

# **CABO**

## **PURPOSES, POLICIES, PROGRAMS & TASKS OF THE CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF BICYCLING ORGANIZATIONS**

29 August 1993

### **1 PURPOSES**

The purpose of CABO is to foster and promote a favorable climate for cycling in California. It does this by:

#### **1.1 Information exchange**

Serving as a forum and information clearing house for cyclists via cycling clubs and other cycling organizations. It thereby represents the interests of cyclists throughout the state.

#### **1.2 Representation**

Representing the interests of cyclists before the appropriate governmental bodies to protect their rights and to promote laws, policies, and actions that treat cyclists equitably.

#### **1.3 Other cycling activities**

Engaging in other activities which reasonably relate to the purpose.

### **2 MEMBERS**

Cycling clubs are the CABO voting members; other classes of members are individual persons and organizations who are interested in cycling. CABO should generally follow the desires of its member clubs.

#### **2.1 MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

The CABO membership represents a wide range of interests in all aspects of cycling. Each cycling club, being composed of many persons, achieves its own balance of interests. Some clubs concentrate on recreational family cycling, some on longer-distance touring, some on the healthgiving aspects of cycling, some on the transportational aspects of cycling, some on the off-road aspects of cycling, some on bicycle racing. These interests need different concentrations of concern.

##### **2.1.1 Cycling Enjoyment**

The enjoyment of cycling is concerned with good roads, competent and lawful cycling, protecting the rights of cyclists to use the roads, fair behavior by motorists, fair treatment by police, reasonable access to all desired destinations, and adequate bicycle parking.

##### **2.1.2 Promoting Cycling**

Promoting cycling is concerned with spreading the enjoyment of cycling. This involves coordination of event calendars, the youth hostel program, the effective cycling program, statewide cycling events and the like, in addition to the items under enjoyment.

##### **2.1.3 Promoting Cycling Events**

Promoting cycling events adds the following to the previous lists: developing media interest, coordination with highway officials, protecting the rights of groups of cyclists to use the roads.

##### **2.1.4 Promoting Transportation Change**

CABO believes that lawful, competent cycling is an enjoyable activity that is good for the individual and for society, both when done for pure recreation and when done for transportation. The more people who enjoy lawful, competent cycling, the more cycling transportation will be done. CABO therefore supports policies and programs, in either the governmental or the private sectors, that encourage people to enjoy and participate in lawful, competent cycling.

CABO also believes that incompetent cycling produces ill effects on the individual cyclist, on society, and on the interests of lawful, competent cyclists. CABO therefore opposes encouragements that tend to develop or favor incompetent cycling.

CABO also believes that cycling is best done, and is most likely to be done, by those who enjoy it. Therefore CABO opposes governmental coercion to cycle and particularly, given the above, CABO opposes governmental coercion that disfavors lawful, competent cyclists.

CABO takes no position on encouragements or coercion to change transportation habits that do not directly affect lawful, competent cyclists.

### **3 POLICIES**

Since the members of CABO represent cycling organizations with generally well-informed members, CABO bases its policies on useful, accurate information about competent, lawful cycling with the rights and duties of drivers of vehicles. That is the

meaning that CABO applies to the terms cycling and cyclist. Although the members of CABO represent cyclists who are better informed about cycling and are more skillful than the average person, CABO represents the interests of child cyclists and beginning cyclists in the belief that they deserve favorable conditions and encouragement to develop into competent, lawful cyclists.

### **3.1 General Principle:**

Cyclists fare best when they act and are treated as drivers of vehicles.

### **3.2 Promotion of lawful, responsible cycling**

CABO has always advocated lawful and responsible cycling with rights and duties of drivers of vehicles.

### **3.3 Rights as drivers of vehicles**

CABO defends cyclists' legal status as drivers of vehicles against attempts to change traffic law in ways that reduce those rights. [1]

### **3.4 Training**

CABO recognizes that particular skills and attitudes are required to operate safely, lawfully, and effectively on the road system.

#### **3.4.1 Cyclist training**

CABO advocates the Effective Cycling Program of the League of American Wheelmen, both for private instruction and for in-school training of those who wish to cycle. [2]

#### **3.4.2 Motorist training**

CABO advocates that instructional materials for motorists, such as those used in driver's education classes, both in-school and private, include statements on the following points:

Cyclists have the right to use the roadways.

Cyclists have the rights and the duties assigned by the rules of the road for drivers of vehicles.

Motorists have the duty of treating cyclists as they would other drivers.

Courtesy between drivers always makes traffic work better.

### **3.5 Access to all locations**

CABO opposes prohibitions that prevent lawful access to normal highway destinations and works to remove those prohibitions or to provide carriage of bicycles over the prohibited section of road. Typical locations for such prohibitions are bridges, tunnels and where a freeway has taken over all reasonable

alternate routes.

### **3.6 Cooperation with other cycling organizations.**

CABO cooperates with other cycling organizations whose goals and means are compatible with ours.[3]

### **3.7 Cooperation with highway safety organizations**

CABO cooperates with those highway safety organizations whose activities reduce the accident rate for cyclists.

### **3.8 Bicycle advisory committees**

CABO supports the principle of committees to advise government about cycling affairs, provided that those committees have an effective majority of well-informed cyclists who are independent of government. [4]

### **3.9 Highway design standards**

CABO advocates adequate width in the outside through lane, bicycle-sensitive detectors for traffic signals, smooth roadway surfaces, bicycle-safe drain grates, left-turn-only lanes, right-turn-only lanes, traffic signals that provide separate left turn phases, and traffic signals that provide adequate clearance time.

#### **3.9.1 Adequate width of the outside through lane**

CABO intends to prepare a table giving adequate widths of the outside through lane for different highway conditions. [5]

#### **3.9.2 Right-turn-only lanes**

Right-turn-only lanes are generally good for cyclists because they allow time and distance for right-turning motorists and straight-through cyclists to coordinate their merging actions before the turning point.

#### **3.9.3 Left-turn-only lanes**

Left-turn-only lanes are generally good for cyclists because they allow both cyclists and motorists to wait safely for oncoming traffic to clear without delaying other traffic.[6]

#### **3.9.4 Traffic signals**

Demand-type traffic signals shall be equipped with bicycle-sensitive detectors at all locations where a cyclist might lawfully ride.[7]

#### **3.9.5 Railroad grade crossings**

CABO advocates that at-grade railroad crossings at all locations where a cyclist might lawfully ride be so built and maintained that they do not endanger the

cyclist or damage the bicycle.[8]

### 3.9.6 Bikeways

CABO does not advocate bikeways in general. It advocates only very limited use and design of transportation bikeways and a less restrictive policy for recreational bikeways. CABO advocates using criteria that protect the rights of lawful cyclists and discourage cycling that does not conform to the normal rules of the road.

### 3.9.7 Roadway trash

CABO advocates all-inclusive container redemption laws because of the adverse effect upon cyclists of debris along roadways.

### 3.9.8 Bicycle parking

CABO supports measures, including legislation, that provide secure bicycle parking at useful locations.[9]

### 3.9.9 Mass transit

CABO takes action regarding short-distance mass transit only insofar as it relates to direct cycling concerns. CABO advocates the provision of secure bicycle parking and storage facilities as mass transit stations.

### 3.9.10 Long-distance transportation

CABO advocates that all passenger common carriers that carry passengers' baggage include bicycles as part of the baggage at rates and conditions that are reasonably comparable to other baggage.[10]

### 3.9.11 Cyclists and employers

CABO encourages cycling between home and work. CABO advocates that employers do not discriminate against employees who cycle to work in matters of hiring, evaluation, pay, or promotion. CABO advocates that those employers who provide motor-vehicle parking for employees provide theft-resistant, weather-protected parking for the bicycles of those employees who cycle to work. CABO advocates that employers provide places in which employees may keep business attire, wash up, and change clothes.

### 3.9.12 Street sweeping

CABO advocates that governments of populated areas frequently sweep the full width of streets to keep them reasonably clean of the items that endanger cyclists or damage their tires and wheels. CABO also advocates that governments take steps to ensure that those in charge at accident sites sweep

up the accident debris expeditiously. Bicycle tires are easily damaged by small bits of glass or metal that would not affect the tire of a motor vehicle.

## 4 PROGRAMS [11]

### 4.1 State government watch

CABO observes the California State government for actions that will or might affect cyclists and takes the appropriate responsive action. For a summary of past actions see endnote [12].

### 4.2 State governmental committees

CABO participates in those committees of state government that consider matters affecting cyclists and to which CABO can gain access. For a summary of past actions see endnote [13].

### 4.3 Statewide events calendar

CABO publishes the California Statewide Cycling Calendar that allows cycling organizations to coordinate their major events and provides the information by which cyclists can participate.

### 4.4 CommunicABO

CABO publishes a newsletter about matters important to its policies and programs that is distributed to member clubs and other interested persons.

### 4.5 Annual Report

CABO will publish an annual report informing members of its actions over the year.

### 4.6 Informing the community

#### 4.6.1 Informing the cycling community

CABO submits articles and information on its doings to cycling publications.

#### 4.6.2 Informing the general public

CABO submits articles and information on its doings and policies to appropriate publications and to other bodies whose knowledge and actions may influence the public.

### 4.7 Institutionalization of scientific and engineering knowledge of cycling

CABO presents and provides knowledge in cycling transportation engineering, particularly that embodied in its formal policies, to the appropriate governmental agencies, with the intent of getting its policies embodied in the policies of those agencies.

#### **4.7.1 Representation on statewide and local governmental advisory committees**

CABO believes, in addition to the presentation of cycling knowledge described in the above paragraph, that cyclists should be represented on those committees established by government to advise or to make recommendations about cycling matters. CABO should be represented on such of these committees that cover statewide cycling matters; local cycling organizations should be represented on those committees that consider cycling matters in their areas.

#### **4.8 Cyclist training**

##### **4.8.1 Cyclist training in public schools**

CABO has a continuing effort to include suitable cycling education into schools statewide.[14]

##### **4.8.2 Cyclist training outside of public schools**

With the number of adults taking up cycling and with the practical absence of suitable cycling education in the public schools, CABO recognizes a great need for other providers of training for cyclists. The training should be directed at teaching the skill of lawful, competent cycling, such as is done by the Effective Cycling Program, both for the direct benefit of those who learn and as a public demonstration that the skill of lawful, competent cycling is easy to learn when properly taught.

#### **4.9 Motorist instruction**

CABO will continue working with the Department of Motor Vehicles in the program of instructing motorists about cycling:

##### **4.9.1 California Driver's Handbook**

The California Drivers Handbook shall include information about cyclists' rights and duties when using the roads, and the actions of motorists with regard to cyclists.

##### **4.9.2 Driving license written examination**

The pool of questions used for the driving license written examination shall include questions about the proper behavior for cyclists and about the actions of motorists with regard to cyclists.

### **5 TASKS [15]**

#### **5.1 Area planning guidelines**

CABO will list the bicycling statements that it believes should be in planning guidelines for any area.

#### **5.2 Outside through lane widths**

CABO will prepare a standard for the widths of outside through lane that are adequate under different conditions of road and traffic.

#### **5.3 Bicycle advisory committees**

CABO will prepare a standard for the kind of bicycle advisory committee that can legitimately represent cyclists' interests.

#### **5.4 Bicycle coordinator job description**

CABO will list the items affecting cyclists that should be in the job description for bicycle coordinators employed by government.

#### **5.5 Bikeway criteria**

CABO will list the criteria for bikeways that protect the rights and safety of lawful cyclists and discourage cycling that is not lawful and competent.

#### **5.6 Road construction sites**

CABO will list the specific hazards for cyclists at road construction sites and the recommended mitigation measures for them.

#### **5.7 Advocacy committee**

As needed, CABO will designate the tasks for an advocacy committee and will form such a committee.

#### **5.8 Funds for cycling purposes**

CABO will prepare and publish a resource guide to funds available for cycling purposes.

#### **5.9 CABO history**

CABO will publish and distribute to members a document outlining CABO's history and accomplishments.

#### **5.10 Board of Directors kit**

CABO will develop and distribute to each member of the Board of Directors a kit containing a job description, this document, CABO bylaws, a bibliography of useful documents and publications, and sample letters to help the director network with area clubs, cyclists and government officials.

1. Examples of such attempts are the mandatory bike path law, the mandatory bike lane law, and the authorization of local governments to prohibit cycling on particular streets. CABO has successfully opposed the attempts by local authorities and the Highway Patrol to require permits for using the road for touring events, or to prohibit such events from using particular roads.
2. CABO worked with the California Department of Education (1974-1976 approx) to produce a cyclist training program for California that was eventually vetoed by the Highway Patrol.
3. Such national organizations are the League of American Wheelmen and Bikecentennial. CABO cooperated with the L.A.W. in holding a national convention in California (1979), with another planned for 1994, and we cooperated with American Youth Hostels in establishing youth hostels in California for cyclists.
4. CABO opposed the actions of the two bicycle advisory committees that have been most important in the state and in the nation: the California Statewide Bicycle Committee (1972-1975) and the California Bicycle Facilities Committee (1975-1978). CABO opposed these committees because they sought to discriminate against, and to restrict, lawful, competent cyclists with results that endangered cyclists. The CSCB sought to do so in traffic law, the CBFC through bikeways. These committees consisted of a majority of government and highway members and did not seek advice from cyclists: they operated to impose their ideas upon cyclists with the misleading appearance of agreement by cyclists. The products of these committees are now the national standards for traffic law for cyclists and for bikeways. Because of CABO's opposition, these standards are far less dangerous and far more equitable than their initial creators intended.
5. Once a suitable table has been developed, the policy will refer to it and will contain words similar to the following: On roads with significant bicycle traffic is expected and where motor-vehicle traffic volume per lane is also significant (per table) the outside through lane shall have a width of 14 feet or more (per table). On roads without curbs where significant bicycle traffic is expected and where motor-vehicle traffic is also significant (per table), either the outside through lane should be wide (per table) or the shoulder should be in fit condition for cycling.
6. Providing a safe place to wait discourages hurried left turns. Hurried left turns by motorists are the most frequent cause of those car-bike collisions that are caused by motorist error. Hurried left turns by cyclists are a significant cause of cyclist-caused car-bike collisions. If the LTO lane is of standard width, cyclists and motorists can use it side by side, eliminating delays caused by cyclists, but a narrow LTO lane is better than none at all. LTO lanes in conjunction with traffic signals that provide protected left turn phases protect both cyclists and motorists from conflicting movements.
7. Pushbuttons are not satisfactory for cyclists because they are often in wrong or inconvenient locations for cyclists.
8. Diagonal crossings require different treatment than do perpendicular crossings. For perpendicular crossings the criterion is largely levelness: the tracks shall not be significantly above or below the level of the roadway and the gap between shall not exceed 2 inches. For diagonal crossings there is the additional problem that the gap between rail and road, including the flangeway gap, can catch the tires of a bicycle. For diagonal crossings the gaps should be filled as much as possible. Rubber materials are very suitable for this purpose.
9. Useful locations include employment centers, public facilities, and transit stations.
10. CABO ought to be involved, and through its alliance with the League of American Wheelmen has been involved, in the issue of how, and at what price, the long-distance passenger carriers will carry bicycles as baggage.

11. Programs are continuing efforts with no fixed end point.

12. CABO has worked with government for the interests of cyclists in both long-duration efforts (such as the engineering committees discussed in the next note) and in short-duration efforts. Several of the short-duration efforts have been in response to proposed legislation.

Assemblyman Lanterman proposed that cyclists be universally prohibited from freeways, removing the authority of Caltrans to decide where cyclists will be prohibited. With CABO's help, this was defeated.

CABO assisted in the defeat of another bill proposing that cities and counties be given the authority to prohibit cyclists from any street they chose.

CABO has explained to the Commissioner of the Highway Patrol the status of cyclists as stated in the California Vehicle Code.

CABO has worked against repeated efforts at state and at local levels to apply to club rides the Vehicle Code authority to require permits for parades.

CABO has obtained changes in the California Highway Design Manual describing adequate lane width, bicycle-safe drain grates, and bicycle-responsive traffic signal detectors.

CABO is currently active about the helmet law proposals being circulated.

13. The first modern California committee that considered cyclists was the California Traffic Safety Education Task Force of 1972-4, organized under the California Department of Education. John Forester was the chairman of the Adult Cyclist Subcommittee, but was active in all parts of the cycling task. The task force agreed that adequate training would markedly reduce the accident rate for cyclists of all ages. Two trial programs were recommended: the program that John had been developing at a community college, that later became the Effective Cycling Program, and a program for upper-elementary-school children. The proto-EC program was expected to develop without further governmental effort, while the governmental effort was to be used to produce and promote the school program. The prototype school program was based on the EC principles but it had too much class work and too little (maybe none?) road work. However, it was installed in a checkerboard pattern of schools and was to be tested by comparing the cycling performance of students from the schools with it against those from schools without it. Unfortunately, the evaluator (a recognized traffic expert from USC) didn't know how to ride and evaluated performance on the basis of how close to the curb students rode on their way to school. Whatever the merits of the program, it was squashed by the Highway Patrol in order to retain its control of cyclist training, much to the disgust of the active contributors from the Department of Education.

The California Statewide Bicycle Committee of 1972-5 was formed by the legislature to make recommendations about changes to the traffic laws concerning cyclists. The instigators of the committee were, so far as we could discover, the Automobile Club of Southern California and the Highway Patrol. Their goal was to enact laws prohibiting cyclists from using roads where bikeways existed. Their weapon was the standard for bikeways that had just been prepared for California by UCLA. John Forester became the sole cyclist representative on this committee of 9. He discerned the motive, discovered the bikeway standards, analyzed their dangers, and roused CABO from its slumbers. Cyclists prevented the enactment of a mandatory-bike-path law, but had to accept a mandatory-bike-lane law with statewide uniformity, so that local authorities were prohibited from doing worse to cyclists than the state allowed (some had done much worse). The existing side-of-the-road law was strengthened by incorporating the same restrictions for the margin of the roadway that were enacted for bike lanes. Enactment of these changes was urged by the other arms of government. For example, the League of California Cities told the legislature that "If cyclists were given the right to use the streets California's cities would be in great trouble." Repeal of the mandatory-bike-path law and strengthening of the mandatory-bike-lane law and the side-of-the-road law later became significant parts of the big bicycle change in the Uniform Vehicle Code. There were some other minor changes in law also, generally favorable for cyclists, but these were the significant ones.

The California Bicycle Facilities Committee was then formed (1975-8) to prepare a second set of standards for bikeways that would not be so dangerous for cyclists as the first ones. John Finley Scott

served as CABO's representative on that committee (1 of about 7 members, the rest government people) while John Forester served as CABO's non-voting leader and chief engineer. (Government hoped, erroneously, that John Scott would defend cyclists' rights as drivers of vehicles and the vehicular-cycling principle less strongly than John Forester had.) CABO steadily opposed proposals that endangered cyclists. Cyclists fare best when they act and are treated as drivers of vehicles, and that is precisely what the committee would not do. By developing engineering and legal scenarios that demonstrated that government would be liable for accidents caused by its proposals, CABO got the most dangerous parts of the proposals withdrawn. What remained did not make cycling safer because the committee refused to consider what designs might reduce accidents to cyclists – that would invalidate the bikeway assumptions. All the standards did was to get cyclists off roadways with less danger than the original proposals, obviously for the convenience of motorists. These standards became the nation's standards by being adopted by the American Association of State Highway and Traffic Officials and by the Federal Highway Administration. As a result of CABO's efforts these are much less dangerous for cyclists than they otherwise would have been. That is a tactical gain; whether it is a strategic gain is very doubtful.

The current California statewide committee is the California Bicycle Advisory Committee, run through Caltrans. CABO's representative is Alan Wachtel. This committee is run on reasonable engineering grounds, given the existence of the bikeway standard and bikeway laws. It handles changes to the California Highway Design Manual, the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices, and related issues, as well as some cycling issues that are less engineering oriented.

14. The scope of the effort varies with the opportunities available, which at this time (1993) are small.

15. Tasks are efforts that are devoted to producing a particular result and are expected to terminate when that result has been produced.