

Communication from Public

Name: David Matsu

Date Submitted: 12/06/2019 12:01 PM

Council File No: 19-1515

Comments for Public Posting: Councilmember Lee's motion to request a LADOT review of the Reseda Blvd protected bike lanes appears to be a thinly veiled attempt to create cover to remove the lanes. Protected lanes are a relatively new street design in Los Angeles although they are wide spread throughout the country and world elsewhere. It is possible that there are aspects of the design and implementation that could be improved to make them more effective and easier to use for both cyclists and motorists. So if there will be a LADOT review of the project, it should focus on a review of safety impacts and usability. Calling solely for a biased 'public opinion survey' is likely to only produce a series of complaints by a small number of vocal drivers and anti-cyclist activists who have no interest in the broader goals or effectiveness of the project and who just want to see it removed. I would encourage you to reject calls to review and remove this critical street design improvement. But if you must ask DOT to review the project, at least base that review of actual safety and design criteria, not on flawed "public survey" polls. Thank you

Communication from Public

Name: Nikhil Schneider
Date Submitted: 12/06/2019 04:21 PM
Council File No: 19-1515

Comments for Public Posting: Hello, I recently learned of City Council's intent to study the protected bike lane on Reseda Blvd. and receive recommendations for improvements or removal of the lane. This bike lane enables me to safely commute to work five days each week, and without it I would have no way to safely commute to work without driving a single-occupant vehicle. I sincerely hope that LADOT considers the safety and mobility of Angelinos who don't have a personal vehicle, or who wish to use a commute mode that doesn't contribute to traffic congestion and air pollution, in their study of the Reseda bike lane. Furthermore, the reasons for the study cited in the motion seem dubious. I would very much like to see the complaints stating that it is difficult to navigate lane markings due to the bike lane. Staying in one's lane is perhaps the most basic driving skill, and anyone capable of earning their driver's license should be able to stay in a lane with ease, regardless of whether or not there is an adjacent protected bike lane. Additionally, entering and exiting a parallel-parked vehicle will always put the driver adjacent to ongoing traffic, whether or not that street has a protected bike lane, and I have to wonder why that is considered acceptable along hundreds of other streets in the Los Angeles, but for some reason is cause for concern on a street with a protected bike lane. In fact, a protected bike lane located between the parking lane and rightmost vehicle lane (like much of the Reseda bike lane) can serve as a buffer zone between drivers exiting vehicles and ongoing traffic, provided that drivers make sure they're not flinging their door into the path of an approaching cyclist. In my mind, the only legitimate complaint regarding the Reseda Blvd. protected bike lane is the fact that it is, in some places, outside of the parallel parking lane. This means that drivers and passengers exiting parallel-parked vehicles have to contend with vehicular traffic on the left, and bicycle traffic on the right. Parked cars can also obscure drivers' vision of cyclists in the protected bike lane, making it more difficult to determine if it is clear to turn into one of the many driveways along that stretch of road. I hope that the motivation of this study is to remedy these issues rather than remove the bike lane. Removing the protected Reseda Blvd. bike lane would be a clear step backwards for a city seeking to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution. It would further

cement the region as a transportation desert, where the only feasible way of getting around is a personal vehicle, and where traffic congestion and limited parking are constants. Removing protected bike lanes is not the behavior of a future-oriented city, nor is it indicative of leadership that prioritizes equity, safety and public health. I don't look forward to the additional parking fees, gasoline and insurance costs I would be forced to incur if this bike lane were to be removed, not to mention the added traffic congestion and air pollution, and reduced opportunities for exercise and recreation. Bike lanes make cities better. They reduce dependence on gasoline and diesel-powered vehicles, increase transportation and transit access and expand mobility choice and recreation opportunities for citizens. Hopefully the Los Angeles City Council will recognize this, and choose to allocate LADOT's limited resources towards more fruitful endeavors than the alteration or removal of existing functional bike lanes.