

**Minutes of Bicycle Advisory Committee of the City of Los Angeles  
Planning and Bikeways Engineering Subcommittee meeting -  
Tuesday, September 16, 2025, 1:00 p.m.  
Location: Little Tokyo Library, Community Room, 203 S. Los Angeles Street, Los  
Angeles, CA 90012**

**Emailed 9/26/25 8:00 AM**

**Online Meeting Access Information**

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81051063004>

Meeting ID: 810 5106 3004

Guests: Eleanor Hunts (LADOT Vision Zero Team), Elliott Shaw (LADOT ATP Team), Brett Slaughenhaupt, Streets Are For Everyone,

Bikeways, Planning and Engineering Subcommittee Members attending: Jennifer Gill (vice chair), Philip Armstrong (chair), and Karen Canady (Glenn Bailey and Michael Schneider, Founder and CEO of Streets For All, attended on Zoom but were not counted as present).

Bikeways, Planning and Engineering Subcommittee members: Jennifer Gill (vice chair), Glenn Bailey, Philip Armstrong (chair), Michael Schneider, Karen Canady, Taylor Nichols (Alternate).

**MINUTES**

1. Call to Order and Introductions and approval of minutes. Please see 7.15.25 minutes available at: [https://labikecommittee.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/Subcom-minutes-7-15-25\\_V2.pdf](https://labikecommittee.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/Subcom-minutes-7-15-25_V2.pdf)

Meeting is called to order at 1:02 PM. Quorum is three for the Planning and Bikeways Engineering Subcommittee and is met. Jennifer moves and Karen seconds approval of the minutes. Motion passes 3-0-0.

2. Public Comment on non-agenda items.

There was no public comment on non-agenda items.

3. Active Transportation project updates. Elliott Shaw.

- Spring/Alameda Corridor Safety and Mobility Project.
  - Project Website: <https://ladotlivablestreets.org/projects/springalameda>
  - Project Survey: <https://sur-vey.typeform.com/to/mgcB7j7x?typeform-source=www.google.com>
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> Street hardening pilot: The only update is they are piloting a new concrete barrier on 3rd Street between Main and Spring. These barriers are 18 inches tall and made of precast concrete and fabricated offsite, enabling LADOT to create concrete bike lane barriers without the need for

onsite concrete pours. It's only a block long, but the pilot is really meant to test how the barriers are installed and maintained, within pre-existing bike lanes. It's both a pilot, for those who are using the lanes, and also a pilot for LADOT to work out any kinks that there may be in the installation process and the maintenance. They were installed over two weekends, August 16th and 23rd. People are definitely noticing them, and ideally they can move forward with using them on some future projects if this goes well. Concrete bike lane barriers [survey](#) open until October 31, 2025

- Jennifer said for the project that Curtis and she are working on they were concerned about construction and development people taking over the bike lane. Could LADOT use something of the height of the concrete barriers and maybe less heavy? What other option does LADOT have in constructing that size of a barrier, is it a K-rail, or what is it called?
- Elliott said they use a bunch of different names. Most commonly, they are referred to as T-barriers, or Toronto Barriers, because the City of Toronto uses them a lot. K-Rails is another name. He thinks the official term is pre-cast concrete barriers. For this pilot, LADOT purchased them from a company that produces them on-site, and then LADOT ships them over. These ones only come in concrete. There are a lot of different options, of course, for hardening. They just decided to go with this one because concrete is one of the more ideal materials, given its weight and rigidity and lower maintenance costs compared to the K71s.
- Jennifer said Curtis didn't like the idea of using bollards or a sign to say move out of the path, move back into the road. It didn't feel like we got safety out of it. We got the typical answer, which is the road is closed, and then you have to move back into traffic and you have to share the road with people moving really fast.
- Jennifer said she wanted to use those rails that they're using on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street for protected bike lanes on temporary closures.
- To which, Elliott said just to be clear, LADOT can't use those concrete rails on construction closures. They're much too much of a burden to install and transport. You need heavy machinery to put them on and off the flatbed. You can't have people lifting them by themselves. In order to do something like that, you need a barrier and a material which is much, much lighter, which, you know, perhaps two people could lift and install off of a truck, and there's not very many materials, even rubber is quite heavy.
- Elliott asked do you feel like this is the case for every worksite that you encounter or just some worksites?
- In response, Jennifer said some are good, they use the orange cones to create a definite path, and you could definitely get through it without getting thrown out into traffic. But some of them just say the road is closed, take the road, the road is yours, share the road.
- Jennifer asked if you knew how long a construction project might last, could they use a more permanent way of assisting us, rather than just a

temporary share of the road or orange cones? Usually, the construction companies have an idea about how long they're going to take, don't they?

- In response, Elliott said they do sometimes. It's his understanding that they give the timeline in their permit. Notification of closures goes through the BOE Permit Office. Each construction contractor will have their own general timeline, there's not specific dates. It's a suggestion worth including in any comments.
- Jennifer said we don't have to have one solution, we could have 3 or 4 that apply to the timeline and apply to the weight or something. Cones are light, and anybody can move them.

#### 4. Vision Zero Update. Eleanor Hunts.

- Hollywood Boulevard Safety and Mobility Project, Phase 1 includes plans to add Zicla zippers within existing buffers. Phase 2 includes civil design plans for curb ramp improvements.
  - Those plans are moving toward implementation with Phase 2 civil design. The Zicla installation is moving forward with zippers.
- [Vermont Transit Corridor Project](#): Waiting to hear from Metro about what treatments might be incorporated into their project.
  - No updates.
- Discussion and possible action regarding joint LADOT/CAO report on [Vision Zero Program Independent Evaluation](#): It's Council File [23-0600-S121](#). The Transportation Committee heard the council file on August 13 and transmitted it to the Budget and Finance Committee and the Public Safety Committee and they may take it up this month.
  - No updates.
- Pico Boulevard Safety and Mobility Project. Discussion and possible action to recommend to the LABAC to approve a Letter of Support for Class IV bike lanes on Pico. Survey is live and linked on the home page of the project website: <https://ladotlivablestreets.org/projects/pico>
  - Survey is closed. LADOT received over 1,100 responses. Looking at the preliminary results of the demographics portion of the survey results, it appears that the sample is fairly representative. LADOT will be hosting an open house in late October to report back on their engagement process so far and hear more from the community. The date of the open house will be posted on the project website (<https://ladotlivablestreets.org/projects/pico>) and sent out via email to anyone who signed up for their mailer and via other communication channels.
  - There's likely going to be two open houses, one in person and one virtual, and it's going to be an open house listening session where they present the final alternative and then get feedback on any last minute things people want to share.

- LADOT will be making a decision on which alternative to proceed with. Option 1 is the protected bike lanes, and option 2 was the unprotected bike lane. They may do an ad buy as part of a big push to make sure that everybody knows what the final alternative was.
- In response to a question from Michael, Eleanor said the breakdown of the survey responses between option 1 and option 2 has not been shared with the council offices yet, so they want to give that information to them first, but they will get that to the LABAC as well.
- Discussion regarding the SRTS Center City Schools Neighborhood Safety & Climate Resilience Project. In July 2024, Eleanor told us detailed design for this project is scheduled to begin in 2026. Will this schedule be maintained and is the project still on track for construction complete in 2028? Could LADOT provide a project webpage on the <https://ladotlivablestreets.org/projects/> website to: 1) provide a context for the community to engage with this project; and 2) emphasize its synchronization with other projects, such as LADOT's [Stress-Free Connections](#), the Bimini Plaza [People St project](#), and the [Wilshire Center-Koreatown NEN Project](#), and LA Metro's [Vermont Transit Corridor Project](#)?
  - Livable Streets webpage for SRTS project is under construction and they'll have more information within a week hopefully. Per Randy Chan: "ATP6 is currently in the environmental clearance phase and we are anticipating completion of design by 2028." Eleanor said the project manager did not mention the timeline for construction and the website will reflect the timeline that the project manager estimates.
  - Subsequent to the subcom meeting, Eleanor reported that the project webpage is live and includes a small timeline update from the project manager in the "About" section that appears in the lower half of the landing page: <https://ladotlivablestreets.org/projects/center-city-SRTS>.
  - Eleanor said Margot Ocanas played a really unique role at LADOT, and she knew everything that was going on with Safe Routes to School, and when she left, nobody really took that over. All of these different projects that we're asking about have separate project managers. They are coordinating with each other. Hopefully the website will tie some of these projects together for us, but they are separate projects now.
  - Regarding the Bimini Plaza project, DJ Williams, the project manager is meeting with CD 13 in the coming weeks, on next steps, so they should actually have an update on that, by our next meeting. But there is movement on that project.
  - The Council/Vermont traffic signal was approved as part of the B permit process. She has emailed several times and not gotten a response regarding what the construction timeline is for that. Philip said he anticipated submitting a [community impact statement](#) later today that addresses this signal.

5. Accommodation of cyclists when bike lanes close in construction areas. CD 4 motion was introduced on August 6, 2024, in [Council File 20-1469-S1](#). Council adopted this motion on October 1, 2024. Elliott.

- Philip said Item 5 is about Council File 20-1469-S1, which is a supplemental council file to [Council File 20-1469](#) that was asking for a report from LADOT on changing policies and procedures for temporary closures. Council File 20-1469-S1 was more specific; however, LADOT's August 7 [report back](#) considered just the notifications and the alternate routes for bike lanes. Philip said he thinks there's a need to open up the scope of the LADOT report, as Jennifer was just talking about, taking into consideration these construction schedules and so forth. The way that LADOT responded in its report, none of that would be considered. He said he expects to submit a proposed [community impact statement](#) later today hopefully to recommend amending the report to increase the scope of the policies and procedures to be addressed.
- Elliott suggested that the item was pushed at the previous Transportation Committee meeting. He would suggest going to the Transportation Committee meeting and making public comment on this item. He said he thinks that community impact statements are helpful. Showing up to key committees and making a comment is helpful.
- Elliott said he hears the critique, and he can offer a couple of points that hopefully lend some explanation, the first being that the 30 miles per hour ceiling speed limit for the construction zones, 30 miles per hour down from 35 is not a significant reduction. The 30 miles per hour speed limit ceiling for construction zones (as written in the LADOT report recommendations) is meant to replicate the speed of a collector road, where class II facilities are typically located.
- The other thing he wanted to mention was that requiring worksites to implement a parallel facility may work in a lot of worksites, but it also may not work in other worksites where there are no parallel facilities. He was told that it can be difficult sometimes to require construction contractors to provide those parallel facilities, or alternative facilities. It may trigger some additional review from StreetsLA or some other department to make sure that the pavement on those parallel facilities is adequate for the bike facility. There's a potential for that to happen, triggering an additional review, which he thinks is a huge deterrent. The policy does not require that now.
- Subsequent to the subcom meeting, Elliott submitted an ATP report that explained that LADOT's oversight is limited when it comes to construction sites. Since notification of bike lane closures is provided by the BOE permit office or the construction contractor conducting the closure, LADOT does not control nor have information associated with specific dates for permits for closures. Permits for closures typically do not specify precise dates, contractors performing the closures ultimately have control over their own timelines during the period within which the permits are active. The current process for accommodating road users through a construction site is as follows:
  1. Retain existing infrastructure if possible, following CA-MUTCD WATCH manual guidance

2. If not possible, accommodate road users to the best of their ability if roadbed allows

- Each worksite and applicant/contractor is, of course, different. Site conditions, roadway geometry, and presence of alternate routes may be unfeasible and/or cost prohibitive

3. If no accommodation can be made, reason must be provided as to why

- Forced efforts to maintain bike lanes in the roadbed or provide a parallel facility (of which not every site has access to) would require additional review and staff time due to the potential need for site specific plans and additional plans developed for any alternate facilities/routes

- Contractors could potentially object and claim excessive hardship, infeasibility, cost, etc., if forced or required to provide alternative routes at every worksite

- On that subject, Philip mentioned a proposed community impact statement on this council file in which it was stated that it appears the developer could have provided an alternate facility by implementing a planned traffic signal at Council and Vermont. (This [community impact statement](#) was subsequently submitted on September 16.) In his understanding, it appears that the developer didn't do that because nobody among LADOT, Bureau of Engineering, and Bureau of Contract Administration was going to be able to call them out. By the time that anybody figured out what was going on, the construction would be finished. The community impact statement says that LADOT should look at this example and consider the possibility of changes in the policies and procedures based on that example. In that example, students were seen walking down the middle of Vermont Avenue (that is, the middle of the right-most northbound traffic lane) for two weeks when an alternate route was not provided from the school to the Metro station.
- Glenn said this council file was agendaized for the Transportation Committee on August 27th. His question is, was there any discussion of this council file during the Transportation Committee meeting?
- In response, Elliott said no, not that he is aware. He listened to the committee meeting and he doesn't think they discussed it. He thinks they made a motion to continue it to this month's Transportation Committee meeting. It seems like this month's Transportation Committee meeting has been canceled, and so is next month's. He's not sure why the September 24 and October 8 Transportation Committee meetings were cancelled.
- To which, Glenn said they meet twice a month, so we can expect it'll show up on probably the next actual meeting agenda that they have.
- Philip said we'll put that next meeting in the announcements in the minutes for today's meeting.

6. Hardening bike lanes: bollards, curbs and other options. Update on City research and tests. The LABAC is interested in a maintenance cost comparison between standard approach of bollards/paint + ongoing maintenance vs. hardened infrastructure over 5-10 year periods. Eleanor.

- Survey for the 3rd Street concrete barriers (Main to Spring) is live through the end of October. <https://form.typeform.com/to/mKQsn7LQ?typeform-source=www.google.com>. Otherwise no updates.
- Here's a list of the materials LADOT has used in this bike lane hardening pilot:
  - Main St (9<sup>th</sup> St to 1<sup>st</sup> St): Zicla Zipper
  - Adams Blvd (Fairfax Ave to Crenshaw Blvd): Zicla Zipper and Treetop 3" Crossover Delineator
  - Spring St (9<sup>th</sup> St to 1<sup>st</sup> St): Treetop 5" Curb Delineator
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> St (Spring St to Main St): Safe-T Lane Divider
- Michael's question is, assuming the results of the survey on 3rd Street for the Toronto barriers are positive, what is the next step? Is DOT's intention to replace all the K71 plastic bollards that are currently protecting bike lanes with these barriers?
- Elliott said their intention is to look at the survey results, of course, and what the reaction is and then, if it's positive and it seems to have worked out well, continue forward and implement with new projects that are going to the ground.
- Michael said the intention is to use this with new projects, but not go back and replace the existing ones, or as the K71s get knocked down, do you think you're going to use this instead of the K71s?
- Eleanor said she thinks that's part of the pilot, is we're trying to see how durable this is compared to the plastic ones, so that we don't have to continuously be replacing the plastic ones.
- Michael asked whether these barriers are things that LADOT can install themselves without StreetsLA?
- Elliott said he thinks that StreetsLA installed this pilot, and he'd have to get back to you on that, he's not sure. It requires, a particular crew, but LADOT may have resources for that, he'll check.
- Karen said she was curious, is there any change to the required space that's got to be allotted to the bike lane, depending on what materials you use? It seems like a lot of extra buffering is used for the K71s, and she wonders if hard barriers don't require as much space.
- Elliott said the buffer space for the K71s is set at 2 or 3 feet and the barriers require 3 feet, so minimum 3-foot buffer for these concrete barriers. They are going to determine that on a case-by-case basis depending on the width of the roadbed for each individual project. There's a slight difference in the dimensions required for the bike lane depending on the material used, like, he thinks the T-barriers, the concrete barriers, require a slightly wider buffer zone to be installed, and the K71s do not require as wide of a buffer zone. The width of the buffer zone is a minimum if that makes sense.

7. Active Transportation Infrastructure Capital Improvement Plan, [Council File 23-0919](#). Discussion and possible action on the North Westwood Neighborhood Council (NWWNC) [community impact statement](#). In addition, please see the Investing In Place [report](#), "A City That Works: Public Space as a Civic Promise." Janis believes it's worth it

to put something together as a BAC “position” on the issue of Capital Improvement planning for Active Transportation — as a “marker” for posterity.

- Please see attached 2-page summary of the Investing in Place report.
- Michael said he would talk about Streets For All’s Charter platform and the changes they are looking for in Item 10.

8. Century City Bikeway Network plan. Report update of prioritized projects from [Metro FLM](#) for the Purple Line (D Line) extension through Century City. It’s not an active LADOT project.

- The subcom passed a motion at our July 15th meeting to recommend that the LABAC send a letter to CD 5 and Metro supporting a FLM plan at the Century City Purple Line Station, but we didn't get quorum at that LABAC meeting. We can bring this motion up again at the October 7 LABAC meeting.

9. Expo Bikeway, Northvale gap update. If it’s possible to include specific questions in the agenda, Elliott said he can work on getting answers before the meeting. Elliott.

- Elliott said he has an update. He saw Michael’s email to Charlie. He just wants to clarify, Charlie may have given you some confusing information. Elliott chatted to the Bike Paths Team, so the reason why he said there is Environmental Review required is because there was a lawsuit which Elliott doesn’t have all the details for but he’s sure we’re all aware of. His understanding is that there was some fence, wall, separation from the path, and the property owner sued. But because of the lawsuit, the project was categorized by Caltrans as a complex CE or Categorical Exemption. And a complex CE is not eligible for a regular CE, which would have provided straightforward environmental clearance (complex CE’s require CEQA review). However, LADOT has provided documentation to Caltrans asking for it to be bumped back down to a regular CE and LADOT is hopeful that they will do that, and that the project will then not require CEQA review, and move forward. But LADOT can't specify a construction timeline, until they hear back from Caltrans. It sounds like there is a good chance of it being knocked back down to a normal CE but again, we have to wait and see what Caltrans headquarters says before proceeding.
- Jennifer asked what is a Categorical Exemption and Elliott responded that it just means that the project doesn't need to go through Environmental Review under CEQA, and because it's a bike path, it usually shouldn't have to but again, because there's a lawsuit, and there was some partial payout. Again, Elliott is not familiar with the details of the lawsuit, but Caltrans has categorized it differently, which has then triggered the Environmental Review, which they're now trying to reverse.

10. Streets For All update. Discussion and possible action on implementation of Measure HLA. Please refer to [Council File 15-0719-S26](#), [Mobility Plan 2035](#) map, and [Mobility Plan Implementation Dashboard](#).

- Michael said on HLA the appeals process is now live. Many appeals have been filed, actually, so we'll see how the City handles that, and if they go and fix things as a result.
- Also on Friday, there was a court appearance in Joe Linton's lawsuit against Metro regarding the Vermont Transit Corridor Project. Metro was added as a defendant, per their request.
- Streets For All launched a Charter reform effort. As well, most of it's aligned with Investing in Place, not everything. You can go to <https://charter.streetsforall.org/> and learn more. How it would impact their work, the main things are they want LADOT to be a chartered department. So, what that means is, unlike the Board of Public Works, the Los Angeles Department of Transportation is not in the Charter. It was formed by Council, not formed by Charter. So Streets For All wants them to be a Charter department. They want to see a dedicated revenue stream to them, just like Recs and Parks or our libraries have, where it's a very small percentage of total assessed property value. That does tie the Budget Committee's and the City Council's hands in creating the budget a little bit, but they think it's worth it, because our streets are our biggest public asset. They would also like to see the Bureau of Street Services brought under LADOT. LA City is very unique in that our Department of Transportation cannot do concrete work, doesn't do sidewalk work, doesn't do ramp work. And so, they don't think the coordination between StreetsLA and LADOT is fixable. In New York City, for example, NYDOT has control property line to property line, not curb to curb. So, they think our LADOT should be the same and be able to do sidewalk work, ramp work, concrete work, etc. Streets For All is also supportive of a 2-year budget cycle and 5-year Capital Improvement Plan. So, all that's at <https://charter.streetsforall.org/>.
- Streets For All will be presenting next month at a special meeting of the Charter Reform Commission at 10 AM on October 18 in CD 7. And, they'll go from there.
- They have Senator Scott Weiner on, tomorrow at 5 PM for Streets for All Happy Hour. It's been a really big year legislatively, including SB 79, which you may have read about, and so they're excited for their conversation with Scott.
- There are five bills that they sponsored sitting on Governor Newsom's desk. AB 382 would lower speed limits in school zones. AB 1085 would crack down on illicit license plate covers. The reason why that's important is things like speed cameras, which obviously we're getting towards, don't work very well if people are covering their license plates. SB 358 reduces fees for housing near transit. SB 79 upzones areas within a half mile of transit. And SB 720 is a red light camera reform bill that aligns the red light camera program with the speed camera program, and their hope is with this, the City of Los Angeles can be able to again have red light cameras and bring them back.
- He also wanted to bring to the subcom's attention SB 707. It's also on Governor Newsom's desk. This is not one of Streets For All's bills, but this would amend the Brown Act. And his interpretation of it is it would allow committees like ours to meet virtually and actually have quorum virtually, and vote virtually, and do everything virtually. So, we'll see if he signs that.

- Lastly, they're tracking, Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) has an absolutely horrible plan for six new miles of roadways in front of LAX, basically turning the front of our airport into a freeway interchange-style thing. By LAWA's own admission, it would induce 18,000 new vehicle miles traveled daily and LADOT did a study, and they concluded it would make traffic and air quality worse. And this is in the light of us spending billions of dollars on rail connections, the PeopleMover, and the new airport train station. So, it's kind of shooting ourselves in the foot. Streets For All is talking to some Westchester residents who are pretty upset about it, and, stay tuned. But it is pretty far along and, unfortunately, the Mayor likes the project so we'll see what happens.
- Glenn asked Michael to spend a minute on the scenarios or an example for an appeal process under HLA. So, Michael put the link in the chat for LADOT's dashboard for HLA: <https://ladot.lacity.gov/mobility-plan>. This dashboard is lacking. It's not a complete overview of the SAGE projects, but there is a lot on there. And if you think that a project that they say is exempt from HLA is not, or if you think that mobility plan elements are missing in a particular project, you can essentially go into that project and initiate an appeal from the dashboard. The appeal, according to the City, not according to HLA, so the legality is dubious, but according to the City, you must do an appeal before you are able to file a lawsuit, and you must do it within 60 days of the project being posted, so there's a time clock here. That's the appeals process.
- Glenn asked if there is any notification for the posting of a project, or does someone have to keep checking the website? In response, Michael said there is an ability to subscribe, and you can get updated, and the link is on the website. Glenn asked if that subscription is project by project, or is that just a general subscription. To which, Michael said he thinks it lets you know when new projects are posted. Glenn said we should probably share that information with the LABAC.

11. Olympics opportunity for bikeway infrastructure and/or the [Festival Trail plan route](#). Considering Paris' bikeways transformation, accelerated by their Olympics, could LA take inspiration to also implement an accelerated bikeway implementation plan in advance of the games? Eli Lipmen.

- On July 15, Jennifer reported that the Letter of Support was approved at the June 3 LABAC meeting and Rob is working on the verbiage.
- Jennifer reported that the project is ongoing but she didn't hear details.

12. City Council files related to bicycling ([link](#)) updates.

- Are there council files missing that should be added? Are there council files that should be removed from the list?
- The subcommittee chairs went through the list and claimed the ones that applied to them so that someone takes responsibility for tracking each one. Please see the [link](#) for the results. At the July 1 A&E Subcom meeting, Rob said he would meet with Jennifer and Philip to go through the list.
  - Philip said we haven't met yet, and he's mentioned it to Rob, and that's that. Anyone can go to the link in the agenda and see what all the items

are, and who they have been assigned to, if they have been. There's some new ones, obviously. It seems like there have been a lot of late. So we can discuss that at the next meeting.

- Council File 25-0930: Departments of Transportation and City Planning. in coordination with Bureau of Street Services and the Bureau of Engineering, to report on options and recommendations that would require bike lanes to provide sufficient width for emergency vehicle access. Lionel.
  - Karen said they had a meeting with CD 10. Lionel and she were there just to find out more about what's going on, but what was clarified is that they're just requesting a study of this. They're not making a decision, but the idea was to look at whether there is an advantage to increasing emergency vehicle access if bike lanes are required. Is that a good idea, or does it create more hazards for bicyclists so it's easier for non-emergency vehicles to drive in? So, it was just a discussion.
  - Philip noted that Michael had also said that they were in favor of it as long as it didn't restrict the use of bike lanes in cases where the road is not wide enough to accommodate a bike lane that would be possible to be used by emergency vehicles. Karen said we wouldn't want it to be an excuse not to have a bike lane.
  - So, Jennifer thinks it's at a stage of people trying to find out. And they didn't clarify whether it was a cycling track or a single lane that they would widen, because cycle tracks are already wide enough, easily, for a fire truck.
  - Glenn said he listened to the Transportation Committee meeting in which they had no discussion on this because it was group-approved with some other items. He has some concerns, while he realizes it's just a report, sometimes reports can take on a life of their own, and they're just a Trojan horse for something worse to come. So, with existing protected bike lanes, especially without the bollards, they are lined with additional space buffer and vehicles, where traffic backs up and they want to turn right, already he sees lines of cars going through in certain areas, so he is really concerned about this. And also, when the fire department puts in restrictions for developments, they ask for a 20-foot width. He realizes that they may be including navigating their vehicle and all that. It's not necessarily straight-ahead travel. So hopefully it's substantially less than that but he guesses the report back will indicate that width, but it's certainly more than the 7 feet, maybe even 8 feet. He doesn't know how wide the trucks are, but they are going to want more width than that. And then thirdly, there's been constant activity by certain community people over the past number of years, at least 3-4 years, if not more, about certain projects, Foothill Boulevard, for one, Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock, using this same argument of emergency vehicles, So, he would suggest that this be on our LABAC agenda. We don't necessarily have to oppose it, but it'd be good if we submit comments at some point. He doesn't know that we need to wait for the report, or we could have it on the agenda, because we never know how long it's going to take before we get

a quorum to take action. So if we could take a vote and have a position on which we're ready to go once the report comes back, and then submit relevant comments we could put it on the LABAC agenda for our October meeting. We should try to do this just knowing some of the people involved, and he's not including Councilmember Hutt in this, but some of the folks who are involved with her office have a close connection with these folks who are opposing some of these protected bike lanes for the same arguments of emergency vehicles, fire danger, evacuation, etc. One of the things that has always been a good fail-safe is having that center lane, a middle center lane in all roadways because that does provide opportunities for emergency vehicles to easily get out of the way. He knows that's not practical in all locations.

- When asked whether he wants to make a motion, Glenn said he couldn't make a motion. However, be too much to ask at this point for the subcom to make a motion, he would ask that this subcom requests Rob to put it on the LABAC agenda for a possible motion although he may be in a minority on this. Karen was at the meeting and Michael has chimed in on his thoughts. We will pass that on to Rob.
- Asked for specific language for a motion, Glenn said discussion and possible action on submitting comments and possible position on this council file. He said he was not going to advocate a specific position because he knows there's different points of view that folks have, and he was not in the meeting with CD 10. A draft could be developed ahead of the LABAC meeting possibly. He would want to circle back with Lionel, Karen, and Michael and you all may say at the meeting let's wait for the study to come back. And to be clear, Karen thinks it's good to have discussion with the whole LABAC because there are different points of view and pros and cons to consider, and maybe we figure out a way to focus on what are the chief concerns for cyclists.
- Regardless of the pro-con of the idea of widening bike lanes, Karen said these are the things that we are worried about because one view is that it might reduce the resistance to adding bike lanes where it requires removing parking if people will give up parking to make emergency vehicle access as opposed to just for a bike lane. But we don't know, there's a lot unknown about what's good or bad from cycling that we need to discuss.
- So, Philip will pass on to Rob the follow-up items from this meeting, the language to be put on the LABAC agenda, and if Karen or Glenn, working with Lionel and others, want to provide some specific language then we will look to see what you provide.
- Glenn said he's a placeholder, and then if we have something that's a link to some position paper document that could work too. It doesn't all have to be on the agenda.
- Subsequent to the subcom meeting, Philip received an update from CD 13 that their office with CD4 and 5 amended the emergency vehicles/bike lane width motion to have report backs on the issue of required widths and safety: [amending motion here](#). Their concerns were making sure the

perfect isn't the enemy of the good; wider bike lanes are good, but also making sure it doesn't slow down what is an already slow bike network installation process and ensuring rider safety. There's a bidirectional bike lane right in front of city hall, and cars have been observed driving unsafely through it all the time.

13. Road resurfacing schedule-bikeway implementation matrix. For current status, please see:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1yGOX-qlbloDbt8exw-v4Bt1Bs8TZoAOo8wmjvtyD7FU/edit#gid=304220517>

- There were no updates.

14. Project Suggestion list.

[https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1nG7dZ5QJUd8bsi\\_VJN3QDh\\_qhEIG12fsrB913uGkrA/edit#gid=0](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1nG7dZ5QJUd8bsi_VJN3QDh_qhEIG12fsrB913uGkrA/edit#gid=0)

- There were no updates.

15. Announcements

- Council File 20-1469-S1, Temporary Closures / Active Transportation Facilities: The Transportation Committee made a motion to continue it to the next Transportation Committee meeting.
- Streets For All will be presenting next month at a special meeting of the Charter Reform Commission at 10 AM on October 18 in CD 7.
- Council File 23-0600-S121, Vision Zero Program / Independent Evaluation: The Transportation Committee heard the council file on August 13 and transmitted it to the Budget and Finance Committee and the Public Safety Committee and they may take it up this month or in October.
- The Neighbor Council Budget Advocates are starting their meetings with the various City department heads regarding the upcoming budget. You can get involved to review the budgets for LADOT, BSS, etc. The meetings are held during the day, 99% of them are held virtually, during the work days with the department heads and budget folks.

16. Adjournment in honor of people killed in crashes with motor vehicles.

- Jennifer moves to adjourn in honor of Damian Kevitt, Founder of Streets Are For Everyone (SAFE). We just went to the 10<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of SAFE and that reminds us of what a great hero he is, we should never forget what he's gone through, and how much he's accomplished in 10 years.
- The meeting was adjourned at 2:26 PM.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, November 18, 2025, 1:00PM.

LABAC Planning and Bikeways Engineering Subcommittee Mtg

Committee members are asked to attend in person. Guests and City Staff may utilize zoom/virtual meeting option.

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81051063004>

Meeting ID: 810 5106 3004

---

One tap mobile

+16694449171,,81051063004# US

+16699006833,,81051063004# US (San Jose)