



August 2013
TPCBAC Packet Guide

PLEASE NOTE THE LOCATION!

We are returning to our usual location at the Himmel Park Library for this and future meetings.

1. BAC August 2013 Agenda
2. Current TPCBAC Roster
3. Draft TPCBAC June Minutes
4. Thank You Letter from Enforcement Subcommittee
5. Articles of Interest:
 - a. Momentum Magazine, July 31: **“Rise of the North American Protected Bike Lane”**
 - b. Streetsblog, August 7: **“Study: Cyclists Gravitate Toward Streets With Protected Bike Lanes”**
 - c. Law and Order Magazine, July 2013: **“Bicycle Law Enforcement: Enforce laws with mutual respect”**
6. Consent agenda letters:
 - a. Letter to jurisdictions regarding inclusion of transportation-related bicycle projects in future bond packages
7. URLs for Marana videos:
 - a. <http://www.screencast.com/t/5xARwbiXdp>
 - b. <http://www.screencast.com/t/LxuJmN3vZfC>



Pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.02, notice is hereby given to the members of the Tucson-Pima County Bicycle Advisory Committee and to the general public that the Tucson-Pima County Bicycle Advisory Committee will hold the following meeting which will be open to the public:

Meeting Date: **Wednesday, August 14, 2013**

Meeting Location: **Himmel Park Library, 1035 N Treat Ave Tucson, AZ 85716**

*****PLEASE NOTE LOCATION*****

Please lock your bikes outside the meeting room. If front door is locked, please use rear entrance.

Meeting Time: **6:00 PM**

Please arrive by 5:50 PM. If a quorum of 12 members is not reached by 6:10 PM City, County and other staff are required to leave and the meeting will be canceled.

Agenda

Projected Duration

- | | |
|--|----------------|
| 1. Call to Order ; approval of June 2013 meeting minutes | 5 min. |
| 2. Call to Public

This is the time when any member of the public may address the BAC. Due to time constraints, the total time allocated for this is 10 minutes. Individuals are allowed three minutes each. If additional time is needed to address the BAC, it may be considered as an agenda item for a future meeting. | 10 min. |
| 3. Law Enforcement Staff Reports from TPD and PCSD | 10 min. |
| 4. New Member Introductions and Role of Subcommittees | 10 min. |
| 5. Streetcar Design/Construction Updates | 30 min. |
| 6. Marana Ride Videos
http://www.screencast.com/t/5xARwbiXdp
http://www.screencast.com/t/LxuJmN3vZfC | 10 min. |
| 7. Downtown Links Update | 10 min. |
| 8. Pima County Bond Update | 10 min. |

- 9. Consent Agenda** **2 min.**
- a. **Letter to jurisdictions regarding inclusion of transportation-related bicycle projects in future bond packages**
- 10.Appointments: CTAC and Broadway Corridor Task Force** **2 min.**
- 11.Staff Reports** **10 min.**
- Ann Chanecka, City of Tucson; Matt Zoll, Pima County; Nancy Ellis, Oro Valley; Brian Varney, Marana; Gabe Thum, Pima Association of Governments
- 12.Subcommittee Reports** **10 min.**
- a. Downtown / University Facilities (David Bachman-Williams)
- b. Enforcement (Colin Forbes)
- c. Executive (Ian Johnson)
- d. GABA (Wayne Cullop)
- e. Downtown Links (Kylie Walzak)
- f. Living Streets Alliance (Kylie Walzak)
- g. Broadway Task Force (Naomi Mclsaac)
- h. SCVBAC (Tony Amos)
- 13.Announcements** **5 min.**
- 14.Adjournment**

If you require an accommodation or materials in accessible format or require a foreign language interpreter or materials in a language other than English for this event, please notify the Tucson Department of Transportation Office at 791-4391 at least five business days in advance.



Office of the City Clerk
BOARDS, COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS
Bicycle Advisory Committee, Tucson-Pima County (TPCBAC)

<u>Appointor (Classification)</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base	Edward G. Yasenchack 3015 N. Dickson Dr. Tucson, AZ 85716 Cell Phone: 817-688-3781 edward.yasenchack@dm.af.mil	3/7/2013	3/29/2016
Ex-Officio ()	Ann Chanecka Ex-Officio (Non-Voting) TDOT, Bicycle & Pedestrian Program 201 N. Stone Tucson, AZ 85701 Work Phone: 837-6691 Cell Phone: 444-1187 Ann.Chanecka@tucsonaz.gov	6/10/2010	
Ex-Officio ()	Nancy Ellis Ex-Officio (Non-Voting) Oro Valley Parks and Recreation Department Bilke Coordinator Oro Valley, AZ 85737 Work Phone: 520-229-5057 Cell Phone: 520-797-2202 nellis@orovalley.net	1/1/2004	
*Ex-Officio ()	Dave Fernandez Ex-Officio (Non-Voting) Tucson Police Department 270 S. Stone Ave. Tucson, AZ 85701 David.Fernandez@tucsonaz.gov	5/16/2013	
Ex-Officio ()	Jean Gorman Ex-Officio (Non-Voting) 1651 W. Thunder Rd. Vail, AZ 85641 Work Phone: 520-240-2723 Home Phone: 520-885-5299 prairiejean@aol.com	4/26/2013	
Ex-Officio ()	Michael Grider Ex-Officio (Non-Voting) Pima County Sheriff's Department Tucson, AZ 85706 Work Phone: 520-351-6108 michael.grider@sheriff.pima.gov	6/10/2010	

<u>Appointor (Classification)</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
Ex-Officio ()	Deputy Ryan Roher Ex-Officio (Non-Voting) Pima County Sheriff's Department Tucson, AZ 85706 Home Phone: 520-351-6108 Cell Phone: 520-351-4941 ryan.roher@sheriff.pima.gov	5/6/2010	
Ex-Officio ()	Roy Schoonover Ex-Officio (Non-Voting) 8701 S. Kolb Rd. #7-327 Tucson, AZ 85706 Cell Phone: 520-906-0981 rschoo2823@aol.com	5/6/2010	
Ex-Officio ()	Gabriel Thum Ex-Officio (Non-Voting) Pima Association of Governments Tucson, AZ 85701 gthum@pagnet.org	6/10/2010	
Ex-Officio ()	Brian Varney Ex-Officio (Non-Voting) Representative of the Town of Marana Tucson, AZ 85701 Home Phone: 520-382-2612 bvarney@marana.com	5/6/2010	
Ex-Officio ()	Matt Zoll Ex-Officio (Non-Voting) Pima County Transportation Systems Bicycle & Pedestrian Program Manager Tucson, AZ 85701 Work Phone: 520-740-6403 matt.zoll@dot.pima.gov	1/1/2004	
Ex-Officio ()	2 Vacant Position(s)		
Mayor	Tory Syracuse 944 N. 4th Ave. Tucson, AZ 85705 Work Phone: 396-3266 Cell Phone: 820-9483 tory.syracuse@gmail.com or tsyracuse@watershedmq.org	2/13/2012	12/7/2015
Pima County	David Bachman-Williams TDOT - Planning Division P.O. Box 27210 Tucson, AZ 85726 Work Phone: 520-622-6992 bachmanwms@gmail.com	7/12/2011	6/30/2013
Pima County	Brian D. Beck 1514 N. Cloverland Tucson, AZ 85712 Work Phone: 795-3000 x113 Home Phone: 326-9587 Message Phone: 326-9587 coyotes@cox.net	1/8/2013	1/31/2015

<u>Appointor (Classification)</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
Pima County	Raymond Copenhaver 7805 N Via Atascadero Tucson, AZ 85743 Work Phone: 575-8001 Home Phone: 744-2126 ray.copenhaver@gmail.com	5/2/2012	2/28/2014
Pima County	Wayne Cullop 3925 N. Pantano Road Tucson, AZ 85750 Home Phone: 290-4321 Cell Phone: 977-3018	1/8/2013	1/31/2015
Pima County	Collin Forbes 3465 N. Richland Dr. Tucson, AZ 85719 Home Phone: 271-7954 Message Phone: 222-6681 collin.forbes@gmail.com	5/25/2012	6/30/2013
Pima County	Martha Lemen Pima County Representative Tucson, AZ 85701 Home Phone: 520-400-9095 mllemen@earthlink.net	7/12/2011	6/30/2013
Pima County	Eric Post Pima County Representative Tucson, AZ 85701 Home Phone: 520-870-3987 EricofAZ@cox.net	7/12/2011	6/30/2013
Pima County	Larry Robinson Pima County Representative Tucson, AZ 85701 Home Phone: 520-237-5792 LarryRobinson08@comcast.net	1/8/2013	1/31/2015
Pima County	2 Vacant Position(s)		
Town of Marana	Glenn Pfleiderer 9467 N. Weather Hill Dr. Tucson, AZ 85743 Home Phone: 572-2292 civilmotion@comcast.net	2/9/2012	9/20/2013
Town of Oro Valley ()	Adam Wade 13037 N. Woosnam Way Oro Valley, AZ 85755 Home Phone: 308-5833 aofog5256@gmail.com	6/19/2012	12/31/2013
Town of Sahuarita	Anthony Amos 125 W. Calle De Las Tiendas #133 Green Valley, AZ 85629 Work Phone: (520) 393-7433 Cell Phone: (623) 388-7603 middlering66@gmail.com	6/11/2012	6/10/2016

<u>Appointor (Classification)</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
University of Arizona	Glenn Grafton The University of Arizona, Parking and Transportation, 1117 E. 6th Street Tucson, AZ 85721 Work Phone: 520-626-2458 ggrafton@email.arizona.edu	4/23/2013	4/22/2017
Ward 1	Naomi McIsaac 1132 E. Glenn St. Tucson, AZ 85719 Cell Phone: 207-752-7312 naomimcisaac@hotmail.com	6/12/2012	12/7/2015
*Ward 2	Ian Johnson Chairperson 776 S. 9th Ave. Tucson, AZ 85701 Home Phone: 248-9810 ian@moiagroup.com	12/13/2011	12/7/2015
Ward 3	Kylie Walzak Secretary 232 N. Melrose Ave. Tucson, AZ 85745 Cell Phone: 891-9094 Kwalzak@gmail.com	1/19/2010	12/2/2013
Ward 4	John Cousins 7861 S. Tarbela Ave Tucson, AZ 85747 Home Phone: 982-6115 jcousins@innsuites.com or jc0510@aol.com	12/5/2011	12/7/2015
Ward 5	Gloria Munoz 2126 S. Tucson Avenue Tucson, AZ 85713 Home Phone: 520-301-1055 gmunoz@arizonacanning.com	4/25/2013	12/2/2013
Ward 6	Elizabeth Scott 4318 E. 13th Cir. Tucson, AZ 85711 Work Phone: 626-9412 Home Phone: 326-8911 Fax: 626-6448 eascott@email.arizona.edu	10/26/2010	12/2/2013

Draft Tucson-Pima County Bicycle Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, September 12th, 2012
Ward 6 Office, 3202 East 1st Street, Tucson, AZ
6:00 PM to 8:00 PM
Prepared and Submitted by Beth Scott

1. Call to Order

- i. Recognize new members of the BAC: New Members: Gloria Munoz – Ward 5, Allen Kulwin – Pima County
- ii. Last month's minutes approved unanimously by a vote of 13 to 13.

2. Call to Public

- i. David Bachman Williams: Corner of 19th St and Park Ave has been fixed to make it much easier for bikes to get through the intersection; Fred ??? Streets Administrator at TDOT, Downtown Committee
- ii. Julia Sepolski – question about Mayor's efforts in urban forestry: is there any coordination between BAC and Mayor's office to provide shade for cyclists

3. Law Enforcement Staff Reports from TPD and PCSD

- A. Deputy Roher: 9 different collisions in the county, 6 were non-injury, 5 of those driver was cited. Final 2 were in foothills deputy cited cyclists, one for running into a parked car. Other was in Gates Pass, near entry to parking area, rider swung wide going round the turn, hit a car going uphill. May 25, injury accident during the Shootout. 3 Injury collisions, one at no details; one at 1st and Rudasill, one in San Xavier – (Ajo and Randolph) – no details. Riding at Gates Pass: riders are behaving really well, all incidents have involved cars, not bikes. Mt Lemmon: riders travelling 2 abreast, moving very slowly up the hill creating frustration for drivers. This is legal, but not courteous. John Aikers case (fatality), at Mission/Irvington: (check Tucson velo blog); wants to let the group know that the Police are interested in the facts of the case, including whether rider is wearing / using proper gear. Investigation- call comes into TPD first, then County is called in. TPD asked County to wait until they investigated the suspect. Get

a search warrant for blood samples (3 over a period of time). Made an arrest based on evidence, investigation. The suspect has numerous violations (no license, previous DUI). Now County attorney's office will take over the prosecution. Collision happened at 3:30, County had contact with suspect about 4:30; Deputy Roher said the suspect appeared extremely drunk, and preliminary blood test was very high for alcohol. Witness saw the car, attempted to follow, but could not get license plate or see suspect clearly. Eric asks if lack of identification will be an issue; Deputy Roher says he doesn't think so, since there is good evidence. News showed that a second person in the vehicle was involved, but DR says the evidence clearly shows that he is not guilty

Guy hanging onto back of truck being hauled up – was not cited, cyclist said it was "his truck".

B.

C. Fernandez, TPD. No fatalities. 5 calls for H&R involving bicyclists – 1 at Columbus, cyclist at fault, but no injury, ticket. At Tucson Mall, car turned in front of cyclist. Other cases not available

4. Tacks on Mt. Lemmon

- A. Repeated reports of tacks on the roadway near Snyder and Houghton, on east side of road. Over several week period. Damion has sent several emails, has offered to be on a task force. Deputy Roher says that everyone who gets a flat there should keep receipt for new tires, because one of the charges could be felony reckless damage to personal property. Need to document these incidents. Colin mentions that Damien was soliciting donations for a reward fund – nothing definite on this.
- B. Eric Post suggests: background on Brad Gorman memorial park, several very angry people in that area ended up stopping the park. Suggests that we set up a meeting with the residents (HOA?), see if they will cooperate to try to identify the perpetrator.
- C. Beth suggest reframing to be more of an informational contact, want the residents of the area to be aware of it for their own sake.
- D. D Roher re-iterates that he is primarily interested in prosecuting, wants to be clear that we don't want to send a message that is merely a warning, wants to make it clear that this is an illegal act.

5. Bicycle-related Hit and Run Policy at TPD! Colin Forbes

- A. Needs to be greater depth of investigation in H&R accidents; frequently no follow-up in non-injury or non-fatal accidents
- B. Fernandez says that is mainly a matter of manpower, since there are only 4 people in TPD who follow up on *all* traffic incidents. The policy now is to use the limited resources they have to follow up on fatal or serious injury accidents.
- C. Naomi asks what constitutes a serious enough injury. Fernandez says bodily harm that limits a person's ability to function normally. Naomi says she had a H&R that resulted in multiple surgeries, and it was never investigated. Fernandez responds that he would consider that a severe injury, needing investigation.
- D. Ian asks if there is anything different about bicycle accidents. Naomi was not brought into emergency room by ambulance, which Fernandez says that may be what made it appear to be a non-serious injury accident.
- E. Fernandez also says that the longer the time between the accident and the reporting of injuries, the less likely they will be able to investigate effectively (deterioration of evidence over a relatively short time frame).
- F. Colin mentions that people may be able to recall specifics after the shock wears off, and detectives should follow up simply to see if there is more information available. Fernandez says that still needs to be initiated by the cyclist / victim.
- G. Ian: How much effort goes into finding the suspect / car? Usually witness info, or specifics (license, description, etc.) prompts this. First responding officer will get info out as fast as possible through dispatcher.
- H. Deputy Roher says that one of the first things they assess is whether there's a fatality or possibility of someone dying. Re-iterates that victim needs to contact the police if something has changed (like injuries are more severe than first thought). Also says that he has been able to track down every perp in fatal collisions that he's worked on.
- I. Track statistics for fatalities (car, ped, bike, etc.), drug/intoxication, etc. This is required for all enforcement agencies by federal

government.

- J. Eric Post: asks Enforcement Committee to get the hierarchy for investigation. Fernandez says there is no defined hierarchy, investigation usually based on what evidence is available. Eric mentions concern that bike community doesn't see those H&R incidents in the same way – every H&R is serious to the cycling community. Further discussion

6. Current Bicycling Projects and Issues in Marana

- A. Brian Varney and Glenn Pfeiderer; Presentation on cycling projects in Marana. Map of bike facilities, which also show up on COT and Pima bike map
- B. Routes lacking connection primarily in subdivision.
- C. OF interest:
 - i. Santa Cruz RP crossing of Ina Rd
 - ii. Shared use path from El Rio Park (Continental Ranch) tying up to Avra Valley
- D. Town owns/maintains 57 miles of bike paths, trails; will continue to make connections to Oro Valley, Pinal County and Saguaro Nat'l Park. Plans for an additional 120 miles of paths and trails.
- E. Shows some of the facilities, including amenities like shade pavilions, water, bathrooms, etc. E.g., Twin Peaks Rd which has both a bike lane and separated 7' path. This is a new standard which town is trying to establish on all new roadways.
- F. Mountain biking trails and trail heads. Trails not well maintained beyond the first mile or so (Wild Burro, Tortolita Preserve trailheads).
- G. Multi-use lanes and dedicated bike lanes. Town prefers 7' multi-use lane. Shows some substandard multi-use lanes, around 2' of a.c., 2' of concrete gutter pan.
- H. Tangerine Rd (2016), 30% design just completed. Will have 7' multi-use lane as well as separated shared use path.
- I. Ian asks about preferred crossings at major intersections. BV says it's primarily marking on asphalt, crosswalks are at these. Ignacio

asks whether shared use paths are bi-directional – they are.

- J. Question regarding Avra Valley Rd..... [check recording]
- K. Brian Beck, Gutter pans: COT and County have stopped doing them altogether. Keith Brant is Town Engineer, best contact regarding that issue.
- L. Roy: North side of Cortaro – switchback on the ramp; BV doesn't know if anything is being done about. Glenn P. affirms that the gravel there is a problem need to do a 360 in about a 12' area.
- M. Glenn also mentions where Cortaro hits Ina, then also going on Ina at I-10: both areas point in opposite direction of bike egress (270 turn), both have gravel problems.
- N. Traffic Eng div adamant about not giving up the extra area in multi-use lanes (why they don't prefer dedicated bike lanes)
- O. Ignacio – bike directional paths – bad meme for young riders, especially with no signage/ traffic control.
- P. Will look at Glenn's videos at next meeting.

7. Pima County Bond Package: Current Inclusions and Next Steps

- A. Working with different jurisdictions to put together a cohesive package of projects for upcoming Bond Initiative
- B. Two items on the list as it's coming from Pima Co administrators to the bond committee
 - i. \$20M ROW acquisition funds for part of Loop that goes through private property
 - ii. Chuckleberry's last presentation: \$24M Shared use path connecting CAP to Loop
- C. Issues: We are happy to have a County administrator who is pro bicycle, but we should not just rubber stamp anything that he recommends. At Friday's meeting DBW would like permission to say that BAC would like to have ability to recommend projects that we have been talking about, working on as a committee for several years.
- D. CAP Authority does not want to pave along top of levy, but is

considering paving at base of levy.

- E. Velodrome left out – problem is that location has not been determined. The \$5M figure that was used is out of date. Homework needs to be done.
- F. Also left off is the urban greenways project, was criticized for not connecting to the loop, all though all 5 segments end at Loop. DBW recommends that we push for the Bond Comm to reconsider this. Much more accessible to a wider range of people than the CAP/Avra Valley project.
- G. Ian reiterates the desire to work with other jurisdictions to put together a robust and varied, comprehensive list of projects.
- H. Will schedule another meeting to discuss this in July or August. Whatever we do recommend needs to be backed up with solid information, numbers – needs to be well developed. Research regarding who would use it, how often, etc.
- I. Don't want to "dis" the CAP project, but we do want to make sure that they know that we consider it lower priority than some.
- J. Naomi asks where these other recommendations are coming from. DBW suggests that Huckleberry uses a fairly personal lens in deciding what should be highest priority. May also be difficult to assess the value of more complex package.
- K. Need to make the Bond Adv. Comm. aware that these priorities completely overlook the deep knowledge of years of successful
- L. DBW asks Nancy for Oro Valley's top priority.

8. Proposed Broadway Cross Sections

- A. Three meetings in late May which were used for setting performance criteria including pedestrian, bicycle, mass transit. Lot of push back on the 8 lane scenario of three vehicular lanes in each direction with a bike/mass transit lane in each scenario. this may be used as a general performance criteria for any other future road reconstructions.
- B. Performance criteria for bicycles. Separation – Eric – We don't always want separation such as left turns by ciclyists where we want safe integration.
- C. Driveways are the main thing that decreases safety. There is a standard that notes this is a main issue. Less frequent driveways is

better

- D. Hopefully bike lane will be 6 foot with a one foot buffer. Eric – Maintenance should be an issue, especially at utility cuts.
- E. Shade and tree issues.
- F. Gabe – need to be careful about using temporary paints before putting in finalized thermoplastic.
- G. Eric – Buses – No pull outs a problem. Beth: Not a problem stops will be well planned to not be a problem.
- H. Should mass transit be in the middle or shared with cycles. David: If its light rail it absolutely needs to be in the middle, Bus Rapid Transit is not so crucial. Ian – don't like to share with buses. Gabe: Putting pedestrians in the position of getting to the middle can be a problem for them, conflicts.
- I. Trees should be included because the shade is worth it for shade for all users. Loop is better where there are trees for shade.
- J. Bike network connections: Are there things that are necessary?
- K. Another idea is to create access road (frontage type) that would be used for commercial access without affecting the main road as much.
- L. Next meeting of Broadway Corridor is next Thursday at Child and Family Services. All are welcome.
- M. Beth leaving so we need a new representative.

9. Summer Schedule –

- A. No meeting in July. Upcoming subcommittee meetings discussed in subcommittee reports

10. Staff reports

- A. **City of Tucson – Ann**; need repaving, striping suggestions
- B. **Matt Zoll, Pima County** – no report
- C. **Nancy Ellis, Oro Valley** – no report.
- D. **Brian Varney, Marana** – see previous
- E. **Gabe Thum, PAG** – New bike maps are out- credit card size; emphasize different facility types, level of comfort.

11. Subcommittee Reports

- A. **Downtown** – David Bachman Williams. Monday, 4:15 PW building, 6th floor conf.
- B. **Education** – no report
- C. **Enforcement** – Collin Forbes. June 27, Thurs
- D. **Facilities** – Next meeting not set, probably in July
- E. **Executive** – July 31st Joel Valdezy Library , Santa Catalina room
- F. **MTB** – Martha Lehmen absent
- G. **GABA** – Board meeting last night;
- H. **Santa Cruz Valley Bicycle Advocate Committee**, Bill Adamson-absent
- I. **Broadway Citizen’s Task Force** – see previous

12. Announcements - none

Adjournment

- A. at 8:15 pm.

Attending:

Ian Johnson, Ward 2
David Bachman-Williams, Pima County
Beth Scott, Ward 6
Glenn M. Pfleiderer, Marana
Collin Forbes, Pima County
Naomi McIsaac, Ward 1
Edward Yasenchack, Davis-Monthan
Adam Wade, Oro Valley
Ray Copenhaver, Pima Count
Gloria Munoz, Ward 5
Eric Post, Pima County
Allen Kulwin, Pima County
Brian Beck, Pima County
Ignacio Rivera de Rosales, Pima County DOT
Jay Alexander, citizen
Julie Zapolski, citizen
Brian Varney, Town of Marana

Andrew Bailey, Kittelson & Assoc.
Deputy Ryan Roher, Pima County Sheriff's Department
Gabe Thum, PAG/RTA
Kate van Roekel, citizen
Robin Steinberg, citizen
Jeff & Dee Kaymeyer, citizens
Nancy Ellis, Oro Valley
Sam Sanford, citizen
Ann Chaneka, TDOT
Sgt. D. Fernandez, TPD

The Enforcement Subcommittee of and for the Tucson-Pima County

Subcommittee Chair:

Collin Forbes
Pima County

Members:

Eric Post
Pima County

John Cousins
Ward 4

Designee:

James McKenzie
Tony Crosby

Jurisdictions:

City of Tucson

Pima County

University of Arizona

Town of Oro Valley

Town of Marana

Town of Sahuarita

Davis-Monthan AFB



August 1, 2013

Tucson Police Department

Records Division

270 South Stone Avenue
Tucson, AZ 85701

RE: Bicycle-Related Crash Reports

On behalf of the Enforcement Subcommittee of the Tucson-Pima County Bicycle Advisory Committee, I want to thank you for your efforts in providing the crash reports for Tucson bicycle collisions.

We have begun processing and analyzing the reports you have sent. The information will be used to help city planners make better decisions about bicycle facilities. In addition, we hope to use the data to help guide police efforts to increase bicycle safety in Tucson.

Sincerely,

Collin Forbes
Enforcement Subcommittee Chair, TPCBAC.
cc: Ian Johnson, TPCBAC Chair.

<http://momentummag.com/features/the-rise-of-the-north-american-protected-bike-lane/>

The Rise of the North American Protected Bike Lane

by [Angie Schmitt](#)

July 31, 2013



Courtesy of NACTO

A 3D rendering of a One-Way Protected Cycle Track with planters and parking buffer from the NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide.

There was a time when a narrow stripe of asphalt in Park Slope, Brooklyn, was the most hotly contested ribbon of pavement in the United States. Reams of news coverage were devoted to the battle for this solitary disputed traffic lane: the Prospect Park West bike lane.

Fighting for its removal was a wealthy and influential group of nearby property owners, headed by Iris Weinshall, the wife of US Senator Chuck Schumer. Meanwhile, on the defense was the full collective strength of America's largest urban bike advocacy community, headed by [Transportation Alternatives](#), an advocacy group with 100,000 active supporters across the city.

The Prospect Park West bike lane was a small part of about 250 miles (400 kilometers) of bikeways that New York City had added over roughly five years, between 2007 and 2012. But most importantly, this space was part of a special class of premium bike infrastructure: a

protected bike lane, separated from car traffic by a row of parked cars. That added protection, coupled with beautiful views of the park, transformed what used to be just another traffic-clogged road into one of the most attractive streets to pedal in the city.

The dispute eventually culminated in a lawsuit for the bike lane's removal. In the end, however, New York City's bike community prevailed over the "not-in-my-backyard" crowd. Today, the Prospect Park West bike lane stands as a crown jewel in the growing network of bike infrastructure that has helped establish New York as one of the most bike-friendly cities in the United States.

In retrospect, it seems clear that the anti-bike lane coalition – dismissed as irrational and parochial by cycling advocates – knew how quietly revolutionary that little green stripe of pavement would be. According to the New York City Department of Transportation (NYC DOT), the bike lane has reduced speeding rates from 74 percent to 20 percent. Meanwhile, since the lane's installation, crashes and injuries of all kinds have dropped by 63 percent. Travel times for motorists did not increase and neither did congestion ([source](#)). Meanwhile, a NYC DOT survey showed more than 70 percent of neighborhood residents supported the improvement.

It's also clear, looking back, that the cycling advocates in New York City understood they were fighting for something much larger than a bike lane. They knew that New York City was pursuing a big idea, something that, if all went as planned, could inspire cities throughout North America.

Protected bike lanes, "green lanes," or cycle tracks, as they are sometimes called, like the Prospect Park West bike lane are upsetting the transportation status quo in more and more cities across North America. Similar treatments have transformed Dearborn Street in Chicago, IL; Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, DC; and Market Street in San Francisco, CA.

In fact, it's getting to the point where if your city doesn't have a protected bike lane yet, it's being left behind. Last year alone, the number of protected bike lanes in the United States nearly doubled from 62 to 102. This year, the number is expected to double again. Protected bike lanes are now in place in 32 cities across the United States, according to Martha Roskowski, director of the [Green Lane Project](#), a nonprofit project of bike advocacy group Bikes Belong. The organization is working with six US cities to install protected bike infrastructure.

The Green Lane Project, which began in 2011, has deliberately helped catalyze another surge in protected bike lanes in cities around the US. The project evolved out of the advocacy organization Bikes Belong, which draws its support from the bike industry. Top cycling industry officials and advocates wanted to establish a program to help individual cities adopt this new bike infrastructure, so that those cities would serve as models for other places around the country.

"What we needed was more projects on the ground so that we could look at them and talk about them and study them," said Roskowski. "We came up with this concept of [starting] with six cities ... an exclusive club."

The Green Lane Project invited 32 cities to apply for the program, and they were overwhelmed with the response. More than 43 cities applied, including some that asked to apply even though they hadn't been invited.

Ultimately, the organization settled on six cities it believed had the political support and technical expertise to move quickly to establish protected bike infrastructure: Austin, Portland, Chicago, San Francisco, Washington and Memphis. Those cities are receiving technical support from 2012 to 2014 to build their own "green lanes." After that, the organization is planning to select six more, as well as forming a looser network of as many as 50 cities that could benefit from some guidance, Roskowski said. You can bet the competition will, once again, be fierce.

"It is no longer just reserved for the Portlands and the Boulders of the world," Roskowski said. "Tulsa, and Omaha, and Tucson – a lot of these cities that would not come to mind as places that are really progressive are talking about these things."

The separation of protected bike lanes is often achieved by a row of plastic bollards. As planners look for more permanent options, more formidable obstacles like landscaping planters or curbs are being used. About half of protected bike lanes, elegantly enough, simply take advantage of row of parked cars between moving traffic and cyclists to establish a buffer – as in Park Slope.

But as flimsy – or robust – as that separation can be, those barriers have a powerful psychological impact on transportation decisions. Cities like New York, Chicago, and Austin have found that protected bike lanes help address a key barrier for Americans: most of them just don't feel safe riding in heavy traffic.

Benefits of Protected Bike Lanes are Ever Increasing

On a quieter neighborhood street, a protected bike lane might not be necessary, said Gabe Klein, Chicago's chief transportation official and a prolific builder of protected bikeways. But on major corridors with lots of traffic, they are a game-changer.

"The protected bike lane can make a huge difference, in particular for the average person who maybe doesn't ride every day," Klein said. "It will make them feel like 'I can get on a bike too,' or 'I wouldn't mind if my child rode a bike to school.'"

Washington, DC, saw a 200 percent increase in cycling along Pennsylvania Avenue after it installed a center-running protected bike lane there in 2010, according to a [study by District Department of Transportation DC](#). Chicago's Kinzie Street protected bike lane boosted cycling along the corridor 55 percent after its installation last year.

Those increases are all the more remarkable given the historical context. For decades, in the United States, the cycling rate has held stubbornly around 1 percent – despite the fact that

almost 50 percent of trips Americans make by any mode are three miles or less. “The number one reason people don’t ride is that they don’t feel safe,” said Roskowski. “When we put in the protected lanes, people feel safe.”

An important study by the Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBT) looked at the public’s attitude toward cycling. Researchers found there are four types of cyclists. The first type – “strong and fearless” – is the daredevil who is comfortable riding with motorized traffic on the busiest roads, no special protection needed. This hardy group, however, represents only about 1 percent of the total population of potential cyclists, the study found.

Meanwhile, about 7 percent of the total population, researchers found, are “enthused and confident.” These are the folks who have been attracted to cycling in Portland by the improvements the city has made. The study found that an additional 60 percent of the population is “interested and concerned,” – so, potentially winnable – followed by a unmovable 33 percent, classified by PBT as “no way no how.”

“The system we have built today has gotten us a 1 percent bike mode share,” said Roskowski. “We think we can do better.”

Increasing the number of cyclists on the roads has been an important motivating factor for cities like New York, Portland, and Chicago. Boosting cycling rates reduces traffic, improves air quality, and public health, while also extending the life of traffic infrastructure.

Additionally, increasing the number of cyclists can, in itself, help reinforce the well-being of the cycling community. Numerous studies have documented the “safety in numbers effect,” wherein increases in overall cycling rates across cities produces a decline in overall injury rates. Between 1993 and 2011, for example, the cycling rate of Minneapolis, MN, almost tripled, but collisions held steady.

But another critical selling point for the political officials championing protected bike lanes is economic. Studies have shown that high-quality bike infrastructure can boost local commerce along the cycling routes, often dramatically. For example, after a protected bike lane was installed on New York City’s Ninth Avenue, NYC DOT recorded a 49 percent increase in retail sales along the corridor. Meanwhile, a Portland study found bike commuters spend 40 percent more at local businesses than their car-driving counterparts.

Even more compelling is the perceived effect on talent attraction and retention. There’s plenty of evidence that highly educated, young workers – who urban economics guru Richard Florida would call the “creative class” – are simply demanding better bicycle infrastructure. Early last year, Transportation Nation announced, “for the tech sector, bikes are the new cars.” The article featured interviews with leading tech companies like Foursquare, which have made locations along important bike corridors a key part of their employee attraction and retention strategy.

Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel has been particularly explicit about his intentions to use bike infrastructure to help attract new tech talent and investment. When Emanuel was campaigning for the mayor's seat in 2011, a key part of his platform was a promise to install 100 miles (160 kilometers) of protected bike lanes during his first term.

"They're an integral part of my economic development strategy," Emanuel told USA Today. "It's no coincidence that the first protected bike lanes were on Kinzie Street, and that's exactly where Google-Motorola Mobility is putting their headquarters with 2,800 jobs."

Emanuel has continued to aggressively pursue bike infrastructure in his first term. In December, at a press conference marking the opening of the Dearborn Street protected bike lane, Emanuel boasted that he was going to use bike infrastructure to attract tech talent and businesses from the city of Seattle. "I expect not only to take all of their bikers but I also want all the jobs that come with this," Emanuel said.

The Mayor of Seattle, Mike McGinn, meanwhile retorted, "We're going to keep them here," saying he would use the 7th Avenue separated cycle track to do so.

Another – perhaps more obvious – justification for protected bikeways is safety. And a handful of studies have confirmed that these facilities do a lot to help shield cyclists from injury and worse.

A 2010 examination of six Montreal cycle tracks found that, compared to similar streets, protected bike infrastructure reduced injury rates by 28 percent. A follow-up study, examining street conditions and collisions in Montreal and Toronto uncovered even more dramatic results, showing that protected bikeways had one-ninth the risk of the most dangerous category of street studied: roads with parked cars that lacked bike infrastructure. Regular, unprotected bike lanes, by contrast, had half the risk, the study found.

A History of Protected Bike Lane Opposition

There has been some controversy about the safety implications of protected bikeways. Indeed, questions about safety have been one of the biggest obstacles to protected bike infrastructure, over the last four decades and continuing today. And protected bike lanes – even regular bike lanes – have their opponents, even within the cycling community.

While Denmark and the Netherlands were building their first cycle tracks in the 1970s, America – beset by the oil crisis – was enjoying a similar renaissance in cycling. But cycling advocacy took a much different tack in the United States than it did in parts of Northern Europe, and one man – a California engineer named John Forester – deserves more credit for that than anyone.

In the 1970s, Forester began the "vehicular cycling movement." Rather than separate cyclists from cars with painted bike lanes or paths, Forester taught that it was best to educate cyclists about the rules of the road and to behave as if they were "driving their bike." The central premise of this philosophy was that "cyclists fare best when they act and are treated as drivers

of vehicles.” Separate infrastructure for cyclists was fundamentally incompatible with this philosophy, and vehicular cycling advocates opposed – and continue to oppose – those types of improvements.

Around the time that Forester was beginning his advocacy in California, a study was released by Santa Barbara researcher Kenneth Cross, finding that “overtaking” collisions – where a driver collides with a cyclist from behind – were quite rare. This study was seen as significant because this is the type of collision that on-street cycleways were being sold as most likely to prevent. Instead, the majority of collisions, Cross found, occurred at intersections. In a follow-up study, Cross said bike facilities might still be justified on safety grounds – and more recent studies examining the issue continue to find fault with some of the foundational studies of the vehicular cycling movement.

Despite questions about North American studies of protected bike lanes, for decades, Forester’s ideas were tremendously influential in the United States. For a time *Effective Cycling* – Forester’s manifesto – was the official educational training offered by the League of American Wheelmen – now the League of American Bicyclists. More importantly, many of Forester’s ideas were adopted and codified by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) in its “Green Book,” often referred to as the “bible” of traffic engineering. Meanwhile, for the last three decades, small but vocal groups of vehicular cyclists effectively quashed bike infrastructure projects in cities like Boston, Dallas, and Cleveland.

“For the longest time, the bicycle movement had been led and dominated by people who thought that bikes had to be on the road, in the travel lane and didn’t need any or want any special help or any separated space,” said Andy Clarke, president of the League of American Bicyclists. The league now supports protected cycling infrastructure.

What has become clear in recent years is that vehicular cycling – teaching cyclists to behave like car drivers – has at least one very critical shortcoming: it did not do much to increase the number of cyclists on American roadways. While cycling rates exploded in the Netherlands and Denmark – which were experimenting with, and then gradually perfecting, protected cycle tracks – in America, cycling rates have yet to surpass 1 percent. In Denmark, 16 percent of all trips are by bicycle. In the Netherlands, the number is 27 percent nationwide and 57 percent in cities.

While there are many aspects of Danish and Dutch culture and law that helped produce their remarkable cycling rates, it seems clear that the physical infrastructure played an important role, said Roskowski.

“You cannot convince a person who is not comfortable riding on the road to be comfortable riding in the road,” she said. “You cannot market them into it. You really have to change how the streets work.”

Another reason vehicular cycling has fallen out of favor with many top advocates and planners is that it has become clear that the whole philosophy is an obstacle to increasing diversity in the cycling community. There is evidence that women in particular are less likely to get involved in cycling in the absence of dedicated infrastructure. The same sort of concern applies to anyone who isn't at the height of their physical fitness – children, the elderly, and novices.

One obstacle for advocates in overcoming safety concerns, however, is that there simply haven't been enough examples of functional protected bike lanes in the United States yet to rigorously study.

"Because these facilities are relatively new in this country, the body of research is relatively small," Roskowski said. "You have to have them on the ground before you can study the effects of them."

Installing these facilities takes professional engineering judgment, consideration of the individual context, and it may even take adjustment. Roskowski said that the designers of these facilities have to use care to make sure, in particular, that intersections are carefully engineered.

Study: Cyclists Gravitate Toward Streets With Protected Bike Lanes

Posted By [Angie Schmitt](#) On August 7, 2013 @ 3:29 pm In [Bicycling, Montreal](#) | [6 Comments](#)



[1]

Intersections in Montreal with protected bike lanes saw 61 percent more bike traffic than comparable intersections with no bike infrastructure. Image: [zmtomako/Flickr](#) [2]

By now there's not much doubt that [protected bike lanes](#) [3] can be a game-changer for cycling in U.S. cities. Making streets feel safe to bike on boosts overall cycling rates, attracting people who otherwise wouldn't even consider cycling. The [safety benefits keep accruing as more people on bikes hit the streets](#) [4], since drivers become more aware of the presence of cyclists and pay closer attention.

Here's some new evidence demonstrating that bike infrastructure attracts cyclists. A study published in the *Journal of Transport and Land Use* [[PDF](#) [5]] found that intersections in Montreal with protected bike lanes see 61 percent more bike traffic than those without. Meanwhile, intersections with plain old painted bike lanes see a not-insubstantial 36 percent more cyclists. The results demonstrate a strong preference for bike infrastructure — the more separation from traffic, the better. [Previous research by Jennifer Dill](#) [6] at Portland State University has also quantified people's preferences for bike infrastructure over streets without bike lanes.

The study, conducted by Jillian Strauss and Luis Miranda-Moreno of McGill University, examined 758 intersections in Montreal. Researchers modeled how different factors are linked to the volume of bike traffic at intersections, controlling for several variables.

In addition to the presence and quality of bike infrastructure, they also found a link to land use: the greater the "mix of uses" — or intermingling of retail, housing, and office space — the more bicycling. A 10 percent increase in "land mix," researchers found, was associated with an 8 percent

increase in bicycling. Higher employment density — or the concentration of jobs near intersections — was also found to be a significant predictor of increased bike traffic.

Article printed from Streetsblog Capitol Hill: <http://dc.streetsblog.org>

URL to article: <http://dc.streetsblog.org/2013/08/07/study-cyclists-gravitate-toward-streets-with-protected-bike-lanes/>

URLs in this post:

[1] Image: http://dc.streetsblog.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/mtl_bike_lane.jpg

[2] zmtomako/Flickr:

<http://www.flickr.com/photos/zmtomako/3964424124/sizes/z/in/photostream/>

[3] protected bike lanes: <http://momentummag.com/features/the-rise-of-the-north-american-protected-bike-lane/>

[4] safety benefits keep accruing as more people on bikes hit the streets:

<http://injuryprevention.bmj.com/content/9/3/205.abstract>

[5] PDF: <http://dc.streetsblog.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/296-2022-1-PB.pdf>

[6] Previous research by Jennifer Dill: <http://www.streetsblog.org/2008/10/20/study-confirms-safer-bike-routes-get-more-people-riding/>

► SUMMARY

Check out some of the most common myths and misunderstandings about traffic. Examine reality to increase safety for all road users. As bicycle use increases around the country, it is important for police leaders to understand these realities and train their line staff in them as well.



Photos courtesy of Keri Caffery.

BICYCLE LAW ENFORCEMENT

ENFORCE LAWS WITH MUTUAL RESPECT.

► By Kirby Beck

America's roads were first paved in the late-1800s after extensive lobbying by bicyclists, then known as "wheelmen." Horse-drawn wagons and early motorcars could function on the rutted dirt roads of the era. But cyclists, balanced on their large wheeled penny-farthings, had a difficult time functioning on the uneven surface. At that time, bicycles were often the fastest vehicles on the road.

As motorcar use increased, motorists found equitable, non-motorized use of the street to be a hindrance. While never codified, these perceptions regarding road use gradually came to be understood and accepted:

Road Use Perceptions

Roads are for motor vehicles: In fact, roads are still for moving people and motor vehicles are but one type of conveyance by which people move. Slow vehicles are unsafe: Most enforcement officers know that speed kills; however, a perception has developed that vehicles that are slower than other traffic create a hazard; in truth, slower is still safer.

The "right" of speed: Many people believe that you can't use the road if you can't keep up. If a heavily loaded truck is unable to accelerate from an intersection or up a hill, most motorists understand and merely tolerate it or pass it when they are able. Yet if the vehicle is a bicycle, intolerance and outrage develops in some drivers. As with all slow-moving vehicles, bikes must use the right lane unless they are preparing for a left turn, but despite common misconceptions, they still have a right to the roadway.

It is safest for bicyclists to stay out of the way: This myth has sadly contributed to the majority of



▲ Some bikes require more space on the roadway.

crashes and near-misses cyclists experience. Hugging the edge of the road is actually dangerous for a number of reasons. Most traffic lanes are too narrow to safely accommodate a motor vehicle and cyclist side by side. Cyclists who keep right so motorists can pass them without changing lanes actually encourage close passes and sideswipes. Cyclists who ride farther left and control the lane report no such problems. Motorists pass them in an adjacent lane. If they have to slow down and wait for an opportunity to pass, that's OK. Empirical evidence shows that any delays motorists experience waiting to pass are usually 30 seconds or less.

Bike lanes make cycling safer: In fact, bike lanes were created because of the myth listed above and the desire for a separate space. Bike lanes force cyclists to ride on the edge, sometimes even in the "door zone" of parked cars, where they might be directly hit or startled into swerving in front of traffic. Channeling bicyclists to the right of other traffic encourages them to be unpredictable—unexpectedly passing slower traffic on the right. When cyclists are forced to ride on the edge of the roadway conflicts arise at intersections and driveways—the most common location of bicycle/motorist crashes. There the cyclist's position conflicts with turning cars—thru cyclists are to the right of right-turning vehicles and are often screened from the view of drivers turning left.

Bicycle paths are safest for cyclists: Since paths fall outside the scope of traffic laws, behavior on them is unregulated, unpredictable and unenforceable. Conflicts and crashes increase at intersections. Unlike roads, paths don't go everywhere people need or want to go.

Cyclists riding in the middle of the traffic lane will impede traffic: Where "impeding" laws exist, nearly all clearly state that only drivers of motor vehicles can illegally impede. In the six states

where the law does not specifically exclude non-motorized vehicles, it provides for the reasonable speed of the vehicle in question, thus accommodating farm tractors, horse carriages and bicycles. Why is it cyclists are being cited for "impeding" when they are actually driving defensively and in a manner reasonable for their vehicle?

The Law

In every state, bicycles are either defined in statutes as a vehicle or cyclists are given the same rights and responsibilities as other vehicle drivers. They have the right to use most roadways, which means the fog line to the centerline. The term "roadway" does not include the shoulder. In many non-snow states, shoulders may be non-existent or too narrow to be rideable. While most states forbid bicycles on freeways, some western states—with vast open space and fewer roads—allow cyclists to ride the shoulder of controlled access highways. Only New York, Hawaii and Alaska mandate shoulder use if it is safely usable.

Most states require cyclists to ride "as far to the right (FTR) as practicable to the right-hand curb or edge of the roadway." This sentence is often misunderstood. For purposes of the statute language "practicable" means as close to the right edge as is safe and reasonable under existing or probable conditions. It does not mean as close as possible to the right-hand curb or edge of the roadway. Moreover, it is up to each cyclist to decide where he/she believes is safest. After all, the cyclist not only has the least protection, but also is passed with the highest speed differential.

Many statutes list specific reasons why cyclists need to ride farther left within a lane. These include avoiding road hazards, preparing for a left turn, passing another vehicle, or avoiding objects such as parked cars, pedestrians or animals. The most significant reason given is a "substandard width lane" within which a cyclist and motorist cannot pass safely side by side. This last reason is the most misunderstood, largely because it applies to the majority of traffic lanes on today's roadways—making the exception the rule. Anywhere bicyclists choose to ride in such a lane is legal.

More experienced cyclists choose to "control the lane." By using a large portion of the lane, cyclists send a clear message to motorists that they must change lanes to pass when safe and legal to do so. Cyclists legally controlling a narrow lane cannot by definition "impede traffic" even though they are moving substantially slower than surrounding traffic. It is important to remember that a traffic lane is a public utility there for the purpose of moving people, not merely motor vehicles.

Substandard Width Lanes

It may shock many to learn that a 12-foot-wide lane is considered a "substandard width" for the purpose of this statute. Federal roadway design standards suggest a cyclist needs a minimum of 4



▲ Example of controlling the lane—using the lane like other drivers.

feet of operating space. The typical cyclist is roughly 30 inches, but requires some lateral “wobble” space. Even 4-wheel vehicles don’t track a perfectly straight line. Realistically, many cyclists need 5 feet or more of space to operate safely, due to the type of bike and accessories or cyclist’s inexperience.

All states require safe passing clearance between vehicles of any type. Some require a 3-foot minimum clearance for passing bicyclists. While nearly impossible to enforce unless a cyclist is struck, it does give the motorist a general idea that they need to move over. With the 3-foot minimum, the cyclist’s operating space and the passing space have already accounted for more than half of a 12-foot lane.

Most passenger cars are roughly 6-foot wide, with mirrors adding another foot. As we’d expect a car takes up more than half of a 12-foot lane, too. The problem is many motorists don’t realize how wide their cars are, or how close the right side is to something they are passing. This is why it is safest for a bicyclist to control the lane in a way that sends a clear message that overtaking motorists must pass them in an adjacent lane. This action by the bicyclist prevents crashes.

Today’s traffic includes a high percentage of large vehicles like pickups and SUVs that are even wider than conventional passenger cars. Below is an example of what happens if a truck attempts to pass a cyclist within a 12-foot lane. Would you want that truck to pass you at any speed that close?

What Laws Should You Enforce?

Traffic laws reflect the rules of safe and predictable movement. These apply to cyclists as they do to motorists. Traffic controls such as stop signs and traffic signals certainly apply. So do destination lanes such as turn-only lanes. Use of headlights, and in many states, taillights, is required at night.

Cyclists are required to travel the same direction as traffic, yet many cyclists are commonly seen riding facing traffic. Due to its unpredictable nature, this is a leading cause of motorist/bicycle crashes. Wrong-way cycling is dangerous and illegal behavior in all 50 states.

The major violations, which cyclist should be stopped and ticketed for are: 1) riding against traffic; 2) failure to yield right of way at stop or yield signs; 3) running red lights; and 4) riding without re-

quired nighttime lighting.

We need to stop cyclists for disobeying traffic controls. Many cyclists ride through red lights because they have no fear of being ticketed. This obvious lawlessness by some cyclists further increases the animosity felt by many motorists. If the police won’t enforce traffic laws for bicyclists, who will? Isn’t that part of the police role in enhancing traffic safety and promoting voluntary compliance with the law?

The major violations by motorists that endanger bicyclists are: 1) failure to yield right of way; 2) unsafe passing; 3) harassment or assault; and 4) inattentive or impaired driving.

By law, cyclists always have the right of first come, first served in the lane that they are occupying. Vehicles can’t legally intrude into their path, or pass them, unless it is safe to do so. Most right-of-way conflicts occur at intersections. There, motorists pull out or make turns across the path of cyclists. Violations also occur when a motorist passes a cyclist just prior to turning right and then turns across the cyclist’s path. This can happen if the cyclist is riding too far right or is in a bike lane, sidewalk or path. These right-of-way violations account for many collisions between motorists and bicyclists. Officers should be watchful to cite these violators and understand them when working crashes.

Seeing and treating cyclists as an expected and respected part of traffic will undoubtedly be a new idea for many police officers and their administrators. Some have even exhibited a bias against cyclists in traffic, which is likely the result of conditioning that cyclists are neither a traditional nor legal part of the traffic mix. Both of those assumptions are historically and legally wrong. While educators have a lot of work to teach cyclists young and old to ride lawfully and responsibly, it is the role of law enforcement to reinforce those lessons with appropriate enforcement and mutual respect.

Kirby Beck is retired after 28 years with the Coon Rapids, Minn. Police. He is a certified IPMBA police cyclist instructor trainer. He is an expert witness in bicycle crash cases. He can be reached at kirby@kbeckconsulting.com.

LaO Post your comments on this story by visiting www.lawandordermag.com



Tucson-Pima Bicycle Advisory Committee

Wednesday, August 14, 2013

TO: JURISDICTIONS

SUBJECT: Bicycle projects in future bond packages

Dear RECIPIENT,

The Tucson-Pima County Bicycle Advisory Committee (TPCBAC) has followed the recent developments of the proposed Pima County Bond package with great interest. We are happy to see so many bicycling-related projects currently being included for consideration, from County-proposed property acquisitions for the Loop to the City-sponsored urban greenway projects. We are concerned, however, that in a pool of potential projects that includes nearly \$200 million for roadways, there are very few bicycling projects included that are directly related to making bicycling a more attractive option for Pima County residents who choose to bicycle for their transportation needs.

Throughout the region there are significant barriers to entry for bicyclists who might be considered "interested but concerned." Some of these barriers include gaps in the bicycle lanes on major streets; the Pima County Bicycle Program Manager was able to provide a list of many of these throughout Pima County at our special Bond meeting in May. Other barriers include the lack of bike-friendly crossings on residential streets that could be included as part of a package of Bicycle Boulevards within the City of Tucson. Other ideas for projects included items like seed money for a Bike Share program suggested by the City of Tucson Bicycle Coordinator, funds for programs that could help with improving safety through public education and outreach, and many others. We know that each jurisdiction has its own priorities and needs related to bicycling, and we think that this or a future bond initiative would be an ideal vehicle to provide funding for such projects that might help answer these needs.

We understand that the Pima County Bond has traditionally included projects most closely aligned with Parks and Recreation facilities, but since that focus has shifted more towards economic development we feel there is a real opportunity to include more transportation-related enhancements that could greatly improve the quality of life for residents throughout the region. There is a growing consensus nationally that bicycling is an important part of economic development strategies. In fact, at a February 2013 ribbon cutting for a new cycle track in Chicago, Mayor Rahm Emanuel was quoted in "Grid Chicago":

*When the mayor took the mic he touted the economic benefits of protected bike lanes, which he argues will attract technology companies to the city. "Two facts in the last year," he said. "Coincidence? I think not. One, the city of Chicago moved from tenth to fifth of most bike-friendly cities in the country [according to Bicycling magazine] in one year... In the same year the city of Chicago moved from fifteenth to tenth worldwide in startup economy... **You cannot be for a startup, high-tech economy and not be pro-bike.**"*

"Now I think it's self-evident that I am a competitive, let alone an impatient person," Emanuel quipped. "So when my staff gave me this headline from Portland, it did bring a smile. The editorial from a magazine in Portland [the blog BikePortland.org] read, 'Talk in Portland, Action

*in Chicago,' as it reflected on Dearborn Street. The Seattle Bike Blog wrote, 'Seattle can't wait longer. We're suddenly in a place where we're envious of Chicago bike lanes.' **So I want them to be envious because I expect not only to take all of their bikers but I also want all the jobs that come with this.**' (emphasis added)*

(It should be noted that Chicago now has 30 miles of protected bike lanes -- towards their stated goal of 110 miles of protected bike lanes and 40 miles of buffered bike lanes by the end of 2015. "Protected bike lanes" are on-road bike lanes that are physically separated from automotive traffic by physical barriers; "buffered bike lanes" are separated from traffic by wide painted strips; traditional bike lanes are separated only by a single stripe of paint. You can learn more about these kinds of bicycle facilities here: <http://www.activetrans.org/bikeways/101> .)

In recent years the pool of funding available for bicycle and pedestrian related projects has diminished considerably; we hope that as opportunities like the Pima County Bond arise in the future that you will consider proposing projects that serve to make bicycling a safe and attractive transportation option for all Pima County residents. The Tucson-Pima County Bicycle Advisory Committee would be happy to provide suggestions and would enjoy working with your staff to support such initiatives.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ian Johnson', with a long, sweeping underline.

Ian Johnson
Chair, TPCBAC

CC: As appropriate

Referenced in this letter:

<http://gridchicago.com/2012/a-great-day-in-chicago-protected-lanes-open-in-the-heart-of-the-loop/>

<http://www.activetrans.org/bikeways/101>