



a sub-element of
the transportation element

department of regional planning
county of los angeles
320 west temple street
los angeles
california
90012



PLAN OF BIKEWAYS



PLAN OF BIKEWAYS



BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

BAXTER WARD, Chairman
Fifth District

PETER F. SCHABARUM
First District

KENNETH HAHN
Second District

EDMUND D. EDELMAN
Third District

JAMES A. HAYES
Fourth District

HARRY L. HUFFORD
Chief Administrative Officer

JAMES S. MIZE
Executive Officer, Clerk of the Board

THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

OWEN H. LEWIS
Chairman

ARTHUR J. BAUM
Vice-Chairman

SADIE B. CLARK
Commissioner

CAROLYN P. LLEWELLYN
Commissioner

LUCILLA BARTHEL
Secretary to the Commission

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

NORMAN MURDOCH
Planning Director

EDGAR T. IRVINE
Acting Chief Deputy Director

ROBERT W. CHAVE
Deputy Director

JOSEPH K. KENNEDY
Deputy Director

WAYNE L. STEWART
Deputy Director

The preparation of this report was financed in part through a grant from the U. S. Department of Transportation—Urban Mass Transportation Administration under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended. Financial support was also furnished by the Federal Highway Administration and the State of California.

Adopted September 18, 1975
Amended June 24, 1976

Summary



BACKGROUND

More than two million Los Angeles County residents use bicycles. They use them to exercise, to save fuel, to have fun. Bikes have become so popular, in fact, that more than 400,000 were sold here in 1973 alone.

People of all ages are now cycling, not only for recreation but for transportation as well. The growing use of the bicycle, particularly for the short and intermediate trip, is proving to be a useful alternative to the automobile. With properly planned routes, the bicyclist can play an important role in reducing traffic congestion, air pollution, and saving energy.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PLAN

The Los Angeles County Plan of Bikeways is a component of the Transportation Element of the comprehensive Los Angeles County General Plan. It sets forth a coordinated framework for bike routes throughout the County while allowing room for each of the 78 cities within the County to incorporate city routes and unique features of their own. The Plan has been reviewed by all 78 cities as well as by adjacent counties.

The Plan consists of a text describing the background, description of plan, intent of plan, goals and policies, design standards, criteria for corridor selection, and implementation. Accompanying the text is a mapped policy indicating bike-way corridor routes. These should not be interpreted as precise locations. The countywide Plan of Bikeways does not show many of the community or local routes planned by cities and unincorporated neighborhoods. The Plan anticipates that each city will adopt a more detailed bicycle feeder system to supplement the agreed upon county-wide network.

INTENT OF THE PLAN

The Bikeways Plan has been prepared to guide the development of an interconnected network of countywide bicycle corridors. It recognizes and encourages the use of the bicycle for personal transportation and recreation.

The Plan will serve as a tool for planners, administrators and legislators. Periodic reviews and revisions will be made to provide additional bicycle routes or support facilities as they are warranted and to accommodate changing conditions, trends and interests of the bicycling public.

GOALS AND POLICIES*

GOAL 1

Encourage the development of convenient bicycle routes throughout the County.

POLICY 1

Develop an interconnected system of bikeways and bikeway support facilities.

POLICY 2

Require new subdivisions to develop bicycle facilities where feasible.

POLICY 3

Require redevelopment projects to provide bicycle facilities within their boundaries.

POLICY 4

Solicit and use all sources of local, regional, state and federal funds to plan, acquire rights-of-way and construct bikeways.

POLICY 5

Seek new means for acquisition, construction and maintenance of bikeways and support facilities.

POLICY 6

Utilize existing and abandoned public rights-of-way for present and future bikeways where feasible and a need can be demonstrated.

POLICY 7

Locate bikeways along designated scenic highways wherever environmentally, physically and economically feasible.

POLICY 8

Provide trees and other appropriate landscaping along bikeways, whenever feasible.

POLICY 9

Provide turnouts, shelters, campgrounds, hostels, toilets and trash receptacles for off-road bike facilities, where needed and feasible.

POLICY 10

Construct bikeways which connect recreational, educational, cultural, commercial and industrial facilities with residential areas.

*For precise wording of complete Goals and Policies, please refer to pages 9 and 10.

POLICY 11

Initiate a program to provide bike racks, lockers and other security devices at public parks, buildings and other activity centers.

POLICY 12

Encourage the provision of bike racks, lockers and other security devices at all private activity centers.

POLICY 13

Separate bicycle from automobile traffic whenever it is physically and economically feasible to do so.

POLICY 14

Accommodate bicycles by modifying and widening existing roadways and shoulders.

POLICY 15

Eliminate conflict between bicycles and parked and parking vehicles whenever it is physically and economically feasible to do so.

POLICY 16

Initiate a bicycle registration program in unincorporated County areas and encourage other jurisdictions to do the same.

POLICY 17

Support state and federal programs which develop and evaluate bicycle equipment standards.

POLICY 18

Enact uniform ordinances (in cooperation with other jurisdictions) which control the operation of bicycles on off-road bikeways.

POLICY 19

Encourage citizen participation in the planning, financing and development of bikeways.

GOAL 2

Initiate comprehensive safety education programs for both bicyclists and motorists.

POLICY 1

Encourage adoption of safety education programs which will:

Encourage bicycle safety courses in the public and private school curriculum and similar courses in the high school driver education program.

Encourage preschool and adult bicycle safety courses and make them available through public agencies.

Include on-the-bicycle instruction as part of the safety education program.

Encourage law enforcement agencies to provide bicycle safety and enforcement training for their personnel.

Encourage judicial agencies to provide similar training to their personnel (including juvenile and traffic court judges) who work with the Vehicle Code.

Encourage the Department of Education, the Department of Motor Vehicles, the Highway Patrol and other appropriate agencies to develop a bicycle safety text and distribute this text to all involved in bicycle programs.

Disseminate bicycle safety information to the public via these same agencies.

POLICY 2

Continue to publish and distribute brochures and other literature on bicycle safety.

POLICY 3

Encourage more uniform and stricter enforcement procedures by law enforcement agencies.

POLICY 4

Encourage all judicial personnel who work with the Vehicle Code (including juvenile and traffic court judges) to adopt uniform procedures in dealing with bicycle infractions.

POLICY 5

Encourage the news media to make public service announcements regarding bicycle safety and operational rules of the road.

POLICY 6

Sponsor a news program which emphasizes the public's need to be made aware of bicycles on the roadway.

POLICY 7

Monitor accident and safety data, identify and solve safety problems, and keep the public informed as to the need for strict observance of safety practices.

GOAL 3

Provide bikeways which interconnect with other transportation modes.

POLICY 1

Coordinate the implementation of bikeways with other transportation modes.

POLICY 2

Encourage other agencies to provide space, where feasible, for recreational and commuter bicycles on public transportation systems.

POLICY 3

Encourage other jurisdictions to adopt a comprehensive bikeway system which interconnects with the County's system.

POLICY 4

Coordinate the planning and implementation of feeder bikeways which connect regional bikeways with regional mass transportation facilities.

DESIGN STANDARDS AND CRITERIA

Lane Clearances

Recommended minimum clearances and widths for bike lanes and separate facilities are shown in Figures 5, 6 and 7 (Pages 15 and 16).

Grade

Where long or severe grades occur, consideration should be given to rest stops or additional widths.

Grades should be less than 7% and preferably no more than 5% or some will have to walk their bicycles.

Speed

A design speed of 20 mph for a particular facility is generally more than adequate.

When grades exceed 4%, a higher design speed should be used.

Surface and Base Material

Any surface wearing-course which has been designed to support the loadings imposed by bicycle traffic, maintenance vehicles, or any other type of loading anticipated on the bicycle facility is acceptable. It may consist of processed native material, asphaltic concrete, concrete or any other material or combination of materials capable of providing an all weather surfacing to facilitate bicycle travel.

The bikeway system should be developed in harmony with the natural terrain. It can do this by taking advantage of attractive scenic features while improving less desirable areas by landscaping. If fences are used to separate the bikeway from vehicular traffic lanes, they should be landscaped whenever feasible and consistent with safety.

Bike paths should be located to capitalize on shade from existing trees wherever possible or the perimeters of the paths should be appropriately landscaped with trees and other suitable plant material.

Safety

The bicycle facility which provides minimum conflict between motor vehicles and bicyclists while maintaining adequate access is usually the safest. In actual practice, however, especially in urban areas, this is difficult to achieve.

Intersections are a big problem. Operators of turning vehicles may not see the cyclist or may not choose to honor his right of way. This is a problem with all types of bicycle facilities including a separate bicycle path which crosses a roadway. Even costly grade separations have not proven effective in some areas since bicyclists will circumvent them if not convenient.

Left turns may be legally accomplished by cycling into the center of the road and turning like a vehicle, but this is of questionable safety to the inexperienced rider. A suggested alternate method for the novice is to walk his bicycle around the intersection on the pedestrian route.

Parking and Signing

Where parking is permitted, the vehicle parking and leaving the curb will be in direct conflict with the cyclist. Therefore, every effort should be made to prohibit or restrict parking where bike routes or bike lanes are to be established.

Additional pavement widening should be considered in locations where the existing roadway width is inadequate.

Adequate signing which is clear and conveys the message that a bikeway exists in the vicinity of the roadway should be provided for all types of bikeway facilities.

Maintenance and Drainage

Gratings, curbs and gutters, local depressions, meters, slotted cross gutters, debris from the sweeping action of cars, water on the pavement and deteriorated pavement cause problems for the bicyclist. Remedial measures must be initiated to remove or mitigate as many of these problems as possible.

Lighting

The cyclist should have reflector pedals and lights clearly visible from the side front and rear.

Bikeway illumination capable of providing nighttime identification and silhouetting of the cyclist should be considered in the design phase.

Bicycle facilities should be illuminated adequately, particularly at decision points and intersections with other facilities.

CRITERIA FOR CORRIDOR SELECTION

Bikeways shown on the map take advantage of the County's unique and varied terrain and of existing linear land holdings. Locations range from existing streets and highways, beaches, railroad rights-of-way, flood control channels and the California Aqueduct to new freeway rights-of-way, under power transmission lines and larger recreation areas. Routes were selected on the basis of the following considerations:

Trip Demand

Recommendations from individuals, bicycling groups, citizen advisory groups, city and county planning agencies, city councils and supervisors.

Proximity to existing, already well-traveled corridors.

Safety

Separation from vehicular traffic.

Lane or roadway width.

Grades.

Traffic volumes.

Continuity

Interconnections with local, subregional and regional systems.

Cost

Use of available right-of-way, roadway widths and graded sections.

Selection of least costly alternative whenever possible.

Impact

Proximity to residences.

Effect on neighborhood.

Closeness to backup subdivisions.

IMPLEMENTATION

It is economically impractical to immediately initiate every bike route shown in this plan. Early development of many routes is feasible, however, especially if available funds are used judiciously and new funds solicited energetically. Several activities already underway should be continued as part of the Bikeways Plan. These include:

Funding and implementing the bikeways shown on the map.

Coordinating the plan among all County agencies involved in bikeway programming.

Modifying the Building Codes and Land Division and Subdivision Ordinances so that new construction will be encouraged to provide new bikeways and support facilities.


Maintaining the present facilities.

Evaluating the need for additional road widening, signals or other traffic control devices.

Continuing regional, state and federal efforts to standardize bikeway development criteria.

Supporting current County, city, state and federal bikeway projects.

Encouraging private developments to provide racks, lockers or other bike security devices at apartments, shopping centers, parking lots and office buildings.



Several additional activities should be initiated as soon as possible. It is recommended that:

The courts and all law enforcement agencies adopt uniform procedures in handling bicyclists who violate the Vehicle Code.

Local governments adopt uniform ordinances relating to bicycle facilities.

A comprehensive bicycle registration/recovery of stolen bicycles program be developed and that all jurisdictions adopt a similar program.

Educational institutions initiate safety programs patterned after those recommended by the Senate Concurrent Resolution 47 Bicycle Committee (See Goal 2, Policy 1).

County-operated facilities install bike racks and lockers and that other jurisdictions do the same.

The County seek additional regional, state and federal funds for an accelerated bikeway construction program.

CONCLUSION

In this era of energy shortages, air and noise pollution and rising costs, the bicycle offers a quiet, economical, non-polluting alternative to the automobile, especially for shorter trips of from three to seven miles. But, just as the automobile has needed support programs from its years of early development to its present stage of maturation, the bicycle needs them now. The 1501 mile countywide Bikeway Plan can help turn these needs into a safer, strategically located network of facilities, one that will be available to anyone choosing to use it.

Table of Contents



SUMMARY	i
Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter 2 TERMS DEFINED	2
Chapter 3 ASSETS AND OPPORTUNITIES	3
Chapter 4 PROBLEMS AND ISSUES	4
A. User Characteristics and Types of Bicycle Riders	4
B. Increasing Number of Bicycle Accidents	5
C. Insufficient Roadway Width, Large Volumes of Traffic and Urban Development	6
D. Uniform Standards	6
E. Safety Programs	7
F. Enforcement of Ordinances	7
G. Multiplicity of Governmental Jurisdictions	8
H. Support and Maintenance Programs	8
I. Legal Rights of Bicyclists on Roadways	8
Chapter 5 - STATEMENT OF GOALS AND POLICIES	9
Chapter 6 CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR BIKEWAYS	12
A. General Criteria	12
B. Criteria for Corridor Selection	12
C. Design Standards	13
Chapter 7 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM	17
A. Identification of Existing Programs	17
B. Evaluation of Existing Programs	17
C. Action Programs	19
D. Use of the Plan of Bikeways	20
E. Conclusion	20
FOOTNOTES	21
BIBLIOGRAPHY	22

1. Introduction



Across the United States and locally, there has been a resurgence of interest in bicycling. Persons of all ages have taken to the riding of bicycles for recreation, exercise, and transportation. Many individuals are discovering that the use of the bicycle, particularly for short and intermediate trips is proving to be a viable and economic alternative to the automobile.

This renewed interest in the use of the bicycle is evidenced both locally and nationwide by increased bicycle sales, increasing numbers of bicycle-related accidents and demand for safe facilities to accommodate the bicyclists.

The Bikeway Plan for Los Angeles County has been prepared to plan for and implement an interconnected network of Countywide bicycle corridors to accommodate bicycle transportation needs. It recognizes and encourages the use of the bicycle for personal transportation and recreation.

This Plan is a Sub-element of the Transportation Element of Los Angeles County and will be included in the Transportation Element when it is revised. It is also complementary to the Noise, Scenic Highway and Open Space Elements of the General Plan since it advocates the establishment of a quiet, non-polluting transportation mode throughout the County as well as along scenic and recreation corridors outlined in the Scenic and Open Space Elements. As additional elements of the General Plan are adopted, or amended, they will be complementary to the element. The land use relationship such as the location of commercial, educational, residential and recreational centers as well as population density and settlement patterns will be addressed in the Transportation and Land Use Elements of the General Plan as mandated by state law.

The Sub-element proposes a coordinated approach to providing bicycle facilities throughout Los Angeles County. It has been submitted to all 78 cities in this County, as well as Orange, Ventura, San Bernardino and Kern Counties. It has also been submitted to the Southern California Association of Governments, the California Department of Transportation, the Citizens Planning Council and various other planning organizations and governmental committees for review and approval.

This Plan identifies major intercity and intercommunity bicycle corridors which will, when implemented, enhance bicycle transportation in this County. These corridors which are shown on the Map on page 11 have been reviewed by the 78 cities, Federal, State and Regional agencies. The Plan anticipates that each city, or groups of cities, as well as unincorporated communities will adopt a more detailed bikeways feeder system which will interconnect and supplement the regional system of bicycle corridors shown on the Map on page 11. These subsidiary systems, when adopted together with the corridors delineated in this Plan, will constitute a comprehensive system of bikeways.

The Plan will be reviewed periodically and revised as necessary to provide additional bikeways or support facilities as they are warranted and to accommodate changing conditions, trends and interests of the bicycling public.

2. Terms Defined



The term "bikeway" is used for all facilities that explicitly provide for bicycle travel. It, like the term "bike route", is a generic term which connotes a bicycle course which is to be traveled. These facilities may be classified into the following three major categories: ¹

OFF-ROAD

Bike Path or Trail – Class I

A bike path is a special pathway designated for the exclusive use of bicycles. Crossflows by pedestrians and motorists are minimized. It is usually separated from motor vehicle facilities by a space or physical barrier. It may be on a portion of a street or highway right-of-way or on a special right-of-way not related to a motor vehicle facility; it is usually grade separated but it may have street crossings at designated traffic controlled locations. It is identified with guide signing and also may have pavement markings.

ON-ROAD

Bike Lane – Class II

A bike lane is a lane on the paved area of a road for preferential use by bicycles. It is usually located along the edge of the paved area outside the traveled lanes or between the parking lane and the first motor vehicle lane. It is identified by "Bike Lane" or "Bike Route" guide signing, special lane lines, bicycle symbols or "Bikes Only" stencils on the pavement and other pavement markings or signs deemed appropriate to give adequate instructions to the users of the facility. Bicycles usually have exclusive use of a bike lane for longitudinal travel, but must accommodate crossflows by motorists at driveways and intersections and also by pedestrians at various locations.

Shared Route – Class III

A shared route is a roadway identified as a bicycle facility by "Bike Route" guide signing only. There are no special lane markings and bicycle traffic shares the roadway with motor vehicles. Special regulations may be enacted and posted along such facilities to control motor vehicular speeds or restrict parking to enhance bicycling safety.²

It should be noted that the 18,481 miles of surface roadways in Los Angeles County are being used by the bicycling public even though they are not presently delineated as bikeways. The Vehicle Code allows this use and it is anticipated that this Code will continue to allow roadways to be used by the bicyclists in the future. When the bikeway facilities shown in this Plan have been implemented, these roadways will act as a feeder system which facilitates access to the regional and local bikeway systems from the various communities located throughout the County.

The term "bicycle" as used throughout this Sub-element is defined in the California Vehicle Code as: a device upon which any person may ride propelled by human power through a belt, chain or gears and having either two or three wheels in a tandem or tricycle arrangement.³

The term "Plan of Bikeways" as used in this Sub-element refers to the written text contained in this document and the corridors shown on the Map on page 11.

3. Assets and Opportunities



Los Angeles County is a region of topographic and scenic diversity. The terrain of the region includes coastal beaches, sand dunes and marshes, coastal plains, broad valleys, gentle high plains, mountains, rolling hills, desert and offshore islands. This diversity of natural topographic features presents a variety of scenic experiences which can be enjoyed by the bicyclist. Climatological diversity, ranging from arid desert to a Mediterranean type climate, with very few days of inclement weather also provide ample opportunity for the bicyclists to use this mode of transportation in this County.

Bicycles are a non-polluting quiet form of transportation. They do not consume energy and are very economical to purchase, operate and maintain. Since they are so economical, they are readily available to all segments of the population. In addition, they contribute to the general health of the users by keeping them physically fit.

The majority of the urbanized areas of the County are located south of the San Gabriel Mountains in a massive area of approximately 1100 square miles. This urban sprawl has contributed to the transportation problems of the area.

In the urbanized areas residential development, especially in the older communities, is generally located in close proximity to schools, shopping areas, neighborhood schools and certain recreational and entertainment centers. This neighborhood development pattern is conducive to the use of the bicycle for a variety of short range trips of from 3 to 7 miles for transportation purposes.

Within the urbanized areas of this County there are a number of linear systems available for use by bicyclists, and there are a number of other linear systems which can be used to accommodate bicycle transportation facilities. Together these systems constitute a comprehensive grid network of transportation facilities capable of accommodating bicycle transportation throughout the County. The linear systems are listed below.

Bikeways may be constructed or implemented along these systems where a need for bicycle facilities can be demonstrated and it is physically feasible to implement safe, convenient bikeways to accommodate bicycle transportation.

		EXISTING MILEAGE
ROADWAYS	Arterial Highways	5,921
	Conventional State Highways	428
	Expressways	12
	Local Streets	12,120
	Freeway Rights of Way	482
	Total Roadways ⁴	18,963
FLOOD CONTROL CHANNELS	Los Angeles Flood Control District ⁵	422
RAILROADS	Railroad Mainlines ⁶	560
UTILITY RIGHTS OF WAY	Power Transmission Lines	380

4. Problems and Issues



The bicycle is a transportation and recreation mode for approximately seven to ten million people in California and for an estimated two million persons in Los Angeles County. New bicycle sales have been increasing steadily through 1973. According to the Bicycle Institute of America, nationwide sales totaled 3.7 million bicycles sold in 1960. In 1973, this figure had risen to a record 15.6 million or more. Figure 1 graphically portrays this increase in sales through 1972. Locally, bicycle sales in 1973 were estimated to be approximately 400,000 units.⁷

With this increase in sales and use of the bicycle came an increase in bicycle-motor vehicle accidents. In 1969, the California Highway Patrol recorded 5,244 such accidents including fatalities. In 1972, the number had more than doubled to 10,622. In 1973, it decreased slightly to 10,535 and for the first 11 months of 1974, the number of such accidents totaled 10,319.⁸

Clearly much work needs to be done to: improve existing roadways, provide additional well-designed cycling facilities, promote bicycle and driver safety education programs and provide consistent enforcement of statewide laws and local ordinances to improve the situation for both the cyclist and the motorist.

The problems and issues of the Plan of Bikeways for Los Angeles County relate to the following broad areas of concern which will be discussed in detail: user characteristics and types of bicycle riders, increasing numbers of bicycle accidents, insufficient roadway width, large volumes of traffic and urban development patterns, uniform standards, uniform enforcement of ordinances, multiplicity of governmental jurisdictions, safety programs, support and maintenance programs and the legal rights of bicyclists on the roadways.

A. User Characteristics and Types of Bicycle Riders

Cycling activity falls into two categories: recreational and utility oriented riding. For recreational cyclists (racers, tourers, exercisers, and general pleasure riders) the trip itself is the objective. For the utility oriented cyclist the objective is not the trip but reaching a specific destination — place of employment, school, home, a store, recreation or community activity center. Because of this destination consciousness the utility oriented cyclist places highest priority on directness of routes, acceptable grade profiles and minimized delay and inconvenience.⁹




FIGURE 1. THE RISE IN BICYCLE SALES

In urban areas, the number of trips and the composite of trip purposes characterized as utility riding normally equal recreational trips. In rural areas, recreational riding is more prevalent. In Los Angeles County, both types of trips are accommodated along our roadway systems and existing bicycle facilities.

Bicycle facilities provided for the public must also be capable of accommodating a broad cross section of the bicycling public. For there will be youngsters, teens, young adults, middle aged, and the aged riders using these facilities for bicycle transportation. Also the facilities must be capable of accommodating bicyclists with varying degrees of expertise and proficiency ranging from the expert bicycling groups to the novice who is just learning the rudiments of bicycling and may not be able to read.

B. Increasing Number of Bicycle Accidents

A recent bicycle accident report compiled by the Los Angeles County Road Department indicates that bicycle accidents increased 160% between 1966-1972. Figure 2 graphically depicts this increase in accidents.¹⁰

This dramatic increase in bicycle-motor vehicle accidents in many cases is largely due to the careless behavior or lack of understanding and failure to follow the rules of the road by the bicyclist.

Figure 3 graphically portrays the causes of 972 accidents investigated by the Los Angeles County Road Department between bicyclists and motor vehicles in 1972.¹¹




FIGURE 2. THE RISE IN BICYCLE ACCIDENTS

VIOLATION	0	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%
Bicyclist entered street from driveway or alley						19%
Bicyclist swerved into path of motor vehicle						14%
Bicyclist on wrong side of street; head on						9%
Other actions; bicyclist at fault						8%
Motorist at fault						7%
MIDBLOCK BICYCLE ACCIDENTS = 57% OF TOTAL						
VIOLATION	0	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%
Bicyclists on wrong side of street Hit by right-turning vehicle						11%
Bicyclist violated motorist's right-of-way						8%
Bicyclist ran stop or signal						7%
Other actions; bicyclist at fault						9%
Motorist at fault						8%
INTERSECTION BICYCLE ACCIDENTS = 43% OF TOTAL						

FIGURE 3. VIOLATIONS CAUSE ACCIDENTS

Other facts revealed from this accident study are as follows:

- There is a trend toward older juveniles and adults riding bicycles which results in more accidents in the older age group.
- The four summer months of June through September account for the highest percentage of accidents, 12% per month.
- Over ½ of the bicycle accidents occur between 3 p.m. and 7 p.m.
- The percentage of nighttime accidents is rising.
- Sixty-percent of accidents occur in residential areas but the number occurring in commercial areas is increasing.
- About ½ of bicycle accidents occur on arterial streets.
- Two-thirds of all intersection accidents occur on arterial highways.
- Eighty-seven percent of all mid-block accidents occur on streets with light to moderate parking.¹²

With the rapid growth of bicycle usage comes the obvious and pressing need for increased bicycle safety. While new facilities may ameliorate some of the conditions leading to accidents, the major share of bicycle travel will still be mixed with motor vehicles using a common thoroughfare. In an encounter between a 150-pound bicycle rider and a 3000-pound automobile the bicyclist in 99% of the cases is injured.¹³

One solution to this problem, which has proven to be effective, is more effective bicycle safety education in our schools and news media for both bicyclists and motor vehicle operators. This educational effort should emphasize the need to obey the rules of the road, the fundamentals of defensive riding and driving, and the need to be aware of the rights of other vehicles operating on our roadway transportation systems.¹⁴

For regardless of fault, there is presently a lack of driver awareness of the bicyclist and his rights to use the roadway system. As more bikeway facilities are provided, the signs, markings and enforcement procedures will also tend to educate the public in the safe, effective use of the systems provided.

C. Insufficient Roadway Width, Large Volumes of Traffic and Urban Development

In our automobile oriented society, a system of roadways has evolved to handle the traffic needs of the various segments of the community.

Local and collector streets provide access and egress to the residential and commercial areas and handle the traffic and parking demands generated in these areas. This traffic then flows onto the arterial system of roadways which interconnects with the freeway system to form a comprehensive network of roadways to accommodate a variety of trips to home, work, commerce, education, shopping and pleasure.

Because of our dependence on the motor vehicle as the main source of transportation, traffic volumes seem to increase in direct proportion to urban development. Consequently, the development of adequate roadway-systems to handle these increased volumes usually lags behind the traffic demands imposed on the road system by increased development. Thus, many of the existing roadways become congested with excessive traffic requiring the complete utilization of all available roadway space to handle traffic demands leaving no room to accommodate separate bicycle facilities or lanes within the road right-of-way. Because of this situation, bicycle traffic sometimes utilizes an entire traffic lane causing motor vehicles to veer into adjacent lanes on roadways where the right lane is not wide enough to accommodate both bicycle and motor vehicle traffic.

Also, as urban development progresses, strip commercial areas, apartment dwellings, and condominiums are allowed to develop along many of the arterial roadways with minimum setback distances from the roadway and minimal off-street parking to accommodate the needs of this type of development. This also presents problems for the effective development of bicycle facilities along roadways so impacted because of the high parking demand along the roadway and insufficient space adjacent to the road to accommodate widening or an off-road bicycle facility.

D. Uniform Standards

There is considerable variance in the bikeway design standards being used nationally, in California, and locally. This diversity is particularly noticeable in the areas of bikeway widths, capacity, design speeds, curvature and grade profiles.

The minimum widths for one-way bikeways, recommended by the Institute of Transportation and Traffic Engineering are in a report prepared for the State of California in 1972. For a two-way, separate bike facility, it is recommended that the width be increased an additional 3 feet to accommodate the additional "shy" distance needed for head-on bicycle traffic.¹⁵

It should be noted that the dimensions shown are minimum widths. Bicyclists frequently like to ride two abreast, not single file, as shown in this diagram. In the design of a bicycle facility, this factor as well as capacity, grade, speed, need for super-elevation and curve widening, horizontal and vertical sight distances and clearances will need to be evaluated and the facility designed to accommodate these factors. Graphical presentations of the recommended geometrical relationships of these factors may be found in a Federal Department of Transportation publication entitled "Bikeways State of the Art 1974".

Also, the State of California Highway Design and Traffic Manuals recommend minimum standards for striping and signing to be used in the implementation of bikeways. These standards are shown in Section 7-1000 of the Design Manual and Chapter 6 of the Traffic Manual.

E. Safety Programs

In a recent report to the California Legislature, the SCR 47 Bicycle Committee endorsed the following recommendations of the California Traffic Safety Education Task Force.¹⁶

1. That the California State Department of Education study and adopt the framework of the programs recommended for each of the target groups identified by the Task Force Bicycle Resource Panel, and that these programs be pilot tested and put into a form useful to California schools and other agencies in counteracting the California bicycle accident problem.

2. That various funding sources be explored for the purpose of development and testing of comprehensive traffic safety education programs including the teaching of bicycle safety, or where appropriate, special bicycle safety programs.

3. More research should be conducted to determine whether the critical behaviors outlined by the Task Force Bicycle Resource Panel for each age group are in fact those contributing to the greatest number of bicycle accidents. If this were known, our educational system could be better designed also that it would become more effective in preparing young cyclists for safe roadway operation.

4. Further research should be conducted to determine ways of modifying negative traffic attitudes and deviant traffic behaviors among bicyclists and motorists alike. These methods must be incorporated into the educational program because poor attitude is as much a factor in bicycle accidents as is lack of knowledge of the rules of the road.

5. K-12 grade bicycle safety education programs should be implemented by the Department of Education in cooperation with the local school districts as part of the school curriculum, either separately or integrated with other appropriate subjects.

6. All schools in California should provide some instruction in bicycling skills, hazard identification and avoidance techniques, and related proficiency requirements before a child is allowed to bring his bike to school.

Although there are some safety programs currently being practiced by various jurisdictions in this County, there is a definite need for a concentrated, coordinated countywide safety education program which encompasses all levels of society. Such a program should consider and incorporate the following recommendations of the SCR 47 Bicycle Committee:¹⁷

1. Bicycle safety education should be provided in public and private schools annually from kindergarten through twelfth grade, including high school driver education courses.

2. Preschool and adult courses should be made available through public agencies.

3. Bicycle safety education should strongly emphasize how to follow the Vehicle Code rules, rather than just require memorization of the rules.

4. Bike safety education must include on-the-bicycle on-the-road (or simulated road) practice to develop proper bicycle handling expertise in both normal and emergency situations.

5. The Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) should include mandatory bicycle safety and enforcement training in both the Basic Course and the Advanced Officer course required of officers from departments participating in the program.

6. Juvenile court judges, traffic court judges and referees, and all other judicial personnel who work with Vehicle Code violation adjudication should be required to take the same bicycle safety and enforcement motivation program as that provided for peace officers.

7. The California Department of Education, in conjunction with the California Department of Motor Vehicles, the California Highway Patrol, and other appropriate agencies (including user groups and local public agencies) should develop an adult level bicycle safety information text and disseminate such to all State and local government personnel involved in bicycle program activities.


8. The Department of Motor Vehicles, Highway Patrol and local law enforcement agencies should take a leading role in a public information effort advising motorists and other road users of their rights and responsibilities in relation to bicyclists, as well as making motorists aware of the bicyclists' needs on the roadway.

9. Adequate funding for implementation of the above recommendations should be appropriated by the State Legislature to assure statewide uniformity.

If such a comprehensive safety program were initiated, it would contribute greatly to the reduction of bicycle — automobile accidents in this County.

F. Enforcement of Ordinances

The California Vehicle Code defines bicyclists as vehicle operators for the purpose of enforcing the rules of the road and accident reporting. This principle provides good guidance for cyclists and other highway users providing the laws are obeyed. In most accidents involving bicyclists and motorists, the bicyclist is usually in violation of one or more laws. Many bicyclists and motorists do not seem to know that bicyclists are subject to the same rules of the road as motorists. This problem is compounded when local jurisdictions enact laws such as mandatory sidewalk riding, restrictions requiring bicyclists to turn left from the right-hand edge of the roadway and requiring motorists to turn right from a position that is not near the right hand edge of the roadway. These special rules confuse cyclists and motorists alike and can cause misunderstanding and accidents.



Testimony presented at the SCR 47 Statewide Bicycle Committee hearings 1974 indicate that many motorists, bicyclists, and law enforcement agencies are confused about present laws. It was readily apparent that the interpretation and enforcement of the Vehicle Code by local police agencies with regard to bicycle laws frequently is not uniform throughout the State.¹⁸

Riding on the wrong side of the road, operating without lights during darkness, not stopping for stop signs, darting into the street and failure to yield the right-of-way are violations most often committed by cyclists. Unless law enforcement agencies adopt uniform procedures for apprehending, citing and fining violators, the present accident situation will probably not improve.

As additional bikeways are provided along off-road rights of way such as flood control channels, beaches, aqueducts, canals, railroad and utility lines, it will be necessary to enact ordinances to establish regulations to control bicycle operations along these facilities. These ordinances will have to cover safety matters, rules of operation and along certain flood control channels, they will have to prohibit contact with polluted waters flowing in the channels.

Law enforcement agencies may eventually have to provide bicycle patrols along certain off-road bicycle facilities to enforce the ordinances and protect the users of these facilities.

G. Multiplicity of Government Jurisdictions

Within Los Angeles County there are 79 city governments, one County Government, Los Angeles County Flood Control District, a regional transportation planning agency — Southern California Association of Governments, the State Coastal Commission, the California Department of Transportation, the State Department of Recreation, the State Department of Water Resources, the Federal Department of Transportation, the Federal Department of the Interior, and the United States Corps of Engineers involved in the planning, funding and implementation of various bicycle facilities throughout the County. Some of these agencies have well defined policies and programs and others are in the process of formulating their plans and programs. Obviously this situation requires a great deal of coordination between the various agencies to initiate and implement a bikeways plan as extensive as the one shown in this Sub-element.

If the limited funds available for the local, regional, state and federal levels are to be utilized effectively to achieve a comprehensive system of bikeways in this County, all levels of government must work cooperatively toward this objective.

H. Support and Maintenance Programs
In 1971 over 400,000 bicycles were stolen in the State of California at a cost of \$20,000,000 to the owners. Recovery rate for this type of theft are extremely low because of inadequate statewide registration programs. Bicycle thieves tend to thrive on local registration inadequacy and the absence of interjurisdictional recovery efforts.¹⁹

In 1972 the Legislature took remedial steps to standardize bicycle registration laws and to encourage recovery of stolen bicycles. This program has had a degree of success and as additional city and county governmental jurisdictions take the initiative in implementing registration and recovery efforts, it will be even more successful in the future.

A frequent complaint vocalized by bicyclists is the complete lack of adequate facilities to secure their bicycles at public buildings or facilities such as post offices, libraries, civic centers, parks, beaches, ball diamonds, parking lots, schools, shopping centers, places of employment and cultural and religious centers.

To alleviate this situation, local governmental agencies must take the initiative to ensure that adequate racks, lockers or other devices are provided for the convenience of the bicycling public.

Another concern of bicyclists is the lack of adequate maintenance along the roadway edge where they are required by the Vehicle Code to ride. The sweeping action of motor vehicles frequently deposits rocks, glass and other debris in the lane adjacent to the curb. Also pavement deterioration and cut slope raveling along the shoulders or edge of the roadway has on occasion made bicycle riding in these areas a problem.

For any bicycle facility to effectively attract bicycle usage by the general bicycling public, it must be properly maintained. This means that the pavement must be maintained in good structural condition and that the bikeway be kept clear of glass, rocks and other debris.

The provision of adequate toilet facilities, trash receptacles, turnouts, shelters, campgrounds, and hostels to accommodate the bicycle traveler or tourist will also need to be considered in the design phase of any proposed off-road bicycle facility. Other considerations are adequate emergency access to off-road trails, directional and location signing, and in some areas convenient communication facilities to report accidents, thefts and maintenance problems along the bikeway.

I. Legal Rights of Bicyclists on Roadways
The California Vehicle Code and local traffic ordinances regulate the operation of bicyclists on the roadway system. Recently the professional bicycling organizations have vocalized their concern that the provision of bikeways may result in governmental agencies and law enforcement personnel restricting the bicyclist to the use of these bikeway facilities. They have indicated that bike lanes in their opinion are unsafe since they restrict the bicyclists operational capability and maneuverability, force them to ride in an unsafe location, gives a false sense of security, and are discriminatory against the bicyclist.

It is their contention that wider roadways and better safety education programs which stress the correct and safe method of operating bicycles on the roadway system are the best answers to improving the accident problems and improving the overall safety of operating bicycles on the roadway system.

This Sub-element does not propose any restrictions on the use of the roadway by bicyclists but does recommend corridors where some modifications such as pavement widening, parking restrictions, separate facilities, or other innovations may be utilized to make bicycling safer throughout this County. It recognizes that the bicyclist will have to continue to use the existing roadway system to gain access to these corridors from a variety of locations and will not use facilities which are not safe, convenient or readily accessible. It anticipates that the Vehicle Code in the future will not restrict the operation of bicycles on the roadway system since it is not logical to do so.

5. Statement of Goals and Policies



Goals reflect the broad aims which an entity strives to attain to accomplish a desired product or achievement. Sub-Goals further refine the goals by stipulating basic values to be considered in attaining the desired product. Policies provide direction for the achievement of the element goals and will be carried out through implementation programs utilizing public and private resources. The Goals and Policies of the Plan of Bikeways of Los Angeles County establish emphasis and tone for program formulation and direction for the decisions and activities of County government.

GENERAL GOAL 1

Provide safer, more convenient bicycle facilities throughout Los Angeles County for transportation and recreation, as a viable alternative to automobile travel.

Sub-Goal A

Promote citizen participation in planning a bicycle program for Los Angeles County.

POLICY 1

Encourage citizen participation in the planning and financing of bicycle routes.

POLICY 2

Encourage all efforts by individual citizens and private organizations interested in the development of bikeways.

Sub-Goal B

Plan and implement a coordinated interconnected system of bikeways and bikeway support facilities to enhance bicycle transportation.

POLICY 1

Implement a comprehensive system of bikeways and related facilities which takes into consideration health, safety, the needs of the bicyclists and their interrelationship with other modes of transportation.

POLICY 2

Require new subdivisions to develop and dedicate bicycle facilities where feasible.

POLICY 3

Require redevelopment projects to consider and provide bicycle facilities within the project limits.

POLICY 4

Solicit and utilize all sources of local, regional, state and federal funds to plan, acquire rights of way, and construct bikeways.

POLICY 5

Utilize existing and abandoned public rights of way along flood control channels, parks, utility rights-of-way, railroad rights of way, and road rights of way, wherever possible and where a need can be demonstrated to construct bikeways for transportation and recreation.

POLICY 6

Actively seek new means for the acquisition, construction and maintenance of bikeways and support facilities to encourage bicycle travel and recreation.

POLICY 7

Initiate a program to provide bike racks, lockers or other devices for securing bicycles in convenient locations at public parks, buildings and other activity centers.

POLICY 8

Coordinate the development of local bikeway feeder systems with other jurisdictions in this County.

POLICY 9

Provide landscaping along bikeways where needed and feasible.

POLICY 10

Provide bikeways which connect cultural facilities, recreation areas, educational facilities, commercial and industrial facilities with residential areas.

POLICY 11

Separate bicycle and automobile traffic whenever possible, taking into consideration safety, use of the facility, economic factors, and physical feasibility.

POLICY 12

Prohibit parking on shared routed (Class III) bikeways where adequate public or private off-street parking is available.

POLICY 13

Initiate a bicycle registration program in unincorporated County areas and encourage all other city jurisdictions to initiate similar programs.

POLICY 14

Locate bikeways along designated scenic highways wherever environmentally, physically or economically feasible.

POLICY 15

Encourage other jurisdictions within the County to adopt a comprehensive system of bikeways which interconnect with the County bikeway system.

POLICY 16

Modify and widen existing roads to accommodate and encourage safe bicycle use.

POLICY 17

Encourage the State and Federal Governments to continue to develop and evaluate bicycle equipment standards in order to provide the safest bicycle possible.

POLICY 18

Enact uniform ordinances in cooperation with other jurisdictions to control the operation of bicycles on off-road bikeways.

POLICY 19

Provide turnouts, shelters, campgrounds, hostels, toilets and trash receptacles for off-road bikeway facilities where needed and feasible.

GOAL 2

Initiate a comprehensive safety education program for both bicyclists and motorists to improve safety on existing roadways.

Sub-Goal A

Educate bicyclists, motorists and enforcement agencies in the proper operation of bicycles on our roadway transportation system.

POLICY 1

Encourage the educational institutions in this County to adopt safety education programs similar to those recommended by the California Traffic Safety Education Task Force and the State SCR 47 Bicycle Committee.

POLICY 2

Continue to publish and distribute brochures and safety literature to citizens and individual bicyclists.

POLICY 3

Recommend uniform and stricter enforcement procedures and programs by local law enforcement personnel and the Highway Patrol.

POLICY 4

Recommend that juvenile court judges, traffic court judges, referees and other judicial personnel who work with Vehicle Code violation adjudication adopt uniform procedures in dealing with bicycling infractions.

POLICY 5

Encourage the news media to make public service information announcements regarding bicycle safety and operational rules of the road.

POLICY 6

Sponsor a safety education program in the news media to make the public aware of the presence of bicycles on the roadway and the need to watch for them.

Sub-Goal B

Monitor accident and safety data to identify safety problems and their solutions.

POLICY 1

Continue to conduct studies of bicycle — motor vehicle accidents and operator behavioral characteristics to discover ways of reducing accidents on the roadway system.

GOAL 3

Interface the Plan of Bikeways with existing and future modes of transportation as they are planned and implemented to ensure the development of a balanced coordinated transportation system which meets the needs of all the citizens of this County.

Sub-Goal A

Coordinate the implementation of bikeways with other modes of transportation.

POLICY 1

Encourage other agencies to plan for and provide space for carrying recreational and commuter bicycles on public transportation systems where feasible.

POLICY 2

Recommend that bike lockers, racks, or other devices be provided at park-and-ride lots and other transportation centers to facilitate bicycle transportation.

POLICY 3

Plan for and implement feeder bikeways which connect regional mass transportation facilities to regional bikeways.

The Plan of Bikeways Map on page 11 is a graphic extension of the written policy. It identifies those corridors along which bikeways may be initiated and depicts corridors in Los Angeles County where bikeways are operational.











The Map shows four major categories of bikeways — proposed off-road, existing off-road, proposed on-road and existing on-road bikeways. It shows 318 miles of proposed off-road, 88 miles of existing off-road, 1,059 miles of proposed on-road and 36 miles of existing on-road bikeway facilities, for a total of 1,501 miles of bikeways. These routes are listed on the Map.

This Plan will be reviewed periodically and revised as necessary to provide additional bikeway corridors as they are warranted and to accommodate changing conditions, trends, and interests of the bicycling public.




TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

76 T-1 N 1/2

- | | | | |
|---|----------|---|-------------------|
|  | existing |  | future |
|  | |  | ON ROAD |
|  | |  | OFF ROAD |
|  | |  | PARK AND RIDE LOT |
|  | |  | ROUTE NUMBERS |

Feb. 16, 1976




- MAJOR BIKEWAY CORRIDORS
1. Avenue C (West)
 2. Main St (West)
 3. Elizabeth Lake Rd.
 4. California Aqueduct
 5. Ft. Tilden Road
 6. 29th St (West)
 7. 29th St (East)
 8. Santa Clara River
 9. Right of Way Railroad
 10. Valley Circle Blvd.
 11. Linden Blvd.
 12. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 13. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 14. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 15. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 16. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 17. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 18. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 19. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 20. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 21. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 22. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 23. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 24. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 25. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 26. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 27. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 28. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 29. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 30. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 31. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 32. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 33. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 34. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 35. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 36. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 37. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 38. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 39. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 40. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 41. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 42. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 43. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 44. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 45. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 46. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 47. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 48. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 49. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 50. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 51. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 52. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 53. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 54. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 55. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 56. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 57. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 58. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 59. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 60. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 61. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 62. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 63. Tatum Cyn. Rd.
 64. Beverly Blvd./Madley St.
 65. Santa Anita Ave.
 66. Santa Anita Ave.
 67. Santa Anita Ave.
 68. Santa Anita Ave.
 69. Santa Anita Ave.
 70. Santa Anita Ave.
 71. Santa Anita Ave.
 72. Santa Anita Ave.
 73. Santa Anita Ave.
 74. Santa Anita Ave.
 75. Santa Anita Ave.
 76. Santa Anita Ave.
 77. Santa Anita Ave.
 78. Santa Anita Ave.
 79. Santa Anita Ave.
 80. Santa Anita Ave.
 81. Santa Anita Ave.
 82. Santa Anita Ave.
 83. Santa Anita Ave.
 84. Santa Anita Ave.
 85. Santa Anita Ave.
 86. Santa Anita Ave.
 87. Santa Anita Ave.
 88. Santa Anita Ave.
 89. Santa Anita Ave.
 90. Santa Anita Ave.
 91. Santa Anita Ave.
 92. Santa Anita Ave.
 93. Santa Anita Ave.
 94. Santa Anita Ave.
 95. Santa Anita Ave.
 96. Santa Anita Ave.
 97. Santa Anita Ave.
 98. Santa Anita Ave.
 99. Santa Anita Ave.
 100. Santa Anita Ave.
 101. Santa Anita Ave.
 102. Santa Anita Ave.
 103. Santa Anita Ave.
 104. Santa Anita Ave.
 105. Santa Anita Ave.
 106. Santa Anita Ave.
 107. Santa Anita Ave.
 108. Santa Anita Ave.
 109. Santa Anita Ave.
 110. Santa Anita Ave.
 111. Santa Anita Ave.
 112. Santa Anita Ave.
 113. Santa Anita Ave.
 114. Santa Anita Ave.
 115. Santa Anita Ave.
 116. Santa Anita Ave.
 117. Santa Anita Ave.
 118. Santa Anita Ave.
 119. Santa Anita Ave.
 120. Santa Anita Ave.
 121. Santa Anita Ave.
 122. Santa Anita Ave.
 123. Santa Anita Ave.
 124. Santa Anita Ave.
 125. Santa Anita Ave.
 126. Santa Anita Ave.
 127. Lincoln Blvd.
 128. Jefferson Blvd.
 129. Santa Barbara Ave.
 130. Santa Barbara Ave.
 131. Santa Barbara Ave.
 132. Santa Barbara Ave.
 133. Santa Barbara Ave.
 134. Santa Barbara Ave.
 135. Santa Barbara Ave.
 136. Santa Barbara Ave.
 137. Santa Barbara Ave.
 138. Santa Barbara Ave.
 139. Santa Barbara Ave.
 140. Santa Barbara Ave.
 141. Santa Barbara Ave.
 142. Santa Barbara Ave.
 143. Santa Barbara Ave.
 144. Santa Barbara Ave.
 145. Santa Barbara Ave.
 146. Santa Barbara Ave.
 147. Santa Barbara Ave.
 148. Santa Barbara Ave.
 149. Santa Barbara Ave.
 150. Santa Barbara Ave.
 151. Santa Barbara Ave.
 152. Santa Barbara Ave.
 153. Santa Barbara Ave.
 154. Santa Barbara Ave.
 155. Santa Barbara Ave.
 156. Santa Barbara Ave.
 157. Santa Barbara Ave.
 158. Santa Barbara Ave.
 159. Santa Barbara Ave.
 160. Santa Barbara Ave.
 161. Santa Barbara Ave.
 162. Santa Barbara Ave.
 163. Santa Barbara Ave.
 164. Santa Barbara Ave.
 165. Santa Barbara Ave.
 166. Santa Barbara Ave.
 167. Santa Barbara Ave.
 168. Santa Barbara Ave.
 169. Santa Barbara Ave.
 170. Santa Barbara Ave.
 171. Santa Barbara Ave.
 172. Santa Barbara Ave.
 173. Santa Barbara Ave.
 174. Santa Barbara Ave.
 175. Santa Barbara Ave.
 176. Santa Barbara Ave.
 177. Santa Barbara Ave.
 178. Santa Barbara Ave.
 179. Santa Barbara Ave.
 180. Santa Barbara Ave.
 181. Santa Barbara Ave.
 182. Santa Barbara Ave.
 183. Santa Barbara Ave.
 184. Santa Barbara Ave.
 185. Santa Barbara Ave.
 186. Santa Barbara Ave.
 187. Santa Barbara Ave.
 188. Santa Barbara Ave.
 189. Santa Barbara Ave.
 190. Santa Barbara Ave.
 191. Santa Barbara Ave.
 192. Santa Barbara Ave.
 193. Santa Barbara Ave.
 194. Santa Barbara Ave.
 195. Santa Barbara Ave.
 196. Santa Barbara Ave.
 197. Santa Barbara Ave.
 198. Santa Barbara Ave.
 199. Santa Barbara Ave.
 200. Santa Barbara Ave.



AMENDED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY
June 24, 1976

**PLAN OF BIKEWAYS
AS ADOPTED 9-18-1975**
a sub-element of the transportation element
Los Angeles county general plan



THE DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
76 T-1 S 1/2

6. Criteria and Standards for Bikeways



The criteria and standards contained in this section will serve as a guide to be used in implementing the bikeways shown in this Plan. They will also serve as the means by which potential bikeways are evaluated and implemented. Criteria are generally non-quantitative rules while standards are usually quantitative or measurable.

The primary responsibility for the design of a bikeway is with the local jurisdiction or public agency which is implementing the bikeway facility. Minimum standards and criteria for bikeways on State highways have been developed by the California Department of Transportation. It should be noted that recent legislation amended Section 99401 of the Public Utilities Code to require that the local transportation agency responsible for analyzing claims for allocation of local transportation funds for bikeway facilities shall apply the general design criteria of the Department of Transportation for such facilities. It is therefore essential that the local agencies use the State's criteria as a minimum standard when seeking funds from this source.

The following criteria and standards are intended to supplement the State's criteria and to assist the local jurisdictions in implementing the bikeways shown in this Plan.

A. General Criteria

Bikeways should be implemented on the basis of three basic design principles.²⁰

ACCESS

The bikeway must be located where bicyclists want to go, readily accessible and convenient for the user.

PROTECTION

The bikeway should be located where it will afford the user the greatest degree of protection.

CONTINUITY

The bikeway system must be continuous internally and provide access connections to bikeways in adjacent communities.

In general a bicycle facility should be located to the right of an existing traveled way if it is located upon or adjacent to a roadway. Two-way separated facilities are possible on one side of a street, but the designer of such facilities must give close consideration to the problems of safe access to the facility. All bikeways should be clearly marked and delineated so that motorists, pedestrians, equestrians and bicyclists are alerted to the location reserved for this use. To delineate the lane or path effectively, the pavement markings, striping, and signing should be in conformance with Figure 4, page 14.

Other factors which must be considered and evaluated for any proposed bikeway are: user characteristics, terminal facilities, conflict points with motor vehicular traffic, maintenance of the facility, clearances, geometrics, lighting, bicycle trip demand, cost, financing, impact of facility on the neighborhood, linear systems, or recreational facilities, grades, energy consumption, pollution and replacement for other modes of transportation.

B. Criteria for Corridor Selection

The bicycle corridors shown on the Map on page 11 were selected on the basis of the following considerations:

1. TRIP DEMAND

Individual citizens, bicycling groups, city planning agencies, city councils, and supervisors nominated many of the bicycle corridors shown. Other routes were selected on the basis of observed usage and projected demand as well as their proximity to existing well-used corridors or roadways which lead to educational, recreational and commercial facilities.

2. SAFETY

Factors such as separation from vehicular traffic, sufficient lane or roadway width to accommodate bicyclists, grades, and traffic volumes along a given facility were considered.

3. CONTINUITY

The interconnection of the proposed facility with other city-wide and regional systems was evaluated.

4. COST VS. AVAILABLE FUNDING

Bikeways that can be implemented at the lowest unit costs were evaluated and utilized wherever possible considering such factors as available right-of-way, roadway widths, and graded sections.

5. IMPACT ON LOCAL NEIGHBORHOOD AND COMMUNITIES

Such factors as proximity of the route to local residences, whether a route is along a backup subdivision, effect of parking restrictions and effect of the bikeway on the neighborhood and recreational facility through which it passes were evaluated for some of the routes shown.

It should be noted that during the design stage for any of the bikeways shown, the above factors will need to be evaluated in more definitive detail before implementation proceeds. This is usually accomplished by conducting surveys, preparing engineering reports and feasibility studies, and through coordination efforts with the local jurisdictions and citizens.

C. Design Standards

Design must consider the space required by the cyclist, user characteristics, minimum widths and clearances, grade, radius of curvature, design speed, parking, signing, surface, base material, maintenance, safety and drainage.

Lane Clearances

The recommended minimum clearances and widths to be utilized for bike lanes and separate facilities in the implementation of this Bikeways Plan are shown in Figures 5 through 7 on pages 15 and 16. These recommendations should be further evaluated in light of the proposed capacity of a particular facility and the maintenance equipment used to clean a particular facility.

Grade

Because of the diversity of terrain in Los Angeles County, a rideable grade is an important design consideration. Where long or severe grades occur, consideration should be given to rest stops or additional width to accommodate bicyclists traveling up or down grade. Grades should be less than 7% and preferably no more than 5% or it is to be expected that some bicyclists will have to walk their bicycles.

Speed

Some bicyclists' speed may exceed 40 mph but usually the speed of the majority of bicyclists is in the 10-15 mph range. Therefore a design speed of 20 mph for a particular facility is probably more than adequate. Where grades exceed 4% this speed may not be conservative enough and a higher design speed should be utilized when designing the geometrics and width for such a facility.

Surface and Base Material

Any surface wearing-course which has been designed to support the loadings imposed by bicycle traffic, maintenance vehicles or any other type of loading anticipated on the bicycle facility is acceptable. It may consist of processed native material, asphaltic concrete, concrete or any other material or combination of materials capable of providing an all weather surfacing to facilitate bicycle travel.

Landscaping

The bikeway system should be developed in harmony with the natural terrain. It can do this by taking advantage of attractive scenic features while improving less desirable areas by landscaping. If fences are used to separate the bikeway from vehicular traffic lanes, they should be landscaped whenever feasible and consistent with safety.

Bike paths should be located to capitalize on shade from existing trees wherever possible or the perimeters of the paths should be approximately landscaped with trees and other suitable plant material.

Safety

The bicycle facility which provides minimum conflict between motor vehicles and bicyclists while maintaining adequate access is usually the safest. In actual practice, however, especially in urban areas, this is difficult to achieve.

Intersections are a big problem to the cyclist. Operators of turning vehicles usually do not see the cyclist or do not choose to honor his right-of-way. This is a problem with all types of bicycle facilities including a separate bicycle path which crosses a roadway. Even the provision of costly grade separations have not proven effective in some areas since bicyclists will circumvent them if not convenient. Also, if they are not properly designed they can cause operational problems and accidents for the user.

Left turns may be legally accomplished by cycling into the center of the road and turning like a vehicle, but this is of questionable safety to the young, inexperienced cyclist. A suggested alternate method for the novice is to follow the pedestrian route around the intersection. Other possible methods of handling bicycles at intersections are shown in *Bikeway Planning Criteria and Guidelines* prepared for the State of California by the Institute of Transportation and Traffic Engineering in April 1972.

Parking and Signing

Realistically and economically it will be necessary to provide bicycle facilities on streets. In these instances a separation between the cyclist and motor vehicle is desirable if it does not compromise the safety of the cyclist or the motorist. Where parking is permitted, the vehicle parking and leaving the curb will be in direct conflict with the cyclist. Therefore, every effort should be made to prohibit or restrict parking where bike routes or bike lanes are to be established. Also additional pavement widening should be considered in locations where the existing roadway width is inadequate to accommodate vehicles and bicyclists. Adequate signing which is clear and conveys the message that a bikeway exists in the vicinity of the roadway should be provided for all types of bikeway facilities. A traffic investigation which evaluates the conflicts from both the bicyclists and motorists viewpoints should be conducted and signs provided accordingly to adequately delineate a bikeway facility.

Maintenance and Drainage

Gratings, curb and gutter, local depressions, meters, slotted cross gutters, debris from the sweeping action of cars, water on the pavement and deteriorated pavement cause problems for bicyclists. In designing and maintaining a bikeway all these factors must be considered and remedial measures initiated to remove as many of these problems as possible.

Lighting

Nighttime accidents involving cyclist are increasing. The visibility of the cyclist by the motorist is a critical factor. The cyclist should have reflector pedals and lights clearly visible from the sides, front and rear. Bikeway illumination capable of providing nighttime identification and silhouetting of the cyclist is a desirable feature and should be considered in the design phase. Also for safety, it is desirable that the bicycle facility be illuminated adequately to provide visibility of the surface and surroundings, particularly at decision points and intersections with other facilities.




FIGURE 4 TYPICAL BIKE LANE MARKINGS

ALTERNATE LEGEND
 ONLY BIKE

C. T. C. D. C.
 June 1973

TYPICAL BICYCLE LANE

(cross section on highway)




FIGURE 5




FIGURE 6
Typical bicycle path cross section along highway




FIGURE 7
Two-Way bicycle path not along highway

7. Implement- ation Program



The purpose of the Bikeway Implementation Program is to identify actions by the various agencies which will promote safe, convenient bicycle transportation in this County.

The programs identified and evaluated in this section represent the range of actions available to the various levels of government to implement bicycle transportation and support facilities. It is not economically possible to immediately initiate all the bikeways shown in this Plan. It is possible, however, to initiate a planned program of construction and implementation which effectively utilizes the available funds to provide additional bikeways and support facilities to accommodate the transportation and recreational needs in this County.

A. Identification of Existing Programs
Following is a listing of existing programs and activities related to the Plan of Bikeways.

1. CITY AND COUNTY PROGRAMS

- Bikeway Implementation
- Bikeway Planning
- Building Regulation and Land Division
- Capital Improvement
- Channel Beautification
- Enforcement of Vehicle Code Regulations
- Highway Construction and Maintenance
- Transportation Planning

2. REGIONAL PROGRAMS

- Funding
- Transportation Planning

3. STATE PROGRAMS

- Bikeway Implementation
- Bikeway Planning
- Funding
- Enforcement of Vehicle Code Regulations
- Highway Construction and Maintenance
- Standardization of Signs and Striping
- Traffic Operations and Management
- Transportation Planning

4. FEDERAL PROGRAMS

- Bikeway Implementation
- Funding
- Research and Standards
- Transportation Planning

B. Evaluation of Existing Programs
Following is an evaluation of the ability of the existing programs to carry out the goals and policies of this Sub-element.

1. BIKEWAY PLANNING

Various County, City, State, and Federal jurisdictions and agencies are currently planning a number of additional bicycle projects which will further improve and enhance bicycle travel in this County. Following is a listing of some of these projects:

- Aliso Creek Bike Trail
- Ballona Creek Bike Trail
- California Aqueduct Bike Trail
- Carson Street Bike Path
- Centinela Creek Bike Trail
- Los Angeles River Bike Trail Extensions
- Malaga Cove Extension of the South Bay Trail
- Marina Del Rey Bike Trail
- Normandie Avenue Bike Trail
- Palos Verdes Drive North Bike Path
- POLARSS Bikeways
- Rio Hondo Bike Trail
- San Gabriel River Bike Trail (extensions North and South)
- Santa Monica Extension of South Bay Trail
- Tujunga Wash Bike Trail
- Wilbur Creek Bike Trail
- 98th Street Bikeway

In addition, the County local jurisdictions, Southern California Association of Governments, Caltrans and the Corps of Engineers, are preparing bikeway plans, and proposing a number of additional bike lanes and signed routes at various locations throughout the County.

2. BIKEWAY IMPLEMENTATION

The County of Los Angeles has been active in providing bicycle facilities since 1970. Bikeways which have been implemented to date include 35 miles of separate bicycle trails along the ocean and the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers and 25 miles of bicycle lanes.

The 78 cities have also been active in providing bicycle facilities. They have constructed 15 miles of separate paths and approximately 30 miles of bicycle lanes. They have also initiated approximately 125 miles of shared routes within their respective jurisdictions.

Other agencies are also active in providing bicycle facilities in this County. The State Department of Water Resources has opened 71 miles of the California Aqueduct in the Antelope Valley for bicycle use. The Corps of Engineers has constructed a 1-mile-long segment of the Tujunga Wash Bike Trail in the San Fernando Valley.

This program of providing additional bicycle facilities for the safe, convenient use by the bicycling public will do much to enhance bicycle transportation in this County.

3. BUILDING REGULATION AND LAND DIVISION

Various County and city agencies issue building permits and control the subdivision of land and related activities. In conjunction with this program, parking facilities are evaluated and controlled, streets are constructed and easements dedicated.

This program presents an excellent opportunity for the responsible governmental agency to require the dedication and construction of additional bicycle facilities and the provision of adequate racks or other locking devices at public parking facilities.

4. FUNDING

The County and city governments maintain capital improvement programs which provide additional public parks, recreational facilities, libraries, courts, hospitals, and buildings. These programs have been utilized in the past by the various jurisdictions to fund construction of bicycle facilities.

It also presents an excellent opportunity for providing adequate bicycle security devices at existing and future public facilities.

The Los Angeles County Flood Control District has initiated a program of channel beautification. Under this program, funds are made available each year to beautify selected reaches of existing flood control channels. The development of bike paths in conjunction with this beautification effort would provide additional bicycle transportation facilities.

In addition to local funding programs, there are a number of regional, State, and Federal sources which may be utilized to construct bicycle facilities and should be a coordinated effort.

The Southern California Association of Governments Executive Committee controls the allocation of bicycle funds from the Local Transportation Fund. Application criteria, the prioritization of projects, and evaluation criteria, are the responsibility of the Federal Aid Urban Committee. Under this program, the local agency submits projects to the F.A.U. Committee for consideration. This Committee evaluates the projects and recommends funding priorities to the SCAG Transportation and Utilities Committee (TUC), which then makes final recommendations to the SCAG Executive Committee.²¹

Section 2106 of the California Streets and Highways Code provides that \$30,000 per month be transferred from the Highway Users Tax Fund to the Bicycle Lane Account Fund. This fund is administered by the California Department of Transportation with the allocation of the funds going to cities and counties.²²

Projects must be submitted to Caltrans for funding consideration prior to December 1 of each year. Caltrans then makes allocations in accordance with a system of priorities established by this agency.

The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1973 authorized the expenditure of Federal Aid Highway Funds (except Interstate) for the construction of independent pedestrian and bicycle facilities.²³

Funds available for these non-motorized transportation developments may be diverted from other Federal Aid Highway purposes.

These Federal Highway Funds may also be utilized to develop bicycle facilities in conjunction with any Federal Aid Urban (FAU) or Federal Aid State (FAS) Highway project.

The Federal Aid Highway Act Amendments of 1974 established a Bikeway Demonstration Program for commuting and recreational purposes in urbanized areas. The legislation authorizes an appropriation of \$10 million nationwide for the program in 1976.²⁴

The Corps of Engineers, under the Code 710 funding program, may develop recreational facilities along or within completed Corps of Engineers projects. The Corps designs, constructs, and funds 50% of the design and construction costs of such facilities, and the local agencies must fund the remaining 50% share from available local funds and assume maintenance responsibility for the completed facility. Right-of-way along the various flood control facilities must either be owned in fee or a recreational easement from the fee owners procured before a project qualifies for consideration under this program.²⁵

Bikeway projects may be funded under a Land and Water Conservation Grant. The Federal funds for this program are derived from the sale of surplus Federal properties, a special marine fuel tax, entrance permits, and user fees at Federal outdoor recreational areas, and oil revenues from offshore drilling. Essentially, it is a reimbursement program. Fifty percent of the actual expenditures up to the support ceiling of the grant will be refunded when the project has been completed. Projects are submitted to the Director of the California Department of Parks and Recreation who is the responsible liaison agency in this State for administering this program. The plans and specifications must be approved by the State, and property acquired under the program must be retained in perpetuity for public outdoor recreation use.²⁶

5. ENFORCEMENT OF VEHICLE CODE REGULATIONS

The California Highway Patrol, the local county and city policing agencies, and the Courts have the primary responsibility for enforcing the regulations of the California Vehicle Code.

To ensure that uniform procedures are followed in citing infractions of this Code by bicyclists and motor vehicle operators is the responsibility of these policing agencies.

If a coordinated enforcement policy could be initiated, it would help to reduce the number of bicycle — motor vehicle accidents in this County.

6. HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION MAINTENANCE AND TRAFFIC OPERATIONS

The State, County and city jurisdictions maintain a program of providing additional highway improvements, maintaining the existing roadway system, and controlling the operation of vehicular traffic on this system. As a part of this program, roadway widenings and the provision of bikeways to accommodate bicycle transportation are considered where a need for such facilities can be demonstrated. Also, the elimination or mitigation of problems along the roadway edge such as deteriorated pavement, drainage grates, chuckholes, and debris, as well as traffic control devices, are considered where bikeway facilities are initiated.

7. STANDARDIZATION OF SIGNS AND STRIPING

The California Traffic Control Devices Committee is the group responsible for reviewing and making recommendations concerning traffic signing and striping to the California Transportation Department. Figure 4, page 14 shows the recommended striping and signing for bikeways within the roadway section. To achieve Statewide standardization, it is essential that bikeways conform to these recommendations as closely as possible.

This Statewide program of providing standard highway markings plays an important part in enhancing the safety of users of the roadway system.

8. RESEARCH

The State and Federal Governments are conducting research programs which are evaluating various ways of handling bicycle traffic at intersections, signing and striping requirements for bikeways, new highway drainage devices and gratings, improvement of the vehicle itself, and accident prevention.

The local agencies continue to compile and evaluate accident statistics and transportation data in an attempt to pinpoint locations where remedial measures are needed to make bicycling safer, and to determine where this mode of transportation may be effectively utilized within this County.

These research efforts will eventually improve bicycle transportation by providing safe, efficient facilities and equipment for the user.

9. EVALUATION SUMMARY

These programs, taken together, will eventually achieve a regional bicycle transportation system in this County. Together, they comprise a program of action which has already been set in motion to solve the bicycle transportation problems of this County. Other action programs are needed, however, to aid and abet this effort. These additional programs are contained in the following section.

C. Action Programs

The Plan of Bikeways action programs consist of all the existing programs discussed and evaluated in the preceding section of this Sub-element. These action programs are summarized below.

1. Continue to fund and implement the bikeways, education and enforcement programs outlined in this Plan.

2. Continue to review, plan, and interface closely with all agencies in this County to provide additional bikeways and bicycle educational programs.

3. Solicit and procure all available funds to construct additional bicycle facilities, initiate safety programs and upgrade enforcement programs.

4. Enact changes in the Building Codes and Land Division Ordinances to ensure that additional bikeways and bicycle support facilities are provided in conjunction with new construction.

5. Encourage private developments to provide racks, lockers, or other bike security devices at apartments, shopping centers, parking lots, and office buildings.

6. Continue to maintain the facilities provided, and to evaluate the need for additional road widenings, signals or other traffic control devices and educational and enforcement programs to enhance bicycle travel and safety.

7. Endorse the State and Federal efforts, and encourage them to continue to investigate all aspects of bicycle safety, and to continue their efforts in standardizing signs, striping, laws, and criteria for the development of bikeways.

Other actions that should be undertaken to further improve bicycle transportation in this County are as follows:

8. Recommend that all law enforcement agencies and the Courts in this County adopt uniform procedures in handling bicyclists who violate the provisions of the Vehicle Code.

9. Recommend that the local governments adopt uniform ordinances relating to bicycle facilities.

10. Initiate a comprehensive bicycle registration and recovery of stolen bicycles program and encourage all other jurisdictions to adopt a similar program.

11. Recommend that all the educational institutions initiate bicycle safety programs patterned after the recommendations of the California Traffic Safety Education Task Force and the SCR 47 Bicycle Committee.

12. Initiate a program of providing bicycle racks, lockers, or other security facilities at all County-operated facilities and encourage the other jurisdictions to initiate similar programs.

13. Fund additional bikeway projects annually and actively seek additional funds from Federal, State and regional sources to accelerate the bikeways construction program.

D. Use of the Plan of Bikeways

The Plan of Bikeways will serve as an advisory tool for County decision-makers, the Board of Supervisors, and the various Department heads, as well as other private and governmental agencies. It will also serve as a guide in implementing and funding regional bicycle facilities. The Sub-element will serve as a device to achieve a consistent course of action in developing an integrated network of bikeways to serve the bicycle transportation needs in this County.

E. Conclusion

The establishment of a safe network of bicycle facilities to serve all segments of the population is the primary purpose of this Sub-element. The accomplishment of this goal is dependent upon the willing coordination and cooperation of citizens, all levels of government, and private enterprise. In this era of energy shortages, air and noise pollution, and rising costs, the bicycle offers a viable, quiet, economical non-polluting alternative to the automobile, especially for the short trip of from 3 to 7 miles. The staged implementation of the 1,501 miles of routes shown in this Plan will greatly encourage the use of the bicycle as an alternative mode of transportation.

Footnotes



1. State of California Department of Transportation, *Bikeway Feasibility Study January 1975 in Portions of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties*, Sacramento, California (December 1974) pg. 3.
2. State of California Department of Transportation, *Design Manual Section 7-1000, Bike Routes*, Sacramento, California (August 1, 1974) paragraph 7-1000.1.
3. State of California Vehicle Code Division 11, Chapter 1, Article 4, Section 21200, *Laws Applicable to Bicycle Use – Bicycle Defined*.
4. Los Angeles County Road Department, *Highway Mileage and Population by Supervisorial District* (January 1973) and Information Supplied by the California Department of Transportation District 7 Office.
5. Information supplied by the Los Angeles County Flood Control District (April 1975).
6. Los Angeles County Regional Planning Department, *County of Los Angeles Noise Element (Proposed)*, Los Angeles, California (October 1974) pg. 9.
7. Information supplied by Bicycle Sales Staff of Various Manufacturers.
8. State of California Department of Transportation, *SCR 47 Statewide Bicycle Committee Final Report*, Sacramento, California (February 1975) pg. 1.
9. Federal Department of Transportation, *Bikeways State of the Art 1974*, Washington, D. C. (July 1974) pg. 4.
10. Los Angeles County Road Department, *Bicycle Accident – Safety Report*, Los Angeles, California (September 1974) pg. 1.
11. *Ibid.*, pg. 4.
12. *Ibid.*, pg. 5.
13. Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, *Major Bicycle Study*, Washington, D. C. (December 10, 1974), pg. 1.
14. Bicycle Accident–Safety Report, Op. cit., pg. 6.
15. Institute of Transportation and Traffic Engineering, *Bikeway Planning Criteria and Guidelines* (prepared for State of California Transportation Agency), Los Angeles, California (April 1972) pp. 23-26.
16. SCR 47 Statewide Bicycle Committee Final Report, op. cit., pg. 17.
17. *Ibid.*, pp. 17-19.
18. *Ibid.*, pg. 6.
19. State of California Department of Transportation, SCR 47 Newsletter, Sacramento, California (June 1974) pg. 6.
20. Tempe Planning Department, *Tempe Bikeways Plan*, Tempe, Arizona (September 1974) pg. 20.
21. Southern California Association of Governments, *Criteria for Allocation of 821 Bicycle and Pedestrian Funds from the Local Transportation Fund*, Los Angeles (May 1975).
22. State of California Department of Transportation, *Annual Report The Development of Nonmotorized Transportation Facilities*, Sacramento, California, (February 1975) pg. 10.
23. *Ibid.*, pg. 11.
24. *Ibid.*, pg. 12.
25. Los Angeles District, Corps of Engineers, Information on Code 710 Program (March 1975).
26. State of California Department of Parks and Recreation, *Procedural Guide for Land and Water Conservation Fund Program*, Sacramento, California (March 1973) pg. 1.

Bibliography



Federal Department of Transportation, *Bikeways — State of the Art*, Washington, D. C. (July 1974).

Institute of Transportation and Traffic Engineering, *Bikeway Planning Criteria and Guidelines*, University of California at Los Angeles (April 1972).

Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, *Major Bicycle Study*, Washington, D. C. (December 10, 1974).

Los Angeles County Regional Planning Department, *County of Los Angeles Noise Element Proposed*, Los Angeles, California (October 1974).

Los Angeles County Road Department, *Bicycle Accident — Safety Report*, Los Angeles, California (September 1974).

Los Angeles County Road Department, *Highway Mileage and Population By Supervisorial District* (January 1973).

State of California Department of Parks and Recreation, *Procedural Guide for Land and Water Conservation Program*, Sacramento, California (March 1973).

State of California Department of Transportation, *Annual Report The Development of Nonmotorized Transportation Facilities*, Sacramento, California (February 1975).

State of California Department of Transportation, *Bikeway Feasibility Study January 1975*, Sacramento, California (December 1974).

State of California Department of Transportation, *Traffic Manual Chapter 6*, Sacramento, California (May 1975).

State of California Department of Transportation, *SCR 47 Newsletter*, Sacramento, California (June 1974).

State of California Department of Transportation, *Design Manual Section 7-1000 Bike Routes*, Sacramento, California (August 1974).

State of California Vehicle Code Division 11, Chapter 1, Article 4, Section 21200, *Laws Applicable to Bicycle Use — Bicycle Defined*.