

Minutes of Bicycle Advisory Committee of the City of Los Angeles

Planning and Bikeways Engineering Subcommittee meeting -

Tuesday, May 19, 2026, 1:00 p.m.

Location: Rampart Village Neighborhood Council, 155 N. Occidental Blvd. Suite 236, Los Angeles, CA 90026

Emailed 5/29/26 11:45 AM

Online Meeting Access Information

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

Meeting ID: 810 5106 3004

Guests: Elliott Shaw (LADOT ATP Team), Eleanor Hunts (LADOT Vision Zero Team), Jonathan Weiss, Lionel Mares MPA (LABAC Member, CD 7 Appointee), Brian Nicosia (Bicycle Advisory Committee Chairman, Coastal Carolina University), Chih-Wei Hsu, CD 13 Planning Deputy, Astrid Theeuwes, KPFF Civil Engineer.

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 3.17.26 minutes available at: https://labikecommittee.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/04/Subcom-minutes-3-17-26_V2.pdf

Meeting is called to order at 1:03 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.
 - a. Lionel Mares posted the following information in the meeting chat: I Attended an Open House Workshop for the Osborne Street: Path to Park Access Project! Last Tuesday!" The project corridor is located along Osborne Street, between San Fernando Road and Foothill Boulevard which links the Pacoima and Lake View Terrace communities. The project aims to improve traffic safety, as well as reduce crashes, injuries, and fatalities. It seeks to enhance pedestrian and cyclist connectivity for Pacoima and Lake View Terrace residents, linking them to the San Fernando Regional Bike Path, Hansen Dam Bike Path, and Glenoaks Boulevard's Class II Bike Lane. It also proposes a lane reduction to

accommodate 3.3 miles of raised Class IV cycle tracks. Pedestrian improvements include improved sidewalks, numerous crossing points with high visibility crosswalks, ADA compliant ramps, and enhanced pedestrian-level lighting fixtures. In addition, hundreds of shade trees will be added to increase comfort and aesthetic appeal, with no tree removals anticipated.

3. Active Transportation project updates. Elliott Shaw
 - a. Sunset Blvd/Cesar Chavez Safety & Mobility Project.
 - i. Project webpage link: <https://ladotlivablestreets.org/projects/sunset>
 - ii. Open houses are being scheduled?
 - iii. Elliott said LADOT would share out the results of Phase 2 outreach and the design proposal for the Active Transportation Program (ATP) run by the California Transportation Commission in April or May, ahead of that ATP grant deadline, June 22nd of this year.
 - b. Sunset West ATP Application: Elliott said we're postponing the application work to the next ATP cycle. What that looks like externally is there's not much change to the project schedule, the construction, and the project going into the ground is still on the same timeline. We've just shifted things around internally, and we think we're going to come up with a much stronger application and be much more prepared for the next ATP cycle in 2028. But, again, it doesn't change much in terms of the project schedule, it just changes the funding strategy slightly. That's the main topic.
 - c. In response to Michael's question about why are you guys doing that, Elliott said there's a couple of reasons. I think the main reason would be public engagement. We felt like the amount of engagement we conducted before submitting the application was not up to the requirement that we hold for other projects, and submitting an application to ATP means that we lock in a lot of that scope. They're quite strict on holding us to the scope that we submit, if that makes sense, so I think that's one main reason, but again, being able to work through the engineering, the plans more effectively in the build-up to the application, this is a huge benefit as well. I think that we're working really hard to submit this application. We committed a lot of hours, but ultimately, we were trying to meet a really tight deadline in our funding disbursement plans. We're requesting funding for construction in the later years. The first year for disbursement was 2028 and we're requesting funds for construction in 2029, 2030, etc., and we're still able to request funds, in those years if we apply to ATP Cycle 9, so that's why I say that the construction timeline has not changed. Just the front end of funding has shifted around a little bit. It just means that we're going to be doing some engineering, working on the engineering a little bit more internally, and conducting some more outreach and engagement over the summer, and perhaps next summer as well.

- d. Michael said it sounds like the decision's been made. I'll just flag that this year, there might be an extra \$200 million in ATP funding, of one-time funding, and we have no idea who the Governor's going to be, or what ATP funding is going to be later, so to the degree it's still possible, I would take that stuff into account.
- e. In response, Elliott said he didn't know that, but the decision's been made to pause it. Unfortunately, it's not our decision, but we do agree that the projects would benefit from more engagement, more engineering work, before the application is submitted. And I hear you too, because we're working at the council offices, two of which are in election year. You're right, the state government will change. There's some unknowns, but we're still confident that we have a strong application, we'll have an even stronger application at the next round.
- f. Philip mentioned that there was a lot of community involvement with the Sunset West project, and I'm just wondering if any of that community involvement has been incorporated into your public engagement.
- g. Regarding Sunset4All, Elliott responded that we're working with Bike LA who is now housing the Sunset4All materials and advocacy. So, we're working directly with Eli. We're definitely incorporating past engagement that they've completed. Regarding whether Sunset4All is still active, Elliott said that is a question for Eli. I think he would say yes. I mean I think the advocacy that was completed and all the materials and the outreach that was completed are available to us, and we've been trying to build off of all that with our project. Ultimately, the scope and the plans are similar, but different enough, that we're still working on our own set of engagement plans and outreach plans.
- h. Jennifer asked, when you say the scope is not finalized, right? Because I know I went on that ride, and talking about cycle tracks versus the lanes on both sides, with bollards, Class IV. So, nothing's been changed yet?
- i. In response, Elliott said we considered all options and that's likely going to be what we're proposing just because we have a limited roadway width along that section between Fountain and Douglas. The roadway width is quite consistent, but it's also limiting, and in order to fit everything that we need to fit on the street and on the cross-section, we are proposing the two-way cycle track because we're able to save a few feet here and there by grouping both westbound, eastbound bike lanes together, as opposed to having them separately. If we were to do that, we would lose a few feet of space for the buffer on each side. Elliott said if they're each on their own side of the street, then they would each require a buffer, and by putting them both on one side, we only need one buffer, and then we're able to keep the existing parking lane, or incorporate our bus lane, or whatever, that's where we're at right now.

- j. Elliott said there are no major updates on any other projects.
Spring/Alameda's about to go into construction, we're just doing a bunch of civil work. The actual restriping in the bike lane is still scheduled to go in approximately a year from now. So, we're still on track, but not really any updates from the other projects.
 - k. Northvale is in the same limbo but Elliott has a note to check on it in June so he can provide an update at the next meeting.
 - l. Discussion on Terra Bella Street - Metro is working with LADOT on an interim replacement bike lane. Waiting for a construction notice once the project team has a finalized date for the installation of the new bike lanes on Terra Bella St. The new bike lanes will be installed before the existing bike lanes on Van Nuys Bl are removed. Removal of the bike lanes on Van Nuys Bl is expected to begin as early as June 2026 to accommodate construction, so installation of the new bike lanes should occur before June.
 - m. According to Metro's Friday Email for May 8, 2026, Work Notices, the new Class II bike lanes on Terra Bella St will be constructed by LADOT beginning Sunday, May 17, 2026. | [Full Details](#)
 - n. In an April 16, 2026 Letter to the Community Leadership Council (copy attached), the LABAC recommended that LADOT, working with LA Metro, add robust bicycle facilities to seamlessly connect the western terminus of the Terra Bella Street bike lanes at Wakefield Avenue to the current Van Nuys Boulevard bike lanes at Parthenia Street, focusing on Tobias Avenue as a viable alternative route for bicyclists.
 - o. On May 6, 2026, Raymond Acevedo, Principal Community Relations Officer, East San Fernando Valley Light Rail Transit Project, informed us that Metro does not plan to expand the scope of the replacement bicycle lane on Terra Bella St, but this does not preclude the City from doing so in the future. LADOT's feedback was that advancing a facility on Tobias Avenue would likely require additional analysis, design, and potential civil improvements to meet current standards and they don't have funding for this.
 - p. In response to Philip's question about whether the LABAC could expect a response from the Community Leadership Council to the April 16 LABAC Letter and whether that letter will be included in the public comments that Metro received on the project, Elliott said he doesn't know.
 - q. The Osborne Street: Path to Park Access Project: project webpage [link](#).
 - r. Update on the Spring/Alameda Corridor Safety and Mobility Project.
 - i. Project Website:
<https://ladotlivablestreets.org/projects/springalameda>
 - s. Draft Environmental Impact Report for the [LA River Path project](#).
4. Vision Zero Update. Eleanor Hunts.

- a. 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.
 - i. No updates.
- b. [Vermont Transit Corridor Project](#): Waiting to hear from Metro about what treatments might be incorporated into their project.
 - i. According to Metro's Friday Email for May 8, 2026, Work Notices, Pre-construction activities for the Vermont Transit Corridor Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project may begin as early as May 11, 2026. Crews will begin by locating underground utilities using small, controlled exploratory holes to confirm the location of pipes, cables, and other infrastructure before construction begins. | [Full Details](#)
 - ii. Michael said the judge should rule on Joe Linton's lawsuit. The meat of it is if the City is required while working with Metro to implement HLA, and therefore a bike lane on Vermont.
- c. Discussion and possible action regarding joint LADOT/CAO report on [Vision Zero Program Independent Evaluation](#): It's Council File [23-0600-S121](#). Council action was final on December 22, 2025.
 - i. Eleanor added to the meeting chat: From the Automated Speed Enforcement project manager: We are targeting the launch of the public information campaign for July 1st, and camera systems start issuing warning citations late summer if the contract is adopted by Council.
 - ii. Glenn said he saw information that the [speed camera locations](#) have gone through public comments.
- d. [Pico Blvd Safety and Mobility Plan Project](#): Elliott said we are at 100% design and wrapping up our community engagement with an open house/community celebration with LADOT, the Council Offices, and the Pico Union Neighborhood Council at the end of the month. It will be at Alvarado Terrace Park on May 30 10am-1pm. More details and RSVP are on the project website <https://ladotlivablestreets.org/projects/pico> There will be more details on the final design, such as which parking spots are being removed in front of which buildings and where they may be installing potential hardening elements beyond plastic bollards.
- e. South Broadway Safety and Mobility Project between MLK Jr Blvd and Manchester Ave:
 - i. The design concept is being shared at an open house event on June 11 6pm-8pm at 5606 S Broadway (Iglesia Koinonia).
 - ii. Eleanor said Vision Zero is partnering with Metro and Metro is hosting a virtual Broadway Bus Priority Lanes Community Meeting on June 1 6pm-7pm. Register at the following link: bit.ly/BroadwayBusLanesWebinar She will ask the project team to add the information about the June 1 public meeting to the

project webpage at the following link:

<https://ladotlivablestreets.org/projects/broadway>

- f. Glenn said he wanted to commend the subcom on a very detailed and informational agenda that is a great all-in-one-place note-taking for him. It would be helpful, especially just on the Vision Zero stuff, that we change the outline format of the agenda from bullet points to perhaps letters. He thanked Eleanor for the updates. Philip said yes, we'll number the bullet points next time in the agenda and minutes. Subsequent to the meeting, Jennifer asked that we please identify the items in these minutes a little more clearly with subdividers: A, B, C or 1, 2, 3; something like that. For that reason, we've adopted that request for the final version of these minutes although the meeting agenda used bullet points.
 - g. Marmion Way Safety and Mobility Project: No updates.
 - h. Discussion regarding the [SRTS Center City Schools Neighborhood Safety & Climate Resilience Project](#): On March 5, 2026, Eleanor shared with us the [ATP6 fact sheet](#).
 - i. Jack Linares, Community Affairs Deputy, Office of Vice President Dr. Rocío Rivas, Board of Education, District 2, is in the process of setting up parent meetings among the local LAUSD schools and community partners. On an April 15, 2026 call, CD 13 Community Development & Planning Director Emma Howard stated that she would check in with LADOT to give us an update and also check in with CD 1.
 - ii. No update.
 - i. Did LADOT apply for the [2026 California Safe System Institute for Road Safety](#), a collaborative effort in partnership with the [Vision Zero Network](#) and [Fehr & Peers](#) with funding provided by the California Office of Traffic Safety, through the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration? Selected participants will join a cohort of practitioners for a deep dive into "forgiving" infrastructure, kinetic energy management, and collaborative implementation.
 - i. Eleanor said their team did not have any capacity to apply for the training.
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. On August 11, LADOT submitted the anticipated [report back](#), dated August 7, 2025. In its subsequent ATP report to the subcom, LADOT stated its oversight of construction sites is limited. When existing infrastructure cannot be maintained, it appears that LADOT allows contractors to accommodate road users to the best of their ability if the roadbed allows, regardless of what is in their permit (following CA-MUTCD WATCH manual guidance), due to the potential need for site-specific plans. Elliott or someone else from LADOT.

- a. Is CD 4 Transportation, Infrastructure & Public Space Director Mehmet Berker available to work with us on an actual change in policy that will be enforced?
 - b. Elliott said Mehmet Berker (CD 4 Transportation, Infrastructure & Public Space Director) returned from paternity leave and he recommends reaching out. At our prior subcom meeting, Michael had recommended going over with CD 4 what LADOT responded with, express our frustration, and ask them to work with us on an actual change in policy that will be enforced. Philip said he will check in.
 - c. Eleanor said no updates.
- 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.
 - a. Here's a list of the materials LADOT has used in this bike lane hardening pilot:
 - i. Main St (9th St to 1st St): [Zicla Zipper](#)
 - ii. Adams Blvd (Fairfax Ave to Crenshaw Blvd): Zicla Zipper and [Treetop 3" Crossover Delineator](#)
 - iii. Spring St (9th St to 1st St): [Treetop 5" Curb Delineator](#)
 - iv. 3rd St (Spring St to Main St): [Safe-T Lane Divider](#)
 - b. 3rd Street pilot is going
 - c. LADOT is considering precast concrete separators for Spring/Alameda.
 - d. Cost comparison for pre-cast barriers vs. K71s. Material/labor cost for 3rd Street pilot. Jack.
 - e. Elliott said pre-cast concrete separators are still being considered for Spring Alameda, but it depends on whether we have the funding for it after we get the cost estimates back for the additional crossing at Mesnager because we had to add an additional crossing at Mesnager that was not in the original plans. We're going to have two crossings, Ann and Mesnager, and we're still working that out. I'm confident that we could implement them along the corridor in some places, but it depends.
- 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.
 - a. Update from Michael on Charter Reform: There is really important stuff going on with charter reform right now. Anyone that's paying attention can look at our socials, we put out a video and a call to action. But basically, having a Director of Public Works that's empowered, that can be the glue and centralize everything between LADOT and StreetsLA, we think is

really important. There is a minimum amount of money now proposed in the charter reform to Public Works for street improvements. We don't think it's enough. We're trying to get that raised. And we're also trying to remove stuff from the charter. So, if we had a different Mayor, we could potentially reorganize departments better, to be much more effective with the dollars we have. In Streets For All's opinion, we think that means giving LADOT responsibility property line to property line, instead of curb to curb, and letting them do asphalt and concrete work, sidewalks, streets, curbs, and curb ramps. That's how New York City does it. That's how other major cities have a fully formed Department of Transportation. We're the only major City in the country where our LADOT can't do concrete work, and our Bureau of Street Services doesn't paint the lines on the street, and they're constantly fighting for resources with different priorities. The Bureau of Street Services cares about smooth asphalt and perhaps LADOT cares more about Vision Zero or multimodal streets. And they don't have the same priorities, and there's very weak leadership coming from the Mayor's Office to align everything. So, pay attention to the charter reform stuff if you're not already.

8. Century City Bikeway Network plan. Report update of prioritized projects from [First/Last Mile](#) (FLM) Plan for the Purple Line (D Line) extension through Century City. It's not an active LADOT project.
 - a. At its October 7, 2025 meeting, the LABAC approved a motion to send a letter to CD 5 and Metro supporting a First/Last Mile (FLM) plan at the Century City Purple Line Station.
 - b. Avenue of the Stars is on the 2035 Mobility Plan from a bike point of view. Removing a lane on each side of Avenue of the Stars would have very little impact on vehicle traffic patterns in Century City. It's just not on anyone's radar, and there's no money for it. Metro did recommend bike lanes on Century Park East, Avenue of the Stars, Century Park West, and Constellation as part of their first/last-mile around the Century City stop.
 - c. No update.
9. Expo Bikeway, Northvale gap update. LADOT is waiting for Caltrans to review documentation of a categorical exemption from CEQA review before providing a construction time line. Elliott.
 - a. Elliott has a note to check in on it in June so he can provide an update at the next meeting.
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](#).
 - a. CD 14 asked for a 2-year extension for \$103 million in grants that the City of LA previously won for bike projects in Boyle Heights, Skid Row, and Wilmington. However, there's nobody at StreetsLA working on the project

- and, unless that changes, that money's just going to go back to the state in 2 years. There are hundreds of millions of dollars at risk across the City.
- b. Thanks to an advocacy push, the City approved the positions that Bureau of Street Services would need to actually effectuate and deliver the projects, and the City is asking the California Transportation Commission (CTC), which awarded the funds, for the extension.
 - c. At their June 25th meeting, the CTC will consider approving the City's request for an extension. If the City gets the extension, then Council has approved the hiring, and we'll get the positions, and we'll deliver those \$103 million in bike projects in those three areas.
 - d. When asked whether the City is going to be able to use grant funds to hire the staff, or are they going to have to take that out of general fund or something like that, Michael said there is also an effort going on with the budget, so everyone knows who the CAO is, hopefully. It's the most powerful unelected person in the City. The CAO has had a policy that basically has said, City departments cannot use grant funds to hire people to deliver grant-funded projects. The logic is that the people that you hire are an ongoing expense, where the projects are one-time money, so it kind of makes sense if you think about it in theory, but the City has such a large backlog of grant-funded projects that the logic doesn't make sense. We could hire these people, they'd be busy for a decade, clearing out the queue of all of our grant-funded projects. So there's an effort going on with the budget process right now to change that, for Council to intervene and say grant funds can be used for grant-funded positions to deliver the projects. And to answer your question, if that happens, that would unlock those funds for the City to be able to hire people as well. Michael said It's not clear yet. The important thing for the CTC is the City is committing to hiring the people. How the City pays for them, the CTC doesn't care. So if the grant extension is approved, it would be up to the City and hopefully this policy change would happen by then, and Council can say you can use grant funding to hire people. So, if Council does that by the end of June, they'll be able to use the grant funding.
 - e. Caltrans' Ohio to Ohio Connector in West LA for those 3 blocks on Santa Monica Boulevard: Michael said we now have a commitment from the director of CD 7 that it will move forward, and it will be done probably by the Olympics. That means that that will connect LADOT's protected bike lane on Ohio, which ends at Westgate, to the other Ohio, west of Bundy. And the City of Santa Monica is putting in concrete protection for Broadway, Ohio turns into Broadway at the City border, all the way to 5th Street near the beach. So, this missing link is really important, and it's great that Caltrans is going to do it, even though it's going to take a few more years.
 - f. In the chat, Lionel asked if there are any updates for the San Fernando Valley. In response, Michael said I don't have anything specific to the San Fernando Valley, those are the project updates I have right now.

- g. Michael said Assembly Bill 1740 would basically get the Coastal Commission out of the way to implement bike projects, especially when you have to remove parking in the coastal zone. So, in the City of LA, this is most of Venice. For example, everything west of Lincoln. Right now, cities have to replace parking they remove on a one-to-one basis, and they often don't have the space for the parking spots, and therefore, they don't do bike projects. This bill would get rid of that requirement, and not force them to replace the parking. The Coastal Commission is "guns blazing." I went up to testify in Sacramento last month, and they basically view this bill as the first step to dismantling the Coastal Commission and eroding their authority. So, as a result of a bunch of negotiations and compromise behind the scenes, the bill was limited to just the City of Santa Monica, with the idea that we could build on it going forward. There may now be a deal in place to expand it, and so there's still negotiations going on. By the time we meet next, I should know where it lands.
- h. Glenn asked whether Streets For All is engaged with the current discussion efforts, etc., regarding prohibiting e-bikes. I know they're talking about City parks, but bicycles are not allowed anyway, so it doesn't really matter if it's human-powered or e-bikes, from my perspective, but maybe I'm missing something. I am concerned about the discussion and I'm not sure that the folks who put forward the City Council motion totally understand the differentiation between the different speed categories, in terms of how they're described, but maybe so. I didn't see it in Council File [26-0338](#).
- i. In response, Michael said there's stuff going on in Sacramento around e-bikes, and there's stuff going on locally. The John Lee motion that you're referring to, it's mostly toothless because this stuff is already prohibited. It sounds like he's trying to clamp down on enforcement. We did work behind the scenes to make sure, and you can see it in the motion, to differentiate between: e-motos that are not street legal and go above 28 miles per hour and have throttles; and Class 1, 2, and 3 e-bikes. And so part of the direction in that motion is to have the City clarify the difference and to propose rules based on that difference.
- j. In Sacramento, everyone seems to be in an uproar over e-bikes, and the media isn't helping. The media covers these crashes, and it's like, a teen crashed on an e-bike and killed a pedestrian. And then you look at it, and it's actually an electric motorcycle that can go up to 50 miles per hour with a throttle, but they call it an e-bike. And so politicians get confused, the media gets confused. We're doing everything we can to make sure that difference is very, very clear, and I put a link in the chat: <https://www.streetsforall.org/blog/2026-california-ebike-legislation>
- k. Another thing we helped with behind the scenes is we killed two really bad e-bike bills, AB 1942 as well as AB 1557. These bills would have required special licenses for e-bikes. They would have lowered it from 20 miles per hour to 16. And with a 250-watt continuous watt limit, they would have come down hardest on rear hub e-bikes, which are the cheapest, as

opposed to the hub in the middle. So, the good news is we have a supportive Appropriations Chair with Buffy Wicks, who likes e-bikes and is willing to play ball, but we need to educate our City Council here, and our legislators in Sacramento on the difference between e-motos and e-bikes. These e-moto companies don't tell parents when they buy them for their teenagers, hey, this bike requires insurance and a license and registration, it can go up to 50 miles an hour. And the kids want them because their friends have them. And so, there's another bill that we're working on to clamp down on that and require that these companies state those requirements, just like when you're buying a car. Like, you couldn't drive it off without showing a driver's license, you shouldn't be able to buy an electric motorcycle and just bike it off without showing that you actually have a motorcycle license. So, there's a lot of work going on, but as far as the LA-specific thing we were involved in, we'll see what the report back says. I was at a meeting where the legislative deputy for CD 12 spoke, and again, recognizing all those various levels, discriminating against, people because of being younger ages.

- l. Glenn said I understand they don't want 10-year-olds and whatever, but on the other hand, there was some discussion about age 18, age 21, and you can have a driver's license at age 16. E-bikes in those type of settings are giving regular bikes or mountain bike's a bad name in some instances, on parks and single-track trails, etc.
- m. Michael said he wanted to let everyone know that there's an effort that he's working with CD 10 on to extend the Pico protected bike lane to San Vicente. That's less than a mile, but it would obviously connect with both the bike lanes on Venice and on San Vicente. LADOT gave CD 10 an estimate of \$1.75 million for less than a mile, but that includes curb ramp upgrades, resurfacing, and things like that. He still thinks it's an insane price, but CD 10 has requested a report back as part of the budget process on: 1) how to both find the money, probably from a special fund, not the general fund, given the City's fiscal condition; and 2) how it could be incorporated to not delay the original project, but do it as a Phase 2, maybe a change order, because the project is about to go out to bid, the original project. CD 10's on board and fighting for it, and that would then give you a complete bikeway from either near the beach on Venice Boulevard, or Beverly Hills and West Hollywood using Burton Way and San Vicente, all the way to Figueroa downtown.
- n. The judge should rule on Joe Linton's lawsuit this month, so it should literally be the next week or two. However, the judge ruled against Joe for disputing the City's implementation ordinance, which required people to appeal to the Board of Public Works before they could file a lawsuit. It doesn't say you have to appeal first. The City claimed that the appeal process is a way to quickly resolve disputes, and therefore it furthers the goals of HLA, and the judge agreed with that argument. So Joe lost that part of the case, but that does not have any bearing on the bigger issue of

either the Vermont service roads or the Vermont BRT and bike lanes on Vermont.

- o. Michael said a new HLA lawsuit was filed since our last meeting, again by Joe, honestly, based on a lot of the stuff I heard discussed at our last meeting. The bike lane on Cesar Chavez was downgraded from a Class IV to a Class II because the community plan was updated. Also, Ohio Avenue in West LA, between Bundy and the City border of Santa Monica at Sentinella, was slurry sealed and not upgraded to Class IV, which was required by the mobility plan. So the lawsuit has three main components.
 - i. One is that, specific to the Sunset and Cesar Chavez project, a community plan update done after HLA passed and after the December 2021 point, which HLA said the mobility plan as of the end of 2021 is the mobility plan. The City can improve on it or change it with good intentions, but they can't just downgrade bike facilities. And so, the first part of the lawsuit is that a community plan update cannot downgrade a bike facility.
 - ii. The second part of the lawsuit is that slurry seals should not be exempt from HLA. The City is trying to claim that slurry seal is a maintenance activity, and therefore it doesn't count as road work, but it's kind of ridiculous. If you go to Ohio Avenue in West LA, from the naked eye, you could not tell the difference between a resurfacing or a slurry seal. They still have to redo the lines.
 - iii. The third one is that large asphalt repair cannot be used to get around HLA, which the City is doing large asphalt repair all over the place. You guys have probably seen it biking around, the weird patches here and there on streets. And that it can't be daisy-chained, meaning within a mile section of Melrose near Vermont, there's probably patches for a mile, but they don't all connect. And so the City's saying, well, none of these is over an eighth of a mile. But the project overall is.

Long story short, the City is doing everything it can to still avoid HLA. They just filed what's called a demurrer, claiming that HLA as a whole might be illegal, because it's interfering with the City's general ongoing operations, which is just amazing.

- 11. Olympics opportunity for bikeway infrastructure and/or the [Festival Trail plan](#) and [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.
 - a. At its October 7, 2025 meeting, the LABAC approved a motion to sign onto a letter supporting Los Angeles' commitment to a Car-Free Olympics.
 - b. Karen is aware that there's an effort to gather signatures and support by May 28th to encourage Metro supporting the formation of a joint power authority to be able to allow people to move forward with the project and not leave it solely in Metro's hands. I can forward a link to information on

that. I got an email from Dave Snyder about this, and I need to follow up and find out where it stands right now.

- c. Glenn said those of you who are involved with Neighborhood Councils probably got a communication that LA 2028 has initiated a month-to-month dialogue with Neighborhood Council folks, and it would be open to the public. They are on the first Fridays of the month so the next one will be June 5th and I think it's at 11am. It's one hour. I just need to confirm the time. We could maybe put that out to all the LABAC and just let them know. We don't know what the agenda is for each of the meetings, the topics and focus, but it wouldn't hurt to have some advocates show up and just raise this idea. I do plan to attend on June 5th. Since this is raised on this agenda, I think it might be good if several of us were saying what's the Olympics doing to accelerate bikeway implementation in advance of the games.

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

- a. Are there council files missing that should be added? Are there council files that should be removed from the list?
- b. 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.
- c. 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. With CD 4 and CD 5, CD 13 amended the emergency vehicles/bike lane width motion to have report backs on the issue of required widths and safety: [amending motion here](#). At its October 7, 2025 meeting, the LABAC tabled this motion and sent it back to committee for monitoring. Lionel.
- d. Council File [23-1210](#), Leading Pedestrian Intervals (LPI) / Vision Zero Safety Study / Signal Phasing and Timing / Traffic Violence. Motion passed on January 10, 2024, City Council to INSTRUCT the Department of Transportation to report back, within 120 days, with draft updated guidelines for the use of Leading Pedestrian Intervals (LPI), scramble crosswalks, and NO RIGHT TURN ON RED restrictions, taking into account the appropriateness of longer LPI duration, a more liberal set of criteria for scramble crosswalks, and increased usage of restricting right turns on red to reduce vehicle-pedestrian conflicts. Kent.
- e. Council File [25-0481](#), Bicycle and Multi Use Paths / Maintenance Responsibility / Department of Public Works / Los Angeles Administrative Code / Amendment. The Council to REQUEST that the City Attorney, in consultation with the Department of Public Works (DPW) and its bureaus, to prepare and present an ordinance amending the Los Angeles Administrative Code to assign the responsibility for maintaining City bicycle and multiuse paths to the Department of Public Works and

INSTRUCT the City Administrative Officer, with the cooperation of DPW and the Department of Transportation, to provide recommendations regarding alignment of staffing and funding to provide an adequate level of maintenance for bicycle and multi-use paths, at least equal to that provided to streets and sidewalks. Rob.

- f. Council File [25-1358](#), Senate Bill (SB) 707 / Brown Act / Policy and Procedure / City Compliance / July 1, 2026. At the May 5, 2026 A&E subcom meeting, Rob or Glenn said they would look for motion language.
- g. Council File [22-1566](#), Climate Action and Adaptation Plan / City General Plan: At its May 5, 2026 meeting, the A&E subcom considered a proposed Letter to the City that also addressed the [Climate Action Plan for Los Angeles](#). Discussion and possible action on the revised proposed Letter to the City (copy attached).
- h. Philip screen-shared and read the proposed Letter to the City, summarized what had changed from the prior version of the letter that was shared with the final subcom agenda, and incorporated a comment from Glenn. Jennifer moved to recommend to the full LABAC to consider approving this letter, as amended at this subcom meeting, at the June 2 LABAC meeting. Karen seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-0-0.
- i. Council File [26-0338](#), Prohibit Electric Bicycles / Equestrian, Hiking and Recreational Trails / Enforcement Tools: Glenn asked in his recent email to the LABAC that this council file be included on the upcoming LABAC agenda as an unfolding issue.

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

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

- a. There were no updates.

14. Project Suggestion list.

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1nG7dZ5QJUd8bsi_VJN3QDh_qhEIG12fsrB913uGkrA/edit#gid=0

- a. There were no updates.

15. Announcements

- a. Open house/community celebration with LADOT, the Council Offices, and the Pico Union Neighborhood Council at the end of the month. It will be at Alvarado Terrace Park on May 30 10am-1pm. More details and RSVP are on the project website <https://ladotlivablestreets.org/projects/pico>
- b. South Broadway Safety and Mobility Project: The design concept is being shared at an open house event on June 11 6pm-8pm at 5606 S Broadway (Iglesia Koinonia).
- c. LADOT is partnering with Metro for the Broadway Bus Priority Lanes Community Meeting on June 1 6pm-7pm. Register at the following link: bit.ly/BroadwayBusLanesWebinar

- d. LA 2028 has initiated a month-to-month dialogue with Neighborhood Council folks on the first Fridays of the month so the next one will be June 5th and Glenn thinks it's at 11am for one hour.
- e. Automated Speed Enforcement project: LADOT is targeting the launch of the public information campaign for July 1st, and camera systems start issuing warning citations late summer if the contract is adopted by Council. Locations may be found at the following link for [LADOT's speed camera program](#).

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

- a. Karen moved to adjourn in honor of Melvin Salgado, Age 37, who was killed in a hit & run at the intersection of 36th Street and 5th Avenue on April 25, 2026, in the Jefferson Park area while riding an e-bike.
- b. The meeting was adjourned at 2:23 PM.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, July 21, 2026, 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)