

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

Date: March 3, 2011

To: The City Council, City of Los Angeles
c/o City Clerk, Room 395, City Hall
Attention: Honorable Bill Rosendahl, Chair
Transportation Committee

From: Amir Sedadi, Interim General Manager
Department of Transportation

Subject: **MEASURE R LOCAL RETURN FUNDS – ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON
THE PROPOSED BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS (COUNCIL FILE
10-0600-S49)**

SUMMARY

At its meeting on December 8, 2010, the Transportation Committee heard a report from the City Administrative Officer which listed proposed projects for the unallocated Measure R Local Return (LR) funds and conceptual expenditure plans for the Measure R LR allocations for the bicycle and pedestrian programs. The Transportation Committee directed the Department of Transportation (DOT) to report back with more detailed information regarding the specific bicycle and pedestrian projects to be implemented using Measure R LR bicycle and pedestrian program funds.

DOT, in cooperation with other City departments, developed citywide bicycle and pedestrian projects that would either promote the use of these alternative modes of travel or further enhance the safety of these modes. The proposed bicycle projects, comprised of bicycle lanes, friendly streets, parking/racks, and sharrows, are consistent with those in the recently approved City Bicycle Plan. The proposed pedestrian projects consist of a Safe Routes to School Study, pedestrian devices and transit stop enhancements. The Safe Routes to Schools Study will include a strategy and work plan to evaluate and implement Safe Routes to Schools projects citywide at elementary and middle schools. The pedestrian devices include signal improvements at intersections that yield the greatest benefit when compared to their cost, based on accident data. Finally, the proposed transit stop enhancements are intended to be implemented in each council district with specific locations to be determined in coordination with DOT, Public Works and City Council offices.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the City Council, subject to the concurrence of the Mayor:

1. AUTHORIZE the Controller to transfer appropriations, totaling \$2,674,625, within the Measure R LR Fund No. 51Q/94, Account No. G306, to the following bicycle program accounts (some account numbers to be determined) as follows:

Bicycle Lanes	\$1,100,000
Bicycle Friendly Streets	\$ 824,625
Bicycle Parking/Racks	\$ 300,000
Sharrows Pavement Markings	\$ 250,000

Bicycle Program Salaries	
Fund 100/94, Overtime Account 1090	\$ 150,000
Fund 100/94, Salaries Account 1010	<u>\$ 50,000</u>
Total	\$2,674,625

2. AUTHORIZE the Controller to transfer appropriations, totaling \$2,674,625, within the Measure R LR Fund No. 51Q/94, Account No. G305, to the following pedestrian program accounts (account numbers to be determined) as follows:

Safe Routes to School Study	\$1,261,000
Pedestrian Safety Devices	\$ 660,000
Transit Stop Enhancements	<u>\$ 753,625</u>
Total	\$2,674,625

3. AUTHORIZE the City Administrative Officer to make any technical adjustments as necessary to implement the above recommendations and instruct the Controller to implement these instructions.

DISCUSSION

The bicycle and pedestrian programs were each allocated \$2,674,625 in the Fiscal Year 2010-2011 Adopted Budget from the Measure R LR Fund. The proposed uses of those funds relative to each category are discussed in detail below.

Bicycle Program

With the recent adoption of the City's Bicycle Plan and approval of a five year implementation program, numerous bicycle lanes, shared pavement markings and friendly streets, consistent with the Bicycle Plan, have been identified to be installed across the City using a combination of funding sources such as Proposition C, Transportation Development Act (TDA) and Measure R LR. DOT plans to use the Measure R LR bicycle program allocation to specifically fund new citywide bicycle lanes, friendly streets, parking areas and racks, sharrow pavement markings, and program administration salaries required to design and implement the aforementioned improvements. The estimated funds required from Measure R to implement the bicycle improvements are shown below:

<u>Bicycle Program</u>	
Bicycle Lanes	\$1,100,000
Bicycle Friendly Streets	\$ 824,625
Bicycle Parking/Racks	\$ 300,000
Sharrows Pavement Markings	\$ 250,000
Bicycle Program Salaries	
Overtime	\$ 150,000
Salaries	<u>\$ 50,000</u>
Total	\$2,674,625

Bicycle Lanes, Friendly Streets and Sharrows Pavement Markings

Bicycle lanes are defined as a portion of the paved area of a road which has been designated by striping, signing and pavement marking for the preferential or exclusive use by bicyclists. It is usually located on major arterials and collector roadways along the edge of the paved area or between the parking lane and first motor vehicle travel lane. Bicycle lanes facilitate predictable behavior and movements between bicyclists and motorists.

Bicycle friendly streets are street improvements made to collector and local roads that parallel major corridors where there is greatest potential to provide continuous bicycle access to neighborhood schools, libraries, parks, and retail areas. These street improvements may include bicycle refuge islands, roundabouts, bicyclist activated crossings, pavement markings, signs, and/or regular traffic signals.

Bicycle shared lane pavement markings (commonly called "sharrows") have been introduced for use in California and may be used as an additional treatment for bicycle route facilities, but are currently only allowed for use in conjunction with on-street parking. The markings can serve a number of purposes, such as reminding bicyclists to ride further from parked cars to prevent "dooring" collisions, making motorists aware of bicycles potentially in the travel lane, and showing bicyclists the correct direction of travel.

DOT, working with City Planning Department, developed a list of bicycle improvement projects that are expected be initiated or installed during the current year. Those projects that have yet to be installed are listed in Table 1. It should be noted that the locations in Table 1 are anticipated to use either use TDA and/or Measure R LR funds. At this time, DOT is unable to identify which locations will use Measure R funds since the price of bicycle improvements vary from project to project. Also, there is a greater need to expend the TDA money prior to Measure R LR because of the funding expiration associated with the funds.

DOT submitted an application to fund bicycle friendly streets in the Metro's 2011 Call for Projects. If the project receives funding, then Measure R LR can be used as the local match. If there is no Call for Projects grant funding, then DOT plans to use Measure R LR funds for two to four bicycle friendly street projects included in Table 1, depending on the cost of improvements for each project.

Bicycle Parking/Racks

DOT Bicycle Program installs bicycle parking/racks citywide in the public right-of-way (City property) to encourage bicycling to shopping, school, and play. Bicycle racks provide secure, convenient, short-term bicycle parking at office buildings, businesses, or stores near public sidewalks. Locations for the installation of bicycle racks can be identified in two ways. The first is a request from the public, in which a city resident or business person may submit a request online to DOT asking for a bicycle rack(s) to be installed in front of a specific location within city limits. The second is identification by DOT Bicycle Program staff. DOT analyzes if it is feasible to install the rack(s) at the requested location (whether the local business is supportive, whether there's space on the sidewalk that won't impact bus or parking zones, etc.), then marks the location for DOT's contractor to install the rack(s). Because the some racks have already been purchased using other funds, and the demand for bike racks is citywide and mainly driven by public requests, specific locations using Measure R LR are not known at this time.

Table 1: Potential Bicycle Improvement Locations Using Measure R LR

CD	Street	1st Cross Street	2nd Cross Street	Bikeway Type
1	Adams Blvd.	Vermont Ave.	Chester Pl.	Sharrows
1	Figueroa St.	SunsetBlvd./Cesar E. Chavez Ave.	US-101 Fwy.	Future Lane
1	1st St.	Boyle Ave.	Lorena St.	Future Lane
1	11th St.	110 Fwy.	Hoover St.	Friendly Street
2	Tuxford St.	Lankershim Blvd.	Glenoaks Blvd.	Future Lane
2	Sheldon St. (South Side)	Glenoaks Blvd.	Wentworth Ave.	Future Lane
3	Reseda Blvd.	Roscoe Blvd.	Parthenia	Future Lane
3	Reseda Blvd.	Vanowen St.	Valerio St.	Sharrows
4	4th St.	Cochran Ave.	Hoover St.	Friendly Street
5	Sepulveda Blvd. (East Side)	Skirball Ctr. Dr.	Bel Air Crest Rd.	Future Lane
5	Westholme Ave.	Santa Monica Blvd.	Hilgard Ave.	Friendly Street
6	Tuxford St.	Lankershim Blvd.	Glenoaks Blvd.	Future Lane
6	Woodman St	Oxnard St.	Vanowven St.	Future Lane
6	Riverside Dr.	Fulton Ave.	Coldwater Cyn. Ave.	Future Lane
6	Foothill Blvd.	Wentworth Ave.		Future Lane
7	Astoria St.	San Fernando Rd.	Foothill Blvd.	Friendly Street
7	Wentworth Ave.	1,373 ft W/O Wheatland Ave.	Foothill Blvd.	Future Lane
7	Sheldon St. (North Side)	Glenoaks Blvd.	Wentworth Ave.	Future Lane
8	Vermont Ave.	1/2 Block S/O Manchester Ave.	Gage Ave.	Future Lane
8	Vermont Ave.	110th St.	88th St.	Future Lane
8	Adams Blvd.	Vermont Ave.	Chester Pl.	Sharrows
8	MLK Jr. Blvd.	Rodeo Rd.	Marlton Ave.	Future Lane
8	Roxton Ave.	Rodeo Rd.	MLK Jr. Blvd.	Friendly Street
8	4th Ave.	MLK Jr. Blvd.	Florence Ave.	Friendly Street
8	48th St.	Crenshaw Blvd.	Normandie Ave.	Future Lane
8	54th St.	4th St.	Normandie Ave.	Friendly Street
9	54th St.	Normandie Ave.	Central Ave.	Friendly Street
10	4th Ave.	Exposition Blvd.	Rodeo Rd.	Friendly Street
11	Abbot Kinney Blvd.	Venice Blvd.	Washington Blvd.	Friendly Street
11	Rose Ave.	Pacific Ave.	Lincoln Blvd.	Future Lane
11	Main St. (Venice)	Winward Ave.	Santa Monica City Limit	Future Lane
11	Washington Pl.	Grandview Blvd.	Mc Laughlin Ave.	Future Lane
11	National Pl.	Malcolm Ave.	Overland Ave.	Future Lane
11	Venice Blvd.	Western Ave.	Crenshaw Blvd.	Future Lane
12	Reseda Blvd.	Valerio St.	Roscoe Blvd.	Future Lane
12	Winnetka Ave.	Plummer St.	Devonshire St.	Future Lane
12	Devonshire St.	Reseda Blvd.	Hayvenhurst Ave.	Future Lane
12	Plummer St.	DeSoto Ave.	Winnetka Ave.	Future Lane
12	Devonshire St.	I-405 Fwy.	Woodman	Future Lane
13	Echo Park Ave.	Morton Ave.	Sunset Blvd.	Friendly Street
13	Echo Park Ave.	Sunset Blvd.	Bellevue Ave.	Friendly Street
13	Fountain Ave.	Western Ave.	Vermont Ave.	Sharrows

CD	Street	1st Cross Street	2nd Cross Street	Bikeway Type
14	Alumni Ave.	Eagle Rock Blvd.	Campus Rd.	Friendly Street
14	York Blvd.	Ave. 56	Figueroa St.	Future Lane
15	Anaheim St.	Gaffey St.	I St	Future Lane
15	Blinn Ave.	Lomita Blvd.	Opp St.	Friendly Street
15	L St.	Figueroa St.	Blinn Ave.	Friendly Street
15	Vermont Ave.	I-105 Fwy.	110th St.	Future Lane

Pedestrian Program

DOT proposes to use the Measure R LR pedestrian program allocation to fund a Safe Routes to Schools Study, pedestrian devices, and transit stop enhancements. The estimated funds required from Measure R LR to implement the pedestrian program are shown below:

<u>Pedestrian Program</u>	
Safe Routes to School Study (Year 1)	\$1,261,000
Pedestrian Devices	\$ 660,000
Transit Stop Enhancements	\$ 753,625
Total	\$2,674,625

Safe Routes to Schools Study

On June 30, 2010, the City Council (CF 08-1751-S1) directed the DOT and the Bureau of Street Services to report on how to develop a comprehensive citywide approach for future State and Federal Safe Routes to School grant funds. Such funds allow the City to strategically focus on projects at schools with the greatest needs.

The City must improve its ability to secure a greater share of the State and Federal school safety grant funds by using a robust, data-driven approach to develop new school safety projects. The State and Federal programs have yet to award the City a proportionate share of the grant funds, from the perspective that the City has 10% of the State population (and 11% of the State’s school age population). Furthermore, the City’s outcome can also be improved by aligning with the apparent preference of the State and Federal programs for projects with comprehensive improvements, not just a traffic control device, at an individual school. Besides Measure R and Safe Routes to School funding, there are also capital improvement funds available from the Federal Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and the Transportation Development Act’s Local Transportation Fund. Notwithstanding potential changes to the Federal transportation funding structure, the most effective way to secure additional funds is to propose competitive, thoughtful applications based on data-driven assessment and recommendations.

The need to address school pedestrian safety in Los Angeles is clearly demonstrated by one of the findings in DOT’s report, “Pedestrian Collision in Los Angeles 1994 through 2000,” which concluded the following:

- Children ages 5 to 9 and adults ages 20 to 49 are most frequently involved in pedestrian-related collisions.
- Children ages 9 and younger accounted for the largest group of pedestrians involved in collisions, about 18% of all collisions.

- The younger school age pedestrians (5 to 14) experienced the highest collision rates (see table 2).

Table 2: Collision Rate per Age Group

Age Groups (Years)	Collision Rate (per 100,000)
0-4	67.1
5-9	113.8
10-14	111.5
15-19	95.4
20-29	78.4
30-39	77.2
40-49	90.5
50-59	94.1
60-69	90.6
70-79	100.0
80-89	98.5
90-99	68.01

**Based on Year 2000 Census*

New York City started a Safe Routes to School initiative in 2002, which is a comprehensive collision data-driven assessment of school safety needs, and has already completed an assessment study and implemented some improvements, as part of the first phase of their project. Their Phase 1 study cost \$2.5 million, which assessed the severity of needs of 1,471 public and private schools that cover the K to 8 grade levels. The Phase 1 study cost \$2.5 million and took four years. The Phase 1 study included a selection of 135 priority schools, for which recommendations for short-term and long-term improvements were developed. New York is currently working on their Phase 2 study, which will include a selection of the next 135 priority schools.

Hence, DOT recommends that a citywide Safe Routes to Schools Study be conducted, which would serve to provide an initial prioritized list of schools as well as recommendations for short and long improvements for a selected number of priority schools with the greatest needs. The methodology for ranking the schools would primarily focus on the severity of the traffic collision patterns surrounding each school site. The scope of the study would concentrate on public and private schools serving the elementary and middle school grade levels. New York's notable effort provides examples of good practices that would be incorporated into a Los Angeles study, but our study would be customized to address unique challenges of Los Angeles' transportation system, land use, and population.

	<u>Los Angeles</u>	<u>New York</u>
Population	3,833,995	8,391,881
Land Area	469 square miles	305 square miles
Miles of public streets	6,500 miles	6,000 miles
Elementary & middle schools (public and private)	Total # of school = 1,166 Elementary schools: 788 Middle schools: 378	Total # of schools = 1,471
<i>*Not including high schools</i>	<i>*Based on recent data for LAUSD and LAUSD charter schools, and old data for private schools.</i>	
Cost of Phase 1 Study	\$2.6 million (estimated)	Methodology & Selection of the 1 st 135 Schools-- \$2,500,000
Duration of Phase 1 Study	2 years (estimated) FY 2012 to FY 2014	4 years (actual) 2002 to 2006

The proposed first phase of a pedestrian safety study is estimated to take two years at a cost of approximately \$2.6 million. The necessary funding is estimated based on the New York effort and on the cost of a project team tasked with data collection, data analysis, engineering, project coordination, outreach, project management, Geographic Information Systems (GIS) manipulation, and graphics. Data Analysis and Engineering should account for 58% of the total study cost; Project Management and Coordination, 15%; Outreach and Coordination, 14%; and GIS and Graphics account for 13% of the total budget.

If the requested funding for the study is approved, the study may be conducted by consultants or by City staff, since City staff may possess the necessary expertise to conduct the study and provided there is City staff available to do the work over the course of the study. The study would include, but not be limited to the tasks in Table 3. Regardless of the approach, it is recommended that a Pedestrian Project Coordinator position be established in the future to work on project coordination and outreach for this project, and who can be dedicated thereafter to pedestrian facilities planning and implementation in the City as well. The City would greatly benefit from a specialist that brings multiple-disciplined knowledge and skills to oversee the development and implementation of specific pedestrian-related projects to encourage walking and the use of transit. A dedicated Pedestrian Project Coordinator would provide critical support in the goal to enhance accessibility and mobility for all users. Establishing such a position would be viewed as a solid commitment to pedestrian safety from the perspective of the public, advocates, and the State/Federal agencies that are awarding grants.

Table 3: Safe Routes to School Study Tasks

TASKS	By City staff or contractor	By City Staff	Contract Oversight By City Staff
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update schools database • Establish prioritization method • Conduct field surveys of street, traffic, school site conditions • Obtain and process traffic data, including collisions • Obtain and process school and student information • Incorporate school information and traffic data into existing GIS school database • Prepare final methodology report • Analyze prioritization data and establish an initial list of priority schools • Analyze street, traffic, school site conditions and identify feasible safety improvements for each priority school • Prepare individual school reports of the recommended safety improvements 	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate with schools, elected officials, City agencies, and outside agencies • Coordinate review of the study, engineering recommendations, policy matters • Prepare project status reports 		X	
<p><u><i>If Study is Contracted Out:</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare the Request for Proposals • Prepare and negotiate the agreement • Administer the contract and billings • Provide training and guidance to consultant regarding City policies, procedures, engineering standards, etc. 			X

Pedestrian Devices

The City recently participated in Cycle 4 of the Federal HSIP Projects. Projects may qualify for HSIP funding and are evaluated primarily based on a calculated benefit/cost ratio, emphasizing the importance of identifying needs based on collision data and the proposed cost of the project. The City submitted 30 applications screened for demonstrated collision histories. The City was awarded 22 of the 30 projects. Of the remaining eight unfunded projects, three projects have been identified as projects which would improve pedestrian safety and therefore qualify for implementation using Measure R LR funds. Based on our findings and analysis of the most recent available data, these identified projects have demonstrated the greatest benefit as compared to their cost. Therefore, DOT recommends implementing the following three projects:

	<u>Est. Cost</u>
Martin Luther King Jr Boulevard & Nicolet Avenue - New traffic signal (Near Coliseum Elementary School & Dorsey High School)	\$250,000
Laurel Canyon Boulevard & Paxton Street – Left turn signal (Located next to two parks)	\$110,000
84th Place & San Pedro Street - New traffic signal (Near South Park Elementary School)	<u>\$300,000</u>
Total	\$660,000

Transit Stop Enhancements

Transit stop enhancements are improvements to existing transit stops that are in need of amenities such as pedestrian lighting, shelter footings and/or street furniture to enhance safety or utility. DOT, in coordination with the Department of Public Works, proposes to expend the funds in each City Council district to implement enhancements at transit stops that lack one or more of the previously mentioned amenities. The specific locations in each Council district will collaboratively be determined by DOT, Public Works and the corresponding Council offices.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The bicycle and pedestrian programs were each allocated \$2,674,625 in the Fiscal Year 2010-2011 Adopted Budget from the Measure R Local Return Fund. There is no impact to the General Fund.