

## 7. COST ESTIMATES AND FUNDING

This chapter provides planning level cost estimates of constructing and maintaining the proposed bicycle network and lists potential project funding sources.

Cost estimates provided in this chapter do not reflect costs of recommended programs and support facilities such as signage, kiosks and bike parking. Planning level cost estimates for this type of work are difficult to accurately estimate and need to be developed in context with a selected location. For items such as kiosks, design guidelines would be developed at a future date.

### 7.1. COST BREAKDOWN

A breakdown of cost estimates for the recommended bicycle network provided by this plan is presented in **Tables 7-1 through 7-7** below. Buildout of the recommended system will result in a total of more than four miles of new Class I Bike Paths, two miles of new Class II bike lanes, almost three miles of Bicycle Boulevards, two-thirds of a mile of Shared Lane Markings, and nearly twenty-two miles of Class III Bike Routes. The total cost of constructing the recommended projects is estimated to be about \$12.7 million dollars, with approximately \$11 million due to the high cost of constructing off-street bike paths. Due to the large quantity of high priority projects that only require signing and striping, the City is in the favorable position of being able to complete approximately 78% of its planned projects for only 17% of the total estimated cost of the Plan's projects. All costs are in 2006 dollars.

**Tables 7-1** provides a summary of Bikeway costs by bikeway Class. **Table 7-2** provides a summary of costs for high priority bikeways, and **Tables 7-3 through 7-6** provide a cost breakdown of each bikeway segment, organized by bikeway class. Unless otherwise noted, cost estimates are based on per mile averages of bikeway construction in California and supplemented by information provided by the City of Lafayette. Estimates include 12% for survey and design work, 25% for contingency and 10% for construction administration. Major projects include 7% for traffic control and mobilization and a 15% mark-up for ancillary related improvements. Cost estimates are planning level, and do not include feasibility or environmental clearance. Project-specific factors such as grading, landscaping, intersection modification and bridge construction may increase the actual cost of construction.

All the projects are recommended to be implemented over the next twenty years. However, due to the unpredictability of funding sources, economy and political support, some projects, especially those that require right-of-way purchase or coordination with multiple jurisdictions, may not be completed within the next twenty years. A description of available funding sources is provided at the end of this chapter.

7. Cost Estimates and Funding

**Table 7-1**  
**Cost Summary of Proposed Bikeways**

| <b>Bikeway Type</b> | <b>Miles</b> | <b>Estimated Cost</b> |
|---------------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| Class I             | 4.52         | \$ 11,134,000         |
| Class II            | 2.29         | \$ 203,000            |
| Bike Boulevard      | 2.99         | \$ 703,000            |
| Shared Lane         | 0.62         | \$ 23,000             |
| Class III           | 21.87        | \$593,000             |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>32.29</b> | <b>\$ 12,656,000</b>  |

*Note: Costs are in 2006 dollars.*

*Class I refers to off-street bike paths, Class II refers to on-street bike lanes, Class III refers to signed on-street bike routes.*

**Table 7-2**  
**Cost Summary of Proposed High Priority Bikeways**

| <b>Bikeway Type</b> | <b>Miles</b> | <b>Estimated Cost</b> |
|---------------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| Class I             | 2.54         | \$1,305,000           |
| Class II            | 0.26         | \$12,000              |
| Bike Boulevard      | 1.80         | \$337,000             |
| Shared Lane         | .62          | \$23,000              |
| Class III           | 19.82        | \$531,000             |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>25.04</b> | <b>\$2,208,000</b>    |

*Note: Costs are in 2006 dollars.*

*Class I refers to off-street bike paths, Class II refers to on-street bike lanes, Class III refers to signed on-street bike routes.*

*Class I costs include \$75,000 for EBMUD Aqueduct ROW feasibility study between Walter Costa Trail and Brown Ave.*

**Table 7-3**  
**Recommended Class I Bike Paths: Planning Level Construction Cost Estimates**

| Project Category   | Project #/<br>Priority | Location   | Start              | End   | Miles       | Estimated Cost <sup>1</sup> | Notes  |
|--|------------------------|--|--------------------|---|-------------|-----------------------------|--|
| EBMUD<br>Aqueduct/Caltrans<br>ROW Trail                      | 10A/<br>High           | EBMUD<br>Aqueduct ROW <sup>2</sup>                   | Walter Costa Trail | Brown Ave                                       | 1.93        | \$50,000                    | Feasibility study  |
| EBMUD<br>Aqueduct/Caltrans<br>ROW Trail                      | 10B/<br>Low            | EBMUD<br>Aqueduct ROW <sup>2</sup>                   | Walter Costa Trail | Brown Ave                                       | 1.93        | \$4,903,000                 | Cost estimate includes City's estimate of \$2.9 million to construct pathway between BART station and Second Street. Includes costs for signal or bridge at Happy Valley Road, Oak Hill Road and First Street. |
| EBMUD<br>Aqueduct/Caltrans<br>ROW Trail                      | 10C/<br>Low            | Caltrans ROW <sup>2</sup>                            | Brown Ave          | Pleasant Hill Road                              | 0.81        | \$1,281,000                 | Segment will additionally require crossing at Pleasant Hill Road possibly by bridge or modification of the existing traffic signal at Deer Hill Road. The cost of the crossing is not included in cost.        |
| EBMUD<br>Aqueduct/Caltrans<br>ROW Trail                      | 10D/<br>Low            | Caltrans ROW &<br>EBMUD<br>Aqueduct ROW <sup>2</sup> | Pleasant Hill Road | Briones<br>Regional Trail<br>in Walnut<br>Creek | 0.80        | \$1,267,000                 |  |
| Hidden Valley -<br>Acalanes Road<br>Connector                | 22/<br>Low             | Arbor Way and<br>SR 24 EB Off<br>Ramp                | Hidden Valley Rd   | Acalanes Rd                                     | 0.24        | \$378,000                   |  |
| Buckeye<br>Fields/Lafayette-<br>Moraga Trail<br>Connector    | 23/<br>Low             | off-street path                                      | Buckeye Fields     | Lafayette<br>Moraga Trail                       | 0.13        | \$2,000,000                 | Cost estimate provided by the City of Lafayette. The estimated segment cost is \$2 million due to special construction involving extensive grading, bridge, utilities, walls, and landscape mitigation.        |
| Pleasant Hill Road<br>Bike and<br>Pedestrian<br>Improvements | 24A/<br>High           | Path on east side<br>of PHR <sup>2</sup>             | Condit Road        | Olympic Blvd                                    | 0.40        | \$837,000                   | Figures based on estimates provided by the City of Lafayette.  |
| Pleasant Hill Road<br>Bike and<br>Pedestrian<br>Improvements | 24B/<br>High           | Path on west side<br>of PHR <sup>2</sup>             | Reliez Station Rd  | Olympic Blvd                                    | 0.21        | \$418,000                   | Figures based on estimates provided by the City of Lafayette.  |
| <b>TOTAL</b>   |                        |  |                    |   | <b>4.52</b> | <b>\$11,134,000</b>         |  |

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise noted, cost estimates for bike paths are based on a per-mile cost of \$1,581,389 in 2006 dollars. Per-mile cost estimates include 12% survey and design, 25% contingency, 10% administration, 7% traffic control and mobilization and 15% major project mark-up. Costs are planning level only. Actual construction costs may differ. All costs are in 2006 dollars.

<sup>2</sup> EBMUD= East Bay Municipal Utility District; ROW = Right of way; PHR=Pleasant Hill Road

*This page left blank intentionally.*

**Table 7-4**  
**Recommended Class II Bike Lanes: Planning Level Construction Cost Estimates**

| Project Category | Project #/<br>Priority | Street                                   | Start  | End                   | Miles       | Estimated<br>Cost <sup>3</sup> | Notes  |
|------------------|------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|-------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Gap Connector    | 19/<br>High            | Olympic<br>Boulevard                     | Reliez Station Rd  | Pleasant Hill<br>Road | 0.26        | \$12,000                       |  |
| Gap Connector    | 20A/<br>Low            | Taylor Blvd/<br>Pleasant Hill Rd         | Rancho View Dr<br>(southbound)<br>Taylor<br>Blvd/Pleasant<br>Hill Rd split<br>(northbound) | Withers Ave           | 1.29        | \$61,000                       | Proposed bike lanes on Taylor Blvd. between Pleasant Hill Road and Withers Ave. will require multi-jurisdictional study. Proposed southbound bike lanes on Pleasant Hill Rd. between Taylor Blvd. and Rancho View Dr. will require lane narrowing. |
| Gap Connector    | 20B/<br>Low            | Pleasant Hill Rd<br>(northbound<br>only) | Reliez Valley Rd   | Taylor Blvd           | 0.74        | \$130,000 <sup>4</sup>         | Proposed northbound bike lanes along entire corridor will require multi-jurisdictional study. Proposed northbound bike lanes on Pleasant Hill Rd. between Taylor Blvd and Rancho View Dr. will require road widening (~.42 mi)                     |
| <b>TOTAL</b>     |                        |  |  |                       | <b>2.29</b> | <b>\$203,000</b>               |  |

<sup>3</sup> Costs are based on per-mile estimate of \$47,628 for Bike Lanes and \$583,538 for Bike Lanes that require shoulder widening. All cost estimates are in 2006 dollars. Per-mile cost estimates include 12% survey and design, 25% contingency and 10% admin. Cost estimates for Bicycle Lanes that require shoulder widening include an additional 15% major project mark-up and 7% traffic control and mobilization. Costs are planning level only. Actual construction costs may differ.

<sup>4</sup> Per-mile cost estimates are halved for project 20B, as it consists of bike lanes on one side of the roadway only.

7. Cost Estimates and Funding

**Table 7-5  
Recommended Shared Lane Markings and Bicycle Boulevards: Planning Level Construction Cost Estimates**

| Project Category                  | Project #/<br>Priority | Street   | Start                  | End                             | Type of Bikeway      | Miles       | Estimated Cost <sup>5</sup> |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|--|------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|
| Downtown Mt. Diablo Bypass Route  | 1/<br>High             | Mountain View Dr/ Bickerstaff Rd/ Dewing Ave/ Brook St | Mt. Diablo Blvd        | Moraga Rd                       | Bike Boulevard       | 0.65        | \$172,000                   |
| Downtown Mt. Diablo Bypass Route  | 4/<br>Medium           | Golden Gate Way  | Mt. Diablo Blvd        | Mt. Diablo Blvd                 | Bike Boulevard       | 0.43        | \$115,000                   |
| Downtown Mt. Diablo Bypass Route  | 5/<br>Medium           | Hough Avenue   | Lafayette Cir          | Brook St                        | Bike Boulevard       | 0.14        | \$55,000                    |
| Downtown Mt. Diablo Bypass Route  | 6/<br>Medium           | Lafayette Circle                                       | Mt. Diablo Blvd (East) | Mt. Diablo Blvd (West)          | Bike Boulevard       | 0.31        | \$61,000                    |
| Downtown Mt. Diablo Bypass Route  | 8/<br>Medium           | School Street  | Moraga Rd              | Lafayette Moraga Trail          | Bike Boulevard       | 0.30        | \$135,000                   |
| School Access Route               | 39/<br>High            | Stanley Boulevard and Springbrook Road                 | Pleasant Hill Road     | Mt. Diablo Blvd in Walnut Creek | Bike Boulevard       | 1.15        | \$165,000                   |
| <b>Total Bike Boulevard</b>       |                        |  |                        |                                 |                      | <b>2.99</b> | <b>\$703,000</b>            |
| Gap Connector                     | 16/<br>High            | Mt. Diablo Boulevard (downtown)                        | Mountain View Dr       | First St                        | Shared Lane Markings | 0.62        | \$23,000                    |
| <b>Total Shared Lane Markings</b> |                        |  |                        |                                 |                      | <b>0.62</b> | <b>\$23,000</b>             |

<sup>5</sup> Costs are based on per-mile estimate of \$34,516 for Bicycle Boulevards and \$36,910 for Shared Lane Markings in 2006 dollars. Cost estimates for Bicycle Boulevards include \$25,000 per major intersection for traffic calming devices. Actual construction costs may differ. Per-mile cost estimates include 12% survey and design, 25% contingency and 10% admin. Cost estimates for Shared Lane Markings include an additional 15% major project and 7% traffic control and mobilization. Costs are planning level only.

Table 7-6

## Recommended Class III Bike Routes: Planning Level Construction Cost Estimates

| Project Category                 | Project #/<br>Priority | Street  | Start                            | End  | Miles        | Estimated Cost <sup>6</sup> | Notes   |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|---|----------------------------------|--|--------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Downtown Mt. Diablo Bypass Route | 2/<br>High             | Brook Street                                    | Mountain View Drive              | Dewing Ave   | 0.26         | \$7,000                     |   |
| Downtown Mt. Diablo Bypass Route | 3/<br>High             | Dewing Avenue                                   | Mt. Diablo Blvd                  | Bickerstaff Rd.  | 0.09         | \$2,000                     |   |
| Downtown Mt. Diablo Bypass Route | 7/<br>High             | Mountain View Drive                             | Bickerstaff Rd                   | Brook St   | 0.16         | \$4,000                     |   |
| Downtown Mt. Diablo Bypass Route | 9/<br>High             | Moraga Boulevard                                | Moraga Road                      | To Lafayette-Moraga Trail via Hawthorne Drive and Foye Dr. | 0.96         | \$26,000                    |   |
| Gap Connector                    | 11/<br>High            | Acalanes Road                                   | El Nido Ranch Rd                 | Mt. Diablo Blvd  | 0.22         | \$6,000                     |   |
| Gap Connector                    | 12/<br>High            | El Nido Ranch Rd                                | Mt. Diablo Blvd                  | Acalanes Rd  | 0.65         | \$18,000                    |   |
| Gap Connector                    | 13/<br>Low             | Exit Road                                       | Lafayette Reservoir              | Mt. Diablo Blvd  | 0.33         | \$9,000                     |   |
| Gap Connector                    | 14/<br>High            | Hidden Valley Road                              | West City Limits                 | Acalanes Rd  | 0.77         | \$21,000                    |   |
| Gap Connector                    | 15/<br>High            | Moraga Road                                     | Mt. Diablo Blvd                  | Old Jonas Hill Rd  | 0.76         | \$21,000                    |   |
| Gap Connector                    | 17/<br>High            | Glenside Drive North                            | Lafayette Moraga Trail           | St. Mary's Road  | 0.12         | \$3,000                     |   |
| Gap Connector                    | 18/<br>High            | Mt. Diablo Boulevard                            | Mt. Diablo Ct                    | Pleasant Hill Rd   | 0.13         | \$3,000                     |   |
| Gap Connector                    | 21/<br>Low             | Withers Avenue                                  | Reliez Valley Rd                 | Taylor Blvd  | 0.43         | \$12,000                    |   |
| Regional Recreation Route        | 25/<br>High            | Acalanes Road                                   | End of bike lanes on Acalanes Rd | South City Limits/Glorietta Blvd.                          | 0.57         | \$15,000                    |   |
| Regional Recreation Route        | 26/<br>High            | Happy Valley Road                               | Mt. Diablo Blvd                  | West City Limits   | 2.57         | \$70,000                    |   |
| Regional Recreation Route        | 27/<br>High            | Reliez Valley Road                              | Pleasant Hill Road               | North City Limits  | 2.39         | \$65,000                    |   |
| Regional Recreation Route        | 28/<br>High            | St. Mary's Road                                 | Moraga Rd                        | South City Limits  | 3.19         | \$87,000                    |   |
| Regional Recreation Route        | 29/<br>High            | Upper Happy Valley Road                         | El Nido Ranch Rd                 | Happy Valley Rd  | 1.03         | \$28,000                    |   |
| School Access Route              | 30/<br>High            | Acalanes Avenue/Nogales St                      | Pleasant Hill Road               | Camino Diablo  | 0.29         | \$8,000                     |   |
| School Access Route              | 31/<br>Low             | Camino Diablo - Walnut Creek                    | Lafayette City limits            | Mt. Diablo Blvd<br>Walnut Creek                            | 0.40         | \$11,000                    | cost likely to be shared with Walnut Creek and County |
| School Access Route              | 32/<br>High            | Camino Diablo Boulevard                         | Stanley Blvd                     | Old Tunnel Rd via SR24 overpass                            | 0.78         | \$21,000                    | cost likely to be shared with County                  |
| School Access Route              | 33/<br>High            | Condit Road                                     | Pleasant Hill Road               | east City limits via Meek Pl & Sunset Loop                 | 0.50         | \$13,000                    |   |
| School Access Route              | 34/<br>High            | Kinney Dr/Boulevard Way                         | Lafayette/Saranap border         | Boulevard Way  | 0.52         | \$14,000                    | cost likely to be shared with Walnut Creek            |
| School Access Route              | 35/<br>High            | Old Tunnel Road/Saranap Ave                     | Pleasant Hill Road               | Boulevard Way in Walnut Creek                              | 1.01         | \$27,000                    | cost likely to be shared with Walnut Creek            |
| School Access Route              | 36/<br>Low             | Quandt Road                                     | Pleasant Hill Road               | End  | 0.47         | \$13,000                    |   |
| School Access Route              | 37/<br>High            | Rohrer Dr/Merriewood Dr/Burton Dr/Glenside Dr S | St. Mary's Road                  | St. Mary's Road  | 1.66         | \$45,000                    |   |
| School Access Route              | 38/<br>High            | Springhill Road                                 | Pleasant Hill Road               | West City Limits   | 1.31         | \$36,000                    |   |
| School Access Route              | 40/<br>High            | School Access Route                             | Hamlin Road                      | Moraga Rd  | 0.31         | \$8,000                     |   |
| <b>Total Class 3</b>             |                        |   |                                  |  | <b>21.87</b> | <b>\$593,000</b>            |   |

<sup>6</sup> Costs for bicycle routes are based on per-mile estimate of \$27,166 in 2006 dollars, and include 12% survey and design, 25% contingency and 10% admin. Costs are planning level only Actual construction costs may differ.

*This page left blank intentionally.*



Increases in maintenance costs due to the recommended bikeway network will be relatively low due to the lack of long Class I path facilities. The existing and recommended bikeway network is predominately made up of on-street bike lanes and routes that will be treated as part of the normal roadway maintenance program. However, extra emphasis should be put on keeping the bike lanes and roadway shoulders clear of debris and keeping vegetation overgrowth from blocking visibility or creeping into the roadway. The other typical maintenance costs for the bikeway network, as shown below in **Table 7-7**, include the maintenance of signage, striping and stencils.

The total annual budget increase related to bikeway maintenance cost is estimated to be about \$64,950 per year, assuming all of the projects listed in **Tables 7-3 through 7-6** are implemented.

**Table 7-7**  
**Cost Estimates for Recommended Network: Ten-Year Operations and Maintenance**

| Facility Type                           | Unit Cost | Description | Length (Miles) | Yearly Cost       | Notes  |
|---|-----------|-------------|----------------|-------------------|--|
| Class I                                 | \$8,500   | Miles/Year  | 4.52           | \$38,500          | Lighting and debris and vegetation overgrowth removal.   |
| Class II                                | \$2,000   | Miles/Year  | 2.29           | \$4,580           | Repainting lane stripes and stencils, sign replacement as needed   |
| Class III                               | \$1,000   | Miles/Year  | 21.87          | \$21,870          | Sign and shared use stencil replacement as needed  |
| <b>Avg. Cost/Year</b>                   |           |             |                | <b>\$64,950</b>   |  |
| <b>Est. 10-Year Cost (2016 dollars)</b> |           |             |                | <b>\$832,659,</b> | 10 year cost includes one time cost of pavement seal coat at \$10,000 per mile for class I bikeways and estimates inflation rates calculated using conversion factor of 1.282. |

## 7.2. FUNDING

There are a variety of potential funding sources including local, state, regional, and federal funding programs as well as private sector funding that can be used to construct the proposed bicycle improvements. Most of the Federal, state, and regional programs are competitive and involve the completion of extensive applications with clear documentation of the project need, costs, and benefits. Local funding for bicycle projects typically comes from Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding, which is prorated to each County based on the return of gasoline taxes. Many of the projects and programs recommended in the Lafayette Bikeway Plan would need to be funded by sources such as TDA, general fund (staff time), and regional, State and Federal programs. Due to Lafayette's central location within Contra Costa County, several designated routes in Lafayette's Bikeway Plan are also included on the countywide bicycle network that traverses the City and county. Federal and state grant funding may be more readily available to assist in implementing projects on these routes within Lafayette or as part of a multi-jurisdictional grant application. Local businesses, organizations and foundations may also provide another source for funding projects and programs. The City of Lafayette successfully utilized private sector funding for its new Library and Learning Center. The primary funding sources are described below.

### FEDERAL FUNDING SOURCES

The primary federal source of surface transportation funding—including bikeway facilities—is SAFETEA-LU, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users. SAFETEA-LU is the fourth iteration of the transportation vision established by Congress in 1991 with the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) and renewed in 1998 and 2003 through the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) and the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act of 2003 (SAFETEA). Also known as the federal transportation bill, the \$286.5 billion SAFETEA-LU bill was passed in 2005 and authorizes Federal surface transportation programs for the five-year period between 2005 and 2009.

SAFETEA-LU funding is administered through the state (Caltrans and Resources Agency) and regional planning agencies. Most, but not all, of these funding programs are oriented toward transportation versus recreation projects, with an emphasis on reducing auto trips and providing inter-modal connections. The SAFETEA-LU programs that either directly or indirectly, via regional programs that reconfigure and combine federal funds to form new regional sources, include:

- Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) – Funds projects that are likely to contribute to the attainment of national ambient air quality standards. Funds are available for projects and programs in areas that have been designated in non-attainment or maintenance for ozone, carbon monoxide or particulate matter (PM 2.5 or PM 10). The Bay Area is in attainment for all pollutants except ozone. Regulations regarding future Bay Area CMAQ allocations are currently being determined.
- Recreational Trails Program – \$370 million through 2009, to be dedicated to non-motorized trail projects.
- Safe Routes to School Program – A new program with \$612 million through 2009.
- Transportation, Community and System Preservation Program - \$270 million over five years reserved for transit oriented development, traffic calming and other projects that improve the efficiency of the transportation system, reduce the impact on the environment, and provide efficient access to jobs, services and trade centers.

### STATE FUNDING SOURCES

#### Bicycle Transportation Account

The State 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. Due to the passage of AB1772 in the year 2000, the BTA has \$7.2 million available each year for the next five years. Following the year 2005, the fund will drop to \$5 million per year unless new legislation is authored. The local match must be a minimum of 10% of the total project cost.

#### Safe Routes to School (AB 1475/SB 1087)

In September 2004, with the passage of SB 1087 (Soto), the State extended Safe Routes to School legislation for three more years. The bill is scheduled to sunset on January 1, 2008. This program is meant to improve the safety of walking and cycling to school and encourage students to walk and bicycle to school through identification of existing and new routes to school and construction of

pedestrian and bicycle safety and traffic calming projects. In 2006, Caltrans is evaluating California's SR2S funding, in light of the new federal SR2S. Recent SAFETEA-LU legislation which requires each state's Department of Transportation to designate a SR2S Coordinator, also contains a SR2S program, but as of this printing, whether or not these programs will be combined in California or will remain autonomous has not yet been determined.

### **Office of Traffic Safety Grants**

The California Office of Traffic Safety distributes federal funding apportioned to California under the National Highway Safety Act and SAFETEA-LU. Grants are used to establish new traffic safety programs, expand ongoing programs or address deficiencies in current programs. Bicycle and pedestrian safety are included in the list of traffic safety priority areas. Eligible grantees are: governmental agencies, state colleges, and state universities, local city and county government agencies, school districts, fire departments, and public emergency services providers. Grant funding cannot replace existing program expenditures, nor can traffic safety funds be used for program maintenance, research, rehabilitation, or construction. Grants are awarded on a competitive basis, and priority is given to agencies with the greatest need. Evaluation criteria to assess need include: potential traffic safety impact, collision statistics and rankings, seriousness of problems, and performance on previous OTS grants. OTS expects to have \$56 million in funding available statewide for FY 2006/07.

### **Land and Water Conservation Fund**

Land and Water Conservation Fund is a federally funded program that provides grants for planning and acquiring outdoor recreation areas and facilities, including trails. The Fund is administered by the California Department of Parks and Recreation and has been reauthorized until 2015. Cities, counties and districts authorized to acquire, develop, operate and maintain park and recreation facilities are eligible to apply. Applicants must fund the entire project, and will be reimbursed for 50% of costs. Property acquired or developed under the program must be retained in perpetuity for public recreational use. The grant process for local agencies is competitive, and forty percent of grants are reserved for Northern California. In 2006, approximately \$480,000 is available for projects in Northern California.

### **National Recreational Trails Fund**

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. In FY2006 approximately \$3.3 million is available nationally for this program.

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);

## 7. Cost Estimates and Funding

- 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).

### REGIONAL FUNDING SOURCES

Regional bicycle grant programs come from a variety of sources, including SAFETEA-LU, the State budget, vehicle registration fees and bridge tolls. Although most regional funds are allocated by regional agencies such as the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), some (such as TDA and a portion of the regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program) flow to county congestion management agencies, such as the Contra Costa County Transportation Authority, which allocate funds to project sponsors.

### Transportation Funds for Clean Air Program (TFCA)

These funds are generated by a four dollar surcharge on automobile registration fees in the nine-county Bay Area. Approximately \$20 million is collected annually which funds two programs: 60% of the TFCA monies go to the Regional Fund and 40% of the monies go to the County Program Manager Fund. In Contra Costa County, the TFCA Program Manager Funds are managed by the Contra Costa County Transportation Authority. The CCTA distributes the first \$800,000 of TFCA funds to the four Regional Transportation Planning Committees based on population and employment. The remaining funds are allocated on a competitive basis to public agencies in the County. Pedestrian infrastructure improvements are eligible for TFCA funds through its Smart Growth funding category.

### Regional Measure 2 (RM2)

Regional Measure 2 (RM2), approved in March 2004, raised the toll on seven state-owned Bay Area bridges by one dollar. This fee increase funds various operational improvements and capital projects which reduce congestion or improve travel in the toll bridge corridors. Over the life of the measure, twenty million dollars of the RM2 funding funds the Safe Routes to Transit Program (SR2T), which provides competitive grant funding for capital and planning projects that improve bicycle and pedestrian access to transit facilities. Eligible projects must be shown to reduce congestion on one or more of the Bay Area's toll bridges.

The competitive grant process is administered by the Transportation and Land Use Coalition and the East Bay Bicycle Coalition. Competitive funding is awarded in five \$4 million grant cycles. The first round of funding was awarded in December 2005. Future funding cycles will be in 2007, 2009, 2011 and 2013.

### Regional Bike and Pedestrian Program

The Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program (RBPP) was created in 2003 as part of the long range Transportation 2030 Plan developed by the Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Commission. The program—currently funded with Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality funds—funds regionally significant bicycle projects, and bicycle and pedestrian projects serving schools or transit.

Between the 12 year period from FY 2005-06 to FY 2017-18, MTC will allocate \$96 million to the nine bay area counties.. Seventy five percent of the funds are allocated to the county congestion management agencies and transportation authorities based on population (the *County Portion*). The remaining 25% of the funds are regionally competitive; county Congestion Management Agencies (CCTA in Contra Costa County) determine projects to submit to MTC for funding consideration. Contra Costa County is guaranteed \$3.36 million in regionally competitive funds and \$10 million in County Portion funds over the next 12 years.

### **Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC)**

MTC offers two kinds of assistance through the TLC program: capital improvement and planning. TLC grants are competitive funds meant to fund small-scale transportation improvements that are designed to make a big difference in a community's vitality. Eligible projects include streetscape improvements, transit, pedestrian, and bicycle oriented developments. Projects should be designed to "bring new vibrancy" to downtown areas, commercial cores and neighborhoods, enhancing their amenities and ambience and making them places where people want to live and visit. Funds vary from year to year, but for FY 2004/05 \$18.3 million was awarded to projects around the Bay Area.

## **LOCAL FUNDING SOURCES**

### **TDA Article III (SB 821)**

Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 funds are state block grants awarded annually to local jurisdictions for transit, bicycle and pedestrian projects in California. These funds originate from two revenue streams: the State Transit Assistance Fund (STA) is derived from the statewide gasoline tax and the Local Transportation Fund (LTF) is derived from a ¼ cent of the general state sales tax. STA funds are allocated to planning agencies and other selected agencies based 50% on population and 50% on operating revenues from the prior year. LTF funds are returned to each county based on sales tax revenues. Eligible bicycle projects include: construction and engineering for capital projects; maintenance of bikeways; bicycle safety education programs; and development of comprehensive bicycle or pedestrian facilities plans. A city or county is allowed to apply for funding for bicycle plans not more than once every five years. These funds may be used to meet local match requirements for federal funding sources. In Contra Costa County approximately \$980,000 is available for FY 2006/2007.

### **Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act**

The Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act was passed by the Legislature in 1982 in response to reduced funding opportunities brought about by the passage of Proposition 13. The Mello-Roos Act allows any county, city, special district, school district, or joint powers of authority to establish a Community Facility Districts (CFD) for the purpose of selling tax-exempt bonds to fund public improvements within that district. CFDs must be approved by a two-thirds margin of qualified voters in the district. Property owners within the district are responsible for paying back the bonds. Bicycle facilities are eligible for funding under CFD bonds.

### **Impact Fees**

One 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 attempt to reduce the number of trips (and hence impacts and cost) by paying for on- and off-site bicycle improvements designed to encourage residents, employees and visitors to the new development to bicycle rather than drive.

## 7. Cost Estimates and Funding

Establishing a clear nexus or connection between the impact fee and the project's impacts is critical to avoiding a potential lawsuit.

### **PRIVATE FUNDING SOURCES AND VOLUNTEER PARTNERS**

#### **Lafayette Community Foundation**

The Lafayette Community Foundation serves as a vital community resource, investing in programs and projects which promote and enhance the civic, cultural, educational and environmental health of Lafayette. The Foundation provides donors the opportunity to build a legacy by investing in Lafayette and beyond, through identification and support of community needs and organizations. The Foundation raises funds and awards grants to implement large and small scale projects within Lafayette.

#### **Lafayette Chamber of Commerce**

The Chamber is a volunteer based organization serving the interests of the business community and with an ongoing commitment to the City of Lafayette. It remains the principal advocate for the business community, working to promote businesses in town and encouraging new enterprises to locate here.

All aspects that make up a community are important to the Chamber: schools, residents, churches and synagogues, community organizations and activities, and the city government. Chamber members work with representatives of all these groups for the betterment of the community. Many of the projects and programs contained in the Master Bikeways Plan would directly benefit local businesses, their customers and employees, therefore, the Chamber may serve as an important community partner for implementing the Plan.

#### **Other Local Organizations**

Numerous civic, communal, educational, and philanthropic groups are either headquartered in Lafayette or have active members in the City. Organizations such as the Rotary Club, the East Bay Bicycle Coalition, Boy and Girl Scouts, and Lafayette Juniors, provide a variety of opportunities to assist in the implementation of the projects and programs outlined in the Master Bikeways Plan.