Los Angeles needs a Capital Infrastructure Program (CIP)

But structural change often raises questions (as it should).

Common concerns about a CIP for LA, honest answers.

INVESTING *in* PLACE

LA needs a CIP, but

“We don’t have the money.”

In reality:

- Cities with a CIP don’t necessarily spend more: they spend smarter.
- Cities use dollars more effectively by coordinating projects across departments, bundling contracts, and reducing redundancies.
- A CIP strengthens the City’s ability to compete for funding. By planning ahead, a CIP can help LA avoid consequences of deferred maintenance and reduce liability payouts.
- Inaction costs more.

INVESTING *in* PLACE

LA needs a CIP, but

“We already have plans.”

In reality:

- That’s true. But they live in separate departments, use different timelines, and rarely intersect, even when they involve the same stretch of road or sidewalk.
- A CIP doesn’t replace existing plans; it connects them, giving City Council and the Mayor a tool and a multi-year budget to lead across systems.
- A CIP makes it more likely that existing plans will actually be implemented.

LA needs a CIP, but

“It’ll take too long.”

In reality:

- That’s why we need to start now.
- With leadership from the Mayor, City Council, and the City Administrative Officer, LA can move from talk to action and finally put a citywide program in place.
- The longer we wait, the more time and money we lose.
- Behind every liability payout is often a person whose life was changed, a neighbor injured, a loved one lost.
- Delay isn’t just inefficient, it’s harmful.

INVESTING *in* PLACE

LA needs a CIP, but

“It’s too complex.”

In reality:

- Yes, creating a CIP is complex.
- But it’s not nearly as complex as building a city without one.
- A CIP doesn’t add complexity; it organizes what’s already happening and makes that work understandable to the people it’s meant to serve.
- Ultimately, a CIP reduces complexity.

INVESTING *in* PLACE

LA needs a CIP, but

“Haven’t we tried this already?”

In reality:

- Almost.
- Over the years, City leaders and experts have called for a Capital Infrastructure Program.
- Motions have been introduced.
- Reports commissioned.
- But those efforts didn’t move forward—not because the vision was wrong, but because we didn’t have the leadership needed to coordinate, commit, and carry it through.
- That’s the opportunity now.

LA needs a CIP, but

"What about the CTIEP?"

In reality:

- **Forecast, Not a Budget: CTIEP makes funding assumptions without confirming them with departments or committing resources.**
- **No Citywide Coordination: Departments submit separate reports with inconsistent information, leading to fragmented decision-making.**
- **Staffing Challenges: Without a CIP, LA cannot align staffing with long-term infrastructure goals, leaving departments understaffed, especially for grant-funded projects.**
- **CIP as a Solution: A true capital program aligns investments, policy priorities, and staffing resources, improving efficiency and long-term sustainability.**

INVESTING *in* PLACE

LA needs a CIP

For sidewalks, streets, and parks.

About Us:

For more than a decade, Investing in Place has been a steady civic presence in Los Angeles, helping people understand how infrastructure decisions are made and shaping those decisions to reflect care, access, and daily life.

We focus on sidewalks, streets, and parks because these spaces define how people move through the city and connect with one another.

INVESTING *in* PLACE