

5. Funding and Implementation



This page intentionally left blank.

This chapter is intended to support the implementation of the Plan's recommendations by providing the following information:

- Planning-level cost estimates for the entire proposed un-built network, presented in Table 5-2
- An overview of the implementation strategies for the proposed programs, presented in Table 5-6
- An overview of funding sources for those proposed projects, presented in Table 5-7

5.1 Program Monitoring

The Plan provides a long-term vision for the development of a region-wide bicycle network that can be used by all residents for all types of trips. Implementation of the Plan will take place incrementally over many years, and the Plan is intended to guide bicycling in the County for the next 20 years. The County shall review and update the Plan every five years pursuant to Policy 1.5 of the Plan. The following actions and measures of effectiveness are provided to guide the County of Los Angeles toward the vision identified in the Plan.

5.1.1 Update the Plan

While the Plan is intended to guide bicycle planning in the County of Los Angeles for the next 20 years, it shall be reviewed and updated every five years pursuant to Policy 1.5, to reflect the current needs of the community and enable the County to remain eligible for Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) funding.

5.1.2 Regularly Revisit Project Prioritization

The proposed bikeways were prioritized and grouped into three implementation phases based on bicycling demand, facility deficiencies, barriers to implementation, public input, and other criteria described in detail in Appendix I. County staff shall review the projects in each phase on a regular basis, and consult with the community stakeholder group and other interested parties for prioritizing project implementation within each phase. Community input should also be sought after adoption of the Plan via the web or through community meetings, for new infrastructure or programs to improve bicycle mobility in the County, which will be reflected in future updates to the Plan.

5.1.3 Establish Measures of Effectiveness

Measures of effectiveness are used as a quantitative way to measure the County's progress toward implementing the Plan. Well-crafted measures of effectiveness will allow the County to determine the degree of progress toward meeting the Plan's goals, and include time-sensitive targets for the County to meet.

Table 5-1 describes several recommended program measures for the County. These measures were developed based on known baseline conditions. When given, goal targets are developed based on reasonable expectations within the time frame. As new baseline information is made available, and the County implements more of the Plan, the measures of effectiveness should be re-evaluated, revised, and updated. The County of Los Angeles should regularly review the progress made toward these goals.

Table 5-1: Program Measures of Effectiveness

Measure	Existing Benchmark (if available)	Target	
Bicycle mode share	Existing County bicycle mode share estimated to be 1.86%.	Increase bicycle mode share in the County to 2.5% within 5 years.	
Public attitudes about biking in the County of Los Angeles	A survey geared specifically toward attitudes of bikers and non-bikers should be developed.	Increase bikeway-related public service announcements and initiate education and evaluation programs for County staff and the general public within 5 years. All educational material should be accompanied with surveys to gauge shifts in opinion and general knowledge regarding bicycling in the region.	
Number of miles of bike paths, lanes and routes maintained by the County of Los Angeles	Mileage of existing bicycle network: Class I Bike Paths – 100.3 miles Class II Bike Lanes – 20.2 miles Class III Bike Routes – 23.5 miles	Mileage of full build-out of proposed bicycle network: Class I Bike Paths – 170.9 miles Class II Bike Lanes – 286.1 miles Class III Bike Routes – 482.1 miles Bicycle Boulevards – 18.9 miles	
Proportion of arterial streets with bike lanes	8.9 miles out of an estimated 690 miles of County-maintained arterial streets have bike lanes (1.3%).	Within 5 years, increase the proportion of arterial streets with bicycle facilities. Suggested target of 5% to spur greater bicycle commuting (an additional 25 miles of bike lanes on County-maintained arterial roads).	
Independent recognition of non-motorized transportation planning efforts	No bicycle awards to date.	Independent recognition of efforts to promote biking within 3 years. League of American Bicyclists’ Bronze Award within 8 years and Silver or Gold Award within 18 years.	
Number of collisions involving bicyclists and motor vehicles in unincorporated areas	Year	Crashes	Killed
	2004	272	5
	2005	245	2
	2006	209	6
	2007	220	5
	2008	220	5
	2009	203	2

Sources: NHTS (2010); US Census (2000); LACMTA (2010); SWITRS (2010)

5.2 Cost Estimates

Table 5-2 summarizes cost estimates for the proposed bikeway network recommended in the Plan. Unit cost estimates for the Plan were developed by KOA Corporation. The cost of completing the proposed bicycle network is estimated to be about \$76 million for bike path projects, \$251 million for bike lane and bike route projects, and \$0.57 million for bicycle boulevard projects, for a combined total system build-out cost of approximately \$327.6 million. Cost estimates include costs for survey and design, construction, administration, and contingencies. These costs do not include programmatic or project-level environmental review or detailed traffic studies for implementing neighborhood traffic management programs as part of on-road bikeways. Refer to Appendix H for detailed subcomponents of the unit costs.

Table 5-2: Proposed Bicycle Network Cost Estimates

Facility Type	Unit Cost (per mile)	Miles of Un-Built Proposed	Cost Estimate
Class I – Bike Path	Varies	76.1*	\$76,097,000
Class II – Bike Lane	\$40,000	78.4	\$3,136,000
Class II – Bike Lane (curb reconstruction/ raised median)	\$1,700,000	41.8	\$70,996,000
Class II – Bike Lane (widening/ paved shoulder)	\$400,000	85.1	\$34,040,000
Class II – Bike Lane (road diet)	\$165,000	68.6	\$11,318,000
Class III – Bike Route	\$15,000	88.4	\$1,327,000
Class III – Bike Route (sharrows)	\$25,000	40.0	\$1,000,000
Class III – Bike Route (widening/ paved shoulder)	\$400,000	330.3	\$132,114,000
Bicycle Boulevard	\$30,000 ³⁷	22.8	\$685,000
Totals		831.4	\$330,713,000

Source: KOA Corporation, August 2010

* This total includes 4.9 miles of on-street Class III connections for some proposed Bike Paths.

³⁷ This unit is a base cost and does not include the potential need for intersection treatments.

5.3 Implementation Plan

The following sections describe the implementation plan for the proposed bikeway network, as well as the programs recommended in the Plan.

5.3.1 Bikeway Network Phasing and Implementation Plan

Prioritization Process

The bicycle network was prioritized based on key indicators of demand, deficiencies, and implementation factors in order to guide network implementation phasing. The project prioritization was completed in a two-phase process, the first of which focused on factors related to people’s propensity to use the proposed network (utility factors) and a second phase that addressed key implementation factors. The utility prioritization factors include connections to existing and proposed bikeway network; connections to key destinations such as schools, libraries, parks, recreation centers, and transit hubs; lack of existing bikeways; bicycle crashes; and community support of the proposed facilities obtained through the public outreach process.

Table 5-3 summarizes the utility prioritization factors and point values assigned to each proposed bikeway throughout the County of Los Angeles, which were developed to measure the overall usefulness and utility of the proposed bikeway projects. These prioritization factors were finalized after extensive review and input from members of the Bicycle Advisory Committee and the Technical Advisory Committee. For a more detailed description of the prioritization approach, refer to Appendix I.

Table 5-3: Bicycle Network Prioritization Utility Factors and Points

Utility Prioritization Factor	Point Range
Connects to Existing Bikeway Facility:	0 to 20
Class I Bike Path = 20 points	
Class II/III On-Street Bikeway = 15 points	
Connects to Proposed Bikeway Facility	0 or 10
Alternative Route Availability	0 or 10
Connects to University	0 or 20
Connects to Transit Station	0 or 20
Connects to K-12 School	0 to 20
High Employment Density	0 or 10
Connects to Park, Library or Recreational Facility	0 to 20
High Rate of Collisions	0 or 5
High Rate of Zero Vehicle Households	0 or 10
Public Input	0 to 10
Maximum Total Points	155

Source: Alta Planning + Design, 2011

The second phase of the prioritization process focused on implementation-oriented factors, such as project cost, project coordination, travel lane and parking removal, and other considerations. These prioritization factors are intended to measure issues, challenges, and the “degree of difficulty” of implementing the proposed

bikeway projects. Table 5-4 summarizes these implementation-oriented prioritization factors and describes the scoring process that was utilized for each factor.

Finally, the project scores from the two prioritization phases described above were tabulated to generate an overall project score for each project. All projects were ranked numerically based upon their respective overall project scores.

Table 5-4: Bicycle Network Prioritization Implementation Factors and Points

Implementation Prioritization Factor	Point Range
Project Cost was ranked as follows:	
Less than \$100,000 = 20 points	0 to 20
\$100,000 to \$500,000 = 15 points	
\$500,000 to \$1,500,000 = 10 points	
\$1,500,000 to \$3,000,000 = 5 points	
Greater than \$3,000,000 = 0 points	
Project Coordination	0 or 10
Requires Travel Lane Removal	0 or 5
Requires Reduction in Width of Landscaped Median	0 or 5
Requires Street Widening of Paved Surface	0 or 5
Requires Parking Removal	0 or 5
Maximum Total Points	50

Source: Alta Planning + Design, 2011

5.3.2 Bikeway Network Implementation Plan

The proposed bikeway projects were grouped into three phases primarily based on the overall prioritization score for each project and the anticipated available funding. Projects for which funding has already been allocated, or which are expected to be implemented in conjunction with County road reconstruction and/or rehabilitation projects may be shown in an earlier phase, regardless of their prioritization score. The implementation timeline for the three phases is shown below:

- Phase I: Projects listed are anticipated to be implemented within the first five-year period following adoption of the Plan (2012-2017).
- Phase II: Projects listed are anticipated to be implemented within the ten-year period following Phase I (2017-2027).
- Phase III: Projects listed are anticipated to be implemented within the final five-year period of the term of the Plan (2027-2032).

Table 5-5 lists the projects in Phase I. Refer to Appendix I for more information on the phasing and a list of all projects in the three phases.

Table 5-5: Phase I Projects

Segment	From	To	Class	Planning Area
N. Sunset Avenue	Amar Road	Temple Avenue	2	East San Gabriel Valley
Workman Mill Road	San Jose Creek Bicycle Path	Strong Avenue	2	Gateway
Woods Avenue	1st Avenue	Olympic Boulevard	BB	Metro
Cesar Chavez	Mednik Avenue	Roscommon	2/3	Metro
Crocket Boulevard	76th Place	83rd Street	3	Metro
Hawthorne Boulevard	104th Street.	111 Street	2	South Bay
Redondo Bch Boulevard	Prairie Avenue	Crenshaw Boulevard	2	South Bay
Madre Street / Muscatel	San Pasqual	Longden Drive	3	West San Gabriel Valley
Del Mar Boulevard	Pasadena City Limit	Rosemead Avenue	3	West San Gabriel Valley
San Jose Creek	7th Avenue	Murchison Avenue	1	East San Gabriel Valley
Normandie Avenue	98th Street	El Segundo Boulevard	2	Metro
E. 68th Street	Central Avenue	Compton Avenue	3	Metro
Maie Avenue / Miramonte Boulevard	Slauson Avenue	92nd Street	BB	Metro
Redondo Beach Boulevard	S Figueroa Street	Avalon Boulevard	2	Metro
Florence Avenue	Central Avenue	Mountain View Avenue	2	Metro
Vermont Avenue	87th Street	El Segundo Boulevard	2	Metro
Rosemont Avenue	Rockdell Street	Honolulu Avenue	3	San Fernando Valley
Budlong Avenue	N County Border	El Segundo Boulevard	BB	Metro
El Segundo Boulevard	Figueroa	Central	2	Metro
Compton Avenue	Slauson Avenue	92nd Street	2	Metro
Broadway	E. 121st Street	E. Alondra Boulevard	2	Metro
Firestone Boulevard	Central Avenue	Alameda Street	2	Metro
Imperial Hwy	Van Ness Avenue	Vermont Street	2	Metro
La Crescenta Avenue	Orange Avenue	Foothill Boulevard	3	San Fernando Valley
111th Street	Buford Avenue	Prairie Avenue	3	South Bay
Allen Avenue	Pinecrest Drive.	New York Drive	3	West San Gabriel Valley
Pathfinder Road	Paso Real Avenue	Alexdale Lane	2	East San Gabriel Valley
Vineland Avenue	Nelson Avenue	Proposed bike path	3	East San Gabriel Valley
Killian Avenue	Paso Real Avenue	Otterbien	3	East San Gabriel Valley
Paso Real Avenue	Colima Road	Pathfinder Road	3	East San Gabriel Valley
Denker Avenue	Century Boulevard	Imperial Hwy	3	Metro
Holmes Avenue	Slauson Avenue	Gage Avenue	2	Metro
Rosecrans Avenue	Figueroa Street	Central Avenue	2	Metro
Manhattan Beach Boulevard	Prairie	Crenshaw	2	South Bay
Eaton Wash Channel	New York Drive	Rio Hondo Bikeway	1/3	West San Gabriel Valley
30th Street West	Avenue M	Avenue 0-12	2	Antelope Valley
Los Padres Drive/ Jellick Avenue	Greenbay Drive	Aguiro Street	3	East San Gabriel Valley

Table 5-5: Phase I Projects (continued)

Segment	From	To	Class	Planning Area
Amar Road	Vineland Avenue	N. Puente Avenue	2	East San Gabriel Valley
W Gladstone Street	Blender Street	Big Dalton Wash	3	East San Gabriel Valley
Ford Boulevard	Floral Drive	Olympic Boulevard	3	Metro
Hazard Avenue	City Terrace Drive	Cesar Chavez Avenue	3	Metro
6th Street	Ford Boulevard	Harding Avenue	3	Metro
92nd Street E	Central Avenue	Alameda Street	3	Metro
Nadeau Street / Broadway	Central Avenue	E County Border	2	Metro
Altura Avenue	La Crescenta Avenue	Rosemount Avenue	3	San Fernando Valley
La Crescenta Avenue	Foothill Boulevard	Montrose Avenue	3	San Fernando Valley
104th Street	Buford Avenue	Prairie Avenue	3	South Bay
Marine Avenue	Gerkin Avenue	Crenshaw Boulevard	3	South Bay
Balan Rd / Annandel Avenue	Cul-de-sac s/o Pathfinder Rd	Brea Canyon Cut Off Rd	3	East San Gabriel Valley
Batson Avenue	Colima Rd	Dragonera Drive	3	East San Gabriel Valley
Nogales Street	La Puente Road	Hollingworth Street	2	East San Gabriel Valley
Pathfinder Road	Fullerton Road	Paso Real Avenue	2	East San Gabriel Valley
Fullerton Road	Colima Road	Pathfinder Road	2	East San Gabriel Valley
Whiteside Street	Hebert Avenue	Eastern Avenue	3	Metro
Seville Avenue	E. Florence Avenue	Broadway	2	Metro
Pico Canyon Rd	The Old Road	Whispering Oaks	2	Santa Clarita Valley
Normandie Avenue	225th Street	Sepulveda Boulevard	2	South Bay
Longden Avenue	8th Avenue	Peck Road	3	West San Gabriel Valley
Holliston Avenue	S County Border	Altadena Drive	3	West San Gabriel Valley
Fiji Way	0.7 Miles South of Lincoln Boulevard	Lincoln Boulevard	3,2	Westside
Fiji Way	Lincoln Boulevard	Admiralty Way	3	Westside
Elizabeth Lake Rd	10th Street	Dianron Rd	2	Antelope Valley
170th Street E	Avenue M	Palmdale Boulevard	2	Antelope Valley
Nogales Street	Arenth Avenue	Pathfinder Rd	2	East San Gabriel Valley
Pathfinder Road	Alexdale Lane	Canyon Ridge Road	2	East San Gabriel Valley
Mills Avenue	Telegraph Rd	Lambert Rd	2	Gateway
Mednik Avenue	Floral Drive	Olympic Boulevard	2	Metro
124th Street E	Slater Avenue	Alameda Street	3	Metro
Whitter Boulevard	Indiana Street	Ford Boulevard	3	Metro
Success Avenue/Slater Avenue	Imperial Hwy	El Segundo Boulevard	3	Metro
Avalon Boulevard	121st Street	E Alondra Boulevard	2	Metro
Briggs Avenue	Shields Street	Foothill Boulevard	3	San Fernando Valley
Las Virgenes Rd / Malibu Canyon Rd	Mureau Rd	Pacific Coast Hwy	3	Santa Monica Mountains

Table 5-5: Phase I Projects (continued)

Segment	From	To	Class	Planning Area
Lennox Boulevard.	Felton Avenue	Osage Avenue	3	South Bay
Daines Drive/ Lynd Avenue	Santa Anita Avenue	Mayflower Avenue	3	West San Gabriel Valley
Lake Avenue	Loma Alta Drive	S County Border	3	West San Gabriel Valley
Sierra Hwy	915' s/o Avenue	Pearlblossom Hwy	2	Antelope Valley
Mauna Loa Avenue	Citrus Avenue	E County Border	3	East San Gabriel Valley
Colima Rd	Mulberry Drive	Poulter Drive	3	Gateway
Whitter Boulevard	Ford Boulevard	Via Clemente Street	3	Metro
Imperial Hwy	Central Avenue	Wilmington	2	Metro
Alondra Boulevard	Figueroa Street	Avalon Boulevard	2	Metro
Mureau Rd	Las Virgenes Road	Calabasas Rd	2	Santa Monica Mountains
S Freeman Avenue	W 104th Street	W 111th Street	3	South Bay
S. Lemoli Avenue	Marine Avenue	Manhattan Beach Boulevard	3	South Bay
Doty Avenue	Marine Avenue	Manhattan Beach Boulevard	3	South Bay
Aviation Boulevard	Imperial Hwy	154th Street	2	South Bay
Huntington Drive	San Gabriel Boulevard	Michillinda Avenue	2	West San Gabriel Valley
Sierra Madre Villa Avenue	I-210	Green Street	3	West San Gabriel Valley
Avenue L-8	65th Street West	60th Street West	2	Antelope Valley
Willow Avenue	Amar Rd	Francisquito Avenue	3	East San Gabriel Valley
Las Lomitas Drive / Newton Street	Vallecito Drive	Hacienda Boulevard	3	East San Gabriel Valley
Los Robles Avenue	7th Avenue	Kwis Avenue	3	East San Gabriel Valley
Fairway Drive / Brea Canyon Cut Off Rd	Walnut Rd	Bickford Drive	2	East San Gabriel Valley
Glendora Avenue	Arrow Hwy	Cienega Avenue	2	East San Gabriel Valley
Ceres Avenue	Broadway	Telegraph Rd	3	Gateway
Mulberry Drive	Greenbay Drive	Colima Road	2	Gateway
Atlantic Avenue	Rosecrans Avenue	Alondra Boulevard	3	Gateway
E. Victoria Street	S. Santa Fe Avenue	Susana Road	2	Gateway
Compton Boulevard	Harris Avenue	LA River Bikeway	2	Gateway
Leffingwell Rd	Imperial Hwy	Scott Avenue	2	Gateway
Rowan Avenue	Floral	Olympic Boulevard	BB	Metro
120th Street	Central Avenue	Wilmington	2	Metro
Willowbrook Avenue	Imperial Hwy	119th street	1	Metro
The Old Rd	Sloan Canyon Road	Weldon Cyn Rd	2	Santa Clarita Valley
Duarte Rd	San Gabriel Boulevard	Sultana Avenue	3	West San Gabriel Valley
San Gabriel Boulevard/ Hill Drive	Graves Avenue	Lincoln Avenue	2	West San Gabriel Valley

Table 5-5: Phase I Projects (continued)

Segment	From	To	Class	Planning Area
Emerald Necklace Gateway	San Gabriel River Path	Park entrance (parking lot)	1	West San Gabriel Valley
San Jose Creek	Workman Mill Rd	San Gabriel River Bikeway	1	East San Gabriel Valley
Bouquet Canyon Road	Hob Ct	Elizabeth Lake Rd	3	Santa Clarita Valley
Rosemead Boulevard	Colorado	Callita Street	2	West San Gabriel Valley

5.3.3 Programs Phasing and Implementation Plan

The multitude of programs recommended in Chapter 4 are a relatively low-cost and highly effective method for promoting public awareness of bicycling and adding to the safety and enjoyment of bicyclists in the County. The programs have been grouped into two tiers; Tier I includes programs that can be implemented within a year of Plan adoption, and Tier II includes the remaining programs which are anticipated to be implemented within the five-year period following Tier I. Table 5-6 lists the programs in each tier, and provides additional information for the programs, such as the timeframe for implementation; the entity most appropriate for initiating and overseeing the program (noted as “Lead Agency”); the nexus between the recommended program with the goals, policies and implementation actions outlined in Chapter 2; and a list of potential funding sources for implementing the program.

While the majority of infrastructure projects fall within the exclusive jurisdiction of the County, many program recommendations can fall under the banner of outside agencies, local and regional nonprofit organizations and, in some cases, private sector partners. A collaborative approach to implementing and sustaining bicycling programs will contribute to the broader vision of improving bicycling conditions in the County and fostering a strong bicycle advocacy community and bicycle culture.

Table 5-6: Program Implementation Recommendations

Program	Nexus with Chapter 2	Timeframe	Lead Agency	Possible Funding Sources
Tier I Programs				
Community Bicycle Education Courses	<i>Goal 3 – Education</i> Offer bicycle skills, bicycle safety classes and bicycle repair workshops. (IA3.1.1)	Ongoing	DPW & DPH	Center for Disease Control (CDC) - Community Transformation Grants
Youth Bicycle Safety Education Classes	<i>Goal 3 – Education</i> Offer bicycle skills, bicycle safety classes and bicycle repair workshops. (IA3.1.1)	Annual	DPW, DPH & LACOE	Safe Routes to School – Federal and State

Table 5-6: Programs Implementation Recommendations (continued)

Program	Nexus with Chapter 2	Timeframe	Lead Agency	Possible Sources	Funding
Bicycle Rodeos	<i>Goal 3 – Education</i> Offer bicycle skills, bicycle safety classes and bicycle repair workshops. (IA3.1.1)	Biannual. In conjunction with Bike Month events and Summer Out-of-School programs.	DPW & DPH	CDC - Community Transformation Grants	
Suggested Routes to School	<i>Goal 3 – Education</i> Create Safety Education Campaigns aimed at bicyclists and motorists. (P 3.2)	Ongoing.	DPW	Safe Routes to School – Federal and State	
Family Biking Programs	<i>Goal 4: Encouragement</i> Support organized rides or cycling events. (P 4.1)	Ongoing. In coordination with regular bicycle events.	DPW	CDC or other health grant programs	
Bicycling Maps	<i>Goal 4: Encouragement</i> Develop maps and wayfinding signage and striping to assist navigating the regional bikeways. (P 4.3)	One time with regular updates.	DPW	CMAQ - Surface Transportation Program	
Bike to Work Week/Month	<i>Goal 4: Encouragement</i> Promote Bike to Work Day/Month among County employees. (IA 4.2.1)	Annual.	DPW	General transportation fund; local donations	
Launch Parties for New Bikeways	<i>Goal 5: Community Support</i> Maintain efforts to gauge community interest and needs on bicycle-related issues. (P 5.3)	As new bikeways are built.	DPW	General transportation fund; local donations	
Bike and Hike to Park Programs	<i>Goal 4: Encouragement</i> Support organized rides or cycling events. (P 4.1)	Ongoing.	DPW & DPR	CDC - Community Transformation Grants	

Table 5-6: Programs Implementation Recommendations (continued)

Program	Nexus with Chapter 2	Timeframe	Lead Agency	Possible Sources	Funding
Community Stakeholder Group	<i>Goal 5: Community Support</i> Establish a community stakeholder group to assist with the implementation of the Bicycle Master Plan. (IA 5.1.1)	Ongoing.	DPW	N/A	
Annual Progress Report	<i>Goal 1: Bikeway System</i> Measure the effectiveness of the Bikeway Plan Implementation. (IA 1.5.1)	Annual.	DPW	N/A	
Bicycle Counts	<i>Goal 2: Safety</i> Conduct biennial counts. (IA 2.4.2)	Biennial.	DPW	Federal transportation funding, such as Transportation Enhancements or mini grants	
Tier II Programs					
Share the Path Campaign	<i>Goal 3- Education</i> Create safety education campaigns aimed at bicyclists and motorists. (P 3.2)	Ongoing. Host one event in the Summer.	DPW & DPR	General transportation fund; federal funding; can use volunteers for outreach	
Public Awareness Campaigns	<i>Goal 3- Education</i> Develop communication materials aimed to improve safety for bicyclists and motorists. (IA 3.1.2)	Every 2 to 4 years.	DPW	General transportation fund; federal funding; donations from transit agencies and advertising/media	
Bicycle Patrol Unit	<i>Goal 2- Safety</i> Support traffic enforcement activities that increase bicyclists' safety. (P 2.3)	Ongoing.	CHP, Sheriff's Dept. and local law enforcement	Law enforcement budgets	
Bicycle Light Enforcement	<i>Goal 2- Safety</i> Encourage targeted enforcement activities in areas with high bicycle and pedestrian volumes. (IA 2.3.2)	Ongoing.	CHP, Sheriff's Dept. and local law enforcement	General transportation fund; law enforcement budgets; federal funding	

Table 5-6: Programs Implementation Recommendations (continued)

Program	Nexus with Chapter 2	Timeframe	Lead Agency	Possible Sources	Funding
Valet Bike Parking at Events	<i>Goal 4: Encouragement</i> Support organized rides or cycling events. (P 4.1)	Ongoing. In coordination with annual bicycle events.	DPW		Mostly volunteer effort
Bicycle Sharing Program	<i>Goal 4: Encouragement</i> Develop a regionally consistent bicycle sharing program for Los Angeles County (IA 4.2.4)	Ongoing.	DPW	LACMTA	
Local Partnerships for More Bicycle Parking	<i>Goal 1: Bikeway System</i> Ensure the provision of convenient and secure end-of-trip facilities at key destinations. (IA 1.4.3)	Ongoing.	DPW		General transportation fund; donations from transit agencies and local businesses

5.4 Funding Sources

This section explores the available funding opportunities for implementing the proposed bikeway network from Chapter 3. It is important to note that the County will pursue funding for education, encouragement, enforcement, and monitoring and evaluation programs along with the proposed bikeway projects as implementation of the Plan moves forward. Potential funding sources for bicycle projects, programs, and plans can be found at all levels of government. This section covers federal, state, and regional sources of bicycle funding, as well as some non-traditional funding sources that may be used for bicycle projects. All the projects are recommended for implementation over the next five to 20 years, or as funding is available. The more expensive projects may take longer to implement. In addition, many funding sources are highly competitive. Therefore, it is not possible to determine exactly which projects will be funded by which funding sources. The information in Table 5-7 below is intended as a general guide to funding sources. County staff should refer to current guidelines provided by the granting agency when pursuing any funding opportunity.

Table 5-7: Bikeway Improvements Funding Source Summary

Funding Source	Due Date*	Administering Agency	Annual Total	Matching Requirement	Eligible Applicants	Planning	Infrastructure	Other	Comments
Federally-Administered Funding									
Transportation, Community and System Preservation Program**	Varies, generally January or February.	Federal Transit Administration	\$204 million nationally in 2009	20%	States, MPOs, local governments and tribal agencies	X	X	X	Because TCSP program is one of many programs authorized under SAFETEA-LU, current funding has only been extended through March 4 of 2011, and program officials are not currently accepting applications for 2011. In most years, Congress has identified projects to be selected for funding through the TCSP program. TAMC will need to work with AMBAG, Caltrans and Members of Congress to gain access to this funding.
Federal Lands Highway Programs**	Not available	Federal Highway Administration	\$1,019 million nationally in 2009	Not applicable	States	X	X	-	Grant funds are allocated for highways, roads, and parkways (which can include bicycle and pedestrian facilities) and transit facilities that provide access to or within public lands, national parks, and Indian reservations.
Rivers, Trails and Assistance Program	Aug 1 for the following fiscal year	National Parks Service	Program staff time is awarded.	Not applicable	Public agencies	-	-	X	RTCA staff provides technical assistance to communities to conserve rivers, preserve open space, and develop trails and greenways. The program provides only for planning assistance – there are no implementation monies available.

Table 5-7: Bikeway Improvements Funding Source Summary (continued)

Funding Source	Due Date*	Administering Agency	Annual Total	Matching Requirement	Eligible Applicants	Planning	Infrastructure	Other	Comments
Partnership for Sustainable Communities	Not applicable	Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT)	Varies	Not applicable	Varies by grant	X	X	X	Though not a formal agency, the Partnership for Sustainable Communities is a joint project of the EPA, the HUD, and the USDOT. One goal of the project is to expand transportation options that improve air quality and public health, which has already resulted in several new grant opportunities (including TIGER I and TIGER II grants). The County should track communications and be prepared to respond proactively to announcements of new grant programs.
Surface Transportation Program**	Not available	Federal Highway Administration	\$6,577 million nationally in 2009	Not applicable	States and local governments	X	X	X	Grants fund projects on any federal-aid highway. Bicycle and pedestrian improvements include on-street facilities, off-street paths, sidewalks, crosswalks, bicycle and pedestrian signals, parking, and other ancillary facilities. Non-construction projects, such as maps, bicycle/pedestrian coordinator positions, and encouragement programs are eligible. The modification of sidewalks to comply with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is also an eligible activity.

Table 5-7: Bikeway Improvements Funding Source Summary (continued)

Funding Source	Due Date*	Administering Agency	Annual Total	Matching Requirement	Eligible Applicants	Planning	Infrastructure	Other	Comments
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)**	Not available	Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration	\$1,777 million nationally in 2009	Not applicable	States and Metropolitan Planning Organizations in air quality non-attainment and maintenance areas	X	X	X	Funds are allocated for transportation projects that aim to reduce transportation related emissions. Funds can be used for construction of bicycle transportation facilities and pedestrian walkways or for non-construction projects related to safe bicycling and walking (i.e. maps and brochures).
Transportation Enhancements**	Not available	Federal Highway Administration	10 percent of State Transportation Program funds	Not applicable	States	X	X	X	Funds are a set-aside of Surface Transportation Program (STP) monies designated for Transportation Enhancement (TE) activities, which include the pedestrians and bicycles facilities, safety and educational activities for pedestrians and bicyclists, and the preservation of abandoned railway corridors (including the conversion and use thereof for pedestrian and bicycle trails).
Highway Safety Improvement Program**	October	Federal Highway Administration	\$1,296 million nationally in 2009	Varies between 0% and 10%	City, county or federal land manager	X	X	X	Funds projects on publicly-owned roadways or bicycle/pedestrian pathways or trails that address a safety issue and may include education and enforcement programs. This program includes the Railroad-Highway Crossings and High Risk Rural Roads programs.

Table 5-7: Bikeway Improvements Funding Source Summary (continued)

Funding Source	Due Date*	Administering Agency	Annual Total	Matching Requirement	Eligible Applicants	Planning	Infrastructure	Other	Comments
Community Development Block Grants	Varies between grants	U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	\$42.8 m	Varies between grants	City, county	X	X	X	Funds local community development activities such as affordable housing, anti-poverty programs, and infrastructure development. Can be used to build sidewalks and recreational facilities.
Recreational Trails Program**	October	CA Dept. of Parks and Recreation	\$1.3 m in 2010	12%	Agencies and organizations that manage public lands	X	X	X	Provides funds to states for acquisition of easements for trails from willing sellers, maintenance and restoration of existing trails, construction of new paved or unpaved trails, and operation of educational programs to promote safety and environmental protection related to trails.
Federal Safe Routes to School**	Mid-July	Federal Highway Administration	Max. funding cap for infrastructure project: \$1 million. Max funding cap for non-infrastructure project: 500,000	Not applicable	State, city, county, MPOs, RTPAs and other organizations that partner with one of the above.	X	X	X	Grant funds for infrastructure and non-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. 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.

Table 5-7: Bikeway Improvements Funding Source Summary (continued)

Funding Source	Due Date*	Administering Agency	Annual Total	Matching Requirement	Eligible Applicants	Planning	Infrastructure	Other	Comments
Community Transformation Grant	July	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention	\$50,000-10,000,000 per applicant	Not applicable	State and local governmental agencies, tribes and territories, and national and community-based organizations	X	-	X	Funding is available to support evidence and practice-based community and clinical prevention and wellness strategies that will lead to specific, measurable health outcomes to reduce chronic disease rates. Bicycle and pedestrian improvements are applicable as they encourage physical activity, which has been proven to reduce the risks of diseases associated with inactivity.
State-Administered Funding									
Bicycle Transportation Account	March	Caltrans	\$7.2 million	Minimum 10% local match on construction	Public agencies	X	X	X	Funds bicycle projects that improve safety and convenience of bicycle commuters. In addition to construction and planning, funds may be used for right of way acquisition.
California Safe Routes to School	Varies	Caltrans	\$24.5 million	10%	Cities and counties	-	X	X	SR2S is primarily a construction program to enhance safety of pedestrian and bicycle facilities near schools.
State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)	December	Caltrans	Varies	Not applicable	Cities	X	X	X	The STIP is a multi-year capital improvement program of transportation projects on and off the State Highway System, funded with revenues from the Transportation Investment Fund and other funding sources.
State Coastal Conservancy	Rolling	State Coastal Conservancy	Varies	Not applicable	Public agencies, non-profit organizations	X	X	X	Projects must be in accordance with Division 21 and meet the goals and objectives of the Conservancy's strategic plan. More information can be found at http://scc.ca.gov/applying-for-grants-and-assistance/forms .

Table 5-7: Bikeway Improvements Funding Source Summary (continued)

Funding Source	Due Date*	Administering Agency	Annual Total	Matching Requirement	Eligible Applicants	Planning	Infrastructure	Other	Comments
Community Based Transportation Planning	March	Caltrans	\$3 million	20%	MPO, city, county	-	X	-	Eligible projects that exemplify livable community concepts including enhancing bicycle and pedestrian access.
Land and Water Conservation Fund	March	NPS, CA Dept. of Parks and Recreation	\$2.3 million in CA in 2009	50% + 2-6% administration surcharge	Cities, counties and districts authorized to operate, acquire, develop and maintain park and recreation facilities	X	-	X	Fund provides matching grants to state and local governments for the acquisition and development of land for outdoor recreation areas. Lands acquired through program must be retained in perpetuity for public recreational use. Individual project awards are not available. The Department of Parks and Recreation levies a surcharge for administering the funds. The LCWF could fund the development of river-adjacent bicycle facilities.
Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program	October	California Natural Resources Agency	\$10 million	Not applicable	Federal, State, local agencies and MPO	-	X	X	Support projects that offset environmental impacts of modified or new public transportation facilities. These projects can include highway landscaping and urban forestry projects, roadside recreation projects, and projects to acquire or enhance resource lands. EEMP funds projects in California, at an annual project average of \$250,000. Funds may be used for land acquisition.

Table 5-7: Bikeway Improvements Funding Source Summary (continued)

Funding Source	Due Date*	Administering Agency	Annual Total	Matching Requirement	Eligible Applicants	Planning	Infrastructure	Other	Comments
State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP)	Not Available	Caltrans	\$1.69 million statewide annually through FY 2013/14	Not Available	Local and regional agencies	-	X	X	Capital improvements and maintenance projects that relate to maintenance, safety and rehabilitation of state highways and bridges.
Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) Grants	January	Caltrans	Varies annually - \$82 million statewide in FY 2009/2010	Not applicable	Government agencies, state colleges, state universities, city, county, school district, fire department, public emergency service provider	-	-	X	Funds are used to establish new traffic safety programs, expand ongoing programs, or address deficiencies in current programs. Bicycle safety is included in the list of traffic safety priority areas. Grant funding cannot replace existing program expenditures, nor can traffic safety funds be used for program maintenance, research, rehabilitation, or construction. Evaluation criteria to assess needs include potential traffic safety impact, collision statistics and rankings, seriousness of problems, and performance on previous OTS grants.

Table 5-7: Bikeway Improvements Funding Source Summary (continued)

Funding Source	Due Date*	Administering Agency	Annual Total	Matching Requirement	Eligible Applicants	Planning	Infrastructure	Other	Comments
Regional- and Local-Administered Funding									
Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 (SB 821)	January	LACMTA	Varies	Not applicable	Cities and counties	-	X	X	Funds are a percentage of the state sales tax given annually to local jurisdictions for bicycle and pedestrian projects. Funds may be used for engineering expenses leading to construction, right-of-way acquisition, construction and reconstruction, retrofitting existing facilities, route improvements, and bicycle support facilities.
Metro Call for Projects (CFP)***	January	LA Metro	Varies annually	Not applicable	Public agencies that provide transportation facilities or services within Los Angeles County	X	X	X	Co-funds new regionally significant capital projects that improve all modes of surface transportation. Relevant categories include Bikeway Improvements; Regional Surface Transportation Improvements; Transportation Enhancement Activities; Transportation Demand Management; and Pedestrian Improvements.
Proposition A	N/A	LA County	Varies	Not applicable	Cities and unincorporated communities in LA County				A half-cent sales tax dedicated to transportation funding. One-fourth of the funds go to Local Return Programs. The monies help these entities develop and improve local public transit, paratransit, and related transportation infrastructure

Table 5-7: Bikeway Improvements Funding Source Summary (continued)

Funding Source	Due Date*	Administering Agency	Annual Total	Matching Requirement	Eligible Applicants	Planning	Infrastructure	Other	Comments
Proposition C	N/A	LACMTA	Varies	Not applicable	Cities and unincorporated communities in LA County	-	-	-	Revenues are allocated into categories including Rail & Bus Security; Commuter Rail, Transit Centers and Park and Ride Lots; Local Return; and, Transit Related Improvements to Streets and Highways. Supports projects and programs developed with Prop A funds.
Measure R	N/A	LACMTA	Varies	Not applicable	Cities and unincorporated communities in LA County	X	X	X	A half-cent sales tax to finance new transportation projects and programs, and accelerate many of those already in process.
Adopt-A-Trail Programs	Not applicable	Local trail commission or non-profit	Varies	Not applicable	Local governments	-	X	X	These programs used to fund new construction, renovation, trail brochures, informational kiosks and other amenities. These programs can also be extended to include sponsorship of trail segments for maintenance needs.
Other Funding Sources									
Vehicle Impact Fees	Not applicable	LA County	Not Available	Not Available	Local communities affected by development projects	-	X	-	These fees are typically tied to trip generation rates and traffic impacts produced by a proposed project. A developer may reduce or mitigate the number of trips by paying for on- and off-site bikeway improvements that encourage residents to bicycle rather than drive. Establishing a clear connection between the impact fee and the project's impacts is critical.

Table 5-7: Bikeway Improvements Funding Source Summary (continued)

Funding Source	Due Date*	Administering Agency	Annual Total	Matching Requirement	Eligible Applicants	Planning	Infrastructure	Other	Comments
Bikes Belong Grant	Multiple dates throughout year.	Bikes Belong	Not Available	50% minimum	Organizations and agencies	-	X	X	Bikes Belong provides grants for up to \$10,000 with a 50% match that recipients may use towards paths, bridges and parks.
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF)	Multiple dates throughout year.	RWJF	\$2,000 to \$14 M	Not Available	Organizations and agencies	-	X	-	The RWJF funds aim to improve health and health care in the United States. RWJF funds approximately 12 percent of unsolicited projects. Bicycle and pedestrian projects applying for RWJF funds qualify under the program’s goal to “promote healthy communities and lifestyles.”

* Due dates are subject to change due to pending authorization of a new federal transportation bill.

** Program is one of many programs authorized under SAFETEA-LU and current funding has only been extended through March 31, 2012.

*** Refer to Table 5-8 for more information on eligible project types

Regional Funding Sources

LACMTA is responsible for allocating discretionary federal, state, and local transportation funds to improve all modes of surface transportation. LACMTA 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), LACMTA accepts Call applications in several modal categories. Funding levels for each of the modes is established by mode share as determined by the LACMTA Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). As of the writing of this Plan, the Call 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 may submit applications proposing projects for funding. LACMTA staff ranks eligible projects and presents preliminary scores for approval to LACMTA's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), which is made up of members of public agencies and the LACMTA's Board of Directors. Upon approval, the TIP is updated and formally transmitted to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and the California Transportation Commission (CTC) planning agencies. The TIP then becomes part of the five-year program of projects scheduled for implementation in the County of Los Angeles.

The modal categories relevant to the implementation of bicycle projects and programs are Bikeway Improvements, Regional Surface Transportation Improvements (RSTI), Transportation Enhancements Activation (TEA), and Transportation Demand Management (TDM). Typically, funding provided for bicycle improvements under the Call comes from different sources including SAFETEA-LU, Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), Transportation Enhancement (TE), and CMAQ. Wherever possible, projects from this Plan should be included as part of larger arterial improvement projects and submitted under the RSTI category. Other regional funding sources include the Policies for Livable, Active Communities and Environments (PLACE) grant, and the Regional Parks and Open Space District (RPOSD) grants. The Los Angeles County Department of Public Health's PLACE Program in 2008 awarded approximately \$100,000 per year over a three-year period to five agencies to initiate policy changes and physical projects to enhance the built environment and increase physical activity among community residents. The funded projects include bicycle plans, a Safe and Healthy Streets Plan, and several bicycle corridor improvements. The RPOSD grants program allocated \$859 million to date for acquisition, development and rehabilitation of open space, and improvement of recreation facilities to several regional agencies within the County. Grant funds from RPOSD are administered through the Specified Project, Per Parcel Discretionary, and Excess Funds Grant Programs.³⁸

Table 5-8 provides information on each of the relevant modal categories within the LACMTA Call for Projects as of 2011.

³⁸ For more information about RPOSD grants refer to: *Grant Program Procedural Guide, June 2009. Available at http://openspacedistrict.lacounty.info/cms1_139608.pdf*

Table 5-8: LACMTA Call for Projects (Bicycle Related)

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 (RSTI)	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 (TEA)	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 (TDM)	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 biennial (every other year) based on the approved funding from the 2009 Call.

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

See http://www.metro.net/projects_studies/call_projects/images/2011-Call-for-Projects-Application.pdf

Under the 2011 Draft Guidelines, the following projects are eligible for Bikeways Improvement funding:

- Bicycle parking (racks or lockers); membership-based attended or unattended high-capacity bicycle-parking facility (20 spaces and above) at major destinations or transit stations (examples are: store fronts, bike rooms, or sheltered rack parking with bicycle-information kiosk).
- On-street improvements to increase bicycle access to transit hubs (see 2006 BTSP Section 3 for bike-transit hubs).
- Wayfinding and directional signage to major destinations and transit stations, as part of a larger bikeway project.
- Bike sharing programs.

- Road diet (lane reduction to add bike lanes, center left-turn lanes, and intersection improvements for bikes – be aware that this cannot be on a street that received RSTI funds to widen for car lanes in the last seven years).
- Class II bike lanes or Class I bike path projects that improve continuity to other bicycle facilities (i.e., gap closures).
- Enhanced Class III bike routes or bicycle priority streets (i.e., bicycle boulevards) that modify a roadway to prioritize bicycle throughput and divert cut-through motor traffic (treatments such as signage, pavement legends, roundabouts, diverters, curb extensions, highly visible crossings, stop signs or cross streets, etc.).
- Sharrows on identified bike routes (see Caltrans Traffic Operations Policy Directive 05-10).

This page intentionally left blank.