

**Minutes of Bicycle Advisory Committee of the City of Los Angeles
Planning and Bikeways Engineering Subcommittee meeting -
Tuesday, March 17, 2026, 1:00 p.m.
Location: Little Tokyo Library, Community Room, 203 S. Los Angeles Street, Los
Angeles, CA 90012**

Emailed 4/1/26 5:15 PM

Online Meeting Access Information

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81051063004>

Meeting ID: 810 5106 3004

Guests: Elliott Shaw and Jack Moreau (LADOT ATP Team), Raymond Acevedo (LA Metro Consultant and Community Relations Officer), Maria Lopez (LA Metro Construction Relations Department) and Candace Lee (LA Metro Environmental Lead), Jonathan Weiss (North Westwood Neighborhood Council), Lionel Mares (LABAC), Brian Nicosia (Bicycle Advisory Committee Chairman, Coastal Carolina University).

Bikeways, Planning and Engineering Subcommittee Members attending: Jennifer Gill (vice chair), Philip Armstrong (chair), and Karen Canady (Glenn Bailey and Michael Schneider, Founder and CEO of Streets For All, attended on Zoom but were not counted as present).

Bikeways, Planning and Engineering Subcommittee members: Jennifer Gill (vice chair), Glenn Bailey, Philip Armstrong (chair), Michael Schneider, Karen Canady, Taylor Nichols (Alternate).

MINUTES

1. Call to Order and Introductions and approval of minutes. Please see 1.20.26 minutes available at: https://labikecommittee.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/01/Subcom-minutes-1-20-26_V2.pdf

Meeting is called to order at 1:06 PM. Quorum is three for the Planning and Bikeways Engineering Subcommittee and is met. Karen moves and Jennifer seconds approval of the minutes. Motion passes 3-0-0.

Regarding SB 707, Glenn said to the best of his knowledge, City Council has not acted to implement it for the City Boards, commissions, and committees.

2. Public Comment on non-agenda items.

- There were no public comments.

3. Active Transportation project updates. Elliott Shaw

- Presentation on a new Safety & Mobility Improvement Project along Sunset Blvd and Cesar Chavez Ave between Fountain Ave and Alameda St. As with all of LADOT's outreach phases, they hope to gather feedback on transportation safety

concerns, access challenges, how the street is currently serving the community, and ideas on how the corridor can better function for those who use it. currently in outreach and engagement.

- Online survey link closes on March 31: bit.ly/sunsetchavez_survey
 - Project webpage link: <https://ladotlivablestreets.org/projects/sunset>
- Sunset/Chavez presentation on outreach phase I: copy attached.
- Elliott said the project corridor is Sunset Boulevard and Cesar Chavez Avenue. It spans between Fountain Avenue up at the top, all the way to Alameda Street. And you'll notice that Alameda Street will connect it to the Spring/Alameda project that we talked about previously. This project's being implemented in two phases. The first phase is in red (in the attached presentation) you'll see here. It's 1.5 miles long. That phase is being implemented before 2028. It's funded and is currently going through design. We're aiming to begin construction at the end of this year or the beginning of next year. LADOT is calling them East and West, just for the purposes of this presentation, but Sunset West is the western portion, that's Phase 2. You'll see it in blue. That is unfunded. We're seeking a large state grant to fund that portion of the project, and we're aiming to implement that portion after 2028. We're aiming to have a consistent design across the entire corridor for just one project, and we're presenting it to the community and outreaching for the entire corridor. So this is an outreach phase for the entirety of the Sunset/Chavez project. We're receiving feedback, we have the survey, I sent the email with a lot of materials, and once we finish this Phase 1 round of outreach, and work on the design a little bit, and then we'll go back to the community this summer with a proposed design and a second round of outreach and feedback, and then continue with the design, final design, and it will move on to construction. For Phase 2, 2028 through 2030, we'll finalize the design for Phase 2 if the grant is awarded, and then implement it after the 2028 Olympic Games.
- This phase of outreach, similar to all of our first initial phases of outreach, is just getting to know how people are using the street and identify safety concerns, that's the priority right now. We want to know where people are going and how they're getting there, how they're using the street. Are they feeling safe or unsafe using the street? And if they're feeling unsafe, then why? And what kind of transportation modes are they using, and why are they using that mode of transportation, why not others, how the street can be changed to better serve them and their needs? So the public survey closes on March 31st. After that, we're going to analyze the results and use that to directly influence the proposed design.
- In the chat, Jonathan Weiss wrote: LAMC 85.11 (HLA): “(b)(1) Whenever the City makes Improvements to a segment of a City-owned Mobility Plan Street, the Mobility Plan street enhancements described in the Enhanced Complete Street System shall be installed” “Enhanced Complete Street System” means the network of major streets described in the Mobility Plan “Mobility Plan”

means Mobility Plan 2035, originally adopted by the City Council on August 11, 2015 as the Circulation Element of the City's General Plan, as amended through December 31, 2021. Bottom line: HLA says must implement "Mobility Plan 2035, originally adopted by the City Council on August 11, 2015"

- Michael referred to the Mobility Plan. Between Fountain and Main is entirely on the Bicycle Enhanced Network (BEN), which requires a protected bike lane. In response, Jack said we're all kind of new to Measure HLA and how it applied, but these are the mobility plan networks as based on the current mobility plan designations, which are updated through the community plans. Michael said he doesn't think a community plan update overrides the mobility plan that Council passed, and he has not seen any official update through Council to update the mobility plan. Elliott said to clarify we'll be implementing the minimum required improvements based on the mobility plan networks, and our understanding of that is that between Beaudry and Alameda lands on the Bicycle Lane Network (BLN), but as a caveat those are the minimum requirements. If the community and the feedback from the survey call for going above and beyond those requirements, we'll follow that guidance. That is in CD 1.
- In answer to Michael's question, Elliott said the funding for Phase 2 will come through the Active Transportation Program (ATP) run by the California Transportation Commission. That grant is due June 22nd of this year, so we're working on the application currently, in the range of \$30 to \$50 million for design and construction. We will be sharing out the results of that outreach and the design proposal in April, or probably more like May, definitely ahead of that ATP grant deadline. The soonest they could start scheduling open houses would be May.
- Update on the Spring/Alameda Corridor Safety and Mobility Project.
 - Project Website: <https://ladotlivablestreets.org/projects/springalameda>
 - Project Survey: <https://sur-vey.typeform.com/to/mgcB7j7x?typeform-source=www.google.com>
- Spring/Alameda presentation on outreach phase II and construction updates: copy attached.
- Jack said Spring/Alameda is another one of our projects that is a bit further along. We have a design proposal that was first shared out last fall at the open house, and we'll be doing a little bit of additional tabling and outreach for this project as well, through the spring.
- So, the project area is between Los Angeles Street and Wilhardt Street, along Spring and Alameda. The project proposes entirely protected bike lanes, from the Spring Street Bridge to Union Station, so that would connect the protected bike lanes that are on the Spring Street Bridge to Los Angeles Street, which also has protected bike lanes, and create a continuous network through the neighborhood. This does include about 35 curb ramps needing reconstruction for the project. The entire area won't be resurfaced. Some of it, especially by the park, was resurfaced in 2022, so we don't need to resurface the entire street. But there is going to be about 0.8 miles of slurry seal, 0.4 miles of street resurfacing.

There will be protected left turns added at Alpine and Alameda Street. As well, there will be new PHB, pedestrian hybrid beacons, so signalized pedestrian crossings at Ann Street and Messenger Street, which are right at the LA State Historic Park. All signalized intersections will be restriped with high-visibility crosswalks, and all signalized intersections will have LPs, leading pedestrian intervals, added. Here's a rendering (in the attached presentation) of the improvements at Anne Street, so you can see the new PHB crossing, as well as protected bike lanes on both sides of the street. There are some trade-offs with this project, in terms of parking, as there are with all protected bike lanes, particularly around driveways and intersections. There will be about one to two spaces removed per block in order to accommodate the visibility needs of a protected bike lane. In general, it's not a major impact. There's about 209 existing parking spaces. Expect 30 to 40 spaces to be removed as a result of the project, so 80-85% of all parking is retained. There's also a modest increase in travel time for vehicles. This is modeled through synchro analysis that found an increase in travel during the peak periods less than 1 minute. Our LADOT guidelines say that any increase in delay that's less than 2 minutes is not a cause for concern, and so the project would proceed without any additional travel delay review. In terms of the next steps, we're taking a similar approach, where we'll be starting the curb ramps this spring and knocking those out while we finalize the signing and striping plans, which are quite close to complete, but we do want to provide an opportunity for feedback, and we do have some time to make adjustments as needed if there's something we've missed. So, we would kind of continue with that final design through the spring and into the summer, really, if needed. The last thing I'll share is that we do have a feedback form where you can learn more about the project improvements, you'll see some of the same information I shared here, and you could state your opinion on the design proposal through that form.

- In slide 9 in the attached presentation, in response to Michael's question, Jack said you are looking at a concrete curb. That's the plan. It might not look exactly the same because this is a photo rendering, so there may be some artistic license in this. Our hope and goal would be to use a precast concrete curb, along Spring and Alameda. We could be limited in terms of budget and exactly where we place it. Our ideal would be to use it through the entire corridor, but if we run into budget limitations, we might need to be more selective, where we're using it particularly at intersection approaches and departures, and maybe considering the value of that curb protection alongside parking lanes. You might have a parking-protected bike lane. We might need to pull back on some of the curb separation there, but that'll be more through a budget assessment. In answer to Michael's question whether this is the first time LADOT would use precast concrete curbs for a protected bike lane, Jack said yes and no, so we have the Toronto barrier on 3rd Street in downtown LA for that one short block. That was a pilot project, where we were testing out the use of precast concrete. We have

space so that Toronto barrier, which is 18 inches high, can be used when you have a 3-foot-wide buffer, and obviously no parking alongside, because you can't step over an 18-inch barrier when your car's parked next to it. So, if there's no parking, and there's a 3-foot-wide barrier, we're able to add a Toronto barrier, so you might see that in front of this LA State Historic Park where you have this nice long uninterrupted stretch. So, we have smaller devices that are only 6 inches high, which could be used in other areas. We don't know right now whether it will be a Toronto barrier. I don't think we've selected that exact material, for this departure. It could be, but it also might be a lower profile, like 6 inch high by 18 inch wide precast barrier, so we're still trying to get the width there as opposed to, like some cities use, a 1-foot-wide by 6 inches high. We have a supplier who is also producing precast barriers for the city of Seattle. We can copy some of the products that Seattle's using here.

- Referring to the same slide, Jack said the bike lane will probably not be green as shown on the slide. I think it would probably be green closest to the intersection, but I don't think that we would have it be continuously green alongside the park, so this rendering was probably inaccurate in that regard, so we'd focus more on the conflict area and the intersection approaches and departures.
- Referring to the proposed design for the Westwood Blvd Safety and Mobility Project, Jack said LADOT could repost the slides.
- Discussion on Terra Bella Street - Metro is working with LADOT on an interim replacement bike lane. In a March 6 email, Raymond Acevedo, Consultant at LA Metro, informed the subcom that the project team does not have a finalized date for the installation of the new bike lanes on Terra Bella St. Once a date is confirmed, a construction notice will be prepared and shared with those details. The new bike lanes will be installed before the existing bike lanes on Van Nuys Bl are removed. Removal of the bike lanes on Van Nuys Bl is expected to begin as early as June 2026 to accommodate construction, so installation of the new bike lanes should occur before June. In addition, he provided a fact sheet (copy attached) and said the project can be present at the subcommittee meeting later this month to share information on the new bike lanes.
- Raymond Acevedo (LA Metro) provided a quick overview of our construction project (presentation to be provided with final minutes). So again, this is the East San Fernando Valley Light Rail Transit Project. It is going to be a 6.7 mile at-grade double-track alignment. It's in the San Fernando Valley, and it runs through the communities of Van Nuys, Panorama City, Arlita, and Pacoima, and it has connection points to various other systems, like the MetroLink Amtrak, to the Metro G-Line. This project is currently in construction, primarily focused on utility adjustments, but we do expect more major construction activities potentially later this year. So as part of the initial fleet, there will be 33 electric light rail vehicles that'll serve this line. There will be 11 sensor platform stations. All of these stations and the train itself will be at-grade. And then there'll be traction and power substations along the corridor to power the train, as well as a maintenance

and storage facility and communications line to Metro's rail operations center. So, as part of this project, in order to fit the train guideway and everything into the corridor, which is Van Nuys Boulevard between Oxnard Street roughly and San Fernando, we do have to relocate the existing bike path, which starts a little bit towards Parthenia Street here, and then goes all the way up to San Fernando Road with some breaks. So that bike path does have to be relocated, because there's not enough space to build the train and have two lanes of traffic on each side, and then, ADA-compliant sidewalks.

- Candace Lee said this is a plan to provide a replacement for what is currently the Van Nuys bike lane, that is currently on Van Nuys, where the East San Fernando Valley Transit Line will be going. We're making a change to Van Nuys Boulevard, removing the bike lanes between Parthenia Street and San Fernando Road. The removal was required, obviously, to make way for the train guideway and for ADA compliance. The bike lane replacement is a part of our mitigation measure strategy. When the board approved the East San Fernando Valley project, they approved us working with LADOT to identify different options for a replacement bike lane. Over the years, we settled on Terra Bella, which we're presenting to you now, as it meets the best-case scenario, and needs of the community. It both connects the current bike lanes that are on San Fernando and off of Nordhoff and provides an increase in safety for Terra Bella, which has had a number of traffic accidents, with pedestrians and vehicles, over the last couple of years. And so, in identifying an alternative, Terra Bella made the best-case since it could be done efficiently in the next couple of months, and it has the least impact of the other parallel streets to Van Nuys Boulevard. We came up with this plan in coordination with LADOT. Jack has actually been a big part of the design for the Terra Bella bike lane. Terra Bella Street is a part of the City of LA's Mobility Plan 2035, so it is also in alignment with the City of LA in terms of providing that bike lane. It will be a Class 2. So currently Van Nuys is a mixture of both Class 2 and Class 4. In order to make the bike lane work on Terra Bella, we'll have to do only Class 2 for now, and there might be room for improvements for the future, but at this point it will be Class 2. The anticipated, construction of the bike lanes will start with the removal of their pre-existing street striping, we'll apply a slurry seal, and then do restriping of the roadway. This is anticipated to start in spring of 2026. Metro is still working on our MOU with the city to get that work kicked off, but once we get a solid date, we have a couple other community meetings that we have coming up that we plan to present to both the direct community and the folks on Van Nuys who are directly impacted by the East San Fernando Valley Project. The replacement bike lane will provide cyclists with a new lane, obviously not exactly on Van Nuys, but adjacent enough to where that lane is, and it is a decent corridor to what is already bike lanes on San Fernando Road and off of Nordhoff. So, it does provide an arterial lane, and access to the current bike path in that area. It should be as accessible for all bike riders traveling to and from the light rail as well. And the new lane configuration for us is

a really big part of calming those streets down, reducing the speed of drivers on that street to improve safety for both pedestrians and for folks using their cars on their street. As I mentioned, there had been a number of accidents so we're looking to reduce the speed and reduce the lanes to calm those streets down.

- Michael said they seem very focused on not removing parking and emphasizing how little parking's being lost, including on Terra Bella. It's not accessible for all bike riders, 8 to 80, and it's a policy choice. The choice could have been to remove a vehicle travel lane and make space for protected bike lanes. We're removing protected bike lanes and putting door zone bike lanes on a street half a mile away. So, we could package this up however we want, but it's simply not an improvement for cyclists. Cyclists, just like drivers, want to go from point A to point B. If you're patronizing something on Van Nuys Boulevard, you don't want to go half a mile out of your way, and another half-mile to get back to Van Nuys Boulevard, you just want to go to where you need to go. I'll also say this goes against the mobility plan, which has a protected bike lane all the way to San Fernando Road. That's more of a comment, but I was very curious what was being maintained, because that's essentially the policy decision that's been made to maintain that vehicle infrastructure and push bikes to the side.
- In his comments, Glenn said I'm not pushing on the center lane, the entire length. I'm only pointing out the challenges when you don't have it available at the intersections. In response, Jack said we did look at both alternatives and shared both with the council offices. It's really just at Telfair and Haddon, which are the two signalized intersections in this segment, where left-turn pockets might be most valuable, and equated to, to maintain that left turn pocket, losing an additional 14 parking spaces per intersection, so 28 total. So, the delay study did assess the configuration without turn pockets, and found very, very minimal 5 to 20 second delays per mile, including the exclusion of those turn pockets. So, the risk of travel delay is very, very low. But, there's still some preference or safety consideration about whether we should move those left turners into a center-turn lane or a left-turn pocket at the intersection. And ultimately, I think our recommendation was just that it would be better to narrow the street. We have this configuration in many other streets. It's a relatively narrow, slow street right now in this area. So, there's no significant safety concern, and there's no significant travel delay concerns, so the design, this future condition shown, balances those different competing needs and gets us this continuous buffered bike lane. Maximizing parking is what people wanted to see. And that's ultimately what drove our decision to remove those left-turn pockets. There isn't really time to change. I think we've signed the plans, we're ready to move forward, so what we're presenting is what the design would be on Terra Bella.
- What other bicycle facilities will be included in the East San Fernando Valley Light Rail Transit (ESFV LRT) Project?
- Raymond said there will be no additional bike facility on Van Nuys Boulevard as part of the East San Fernando Valley Light Road Transit Project, due to what

was discussed earlier in terms of not having enough space on Van Nuys Boulevard, so there's not enough room, and I'll share a slide of what it looks like. But for most of the corridor, it's either two lanes of traffic on each end, the train guideway in the center of the street, and then the ADA-compliant sidewalk, so there's not enough room for any additional biking facilities as part of the project.

- Glenn asked whether LA Metro will provide bike parking at the stations. In response, Raymond said let me check in with our design lead. I can follow up on that. From my understanding, I do not believe so but let me confirm that. He confirmed with Philip on March 25 that bike parking is not in the project scope.
- On March 25, in a follow-up question, Philip asked Raymond how will cyclists get between Parthenia and Nordhoff, given that Candace said LA Metro will be removing the bike lanes on Van Nuys between Parthenia Street and San Fernando Road, and the access to the replacement bike lanes on Terra Bella St is at Nordhoff. In response, Raymond said: Regarding your question about the bike lane segment on Van Nuys Bl between Parthenia St and Nordhoff St, this segment will need to be removed due to train construction. When the City evaluated alternatives, Terra Bella St was identified as the best option because it offers a continuous parallel route. Although that segment will be gone, cyclists in the area can use the existing bike lanes on Woodman Av, which connect at Parthenia St and northward, linking to the future Terra Bella St bike lanes. I have made an image showing what I mean (copy attached). Also, to view a map that includes the routes of the current bike lanes on Van Nuys Blvd and the proposed bike lanes on Terra Bella St, please follow this link: <https://www.la-bike.org/bike-maps>. There is an interactive map, as well as a PDF map that shows this. To help, I also created and attached a quick image that shows information pertaining to bike lanes as it relates to this project. Please find attached the following information:
 - Presentation that was provided to the Bicycle Advisory Committee.
 - Conceptual image of what the train will look for most of the project corridor (certain sections will only have one lane of traffic)
- The Osborne Street: Path to Park Access Project: survey [link](#).
 - Update: Elliott said he's not familiar with this project.
- Draft Environmental Impact Report for the [LA River Path project](#): There is no update.

4. Vision Zero Update. Eleanor Hunts.

- Hollywood Boulevard Safety and Mobility Project, Phase 1 includes plans to add Zicla zippers within existing buffers. Phase 2 includes civil design plans for curb ramp improvements.
- [Vermont Transit Corridor Project](#): Waiting to hear from Metro about what treatments might be incorporated into their project.
 - No updates.

- Discussion and possible action regarding joint LADOT/CAO report on [Vision Zero Program Independent Evaluation](#): It's Council File [23-0600-S121](#). Council action was final on December 22, 2025. During the November 20, 2025 Neighborhood Council Budget Advocates' meeting with Kevin Minne and Clare Eberle of LADOT, LADOT said they are coming up with a budget for automated enforcement and speed cameras. They said they were interested in coming up with a budget for the red light camera program also and they were unaware that Recommendation #5 was deleted in the Transportation Committee on August 13, 2025.
 - No updates.
- Pico Boulevard Safety and Mobility Project: LADOT hosted an open house in late October to report back on their engagement process.
 - Update: Elliott said they're finalizing geometric design and civil design. Expecting construction to begin late this year, following a bid and award process. And they're contracting out the construction. There are several engagement events planned over the next few months to spread awareness about the project to the community. Eleanor said to check the website for updates.
- At its October 7, 2025 meeting, the LABAC approved a Letter of Support for Class IV bike lanes on Pico.
- Discussion regarding the SRTS Center City Schools Neighborhood Safety & Climate Resilience Project: the project webpage is live: <https://ladotlivablestreets.org/projects/center-city-SRTS>. The "About" section, in the landing page, states the design phase is scheduled from February 2026 to March 2027. Jack Linares, Community Affairs Deputy, Office of Vice President Dr. Rocío Rivas, Board of Education, District 2, is in the process of setting up parent meetings for February and March among the local LAUSD schools and community partners. We'd appreciate feedback from LADOT as they want to see the names of speakers and the presentation as well as to know whether there are any flyers or one pagers to share with parents.
- At the January 20 subcom meeting, Eleanor said Randy Chan may not have been aware of these meetings before Philip's email, but he was starting to work on materials, so that even if he's not available for these meetings, he'll at least have some sort of document to share. On March 5, the project manager shared with Eleanor and she shared with us the SRTS Center City Schools Neighborhood Safety & Climate Resilience Project ATP6 fact sheet (copy attached).
 - Update: Elliott said he would send a message to Randy Chan today.
- From the February 23 LA Times: LA's [worst intersections](#). How is LADOT prioritizing these intersections?
- Per Elliott, Eleanor just said that the 2024 safety study identified priority corridors and intersections using methodology that factored in collision history and other contextual factors. Which is outlined in the study's methodology section and the

Vision Zero Program uses that document for project and corridor prioritization. Those intersections are prioritized if they show up on the High Injury Network and the Priority Safety Corridors.

- Discussion and possible action on the following item. As mentioned in SafeTREC News February 26, 2026, applications are now open for the [2026 California Safe System Institute for Road Safety](#), a collaborative effort in partnership with the [Vision Zero Network](#) and [Fehr & Peers](#) with funding provided by the California Office of Traffic Safety, through the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Application deadline: March 30. This grant-funded training and technical support program is designed for California professionals in planning, engineering, public works, law enforcement, and public health who are ready to move the needle on Vision Zero in their communities. Selected participants will join a cohort of practitioners for a deep dive into "forgiving" infrastructure, kinetic energy management, and collaborative implementation.
 - Elliott said thank you for the information and we'll look into it.

5. Accommodation of cyclists when bike lanes close in construction areas. CD 4 motion was introduced on August 6, 2024, in [Council File 20-1469-S1](#). Council adopted this motion on October 1, 2024. On August 11, LADOT submitted the anticipated [report back](#), dated August 7, 2025. In its subsequent ATP report to the subcom, LADOT stated its oversight of construction sites is limited. When existing infrastructure cannot be maintained, it appears that LADOT allows contractors to accommodate road users to the best of their ability if the roadbed allows, regardless of what is in their permit (following CA-MUTCD WATCH manual guidance), due to the potential need for site-specific plans. Elliott or someone else from LADOT.

- Elliott said he talked to the head of engineering design at LADOT, and he said it's not under the jurisdiction of LADOT. He said an effective path is to go through the council office.
- Michael said my suggestion is you and I should schedule something with Mehmet Berker (CD 4 Transportation, Infrastructure & Public Space Director) within the next 30 days, go over what LADOT responded with, express our frustration, and ask them to work with us on an actual change in policy that will be enforced. Philip said yes, let's do that.

6. Hardening bike lanes: bollards, curbs and other options. Update on City research and tests. The LABAC is interested in a maintenance cost comparison between standard approach of bollards/paint + ongoing maintenance vs. hardened infrastructure over 5-10 year periods. Eleanor.

- Here's a list of the materials LADOT has used in this bike lane hardening pilot:
 - Main St (9th St to 1st St): [Zicla Zipper](#)
 - Adams Blvd (Fairfax Ave to Crenshaw Blvd): Zicla Zipper and [Treetop 3" Crossover Delineator](#)
 - Spring St (9th St to 1st St): [Treetop 5" Curb Delineator](#)
 - 3rd St (Spring St to Main St): [Safe-T Lane Divider](#)

- Update: Elliott said there is no update. However, we still have the 3rd Street pilot going, but you heard that we're considering precast concrete separators for Spring/Alameda. As far as I'm concerned, and as far as our team is concerned, using the precast concrete is a priority, but as Jack mentioned, we come up against barriers with funding and cost, and we have a lot of civil improvements that we need to prioritize.
- Michael asked whether LADOT is taking into account the full cost of the K71s, bike lane bollards, because my understanding is they last a matter of months, and you guys then have a 311 request or other requests to go and replace them, and on and on we go. So, when LADOT says cost, I just want to make sure you're thinking about the life cycle of a K71, how often you have to replace it, vis-a-vis something more permanent.
- In response, Elliott said I can get clarification on this, but I think this is referring to upfront costs. He passed the mike to Jack who said it's definitely a frustration for us, too. I totally agree that we're constantly replacing the K71s, and it's not sustainable, especially as we build out and add more protected bike lanes. We struggle to maintain the existing network, and how can we add more material to maintain without the ability to maintain what already exists, and so that's definitely part of the reason why we're moving away. And, it is a function of pay now, pay later, and our inability to pay now, requiring us to pay later. It would definitely be cheaper if we could amortize the cost of permanent, durable infrastructure but, without the cash up front, the limitation is the city's inability to maintain basically anything.
- Michael said if you guys have an intern on staff or someone you could throw a quick project to, it might be interesting to take a mile stretch of protected bike lane and say, how much does it cost us over a year to replace the K71s, or over 2 years, or whatever data set, you can go back and then look at that cost compared to per mile of the prefab concrete. I understand what you're saying, it's a cash flow issue, and it's cheaper long-term, but if you can't afford long-term, who cares about the short, but just having those numbers would give us, as a committee and advocates, something to work with to then talk to the budget chair and other people to say, hey, we're being penny-wise and pound foolish. But right now, we don't have the data.
- To which, Jack said because we haven't deployed many precast barriers, we don't have great numbers on the install cost, we only have estimates. So, as we deploy some of these products. Michael mentioned Toronto barriers. Jack said we have the Toronto Barriers, which I can say that one block was something like \$30,000 for a single block on one side of the street with labor and materials. Actually, plus materials. It might have been \$50,000 included. I think it was a \$30,000 labor cost. So, the other challenge that we run into is that LADOT crews are unable to install the precast barriers, we need to either contract it out or have StreetsLA do it, because of the weight, and the equipment required. They're between 500 and 1,000 pounds for a precast barrier. So, just the physical logistics of the fact that someone can pick up a K71 and drill it and one person can install it, it's always going to be cheaper, but we can get you those actual costs, and I think that'll give us a better comparison.

- Michael said the Holy Grail would be to include wrongful death lawsuits on corridors, and to say, yeah, okay, it's \$30,000, but the city paid out \$6 million to someone who was killed on the street. In response, Jack said for sure. And then allocating, and then having the city allocate that budget, that other line item, and move it over to LADOT, like that function also needs to occur. Another department's budgeted for it, and it doesn't go into Elliot and I's line item to spend from. It's definitely a structural issue, and I think we're on the same page about what the major issue is, and the same goal. It's these curb ramps that keep on dragging us down, too, and the utility relocations that we run into that are unavoidable. We need to value-engineer a project and some of the most impactful improvements that we wish we could include. So, we'll see what we can do to give you more information. I can definitely give you the results of the 3rd Street pilot, that we have those numbers available, the material cost and the labor cost. But that was just a pilot as well. I'm hoping that those numbers even come down. It was everyone's first time installing it, and so maybe StreetsLA can get faster and more efficient with its install as well, so those might even be a worst-case scenario that you're working with. Do keep in mind they're only on one side of the street, so it would double if it was a regular Class 4 as opposed to a two-way cycle track. I think it'd be great to work towards that, because it's penny-wise, pound foolish, as you mentioned.

7. Active Transportation Infrastructure Capital Improvement Plan, [Council File 23-0919](#). Discussion and possible action on the North Westwood Neighborhood Council (NWWNC) [community impact statement](#). In addition, please see the Investing In Place [report](#), "A City That Works: Public Space as a Civic Promise." Janis believes it's worth it to put something together as a BAC "position" on the issue of Capital Improvement planning for Active Transportation — as a "marker" for posterity.

- Michael said the Charter Reform Commission included a Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) in its recommendations to Council, so we'll see what Council does. We got 3 out of our 4 asks. The Charter Reform Commission is recommending a Director of Public Works which, if it passed and implemented, it would become the most powerful person in the city as far as infrastructure. They would be in charge of effectuating the CIP, of coordinating everybody. And we think it could really help unblock a lot of things. So Director of Public Works, they also approved a CIP, as well as a 2-year budget cycle. So again, we need to see what Council does with this stuff, but a 2-year budget cycle will be much better than the current system, where you essentially approve a budget, and then 6 months later, people are already jockeying for the next budget, and it's a huge wasted amount of effort and time and cycles. They also approved, a recommendation to have a small percentage of assessed property values be dedicated towards transportation. Unfortunately, it is quite small. So, it's good that we have a floor and a minimum amount of investment the city has to make, but that percentage is not nearly enough, what they approved, compared to the need of Los Angeles. So, those are the three things that the Charter Reform Commission approved and will send to Council. There's no guarantee we'll have

some charter reform on the ballot. They could decide not to do it, so literally, they can do anything they want. These are just recommendations.

- Glenn said we should put the Charter Reform Commission recommendations relevant to our purview on the LABAC agenda so that we may weigh in with City Council, because charter reform is going to go to City Council, and they do have to make a decision by the end of June in order to get on the ballot.

8. Century City Bikeway Network plan. Report update of prioritized projects from [First/Last Mile](#) (FLM) Plan for the Purple Line (D Line) extension through Century City. It's not an active LADOT project.

- At its October 7, 2025 meeting, the LABAC approved a motion to send a letter to CD 5 and Metro supporting a First/Last Mile (FLM) plan at the Century City Purple Line Station.
- Update: Michael said the only street in Century City that's on the mobility plan from a bike point of view is the Avenue of the Stars, between Pico and Santa Monica. I did suggest to CD5 that they have Metro do something there, but they've already had their striping plans.

9. Expo Bikeway, Northvale gap update. LADOT is waiting for Caltrans to review documentation of a categorical exemption from CEQA review before providing a construction time line. Elliott.

- Elliott said he will make a note and provide an update and Philip said when he does, we'll take this item off the agenda.

10. Streets For All update. Discussion and possible action on implementation of Measure HLA. Please refer to [Council File 15-0719-S26](#), [Mobility Plan 2035](#) map, and [Mobility Plan Implementation Dashboard](#).

- Update: Michael said we are hosting a mayor debate, next week, in person. Please see the following link: bit.ly/lamayordebate It's a 400-person venue near downtown. Right now it's Nithya Raman, Adam Miller, And Ray. And we'll see if the Mayor decides to join in the end. It's a free event.
- He wanted to make sure everyone was aware and saw the kerfluffle around \$103 million in grants that the City of LA previously won for bike projects in Boyle Heights, Skid Row, and Wilmington. They successfully got CD 14 to ask for a 2-year extension, but if nothing changes, that money's just going to go back to the state in 2 years. There's nobody at StreetsLA working on the project. And I think it's the tip of the iceberg. I think there's several hundred million dollars worth of bike projects for which the city has previously won money that are at risk right now, because we don't have the staff to deliver them. So, it's a very sad situation. LA is very good at winning the money, we're very bad at delivering projects on time. There is a change that should be coming up as part of the next budget cycle to get rid of the CAO's ability to set policy, which has been so far to not allow city departments to use grant funding to hire people to deliver the grant-funded projects. The logic being, the projects are one-time expenses, and if you hire someone, it's an ongoing obligation under payroll, which makes sense, except for the fact that we have a decade of backlog of projects, and so there's

plenty of work to keep people busy for many years. So, my understanding is that policy is going to be changed by Council and that could be a big difference, where LADOT or StreetsLA could then use grant funding to hire up positions in the departments to then deliver the grant-funded projects. So, we should keep an eye on it, but it's a very sad situation. There are hundreds of millions of dollars at risk across the city.

- A slight bit of good news, as everyone knows, LADOT is putting in protected bike lanes on Ohio up until Westgate. And then the City of Santa Monica is upgrading their bike lanes on Broadway to protected, and then there's a short stretch between Sentinella and Bundy that will remain unprotected for now. But the problem is that Ohio ends at Westgate and picks up again near Bundy, and there's a 3-block gap, otherwise known as the Ohio-to-Ohio Connector. We have been trying to get Caltrans to move on this, given that they're spending tens of millions of dollars resurfacing the street and doing sidewalk upgrades, etc., over the next 2 years. And they were throwing out crazy numbers, like \$20 to \$30 million estimates for a 3-block segment, and sometime in the 2040s. And so we mounted a campaign, and we got the state senator, the state assembly member, the neighborhood councils, the county supervisor, all asking Caltrans to do it now. And they have agreed. So, they're now moving this up into this year's shop cycle, and my understanding is it should be done by 2028, by the Olympics. I'm now trying to make sure that they're protected. It's probably going to be a two-way cycle track on the south side of the street and I'm trying to make sure it's protected with curbs and not K71 plastic bollards. But anyway, we saved a couple decades and tens of millions of dollars, which obviously was nonsense.
- Jennifer said she was out there the other day on Pico, and I came down Avenue of the Stars, and the sidewalk, have they ever considered using the sidewalks? They're pretty wide. Michael asked, do you mean, painting the sidewalk to make it a bike lane? He said the crossings would still be a challenge, because you still have a narrow curb ramp and a single crosswalk at the cross sections. Jennifer said she just wondered, because nobody's walking, they're all driving. To which Michael said all of Century City, nearly, is overbuilt compared to the amount of cars that use the streets, and so removing a lane on each side of Avenue of the Stars would have very little impact on vehicle traffic patterns in Century City. So, I don't think we have a geometry problem in Century City. It's just not on anyone's radar, and there's no money for it. Metro did recommend bike lanes on Century Park East, Avenue of the Stars, Century Park West, and Constellation as part of their first/last-mile around the Century City stop. And, Metro just invents these first/last-mile plans, and then it's up to the city to implement them, and as far as I can tell, the city's not doing anything.

11. Olympics opportunity for bikeway infrastructure and/or the [Festival Trail plan](#) and [route](#). Considering Paris' bikeways transformation, accelerated by their Olympics, could LA take inspiration to also implement an accelerated bikeway implementation plan in advance of the games? Eli Lipmen.

- At its October 7, 2025 meeting, the LABAC approved a motion to sign onto a letter supporting Los Angeles' commitment to a Car-Free Olympics.

- No updates.

12. City Council files related to bicycling ([link](#)) updates.

- Are there council files missing that should be added? Are there council files that should be removed from the list?
- The subcommittee chairs went through the list and claimed the ones that applied to them so that someone takes responsibility for tracking each one. Please see the [link](#) for the results. At the July 1 A&E Subcom meeting, Rob said he would meet with Jennifer and Philip to go through the list.
- Council File 25-0930: Departments of Transportation and City Planning, in coordination with Bureau of Street Services and the Bureau of Engineering, to report on options and recommendations that would require bike lanes to provide sufficient width for emergency vehicle access. With CD 4 and CD 5, CD 13 amended the emergency vehicles/bike lane width motion to have report backs on the issue of required widths and safety: [amending motion here](#). At its October 7, 2025 meeting, the LABAC tabled this motion and sent it back to committee for monitoring. Lionel.
- Council File [23-1210](#), Leading Pedestrian Intervals (LPI) / Vision Zero Safety Study / Signal Phasing and Timing / Traffic Violence. Motion passed on January 10, 2024, City Council to INSTRUCT the Department of Transportation to report back, within 120 days, with draft updated guidelines for the use of Leading Pedestrian Intervals (LPI), scramble crosswalks, and NO RIGHT TURN ON RED restrictions, taking into account the appropriateness of longer LPI duration, a more liberal set of criteria for scramble crosswalks, and increased usage of restricting right turns on red to reduce vehicle-pedestrian conflicts. Kent.
- Council File [25-0481](#), Bicycle and Multi Use Paths / Maintenance Responsibility / Department of Public Works / Los Angeles Administrative Code / Amendment. The Council to REQUEST that the City Attorney, in consultation with the Department of Public Works (DPW) and its bureaus, to prepare and present an ordinance amending the Los Angeles Administrative Code to assign the responsibility for maintaining City bicycle and multiuse paths to the Department of Public Works and INSTRUCT the City Administrative Officer, with the cooperation of DPW and the Department of Transportation, to provide recommendations regarding alignment of staffing and funding to provide an adequate level of maintenance for bicycle and multi-use paths, at least equal to that provided to streets and sidewalks. Rob.
- Council File [25-1358](#), Senate Bill (SB) 707 / Brown Act / Policy and Procedure / City Compliance / July 1, 2026
 - Glenn said he hasn't heard anything, although I've been trying to get some of the other boards and commissions, so I, a few weeks ago, had dialogue with one of the Department of Water and Power commissioners and she said she would contact their legal counsel. Because the same provisions would apply for the commissions as for the LABAC, I also had communication with the Community Forest Advisory Board asking them to do the same thing, and they're under Public Works.

13. Road resurfacing schedule-bikeway implementation matrix. For current status, please see:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1yGOX-qlbloDbt8exw-v4Bt1Bs8TZoAOo8wmjvtyD7FU/edit#gid=304220517>

- There were no updates.

14. Project Suggestion list.

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1nG7dZ5QJUd8bsi_VJN3QDh_qhEIG12fsrB913uGkrA/edit#gid=0

- There were no updates.

15. Announcements

- March Madness twist: [Help crown the worst intersection in greater LA](#)
- Online survey link for Sunset/Chavez project closes on March 31st: bit.ly/sunsetchavez_survey
- Although the formal deadline is past, we understand it may still be possible to submit comments to City Council regarding potential locations for [LADOT's speed camera program](#).

16. Adjournment in honor of people killed in crashes with motor vehicles.

- Karen moved to adjourn in honor of a 73-year-old woman who was killed by a hit-and-run driver while biking at the intersection of Vermont and Olympic.
- Jennifer moved to adjourn in honor of Councilmember Hugo Soto-Martinez as a champion for the work he's done on Sunset and on the Hyperion Bridge, honing his council district while joining bike routes.
- The meeting was adjourned at 2:57 PM.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, May 19 , 2026, 1:00PM.

LABAC Planning and Bikeways Engineering Subcommittee Mtg

Committee members are asked to attend in person. Guests and City Staff may utilize zoom/virtual meeting option.

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81051063004>

Meeting ID: 810 5106 3004

One tap mobile

+16694449171,,81051063004# US

+16699006833,,81051063004# US (San Jose)

