%	18.19%	17.10%
	2-3 hours	28.72%	10.08%	34.28%
	3-4 hours	25.76%	39.84%	25.15%
	4-5 hours	13.39%	15.02%	9.05%
	5+ hours	12.74%	12.48%	9.30%
12) How long will you be physically active at CicLAvia				
today?	All the time		43.06%	46.91%
	Most of the time		39.18%	39.72%
	about half		12.05%	9.70%
	< half		2.61%	2.09%
	not much		3.10%	1.59%
			0.20/0	
13) What would you be doing today if you were NOT				
at CICLAVIA?	Home	27.08%	39.86%	36.99%
	Other Sedentary	17.93%	16.14%	14.63%
	Other Active	39.65%	30.18%	32.09%
	Other / multiple	15.34%	13.83%	16.29%
14) How do you rate your routine level of physical				
activity	Highly active		33 07%	33 95%
	Moderately active		50.07/0	A8 07%
	Low active		14 38%	16 12%
			2 1 20/0	1 95%
			2.12/0	1.03/0
	1	1		

11) How many times per week do you engage in				
physical activities that cause increased	mean	4.1		
breathing/heart rate?	0	2 21%		
	1	7 59%		
		12 959/		
	2	12.85%		
	3	18.85%		
	4	14.05%		
	5	18.95%		
	6	10.26%		
	7 or more	15.16%		
12) What is the usual length of these physical				
activities	mean (minutes)	36.5		
	< 5 minutes	1.69%		
	5 -15 minutes	2.81%		
	15 - 30 minutes	21.46%		
	30 - 45 minutes	25.68%		
	> 45 minutes	48.36%		
15) How do you usually travel around Los Angeles				
	Car	68.37%		
	Train/transit	9.00%		
	Bicycle	8.53%		
(	Walk/Skate	2.13%		
	Other	1.39%		
	Multiple	10.58%		
16) How did you get to Cicl Avia today?				
Toy now and you get to cice Avia today:	Cor	27.02%	12 669/	28.00%
	Cdi	37.92%	43.00%	50.09%
	Nietro train/bus	22.05%	18.78%	15.00%
	BICYCIE	28.97%	27.36%	33.81%
	Walk/Skate	5.63%	4.25%	4.87%
	Other / multiple	5.44%	5.95%	7.64%
17) What are your reasons for participating at				
CicLAvia? (check all)	Exercise		60.44%	65.27%
	Explore		60.83%	67.36%
	Socialize		45.60%	48.08%
	Kids out of home		10.36%	10.38%
	Visit shops		13.34%	10.30%
·	Fun		47.25%	48.17%
	Happened upon		2.75%	2.36%
	No traffic		46.55%	50.70%
	Other reason		7.30%	6.02%
			,	0.02/0

18) How often do you think CicLAvia should happen?			
	Every week	10.60%	13.64%
	Once a month	28.20%	36.05%
	2-5 /year	41.40%	27.72%
	6-9/year	16.10%	20.99%
	once a year	3.46%	1.51%
	never again	0.24%	0.09%
19) How did you hear about CicLAvia (check all that			
apply)			27.05%
	S = Social media		37.05%
	P = Press E = Elvor		2 57%
	r - riyei W = Website		3.37 <i>%</i> 25.72%
	F = Fmail		11.16%
	M = Word of		31.82%
	mouth		0_10_/0
	O = Other		10.99%
20) Would you like to see a CicLAvia event in your			
neighborhood?	Yes	89.92%	93.16%
	No	3.81%	3.07%
	Already exists	6.27%	3.77%
21) Do you feel safe at CicLAvia?			
	Yes	96.69%	96.60%
	No	1.26%	0.78%
	DNK / Not sure	2.05%	2.61%
22) How safe is it to walk in your neighborhood?			
	Very safe	53.46%	51.52%
	Somewhat safe	36.16%	35.77%
	Somewhat unsafe	7.94%	9.75%
	Very unsafe	1.49%	1.74%
	DNK / Not sure	0.94%	1.22%
23) How safe is it to bicycle in your neighborhood?			
	Very safe	33.39%	29.70%
	Somewhat safe	41.71%	43.73%
*	Somewhat unsafe	17.75%	20.03%
	Very unsafe	5.11%	4.53%
	DNK / Not sure	2.04%	2.00%

22) Compared to the rest of LA, how safe is it to walk				
in your neighborhood?	Much safer		41.38%	35.77%
	Somewhat safer		29.59%	28.63%
	About the same		17.41%	20.70%
	Somewhat less safe		7.83%	10.22%
	much more unsafe		1.58%	2.47%
	DKN / Not Sure		2.22%	2.20%
23) Compared to the rest of LA, how safe is it to bicycle in your neighborhood?	Much safer		32.12%	25.55%
	Somewhat safer		31.18%	32.22%
	About the same		19.10%	22.56%
	Somewhat less safe	C	9.94%	12.99%
	much more unsafe		3.55%	3.51%
	DKN / Not Sure		4.10%	3.16%
24) How supportive are you of local efforts to				
promote walking, biking, or public transit?	Very supportive		74.59%	78.91%
	Somewhat		16.05%	14.41%
	supportive			
	Neutral		7.32%	4.83%
	Somewhat		0.39%	0.53%
	Very opposed		0.08%	0 18%
(	DNK		1.57%	1.14%
			1.5775	111470
25) How engaged are you in supporting or opposing				
local efforts to promote walking, biking, or public	Actively engaged		30.97%	30.34%
indiste.	Somewhat		37.26%	40.37%
	Not ongogod		24 76%	20.05%
			24.70%	20.05%
	DINK		7.00%	5.23%
26) How supportive are you of LA County plans to add	Very supportive		76.90%	80.02%
ingli quality bicycle paths along some city streets.	Somewhat		14.61%	12.53%
	supportive			
	Neutral		5.03%	4.03%
	Somewhat opposed		0.63%	0.61%
	Very opposed		0.39%	0.35%
	DNK		2.44%	2.45%
27) May we follow-up with you?				
	Ves		51 56%	67 24%
	No		48 44%	37.76%
			-070	57.7070

## LOCAL BUSINESS STUDY

## Introduction and Methodology

CicLAvia is an open streets event that happens in Los Angeles, closing the streets to motor vehicle traffic and opening them for people to walk, bicycle, skate and enjoy. This event brings thousands of people to the streets. The UCLA Institute of Transportation Studies along with the Lewis Center for Regional Policy Studies is a part of a team of UCLA researchers examining was interested in quantifying various metrics associated with CicLAvia. This summary provides an economic snapshot of businesses along the October 2014 "Heart of Los Angeles" route and compares this snapshot to our larger observed trends from four events, Wilshire 2013, Wilshire 2014, October 2014 Heart of LA and December 2014 South LA.

There are a variety of different ways to approach Open Street economic analysis. The approach provided in the report "Open Streets Initiatives: Measuring Success Toolkit" is survey based. This involves asking businesses to estimate how many people came into the location on the event day and estimate how many of these people bought something. They also provide a slightly longer survey instrument asking businesses to answer either "yes" or "no" whether "the open street event had an impact on your business." This response is then qualified by asking "how would you rate the impact of open streets on your business" and the responses are either "increase in customer activity & sales," "no change," or "decrease in customer activity and sales." This approach allows the researcher to understand general business perceptions but not track changes in sales volume. Overall, the survey approach is limited in the conclusions because it's only based on perceptions.

The UCLA approach differs from the survey approach. We isolate one question (total sales) and obtain the exact amount for the Sunday before and the day of the event. This approach is data-based, rather than perception based. Businesses are less willing to participate in the study because they are reluctant, unwilling, or restricted in the case of corporate chains, to provide sales figures. This approach results in a small sample of businesses, and that sample is not representative of the business mix along the route. This means the results from any individual event sample are not to be extrapolated to all businesses along the route.

UCLA has the unique position of consistent methodology from multiple events. As we collect more sales data from more events, we can build our overall dataset and understand how one event differs from the pattern overall.

**CicLAvia Research & Evaluation Group** 

## Interpreting results

Statistical data can be interpreted and analyzed in many different ways. For the purposes of this event, we report three key statistics: average percentage difference, median percentage difference, and the standard deviation. We also look at how the average percentage change varies by business type. The businesses in the sample vary dramatically in their business size, from small stores that do less than \$1,000 of business per day to large retailers with daily sales of over \$60,000. Reporting data for a range this large and a small sample is problematic. A large retailer may have a sizeable dollar amount change, but the percentage will be very small. For example, a large retailer may have a \$2,000 increase from the pre-day to the event date, but this could only represent a 3% change. But for a small business the same \$2,000 could represent a 200% change. However, the percentage change is a better approach to the analysis because it provides a relative measurement rather than dollar amounts, an absolute measurement. At this time, we have less than 200 sum total observations from all events. This small sample provides little ability to break the sample into distinct groups by business size.

## **Outreach Results**

In the 2014 Heart of LA CicLAvia route, we were able to collect data from 60 businesses. There are approximately 525 businesses along this 10-mile route. We randomly selected 400 businesses to represent a random sample geographically and along general business types. [pull information from general trends, don't think it's much different than the explanation here]

We coded our outreach results into four categories:

- 1) Yes, participating
- 2) No, not participating
- 3) Unavailable; businesses for whom we spoke with but could not meet with manager
- 4) Closed; either on Sundays or permanently.

Our final sample is consistently smaller than the initial outreach results. Some businesses said they would participate. Upon data collection, they had changed their position or we were unable to connect with the appropriate staff member at the pre-arranged pick-up time.

Category	Initial c	outreach	Final	results
Yes	91	23%	61	15%
No	172	43%	202	51%
Unavailable	106	27%	106	27%
Closed	31	7%	31	7%

Example outreach to final sample from Heart of LA

## Business Change results

	All events	Wilshire	Wilshire	Heart of LA	South LA
		2013	2014	2014	
Average	-1.85%	20.1%	24%	1.74%	-43.2%
Median	-10.33%	15.8%	22.3%	-0.58%	-49.2%
Standard Deviation	67%	52%	67%	65.6%	56.5%

All data sets have a high standard deviation value, meaning the individual effects are quite different than the average value. This is displayed graphically below in figures 1 and 2. The change in sales exhibits a binomial distribution; a group of businesses experiencing gains and a group of businesses experiencing declines.

The percentage change, on average, varies greatly by business type. The Heart of LA route sample contained three fullservice grocery stores, a business category that was not found in other route samples. It appears full-service grocery stores experience a more marked decline, compared to other business types. We do see a similar decline in the salon category. However, the salon customers likely shifted business to another day of the week rather than eliminated it altogether. Comparatively, full-service grocery store customers have more options. Customers may have shifted their shopping to another day of the week but they also may have gone to a different grocery store. Many grocery stores chains have multiple locations, so the business may have even shifted to another location from that same chain. We have no idea of knowing the effects of this shifting from salons or full-service grocery stores.

We also measured whether businesses were "actively engaging" with the route. Of the 161 businesses in the sample, we observed 19 businesses actively engaging with the event; 12 restaurants and 7 retail establishments. These businesses experienced a 45% increase in sales on average, while the businesses that were not actively engaging experienced a 4% decrease in sales, on average.

## Conclusions

The Heart of LA CicLAvia event analysis and our analysis as a whole, is limited because of small sample size. We could attempt to increase our sample size in a number of ways. We could switch to a survey approach and ask more general perception questions. This methodological shift would limit our analysis and the new data would not be comparable to our previously collected data. Secondly, we could expand the geographic scope of the project, expanding to businesses near the route, rather than directly on the route. It's likely to assume there is some spill over beyond the route itself. But we may not be able to get enough of these businesses to fully understand how the effect changes by distance away from the route. We would like to find ways to increase the sample at each event. For now, we are trying to strengthen our analysis by adding business effects from more events over time.

Our analysis thus far demonstrates that some businesses, particularly restaurants and convenience stores have more business when CicLAvia occurs. Businesses actively engaging with the route appear to see more businesses. We only know how many businesses are engaging among our sample, but from this, it appears less than half of businesses are doing something to interact with CicLAvia attendees. The CicLAvia organization could increase the visibility local business encouragement on their website. Additionally, local business improvement associations, community groups, and City of LA agencies can further encourage businesses along the route to actively engage.

## **CRIME STATISTICS ANALYSIS**

We analyzed data downloaded from the LAPD Crime Report Database (https://data.lacity.org/A-Safe-City/LAPD-Crime-and-Collision-Raw-Data-2014/eta5-h8qx) to test the hypothesis that crime rates drop during CicLAvia events. The two-way comparison compared crime rates along CicLAvia routes to crime rates in nearby areas and CicLAvia Sundays to other Sundays in 2014. The analysis included all three CicLAvias during 2014 (Wilshire, Heart of L.A. and South L.A.) separately and pooled together.

CicLAvia-adjacent areas were defined as within a one-quarter mile of CicLAvia routes. Comparison areas were defined by a buffer zone onequarter to one mile from CicLAvia routes. To ensure fair comparisons and that the analysis was not biased by time of occurrence we included only crimes occurring between 8 am and 5 pm.

We included all crimes with a plausible nexus to open streets events, including most property crimes and violent crimes. We did not include crimes such as embezzlement, forgery, gambling and identity theft. The LAPD Crime Reports dataset does not include drug/narcotic-related offenses of alcohol-related offenses (e.g. public drunkenness, underage drinking), so these were not included in the analysis.



Figure showing set up of buffer zones for the analysis of CicLAvia's impacts on crime rates. Rates of crime occurring along CicLAvia routes (0-1/4 mile) were compared to crime rates in nearby areas (1/4 to 1 mile from CicLAvia) on CicLAvia Sundays and other Sundays during 2014.

We used risk ratios to estimate the effects of CicLAvia on crime. By first comparing the number or crimes on event days to the number of crimes in the same area on non-event day (equation below), the area denominators for each buffer zone cancel each other out. This is important because the areas and populations for the CicLAvia-adjacent areas and comparison areas are different. This lets us compare "apples to apples."

	Crimes	Crimes
	(0-1/4 mi event day)	(0-1/4 mi other Sunday)
VICK VATIA -		
RISK RALIU –	Crimes	Crimes

Risk ratios are also easy to interpret. A risk ratio of 1.0 indicates no change. A risk ratio of 1.1 would indicate a 10% increase and a risk ratio 0.9 would indicate a 10% decrease. What the risk ratio calculation does not do, however, is to take into account the influx of people during CicLAvia events. Crime rates are usually reported as occurrences per 10,000 or per 100,000 residents. Since CicLAvia brings in significant numbers of people in an area, an uptick in the number of crimes may still reflect a lowered crime rate, if CicLAvia participants are included in the denominator. The problem is that knowing how many additional people come into a given area during CicLAvia is difficult to determine and adjusting rates to account for this influx may introduce new biases. Of course, risk ratios that suggest a drop in crime unambiguously reflect a true drop in crime that may be underestimated by the risk ratio.

Due to the relatively small numbers of crimes each day, the pooled analysis that combines crimes for all three CicLAvia events and comparison areas provides the most robust results. This pooled analysis shows that on average that the 2014 CicLAvias did not change property crime rates in CicLAvia-adjacent areas (RR=1.), however there was a 40% decrease in violent crime (e.g. assault, battery, forcible rape, homicide) in CicLAvia-adjacent areas on CicLAvia Sundays compared to comparison areas. Rates of vandalism, sex crimes (other than forcible rape) and firearm violations were too low to make meaningful comparisons. The Wilshire and Heart of L.A. events each had a single report of a stolen bicycle.

#### Wilshire 4/62014

		Location and Day				Risk Ratio
		0-1/4 mi event day (a)	1/4-1 mi event day (b)	Avg. 0-1/4 mi other Sundays (c)	Avg. 1/4-1 mi other Sundays (d)	(a/c)/(b/d) >1:higher risk <1:lower risk
ргу	Theft*/burglary/robbery	5	3	4.0	4.7	2.0
egc	Violence: assault, battery, homicide	1	3	1.6	2.7	0.6
Cat	Sex crimes (other than rape)	0	0	0.2	0.0	
me	Firearm	0	1	0.0	0.1	0.0
Crii	Vandalism	0	2	0.5	0.8	0.0

\* theft includes 1 stolen bike report

## Heart of LA 10/5/2014

		Location and Day				Risk Ratio
		0-1/4 mi event day (a)	1/4-1 mi event day (b)	Avg. 0-1/4 mi other Sundays (c)	Avg. 1/4-1 mi other Sundays (d)	(a/c)/(b/d) >1:higher risk <1:lower risk
Category	Theft*/burglary/robbery	3	6	3.1	2.9	0.5
	Violence: assault, battery, homicide	2	3	1.8	2.2	0.8
	Sex crimes (e.g. rape)	0	0	0.1	0.0	
me	Firearm	0	0	0.0	0.1	
Cri	Vandalism	0	0	0.3	0.4	

\* theft includes 1 stolen bike report

### South LA 12/7/2014

				Risk Ratio		
		0-1/4 mi event day (a)	1/4-1 mi event day (b)	Avg. 0-1/4 mi other Sundays (c)	Avg. 1/4-1 mi other Sundays (d)	(a/c)/(b/d) >1:higher risk <1:lower risk
ry	Theft/burglary/robbery	0	4	1.4	6.5	0.0
egc	Violence: assault, battery, homicide	1	4	1.3	2.0	0.4
Cat	Sex crimes	0	0	0.0	0.1	
me	Firearm	0	2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cri	Vandalism	0	2	0.3	1.1	0.0

### All three 2014 Events

		ion and Day		Risk Ratio		
		0-1/4 mi event day (a)	1/4-1 mi event day (b)	Avg. 0-1/4 mi other Sundays (c)	Avg. 1/4-1 mi other Sundays (d)	(a/c)/(b/d) >1:higher risk <1:lower risk
me Category	Theft/burglary/robbery	8	13	8.5	14.1	1.0
	Violence: assault, battery, homicide	4	10	4.7	6.9	0.6
	Sex crimes	0	0	0.4	0.1	
	Firearm	0	3	0.1	0.2	0.0
Ċ	Vandalism	0	4	1.0	2.4	0.0

## **NOTES**

1. Excludes crimes without plausible nexus to CicLAvia, such as forgery, bunco, identity theft

2. Includes only crimes reported between 8am and 5pm on Sundays

3. LAPD crime record reports do not include drug or alcohol-related crimes

CicLAvia Research & Evaluation Group

## SOCIAL ELEMENTS STUDY

Preliminary Analysis of Participation and Social Factors Heart of L.A. (10/5/2015) and South L.A. (12/7/2015)

Analysis conducted by Brian Cole (UCLA) with help from Christina Batteate and Madeline Brozen

Survey designed by members of the CicLAvia Research team including RAND, L.A. County DPH, CicLAvia and UCLA FSPH with support from CicLAvia.

## Distance traveled from home to attend CicLAvia

	Heart of LA		South LA	
	n**	%	n	%
1 mile or less	50	4%	4	0%
1-5 miles	223	18%	152	13%
5-10 miles	326	26%	299	26%
10-30 miles	532	42%	581	51%
30-70 miles	115	9%	91	8%
70-100 miles	19	2%	14	1%
Mean	15.1 miles		15.2 mil	les
Median	11.4		11.6	
Std. Dev.	14.7		12.9	

#### comments

articipants travel on average 15 niles from home to CicLAvia. About alf of participants come from 10 or ewer miles away. For the most part here were few differences between ravel patterns to HOLA and S. LA xcept S. LA had virtually no articipants living within 1 mile of oute.

\* excludes surveys with home distance > 100 miles and surveys with missing home zip code \*\* "n" indicates numerator of associated percentage

## Data below combine survey responses from Heart of L.A. and South L.A.

#### Travel distance from home to CicLAvia by respondent characteristics

		Distance Home-CicLAvia (miles)			
	Ν	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	<u>Comments</u>
male	1300	15.3	12.1	14.5	No difference between males and
female	1096	14.9	11.2	13.1	females in how far away they lived.
Asian	293	17.1	13.7	13.6	Asians and Whites tended to live
Afr Am	225	13.6	10.7	11.8	Americans and Latinos (13 mi).
Latino/Hisp	899	13.1	9.1	13.6	50-70 year-old participants tended
White	808	17.2	13.1	14.3	to live further away (17 mi) from
Other/Mixed	162	14.3	11.1	12.8	CicLAvia events than younger &
Age 18-29 years	710	14.8	11.0	13.8	
30-39 years	655	14.5	11.0	14.0	
40-49 years	459	14.3	11.0	13.1	
50-59 years	381	17.5	13.1	14.5	
60-69 years	156	17.3	13.7	14.1	
70-79 years	27	12.3	11.0	7.1	
80+ years	4	16.2	15.5	10.6	
Ed < HS	104	7.4	6.2	6.6	Participants with less than H.S.
HS/GED	219	12.4	8.2	12.9	degree traveled only 7.4 miles to
Some College	552	16.8	12.1	15.8	CicLAvia compared to 15.5 miles for
College Grad	869	16.4	12.3	14.9	

Grad Degree	643 14	1.4 12	2.3 10	.9
-------------	--------	--------	--------	----

### Distance from Home by Reason for coming to CicLAvia

		Distance Home-CicLAvia (miles)				
Reason	Ν	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.		
Exercise	1408	15.2	12.2	13.2		
Explore	1441	15.9	12.4	13.7		
Socialize with friends	1047	15.6	12.3	13.8		
Get Kids Out	235	13.5	10.7	11.8		
Restaurant or Store	264	16.4	12.4	15.3		
Fun	1084	16.1	12.4	14.1		
Happened on it	53	14.7	10.7	14.6		
No traffic	1099	15.4	12.3	13.4		
Total	2406	15.1	11.5	13.8		

#### **Comments**

Participants saying that their reason for participating was to give their kids a chance to get out or that they just "happened upon the event" tend to live somewhat closer to the event (10.7 vs. 12.3 miles)

## Distance from Home by Participating in CicLAvia by self or with family

		Distance Home-CicLAvia (miles)				
Participating	Ν	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.		
as Individual	763	13.6	10.7	12.4		
with family or friends	1526	15.9	12.2	14.4		
without children	1847	15.5	12.2	14.0		
with children	559	13.9	10.7	13.3		

**Comments** Participating with family or friends is associated with greater travel distance compared to solo participants (15.9 vs. 13.6 milies). Particpating w/chldren is associated with shorter travel distance to CicLAvia (13.9 vs. 15.5 miles)

## Distance from Home by perceived safety of home neighborhood for walking

		Distance Home-CicLAvia (miles)				
Safety for walking	Ν	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	9	
Very Safe	1164	17.8	13.1	15.0	F	
Somewhat Safe	819	13.0	9.9	12.0		
Somewhat Unsafe	198	11.1	7.8	11.5		
Very Unsafe	34	10.9	6.8	11.8		
DK	23	12.5	9.1	11.5		
Total	2238	15.3	12.0	13.8		

Comments

Participants living further away perceive that their neighborhoods are safer for biking

### Distance from Home by perceived safety of home neighborhood for biking

		Distance Home-CicLAvia (miles)				
Safety for biking	N	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Co	
Very Safe	686	18.3	14.8	14.8	Pa	
Somewhat Safe	972	14.4	11.2	13.0	ar	
Somewhat Unsafe	427	13.3	9.4	13.7		
Very Unsafe	108	12.4	9.8	11.6		
DK	45	13.6	9.1	16.2		
Total	2238	15.3	12.0	13.9	1	

<u>Comments</u>

Participants living further away perceive that their neighborhoods are safer for biking

CicLAvia Research & Evaluation Group

## Participants for whom this was their first CicLAvia

Heart of L.A. (10/5/2015) and South L.A. (12/7/2015)

#### Participants coming to CicLAvia for the first time by Event

Event	n*	%	Comments
Heart of LA	481	42%	
South LA	383	27%	A greater percentage of

\* "n" indicates numerator of associated percentage

A greater percentage of participants at Heart of L.A. participated for the 1st time than at S. LA

## Data below combine survey responses from Heart of L.A. and South L.A.

Participants coming to CicLAvia for the first time by Participant Characteristics

by Participant Characteristics	n	%	<u>Comments</u>
male	400	28%	The percentage of 1st time participants was
female	401	34%	higher among women than men (34% vs.
Asian	111	33%	28%) and among African Americans
Afr Am	97	40%	races/ethnicities (40% vs. 28%-33%)
Latino/Hisp	287	29%	
White	253	29%	
Other/Mixed	49	28%	
Age 18-29 years	310	40%	Among participants under 30, the
30-39 years	194	27%	percentage of 1st time participants was
40-49 years	143	28%	more 50% higher than the percentage of 1st
50-59 years	105	26%	age 50 (40% vs. 26%)
60-69 years	40	22%	
70-79 years	6	21%	
80+ years	0	0%	
Ed < HS	43	36%	The percentage of 1st time participants was
HS/GED	88	36%	higher among participants with less than
Some College	197	34%	H.S. degree compared to participants with college degree or higher (36% vs. 28%)
College Grad	276	29%	Concec (2010 01 11gher (30% vs. 20%)
Grad Degree	190	27%	

## Participants coming to CicLAvia for the first time by Group Participation

Participating	n	%	<b>Comments</b>
as Individual	258	31%	
with family or friends	474	29%	
without children	622	31%	
with children	182	29%	

## Participants coming to CicLAvia for the first time by Distance to CicLAvia

Distance from home to CicLAvia	n	%	<u>Comments</u>
1 mi or less	20	37%	
1-5 mi	112	30%	
5-10 mi	161	26%	
10-30 mi	339	31%	
30-70 mi	78	38%	

## What would CicLAvia participants be doing if they were not at CicLAvia?

## Would be staying at home if not at CicLAvia by Event

Event	n*	%	Co
Heart of LA	596	42%	Ab
South LA	473	40%	eve

mments out 40% of participants at both ents say they would have stayed home if they hadn't come to

**CicLAvia** 

\* "n" indicates numerator of associated percentage

### Data below combine survey responses from Heart of L.A. and South L.A.

#### Would be staying at home if not at CicLAvia by Participant Demographics

Participant			
Characteristics	n	%	<u>Comments</u>
male	601	42%	About 1/3 of Whites and nearly half of
female	461	39%	African-Americans, Asians and Latinos
Asian	146	44%	said that they would be staying at nome if
Afr Am	117	48%	Hot dt Cicerwid.
Latino/Hisp	455	47%	
White	282	32%	
Other/Mixed	59	34%	
Age 18-29 years	367	48%	younger participants were more likely
30-39 years	281	40%	than older participants to say they would
40-49 years	191	38%	have stayed at home if not participating
50-59 years	148	37%	III CICLAVIA.
60-69 years	57	33%	
70-79 years	8	28%	
80+ years	4	80%	
Ed < HS	43	36%	
HS/GED	88	36%	
Some College	197	34%	
College Grad	276	29%	
Grad Degree	190	27%	

Would be staying at home if not at CicLAvia by Group Participation

Participating	n	%	Comments
as Individual	322	39%	
with family or friends	671	41%	
without children	784	39%	
with children	285	46%	

### Would be staying at home if not at CicLAvia by Distance from Home

Distance from home to CicLAvia	n	%	Comr
1 mi or less	29	54%	Partici
1-5 mi	164	44%	route
5-10 mi	261	42%	report if not r
10-30 mi	418	38%	
30-70 mi	85	42%	

### nents

pants living within 1 mile of the were somewhat more likely to that they would have stayed home participating in CicLAvia.

## 70-100 mi 11 33%

## Would be sedentary if not at CicLAvia by Event

Event	n*	%
Heart of LA	259	18%
South LA	207	17%

## Comments

About 16% of participants at both events said they would have been sedentary if they were not at CicLAvia

\* "n" indicates numerator of associated percentage

## Data below combine survey responses from Heart of L.A. and South L.A.

Would be sedentary if not at CicLAvia by Participant Demographics

Participant Characteristics	n	%	Comments
male	198	14%	About 18% of participants said they
female	266	22%	would have been sedentary (mostly at
Asian	64	19%	CicLAvia.
Afr Am	36	15%	
Latino/Hisp	179	18%	
White	148	17%	
Other/Mixed	32	18%	
18-29	144	19%	
30-39	146	20%	
40-49	100	20%	
50-59	53	13%	
60-69	17	9%	
70-79	1	3%	
80+	0	0%	
Ed < HS	19	16%	
HS/GED	33	14%	
Some College	109	19%	
College Grad	181	19%	
Grad Degree	118	17%	

## Would be sedentary if not at CicLAvia by Group Participation

Participating	n	%	Comments
as Individual	119	14%	
with family or friends	327	20%	
without children	333	16%	
with children	133	21%	

## Would be sedentary if not at CicLAvia by Distance from Home

Distance from home to CicLAvia	n	%	<u>Comments</u>
1 mi or less	12	22%	
1-5 mi	74	20%	
5-10 mi	119	19%	
10-30 mi	193	17%	

30-70 mi	27	13%
70-100 mi	6	18%

## POLITICAL SENSITIVITY STUDY

**Purpose**: We reached out to key informants in local community organizations and agencies in order to gauge how their organizations were engaged in CicLAvia and how this engagement has affected their communities and their organizations. Community-based organizations and public agencies have been crucial to getting CicLAvia off the ground and in assuring the success of each event. They will also play a critical role in longer term efforts to build on single-day CicLAvia events to transform the city's infrastructure and culture so that walking and biking are safe, convenient, accessible and ubiquitous throughout the city.

**Methods**: Several weeks prior to both the Heart of L.A. and South L.A. events CicLAvia organizers provided the UCLA research team with a list of organizations that had been involved in organizing that particular event. Organizations included community-based organizations, neighborhood organizations, advocacy groups and public agencies. Research staff then contacted each organization to identify a responsible official (e.g. program director, top-level manager) who could speak to the organization's involvement in CicLAvia and future efforts to promote active transportation. After explaining the purpose of the study, officials were asked to complete an anonymous on-line survey and were provided with a link for the survey. After each CicLAvia all candidate organizations were contacted again whether or not they completed a pre-event survey and were asked to complete a follow-up survey, also anonymous and on-line. A total of twenty-four (n=24) respondents completed surveys. The breakdown between pre=/post-surveys and CBOs and public agencies is shown below.

	Pre-event	Post-event	
CBOs	8	8	
Public agencies	5	3	
Total	13	11	

### **Political Sensitivity Survey Respondents**

Survey questions were developed by the project team after reviewing similar studies and interviewing open streets experts in the U.S., Brazil and South Africa Survey. This process yielded questions on:

- 1. Type of organization
- 2. Organization's role in supporting or facilitating CicLAvia
- 3. Perceived factors contributing to community support for CicLAvia
- 4. Perceived factors contributing to community opposition to CicLAvia
- 5. Support for future open streets event
- 6. Priorities for effective open streets events
- 7. Priorities for evaluating open streets events

## Results:

## What were the obstacles related to Open Streets?

The table below lists the frequency in both Pre and Post CicLAvia policy surveys that were mentioned as reasons for opposition and/or lack of support from stakeholders and public officials when creating Open Streets.

	Pre-Survey Oct+Dec		Post-Survey Oct+Dec	
	Stakeholders	Public Officials	Stakeholders	Public Officials
Most Mentioned	Disruption to communities	Disruption to communities	Gentrification	High Costs
Frequently Mentioned	Traffic and safety concerns	<ul> <li>Traffic and safety concerns</li> </ul>	<ul><li>Traffic and safety</li><li>High costs</li></ul>	• Traffic and safety
Somewhat Mentioned	Lack of Interest	High costs	<ul><li>Disruption to communities</li><li>Lack of interest</li></ul>	Disruption to communities
Somewhat Absent	Gentrification	Gentrification	<ul><li>Disruption</li><li>Lack of Interest</li></ul>	Conflicts with     existing policies
Frequently Absent	• Crime	<ul> <li>Conflicts with existing policies</li> </ul>	• Crime	<ul><li>Disruption</li><li>Gentrification</li><li>Crime</li></ul>
Most Absent	<ul> <li>High costs</li> <li>Conflicts with existing policies</li> </ul>	<ul><li>Crime</li><li>Lack of Interest</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Conflicts with existing policies</li> </ul>	Lack of Interest

Political Sensitivity Survey: Reasons cited for community opposition to CicLAvia and/or lack of support

## Of the obstacles listed several times, what are the corresponding actions recommended?

## I. CicLAvia Pre-Survey Analysis (HOLA+SLA)

The most **commonly perceived obstacles** for stakeholders and public officials/agencies were *disruption to communities, traffic and safety concerns and lack of interest* 

## **Actions Needed** Perceived Obstacle (according to respondents) involve community residents; (pre) Disruption to communities (pre) Listen to what community members actually need (pre) Install separated bike paths that are connected to well Deficiencies in bicycle infrastructure used destinations (pre) (pre) High costs to put on CicLAvia (pre) Provide outreach funding (pre) Traffic, safety and crime (deter walking Increase support and buy-in from local law enforcement and biking) (pre+post) (pre+post) Include more bike and pedestrian elements in regional planning (pre, not clearly aligned with obstacle in Lack of interest (pre) post) Conflicts with existing policies (pre) Increased participatory planning process in regional planning (pre) Special ordinance to allow for food establishments to Conflicts with existing policies on food vend outside their business in order to take advantage sales (post) of the Open Streets Day without fear of harassment from the local law enforcement. Education youth and local community members near route, (pre) Gentrification (pre) Improve communication across language-barriers for events (pre) Public, private and government entities Multi-sector collaboration (post) are not working together. (post)

### Perceived obstacles linked to statements about needed actions



## Solutions looking for problems, statement of needed actions not associated with a specific obstacle

- Encouraging stakeholders to use public spaces as way to promote physical activity and importance of open space. (pre)
- Transportation plans that include active transportation (post)

## Obstacles and problems without corresponding suggestions for action

- Some statements about conflicts with existing policies had corresponding solutions, but many did not; (pre)
- High costs of putting on CicLAvia; (pre and post)
- Gentrification; (pre and post)
- Traffic and safety; (pre)
- Lack of interest among residents. (pre)
- Crime (post)
- Unflattering depictions of host communities (post)

The most **commonly perceived obstacles** for stakeholders and public officials/agencies were disruptions to communities, traffic and safety, high costs and concerns for gentrification. (post)

### Synthesis:

- 1. Improve trust through interaction bridge-building. CicLAvia, even if it benefits efforts to improve social relations, occurs in an environment colored by history and current problems.
- 2. There seems to be a gap between developing plans to promote active transportation and specific problems in local communities. Small demonstration and pilot projects may offer a way to move forward by building cooperative relationships and helping raise up ideas about how active transportation intersects with other community concerns, e.g. gentrification, community safety, jobs. Earlier and more extensive community engagement with other community groups that do not see themselves as involved in promoting active transportation might also help find these common areas of interest.

## LOCAL TRANSPORTATION DATA ANALYSIS

We are waiting for METRO to release the data to us.

## PUBLICITY

Little publicity has been done to date.

Preliminary results were shared amongst the Open Streets Network. One journal article was submitted to *Health & Place* by Deborah Cohen on physical activity at the April 2014 CicLAvia. The results of the CicLAvia air quality study will be submitted to *Environmental Pollution* special issue Urban Health & Wellbeing on May 29, 2015.

## **RESEARCH GROUP SUSTAINABILITY**

Recognizing that meaningful evaluation should be ongoing, and for the purposes of making definitive conclusions, we anticipate seeking several other sources of funds to maintain our research efforts over the coming years. CicLAvia staff have already played an important role in assisting with submissions, by vetting project designs, assisting in some cases with the actual grant-writing where cost share is proposed and leveraging existing funding connections. Below is a schedule for planned funding applications to be submitted. When new potential sources are identified they are vetted with the group and a decision is made whether or not to purse. We will solicit continued funding for this research from additional sources as our work progresses, including:

- CALTRANS Active Transportation Program (submitted, unfunded 2014)
- CALTRANS Active Transportation Program (to be submitted June 1<sup>st</sup> 2015)
- BREATHE LA Air Quality Study (funded)
- METRO Evaluation Program (RFP to be released in Fall/Winter 2014--delayed)
- The California Endowment (proposal to be developed March/April 2015)
- Kresge Foundation (meeting to be set up with David Fukuzawa)
- Haynes Foundation (proposal to be submitted June 2015 or Fall 2015)
- Kaiser Foundation (Christina Batteate meeting with program officer March 2015)
- Irvine Foundation (proposal to be submitted at sponsor's request, unsure of timeframe)

## SELECTED REFERENCES

<sup>i</sup> Sarmiento, O., Torres, A., Jacoby, E. et al (2010) The ciclovia recreativa: a mass-recreational program with public health potential. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health.* Vol 7(Suppl 2), S163-S180

<sup>ii</sup> Zeiff, S.G., Hipp, A., et al. (2013) Ciclov'ıa Initiatives: Engaging Communities, Partners, and Policy Makers Along the Route to Success. J Public Health Management Practice, 2013, 19(3) E-Supp, S74–S82.