



Mar Vista Community Council



Mobility Sub Committee (Bike+ Mar Vista)

Coffee Connection – public seating area, 3838 S. Centinela Ave. 90066

Agenda - Monday April 29, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. at

Committee Co-Chair: Rob Kadota (rob.kadota@marvista.org)

Committee Co-Chair Galen Graham (galen.graham@gmail.com)

- 1) **Call to order**
- 2) **Announcements**
- 3) **Public Comment for Items NOT on This Agenda**
- 4) **Old Business (60 min)**
 - a) Venice Great Street Bike Lanes development and refinement of a pros and cons info sheet of current Great Street to share with MVCC BOD and public. Goal is to finish and share with MVCC BOD at May 14th Board of Directors meeting.
 - b) Link to draft document can be found under the resources links here:
<https://www.marvista.org/bicycle-committee.php>
- 5) **Future Agenda**
- 6) **Announcements/Public Comment**
- 7) **Adjournment** (not later than 9:00 p.m.)

* **PUBLIC INPUT AT NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL MEETINGS** – The public is requested to fill out a “Speaker Card” to address the Board on any agenda item before the Board takes an action on an item. Comments from the public on agenda items will be heard only when the respective item is being considered. Comments from the public on other matters not appearing on the agenda that are within the Board’s jurisdiction will be heard during the General Public Comment period. Please note that under the Brown Act, the Board is prevented from acting on a matter that you bring to its attention during the General Public Comment period; however, the issue raised by a member of the public may become the subject of a future Board meeting. Public comment is limited to 2 minutes per speaker, unless adjusted by the presiding officer of the Board.

* **PUBLIC POSTING OF AGENDAS** - MVCC agendas are posted for public review at Mar Vista Recreation

Center, 11430 Woodbine Street, Mar Vista, CA 90066 You can also receive our agendas via email by subscribing to L.A. City’s Early Notification System at <https://www.lacity.org/subscriptions>

* **THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT** - As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with

Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability and, upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to its programs, services and activities. Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices and other auxiliary aids and/or services, may be provided upon request. To ensure availability of services, please make your request at least 3 business days (72 hours) prior to the meeting you wish to attend by contacting chair@marvista.org.

* **PUBLIC ACCESS OF RECORDS** – In compliance with Government Code section 54957.5, non-exempt writings that are distributed to a majority or all of the board in advance of a meeting may be viewed at our website, <http://www.marvista.org>, or at the scheduled meeting. In addition, if you would like a copy of any record related to an item on the agenda, contact secretary@marvista.org.

* **RECONSIDERATION AND GRIEVANCE PROCESS** - For information on MVCC’s process for board action reconsideration, stakeholder grievance policy, or any other procedural matters related to this Council, please consult the MVCC Bylaws. The Bylaws are available at our Board meetings and our website.

www.marvista.org.



Historic Setup

(3 lanes of car traffic + Bike Lane + Car parking along curb)
Historically, and on the rest of Venice Blvd, this stretch consisted of three vehicular traffic lanes, a Class II bike lane, and on-street parallel parking. The bike lane had no buffer on either side, and thus was directly in the door zone.

Pros

1. Cyclists were fully visible to vehicles.
2. Three lanes of traffic were available for cars to use.
3. Has an established history and conforms to many expectations

Cons

1. Inattentive drivers ran the risk of “dooring” cyclists, by opening a door into their path of travel.
2. Due to lane width, if a cyclist were to anticipate a dooring, they would likely swerve into an active lane of traffic and risk being rear-ended or side swiped by a car.
3. Traffic is impeded by vehicles attempting to park. And often car parking will stop and block the bike lane.
4. High speed traffic immediately next to bike lanes discourages more cyclists from using this important bike route.

Alternative: Buffered bike lanes

This format is being used on the south side of Venice between Beethoven and Centinela



Buffered bike lanes are a type of Class II bike lane in that they are not physically separated from traffic, but are instead given a wide buffer of cross-painted lanes. Parts of Venice Blvd. currently use this setup. The configuration currently consists of two vehicular lanes of traffic, a buffer zone, a Class II bike lane, and curbside parallel parking.

Pros

1. Cyclists remain fully visible to vehicles while on the road and are seen and treated like normal traffic but with greater separation from vehicle traffic.
2. The addition of a buffer zone gives cyclists added space to avoid obstacles in the bike lane and each other.
3. The more open design might lessen conflict between slow and fast cyclists, e-assist cyclists, and e-scooter drivers..
4. Parking vehicles can leave the lane of traffic to park and not obstruct traffic
5. Parking would be returned to previous levels since spaces are not needed for cyclist riding in the separated lanes that block them.
6. Potential for the lane to be shared with buses and emergency services (fire trucks, police cars), providing more forms of alternative transport (((this has potential conflicts too.)))
7. Allows for the construction of parklets along the route without impeding any type of traffic

Cons

1. Car drivers would need to remain vigilant to not cut off cyclists when initially moving to park
2. Potential for abuse by rideshare users blocking the bicycle lane
3. Lack of a barrier between vehicles and bicycle and pedestrian traffic
- 4.

Alternative: Protected/ Separated bike lanes



(Two car

lanes, off curb car parking, bollards and bike lane against curb)

Protected bike lanes make up the bulk of the Venice Great Streets project, and are Class I facilities, fully separated from vehicular traffic. These offer the greatest protection of pedestrian and cycling, due to parking and vehicular traffic being physically separated from other modes of transportation.

Pros

1. Greatest perceived sense of protection for cyclists and pedestrians. Often most appreciated by the most intrepid bicyclist.
2. Vehicles are discourage from blocking/parking in bicycle lanes due to physical barriers
3. Allows for the construction of parklets along the route

Cons

1. Cyclists and pedestrians are only visible to vehicular traffic at intersections
2. Drivers attempting to park block a lane of traffic
3. Reduced parking due to visibility needed near intersections

4. Narrower lane width prevents cyclist overtaking except near intersections, often not as appreciated by intermediate to advanced skilled bicyclists.

Current Venice Blvd Bike Lanes Setup

The current setup for Venice Boulevard consists of a mix of Class I and Class II bike lanes, depending on the block. The addition of Class I sections resulted in a trade off of one existing traffic lane, reconfiguring the street from 3-lanes to 2 in each direction.

Pros

1. Dooring of cyclists is not possible due to the separation of bike lane and parking
2. Chance of cyclists or pedestrians being hit outside of intersections is greatly decreased due to the separation from vehicular traffic lanes
3. Isolation of cyclists from car traffic creates a safer, more inviting cycling facility, mitigating speed differential conflicts and is able to attract riders of all abilities.
4. The lanes separated from traffic also serve the growing number of scooter users, thereby encouraging them to not use sidewalks.

Cons.

1. Cyclists are less visible to drivers until just before the intersections
2. Some cyclists disregard the hazards at mixing zones, where they cross paths with right-turning cars as they continue straight.
3. A reduction in lanes resulted in the misconception that travel times on this stretch of street were significantly impacted -- this is only true of EB traffic in evenings.
4. A reduction of lanes, coupled with parallel parking, results in some traffic backups in the right-most lane while drivers park