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Residents of South Los Angeles and many other urban areas face a challenge in accessing healthy food. Despite the recent opening of a Superior grocery store and a Fresh & Easy Neighborhood Market, South Los Angeles still has fewer supermarkets per capita than the more affluent parts of the region. The small and high concentration of corner stores and mini marts throughout the area carry a limited selection of healthy and fresh items. South Los Angeles also has the highest rate of poverty and obesity in Los Angeles County, with nearly 30 percent of households living in poverty and 35 percent of adults considered obese. Many residents are transit dependent, making it increasingly difficult for them to access healthy food when it is located far from their homes.

A healthful food environment helps people make healthier food choices. The relationship between a community’s food environment and the likelihood that residents of that community will meet dietary recommendations has been documented; specifically, more fruits and vegetables were eaten in areas that had more supermarkets. A follow-up study found an association between supermarket concentration and lower prevalence of obesity, and between concentration of corner stores and a higher prevalence of obesity. Supermarket concentration also has been associated with lower body mass index and weight, and convenience store concentration with higher body mass index and weight.

Better availability of healthful foods, such as low-fat and high-fiber foods, has been associated with eating a more healthful diet, but availability of healthful food varies by store type. Compared to corner and convenience stores, supermarkets are often able to sell a greater variety of foods at lower prices. Equivalent food items sold at smaller food stores can cost up to 75% more than at supermarkets, and quality can be lower.

Several studies have documented a relationship between income or ethnicity of neighborhood residents and concentration of food retail outlets. Low-income neighborhoods have fewer chain supermarkets than do middle-income neighborhoods, and African American and Hispanic neighborhoods have fewer chain supermarkets than do non-Hispanic white neighborhoods. Community members and policy makers have sought to improve the food environment in underserved neighborhoods by attracting new sources of nutritious food, such as grocery stores, farmers’ markets, and community gardens; and encouraging existing sources such as corner stores and restaurants to offer healthier items.

Transportation has not yet received sufficient attention as an approach to improve food access in low-income urban areas. This report analyzes food access and transportation in South Los Angeles and suggests policies and programs to link food access, transportation and land use to bring people to good food and good food to people. The report contains cutting-edge research on the nexus between transportation, food access and land use.

Project partners presented a menu of policy options to community residents in a series of public forums. Eleven of the ideas emerged as community favorites. These were policies that residents felt were most relevant to the food access landscape and conditions in South Los Angeles. Elaborated and substantiated versions of the recommendations are available in the Community Meetings section of the report, which also contains dozens of additional policies and programs that could help improve transportation and food access.

This report is the product of the Food Access and Transportation in South Los Angeles project, a collaboration between the Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles (CRA/LA), the Urban & Environmental Policy Institute at Occidental College (UEPI), and Esperanza Community Housing Corporation (Esperanza). The recommendations were developed through research of best practices and policies throughout the country; surveys of food retail stores and mobile food vendors in the project area; mapping of food retail locations and transportation routes in the project area; and the experiences of the project partners in working on food access issues in low-income communities in Los Angeles. The project’s Advisory Board, community members, community based organizations, policy makers and private sector food retailers provided feedback that shaped the final recommendations.

Throughout the report, we acknowledge and build upon decades of activism and interest in South
Los Angeles on attracting and improving food retail.\textsuperscript{13} The recommendations draw upon the specific circumstances and food access challenges of South Los Angeles, but are also applicable in other low-income urban areas.

The report will be shared with policy makers, food retail companies, community partners and project funder, CalTrans, to encourage adoption of policies and programs to enhance access to healthy food.

### Top 11 Community Favorites in Order of Popularity

1. Increase public transit to and from areas with healthy food.
2. Encourage or incentivize food markets and farmers’ markets that provide customers with free or low-cost transportation.
3. Make food-shopping trips affordable through fare reductions for low-income residents with WIC or EBT benefits.
4. Legalize sidewalk vending and support and regulate mobile food vending.
5. Encourage vending of healthy items.
6. Institute ‘healthy’ grade for mobile food vendors.
7. Restrict sales of unhealthy items near schools.
8. Support the development of a Regional Food Hub, incorporating the voices of South Los Angeles residents.
9. Site food retail at transit stations and in mixed-use developments.
10. Connect stores to surrounding sidewalks and neighborhoods.
11. Create safer routes to shopping.
The Food Access and Transportation Landscape in South Los Angeles

Project Geography and Demographics

The Food Access and Transportation in South Los Angeles project partners designated the project area as the region between the 10 freeway to the North, Alameda Boulevard and the City boundary on Central Avenue to the East, the 105 freeway to the South and the 110 freeway on the West. This geography includes most of the Southeast Community Plan Area of the City of Los Angeles and extends to the North to include areas served by Esperanza Community Housing Corporation. The project area is home to over 232,000 people: 54% Latino, 38% Black, 4% White, and 3% Asian. The area is densely populated, averaging 14,136 people per square mile as compared to the density of Los Angeles County, which is 2,427 people per square mile. Household income averages around $21,508 per year with roughly 40% of families with incomes less than 100% of the Federal Poverty Level.

Despite the large and dense urban population in South Los Angeles, there are few full service grocery stores and farmers’ markets. There is one grocery store per 22,156 people in South Los Angeles compared to one store per 11,150 people in the more affluent West Los Angeles. And while there are roughly 848 non-restaurant food access points in South Los Angeles, over 70% are liquor stores and convenience stores with a limited selection of fresh fruits and vegetables and with significantly higher prices. While community members and policy makers have taken steps to curb proliferation of fast food restaurants, such as the recently extended South Los Angeles fast food moratorium, fast food makes up 71.8% of restaurants in the area.

Limited access to fresh, healthy and affordable food has severely affected the overall health of South Los Angeles residents: over 35% of adults in South Los Angeles are obese, 12.3% have diabetes and 217.6 per 100,000 adults die from heart disease each year. Comparatively, in West Los Angeles, only 10% of adults are obese, 4.8% of adults have diabetes and 132 adults per 100,000 die of heart disease annually.

The considerable health disparities, resulting in part from limited availability of healthy food in South Los Angeles, are compounded by lack of public and private transportation options. Residents of areas poorly served by food retail are more likely than the general public to be transit-dependent, making it difficult for them to travel to food markets, especially those located outside of their immediate neighborhoods. Although there are several major transit corridors in South Los Angeles, buses may not directly service the areas where people live nor do they necessarily make it easy for residents to carry groceries. Car ownership in the project area is one of the lowest in the Los Angeles region. Within the project geography, car ownership rates are generally lower in the more dense northern third of the project area where healthy food options are most prevalent.

Obesity and Diabetes Rates in South and West Los Angeles

The project area is defined as Interstate 10 to the north, Alameda Ave to the east, Interstate 105 to the south, and Route 110 to the west.

For a larger version of this map, please view the report online at www.uepi.oxy.edu
To determine how food access and transportation intersect in South Los Angeles, the Food Access and Transportation project mapped non-restaurant food retail store locations, transit lines, and demographic data within the project area and then surveyed stores and mobile vendors to further analyze where and how residents could access healthy food. Project partners divided the project geography into zones, then drove and walked the streets to verify and correct the location and categories of stores identified from databases of commercial properties. The four categories of stores were supermarkets, convenience and liquor stores, gas stations, and specialty stores, which included butchers, bakeries, fish markets, etc. (See chart right for definitions.)

### Store Surveys

Once partners had created a more accurate map of store locations, they developed a survey tool to determine healthy food availability and accessibility in stores and within the project area. Store surveys drew upon two survey tools that had been developed for previous community food assessments conducted in South Los Angeles, supplemented by new questions that addressed transportation options and connections. More than 90 store surveys were administered by community health promoters from Esperanza, UEPI staff and CRA/LA interns. The stores were sampled randomly with a selection chosen from each zone.

### Food Availability and Quality

Several survey questions examined the availability of different food groups at stores. While grains, dairy, and beverages were prevalent at many stores (carried by 70% of stores), fruits, vegetables, and proteins were less common (carried by less than 56% of stores). In terms of availability of foods, supermarkets were the most likely to carry each food type. However, supermarkets were among the least common food store type, representing only 17.4% of the stores surveyed.

Convenience, liquor and corner stores were by far the most common food store type surveyed (48.8%), yet they have notable shortcomings: with the exception of gas stations that did not carry any produce, convenience stores had the lowest likelihood of carrying fresh or frozen vegetables, and had the lowest likelihood of carrying fruit.
Food Availability & Quality by Store Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOOD TYPE</th>
<th>SUPERMARKET</th>
<th>CONVENIENCE/ LIQUOR STORES</th>
<th>GAS STATION</th>
<th>SPECIALTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbs/spices</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canned/frozen vegetables</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fats or oils</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breads/cereals/grains</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverages</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh fruit</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh vegetables</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

spoiled or expired fruits and vegetables. Only 42.5% of stores had a selection of fruit with no spoilage, 38.8% stores had a selection of vegetables with no spoilage, and 38.8% sold canned/frozen vegetables with no expired inventory.

Specialty food stores were found to have the worst interior environments. They were more likely to have poor lighting, dirty floors, dirty/disorganized shelves, foul odors and/or food-infesting insects. Supermarkets, on the other hand, were found to be the most clean and organized and to have friendly staff (92% of stores) over the other three store types.

While acceptance of Electronic Benefit Transfer program (EBT) funds was fairly equivalent across store types, supermarkets were nearly twice more likely to participate in the Women Infants and Children program (WIC) than convenience or specialty stores. Again, supermarkets were 50% less prevalent in the project area than convenience and liquor stores.

Expired Food at Surveyed Stores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOOD TYPE</th>
<th>STORES CARRYING EXPIRED PRODUCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breads/cereal/grains</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh fruit</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canned/frozen vegetables</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh vegetables</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transportation Options

A significant portion of the survey was dedicated to assessing accessibility and transportation services:

- Only one store surveyed operates a shuttle service for customers.
- Of the 79 stores with available data, only five (6.3%) had accommodations for bike riders to secure their bicycles.
- Forty-two (52.5%) of the stores surveyed had dedicated, off-street parking. When examined by store type, 100% of gas stations and 78.6% of supermarkets provided off-street parking. Convenience stores were by far the least likely to provide parking with only 33.3% doing so.
- Twenty-seven Metro bus routes, five Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) DASH routes (short distance bus), and the Metro Blue light rail line were identified as having transit stops within two blocks of the surveyed stores. Metro’s Expo Line light rail system will open soon, with two stops in the upper northwestern segment of the project area. The most frequently operating bus lines are the DASH bus with five routes within the project area, and Metro bus lines 48, 51, and 53, which run from Downtown Los Angeles through the project area on major north-south thoroughfares where many of the surveyed stores are located. More than half of the stores (56%) were located within two blocks of multiple bus lines.
- The transit lines that do run through the project area vary in frequency of service. During peak hours, most bus lines run every 5-15 minutes. However, during off-peak hours buses may not run for between 30 and 60 minutes. The DASH runs every 20 minutes.

Source: Survey of stores by project partners, 2010.
Healthy Food Ratings

After surveying over 90 supermarkets, specialty, liquor, and corner stores, we developed a model for rating availability of healthy items at store locations. Red designates that the store has at least one type of fresh, lean meat (and no expired meat). Green designates a store with at least five fresh fruits and five fresh vegetables (and no moldy or expired produce). Yellow designates that the store has at least two types of unexpired dairy/egg products, such as milk and cheese, or eggs. Finally, brown designates that the store carries at least three unexpired types of grains (i.e. rice, whole grain bread, tortillas, etc.). Viewed on a map, these color wheels containing one, two, three or all four of the healthy colors help indicate where there are ‘healthy clusters’ of food retail. Orienting transit stops and other transportation programs among these clusters could be a good strategy for allowing people to access healthy food more easily. Areas lacking these clusters are likely to be places that need more and healthier food stores and/or that need improved transportation so local residents can reach places with a better selection. (See map next page.)
Mobile Vending

Project participants viewed the proliferation of mobile vending in Los Angeles as a potential asset to South Los Angeles residents looking for a way to purchase fresh and healthy food. There were several barriers we faced in reaching out to, and surveying mobile vendors, including that many of the vendors were operating without permits and could fear that surveyors were connected to law enforcement. Surveys were conducted mainly by Spanish-speaking health promoters from Esperanza, who, as neighborhood residents, found it easier to interact with vendors in a supportive, non-intimidating manner. Surveyors talked to a set number of vendors in each zone in the project area that had been identified by project partners.

The largest number of the mobile vendors surveyed (over 25%) were operating out of “push or pulled improvised vehicles” such as shopping carts. The second highest reported “vehicle” type were small carts (17%), “small automotive” (14%), and “large automotive” (14%). Of the mobile vendors interviewed, the majority (80.0%) owned their own vehicle, 17.5% were employees of the vehicle owner, and 2.5% rented their vehicle.

Of the 45 vendors surveyed, only 11.6% advertised healthy food and 11.5% showed health grades or permits. None of the vendors displayed nutritional information.

In terms of supply logistics, 75% of vendors reported buying supplies from “food retail,” 44% of the vendors cooked the food they sold at home, 33% bought supplies from the terminal markets in Downtown Los Angeles, 12% bought from mobile vendor commissaries, and 5% bought from farmers’ markets. 73% of surveyed vendors were selling to both adults and children. Sales ranged from $40-$500 per day with an average of $162.50.

### Foods Availability by Mobile Vendor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF FOOD</th>
<th>FREQUENCY (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beverages, bottled</td>
<td>19 (44.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fried foods</td>
<td>18 (41.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snack foods (e.g. chips)</td>
<td>15 (34.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooked meals (e.g. tacos)</td>
<td>12 (27.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit/vegetables, whole</td>
<td>11 (25.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit/vegetables, cut</td>
<td>11 (25.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverages, poured (e.g. horchata)</td>
<td>7 (16.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice cream/frozen snacks</td>
<td>6 (14.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot dogs</td>
<td>4 (9.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-packaged meal (e.g. sandwich)</td>
<td>2 (4.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of those interviewed, only 30.2% reported being aware of any laws governing street or mobile vending. 34.9% reported having had encounters with law enforcement in the past. Of the 15 who reported encounters with law enforcement officials, 30.8% reported encounters with the police, 23.1% reported encounters with the health department officials, and 46.2% reported having had encounters with both. 46.7% reported having been let off with only a warning, while five were fined $35 to $160.

If a legal permit were available, 50% of vendors surveyed said they would pay up to $100 for a permit. 16% of surveyed vendors said they would pay for a permit ‘no matter its cost.’ Only 4% said they would not pay for a permit.

Community Meetings

To supplement data gathered from mapping and surveys, we held three interactive community meetings where community members in the project area learned about best practices related to healthy food access and transportation; voted on their favorite policies; shared personal stories about how they got to and from food stores; and suggested additional policies and interventions that they believe could improve transportation and food access in their neighborhood. Over 30 community residents attended each of the three community meetings.

As part of the community meetings, CRA/LA, UEPI, and Esperanza staff engaged with community members for several interactive activities. The first activity was to list grocery items that they shop for each week. The top grocery items from all three community meetings included: vegetables, milk, fruit, tortillas, cheese, chicken, eggs, beans, bread, water, and cereal. Soda, cookies, canned and frozen foods, and chips were the least frequently listed grocery items at the community meetings. Community members spoke at length about the different types of food they ate, why they chose to eat them, and whether they had trouble finding or purchasing certain food items. Some of the recurring themes throughout the three community meetings included:

- Community members would prefer to buy whole and organic foods - if available and reasonably priced - because of the perceived increased nutritional value and better taste.
- Organic, fresh and perceived “healthy” foods are either too expensive or not carried by local stores.
- Residents want to know where their food comes from.
- If fruits or vegetables are in poor condition, moldy or expired, residents will not buy them.
- Sale items or ‘manager’s special’ are usually expired items or items near expiration; they may be cheaper but may also ‘make you sick.’
- Some of the problems with local food stores include overcrowding and limited bilingual staff.

Next, on large maps of the project area, attendees indicated where they lived, where they shopped and how they got from their homes to food stores. (See next page for compiled maps from the community meetings.)

Finally, the last exercise at the community meetings involved attendees ‘voting’ for their favorite policy recommendations, which are discussed in the following section.
Most of the participant responses to the mapping exercise showed medium to long distance trips to food stores. Some attendees drove, but most either walked or took public transportation. During this exercise, attendees also shared personal stories about accessing healthy and fresh food in South Los Angeles. Many community members ride the bus to the grocery store and noted the difficulty they have coming home on the bus with multiple bags full of groceries. Some bus drivers refuse to let shoppers on the bus with groceries because they take up too much space. Other public transportation challenges include:

- Bus drivers who are unwilling to wait even if you flag them down.
- DASH bus service hours and stops are severely limited.
- METRO prices are too expensive.
- METRO no longer provides transfer passes.

Others shared problems with supermarket funded and operated shuttles:

- Many have high ($30-$60) minimum purchasing requirements, which may be difficult to reach on a limited food budget.
- Shuttles allow only one child per paying adult.
- Shuttle hours are sporadic; some customers had to wait up to an hour or more.

Community members who sometimes drive to food stores stated that they borrow a car from friends or ask for rides. Others commented that they often offer rides to friends and family; one resident said she drove the entire span of the project area to pick up her aunt, drove back the entire length of the project area to shop and then had to drive her aunt home again. Several participants reported driving over 15 miles to get to the Whole Foods in El Segundo or at 3rd and Fairfax, or to Trader Joe’s in Culver City for organic, ‘healthy,’ or specialty products.
Community Recommendations in Order by Popular Vote

1. Increase public transit service to and from areas with healthy food. Commercial transit stops and schedules should be adjusted to help facilitate shopping trips to healthy food locations. There are several local examples of bus routes being changed to help riders reach popular food shopping destinations. In 2007, the Los Angeles Department of Transportation rerouted the weekday C and weekend DD DASH routes to accommodate riders shopping at the newly opened Ralphs supermarket in Downtown Los Angeles.23

The transit lines most often identified in the survey run quite frequently (every three to eight minutes) during peak hours. However, during non-peak hours the 48, 51, and 53 lines run every 20 minutes, and the 53 runs every 30 minutes. Three major bus routes and five DASH lines travel within at least two blocks from most of the stores larger than 10,000 square feet. (See map next page.) From our research, we have identified that transit lines are, in fact, located near food retail. Since community members ‘voted’ for this policy, we must presume that transit is not necessarily getting people from where they live to where they shop. Riders may have to take multiple buses, which can be expensive and time consuming. Buses may be too sporadic during certain hours. Bus stops may be far from residents’ homes even if stops are close to supermarkets. It may be difficult to board and ride buses when carrying groceries. Metro and DASH should work in conjunction with concerned community based organizations, municipal authorities and supermarket chains to make food shopping via buses a more convenient option.

2. Encourage or incentivize food markets and farmers’ markets that provide customers with free or low-cost transportation. Some supermarkets operate shuttles to assist customers travelling by foot to return home with heavy grocery bags.24 In the late 1990’s, Numero Uno Market in Los Angeles capitalized on the population density and high transit-dependence in the inner city to establish a van shuttle service that takes shoppers who spend at least $30 to their door. Coordinated with two Metro bus routes as a means for people to get to the store, Numero Uno ran a 9-van shuttle service.25 Los Angeles City and County could explore incentivizing similar shuttle programs by encouraging stores receiving public funding to operate shuttles or by giving tax rebates to stores with accessible shuttle programs.

3. Make food-shopping trips affordable through fare reductions for low-income residents with WIC or EBT benefits. Currently seniors, disabled riders and Medicare recipients are eligible for subsidized fares. Subsidizing recipients of WIC (a federally-funded health and nutrition program for women, infants, and children that gives clients checks to buy healthy supplemental foods from WIC-authorized vendors) and EBT (an electronic payment system for public assistance programs including food assistance formerly known as food stamps) would give them access to more stores with healthier choices. A lower fare option would also reduce low-income riders’ transportation spending, increasing the amount of money they have to spend on food.26 Currently, 1,189,308 Los Angeles County residents receive WIC and/or EBT.27 Reducing transit fare for WIC and EBT recipients to the level of a senior/disabled/Medicare fare would decrease the ridership costs by $0.95 per individual ride, $4.20 per day pass, and $61.00 for a monthly pass.28 There would be some overlap between existing low fare category riders and WIC/EBT recipient riders so it is difficult to calculate total costs of implementing this recommendation.

4. Legalize sidewalk vending and support and regulate mobile food vending. The City of Los Angeles should allow permitted sale of food on city sidewalks. A legal permitting process would recognize the value of street and mobile food, create opportunities for entrepreneurship in the legal economy and allow the City to regulate and influence street food. (See Policy Recommendation Section II Street and Mobile Vending for details.)

5. Encourage vending of healthy items. In neighborhoods like South Los Angeles where there are not enough stores selling a wide selection of fruits and vegetables or restaurants with healthy meals, mobile and street food can be a source of affordable, healthy food. The City should use incentives and disincentives to encourage more vending of healthy items by produce trucks, food carts and other mobile vendors, as well as corner stores. Similar to the Restaurant and Hospitality Express program initiated by the Central City Association and City Council
Member Jan Perry, which reduced the time it took to obtain permit for restaurants opening in Downtown Los Angeles by 50%, a healthy vendor express program could expedite the permitting process for mobile vendors selling whole foods or healthy food options. The Los Angeles Department of Building & Safety (LADBS), Public Works Bureau of Sanitation (BOS), City Planning Department, Fire Department, and Public Works Bureau of Engineering (BOE) could collaborate to offer assistance in design, permitting and construction of healthy mobile vending operations to increase food access throughout Los Angeles.29 Los Angeles County Department of Public Health is also interested in legalizing sidewalk vending of fruits and vegetables in unincorporated sections of the County.30

6. Institute ‘healthy’ grade for mobile food vendors. Similar to the letter grading of restaurants, mobile vendors in Los Angeles will now have a grade from the County Department of Public Health. We propose a grade denoting healthfulness, as defined by a task force on healthy food options composed of health experts. The health grading could be proposed as a County pilot project.

7. Restrict sales of unhealthy items near schools. Sales of unhealthy food and beverages near schools, especially in the morning when students arrive and in the afternoon when school is over, undermine healthy school food policies that have strengthened nutrition standards for lunches and eliminated sodas and unhealthy snacks from vending machines and school stores. Audits and studies have found that vendors are common at schools in Los Angeles and that most students at these schools have purchased unhealthy snacks and drinks from outside vendors.31 To support schools as healthy places to learn and oases from the junk and fast food that characterize many neighborhoods, the City should maintain and enforce a ban on most food vending near schools and work to provide alternative healthier snacks.

8. Support the development of a Regional Food Hub, incorporating the voices of South Los Angeles residents. A Regional Food Hub is an “integrated food distribution system that coordinates agricultural production and the aggregation, storage, processing, distribution, and marketing of locally or regionally produced food products.”32 In other words, a Regional Food Hub is a place where food grown by local farmers can be brought together so it can be sold to food brokers, stores, restaurants, public institutions and individual consumers. Components of a food hub could include some combination of a warehouse, permanent farmers’ market, and community kitchen with a goal of increasing distribution of local, fresh food to underserved neighborhoods. The development of a Regional Food Hub is a top priority for the Los Angeles Food Policy Task Force as a means to “make Los Angeles a model in growing a sustainable, equitable, regional food economy.”33 While no specific decisions have been made about where this Regional Food Hub will operate and how it will be organized, UEPI is currently convening conversations between key farmers, distributors, as well as labor and institutions.

- Incorporate the voice of South Los Angeles residents to ensure that the Regional Food Hub serves them. South Los Angeles stakeholders should take part in planning the hub and should develop transportation linkages to connect the hub’s local food resources to commercial enterprises and consumers.

9. Site food retail at transit stations and in mixed-use developments. Concepts such as locating new supermarkets in mixed used developments near affordable housing, or opening a farmers’ market at a major transit hub, are gaining popularity across the country as urban planners work to improve the quality of life in urban communities. Los Angeles has several recently built examples of well-designed mixed-use developments including the new Ralphs grocery store development in Downtown Los Angeles. Both Fresh and Easy and Superior obtained funding from the CRA/LA and recently opened new stores in the northern section of the project area that are co-located with housing. In Portland, Oregon, a Whole Foods Market occupies two stories of a mixed-used development below office space. In Seattle, Washington, Puget Consumer’s Coop, a chain of seven food stores, has a location in a mixed residential/retail building. Both of these examples have underground parking and are near transit stops.

10. Restrict excessive concentrations of unhealthy food retail. Achieving a more healthy food environment can partly be accomplished by attracting more healthy stores and restaurants and helping existing stores offer more healthy choices.
But in some cases, an excessive concentration of fast food restaurants and unhealthy food stores can overwhelm a small number of healthier options. Planners should consider limiting numbers of food stores and restaurants that primarily sell unhealthy items.

- **Extend fast food moratorium.** The City recently extended the two-year moratorium on new fast food restaurants by incorporating the concept into the Southeast, South Los Angeles, and West Adams - Baldwin Hills - Leimert community plans. In the current version of the legislation, the City prohibits new stand-alone fast food restaurants located within one half mile of any existing fast food restaurants in the defined area. The City could consider expanding the moratorium geographically, and/or expanding the scope to include candy stores, donut shops and other retail establishments that predominately sell high calorie, high fat and high sugar items.

11. **Connect stores to surrounding sidewalks/neighborhoods.** Food stores with healthy options should be visible, prominent parts of the retail landscape, well integrated into the existing sidewalk and streetscape. The way stores link to their surroundings can in turn help enliven the public realm of the sidewalk. The design goals in this section create a win-win outcome for stores benefitting from increased walk-in business and for residents who will enjoy easier access to groceries and a more walkable, human-scaled neighborhood.

- **Ensure safe routes to shopping.** Improve pedestrian and cycling safety infrastructure and amenities like improved lighting, protected bike lanes, traffic calming measures and crosswalks along major commercial streets where there are food stores.

- **Locate at transit.** Build food stores in transit-oriented developments.
Policy Recommendations

To identify policies and programs that utilize transportation and land use to increase healthy food access, project partners researched best practices for linking food access and transportation that have been implemented or proposed in Los Angeles and in other urban regions throughout the nation. These policy recommendations were shared with members of the project’s advisory board for feedback. Recommendations were also explained to local residents who attended the public community meetings held by the project. Attendees voted on their favorite ideas. To solicit input from food retailers, the draft recommendations were discussed with a representative from the California Grocers Association. In addition to gathering feedback and suggestions from these sets of stakeholders, project partners re-examined and organized policy ideas based on the findings of the project’s mapping and survey phases.

The food access situation in South Los Angeles is complex, with numerous challenges to ensuring that all residents can reach and afford good food. There is no single solution to these challenges. The diverse policy recommendations that follow were chosen because project partners and stakeholders believe that each idea could individually, and in aggregate, help improve food access in the project area, throughout South Los Angeles, and beyond. But each specific policy or program suggestion has its own specific context in terms of who would be able to implement the idea; where in the project area the idea would create positive change; when the idea might be implemented; and which ideas have local support. This section of the report therefore includes symbols placed next to the various policy recommendations to indicate the ‘who,’ ‘when’ and ‘where’ of the policies and to show ideas that local residents support in particular.

Who can implement changes?

The food environment in South Los Angeles results from a mix of private decisions by food retail companies, business owners, lenders (and shoppers), and public policies and investments. Improved access to good food requires action by both public and private interests. The public sector (elected officials and municipal and transportation agencies) can modify land use rules, transportation routes, street designs, regulations, food safety net programs and financial incentives and disincentives. The private sector can invest in food enterprises in underserved neighborhoods, adopt innovative store designs and transportation programs to give customers more healthy choices, and partner with community members and organizations focused on health and sustainability. This report contains recommendations for both the public sector and private sector.

represents the private sector

represents the public sector

When can changes be implemented?

For communities that have been underserved for decades, with high rates of diet related illness, there is a need for rapid change to the food environment. That said, not all of the policies and programs in this report can be implemented immediately. Funding issues, the procedural requirements of rule making, market forces, the need to consult with stakeholders and other factors can make certain recommendations difficult or time-consuming to adopt. The report labels some policies/programs as short term because they can be introduced soon. Other recommendations are labeled long term because they are important goals that should be pursued even if they require more time or money to address.

represents short term solutions

represents long term solutions

Where should changes be implemented?

South Los Angeles (and other low-income communities) contains geographically diverse areas including residential neighborhoods, major commercial thoroughfares and industrial zones. The policies and programs in this report should be implemented in a site-sensitive manner. Different local conditions require different strategies to improve access to healthy food. Surveys of the project geography identified three main types of
locations relevant for food access. The first are commercial corridors with clusters of food retail that would allow a shopper to buy ingredients for a healthy meal. The second are commercial streets that lack adequate sources of healthy food. Both of these areas receive some service from public transit. The third type of location is residential neighborhoods, which by zoning, lack formal food retail locations and have less transit service. Each of these three zones is ripe for a few priority actions.

- **Commercial corridors with clusters of healthy food retail**
  - a. Improve transit access and stop locations to increase accessibility of healthy food centers.
  - b. Ensure that streets are safe for pedestrian and cyclists.
  - c. Improve store design to orient towards sidewalks and transit users.

- **Commercial streets with limited food access**
  - a. Implement zoning changes to attract/incentivize stores.
  - b. Help small stores offer healthier food choices.
  - c. Encourage healthy mobile and sidewalk vending.

- **Residential neighborhoods**
  - a. Allow healthy food retail to operate on corners lots.
  - b. Encourage healthy mobile vending.

Other policies and programs should be implemented because they would help improve access in all areas. For instance, making transit more affordable would assist lower income residents in travelling to food retail locations. Creating a Regional Food Hub would make it easier for stores, institutions and families to acquire local, fresh food.

**Who likes the policies?**

The policies and programs contained in this report were researched and recommended by the project partners with input from members of the project’s Advisory Board. To check whether community members and other stakeholders agreed that these policies would help address food access challenges, initial recommendations were shared with residents of the project area during community meetings and with representatives of food retail companies. These respondents were asked to rank the policies.

- **represents community stakeholder favorites**

The following compilation of nationwide best practices is organized into five categories of recommendations: Orient transit and paratransit for access to healthy, convenient, and affordable food; legalize and regulate mobile vending; develop local food distribution strategies to deliver more fresh, local food to underserved neighborhoods; change land use rules to encourage healthy food retail; and design food stores that connect to urban streets.

**Key to Policy Options**

- 🛒 private retail sector
- 🏢 public sector
- 🔶 short term
- 🔴 long term
- 🔴 healthy corridor
- 🍓 food dessert/underserved commercial
- 🏠 residential
- 🌵 all areas
- 🧑‍✈️ community favorites
I. Transit

Los Angeles County is served by the Metro bus and rail transit system with 1.5 million daily weekday boardings. In South Los Angeles, both Metro and LADOT (Community DASH) provide bus service, while Metro also operates the Metro Blue Line along Washington Boulevard and along Long Beach Avenue. The Blue Line is the longest light rail route in the nation, and the light rail service with the second highest ridership in the nation. Blue Line rail stations are served by a number of Metro local and Rapid bus routes, as well as by five Community DASH routes. Virtually every major east-west and north-south street is served by bus - although with varying frequencies and spans of service.

Recent transit fare increases from $1.25 to $1.50 for a single trip, from $5 to $6 for a day pass and from $62 to $75 for a monthly pass will have direct impact on South Los Angeles residents who are dependent on public transit for grocery shopping. Fares did not increase for students and the elderly but adults doing shopping for their families will find it more expensive to travel to food sources.

For elderly and disabled residents in South Los Angeles, transportation options are limited. Access Services Inc. (funded by Metro) and Cityride (funded by the City), the only public paratransit services available to senior and disabled residents, have strict requirements that often create barriers to those who would like to utilize these services on a regular basis. Users must be screened and make appointments 24 hours in advance of needed transportation with separate appointments for each stop. There are also limitations on how much passengers are allowed to bring aboard from a grocery store.

Some larger grocery stores offer successful shuttle services that provide free rides home for customers who spend a minimum amount. But not all residents live near stores that offer this service. The minimum purchase amount (which is typically between $30 and $60) can be higher than many lower income residents would typically spend at a store. While some stores offer food delivery, these services can be expensive. Food bank food delivery does not meet current demand because demand for emergency food assistance has skyrocketed with the downturn in the economy. With minor modifications, these existing transit systems can better help ensure that people living in neighborhoods without adequate access can reach places to shop for healthy food.

Recommendations:

1. Increase public transit service to and from areas with healthy food. Commercial transit stops and schedules should be adjusted to help facilitate shopping trips from residential areas to healthy food locations.

   - Focus routes and investment on short and medium distance (errand) trips in addition to the current focus on long distance (commuter) oriented transportation trips.

   - Reroute or add stops to existing bus lines or implement new bus lines specifically aimed at transporting passengers to grocery outlets and farmers’ markets. Bus stop locations, often far from the store entrance, do not always take into account a person who is walking with multiple grocery bags.
Transportation agencies should gather data on when and how riders use rail and bus specifically for food shopping and which stops are heavily used by food shoppers.

2. Increase paratransit and delivery options to help consumers access healthy food.

- Create public or non-profit paratransit programs to connect consumers to food markets.42
- Paratransit providers should keep statistics on trip destinations and number of passengers using trips for food shopping.
- Encourage and incentivize food markets and farmers’ markets that provide customers free or low-cost transportation (such as supermarket shuttles).43, 44
- Promote grocery delivery services to elderly, disabled and low-income residents (or service agencies for redistribution).45
- Partner with food stores to distribute free or subsidized lightweight shopping carts that can be easily taken on and off buses and trains. Residents have raised concerns about the durability of carts readily available, stores and public agencies should collaborate to find a durable, green and user-friendly model for distribution.

3. Make food-shopping trips affordable. Metro should offer reduced price fares to food insecure populations.

- Give transit fare reduction to customers who have WIC or EBT. Currently Medicare recipients get subsidized fares. Subsidizing WIC and EBT clients’ transportation would give them access to more stores with healthier choices that accept EBT and WIC. A lower fare option would also reduce low-income rider’s transportation spending, increasing the amount of money they have to spend on food.26
- Reinstate transfer passes for increased affordability for passengers who take more than one bus per trip.

II. Street and Mobile Food

Street and mobile food are common in South Los Angeles. Meals, snacks, produce and other groceries are sold from pushcarts, trucks and other vehicles constructed or adapted for vending; from grills, tables and tarps temporarily placed along streets and sidewalks; and by vendors carrying food on foot. As such, mobile and street vending are an important source of food and a significant sector of the formal and informal economy in many neighborhoods. Street and mobile food also reflect the region’s cultural diversity and have become an increasingly popular way for residents of all backgrounds to sample diverse cuisines and to experience a vibrant street scene.

Many of Los Angeles’ near ubiquitous street food and mobile food vendors are also operating illegally. Sidewalk vending is currently illegal in the City of Los Angeles47 and food trucks, while legal, have been the targets of City and County laws to restrict their time and location of operation. Mobile and street food have been barred or restricted in Los Angeles due to efforts by fixed location stores and restaurants to restrict competition; a narrow
definition of what streets and sidewalks are for (unimpeded flow of cars and pedestrians respectively); concerns with food safety; and a ‘suburban’ vision of what a city should look like (a fear of crowds, ethnic diversity, poor people, density etc.) However, restrictions on street and mobile food are patchily enforced.

Because street and mobile vending are important sources of food, economic activity, and vibrant streets, especially in neighborhoods that lack adequate full service food stores and where many residents do not own cars, the City of Los Angeles should legalize, support, and regulate the sale of food from mobile vehicles on streets and sidewalks. It should especially encourage vending of healthy foods and do more to restrict sales of unhealthy foods and beverages near schools. Our recommendations specifically focus on mobile vending that is currently illegal, but we also support efforts to utilize legal vending strategies to increase healthy food access in South Los Angeles. For recommendations regarding legal mobile vending, see section III Food Distribution Strategies.

**Recommendations:**

1. Legalize sidewalk vending and support and regulate mobile food vending. The City of Los Angeles should allow permitted sale of food on city sidewalks. A legal permitting process would recognize the value of street and mobile vending, create opportunities for entrepreneurship in the legal economy and allow the City to regulate and influence street food.

   - **How Many?** There should not be a cap on the number of permits available or sidewalk vendors allowed to operate.
   
   - **Where?** Sidewalk vending should be allowed in all areas except for streets close to schools (see recommendation 3 below). Do not assign specific spaces to sidewalk vendors but do establish where on sidewalks vendors can station their carts so they do not entirely block sidewalks, doorways, ramps etc.

   - **What are the requirements to operate legally?** Require vendors to have a vending permit from the City (with an affordable cost), a business license, and to carry liability insurance. Vendors will need to follow County health regulations and be responsible for the removal of their customers’ trash, as well as:

     1. Have a Los Angeles County Department of Public Health permit.
     2. Keep medium to larger sized carts in an approved commissary or stationary facility when not in use.
     3. Pass a food safety certification examination.
     4. Pass an annual vehicle inspection and display a certification decal on the vehicle.

   - **Who can vend?** Many street vendors are undocumented workers. Set up the permitting process so that forms of identification and data available to undocumented residents are accepted.

   - **Who can veto?** Only require permission from adjacent/local restaurants or food stores if mobile vendors are selling similar products as the store/restaurant. If restaurants have concerns over competition from mobile vendors with fewer fixed costs, work with
restaurants to reduce permitting expenses and time, similar to the City’s Restaurant and Hospitality Express program. The City and County can also encourage vendors to partner with small stores to avoid conflicts and allow small merchants to diversify their points of sale. If many conflicts arise between mobile vendors and small food stores and restaurants, the City could re-examine this topic and consider requiring all stationary vendors to receive permission from adjacent stores.

• **What must carts/vehicles look like?** Do not mandate the aesthetics of carts. Work with the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health Department and manufacturers on standardized cart/vehicle designs that are easy to construct and operate, and that meet food handling/storage rules.

• **How to help vendors?** Create a ‘one-stop-shop’ where vendors can apply for all necessary permits. Conduct outreach and training to encourage illegal vendors to apply for permits and to instruct vendors on their rights and responsibilities. Provide financing through the Community Redevelopment Agency and/or link vendors with micro-finance programs. Establish ‘street vendor markets’ where prepared food and produce trucks and carts can park.

2. **Encourage vending of healthy items.** In neighborhoods like South Los Angeles where there are not enough stores selling a wide selection of fruits and vegetables or restaurants with healthy meals, mobile and street food can be a source of affordable, healthy food. The City should use incentives and disincentives to encourage more vending of healthy items by produce trucks, food carts and other mobile vendors.

• **Cheaper permits for healthy vendors.** Offer a reduced price permit for vendors who sell all or a majority of healthy items. The City would need to define healthy (by establishing nutrition criteria or limiting a lower cost healthy vending permit to fruits/vegetables).

• **Access to more areas.** The City should allow healthy vendors to sell in areas that are off limits to other mobile vendors. For example, only healthy vendors could sell near schools, at train stations and bus stops, on residential streets and/or in/next to public parks and buildings.

• **Priority access to public/private financing.** The City should prioritize vendors of healthy items for public financing or private low cost loans.

• **Links to sources of local, healthy food.** The City should help vendors source local produce and local, healthy bread, dairy, meats and prepared food.

• **Waiver of commissary requirement or support for community commissaries.** The City should work with the County to exempt vendors of fruits and vegetables from having to store carts/trucks in a commissary. They should also support vendors and community organizations who want to run vending commissaries for healthy vending.

• **Enforcement targeted against unhealthy unlicensed vendors.** Even if sidewalk vendors can receive permits to sell food, there will likely be some mobile vendors operating without permits. In
enforcing health and vending laws, authorities should focus on unlicensed vendors who sell unhealthy foods.60

- **Grade mobile vendor on healthfulness as well as safety.** Similar to the letter grading of restaurants, mobile vendors in Los Angeles will now have a grade from the County Department of Public Health. We propose a grade denoting healthfulness, as defined by a task force on healthy food options composed of health experts. The health grading could be proposed as a County pilot project.

3. **Restrict sales of unhealthy items near schools.** Sales of unhealthy food and beverages near schools, especially in the morning when students arrive and in the afternoon when school is over, undermine healthy school food policies that have strengthened nutrition standards for lunches and eliminated sodas and unhealthy snacks from vending machines and school stores. Audits and studies have found that vendors are common at schools in Los Angeles and that most students at these schools have purchased unhealthy snacks and drinks from outside vendors.31 To support schools as healthy places to learn and oases from the junk and fast food that characterize many neighborhoods, the City should maintain and enforce a ban on most food vending near schools and work to provide alternative healthier snacks.

- **Modify existing ban on vending within 500 feet of schools to allow healthy food vending.** The City should modify its ban on all forms of food vending within 500 feet of schools61 to allow vending of healthy items (fruits, vegetables and/or fruits and vegetables plus other items based on nutrition criteria).

- **Better enforce ban on non-healthy vending near schools.** LAUSD police and LAPD officers do not prioritize enforcing bans on snack vending near schools and even when vendors are cited, the $35 fine is considered a cost of doing business and is not always collected.62 The City should collaborate with the school district to enforce the rule in a manner that is sensitive to community concerns over law enforcement and immigration issues.

- **Educate vendors about rules.** The City should collaborate with schools and community organizations with health promotion programs to outreach to vendors about the rules against selling unhealthy snacks near schools.

4. **Work with local food banks to build a mobile operation.** Several food banks across the country have created diverse models for mobile operations. Many exist in rural areas, but the mobile model would also work well in very low-income urban food deserts where distances between homes and food banks may be even greater than the distances between homes and supermarkets.63

III. **Food Distribution Strategies**

The fact that residents of South Los Angeles face challenges in accessing healthy food is ironic given the vast amount of food that travels through South Los Angeles on freeways and is stored in warehouses and terminal markets along the Alameda and Figueroa corridors and in Downtown Los Angeles.64 Modern food distribution channels also bypass most small, local farmers operating in the counties surrounding Los Angeles. Creating a food distribution infrastructure that links local farmers and underserved urban
neighborhoods can simultaneously improve access to healthy food and boost farmer income.

Resolving local food distribution barriers is essential to bring local, healthy food to the people of South Los Angeles. Planners, economic development officials, health advocates, farmers and major purchasers of food in the private and public sector should help develop more comprehensive distribution channels that reach all communities and infrastructure to get good local food distributed within the Los Angeles region. The centerpiece of improved local food distribution can be the development of a Regional Food Hub where food grown within the Los Angeles foodshed (commonly defined as a 200 mile radius) can be aggregated, processed and sold. Local food distribution transportation, promotion and sales strategies can work to get local, fresh food to the broadest number of consumers.

**Recommendations:**

1. **Support the development of a Regional Food Hub.**

   The development of a Regional Food Hub is a top priority for the Los Angeles Food Policy Task Force as a means to “make Los Angeles a model in growing a sustainable, equitable, regional food economy.” While no specific decisions have been made about where this Regional Food Hub will operate and how it will be organized, UEPI is currently convening conversations between key farmers, distributors as well as labor and institutions.

   - **Incorporate the voice of South Los Angeles residents** to ensure that the food distribution network serves them. South Los Angeles stakeholders should take part in planning the hub and should develop transportation linkages to connect the hub’s local food resources to commercial enterprises and consumers. Incentivize local business and institutional participation in these efforts to ensure the infrastructure incorporates them.

2. **Support diverse local food distribution channels.**

   - **Build capacity in stores to receive and vend local produce.** The passage of the Healthy Food Retail Innovations Fund offers specific funding from the State for increasing healthier options in stores. These funds can help stores purchase equipment and develop infrastructure to prepare to receive and store local produce.

   - **Build demand through promoting local products.** Provide economic and moral support to community groups, businesses and institutions currently bringing local food into the community. Look to models such as the new WIC local food campaign that has been designed with data collected from market research interviews of WIC clients.

   - **Identify and publicize current access points.** Promote existing local food access points such as farmers’ markets and community supported agriculture (CSA) baskets or box drops in school parking lots. These “micro-hubs” can serve as distribution sites during weekends or as distribution hubs for food delivery programs in off-peak hours.

   - **Connect existing produce trucks to local sources and launch mobile farmers’ markets.** Identify sources of local food from which produce trucks that already serve some low-income neighborhoods...
can buy. Farmers’ markets can operate mobile or satellite markets, taking vans or stands to different underserved areas.\(^{68}\)

- **Support local food banks and connect them to local agriculture.** Promote creative ways of donating local produce from farms and back yard gardens/trees to food bank.\(^{69}\)

### IV. Land Use and Zoning

Coordinating land use, transportation and economic development policies is an important part of ensuring that a community has access to healthy food. Land use and zoning rules are sometimes overly restrictive in regulating where food retail establishments can be located and how they must be oriented and designed. In particular, a ‘suburban’ bias in the zoning code that separates different kinds of land uses and requires copious automobile parking is ill suited to contemporary, increasingly dense Los Angeles. These land use restrictions assume that all individuals will have cars to reach commercial centers and that land is available for supermarkets surrounded by large parking lots. In many low-income communities, however, people are transit dependent and full service food stores are not in walking distance. Adjusting zoning rules and community plans to allow and encourage a range of food retail in underserved neighborhoods, connect stores to transit, and limit excessive concentrations of unhealthy food will bring health and economic benefits to South Los Angeles.

**Recommendations:**

1. **Make it easier to locate and develop healthy food retail in urban areas.** Planning codes should be flexible in allowing the siting and design of healthy food stores in underserved areas.
   - **Set healthy food retail target numbers for each community plan area.** Target numbers should be established through community plan updates as part of a special focus on creating healthy communities.\(^{70}\) Target numbers, such as housing and affordable housing, already exist for each Community Plan area.
   - **Reduce parking requirements for food stores.** Many chain supermarkets have cited the difficulty of assembling a sizable piece of land as a reason not to enter underserved urban areas. Reducing parking requirements or incentivizing underground parking, both reduce the footprint of a new store. De-emphasizing vehicle parking also encourages use of alternative transportation. This could be accomplished through establishing a Parking Exception Area for new food retail. The current City requirement is four parking spaces for each 1,000 sq ft of floor area. Parking requirements in the State Enterprise Zone (covering most of the project area), have already been reduced to 2 spaces per 1,000 sq ft.\(^{71}\) Within the project area the requirement should be reduced to 1 space per 1,000 sq ft (if the potential supermarket developers concur).\(^{72}\)
   - **Grant healthy food retail density bonuses.** Food stores dedicating a significant percentage of their floor/shelf space to produce or with a “healthy” grade should be granted density bonuses to allow them to be built to greater square footage on the lot than would otherwise be allowed.\(^{73,74}\) Retail density bonuses will make sense in more dense areas of South Los Angeles; in less dense areas, this may not be appropriate.
2. Site food retail at transit stations and in mixed-use developments. Concepts such as locating new supermarkets in mixed used developments near affordable housing, or opening a farmers’ market at a major transit hub are gaining popularity across the country as urban planners work to improve the quality of life in urban communities. Los Angeles has several recently built examples of well-designed mixed-use developments including the new Ralphs grocery store development in Downtown Los Angeles. Both the new Fresh and Easy and Superior built in the northern section of South Los Angeles use the mixed-use model. In Portland, Oregon, a Whole Foods Market occupies two stories of a mixed-used development below office space. In Seattle, Washington, Puget Consumer’s Coop, a chain of seven food stores, has a location in a mixed residential/retail building. Both of these examples have underground parking and are near transit stops. The Metro Expo line runs though the most Northwestern corner of the project area, giving the City several opportunities to build or incentivize healthy food retail.

3. Restrict excessive concentrations of unhealthy food retail. Achieving a more healthy food environment can partly be accomplished by attracting more healthy stores and restaurants and helping existing stores offer more healthy choices. But in some cases, an excessive concentration of fast food restaurants and unhealthy food stores can overwhelm a small number of healthier options. Planners should consider limiting numbers of food stores and restaurants that primarily sell unhealthy items.

- **Extend fast food moratorium.** The City recently extended the two year moratorium on new fast food restaurants by incorporating the language into the Southeast, South Los Angeles, and West Adams - Baldwin Hills - Leimert community plans. In the current version of the legislation, the City prohibits new stand-alone fast food restaurants located within one half mile of any existing fast food restaurants in the affected area. The City could consider expanding it geographically, and/or expanding the scope to include candy stores, donut shops and other retail establishments that predominantly sell high calorie, high fat and high sugar items.

- **Establish Healthy Food Zones around schools.** Similar to a ban on alcohol sales and cigarette smoking in certain areas where children are likely to frequent, establish an ordinance limiting fast food restaurants near schools, recreation centers, libraries, etc.
V. Store and Street Design/Operation

The goal of linking food access and transportation is to make it easier for people to get to good food and for good food to get to people. One of the ways to strengthen and expand this connection is for food stores to be designed to be accessible and welcoming to people as they move around in their daily lives. In South Los Angeles, this means that food stores should be ‘urban’ in that they connect stores to surrounding sidewalks/neighborhoods rather than erect a suburban-style moat of parking. It means that stores and streets should welcome and provide safe access to pedestrians, cyclists and transit users. Stores should also be designed to feature healthy food in places where the store abuts public space. Stores often have unhealthy items placed visibly due to marketing agreements with manufacturers and distributors, and because sugar-dense items have traditionally been seen as impulse purchases. The following design goals provide a more specific set of recommendations for how stores (and the streets that connect people to retail) should be oriented, constructed and operated so that they create maximum points of connection with local residents, their surroundings and healthy food. Food stores operators often do not control the space on which they are located and smaller stores may lack capital to alter their architecture/site design (although some of the suggested changes are inexpensive to implement). So achieving these kinds of design changes will often require collaboration between stores, commercial property owners and lenders in the private sector as well as community organizations, planners and elected officials.82

1. Connect stores to surrounding sidewalks/neighborhoods. Food stores with healthy options should be visible, prominent parts of the retail landscape, well integrated into the existing sidewalk and streetscape and retail. The way stores link to their surroundings can in turn help enliven the public realm of the sidewalk. The design goals in this section create a win-win outcome for stores benefitting from increased walk-in business and for residents whom will enjoy easier access to groceries and a more walkable, human-scaled neighborhood.

- **Face the sidewalk.** Locate the main store entrance facing the streets/sidewalks that the store is located on, instead of side/back parking lots.

- **Embrace the sidewalk.** Stores should be built right up against sidewalks rather than having parking lots between sidewalk and store.83

- **Shrink parking.** Stores should minimize the amount of space dedicated to automobile parking, especially at ground level. Policy changes to reduce minimum parking requirements are also needed (see Section IV: Landuse and Zoning for more details).

- **Bury parking.** If possible, locate parking spaces in underground lots, rooftop lots, or on street spaces rather than in parking lots in front of or surrounding store.84

- **Eliminate drive-throughs.** Municipalities across the United States have banned drive-throughs as a strategy to maintain local character, reduce air pollution caused by idling cars and discourage people from consuming fast food.85 As suggested below, eliminating drive-throughs also makes biking and walking to such establishments more appealing and safer.
• **Surround with small shops.** Integrate smaller shops next to or below the food store so there is a mix of retail along street. It is better to have small stores next to a grocery store rather than integrated as kiosks inside the store because adjacent stores create a more vibrant sidewalk and public space.86

• **House people above.** Consider building housing above store to create a mixed-use development.87

• **Wider sidewalks with fewer driveways.** Provide wide sidewalks broken in fewer locations by driveways to allow a pedestrian plaza feel with social uses in front of the store.88

• **Be transparent.** Have windows facing sidewalk rather than blank wall, to promote sales and make surrounding environment feel safe and welcoming.89

• **Put seating in front of store.** Adding benches or tables and chairs will encourage people to sit and socialize in front of the store (and possibly shop more as well).

2. **Welcome and protect pedestrians, cyclists and transit-users.** Much of the food retail in Los Angeles is located in strip malls or drive through restaurants that endanger pedestrians and cyclists with curb cuts and drive ways that channel automobiles through sidewalks. Streets and stores can be better designed and oriented to prioritize the safety and convenience of transit users, pedestrians and cyclists.

• **Safe routes to shopping.** Improve pedestrian and cycling safety infrastructure and amenities like protected bike lanes, traffic calming measures and crosswalks along major commercial streets where there are food stores.
• **Sidewalk to the door.** Shoppers should be able to walk all the way to the store entrance without having to cross parking lots or walk in lanes used by vehicles. Traffic lights, stop signs, signage and traffic calming measures should give priority to safe walking and cycling on and near the store property.

• **Locate at transit.** Build food store in a transit-oriented development.

• **Team with transit.** Locate bus stops in front of grocery store or clusters of food retail.

• **Be nice to bikes.** Provide adequate bike parking through racks and/or bike valet parking.

• **Light right.** Provide enough lighting to make pedestrians feel safe at night (while reduced parking will mean less light pollution for neighbors).

• **Encourage two-wheeled shopping.** Co-sponsor bike training programs focused on transporting groceries on bikes.

• Let carts off the lot. Provide free or cheap pushcarts to help customers who walk to shop. Stores should also retrieve grocery carts from customers after they push them home rather than investing in hi tech grocery carts that lock when pushed off the store property.

• **Reward walkers/bikers.** Stores that offer validated parking to drivers should offer an equivalent amount in discounts or coupons to shoppers to walk, bike, or take transit to the store.

• **Hide trucks.** Regulate location and hours of truck delivery and idling, ideally concealing loading docks (underground if there is underground parking).

3. **Feature healthy food in connection to the store’s surroundings.** One positive way to signal that a food store is well designed and open for business is to feature healthy, appealing food at the places where it interacts with the community. Cafés, colorful produce piled on stalls, and nearby farmers’ markets, can all attract customers and add amenities to the neighborhood.

• **Open sidewalk cafe.** Sell beverages and or prepared food for customers to eat sitting in a sidewalk café in front of store.

• **Sell to outside.** Have to-go window opening onto sidewalk to sell coffee or food.

• **Sell on sidewalk.** Display and sell products in front of store, especially fresh produce.

• **Host farmers/vendors.** If the store has outdoor parking or sufficiently wide sidewalks, host farmers’ markets and/or mobile vendors.
Endnotes


3 Los Angeles County Department of Public Health. “Key Indicators of Health by Service Planning Area.” Los Angeles County Department of Public Health. 2009.


12 In its 2010 report The Good Food for All Agenda: Creating a new Regional Food System for Los Angeles, the Los Angeles Food Policy Task Force defined good food as “food that is healthy, affordable, fair and sustainable.” See page 15 of the report for more detailed explanations of these terms. http://goodfoodla.org

13 A number of resources are available suggesting policies and programs to expand access to healthy food in existing stores in south Los Angeles. See, for example:


21 Density often attracts new stores, which is good news for the northern portion but worse news for the less dense and older Southern sections of the project area.

The store survey tool incorporated questions from two different surveys. See:


Community Health Council’s Neighborhood Food Watch http://www.chc-inc.org/article.php?list-type&type=51

Los Angeles Department of Transportation. Los Angeles Department Of Transportation Reroutes DASH Downtown To Better Serve The Growing South Park Area.” http://ladot.lacity.org/pdf/LADOTDASHDowntownGrowth.pdf

Many farmers’ markets already accept WIC and EBT benefits. Community members and market patrons in South Los Angeles have a demonstrated need for increased transportation options as well as affordable fresh produce and would greatly benefit from a farmer’s market shuttle.


As TAP card technology evolves, it may be possible to move away from a flat ($1.50, one-way) fare for any and all bus boardings to distance-based fares which make short trips less expensive.

Conversation with Michael Davies, Supervising Transportation Planner, LA Department of Transportation.


Based on existing senior citizen discounts from METRO.

Metro. “Fares” http://www.metro.net/around/fares/


Fielding, Jonathan E. Memo to the Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles County Regarding Mobile Food Facilities. 16 Dec. 2010 http://file.lacounty.gov/bc/g4_2010/cms1_154796.pdf

A 2008-2009 audit of 70 LAUSD schools found that “30 had vendors using pushcarts, trucks or bicycles to sell such food as ice cream, chips, soda and candy. Sixty-eight of the 70 administrators did not have written policies on what to do about such vendors, the audit said.”


Surveys of 776 students 3rd, 4th and 5th graders at two schools in South Los Angeles by UCLA graduate students showed that 83 % of respondents purchased snacks from vendors (54% one to two times per week, 17% three to four times per week, and 28% bought snacks from vendors five or more times per week. The five most popular items purchased were chips, ice cream, candy, soda and water (fruit and corn were eighth and tenth respectively).


http://www.lewis.ucla.edu/publications/studentreports/Final42006/IG-StreetVendors_pdf.pdf


Los Angeles Food Policy Task Force, “The Good Food For All Agenda: Creating a New Regional Food System for Los Angeles” July 2010. pg. 16-19.


http://thesource.metro.net/2010/06/30/reminder-metro-fares-increase-tomorrow/

An interview 4-2010 with ACCESS, staff reported that to use this service residents must:

• Have to have a number that shows you have been screened as eligible.
• Have to make appointment 1 day in advance for pick-up.
• Make separate appointments for each stop.
• Cannot carry more than 25lbs, 2 paper bags or 6 plastic bags.
• Cannot stay on more than 2 hours.
• Do not provide referrals for other alternate transit except for those on web-page.

Safeway online shopping cost is: $6.95 - 9.95 depending on order, minimum order is $50. Delivery is not available in all zip codes.

The number of residents receiving aid from the Los Angeles Regional Food Bank was 21% higher in 2010 than 2009 and 48% higher than 2008.

Zavis, Alexandra “Increased Demand Strains Los Angeles County Food Banks.” Los Angeles Times, September 2, 2010.

The Austin, Texas Capital Metro, working with the Austin/Travis County Food Policy Council started a “grocery bus” line in 1996 with the specific intent of providing improved food access to residents of the primarily low-income, Latino Eastside. The bus route was designed to run at regular intervals seven days a week and to link neighborhoods with two supermarkets.


Merchants do not always want bus stops located in front of their stores and have input on bus stop siting. Some outreach must occur to store owners citing the profitability of inviting bus riders to patronize retail stores.

Conversation with Michael Davies, Supervising Transportation Planner, LA Department of Transportation...

Work with service providers for seniors and low-income residents to create and fund programs that would provide transportation for trips to supermarkets and farmers’ markets. The service could focus on food shopping or be flexible to allow shopping or other errands, modeled after the Sacramento Regional Transit Neighborhood Ride program that could deviate off a set route for pick-ups and drop-offs for elderly and disabled passengers. Sacramento Regional Transit Services operates a hybrid between bus and shuttle that has a set route, but can deviate ¼ of a mile for pick up/ drop off. Not specific to food shopping, but emphasis on intra-community trips for seniors. Interview with Sacramento RT Neighborhood Ride Services.

Sacramento Regional Transit Services “Transportation Options” http://www.sacrt.com/transportationoptions.stm

Numero Uno Market in Los Angeles, CA capitalized on the population density and high transit-dependence in the inner city to establish a van shuttle service that takes shoppers who spend at least $30 to their door. Coordinated with two Metropolitan Transportation Authority bus routes as a means for people to get to the store, Numero Uno’s 9-van shuttle service made it one of the top five grossing supermarkets in Los Angeles.


Many farmers’ markets already accept WIC and EBT benefits. Community members and market patrons in South Los Angeles have a demonstrated need for increased transportation options as well as affordable fresh produce and would greatly benefit from a farmer’s market shuttle. At least 22 farmers’ markets in Los Angeles County accept EBT.

http://www.see-la.org/html/projects.html

The Hartford Food System in Connecticut ran a program for seniors, partnering with Geissler’s Supermarket to provide phone order grocery service. Funded by the North Central Area Agency on Aging and other local businesses and churches, delivery is free for participants, making the service a competitively priced way for elderly people without cars or with disabilities to have access to a variety of fresh, quality food.


Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 42(b) broadly prohibits sale of any products, including food, on sidewalks. “Street Sale of Goods Prohibited. (Amended by Ord. No. 169,319, Eff. 2/18/94.) No person, except as otherwise permitted by this section, shall on any sidewalk or street offer for sale, solicit the sale of, announce by any means the availability of, or have in his or her possession, control or custody, whether upon his or her person or upon some other animate or inanimate object, any goods, wares or merchandise which the public may purchase at any time.”

Section 42 (m) of the Municipal Code allows for the “Establishment and Regulation of Special Sidewalk Vending Districts. (Added by Ord. No. 169,319, Eff. 2/18/94.)” This provision however imposed numerous conditions on the establishment and operation of special sidewalk vending zones, including a requirement that 20 percent of surrounding landowners and residents sign the application in favor of a new district, a complicated process to apply for and designate a zone, and assignment of vendors to a specified, fixed location. As a result, only one district was established, in McArthur Park, and it was not a success.

“Omnipresent complaint against street vendors’ “third world imagery” and the first world expectations as articulated by merchants and BIDs.”


For context on the history of regulation of street and mobile food, see: Alfonso Morales and Gregg Kettles. “Healthy Food Outside: Farmers’ Markets, Taco Trucks, and Sidewalk Fruit Vendors. 26 J. Contemp. Health L. & Pol’y Fall 2009; Anastasia Loukaitou-
49 In New York City, where the number of traditional food vending permits has been capped at 3000 since 1979, there is a 20 year waiting period to get a permit and vendors lucky enough to have a permit often ‘rent’ out their permit for $12,000 to $20,000 per year.


50 For example, in Portland, the following rules regulate use of sidewalk space by vendors: “5. The immediate operating area can not exceed twenty-four square feet of the sidewalk. 6. The site shall not be within ten feet of the intersection of the sidewalk with any other sidewalk. 7. The site shall not be within eight feet of the adjacent property line. 8. The site shall not be within ten feet of the extension of any building entrance or doorway, to the curb line. 9. The site shall not be within ten feet of any parking space designated as “disabled,” or “access ramp.”

City of Portland Office of Transportation” Sidewalk Vending Cart Permit Application Packet.” http://www.portlandonline.com/shared/cfm/image.cfm?id=57948

51 The annual fee in Portland is $75; it is $200 in New York City. Costs of applying for a permit, meeting health codes etc. will add to the cost so keep the permit fee low.

Based on our survey results we recommend a cost of $100, which a majority of surveyed vendors said they would be willing to pay annually.

52 Workshops with information about New York City’s Green Cart program are offered multiple languages.


53 The Michigan Neighborhood Food Movers program partners with the Detroit Midtown Micro-Enterprise Fund (DMEF) “for managing and processing low interest loans for this program. Loans can be applied for startup operations by an entrepreneur for up to $15,000 for a three year period with favorable payment terms. The loan can be used for purchasing a truck and/or ongoing operations.”


New York City’s Green Cart program directs potential vendors to the micro-credit lenders Accion USA to help vendors buy carts and inventory. http://www.accionusa.org/

54 The Los Angeles City Council recently passed a motion to establish a pilot project location for street vendors in Boyle heights to hold hot food farmers’ market in evenings:


55 Kansas City has set nutrition standards for a lower cost category of vending for their parks and recreation facilities:


56 New York City has a special category of Green Carts to promote sales of fruits and vegetables in low income neighborhoods with inadequate access to healthy food. “A Green Cart can only sell raw fruits and vegetables such as whole carrots, bananas, apples and berries. For food safety reasons, Green Cart operators cannot cut, slice, peel or process fruits or vegetables on the cart.” http://www.nyc.gov/html/doh/html/cdp/cdp_pan_green_carts.shtml

In Chicago, vendors selling only fruits/vegetables are classified as peddlers and pay $165 for a two year permit versus $275 for other vendors.


57 Michigan’s Neighborhood Food Mover produce trucks source fruits and vegetables, with a focus on locally grown food. “Aggregating smaller orders from a number of vendors into a larger order will result in lower pricing from growers or distributors… Fruit and produce will be sourced from local growers when possible and augmented by produce from outside the region when needed to fill out orders.”


59 Mobile vending vehicles must be stored in County approved facilities. These facilities often function as commissaries that sell ingredients or food products
to the vendors who store their vehicles at the site. In Oakland, The City approved a zoning variance to create a restaurant and commissary for fruit vendors active in a low-income neighborhood.


The Michigan Neighborhood Food Movers contracted with a produce distributor to provide overnight refrigerated storage and crushed ice to fruit and vegetable trucks operating under the program.


60 Officials have discretion under Food Safety codes and in practice police and health inspectors in L.A. have cracked down on some vendors (selling bacon-wrapped hot dogs) more than others (cut fruit vendors).


61 “The dispensing of victuals shall be permitted on any street except at or from: ...Any location within 500 feet of the nearest property line of any school.” Los Angeles Municipal Code. Chapter VIII, section 80.73 b.2.a.5


63 Second harvest in Eastern Washington operates a mobile food bank operation.

2nd Harvest “Mobile Food Bank” http://www.2-harvest.org/20/mobile-food-bank/

Sister’s Camelot operates a mobile foodshare program as well as a mobile community kitchen.


64 “Los Angeles County is the great conduit of California agriculture. Although many of our farms, ranches, groves, and nurseries have been replaced over the years by housing tracts and business parks, we’re still an agricultural hub. The Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach are an unparalleled American import/export gateway. Los Angeles International Airport handles enormous volumes of cargo. The Los Angeles Wholesale Produce Market, the largest operation of its kind in the nation, bustles with customers in the heart of Los Angeles.”


66 Urban & Environmental Policy Institute “Farm to WIC” http://departments.oxy.edu/uepi/cfj/ftw.htm

67 For example: “Grub Boxes” from People’s Grocery and Detroit’s Good Food Box.


Food Share. “What is the Good Food Box?” http://www.foodshare.net/foodbox01.htm

68 Several non-profits run mobile farmer’s market programs that bring locally grown affordable produce to low-income residents See:

Healthy Eating Active Communities “San Joaquin Mobile Farmer’s Market” http://www.healthyeatingactivecommunities.org/communications3_15.php


69 The California Association of Food Banks runs a program where they link local farmers to food banks “Farm to Family connects the state’s growers and packers with food banks to deliver fresh, nutritious fruits and vegetables to families in need.”

CA Association of Food Banks. “Farm to Family.” http://www.cafoodbanks.org/Farm_to_Family.html

Food Forward in Los Angeles collects fallen fruit throughout the city and then distribute the fruit to local food pantries:

Food Forward. “Mission” http://foodforward.org/about/

70 Several new tools within the Los Angeles City Department of City Planning are being developed to implement the community plans. One such tool, the Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone (CPIO), will give teeth to the long term vision in the community plans. The tool was developed so that it could be tailored to each separate community. The first CPIO is currently being developed in Baldwin Hills to deter the development of fast food restaurants by limiting the physical layout of new restaurant and food related developments. A target healthy food retail in South Los Angeles could be developed with a CPIO-like tool in conjunction with the long term vision of the South Los Angeles community plan update currently under revision.

Los Angeles Department of City Planning. “Community Plan Implementation Ordinance” Nov. 23, 2010 http://cityplanning.lacity.org/
71 Los Angeles Community Development Department. “State Enterprise Zones” http://www.ci.la.ca.us/cdd/bus_statecred.html

72 Some cities are passing initiatives, such as New York’s Food Retail Expansion to Support Health (FRESH) program that has changed the zoning requirements for new supermarket projects - to allow construction in light manufacturing districts, allow developers to build larger buildings than would otherwise be permitted if they include a grocery store on the ground floor, and to reduce the number of required parking spaces. “Stores up to 40,000 square feet in commercial districts that permit residential buildings with ground floor retail will not be required to provide parking.” The First 15,000 square feet are “exempt from parking in other Commercial and Light Manufacturing districts.”


“Convenient parking is important to shoppers who do not walk to the store, but the large surface parking lots typical of suburban supermarkets leave vast gaps in the urban fabric. Supermarket chains often overestimate the amount of parking needed in an urban environment by overlooking the fact that many shoppers walk or take public transportation rather than drive to the store. In most urban neighborhoods, a parking garage or shared street parking is almost always essential to the supermarket project in order to avoid the need for a large surface parking lot (Neuendorf, 2007).”


73 New York City’s FRESH initiative grants developers density bonuses for mixed use developments that locate food retail below housing: “One additional square foot of residential floor area for each square foot of grocery store, up to a maximum of 20,000 additional square feet. The food retailer must have at least 6,000 square feet of selling area for general food and nonfood grocery products, with at least half the square footage devoted to the sale of general food products intended for home preparation and consumption, and 30% of the area for perishable food, with at least 500 square feet for the sale of fresh produce.”


74 Density bonuses would apply mainly to developers building mixed-use developments with plans for food retail. The newer stores built in Los Angeles have been developer driver grocery projects.

75 “To encourage grocery store development in areas zoned for light manufacturing use (M-1 districts), the proposed zoning would allow large food stores to be permitted as-of-right. In New York, where the uniform land use review process (ULURP) and environmental reviews can drag on for many months, even for relatively uncontroversial projects, as-of-right development can save a developer time and money.”


76 “Our zoning rules should allow a greater diversity of uses, with some corner stores in residential zones and a mix of single-family and multifamily buildings, especially when the community supports the change. Rules that require review but set a lower bar, such as under a “special exception”, could fit the bill and maintain a good stock of single-family homes while also helping our city grow, provide adequate housing choices to households of all sizes and all income levels, and strengthen our neighborhood businesses.”


http://greatergreaterwashington.org/post.cfm?id=1635

77 Currently, public and wholesale markets are allowed on Commercial/Manufacturing zoned land as well as MR-1 Restricted industrial use land. South Los Angeles was zoned for the manufacturing districts that occupied the area during World War II and haven’t been adequately reviewed for the increased population and their needs.

78 For example, there is no setback requirement in most commercial zones in the City of Portland, Oregon. The required building setbacks promote streetscapes that are consistent with the desired character of the different commercial zones. The CN1, CM, CS, and CX setbacks promote buildings close to the sidewalk to reinforce a pedestrian orientation and built-up streetscape. The setback requirements for areas that abut residential zones promote commercial development that will maintain light, air, and the potential for privacy for adjacent residential zones. The setback requirements along transit streets and in Pedestrian Districts create an environment that is inviting to pedestrians and transit users.


79 The weekly farmers’ market at 7th and Figueroa, as well as the Ralphs Fresh Fare supermarket located at 645 West 9th Street, are both located less than .5 miles from the 7th street metro stop. The Old L.A. farmer’s market in Highland Park is located at the Highland Park Gold line station.


82 The City of Los Angeles has developed urban design guidelines in Downtown Los Angeles, which if applied to the project area would encourage good store and street design.


83 “The Safeway project in Georgetown is located on the site of an existing grocery store that is divided from the street by a large parking lot. The new design mends this urban edge by pulling the building back to the street – recreating the urban pedestrian experience along Wisconsin Avenue. The parking garage is then located behind the ground floor retail while still keeping an above-ground parking deck off of the back of the second level. This creates a more pedestrian friendly store with a more active street front environment.”


84 Underground or roof-top parking are typically considered based on land cost (the more expensive the land, the less likely that surface parking makes financial sense); land costs in South LA would currently not justify the expense of subterranean parking in most cases.

85 Baldwin Park, CA and San Luis Obispo, CA both have drive through bans.


86 “But the Safeway Company has an opportunity to capitalize on this underdeveloped site. They could move the grocery store entrance to the sidewalk along 14th Street, and turn the store 90 degrees so the narrower edge faces 14th. The store would back onto Guellet Court, across the street from a parking lot. This would free up space along D and 13th 14th for retail, including the retail already inside the store. Currently, in addition to a grocery store, the Safeway houses a pharmacy, a Starbucks, a liquor store and a bank. All of these could moved outside the store and onto D Street, wrapping around the corner onto 13th 14th along with other neighborhood appropriate retail. Starbucks, or other such retail, could spill out onto the wide sidewalks.”


The new building is two stories with the Safeway Grocery on the second floor and smaller “mom and pop” liner retail stores on the ground floor. The main store is accessed from a two-story corner piece that will also act as a public area. In the winter, the second floor of this entry will provide enclosed seating space, while in the warmer months, windows surrounding the corner might be opened to provide a more inviting atmosphere.


87 The Community Redevelopment Agency of Los Angeles recently helped finance two mixed use developments in South Los Angeles, the Central Village Apartments with 85 units of rental housing and a 32,000 square foot Superior Market and Central and Adams, with 80 units of affordable rental housing and a 17,000 square foot Fresh & Easy Neighborhood Market.

88 “From the end of the parking lot to the furthest corner of the store, the footprint faces 282 feet of Milwaukee Avenue. This may not seem like a great distance, but that’s the width of eleven standard Chicago buildings. On the pedestrian level it’s basically a dead zone. If you’re walking southeast on Milwaukee, first you pass the parking lot, then a long blank wall… This is a public space, and should be treated like one. It’s unrealistic to call for every Walgreens in the city to be torn down and rebuilt, but with a few minor design changes they could be better urban neighbors and take advantage of increased pedestrian traffic at the same time… [By] getting rid of the Milwaukee driveway (the parking lot would still have an entrance on Wolcott) and losing a whopping four parking spaces, the sidewalk could be widened into a pedestrian plaza.”


89 “Display windows can be incorporated but are often a result of building design codes for urban areas
rather than the norm for grocery stores. Attractive store windows not only help sell goods but they make the walk past the store much more enjoyable. Placing the store entrance and building at edge of the sidewalk also makes pedestrians feel much safer because more people are at hand.”


“Storefront windows help large buildings fit more comfortably into neighborhoods with small scale buildings. And by blurring the public space of the sidewalk with the semi-private space of the store inside, the presence of display windows lets pedestrians know that they are welcome to step inside and look around. Storefront windows pull pedestrians along the sidewalk and help keep them browsing. They also help reinforce the retail district feeling (Neuendorf, 2007).”


90 Bike racks should be placed so as to be visible from the doors/windows of the store, this makes riders more comfortable locking their bikes to shop. For description of a dialogue with L.A. area Trader Joe’s stores about increasing and improving bike racks:


91 The Sunday farmers’ market in Santa Monica offers free bike valet parking (riders leave their bikes at a location where they are “overseen by a professional bike watcher.”)

City of Santa Monica “Where to Park for the Sunday Farmers’ market” http://www01.smgov.net/farmers_market/SundayParking.htm

92 “Light pollution can be a discouraging thing for adjoining residences to put up with in the evening. Store fronts that use zero lot setbacks don’t have the need to illuminate the acres of parking that front- loaded parking lots have. Light pollution can also be addressed through specified lumen levels during hours of operation and reduced levels of lumens afterwards. In short, however, reduced parking lot size doesn’t require as much parking lot lighting.”


93 “Kroger in Savannah, GA will dispatch an employee to your home to pick-up a cart after you’re done with it.”

94 The loading dock for the Whole Foods store on Arroyo View in Pasadena, CA is located underground.

95 “For example, while Whole Foods has their pizza station in Austin, Texas inside the store, on a street that is highly pedestrianized in an urban setting like the Tivoli Square Giant, I’d put it on the street.”


“Capital City Grocery, located in downtown Raleigh on West Franklin Street, occupies a single story out parcel and is approximately 18,000 square feet... The independent grocery store has an on-premise liquor license so customers can enjoy a cold beer or a glass of wine while they relax on the large porch.” Jennings, Jennifer B. “Back to the City: The Re-emergence of Urban Grocery Stores in Mid-Sized Cities.” (2009) http://libres.uncg.edu/ir/uncg/listing.aspx?id=1873

96 “I mean, even Nordstrom’s understands that since their Downtown store abuts the most active public space in Portland, Oregon, that it makes sense to open up to the street somehow, and sell people stuff, in this case, espresso.”


97 “Supermarkets like Manhattan’s Fairway line their sidewalk frontage with produce stands. This draws customers into the store who see an appealing mango as they walk by, go inside, and end up buying a few items. Clearly, they’ve determined that any loss to theft pales in comparison to the profit in drawing more customers. Yet DC’s supermarkets leave these spaces dead and unused.”


98 “At least one Andronico’s store, they let a farmers’ market operate in the store parking lot on Saturdays, because they feel that while both the farmers’ market and the store sell produce, overall the supermarket will get more customers because of spillover from the farmers’ market.”