

Chapter 6. Prioritization and Funding

This chapter provides a methodology for prioritization and funding of the proposed bikeway network. This methodology will assist with the implementation of the Bicycle Plan policies..

6.1. Prioritization and Cost

A prioritization methodology was developed to provide a quantitative analysis of individual projects in the proposed bikeway network. The quantitative variables are consistent with the selection criteria described in Chapter 4. Qualitative measures such as political/community support should also be considered (see Policy 1.5, Program/Project 1.5.1) during the implementation process. The City maintains flexibility in project selection in order to take full advantage of implementation opportunities as they arise. For example, if a lower priority bikeway project is within the geographic boundary of an unrelated development or public infrastructure project, City staff will take the necessary steps to ensure that the bikeway project is included.

6.1.1. Factors for Prioritization

Bicycle Network Projects were prioritized using the following factors:

- Proximity to K-12 schools, colleges and universities.
- General Plan Considerations
- Proximity to Metro Rail stations, Orange Line stations and Metrolink stations
- Connection to existing network—bicycle paths, lanes and facility gaps
- System Gaps
- Collisions
- Proximity to parks
- Ease of Implementation, including type of crossing improvement required for continuity (i.e. at grade intersection enhancements, tunnels, bridges)

Connections to Existing Facilities

Enhancing an existing network can directly benefit bicyclists who are already riding on existing facilities. Facilities connecting to bicycle paths received nine points. Facilities connecting to lanes received five points. Facilities connecting filling gaps between existing bikeways received three points.

System Gaps

Enhancing areas without any existing facilities can induce more people to bicycle in neighborhoods that were previously unsupported, lacking facilities altogether. Facilities further than ½ mile from any parallel existing facilities receive 17 points.

Proximity to Transit

Bike-accessible transit hubs can facilitate transit use by encouraging incorporation of bicycling into trip planning. Facilities within ¼ mile of these Metro train and Orange line stations received 12 extra points depending on how many light rail transit or bus rapid transit line stations they serviced. Facilities within ¼ mile of Metrolink stations received five extra points.

Connections to General Plan Activity Centers

The General Plan for the City of Los Angeles categorizes specific areas as Community Centers, Regional Centers and Downtown, based on their employment and residential density, and their general land use. Facilities connecting to Downtown received 17 points. Facilities connecting to designated Regional Centers received 12.7 points. Facilities connecting to designated Community Centers received 6.3 points

Proximity to Educational Institutions

School children along with college and university students typically have higher rates of bicycling for transportation needs. Facilities within ¼ mile of K-12 schools received seven points depending on how many schools they serviced. Facilities within ¼ mile of a colleges or university received 10 extra points depending on the number of schools they serviced.

Collisions

New facilities can reduce the frequency of bicycle and automobile collisions. This factor uses Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) data, collected by the CHP from the most recent five-year period, to identify roads with an above average incident rate. Proposed facilities with above average rates received 10 points

Proximity to Parks

Much of Los Angeles bicycling is recreational. Connection to community centers, playgrounds and playing fields in parks can encourage people to incorporate biking with their recreational activity. Facilities within ¼ mile of public open space received 10 points depending on how many parks they serviced.

Ease of Implementation

The prioritization of proposed facilities was also based on attributes intended to including the number of required crossing improvements—at-grade intersection improvements vs. grade-separations (bridges and tunnels) to overcome barriers such as freeways and flood control channels. Facilities requiring grade-separated modifications were assigned lower prioritization due to higher costs, engineering feasibility, and the need to coordinate with other jurisdictions such as Army Corps of Engineers, Caltrans and Los Angeles County.

6.1.2. Cost Assumptions

Planning level cost estimates are provided for both capital and maintenance costs. The cost assumptions are described in the **Table 6-1**.

Table 6-1. Cost Assumptions

Facility Type	Cost
Capital Cost	
Bicycle Path (along flood control channel or rail corridor)	\$2,640,000/mile
Bicycle Path (in park, short connector no crossings)	\$500,000/mile
Bicycle Lanes (may include signage, striping, and pavement markings)	\$28,000/mile
Bicycle Route (may include signage and pavement markings)	\$28,000/mile
Bicycle Friendly Streets	\$30,000/mile
At-Grade Crossing Improvements	\$100,000/each
Grade Separated Crossing (Flood Control Channel)	\$500,000/each
Grade Separated Crossing (Freeway)	\$5,000,000/each
Maintenance Costs (Annual)	
Bicycle Path	\$10,000 / mile
Bicycle Lanes / Bicycle Route	\$3,500 / mile
Bicycle Friendly Streets	\$2,500 / mile

The price of total build out for the proposed bicycle network, which includes the cost of all facilities, is \$230,084,511 in 2009 dollars. The cost for the total extent of proposed bicycle lanes is \$4,202,687. The total cost for all proposed bicycle friendly streets is \$70,674,625. The entire network of bicycle routes costs \$2,904,063. The total cost for all proposed bicycle paths is \$152,303,135 in 2009 dollars.

6.1.3. Prioritization Tables

The following tables present the 20 highest priority projects (listed alphabetically) within each of the seven area planning commissions. A complete list of prioritized projects can be found in **Appendix A**.

Table 6-2. Priority Proposed Bikeways - North Valley APC

Street	Type	Start	End	Length (Miles)	Cost	Maintenance	Council District(s)
Foothill Blvd	BR	Hillhaven Ave	Tujunga Canyon Blvd	0.83	\$24,975	\$2,914	2
Laurel Canyon-Hubbard	BL	Hubbard Pl	Rinaldi St	0.98	\$27,471	\$1,962	7
Woodman Ave	BL	Plummer St	Parthenia St	1.04	\$129,016	\$2,073	7,6
Mayall St	BFS	Lurline Ave	Wilbur Ave	2.29	\$168,684	\$4,579	12
Etiwanda Ave	BFS	Chase St	Topham St	2.97	\$188,999	\$5,933	3,12
Terra Bella St	BFS	Dronfield Ave	Terra Vista Way	1.21	\$36,275	\$2,418	7
White Oak Ave	BFS	Parthenia	San Fernando Mission Blvd	2.75	\$282,094	\$5,506	12
Gladstone Ave	BFS	Polk St	MacLay St	1.68	\$50,315	\$3,354	7
Eldridge -MacLay	BFS	Polk St	Hunnewell Ave	1.97	\$59,104	\$3,940	7
Dronfield Ave	BFSB	Foothill Blvd	Hubbard St	1.86	\$55,656	\$3,710	7
Roxford St	BR	Foothill Blvd	Ralston Ave	1.12	\$33,617	\$3,922	7
Bakman-Penrose	BFS/BR	Glenoaks Blvd	Camarillo St	3.89	\$116,744	\$10,786	4,6,2
Sylmar-Terra Bella-Telfair	BFS/BR	Tupper St	San Fernando Rd	2.76	\$82,933	\$8,837	7,6
Strathern St	BFS	Laurel Canyon Blvd	San Fernando Rd	1.86	\$55,739	\$3,716	6,2
Parthenia-Montague	BFS	Vesper Ave	Glenoaks Blvd	3.81	\$6,239,400	\$7,627	6,7
Orange Line Extension Bike Path	BP	Victory Blvd	Lassen St	4.09	\$4,094,999	\$40,950	3,12
Dronfield Ave	BFS	Arroyo St	Terra Bella St	1.62	\$48,674	\$3,245	7
Herrick Ave	BFS	Brownell St	Pierce St	1.34	\$40,091	\$2,673	7
Chase St	BFS	Montague St	Hayvenhurst Pl	4.26	\$327,950	\$8,530	7,6,12
Pierce St	BFS	Foothill Blvd	Woodman Ave	3.54	\$5,481,129	\$7,075	7,6

BFS – Bicycle Friendly Street BL – Bicycle Lane BP – Bicycle Path BR-Bicycle Route

Table 6-3. Priority Proposed Bikeways - South Valley APC

Street	Type	Start	End	Length (Miles)	Cost	Maintenance	Council District(s)
Kittridge St	BFS	Sepulveda Blvd	Matilija Ave	1.88	\$56,271	\$3,751	6,2
Cedros Ave	BFS	Kittridge St	Valleyheart Dr	2.20	\$1,015,995	\$4,400	2,6
Hart-Varna	BFS	Varna Ave End	Hazeltine Ave	1.11	\$33,387	\$2,226	2,6
Dumetz Rd	BFS	San Feliciano Dr	Serrania Ave	1.22	\$36,543	\$2,436	3
Hart St	BFS/BP	Farmdale Ave	Whitsett Ave	1.31	\$160,487	\$3,627	6,2
Riverton Ave	BFS	Chandler Blvd	Kittridge St	1.52	\$345,654	\$3,044	4,2
Mulholland-San Feliciano	BR	Mulholland Dr	Dumetz Rd	0.84	\$25,275	\$1,953	3
Kittridge-Haynes	BFS	Quakertown Ave	E/o Aldea Ave.	3.47	\$104,216	\$6,948	3,12
Addison-Ostego	BFS/BP	Whitsett Ave	Kemp St	3.05	\$603,857	\$8,009	4,2,5
Valley Hill Path Segment 3	BFS	Aldea Ave	Hayvenhurst Ave	1.27	\$38,134	\$2,542	5
Valerio St	BFS	Woodley Ave	Valerio St	3.09	\$992,627	\$6,175	6,2
Hart St	BFS	Mason Ave	Balboa Blvd	4.49	\$334,832	\$8,989	3,12
Riverside Dr	BL/BR	Laurel Canyon Blvd	Vineland Ave	1.50	\$43,251	\$3,856	2,4
Strathern St	BFS	Mason Ave	Balboa Blvd	4.50	\$235,051	\$9,003	3,12,6
Bonner-Burbank-Cumpston-Fair-Lankershim-Bakman	BFS/BR	Vanowen St	Ostego St	3.44	\$303,121	\$8,095	4,2
Valley LA River Path	BP	Cahuenga Blvd	Owensmouth A	18.39	\$48,539,850	\$183,863	2,3,4,6,12,5
Beck-Erwin	BFS	Hart St	Fair Ave	1.50	\$45,025	\$3,002	2,6
Hazeltine Ave	BFS	Valerio St	Ventura Blvd	3.82	\$214,459	\$7,631	2,6
Woodman Ave	BL	Sherman Way	Chandler Blvd	2.25	\$62,954	\$4,497	2
Kittridge St	BFS/BP	Clybourn Ave	Atoll Ave	3.19	\$5,559,872	\$7,904	2

BFS – Bicycle Friendly Street BL – Bicycle Lane BP – Bicycle Path BR-Bicycle Route

Table 6-4. Priority Proposed Bikeways - Central APC

Street	Type	Start	End	Length (Miles)	Cost	Maintenance	Council District(s)
Hope St	BFS	Pico Ave	btw 5th and 6th St	0.93	\$27,917	\$1,861	9
Pico Blvd	BR	Hope St	Stanford Ave	1.04	\$31,287	\$3,650	9
Fairfax Ave	BR	Willoughby Ave	W 3rd St	1.09	\$132,567	\$3,799	5
Harvard Blvd	BFS	W 4th St	W 11th St	1.13	\$33,802	\$2,253	10,4,1
Griffith Ave	BFS	E 14th St	E Martin Luther King Jr Blvd	1.52	\$45,473	\$3,032	9
Alpine-North Spring	BR	North Broadway	Ave 18	1.20	\$38,857	\$4,416	1
17th-20th-New England St	BFS	Westmoreland Ave	Hoover St	1.50	\$44,978	\$2,999	1,10
Stanford Ave	BR	E 4th St	E 14th St	1.14	\$34,083	\$3,959	14,9
Sherbourne Dr	BFS	W Olympic Blvd	Cadillac Ave	1.37	\$41,200	\$2,747	5,10
12th-Queen Anne-Lucerne	BFS	Rimpau Blvd	4th St	1.52	\$45,454	\$3,030	10,4
6th Ave	BFS	Pico Blvd	Adams Blvd	1.03	\$30,928	\$2,062	10
Orange Dr	BFS	Franklin Ave	8th St	3.03	\$491,028	\$6,069	5,4,13
4th St	BFS	Hoover St	3rd St	3.94	\$218,050	\$7,870	4,1
Bonnie Brae St	BFS/BR	Sunset Blvd	11th St	2.20	\$66,126	\$4,420	13,1
James M. Wood-9th-4th	BFS	Venice Blvd	S Westmoreland Ave	2.52	\$75,174	\$3,271	10,1
Airdrome St	BFS	Monte Mar Dr	Venice Blvd	2.02	\$60,736	\$4,049	5,10
Cashio St-Crescent Heights Blvd	BFS	Roxbury Dr	Olympic Blvd	2.31	\$69,198	\$4,613	5,10
Rosewood Ave	BFS	N La Cienega Blvd	N June St	2.47	\$274,235	\$4,949	5,4
New Hampshire-Heliotrope-Edgemont	BFS	James M. Wood Blvd	Los Feliz Blvd	3.92	\$117,526	\$7,835	13,4,10
Rampart-Plata-Coronado	BFS/BL	7th St	Sunset Blvd	1.46	\$42,137	\$2,914	13,1

BFS – Bicycle Friendly Street BL – Bicycle Lane BP – Bicycle Path BR-Bicycle Route

Table 6-5. Priority Proposed Bikeways - East Los Angeles APC

Street	Type	Start	End	Length (Miles)	Cost	Maintenance	Council District(s)
Euclid Ave	BFS	E 4th St	E 8th St	1.03	\$30,932	\$2,062	14
Manitou Ave	BFS	S Ave 21	Lincoln Park Ave	0.89	\$226,626	\$1,775	1
Mott St	BFS	E 8th St	Wabash Ave	2.04	\$161,154	\$4,077	14
2nd St	BFS	Cumming St	Indiana St	1.52	\$145,656	\$3,044	14
1st St	BR	Boyle Ave	Lorena St	1.60	\$52,758	\$5,939	14
St Louis St	BFS	Judson St	S Boyle Ave	1.29	\$38,610	\$2,574	14
Evergreen Ave	BFS	Evergreen Ave End	Lanfranco St	1.54	\$46,172	\$3,078	14
Echo Park-Bellevue-Marion	BFS/BL	Sunset Blvd	Cerro Gordo St	1.17	\$34,025	\$2,346	1,13
Lincoln Park Ave	BR	Flora Ave	N Mission Rd	0.87	\$26,245	\$3,062	1
Monte Vista St	BR	Furness Ave	N Ave 61	1.12	\$33,666	\$3,928	1,14
Monterey Road	BR	Pullman St	Huntington Dr S	1.17	\$35,246	\$4,112	14,1
York Blvd	BFS/BL	Eagle Rock Blvd	Figueroa St	2.21	\$63,369	\$4,413	14,1
Pasadena Ave	BR	E Ave 37	E Ave 26	0.82	\$24,671	\$2,878	1
Echo Park Ave	BFS	Montana St	Cerro Gordo St	1.17	\$35,065	\$2,338	13
Zonal-Charlotte-Chelsea-Alcazar	BFS/BR	Griffin Ave	Soto St	1.50	\$44,906	\$4,144	14
Workman St	BFS	Pasadena Ave	Alhambra Ave	1.15	\$34,420	\$2,295	1
Yosemite Dr	BR	Eagle Rock Blvd	N Figueroa St	1.49	\$44,822	\$5,229	14
Arroyo Seco Connection	BP	Ave 52	Ave 19	2.47	\$2,467,741	\$24,677	1
Jefferies-Ave 28-Cypress	BL/BFS	Figueroa St	Pepper Ave	1.04	\$29,663	\$2,085	1
Ave 19	BFS/BL	San Fernando Rd	North Main St	1.18	\$34,335	\$2,353	1,14

BFS – Bicycle Friendly Street BL – Bicycle Lane BP – Bicycle Path BR-Bicycle Route

Table 6-6. Priority Proposed Bikeways - South Los Angeles APC

Street	Type	Start	End	Length (Miles)	Cost	Maintenance	Council District(s)
30th-29th	BFS	University Ave	Griffith Ave	1.45	\$243,559	\$2,904	9,8
Martin Luther King, Jr Blvd	BR	Crenshaw Blvd	Roxton Ave	0.78	\$23,443	\$2,735	8
Maple Ave	BFS	Washington Blvd	E Martin Luther King Jr Blvd	1.42	\$42,651	\$2,843	9
Budlong Ave	BFS	Washington Blvd	36th Pl	1.25	\$37,357	\$2,490	8,1
Martin Luther King, Jr Blvd	BL	Rodeo Rd	Crenshaw Blvd	1.24	\$34,750	\$2,482	10,8
103rd St	BFS	Avalon Blvd	Alameda St	2.08	\$62,304	\$4,154	15,8
8th Ave	BFS	60th St	76th St	0.99	\$29,720	\$1,981	8
111th Pl	BFS	Hoover St	McKinley Ave	1.51	\$45,229	\$3,015	15
23rd St	BFS	Hoover St	Long Beach Ave	2.69	\$180,829	\$5,389	9,1,8
Coliseum St	BFS	Genesee Ave	Martin Luther King Jr Blvd	1.55	\$46,631	\$3,109	8,10
88th Pl	BFS	Broadway	Caliburn Dr	0.97	\$29,121	\$1,941	9,8
Harcourt-21st-Vineyard	BFS	Venice Blvd	Ferndale St	1.51	\$45,158	\$3,011	10
Colden Ave	BFS	Hopper Ave	Vermont Ave	2.21	\$66,397	\$4,426	8,9
4th Ave	BFS	Florence	Rodeo Dr	3.11	\$193,360	\$6,224	8,10
Budlong Ave	BFS	Exposition Blvd	76th St	3.20	\$95,910	\$6,394	9,8
Buckingham Road	BFS	Adams Blvd	Martin Luther King Jr Blvd	1.24	\$37,148	\$2,477	10
30th-29th	BFS	Harcourt Ave	Hoover St	3.80	\$214,055	\$7,604	10,8
48th-47th	BFS	Crenshaw Blvd	Long Beach Ave	5.34	\$560,088	\$10,673	9,8
67th St	BFS	West Blvd	Budlong Ave	2.26	\$67,754	\$4,517	8
Mckinley Ave	BFS	E Florence Ave	E 11th Pl	2.71	\$81,307	\$5,420	9,8,15

BFS – Bicycle Friendly Street BL – Bicycle Lane BP – Bicycle Path BR-Bicycle Route

Table 6-7. Priority Proposed Bikeways - West Los Angeles APC

Street	Type	Start	End	Length (Miles)	Cost	Maintenance	Council District(s)
National Blvd	BR	S Barrington Ave	Westwood Blvd	1.15	\$34,629	\$4,040	5,11
Walgrove Ave	BFS	Rose Ave	Zanja St	1.12	\$33,452	\$2,230	11
Glencoe Ave	BFS	Washington Blvd	Alla Rd	0.99	\$29,708	\$1,981	11
Emerson Ave	BFS	W 77th St	Westchester Pkwy	1.19	\$35,838	\$2,389	11
Sawtelle Blvd	BR	Ohio Ave	W Pico Blvd	1.12	\$33,515	\$3,910	11
Ohio-Wellesley-Idaho	BFS	Centinela Ave	Federal Ave	1.22	\$36,504	\$2,434	11
Federal	BFS	Ohio Avenue	Tennessee Ave	0.96	\$28,800	\$4,216	11
Manchester Ave	BL	Sepulveda Blvd	E/o Osage Ave	1.06	\$29,675	\$2,120	11
Short-Centinela	BR	Beethoven St	Culver Dr	1.51	\$45,386	\$5,295	11
Beverwil Dr	BFS	Horner St	National Blvd	1.43	\$42,814	\$2,854	5,10
Westholme Ave	BFS	Hilgard Ave	Ayres Ave	2.07	\$62,235	\$4,149	5
Palms-Alhambra	BFS/BR	Royal Ct	Exposition Blvd	5.25	\$257,351	\$13,164	11,5,10
Playa Vista Network	BL	Bluff Creek Dr	Playa Vista Dr	1.94	\$54,350	\$3,882	11
Military Ave	BFS	W Pico Blvd	Venice Blvd	1.95	\$58,543	\$3,903	5,11
Barrington-McLaughlin	BFS	National Blvd	Culver Blvd	1.40	\$141,790	\$2,805	11
Beethoven St	BFS	Palms Blvd	Panama St	1.77	\$53,064	\$3,538	11
Braddock-McConnel-Panama	BFS	Alla Rd	Sawtelle Blvd	1.94	\$58,293	\$3,886	11
Monte Mar-Hillsboro-Cadillac	BFS	Beverwil Dr	La Cienga Blvd	1.66	\$49,797	\$3,320	5,10
Tennessee-Cotner	BFS	Federal Ave	Fox Hills Dr	2.34	\$370,147	\$4,676	5,11
Bluff Creek Dr	BL	Lincoln Blvd	Mesmer Ave	2.06	\$57,681	\$4,120	11

BFS – Bicycle Friendly Street BL – Bicycle Lane BP – Bicycle Path BR-Bicycle Route

Table 6-8. Priority Proposed Bikeways - Harbor APC

Street	Type	Start	End	Length (Miles)	Cost	Maintenance	Council District(s)
253rd St	BFS	320' w/o Western	Vermont Ave	1.09	\$32,607	\$2,174	15
25th St	BFS	Patton Ave	Gaffey St	0.76	\$22,857	\$1,524	15
23rd St	BFS	Patton Ave	Pacific Ave	1.02	\$30,497	\$2,033	15
Alma St	BFS	W Paseo Del Mar	17th St	1.25	\$37,435	\$2,496	15
Cabrillo Ave	BFS	26th St	N Meyler St	1.85	\$55,542	\$3,703	15
Opp St	BFS	Frigate Ave	Eubank Ave	1.31	\$39,445	\$2,630	15
President Ave	BFS	Lomita Blvd	Palos Verdes Dr N	1.22	\$136,548	\$2,437	15
Grand Ave	BFS	Dead End on No Grand Ave	W Hamilton Ave	1.72	\$51,663	\$3,444	15
17th St	BFS	Weymouth Ave	Palos Verdes St	1.63	\$48,917	\$3,261	15
Q St	BFS	Figueroa St	Eubank Ave	1.52	\$45,626	\$3,042	15
Anaheim St	BL	250' e/o Vermont Ave	I St	0.77	\$21,477	\$1,534	15
Neptune Ave	BFS/BR	Lomita Blvd	Harry Bridges Blvd	1.93	\$57,807	\$4,755	15
240th-Frampton	BFS	Western Ave	Lomita Blvd	1.05	\$31,643	\$2,110	15
1st St	BR/BFS	Harbor View Ave	Gaffey St	1.67	\$50,028	\$4,749	15
Walker-27	BFS	W 7th St	Alma St	1.49	\$44,667	\$2,978	15
Weymouth-Elanita	BFS	Wester Ave	23rd St	1.44	\$43,337	\$2,889	15
Gaffey-Shepard	BFS/BR	25th St	Pacific Ave	1.52	\$45,481	\$3,926	15
L St	BFS	Figueroa Pl	Blinn Ave	2.12	\$63,523	\$4,235	15
Lomita Blvd	BL	Figueroa St	Eubank Ave	1.51	\$42,274	\$3,020	15
G St.	BFS	Figueroa St	W Harry Bridges Blvd	1.93	\$157,890	\$3,859	15

BFS – Bicycle Friendly Street BL – Bicycle Lane BP – Bicycle Path BR-Bicycle Route

6.2. Funding Sources

Funding opportunities for the recommended projects and programs identified in this Bicycle Plan are available through a variety of sources.

6.2.1. Federal

Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF)

The LWCF program provides matching grants to States and local governments for the acquisition and development of public outdoor recreation areas and facilities. The program is intended to create and maintain a nationwide legacy of high quality recreation areas and facilities and to stimulate non-federal investments in the protection and maintenance of recreation resources. The LWCF could fund the development of river-adjacent bicycle facilities.

Petroleum Violation Escrow Account (PVEA)

PVEA funds come from fines paid by oil companies in the 70's for violating oil price caps set by the federal government. The Department of Energy's State Energy and Weatherization Assistance Program distribute the money at the state level through grants. PVEA funds projects with an emphasis on energy saving including public transportation and bridge construction or maintenance.

Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Program

Authorized under Section 1404 of SAFETEA-LU (the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users), the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Program came into effect in August, 2005. Consistent with other federal-aid programs, each State Department of Transportation (DOT) is held responsible for the development and implementation of grant funds made available to the states through this new program throughout the life of SAFETEA-LU. Some expected outcomes of the program include:

- Increased bicycle, pedestrian, and traffic safety around schools;
- More children walking and bicycling to and from schools;
- Decreased traffic congestion around schools;
- Reduced childhood obesity;
- Improved air quality, community safety and security, and community involvement;
- Improved partnerships among schools, local agencies, parents, community groups, and nonprofit organizations.

A minimum of 70 percent of each year's apportionment will be made available for infrastructure projects with up to 30 percent for non-infrastructure projects.

Infrastructure Projects

Infrastructure projects are engineering projects or capital improvements that will substantially improve safety and the ability of students to walk and bicycle to school. They typically involve the planning, design, and construction of facilities within a two mile radius from a grade school or middle school. The maximum funding cap for an infrastructure project is \$1 million. Caltrans does not set minimum caps. The project cost estimate may include eligible direct and indirect costs.

Eligible projects may include but are not limited to:

- New bicycle trails and paths, bicycle racks, bicycle lane striping and widening, new sidewalks, widening of sidewalks, sidewalk gap closures, curbs, gutters, and curb ramps. Also includes new pedestrian trails, paths, and pedestrian over and under crossings, roundabouts, bulb-outs, speed bumps, raised intersections, median refuges, narrowed traffic lanes, lane reductions, full or half-street closures, and other speed reduction techniques.
- Included in the category of traffic control devices are: new or upgraded traffic signals, crosswalks, pavement markings, traffic signs, traffic stripes, in-roadway crosswalk lights, flashing beacons, bicycle-sensitive signal actuation devices, pedestrian countdown signals, vehicle speed feedback signs, pedestrian activated upgrades, and all other pedestrian and bicycle-related traffic control devices.

Infrastructure projects should directly support increased safety and convenience for children in K-8 (including children with disabilities) to walk and bicycle to school.

Non-Infrastructure Projects

Non-infrastructure projects are education/encouragement/enforcement activities that are intended to change community behavior, attitudes, and social norms to make it safer for children in Grades K-8 to walk and bicycle to school. Non-infrastructure projects should increase the likelihood of programs becoming institutionalized once in place. Deliverables from a non-infrastructure project must be clearly stated in the application and tangible samples must be attached to the final invoice or Progress Report; i.e., sample training materials or promotional brochures. The funding cap for a non-infrastructure project is \$500,000. Multi-year funding allows the applicant to staff up and deliver their project over the course of four (4) years, thereby reducing overhead and increasing project sustainability.

Noninfrastructure projects must fall into one or more of the following categories. Note: While typical non-infrastructure projects would fall under one or more of the top four E's listed below, it is conceivable that certain non-infrastructure activities may involve engineers in some capacity. For that reason, it is included as one of the five E's below.

- **Education** – Teaching children about the broad range of transportation choices, instructing them in important lifelong bicycling and walking safety skills, and launching driver safety campaigns in the vicinity of schools.
- **Enforcement** – Partnering with local law enforcement to ensure traffic laws are obeyed in the vicinity of schools (this includes enforcement of speeds, yielding to pedestrians in crossings, and proper walking and bicycling behaviors), and initiating community enforcement such as crossing guard programs or pedestrian right of way sting programs.
- **Encouragement** – Using events and activities to promote walking and bicycling.
- **Evaluation** – Monitoring and documenting outcomes and trends through the collection of data, including the collection of data before and after the intervention(s).
- **Engineering** – Creating operational and physical improvements to the infrastructure surrounding schools that reduce speeds and potential conflicts with motor vehicle traffic, and establish safer and fully accessible crossings, walkways, trails and bikeways.

Eligible projects may target a single local school or school district, or the State as a whole. The most effective non-infrastructure activities are conducted within the framework of a community coalition. Thus, it is strongly suggested that an SRTS community coalition be established. A

Walkable/Bikeable Community Workshop convenes community stakeholders to identify, and then pursue concrete steps to make the community more walkable and bikeable. The workshop serves as the impetus to bring together key partners, including schools, elected officials, local government, parks and recreation, law enforcement, emergency services, public health, business owners, residents, advocacy groups and other organizations that can serve as core members of a community coalition to design and implement a plan which incorporates the five Es. Examples of local, regional, and district level noninfrastructure projects might include but are not limited to:

- Hires a Program Manager to coordinate SRTS efforts and volunteers at several schools.
- Conducts a Walkable Community Workshop which includes a walk and bicycle audit.
- Provides a community with walkability checklist.
- Provides modest incentives for SRTS contests, and incentives that encourage more walking and bicycling over time.
- Pays for a substitute teacher if needed to cover for faculty attending SRTS functions during school hours.
- Procures equipment and training needed for establishing crossing guard programs.
- Conducts outreach to local press and community leaders.
- Pays for the cost of additional traffic enforcement or equipment needed for enforcement activities.
- Pays for traffic education and enforcement in the vicinity of schools.
- Forms student sessions on bicycle and pedestrian safety, health, and environmental impacts.
- Develops “Suggested SRTS Maps.”

Transportation, Community, and System Preservation Program (TCSP)

Implementation grants under the TCSP Program are intended to provide financial resources to States, metropolitan planning organizations, local governments and tribal governments to enable them to carry out activities that address transportation efficiency while meeting community preservation and environmental goals. Examples of such policies or programs include: spending policies that direct funds to high-growth regions of the country; urban growth boundaries to guide metropolitan expansion; green corridors" programs that provide access to major highway corridors for areas targeted for efficient and compact development.

6.2.2. State of California

Bicycle Transportation Account-State

The State of California Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) is an annual statewide discretionary program that is available through the Caltrans Bicycle Facilities Unit for funding bicycle projects. Available as grants to local jurisdictions, the emphasis is on projects that benefit bicycling for commuting purposes. As of 2009, the BTA makes \$7.2 million available each year. The local match is a minimum of 10% of the total project cost.

BTA projects are intended to improve safety and convenience for bicycle commuters, and can include, but are not limited to, any of the following:

- New bikeways serving major transportation corridors

- New bikeways removing travel barriers to potential bicycle commuters
- Secure bicycle parking at employment centers, park-and-ride lots, rail and transit terminals, and ferry docks and landings
- Bicycle-carrying facilities on public transit vehicles
- Installation of traffic control devices to improve the safety and efficiency of bicycle travel
- Elimination of hazardous conditions on existing bikeways
- Planning
- Improvement and maintenance of bikeways

Eligible project activities include:

- Project planning
- Preliminary engineering
- Final design
- Right of way acquisition
- Construction and/or rehabilitation

Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program (EEMP)

Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program Funds are allocated to projects that offset environmental impacts of modified or new public transportation facilities including streets, mass transit guideways, park-n-ride facilities, transit stations, tree planting to equalize the effects of vehicular emissions, and the acquisition or development of roadside recreational facilities, such as trails. State gasoline tax monies fund the EEMP, which annually allocates \$10 million for mitigation projects.

Hazard Elimination Safety Program (HES)

The Hazard Elimination Safety Program (HES) is a state safety program that provides funds for safety improvements on all public roads and highways. These funds serve to eliminate or reduce the number and/or severity of traffic accidents at locations selected for improvement.

Each year, local agencies compete for HES funds by submitting candidate safety projects to Caltrans for review and analysis. Caltrans prioritizes these projects, statewide, and releases an annual HES Program Plan that identifies the projects that are approved for funding. Funding is offered annually following the federal fiscal year. Approximately \$27 million dollars were available in the 2007 funding cycle.

Projects may be submitted for consideration of funding through the HSIP under two types of projects: Work Type and Safety Index Projects. Projects submitted under the Safety Index category may qualify for funding on the basis of a calculated safety index. These projects are prioritized statewide by the safety index. Projects submitted under the Work Type category cannot be quantified by a safety index generally due to a lack of data. If a project fails to get funded under the Safety Index category, it will automatically be moved into the Work Type category and re-compete for funding with other projects within this category. Work Type projects receive approximately 75 percent, while Safety Index projects receive about 25 percent of the available HSIP funds.

Examples of projects in the Safety Index category include installation of raised median islands, protected left-turn phasing, and widened and improved roadways. Examples of projects in the Work

Type category include curb ramps, crosswalks, installation of right turn lanes and construction of new bus stop aprons.

Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) Grant

Office of Traffic Safety Grants (OTS) fund safety programs and equipment. Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety is a specifically identified priority. This category of grants includes enforcement and education programs, which can encompass a wide range of activities, including bicycle helmet distribution, design and printing of billboards and bus posters, other public information materials, development of safety components as part of physical education curriculum, or police safety demonstrations through school visitations.

The grant cycle typically begins with a request for proposals in October, which are due the following January. In 2006, OTS awarded \$103 million to 290 agencies.

Recreational Trails Program (RTP)

The Recreational Trails Program provides funds to states to develop and maintain recreational trails and trail-related facilities for both non-motorized and motorized recreational trail uses. Examples of trail uses include hiking, bicycling, in-line skating, equestrian use, and other non-motorized as well as motorized uses.

Recreational Trails Program funds may be used for:

- Maintenance and restoration of existing trails;
- Development and rehabilitation of trailside and trailhead facilities and trail linkages;
- Purchase and lease of trail construction and maintenance equipment;
- Construction of new trails (with restrictions for new trails on federal lands);
- Acquisition of easements or property for trails;
- State administrative costs related to this program (limited to seven percent of a State's funds); and
- Operation of educational programs to promote safety and environmental protection related to trails (limited to five percent of a State's funds).

Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Program

Established in 1999, the State-legislated Safe Routes to School (SR2S) program came into effect with the passage of AB 1475. In 2001, SB 10 was enacted which extended the program for three additional years. In 2004, SB 1087 was enacted to extend the program three more years. And in 2007, AB 57 was enacted to extend the program indefinitely. Seven (7) cycles of the SR2S program have been completed. The list of awarded projects is typically announced in the fall.

The goals of the program are to reduce injuries and fatalities to school children and to encourage increased walking and bicycling among students. The program achieves these goals by constructing facilities that enhance safety for pedestrians and bicyclists, primarily students in grades K-12 who walk or bicycle to school. By enhancing the safety of the pathways, trails, sidewalks, and crossings, the likelihood of attracting and encouraging other students to walk and bicycle increases.

The SR2S program is primarily a construction program. Projects funded by the program are intended to improve the safety of students who walk or bicycle to school. Construction improvements must be made on public property. Improvements can be made on public school grounds providing the cost is incidental to the overall cost of the project. The program typically provides approximately \$25 million annually statewide. The maximum reimbursement percentage for any SR2S project is ninety percent. The maximum amount of SR2S funds that will be allocated to any single project is \$900,000.

Eligible project elements include bicycle facilities, traffic control devices and traffic calming measures. Up to 10% of funding provided for an individual project can be used for Outreach, Education, Encouragement, and/or Enforcement activities. Regarding funding projections, the 2008 cycle is anticipated to provide \$48.5 million in funding. A letter from the Safe Routes to School National Partnership to the California Air Resources Board recognized that awards were part of “the volatile state budget process.”

This California SR2S program should not be confused with the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) Safe Routes to School (SRTS) program authorized under SAFETEA-LU. Although both programs have similar goals and objectives, their funding source, local funding match requirements and other program requirements are different (see following section).

TDA Article III (SB 821)

Transportation Development Act Article 3 funds are distributed by the State of California and administered at the county level, which can be used by cities for planning and construction of bicycle and pedestrian facilities. For the City of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) administers this program and establishes its policies.

These funds are allocated annually on a per capita basis to both cities and the County of Los Angeles. Local agencies may either draw down these funds or place them on reserve. Agencies must submit a claim form to Metro by the end of the fiscal year in which they are allocated. Failure to do so may result in the lapsing of these allocations.

TDA Article 3 funds may be used for the following activities related to the planning and construction of bicycle and pedestrian facilities:

- Engineering expenses leading to construction.
- Right-of-way acquisition.
- Construction and reconstruction.
- Retrofitting existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities, including installation of signage, to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
- Route improvements such as signal controls for bicyclists, bicycle loop detectors, rubberized rail crossings and bicycle-friendly drainage grates.
- Purchase and installation of bicycle facilities such as secure bicycle parking, benches, drinking fountains, changing rooms, rest rooms and showers which are adjacent to bicycle trails, employment centers, park-and-ride lots, and/or transit terminals and are accessible to the general public.

6.2.3. County of Los Angeles

Metro Call for Projects (CFP)

Metro is responsible for allocating discretionary federal, state and local transportation funds to improve all modes of surface transportation. Metro also prepares the Los Angeles County Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). A key component of TIP is the Call for Projects program, a competitive process that distributes discretionary capital transportation funds to regionally significant projects.

Every other year (pending funding availability), Metro accepts Call for Projects applications in several modal categories. Funding levels for each of the modes is established by mode share as determined by the Metro Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). As of the writing of this plan, the CFP is currently on an odd-year funding cycle with applications typically due early in the odd years. Local jurisdictions, transit operators, and other eligible public agencies are encouraged to submit applications proposing projects for funding. Metro staff ranks eligible projects and presents preliminary scores to Metro’s Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Metro Board of Directors for approval. Upon approval, the TIP is developed and formally transmitted to the regional (SCAG) and state transportation (CTC) planning agencies. The TIP then becomes part of the five-year program of projects scheduled for implementation in Los Angeles County.

The modal categories relevant to the implementation of Bicycle Plan projects and programs are Bikeway Improvements, Regional Surface Transportation Improvements (RSTI), Transportation Enhancements (TE), Transportation Demand Management (TDM). Typically funding provided for bicycle improvements include deferral transportation fund, currently SAFTEA-LU, TDA and CMAO categories.. Some intersection improvements or grade-separated crossing projects in this Bicycle Plan may provide an equal or greater benefit to pedestrians. In these cases the City should consider applying for funding within the Pedestrian Improvements modal category. Wherever possible, Bicycle Plan projects should be included as part of larger arterial improvement projects and submitted under the RSTI category.

The following table provides information on each of the relevant modal categories within the Metro Call for Projects as of 2009.

Table 6-9. Metro Call for Projects - Modal Categories Relevant to Bicycle Plan Projects and Programs

Modal Category	Share of Funding*	Eligible Projects**
Bikeway Improvements	8%	Regionally significant projects that provide access and mobility through bike-to-transit improvements, gap closures in the inter-jurisdictional bikeway network, bicycle parking, and first-time implementation of bicycle racks on buses.
Regional Surface Transportation Improvements	40%	On-street bicycle lanes may be eligible if included as part of a larger capacity-enhancing arterial improvement project. Bikeway grade-separation projects may be eligible as part of larger arterial grade-separation projects.
Transportation Enhancement Activities	2%	Bicycle-related safety and education programs. Bikeway projects implemented as part of a scenic or historic highway, and landscaping or scenic beautification along existing bikeways may also be eligible.
Transportation Demand Management	7%	Technology and/or innovation-based bicycle transportation projects such as Bicycle Commuter Centers and modern bicycle sharing infrastructure. Larger TDM strategies with bicycle transportation components would also be eligible.

*Funding estimate is bi-annual (every other year) based on the approved funding from the 2007 CFP.

**The discussion of eligible projects is based on 2009 CFP requirements and assumes all eligibility requirements are met and the questions in the CFP application are adequately addressed. These requirements are subject to change in future cycles. City staff should refer to the latest CFP Application Package for detailed eligibility requirements.

6.2.4. Local

Developer Impact Fees

Another potential local source of funding is developer impact fees, typically tied to trip generation rates and traffic impacts produced by a proposed project. A developer may reduce the number of trips (and hence impacts and cost) by paying for on- and off-site bikeway improvements that will encourage residents to bicycle rather than drive. Establishing a clear nexus or connection between the impact fee and the project's impacts is critical in avoiding a potential lawsuit.

Other opportunities for implementation will appear over time that may be used to implement Bicycle Plan projects.

Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act

Bicycle paths and bicycle lanes can be funded as part of a local assessment or benefit district. Defining the boundaries of the benefit district may be difficult unless the facility is part of a larger parks and recreation or public infrastructure program with broad community benefits and support.

Table 6-10. Funding Sources

Granting Agency	Due Date	Fund Source(s)	Annual Funding (approx) 2009	Matching Requirement	Eligible Bikeway Projects			Comments
					Commute	Recreation	Safety /Ed	
Metro CFP: Bikeway Improvements	Odd-numbered years: late winter / early spring	SLPP TEA CMAQ RSTP	\$17.5 m	20% local match	X			Refer to latest Call for Projects Application Package for eligibility requirements.
Metro CFP: Regional Surface Transportation Improvements (RSTI)	Odd-numbered years: late winter / early spring	Local Prop C SLPP CMAQ	\$110 m	35% local match	X			Refer to latest Call for Projects Application Package for eligibility requirements.
Metro CFP: Transportation Enhancement Activities (TE)	Odd-numbered years: late winter / early spring	TEA CMAQ RSTP	\$6.5 m	20% local match	X		X	Refer to latest Call for Projects Application Package for eligibility requirements.
Metro CFP: Transportation Demand Management (TDM)	Odd-numbered years: late winter / early spring	CMAQ	\$3.5 m	20% local match	X			Refer to latest Call for Projects Application Package for eligibility requirements.
Metro CFP: Pedestrian Improvements	Odd-numbered years: late winter / early spring	SLPP TEA CMAQ RSTP	\$20 m	20% local match	X			Refer to latest Call for Projects Application Package for eligibility requirements.
Bicycle Transportation Account	December	Caltrans	\$7.2 m	min. 10% local match on construction	X		X	State-funded. Projects that improve safety and convenience of bicycle commuters.

Granting Agency	Due Date	Fund Source(s)	Annual Funding (approx) 2009	Matching Requirement	Eligible Bikeway Projects			Comments
					Commute	Recreation	Safety /Ed	
Safe Routes to School – State	May	Caltrans	\$18 m	11.5% min.	X	X	X	Primarily construction program to enhance safety of pedestrian and bicycle facilities.
Safe Routes to School - Federal	April	Caltrans	\$48.5 m	--	X	X	X	Infrastructure improvements must be within 2 miles of elementary or middle school.
Office of Traffic Safety Grants	January	Office of Traffic Safety	\$56 m	--			X	Bicycle and pedestrian projects have been funded through this program.
Recreational Trails Program (RTP)	October	TEA	\$3 m	20% match		X		For recreational trails to benefit bicyclists, pedestrians, and other users.
Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program (EEMP)	November	State Resources Agency, Caltrans	\$10 m statewide	not required but favored	X	X	X	Projects that enhance or mitigate future transportation projects; can include acquisition or development of roadside recreational facilities.
Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 (2% of total TDA)	January	RTPA	--	--	X	X	X	Purchase and installation of bicycle facilities including bikeway support facilities and secure bicycle parking. Retrofit of existing facilities to comply with ADA.
Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act	--	Tax Revenue approved by 2/3 vote	--	--	X	X		Funds have been used for bicycle lanes/paths
Transportation and Community and System Preservation Program (TCSP)	Pending	FHWA	\$61.25 m	--	X	X	--	Projects that improve system efficiency, reduce environmental impacts of transportation, etc.

Granting Agency	Due Date	Fund Source(s)	Annual Funding (approx) 2009	Matching Requirement	Eligible Bikeway Projects			Comments
					Commute	Recreation	Safety /Ed	
Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF)	May	State DPR		\$7.7 m statewide	50%, including in-kind		X	Federally-funded. Projects that acquire and develop outdoor recreation areas and facilities.
Petroleum Violation Escrow Account (PVEA)	On-going	State Legislature		\$5 m	--	X	X	Bicycle and trail facilities have been funded with this program.
Developer Fees or Exactions (developer fee for street improvements - DFSI)	--	Cities or County		--	--	X	X	Mitigation required during land use approval process
Hazard Elimination Safety Program (HES)	April	Caltrans		\$10-16 m	10%		X	Refer to latest Call for Projects Application Package for eligibility requirements.

* Metro Call for Projects funding levels may vary greatly from cycle to cycle. The annual estimates in this table are based on the approved funding from the 2007 CFP.

This page is intentionally left blank.