

# Questionnaire: CSBPP Developments

November 2016

---

## SUMMARY RESULTS

---

On October 19, 2016, Caltrans launched an online questionnaire (not statistically valid) to solicit public input on the draft vision, goals, objectives and strategies for the CSBPP. The questions focus on respondents' level of agreement with the elements, as well as their priorities for the proposed strategies. As of November 14, 2016, the questionnaire received 1,245 responses, and is ongoing through November 22, 2016. This summary provides top-level findings on the results.

### **Vision, Goals and Objectives**

Eighty eight percent of respondents agree (with 59% who strongly agree) that pursuing the vision, goals and objectives would improve the safety, convenience, and comfort for walking and biking for all Californians.

### **Strategies**

Within each category of strategies (safety, mobility, preservation and equity), respondents identified their highest priority strategies. Respondents may choose one, some or all strategies as priorities.

*Safety:* Over 80% identified "safer streets and crossings" as a priority strategy. Over a third of respondents identified "enforcement" and "education" as priority strategies.

*Mobility:* Over 70% prioritized "connected network", and nearly half prioritized "multimodal access." About 47% prioritized "quality design", and 37% "statewide trails."

*Preservation:* Over 70% prioritized "quality of condition", and nearly half prioritized "program integration."

*Social Equity:* Over half prioritized "access to funding" and "community support". About 40% prioritized "equity lens."

*Clarity of the Strategies:* After prioritizing the strategies within a category, respondents checked "yes" or "no" as to whether the strategies are "generally clear and understandable." For most of the strategies, over 80 percent of respondents found the strategies clear and understandable. For the preservation strategies, 68% thought the

strategies are clear and understandable, and 74% thought the mobility strategies are clear and understandable.

### **Additional Comments: Key Themes**

For each of the strategies, as well as the vision, goals and objectives at large, respondents were asked to provide any additional thoughts or refinements. The following section provides a summary of key themes of frequent suggestions. A full set of these responses are available in the Appendix.

#### *Vision, Goals and Objectives*

- Include greenhouse gases or pollution reduction
- Include traffic reduction or reduced congestion
- Identify specific reference to rural communities' contexts and needs
- Ensure Objectives are tied to target numbers and metrics

#### *Safety*

- Increase bicyclist and pedestrian data for collisions and usage levels
- Focus enforcement and education on dangerous driving behaviors, such as increased education during the driver's license process
- Emphasize designing infrastructure that ensures greater safety (such as through separating bicyclists from the Right-of-Way)

#### *Mobility*

- Set measurable outcomes to language such as "high quality" and "comfortable"
- Develop a well-planned trail system that connects local, regional and state-wide networks
- Distinguish different statewide trails for commuting, tourism and recreation.
- Separate bicyclists and pedestrians through protected bike lanes and multi-use trails
- Address the different operational and safety considerations between bicycle and pedestrian
- Clarify and explain "facilities" in the strategy wording
- Model quality bicycle and pedestrian design from other countries
- Elevate the importance of the California Coastal Trail as an asset

#### *Preservation*

- Clarify the intent of the "Program Integration" strategy
- Provide more specific examples and context for "partnerships"
- Explain if "Preservation" strategies will detract from improving infrastructure standards

#### *Social Equity*

- Clarify the definition of "equity lens"
- Understand that low socioeconomic communities are more often dependent on cars because they far away from amenities and employment
- Clarify the definition of "disadvantaged community"

- Ensure equal access to funding among all communities, not just disadvantaged communities

## **Demographics**

The questionnaire included demographic questions to understand who provided input through this tool. Over half of respondents (59%) were male, 41% were female. Respondents represented every county within California; the two counties best represented were Sacramento and Santa Barbara, with 13% and 11% respectively.

For household income, 43% of respondents' household income was \$100,000 or over, only 7% of respondents had a household income under \$35,000. Over three quarters of respondents identified as White (78%), 13% identified as Hispanic or Latino, 12% identified as two or more races.

## **Appendix**

The following pages provide detailed comments from respondents regarding the strategies.

**Questionnaire: CSBPP Developments  
Appendix: Comments on Strategies**

---

**SAFETY STRATEGIES**

Mixed usage on bike paths is dangerous but L.A. is ignoring that. 'It will be necessary to have a separate path for pedestrians' Pre - 2012 Fed. guidelines VS 'You will all have to mix on the same path' LA City community meeting Studio City C.A.

Slow down the cars where the roadway is shared use.

Better safety data also requires better overall mode data so that collision, injury and fatality rates can be meaningfully tracked and improved upon.

So many drivers appear to have gotten their licenses from gumball machines. Harsher penalties for unlicensed drivers - like confiscating they're driving.

They sound good to me.

Road diet is important for consideration for safer streets. We have many issues with current roadway configuration that affects the safety of vulnerable users and in many cases we have roadways that are over built for the current and future need.

Maybe there should be an incentive or recognition program for communities that engage in the safety strategies.

Enforcement should be automated - avoid placing more police in areas that already have negative relationships with the police or work more closely with police to make sure that they aren't targeting people or issuing tickets that people can't afford

People making policy and designs should go for a bike ride in the areas they are making plans for.

Safety Data should not be limited only to more complete information on collisions. We desperately need more extensive data on bicycle and pedestrian usage. The state and local agencies must actually count bicycles and pedestrians as they do motor vehicles. We need exposure data as well as simple collision data.

I don't know where you are trying to focus this

How much are you spending on this instead of fixing and maintaining our freeways?

One good strategy not mentioned was retrofitting existing roadways for vulnerable users.

High speed cars shouldn't be anywhere near bikes or pedestrians. Giant non-freeway highways slicing cities will need to be tamed (see central Cupertino). Freeways dividing cities will need many more safe crossings, preferably at grade and away from entrance and exit ramps.

Prioritize safety and "perceived safety". People will not venture out if they do not "feel" safe. We do this on roadways for driving. Not sure what terms Caltrans uses for this - "comfortable" "accessible".....

You should also educate young drivers on basic procedures of driving in a construction zone. Maybe us workers will stop getting hit and dying. They don't have a clue!!.....on freeways or streets. I get "" what is a pilot car?" all day, all over this state! Educate them before they get a driver's license!! Please!

Enforcement needs to focus on dangerous behaviors by people driving. Far too often, local agencies focus on jaywalking or other minor acts which do not endanger other road users. Police stops for jaywalking, wrong-way bike riding, etc. are often concentrated in areas with primarily Black, Latino, and/or low-income people, and contribute to an atmosphere of police harassment in these communities.

Consult with cycling industry professionals. Bicycle shop owners, manufacturers, messengers, and racers.

---

---

## **SAFETY STRATEGIES**

---

Education is fine as it leads to safer streets. However, there no enforcement of law-breaking by ALL parties, peds, cars, & bikes. For crying out loud, there's no enforcement of rolling stops by cars that narrowly miss -and sometimes hit - those in the crosswalks or the mandate that children wear bike helmets. How do you think the mindset will change if precedent isn't adjusted?

---

As a cyclist, safety is critical. Teaching motorists to look right before turning right or look right before overtaking someone making a left in a residential area. Generally, "look right" (to check the bike lane) is something most motorists don't do. I'd love some copying of Denmark's biking strategies to be copied. Bespoke biking expressways, bike lanes between parked cars and the sidewalk; things like that.

---

the county of san luis obispo public works neglects pedestrian safety and resident safety along roadways. of particular danger is the intersection of hwy 1, old creek road and ocean blvd in Cayucos CA. the CHP does a terrible enforcement job.

---

They're very generalized so it's really hard to comment or make judgements.

---

As a bicycle rider with more than 10,000 miles riden, I have seen much, both urban & rural. The implementation is key, particularly the education part. It will take a long, long time to alter attitudes.

---

All are important, but protective infrastructure is the most important. The built environment helps control human behavior and provide a margin for error. Humans make errors.

---

Enforcement is also so important. I'm glad you have incidents listed as collisions and NOT accidents. 2 ton vehicles do not hit and kill people by accident, they are driven carelessly and aggressively.

---

It's all important, but protective infrastructure is paramount in controlling roadway user behavior and providing a built-in margin for error. Humans make errors.

---

Enforcement needs to be directed toward car drivers only.

---

Please consider a separate, paved, cyclist-only road that would follow US-101 and at other times, CA-1, in order to completely separate cyclist and vehicular traffic. Elsewhere, where it is unavoidable to separate them, there must be concrete barriers erected to protect the cyclists.

---

I am just coming on board with what this is about. You must avoid bureaucratise and speak plainly.

---

Overly vague. In "Safer Streets and Crossings" the word "prioritize" might make people thing that these users take precedence over motorists.

---

While driver behavior is in desperate need of improvement, I feel building the infrastructure to prioritize pedestrian and bicycle transit helps to legitimize the presence of non vehicular users to drivers.

---

education, data collection, enforcement are all good but they are useless if the safe roads and crossings are not in place.

---

1. Require all drivers through the DMV to review a walking and bicycling safety video and answer a series of related questions. Do this every two years. 2. Build mainly offstreet bike lanes and increase signage dramatically in places to identify bike lanes at traffic intersections and street crossings. 3. Many collisions are a result of bad/distracted/angry drivers or walkers/bicyclists that wear dark clothing, have no reflectors or lights, and/or ride the wrong way or disobey traffic laws. Conducting a study would be a waste of time and money. Instead the effort should be put towards enforcement, education, roadway improvements, and signage. 4. Set very high fines for violators, including those who try to run you off the road or do not honor the minimum 3 foot passing rule. Note: My sense is that drivers that do not bicycle (or walk to a lesser degree), do not respect those who do. Changing this attitude will be a much bigger task than doing the objectives above.

---

Separate bikeways wherever possible are key to getting people to bike (they make bike commuting safe and time-efficient), e.g. Steven's Creek Trail, Bay Trail (though sharing with pedestrians is suboptimal). More of those would be great!

---

---

## **SAFETY STRATEGIES**

---

Link safety to data; prioritize engineering efforts on serious safety problems; focus on responsibility of drivers with greatest abilities to cause harm

---

Wider sidewalks and bike lanes!!

---

There may be a major difference in understanding of how streets should be constructed between you and me for safe bicycle and pedestrian transport. In other words, how much are you going to inconvenience the automobile driver.

---

Safety and education go hand in hand for me. Not many car drivers know what a charo is and that it means bikes have full use of that lane.

---

The number one reason people give for not riding a bike more often is the dangerous environment our public roads have become due to the lack of traffic law enforcement.

---

Many current traffic rules are inconsistent with the natural motion of bicyclists which makes enforcing them unnatural for bicycle traffic. However, there is plenty of dangerous behaviors of cars the harm other trafficants, including not the least widespread speeding, so focus enforcement on these dangerous offenses that harm others.

---

safer streets and crossings. provide more bike lanes. bicycle riders tend to be aggressive assholes in many areas, knowing they have that 3' right of way, they take it no matter how unsafe the driving conditions are. for example, they take it on blind curves, in heavy traffic, and ride in vehicle lanes, causing vehicles to either drive 3mph behind them, or swerve into oncoming traffic. provide biking lanes in far more places to deter this type of aggressive riding.

---

Need more explanation of the "means" - though, this may come later.

---

The "means" to achieve these objectives are not clear in the bullet. This may be detailed out later but I'd like to see some explanation of "how" these goals can be achieved.

---

It seems the safety data is available and now the public needs to be controlled via safer streets and crossings and enforcement while being educated about the new transportation values

---

As per earlier comment, this must also address human factors and perceptions. Safety data will not tell the whole story.

---

I think education and enforcement go together, or at least, hand-in-hand.

---

All drivers should have a refresher class every 5 years.

---

multilingual and must be constantly accessible and available

---

Education should include the Dutch reach for driver's education!

---

Rather than "highest risk behaviors by all road users" this should read "focusing enforcement of safety on risky behaviors of all road users but prioritized by the level of public impact of the behavior." For example, a "high risk behavior" by a cyclist/pedestrian is capable of causing far less injury/damage than a "high risk behavior" by a truck driver so focusing enforcement on the more dangerous behavior could prevent much more injury/damage.

---

Safety data is the first priority because facility design is meaningless without it. However, if the safety data simply indicates operator error over and over it should be clear that education is lacking rather than facilities. My 40 years of bicycle commuting experience is that inadequate cyclist and motorist education is the root fault causing most accidents and that most facilities in California need little or no improvement to be safe for bicyclists.

---

It is way too easy to obtain a driver's license. Several multiple questions and \$20 qualifies you to drive?

---

---

## **SAFETY STRATEGIES**

---

Bicycles and pedestrians need to be considered in all highway construction and repair work. For example, recently, a lot of work was done on Highway 89 on the south side of Carson Pass. Unfortunately, the shoulder wasn't widened and the guard rail positioning further reduces rideable space on the shoulder. Also, please consider bicycles when road construction requires pilot car operations. More than once I have been left behind to fend for myself, as the pilot car and all the motor vehicles following it proceeded much faster than I could possibly ride.

---

outreach to cyclists as their use behavior is most visible and annoying to drivers when they (cyclists) appear to flaunt rules of road also some how educate drivers to fact that cyclists have right to roads and to encourage more considerate traffic interactions

---

Safety Data for Bikes and Peds MUST include "soft data", e.g., near misses and fear of injury.

---

Encouragement is missing. Also an important strategy!

---

Investing in data is only worth it if planners reliably use it.

---

Use flashing signs in crossing areas to ALERT drivers that there is someone in the crossing area!!

---

The safety measures need to align with facts on the ground. Pedestrians aren't going to walk a quarter mile (or more!) out of their way to cross the street, and the resulting jay-walking is less safe for everybody.

---

its really up to us, the bicycle rider and pedestrian to be safe . some people that are driving are pure mean . they drive with no license , no insurance, even stolen vehicles

---

Enforcement should include not only citation but also prosecution efforts.

---

Append DMV licensing tests with questions regarding Safety; expand education and increase licensing fees if necessary.

---

Education is important in informing people however the effectiveness of these improvements and goals stem primarily in proper street and engineering design. The usage of data is also important for monitoring its success. Enforcement is the last step for remnants that the other strategies can't handle, but should be done carefully

---

"Bike" lanes on streets w cars parked don't help there should be no parking

---

The three E's need to work together or the plan will not work.

---

Emphasis on bicyclist and pedestrians having priority over automobiles and severe consequences when drivers violates those rights.

---

current enforcement my police is the mentality that the bike rider / pedestrian is at fault. this needs to change

---

We have a lot of people on bikes who were never educated on rules and regulations such as riding on the correct side of the street and stopping at stop signs. This appears to be true for people who were born and raised here and especially true for people who have immigrated here from other countries where English is their second language. They all need to be educated including the parents of children as they are raised to help end the cycles of biking inappropriately. Educating would increase safety.

---

Who are considered vulnerable users?

---

To many bicyclist are being hit by cars and the drivers driving off

---

my ranking of the strategies is #1 safer streets; #2 safety data; #3 education; #3 enforcement

---

I feel we need all 4 strategies and they have not been used enough around the state.

---

Sometimes bike path ends and it not really clear where to continue or how to make a left using the left turn bike boxes.

---

---

**SAFETY STRATEGIES**

---

I believe there's no one way to make it safer for walkers and cyclists... so multiple safety strategies are a good thing.

---

I would like to rank priority: 1. Safe design; 2. Data 3. education 4. enforcement

---

Data is important and we have a lot of it. However, Safer Streets & Crossings and Enforcement are also important, but we have far too little of either.

---

We have already tried Education and, unfortunately, the people who need it the most either don't get it or ignore it.

---

clear cut simple signs directional and informational. no need for unnecessary brochures etc. Social media and mobile ads might work better.

---

If roadway design isn't the top strategy, none of the others will work.

---

It seems that all too often the people making decisions on these matters neither walk nor cycle and make decisions for those that do. Glad for the chance to give input since I very often do both and travel several hundred miles each year on foot and on bike

---

State needs to provide funding to implement.

---

Safer streets and crossings to me means a whole new way of designing streets. They need to be in a human scale, prioritizing peds and cyclists over vehicles. This will be a radical departure from the current emphasis on auto traffic speed.

---

Where are the "none of the above" and "all of the above" choices? Please refer to my earlier comments.

---

Invest in more Class 1 bike paths

---

Often times, terminology is not defined and confusing.

---

there should be a strategy to increase investment in mass transit vs. roadways; de-emphasize "highest risk behaviors by all road users", focus entirely on motorists

---

there is no strategy which talks about investment in mass transportation, last mile, etc.; deemphasize "highest risk behaviors"

---

Drivers have little understanding of rights and responsibilities of bicyclists with whom they share the roads. This should change. Also, many bicyclists flout rules and regulations, which should be enforced. Finally, some laws should be modified for bicyclists, which do not present the same dangers to others as do cars.

---

The biggest boon will be the infrastructure changes. The education will come from those changes.

---

Having more riders will create an environment where riders educate riders. Getting more riders depends on having proper infrastructure.

---

Education - to continuously attempt to change the California/American culture and its perception of pedestrians/cyclists. I.E. go to Stockholm Sweden and the locals tell you you can step in a crosswalk without looking because cars WILL stop no matter what. Same with cyclists in bike lanes. Enforcement and what type of enforcement is a bit unclear to me. Are these increased traffic stops for erratic bicyclists and cars who turn right in front of cyclists?

---

Education is ineffective, at least how you usually do it. Enforcement is not your job.

---

what is quality of data under "safety data"?

---

All students in elementary school should have bike safety training.

---

there is very little traffic enforcement in most cities. Enforcement should focus first on those drivers with the deadly vehicle, rather than cyclists using the sidewalk because the bike lane is blocked by parked cars and trash cans

---

Good data is critical, but education, design, and enforcement are all important uses of the data

---



---

**SAFETY STRATEGIES**

---

Education is huge - Americans are so stuck in their ways, and new things are frightening. I approach people incorrectly parked in Oakland's protected bike LANES, and they say "I dont care" because it is new and they are scared. They feel threatened - cars are tied to our identity as Americans, so to "attack" cars is a personal attack on the individual.

---

Construction of infrastructure with the goal of widespread forcing changes the habits of the public when it makes transportation choices would be a bad thing.

---

We need both cyclist and motorist education.

---

Very broad, Bicycles need to get off the roads

---

Tougher drunk or drug driving laws and rigorous enforcement, e.g., taking away driving licenses/ cars for serious infractions.

---

all strategies all important, need holistic view

---

Enforcement would come in as second to safer streets.

---

I believe they are targeted towards motor vehicles only. Walkers (which I am one) need to be smarter themselves before stepping off curbs in front of cars. Again, see this daily and it is frustrating to watch how dumb people are. Not all motorists are innocent of course, but more dumb people step into crosswalks using their phones, music on, etc. Not one ounce of preventative care done.

---

Bicycling should not be a priority for Cal Trans funds.

---

They are clear to me because I have taught Road Bicycle Safety in the past. Most people are not aware.

---

Safety should not be the highest priority. Quality of life and a high level of enjoyment using the transportation system is more aspirational. Safety is what has gotten us to where we are.

---

Eventhough there are bike lanes I've driven in I've almost been hit by someone going into my lane.

---

How to make this strategy universally accepted by users? Can't be a lick'n'promise.

---

clever campaigns build awareness but heavier traffic calming measures like Smart Crosswalk help those who are not in the know, who are intoxicated, and/or distracted.

---

Better planning and design leads to better outcomes. Enforcement for the most part, is a band aid for bad design.

---

It doesn't make sense to ask for a highest priority and allow checking more than one item.

---

My fear is that "education" and "enforcement" become what they always have with Caltrans: "educating" pedestrians/cyclists on how to not get hit and "enforcing" rules that treat pedestrians/cyclists as secondary to cars. Let's just focus on building infrastructure to keep pedestrians/cyclists safe.

---

Need to include education for officers. Local CHP and police are often quite ignorant as to laws as they apply to cyclists. Enforcement should aim to motor vehicles as they are the most likely to cause death or GBI.

---

So many disregard the laws. Can't tell you the number who do not stop at stop signs or red lights and when they do, they have a tendency to make a close vehicle their leaning post!

---

I think that simply increasing the quality and quantity of dedicated active transportation infrastructure is the most important strategy. More/better infrastructure = more users = safety in numbers, normalization of multimodal transportation, etc...

---

Improve educational and outreach to minorities and newer immigrants whose first language is not English. Walking and biking experience around the world varies, and we need to acknowledge this difference. In many parts of the world riding your bike against traffic is normal and intuitive. People are more comfortable seeing what's in front of them and are afraid of what could hit them from behind.

---

Data - timeliness is also an issue

---

---

**SAFETY STRATEGIES**

---

adding more law and improved facilities is worthless if existing and new law is not enforced.

---

I don't ride bicycles anymore as I'm 73-years-old and really believe bicycling should be banned for anybody over age thirteen.

---

I'm a certified bicycle instructor, so I speak the language; but there has to be a higher standard for training people to ride safely on the streets, because if there isn't, more people will die needlessly.

---

Bicycle enthusiasts need to follow the rules of the road!

---

Bicyclists often ride abreast of each other which is unsafe for all. They often ignore rules of the road and expect cars to yield to their dangerous actions. (I too ride a bike, but responsibly).

---

This is very clear cut and understandable language. Thank you.

---

My community has roadway and crossing designs that encourage bike users to break state laws for transportation. For example, bike paths that merge into crosswalks, etc. So there is some unclearness in terms of how CalTrans is able to create and set safety for streets and crossings... That is why at the state level, I think enforcement of the laws--in particular holding car drivers accountable for collisions where they are at fault--would be an appropriate first priority for a state organization.

---

Safety goals are well understood and have a track record of success. The severe lack of funding for education, data collection/analysis at the local level, and enforcement is a barrier that must be overcome if the statewide plan is to be successful.

---

The Enforcement strategy should be clarified to be: "Focus state and local enforcement of safety on highest risk behaviors by all road users that contribute to pedestrian/bicyclist involved collisions" In other words, we're not trying to simply go out and enforce the most unsafe behaviors that have no bearing on pedestrian/bicyclist safety. The Enforcement strategy should also be aligned with the Social Equity objective by stating that enforcement efforts not disproportionately impact low-income, communities of color. More specific strategies could include ticket diversion programs.

---

I think the use of "vulnerable users" is a bit misleading. I would re-word for clarity. Make this plan clear and simple for all readers. Don't rely on policy-speak.

---

Please include timeliness and accuracy to the Safety Data strategy.

---

Leverage Strava data.

---

Invest in ... data on bicycle and pedestrian collisions' should read 'bicycle- and pedestrian-involved collisions' to match phrasing elsewhere. A goal of 'Safe Streets & Crossings' would be better than 'Safer Streets & Crossings': I'd like them to be safe, in absolute terms, rather than merely safer than they are now. The word 'streets' is used only once, while 'road' or 'roadway' is used three times, implicitly reinforcing assumptions about modes and usage that deprioritize cycling and walking. The phrase 'enforcement of safety' doesn't make sense; laws are enforced, not safety.

---

Safety is the main obstacle to me riding. I don't feel safe on the streets, even on small side streets. We need protected bike lanes.

---

Infrastructure is the best solution. Enforcement and education might help somewhat but they'll never be able to reach everyone, will never be 100% effective. Safety data would be a good secondary strategy, used to inform where improved infrastructure is most needed.

---

---

## **SAFETY STRATEGIES**

---

As part of education and enforcement, we need to reconsider the status quo of both the law and the culture of our law enforcement. We have a system in which, in theory, cyclists have equal access to the road - and it \*has\* \*not\* \*worked\*. Traffic engineering continues to emphasize cars over other travel modes; law enforcement continues to blame the victim when drivers crash their cars into more vulnerable road users. To really have a change in how cyclists and pedestrians are treated in California, the laws must change, and the culture must change.

---

Infrastructure improvements are most critical

---

There needs to be an emphasis on making active transportation options an integral part of the grade school experience starting in Kindergarten. Classroom teaching, volunteer and PTA involvement are critical to changing habits and establishing healthy alternatives to the culture of using cars for short distance trips to and from school.

---

Education would be my second priority

---

Enforcement: should target mostly - but not only - drivers. Cars kill.

---

Make sure safer streets and crossings are a priority near schools since that is where a high number of street users exist.

---

Although all these elements are essential to any Vision Zero plan, empirical data has shown that engineering changes to our streets have the best impact on encouraging people to walk and bike. Please prioritize best practices for bike and ped infrastructure, as well as funding to make these street changes happen.

---

Need better enforcement of infractions that pose the greatest risk to active roadway users

---

all of these things are important, and the blending of them is what really brings safety.

---

You also have to consider land use. And remove other priorities - why is your department working on this but also building so many freeways inside cities at the same time?

---

I think safe infrastructure is the most important by far, because when education & enforcement fail the infrastructure can still protect a pedestrian or cyclist. (I am specifically thinking of protected bike lanes, protected intersections, better crosswalks and safety islands, etc)

---

Stop requiring 12 lanes on arterial as a design standard. These wider lanes encourage higher speeds which may cause safety issues.

---

Enforcement should encompass education and the emphasis should, though not exclusively on motor vehicles (and cyclists, skateboarding, runners, etc. moving more than 5 mph.

---

It is difficult to prioritize amongst these four strategies, all of which are important.

---

Need to add a infrastructure component to the safety strategies. Some safety measure will need to come in the way of investing in pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure.

---

The Enforcement part can be a bit of a double-edged sword - not everyone is exactly trusting of law enforcement.

---

I have seen some cities paint the street green to indicate bike lane and others do not. I don't care for all the green paint. The important thing is to be Consistent across the state. Sharrows are bad, because the cyclist moves to the center of the lane and takes a risk with cars going by. I hate to see cyclists get injured.

---

In our community, there are a couple notorious street crossings and intersections where bikes feel uncomfortable merging or pedestrians feel uncomfortable crossing--and they aren't changed until someone dies. I don't know who provides funding for such things, or who makes those decisions--state, community, ??--but it shouldn't take a death to fix unsafe crosswalks.

---

Less education, more action in creating safe routes for bikes and walkers of all ages.

---

---

## **SAFETY STRATEGIES**

---

Vehicles should always be our first priority -- not bicycles. Pedestrians should always look both ways when crossing the street -- for safety.

---

Education could go further to target knowledge and skills especially for youth bike and walking. Target distracted driving behavior. Another safety strategy could be to collaborate with technology companies and efforts to enhance driver safety (reduce dangerous driving behavior).

---

I would like to see emphasis on safe design because that reduces the need for education (it should be intuitive) and enforcement (it is easy to do the right thing).

---

All the strategies are important with the most important is having adequate shoulder to the right of the fog line.

---

bicyclists often do not follow the rules of the road endangering themselves and motorists.

---

Bike way grade separations at crossings of busy and higher speed streets.

---

My experience is that the vast majority of bicyclists do not ride in the roads with the bike paths, do not stop at stop signs and do not wear helmets

---

Consistent education and enforcement is very important for the bicycling community. They must follow the rules of the road such as stopping at stop signs and red lights. Accountability must be achieved for bicycling roadway users.

---

Some examples would be good. I'm assuming this means bike lanes, well marked/signaled pedestrian crossings, etc.

---

I would recommend to invest in the lighted/flashing pedestrian crosswalks. These are very effective. For enforcement, I think focusing on cars that are speeding would help reduce the number of accidents.

---

Caltrans opposes crosswalks where I live.

---

solar

---

Drivers' education courses/tests should have a specific section about interactions with cyclists.

---

It is imperative that driving speed limits are enforced and that yielding to pedestrians at crosswalks is enforced. These are among the driving behaviors that threaten my life on a daily basis.

---

I believe bicycle-related collision data is underrepresented.

---

Safer streets and crossings should be more specific. Are you willing to move intersection limit lines back to improve visibility? Put in midblock crossings with flashing beacons? Provide 7 foot wide bike lanes? Eliminate right on red? Eliminate double turn lanes and prohibit turning movements at some locations?

---

I don't see any strategies focused on connectivity or accessibility.

---

1. Safer streets & crossings 2. Education 3. Enforcement 4. Safety data

---

Again, the strategies seem a bit vague. Roads should be engineered for safety of all users, not for getting more cars through them faster. Look around the world at the amazing cities that prioritize pedestrians.

---

Data is important, but difficult to collect, and generally is useful for prioritizing spending. But if the goal is to make it possible for me to ride my bike when I'm 80 with my 8-year-old grandchild, street design will have to change radically going forward. That means a wholesale shift in how streets have been designed to now--narrowing streets, slowing cars, letting cars through but making it clear that driving fast is not useful, appropriate, nor acceptable, using design. Education is also important: how will that be done? We don't even have a universal system for teaching people how to drive CARS now, let alone understand the street system from the point of view of someone not in a car (no driver's ed anymore in high schools, for example). Enforcement also important but much more time & resource consuming

---

---

**SAFETY STRATEGIES**

---

Need more separate from car traffic cycling lanes using physical barriers. Other countries have this. The 4 points above are not useful. It has to be intuitive and not forced.

---

make bicycling education psa's on tv a ubiquitous phenomenon, just like drunk driving did. make all drivers licenses dependent upon knowledge of bicycling laws, so they can teach their kids & themselves how to ride correctly

---

Separated pathways would provide the highest safety. Cars can easily drive over a painted line, not so easily over a 12 inch concrete divider

---

safety is the biggest barrier to more ped and bike trips, whether to transit or not. drivers oblivious to ped and bike rights and how to drive around them, and enforcement lax, prosecution dil unless the driver happened to have been drinking. Ridiculous! If you run someone over, sober or drunk, you should be in deep trouble.

---

Safer Streets and Crossings: Design streets and crossings to facilitate low stress bicycling and walking for the most vulnerable users

---

Coming from a community that consistently ranks at the top of OTS rankings for bicycle injury and fatality rates, safer streets and crossings are key. With improvements in real safety leading the way, we can then work on perceived safety through education. Infrastructure investments with proven safety countermeasures are so important.

---

They're all pretty vague. I guess that's OK for broad goals, but some narrowing and specificity seems worthwhile.

---

Vehicle uses are going to need to be slowed down and become more aware of cyclist before the average bike enthusiast uses the facilities.

---

Railroads tho not mentioned also have a negative impact on pedestrians with very few options for traversing them on foot or safely on bike.

---

We don't just need Safer Streets and Crossings. We need Safer Networks of Streets. Without the network, individual street and crossing improvements may not be sufficient to get many new people bicycling for everyday transpo.

---

safety data currently focuses on accidents bad enough to call police. Finding ways to record less severe incidents and near misses would also be useful <http://signalsafety.ca/files/Predictive-Safety-Near-Miss-Hazard-Reporting.pdf>

---

Education and enforcement provide less protection than intelligently designed infrastructure.

---

The first one (Education) is a bit vague. What makes for consistent, accessible and universal education? Will this be for all road users? The second one (Safer Streets & Crossings) needs to specify what is now lower on the priority list. Maybe something like: Prioritize safety of vulnerable users over vehicle throughput (or motorized speed) in roadway design.

---

Safety requires many players. Local, city and county, needs to work together with state to achieve safety goals. Federal laws require safety for drivers and passengers in cars but not for pedestrians or bicyclists outside those cars.

---

an additional strategy to consider is completing nonmotorized transportation systems! Too many trails dead end into undesirable streets

---

Enforcement

---

Lawmakers and enforcement agencies should study the policies of countries where vulnerable road users experience high levels of safety.

---

Fix Roads instead

---

---

**SAFETY STRATEGIES**

---

Youth Educational Sports, Inc. is rolling out bicycling education training of Physical Education Teachers K-12 in CA so cycling is taught annually, that will greatly impact the vision

---

Busy streets are often dangerous for cyclists. Off pavement (i.e. gravel, dirt trail) transportation corridors exist and are used by cyclists and pedestrians. The State can do more to link corridors for people not on paved streets, offering other options besides busy streets and freeways.

---

I think changing the physical environment is key. We know what kills pedestrians & bicyclists - excessive speed and turning cars. Let's move on that first.

---

Using data to create and evaluate safer streets and crossings is the most durable way to improve overall safety. Education and enforcement are likely to have a more limited effect, particularly where the street design promotes unsafe speeds or creates conflicts between modes. Relying on enforcement also has problems related to racial disparities in policing.

---

Very limited presentation of options. What if we wish for more freedom in transportation? How does this impact goods and services?

---

I love riding my bicycle however I could never ride it to work. Now government (nanny state) rules are making it less enjoyable. Recently the state said that I can't ride and listen to the radio with a headset on. This makes bicycle riding less enjoyable. This is Nanny State mentality. I have ridden for years with no problem while listening to a radio with open-ear headphones. When the state starts mandating helmet use by all bicyclists, that will be when I put the bicycle away or move out of state. I love FREEDOM and the state takes it away. I can show you a number of major European cities where bicycle is an alternative form of transportation and the residents can decide for themselves whether to wear a bicycle helmet or not. This is called FREEDOM! Look on YouTube for the videos.

---

The safety of our streets and intersections is a HUGE barrier to access for those on bikes or sidewalks. I am a confident bicyclist however I shy away from large unprotected intersections because cars are huge and unpredictable, and I do not feel safe.

---

Safer Streets & Crossing is key 1st step to get many people comfortable biking

---

These will not work unless you change the design feel/add traffic calming measures to make pedestrians feel more safe and drivers feel less safe to slow traffic

---

Safer streets & crossings are by far the most important issue to me. For so long, we have ignored pedestrians and bicyclists in design, that we have a long way to go to make it safe and welcoming again.

---

Provide the highest grade walking / biking infrastructure to meet the safety of all.

---

The goals are not granular enough. Too much high level talk of which nothing is even remotely actionable.

---

Safety data must be analyzed and generalized to guide decisions.

---

I would like better enforcement of bicyclists adherence to the law. Currently, those that are opposed to sharing transportation corridors with bicyclists is because of the unpredictability of bicyclists behavior.

---

I don't think today's drivers care about safety strategies for any other road users.  
EDUCATION!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

---

You need all of these strategies as a package. They all help.

---

The majority of Peds and Bicycle traffic are low income and homeless. Personal enforcement may be the best conduit to apply all other strategies.

---

Education needs to emphasize that drivers have no more right to the roadway than any other road user. Furthermore, drivers need to be educated about how they can easily kill people with their massive metal death monsters.

---

enforcement of traffic laws

---

---

**SAFETY STRATEGIES**

---

We need separated bike lanes - period. Nothing else comes close to protecting cyclist. Move the parking lane out to the center and let the cyclist ride between the sidewalk and the parked cars.

---

They are thinly veiled Bicycle lobbyist strategies that do not acknowledge the frequent illegal traffic moves by cyclists and instead lean towards all drivers having to assume responsibility for cyclists regardless of how they behave in traffic.

---

i feel like all the strategies are all related and you can't just prioritize one but not the other

---

Make the statements in this survey available in plain English rather than bureaucrats jargon.

---

More 4 way stop signs and/or traffic lights.

---

Improving the safety and appeal of the built environment will have the largest impact supporting the visions and goals of this plan.

---

Engineering our streets should be highest priority. Then enforcement, the education. All important though.

---

I saw a news report of undercover police officers crossing streets in order to ticket drivers that do not respect pedestrians in the crosswalk. Consistent enforcement across the entire state like this will be the best way to change people's behavior.

---

It is unsafe for bicycles to be riding next to cars. Cars should be given first priority when using our roads. Bicycles should stay off the streets if they are concerned for their safety.

---

Public service announcements for education coupled with police involvement for enforcement--3 foot passing rule, not driving in bike lane, keep drivers off phone, etc.

---

Calm behavior of drivers in subconscious and conscious interactions in driving transportation is a strategy for Safety. Education, Safety Data, and Enforcement don't create a strong strategy for me to ride my bike safer.

---

At the highest level ... a motorist can kill a bicyclist or pedestrian and only suffer small consequences from Law Enforcement and the Courts. Until that changes Motorists will continue abhorrent behavior.

---

Please consider using another term besides roadway users--say pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, motorists. It also important to provide education in other languages, including those with disabilities and in plain language.

---

When it comes to the use of funds the highest should be to create safe bike and walking areas. In my area we have bike events that put all on the road at great risk and there is no safety enforcement involved

---

Design is easily the most influential factor. I urge caution with enforcement, since this often dovetails into discriminatory policing.

---

rather vague, tho I do understand them. Safety that doesn't include usability and convenience isn't going to help. Long traffic lights (as opposed to stop signs) are car-friendly alternatives that make walking/biking inconvenient and frustrating (for instance). Cars need to be de-prioritized along certain routes...

---

Should be AT TOP: "Safer Streets & Crossings: Prioritize safety of vulnerable users in roadway design."

---

In addition to amount of collisions determine amount of usage to see if rate is improving, otherwise safety improvement is unknown.

---

"education" needs to be obvious on the streets. "Enforcement" ought to be in place already. "Safety data": how much more do we really need?

---

More bicycle and pedestrian lanes are needed.

---

"Focus state and local enforcement of safety on highest risk behaviors by all road users" "of safety on" means what? Highest risk behaviors?

---

---

**SAFETY STRATEGIES**

---

There will always be conflict between motorists and cyclists as long as cyclists flagrantly ignore basic traffic laws like stopping at stop lights and stop signs.

Law enforcement needs to be present and active on weekends when the amount of bikers & intoxicated people are at the highest level. It is unproductive to have them come on a Tuesday evening. I understand wine is a big deal out here but lets not push aside the families that have been here for generations and act as though their roads should be used as high traffic vacation runways and the families are the only ones held to safety.

This might come under "Education," but I'd like an emphasis on the Share the Road policy and strategy  
The devil is in the details. "Safety" is not defined.

Education is good. But visibility is better. If a car can see me on a bright bike lane.. everything makes more sense to them

provide a safe environment for bikes but NOT by creating traffic problems for cars. Have bikes use alternate streets

Roundabouts and curb extensions are related to greater accident rates not fewer. As Caltrans has experienced the accidents on our highway 246 as a result of roundabouts is greater and creating confusion with visitors. Enforcement of "look before you cross", and all traffic (including bikes) stopping at stop signs/lights will go far to create safe on street environment for "all" users.

I see so many automobile drivers not stopping for pedestrians at unmarked crosswalks. People should be made aware of this. Also, bicyclists not heeding to traffic laws that are in place for all of us. Be they pedestrians, motor vehicle drivers, or cyclists.

More education for police, local and state on the laws regarding cycling. My observation is that most police do not know the law regarding cyclists.

Education is always brought up on government projects. People are knowledgeable and do not need government training us how to live and exist.

Specifically the "3 Feet To Pass" law!

If we have safer usable pathways for bikes and pedestrians the need for any type of enforcement would be reduced significantly.

Education and safety can be done immediately at little cost.

Too many vehicle operators on cell phones.

Please educate road users on proper use of passing lane to prevent unsafe maneuvering.

Try to separate the bike traffic and cars.

Please . . . use your head!!!! The problems of bike/pedestrian safety is so simple but we have out of touch politicians and believers in a fantasy! Live the life before you legislate!

Build a safe bicycle lane and let common sense take its course . . . always use reflective paint for bike lanes and use bicycle icons to show lane continuity.

i would want them to make sense of course! don't go down rabbit holes and spin your wheels and overspend

Who are vulnerable users? What does roadway design mean actually? Why do you have to invest (money) in the data on bicycle-ped collisions? Doesn't law enforcement keep records? I hope highest risk behaviors includes cyclists who run red lights and stop signs.

Need lighting for night bikers flouresant lines

Roads not designed to share bikes, cars and pedestrans.

---



---

## **SAFETY STRATEGIES**

---

I'm not sure most of the publi knows and or understands the rules regarding bicycles/pedestrians so education is important but, for immediate results I'd like to see more enforcement and improved crossings.

---

Enforcement is never a solution.

---

Most people I know who don't bicycle cite lack of safety as the main inhibitor. Infrastructure seems to prioritize vehicles and disregard safety of vulnerable users.

---

1. In addition to distracted driving, education and enforcement need to focus on pedestrian right of way. Yield to pedestrians at unmarked intersection crosswalks has become so poor over the last 40 years that is is almost a joke in California. 2. Safer streets and crossings should prioritize both safety and comfort of vulnerable users.

---

#3 would be more useful if ranked? or scale of priority.

---

bike riders need to understand as well as California law makers that it is a recreational hobby and not a means for interacting with street vehicles. should we allow runners and skateboarders to receive their own street lane.

---

build curb-separated bike lanes like those in Denmark

---

When you talk about "highest risk behaviors of all road users" focus on those who cause the most damage - drivers of motorized vehicles. Failure to yield, speeding, failure to stop at stop signs are all high risk behaviors that are hardly ever enforced.

---

Should include active transportation, or bicycle paths/lanes, in roadway design specifically.

---

shift street side parking to create bike lanes next to side walks and protected by parked cars. Where possible create totally separate bike paths

---

Prioritizing safety of vulnerable users suggests there are current safety issues for vulnerable users in all communities. If the safety data supports that assumption in all communities, then those investments can be prioritized. If safety data suggests that is not the case in some communities, then other improvements should be prioritized.

---

enforcement needs to not impact people of color disproportionately; infrastructural support (physical barriers to protect bike lanes from cars)

---

Yes, as a transportation planner, the strategies are clear to me. Making them clear to all road users is the challenge. Education for motorists, particularly where active mode users are concerned should be high priority

---

Education must not be confined to Caltrans, but must also include agencies like the DMV and Dept of Education.

---

get rid of the parking in the middle of the street in Golden Gate park! So confusing and dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians.

---

These are incredibly important goals.

---

Providing a safe environment for the pedestrian or bicyclist is of great importance.

---

I would focus on car and bike education for immigrants who may have different traffic training from other countries.

---

There are two types collisions that should be studied, motor vehicle and bike/ped, and collisions between bikes and runners/walkers. The amount of conflicts between bikers and runners/walkers is increasing.

---

"Enforcement" should be weighted towards those behaviors that we know kill, i.e. vehicles hitting pedestrians or cyclists. Chasing down people jaywalking or not stopping on bicycles is a waste of

---

---

**SAFETY STRATEGIES**

---

resources and doesn't address the real problem- cars speeding and or not yielding will kill a pedestrian or cyclist.

---

All four areas on safety strategies I totally agree seeing this plan work throughout California.

---

I hope the DMV gets involved in the education portion.

---

We need more bike lanes and pavements for pedestrians. Main roads as well as side roads. For e.g. Middle Rd is a commuter road but in a really bad shape.

---

I don't think even if we have safer streets and crossings for peds and bikes that it will result in the majority of people within CA to get out of their cars.

---

If the way things are written and advertised today, no one should walk or bike or take public transit for their transportation options. Only a car. A part of the strategy needs to be that it is more difficult to bring the car than alternatives especially within the heart of city limits. Force healthier biking/walking to make it appear as if there are options.

---

The devil will be in the details. Support for another comment from the webinar regarding the very significant impact of speed as related to severity of injury.

---

I don't know what "vulnerable users" means.

---

Regarding enforcement: no more vehicle/pedestrian or vehicle/cyclist deaths treated as if it is a minor inconvenience to the driver. Killing a person through negligence should carry stiffer penalties, not a few days in jail and a few thousand dollar fine.

---

You will invest in quality data...then what? Invest in the data; then act on it!

---

Where is advancement of the system for women users?

---

They're very vague.

---

Roadway design is the best way to improve safety, especially bikepaths separate from car lanes by physical barriers or separate bike paths such as along existing storm drains.

---

Make a reasonable effort to provide positive protection between drivers and cyclists/pedestrians

---

Safety data crucial too but already have good data, at least at my agency.

---

Keep cyclists as far away as possible from vehicles. A lot of cyclists have no clue on how to share the road. Cars win every time.

---

N/A

---

A stretch of hwy 1 near Gualala was recently "straightened" but no ped/bike lane was added. How does this square with your second strategy? All new roads should add these features.

---

Question 3 is not very meaningful. You ask for my "highest priority" but allow me to select all 4 answers. That is not prioritizing!

---

Enforcement will help promote and result in safety.

---

Crossing third and fourth is dangerous. We can't see each other.

---

These strategies are incomplete. I don't think "Safer Streets and Crossings" captures the magnitude of changes that must be made to the system; system redesign is by far the most important and difficult of the tasks, but it is made milquetoast and so broad as to allow no significant action here.

---

---

## **SAFETY STRATEGIES**

---

For Example: How we drive on a freeway should be ENFORCED. The Far left lane should be the highspeed lane and a speed of 70mph should be allowed. The #4 lane should be 65mph, the #3 lane should be 60mph and the #2 and #1 lanes ( on and off ramps ) should be the slow lanes with a speed of 55mph. If these speeds were TAUGHT and ENFORCED we would immediately minimize traffic / accidents / and TEACH people how to drive SMART. Right now it's a mess because drivers have nothing to tell them how to drive smart. We need to write tickets for people driving too slow in the fast lane and too fast in the slow lane. This teaches people how to drive correctly.

---

(1) Education of engineers & law-enforcement personnel on what is needed to provide for safe walking & bicycling is badly needed. (2) Crash & injury data is not systematically collected for off-road bicycling, pedestrian & multi-use paths. Comprehensive pedestrian & bicycling use & injury data must be collected & analyzed for all pedestrian & bicycling facilities.

---

The number one reason cars collide with pedestrians and bikes is because it is assumed that it can be safe somehow; and it puts most of the burden on the slower vehicle to pay attention. We must remove pedestrians and bikes from car pathways completely with physical barriers, not painted white lines or 4 inch curbs. Pedestrians and Bikes do not feel safe next to cars and cars do not respect bike lanes: they park in them and it is difficult to tell a shoulder from a bike lane. This effort may be flawed in the assumption that a multi-modal solution must include car traffic and that it can be safe. Also it does nothing about reducing the overall car load on our freeways; or to encourage people not drive because driving is the most dangerous option for everyone to choose, and yet the most commonplace.

---

As mentioned in our webinar comments, we suggest that the safety strategies include: 1) identify & fund safe crossings between communities & parking areas on the inland side of the coastal transportation corridor (highway or rail), and the shoreline itself (recent success example: the La Conchita PUC, crossing the UPRR & Hwy 101); 2) require bike/ped component in all project designs, UNLESS an equal or better bike/ped alignment is or will be provided away from motor traffic (a quality issue as well); 3) fund the provision or completion of the off-highway component, especially if less than or not significantly more costly than building in the highway corridor (recent success example: Pitkins Curve bridge/rockshed project, on SR 1 in Big Sur); 4) IF the bike/ped component MUST be in the highway ROW, then be certain that safety separation is provided to the max.extent feasible, e.g., by barrier separation on bridges (recent success examples: Noyo River, Greenwood Cr. and Tenmile River bridges on SR 1 in Mendocino County).

---

"Invest in Data" will Caltrans be managing or become a clearinghouse for streets data? "Enforcement" how with Caltrans influence local police operations?

---

Based on results of many public health campaigns (e.g. use of seat belts, vaccination, and decreasing cigarette smoking) laws (and their enforcement) that increase safety are probably essential to success of this program

---

Get cops to charge people who kill with their car, not just walk away with a \$150 fine.

---

Drivers have to learn to slow down, drive without distraction and we all have to bring manners back into the picture.

---

I'd say prioritizing safety via engineering should be a top priority. Education and enforcement can only do so much. If the intersections, roads, and crossings are designed to reduce and/or eliminate conflicts, then the inherent failings of enforcement and educations will be mitigated. We need to prioritize safety in design and active transportation over parking and vehicular movement

---

---

## **SAFETY STRATEGIES**

---

Be more specific: 20% of pedestrian deaths in CA are in crosswalks, and motorists are at fault in 79% of turning crashes: therefore prohibit statewide 'Invited Conflicts' by prohibiting permissive and concurrent crosswalk signal phases on all bike/ped crossings of state routes ASAP, and making those crosswalks fully protected. Consider changing the law.

---

A lot of pedestrians get killed in San Diego. And bicyclists.

---

Education in more languages and different demographic groups. Test this on the driving test.

---

Under "Safer Streets & Crossings" it says that CalTrans will prioritize the safety of "vulnerable users." Why not just say "bicycles and pedestrians"? "Vulnerable users" is ambiguous

---

Outdated data has been used by CALTRANS to evaluate needed upgrades to a bike/ped trail crossing of an off ramp, but collisions have increased since the data was collected (2010-2014). I want to see that the data used is more current, and current as possible.

---

I would like to see the local police enforcing pedestrian crosswalks more often (there are too many drivers violating the crosswalks while pedestrians are in them), and I would like to see less people jaywalking, they cause accidents and driver rage. I would also like to see more children wearing bike helmets. I would like to see more education on USING the crosswalks safely and that bike riders are riding safely. I see them wearing headphones most of the time, I do believe that is illegal to wear headphones while riding a bike. I see people on bikes texting and using the phone. I think that pedestrians & bike riders should not text and ride/walk as well as drivers.

---

Be sure to vet possible solutions in trouble spots to a variety of stakeholders.

---

I understand the safety data concept. What I don't clearly understand is what specifically prioritizing safety of vulnerable users is. What and how is this accomplished? Yes, prioritizing is important but what else goes into it?

---

Not clear, but, better signage always helps.

---

None of the above will work without all of the above. I also support legislation that would identify and protect vulnerable users, place greater responsibility on those who are not vulnerable.

---

Out of Education, Enforcement, and Safer Streets & Crossings, I think the latter is most important. But it is very hard to do any of them well without having good data.

---

You cannot engineer/design for stupidity and carelessness. On the other hand, you can slowly change the culture of awareness for sharing the road with non-motorized modes. Enforcement/penalties must be a big part of this.

---

Maintenance of the bicycle network may need more frequent and specific maintenance emphasis to under the safety strategy.

---

You should enforce the traffic laws we have in Coronado

---

Highest Priority: Safer Crossings Next: Education Next: Data. For education: >drivers need to know new rules regarding sharing the roadways with cyclists. Laws get passed, but mysteriously, drivers are unaware of any new laws. >cyclists need to be accountable for illegal riding styles. Perhaps they should be ticketed just like drivers. >education needs to be followed through right to the street/intersection level with signage, road striping, and intuitive / clear instructions so everyone knows what is expected of them. >currently, at any given intersection, the ambiguity of who has what right of way, facilitates drivers and cyclists doing what ever they can get away with. It's horrible.

---

Improve safety for bikes and peds during construction projects also.

---

The people commuting on/off NASNI race on and off the base... I have been given the finger, cut off, tail-gated when I go 25 mph on 3rd/4th between Orange and Alameda, not to mention witnessing multiple near misses of accidents.

---

---

## **SAFETY STRATEGIES**

---

Safer Street Crossings: All pedestrians are vulnerable users of roadway when it comes to the dangers of cars. All ped crossings should utilize the tools that we have to make them safer.

---

The strategies are too vague and can be interpreted however anyone wants. Who are the "vulnerable" users? It is better to specify cyclists and pedestrians here rather than implying it. Additionally, some of the "highest risk behaviors" may not be illegal and hence not enforceable.

---

Caltrans might have to best Safety Data, but can they fix "Stupid"? I see so many pedestrians doing stupid things, I wonder why more aren't hit and killed; quite a few are even people in wheelchairs!

---

As I said before, the thing is not to treat the car the same as a cyclist, so who needs to be careful.... the cyclist. If you educate the car driver, it is great, but... who has to take care of himself, and understand that they are not made of steel and are not equal to a car?... the cyclist. So please protect the cyclist, and make sure the bike paths are in areas where you are considering safe... not like the exit of Coronado Cays, that it is the most dangerous area with a bike path with a YIELD SIGN, and the cars have traffic light. NONSENSE... dangerous. The bike path should have a traffic light, or a bridge. They can not trust that the cars will stop in their green light because they are coming. A car goes in a green light, and that is the law. So with that said, the cyclists have to have a traffic light to stop then the crossing street has a green light, THEY SHOULD NOT HAVE A YIELD SIGN. that yield sign is a yield to an accident.

---

They are to me, but what about Junior?? When I was a kid we had film and discussions about safety and rules of the road and to ride on the sidewalk unless there wasn't one you get off your bike and walk it.

---

I selected Enforcement because I see so many distracted road users. We need to let people know that they are a risk to others and that we won't tolerate it. The longer we ignore it, the more people are maimed and lose their lives because of this inconsiderate behaviour.

---

Change the laws to the "Idaho Rules." Bikes treat stop signs as yield signs and stop lights as stop signs.

---

Do vulnerable users include more than pedestrians and bicyclists?

---

Have adequate sensors at traffic signals. Give information to bikers as to what to do when they want to make a left turn but the signal won't change.

---

Again, need infrastructure not simply telling us about our rights and responsibilities, though that is very important

---

The Enforcement activities need to be carefully thought out.

---

Each item in #3 is vital. Driver's licenses are too easy to obtain and continuing education non-existent. Safer streets and crossings go hand in hand with Safety Data. Finally enforcement. I ride my bike everyday and always see several people talking on phones or texting while they drive. they don't even hide the behavior.

---

Safety strategies are much to weak. The difference in speed between adjacent users should be addressed. For example, high speed motor vehicles should not be adjacent to pedestrians.

---

Data collection is a typical administrative delay strategy applied at the state executive level to avoid making decisions.

---

If strategies are the means to and end, I suggest including complete streets in the strategy. Last mile and 'last block' connections are important.

---

Need to collect data on all roads, with and without specific bike facilities. Cyclist use road without facilities.

---

Strategies all have to go together. All important.

---

The 3 1/2 foot law for bicyclists is clearly inadequate when so many cyclists, even those completely obeying the law, are hit and killed or injured. This law must be augmented.

---

---

## **SAFETY STRATEGIES**

---

Rank order: Education Safety Data Safe Streets (data higher to assure that the 'safer streets' really are safer) Enforcement

---

Collision data isn't useful without exposure data, so crash RATE can be calculated.

---

The safer pedestrians and cyclists feel, the more likely they are to use these forms of transportation  
change critical vehicle speed law on roads to lower 5 mph.

---

Activities that endanger others should be a higher priority than activities that endanger the individual doing the activity

---

Need more information.

---

Need to address safety related legislation that would reduce drunk driving, distracted driving and speeding.

---

What would the investment in the quality and completeness of bicycle an pedestrian collisions look like?  
How would this be different that data that is readily available from law enforcement and through the  
Transportation Injury Mapping system maintained by UC Berekley?

---

I don't see much focus on real safety strategies. It seems to me that education, safety data, and enforcement are all substitutes for the real safety benefits of better cycling infrastructure.

---

I consider Street safety to be paramount because if Peds and Bikes don't feel comfortable they will not bike at all, and most of that comes from roadway design. Impressions matter, even if every car correctly yielded to/passed cyclists. Design to allow mistakes that won't result in death, because mistakes will happen. As for safety data, also invest in the quality, completeness, and openness of map data. It does no one good if a network exists but no one knows how to use it to effectively get to their destination.

---

need more enforcement

---

Education is a big key.

---

Education should include "how to" for all users. Not just rights and responsibilities. Example: Cycling Savvy courses for cyclists.

---

Another important way to increase safety which is not encompassed by the strategies is to change laws, particularly for bicycles. Many of the dangerous behaviors of bicyclists result from the fact that the laws (as well as the infrastructure) are not well designed for them. For example, a "rolling stop" should be allowed for cyclists at stop signs (recognizing the slower speeds and lower risks for cyclists than cars and trucks and the physical effort involved in re-starting) and there should be no penalty for violating traffic signals (e.g., red lights) when those signals are triggered by cars and trucks but not bicycles, leaving cyclists few options.

---

To many bikers on the sidewalks

---

Nothing measurable.

---

It isn't clear why the existing quality and completeness of data on bike/ped collisions needs further investment. (I agree that better data is needed, however.)

---

I feel that having safe/complete streets that safely accommodate all users (motor, bicycle, pedestrians) is the best for safe piratical use of streets. Safe streets reduce the conflicts between motorists, cyclist and pedestrians. As a cyclist, I feel that enforcement is important as I have been involved with and witnessed many 'close calls' that could have been avoided with proper safety procedures (misconduct from both motorists and cyclists). Which leads to education but the education needs to stick. My sense of the general populace is that it would not without enforcement.

---

We essentially don't have enforcement anywhere. I don't see that changing.

---

get input from bikers - build wide bike lanes or shoulders

---

If Safer Streets and Crosings are not done, then the rest does not matter.

---

---

## **SAFETY STRATEGIES**

---

All of these are terribly important, so choosing one is difficult and meaningless. They ALL need to be done in conjunction. When streets are designed properly, education because natural instead of hammering home things that make little logical sense. And for the same reason - if streets are designed correctly, enforcement becomes far less needed. Data will always be important, or we don't know what is working.

---

Question #3 is constructed badly. A Prioritization of 1-4 would make sense here, this checkbox setup does not conform to the question asked. I want to check all 4 boxes, but can't answer this question meaningfully if I do so.

---

I observe the trend that just all streets are being made "safer" for bicycles. This might be the wrong approach. Specific corridors should be made bike friendly while other should be designed to improve all traffic. Just an example: LA street car streets should not also be a bike path since everybody knows how dangerous tracks are for bicycle. The bike path should be built on parallel streets.

---

Education all motorist

---

Active transportation (cycles, pedestrian) needs to be given more emphasis in education, both in schools and somehow to motor vehicle users

---

The focus of enforcement should be concentrated on the most dangerous vehicles truck, buses And especially automobiles not on vulnerable road users. Education should be the primary way to deal with unsafe practices used by vulnerable road users; especially in Los Angeles where essentially there is no safe infrastructure in place for vulnerable road users.

---

In prioritizing vulnerable uses, I'd like to see roads made unpleasant or uncomfortable to behave dangerously on, rather than posting signs and hoping folks will obey them.

---

Collect data on other safety concerns in addition to collisions. Track environmental and health data such as pollution caused by congestion and its impact on the surrounding community.

---

There is little respect for cyclists yet they can help reduce city traffic. Transportation should include all modes of traffic not just cars.

---

Education is unlikely to help much and enforcement is likely to disproportionately criminalize marginalized communities. Therefore I hope the bulk of effort will go toward safer road design and research that supports that.

---

Very curious to see how these safety strategies are going to be executed. My current experience with this has taught me that more often than not the way these strategies are executed to little to nothing (and in many cases actually even cause the opposite results from the intended results) from what I consider to be successful ways of executing said "Safety strategies". A lot of convincing talk but so far no real actions that will actually improve the current situation.

---

Infrastructure changes need to be at the highest priority. My safety while biking or walking can be endangered by a single driver. Education and enforcement are great but only infrastructure can protect me all the time and in all weather conditions. Protected infrastructure such as cycletracks should be standard through California.

---

All the points raised are important, however designing the facilities that we all use tops all the others.

---

All streets should have sidewalks and bike lanes.

---

Enforcement should focus on users that pose the most risk to others. Education should be obvious after design.

---

Usually the three E's are given equal weight. However, the Swedish experience with Vision Zero suggests that Engineering is far more important than other areas. Infrastructure should be easy and intuitive - not require excessive education to understand.

---

---

**SAFETY STRATEGIES**

---

does this mean protected bike lanes? unclear if this will just result in cops harassing bikers without helmets.

---

I hate to just choose one as they are all important.

---

Re: Safer Streets & Crossing: Suggest adding Leading Pedestrian/Bicycle Intervals (timing adjustments to give ped/bicyclist a head start and increase visibility) at known high crash controlled intersections throughout California.

---

No safe infrastructure = no safety. Everything else is secondary.

---

No motorized bicycles, scooters or boards on trails or sidewalks.

---

Education should focus on bicyclists, peds, and MOTORISTS

---

include "...pedestrian use and collisions" in the statement on Safety Data.

---

Need to have robust ways to measure existing condition and future changes.

---

Knowledge is key, most non-biking drivers don't know the rules bikers need to follow.

---

Enforcement is needed; however pedestrian infractions are lower priority and funds concentrated in this strategy could easily be lost / misused.

---

Focus on designing city/suburban streets with lower speeds.

---

See my previous comments. Good start with addressing current concerns and issues.

---

It was difficult to choose only one strategy. They are all very important and would provide significant results.

---

these safety strategies are not organized under the objectives. They are under the safety objective. Obtaining data will not speak to the layman.

---

The problems in our area are bike riders that do not follow the rules of the road. These are however the people who are the least likely to learn the rules.

---

strategies are not details of how things get done.

---

Roadway design needs to come first (and second, and third). Then roadway usage rules, i.e. speed limits. Where would reducing speed limits go in this taxonomy?

---

You will never get people to use bicycling or mass transit unless it is safe, secure, and maintained.

---

Too vague. CHP is the #1 impediment to both education and enforcement. The agency does not believe bicyclists have equal rights to public ROW, despite their lip service. 1.) qualifications for hiring must evolve, 2.) training has to move into the 21st Century.

---

Universal education is very important for success of CSBPP

---

Infrastructure investment is needed as a strategy. Working with existing infrastructure is not enough. Data supports that physical separation between bicycle ROW and auto ROW (i.e. Class 1 and 4) will result in higher ridership due to overcoming bicycle stress.

---

Stronger education and enforcement of vehicle drivers as well as pedestrians and cyclists. Vehicles are armored not people.

---

I wish that I could have checked all four strategies as all of them are 100% high in priority for improving safety for all modes of travel.

---

the education statement is very general and only talks about the rights and responsibilities of all roadway users,. Education should be focus on changing behavior patterns and stereotypes, not just focusing on rights and responsibilities.

---

As enforcement goes, safety follows. CHP need more resources to perform their duties.

---

Comfort for the user should also be considered in the Safety analysis.

---



---

## **SAFETY STRATEGIES**

---

The "Safer Streets & Crossings" should be prioritized above the other strategies. While data, education, and enforcement are great, the most important thing cities such as Portland, Davis, and San Francisco have done to increase levels of walking and bicycling is invest in better active transportation infrastructure. Elsewhere in places such as Denmark and the Netherlands, the primary reason people bike there is due to the quality infrastructure.

---

We need to make this education mandatory, as part of getting your drivers license.

---

We must make it more difficult to obtain a drivers license in this state. Both in expense and skill level. I also suggest that the driver age should be 18, not 16.

---

Safer streets and crossings is by far the most important of these strategies.

---

Safety has to be the #1 goal.

---

Does prioritizing safety of vulnerable users mean it can come at the expense of vehicular throughput in the quest to do so?

---

Education is a sure way to make people understand how to use the network. HOWEVER, the system should be designed so that it is simple and easy for people to use so tourists can use the system without any education. DATA is very important. Not just the amount of data you have, but what TYPE you seek. What do we want to measure? LOS is not good enough as we have learned. There should be multiple factors we consider and be creative on what we measure.

---

The emerging belligerent or aggressive nature of bicyclists is a concern. The majority of the public for the foreseeable future will still need to move good & the people by vehicles. Those on cycles need to strike a balance that they do not demand right of way.

---

Education should be targeted to driving schools to educate drivers about the rights of all road users. Too many people don't know that bicyclists have the right to ride in the lane, for example. Too often the education seems to be targeted to people who ride bikes to teach them how to avoid getting killed, not the other way around.

---

Good data collection should be paramount. How are you going to accomplish the other 3 if you don't know what really is going on?

---

In #3, none of these really apply as the highest priority for me. I don't believe you will be successful until you change our infrastructure to make bicycling nearly as convenient as driving a car. That's a tall order, but a worthwhile goal.

---

1) Strategy is usually defined as "a plan of action or policy designed to achieve a major or overall aim." or similar. The four bullets are NEEDS, but do not describe actions, and they do not specify actors. WHO is going to take action to achieve the Goals and Objectives? How will you get someone to act? 2) Strategy is about making choices from competing options, achieving results, making the best use of opportunities and limited resources. 2) All of the bullets are important. Why prioritize? 3) Why choose only one top priority? Do the others then wait for 5 or 10 years, or never get addressed?

---

Needs more explicit language; more than just "prioritize safety in roadway design". I imagine that is a current strategy in roadway design.

---

Designing for vulnerable users is too general. Roadway design should be contextual, where certain routes can still be auto-focused, and maybe allow for experienced cyclists. Crossing these types of facilities should provide for most vulnerable so that they are no obstacles.

---

Need to add "share effective designs" so that improvements are done correctly and in a way people will use them. Also need to add a strategy that improves mental and physical health by increasing physical activity

---

---

**SAFETY STRATEGIES**

---

Most are paper tiger and beaucratic exercises - should be a very minor consideration - automatically done - not a strategy.

---

We can talk about safety for vulnerable users until the cows come home. But until there is a absolute mandate to implement safety techniques and designs already known to Caltrans and county public works departments, everything will remain unchanged.

---

"Safer Streets & Crossings" reads as limiting to roadways and not highways. Much can and should be done to improve highway safety through better design.

---

Add maintenance to the Safer Streets and Crossings strategy

---

Please make sure District offices understand this new push. There is a disconnect between State and regional employees

---

Regarding vulnerable users in crosswalks: Timing of walk signals need to take into account those who walk very slowly.

---

Most car drivers do not understand they have to yield to pedestrians or to share the road with cyclists. I think education is number 1.

---

Safer streets for all and traffic calming measures would be instrumental in this strategies

---

None

---

Make the bicycle paths safer by getting them away from car traffic. When you drive a car you avoid staying in a driver's blind spot but you have no choice on a bicycle. You have to trust the car will not run you over.

---

I'd suggest adding one on encouragement and incentivizing active transportation, and also a strategy around Safe Routes to School

---

Separated bicycle infrastructure is paramount to encouraging weaker users to choose riding a bike over driving. On street is not good enough.

---

With education, there must be legal reform for the protection of vulnerable road users, including hefty penalties for the injury of a vulnerable road user.

---

The strategies must include the local government agencies.

---

Design and engineering are the most effective in improving safety.

---

The safety strategies must take into account high speed cyclists and the slower, seemingly aimless, cyclists and walkers. Maybe a "fast lane?"

---

Instead of using "SHARE THE ROAD" signs. Use California Law "MAINTAIN at least 3 FEET OF SPACE BETWEEN CAR AND BICYCLE."

---

Education should be parallel to enforcement. If enforcement is not done in a systematic and consistent way, people's behaviors will not be altered and thus education might be taken for granted.

---

Multi-mode strategies are essential to assure compliance. Most bicyclists ignore CVC rules, refuse to acknowledge the risks they create, and are usually self-righteous and arrogant about it.

---

Safety strategies seem to focus on telling people riding bicycles to wear helmets, but a helmet won't help if I'm hit by a 40 mph vehicle. How about protected infrastructure or fewer vehicles going 40 mph?

---

roads must be safe for all types of cyclists, especially children

---

Safer Streets & Crossings - this is by far the most important. It should be noted that the design of all roadways, and roadway rehabilitation projects, shall focus on the safety of all prospective road users.

---

I would rank safer streets and crossings as the top priority since it makes it more intuitive for both bicyclists and drivers to know what is expected. Sharrows are quite useless.

---

---

**MOBILITY STRATEGIES**

---

L.A. ignores non-bike path uses which is a vastly much larger constituency - and need.

---

Design for safety and efficiency for bikes and peds

---

Also, the connected network and/or statewide trails should include working with adjoining states, the FHWA and Adventure Cycling on connectivity of the US Bicycle Route System.

---

Rest stops with water and shade as well as restrooms should also be strategically placed.

---

Use of terms such as "high quality" and "comfortable" are very subjective terms...Unreasonable to expect to meet "all" californias needs. Need quantifiers that can produce some sort of measurable results

---

Again, policy makers and design planners, please come try the areas on foot or on a bike.

---

Regarding Connected Networks: It sounds like a preference for segregated facilities. In already developed areas it may not always be possible to build such facilities. In any case they must not be made mandatory!

---

How about supporting bicycle and trail routes in Sacramento -maybe make one actually along the river?

---

Why is this necessary at the state level?

---

Data is great. You should commit to using the data to replicate and measure the most successful projects. We used eminent domain to build the freeway system. Given NIMBY-tilted regulatory processes, we may need a similarly heavy hand to build a real bike network. Of course we need sufficiently-connected bicyclists ready to use the facilities.

---

Goals not vey specific.

---

I am unclear on the difference between "Improve the quality of bicycle and pedestrian design in California" and "Develop a network of local and regional high quality, comfortable bicycle and pedestrian facilities for all ages and abilities."

---

Once again, reach out to and work with Industry Professionals.

---

Great ideas, however it certainly would help if you repaired the current infrastructure and cleaned up all the CALTRANS trash all around that causes drivers to swerve into bike and ped paths and areas already. Existing networks don't work right now because drivers use them as alternate routes when congestion is unbearable. Frontage roads along highways should be designed for BIKES and PEDS First, and for cars Second. Frontage roads should be bike/led priority routes for longer commutes or alternate thruway bike/ped transportation rather than frustrated driver routes.

---

Instead of just "trails" which to me means recreation, I'd like something like bicycle-only roads to enable fast, efficient, and safe bicycling commuting.

---

there are clear differences between cyclists and pedestrians. pedestrians need more protection from rude, dangerous, loud, self-centered bicyclists, particularly those participating in events which take place in primarily pedestrian areas like neighborhoods.

---

Drilling down to specifics is key.

---

---

## MOBILITY STRATEGIES

---

Connected network is highest importance. The gaps in the networks are where injuries are happening and where speed is high and no protection exists for vulnerable roadway users. Quality design protects everyone and helps "traffic" flow optimally. Excellent data helps you make data driven improvements, so super important as well.

---

A statewide paved trail system would be an investment for the next century. It would be readily taken advantage of. It also need not be free. You could require bicycles to be licensed (technically they already are by the DMV, but this goes unenforced). The licensing fees could help support the trail network.

---

They will become understandable as I track what you seem to be trying to do. Speak clearly and remember to place what you are doing in context.

---

We need more trails that are off-road.

---

We are so far behind the times in providing a multi-connected, offstreet network of walking/cycling paths. Take a look at what Europe has done and model after that - particularly France, Belgium and Switzerland. Perhaps engage some experts from these countries to assist. Just like California has the John Muir hiking trail, we should have a similar paved path for cycling up and down the state. Check out the South Dakota Mickelson trail - it's awesome with mile markers and rest stops with flush toilets and water every 5-10 miles or so.

---

They are related. Creating an effective bike/ped/multi-modal network benefits from data; bike/ped and transit are synergistic

---

Connected is key!

---

Again, it comes down to the implementation.

---

Vulnerable users should have a much higher priority, safe crossings, traffic law enforcement.

---

Please convert unused access roads along creeks to bike-ped trails.

---

I understand social equity is a goal on its own. However, I think it could also be woven into some of these other elements. For example, connected network strategy could specify connections with disadvantaged and traditionally underserved communities

---

I understand social equity is a goal on its own. However, I think it could also be woven into some of these other elements. For example, connected network strategy could specify connections with disadvantaged and traditionally underserved communities

---

Start locally and expand to regionally

---

Critical for mobility strategies to be involved at the planning stage.

---

Need more time

---

When routes open in the Sierra Nevada each spring, allow one week for bikes only - no motor vehicles.

---

"for all ages and abilities" is great but should include a reference to separated/protected bike/ped facilities, which are a huge benefit for those uncomfortable walking/riding along or on busy streets.

---

I have never done the rail + bicycle to destination travel, but it impresses me as the best way to extend the range of bicycling and the coverage of trains/BART. Trains are often slow (wait time for train to arrive, wait times for stops along the route) and that needs to be considered in any design.

---

It seems that these strategies are actually being implemented. Kudos, and keep it going in a big way!

---

---

**MOBILITY STRATEGIES**

---

ability to use multimodal transport to encourage non auto use

---

These strategies cannot be implemented until the State removes outdated 85th% laws.

---

I want better freeway systems, more lanes, etc...

---

Let's go.

---

I assume Quality Design refers to the transportation network but I'm not sure because the language is ambiguous, i.e., "improve the quality of bicycle and pedestrian design..."

---

I would love to be able to ride the bicycle all the way to friendly from the east on 44 . please allow it . also please allow us to ride 44 from turtle bay west bound to downtown redding .

---

A well designed independent (but connected) network should be prioritized. Similar to France's Grand Randonnées (GR). Seems like most bike and pedestrian facilities are an afterthought or retro engineered to place them close to motor vehicles which is either dangerous or woefully incomplete (e.g. The new Bay Bridge- can only go to Treasure Island than turn around. It's a nice parkway but a completely unworkable transportation alternative.)

---

All of this requires a clear and efficient process in implementing this. The less red-tape the better!

---

Bridges for crossing

---

All of these goals are important

---

Education to share the road. Solve San Francisco and you will solve the state.

---

I would like to see a well planned trail system that connects local, regional and statewide and connecting into adjoining state trails

---

Again, specific targets to achieve would help and make it easier to determine if you're meeting your strategies.

---

again, you should be asking people to prioritize the strategies: my choices #1 quality design; #2 multimodal access; #3 connected network; #4 network and travel data - which needs to be updated annually; #5 statewide trails

---

I think we could increase recreation tourism by promoting existing bike trails and improving connections to more of them. We need improved design for safer access through and around highway interchanges for bicyclists.

---

I believe having multiple strategies is the best way to create better conditions for biking and walking.

---

Quality Design: Improve the quality of design for bicycle and pedestrian facilities to increase safety.  
Data: what data-needs more definition (use, users?).

---

what does mobility mean? by definition the whole strategy is to improve mobility. I believe you must highlight those improvements. Mobility is a given.

---

"Connected network" needs to be within the context of a system (currently not happening, as carpool users know), definition of mobility needs to stop relying on 100% physical movement of people, and mobility strategies list ought to include goods movement.

---

Often confusing

---

---

**MOBILITY STRATEGIES**

---

fund data collection across jurisdictional boundaries to allow linkage of systems--who rides where?

---

It's not clear how one redesigns bicyclists and pedestrians to improve their quality. Is this what education is for? If quality design is supposed to mean quality design of facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians, then I'm strongly in favor of that.

---

All of these work hand in hand, so there is no priority.

---

Having "long haul routes" is especially convenient to people who like to bike and travel or travel to bike. The complete California bike route maps are currently all on separately hosted and managed documents by district. A unified map coming from one authoritative source is what is needed.

---

Network and Travel Data is only useful if it is well used in future planning. Otherwise not a priority for me. Emphasis on quality design to make streets safer for peds and cyclists, not just the token bike lane in inappropriate areas I see thrown around the state for the sake of metrics.

---

Wouldn't/Shouldn't "quality design" necessarily be part of the other items?

---

Focus on barriers to connecting networks at the local and regional levels.

---

Making safe streets with connections that work is a high priority. Education for all users is essential in encouraging safe sharing of streets.

---

all good

---

I think that to foster a community feeling, it's important to give all stakeholders a fair chance to enjoy our bikeways

---

The State cannot afford some of those strategies.

---

Bike paths don't go everywhere and they are often blocked or unusable in places. Bicyclists must retain their right to use the roadway.

---

Big difference between bike riding for transport and bicycle racing on public roads. Cars don't race on road along with bicycles.

---

We so need protected bike lanes, delayed traffic signals for peds and bikes, and at a minus, painted bike lanes.

---

need them all

---

Rails and transit systems are not the only place in which bicycle and pedestrian planning should be included. They should be considered in all terms of transportation.

---

Cal Trans should not be influenced by a strong organization of cyclists. Bicycling should not be a big priority for Cal Trans funds.

---

Not only will this path save lives but promote the national sanctuary of Morro bay. This path is in interest to the community for quite some time

---

To be consistent, "Statewide Trails" should read, "DEVELOP bicycle and trail routes..." This makes it consistent with the other strategies.

---

It's a tough question to answer

---

Be nice if light rail had more room for bikes

---

Improving Multi-modal access with better design for bicycles and pedestrians will drive better transportation for all.

---

Please do all of these things!

---

---

## MOBILITY STRATEGIES

---

Particular focus on improving bicycle lanes to meet FHWA guidelines re: width and design.

---

Seems to me "network and travel data" would be a foundation for the other 4 items so I don't understand why it is listed as a standalone item.

---

Biking and walking as travel modes have different operational and safety challenges. Strategies need to acknowledge these differences. The inherent speed differential between biking and walking on the same facility puts the pedestrian at more risk.

---

again, wording should be added for ADA folks who may use these same facilities (especially as it comes to buses and trains).

---

I have none, as I don't ride bikes anymore.

---

Multimodal is essential, especially for those of us in an urban setting.

---

Let bicyclists pay for these Mobility Strategies.

---

These all need to be implemented at the same time. In improving design, please look to the example of Copenhagen where good design encourages good behavior of all road users.

---

Connected network, multimodal access and network and travel data are not clear cut - what exactly do you mean? What is your intent? What do you hope to accomplish? What do facilities look like? What do the designs reflect? Not sure what you are saying or wanting to say in these statements.

---

Under design strategy, local jurisdictions and Caltrans need to be encouraged to undertake experimental treatments to improve safety and accessibility of bike/ped network. Trails networks need to be understood not only for tourism/recreation, but also as a key component of commuter transportation for longer trips (>1 mile).

---

There is too much jargon for the average person. Multimodal should be replaced with other wording, while design should be clarified to be design of facilities. There is also a marked absence of non-infrastructure strategies that increase mobility. Education and encouragement programs not focused on safety should be encouraged as viable complementary strategies to infrastructure projects by the state. The FHWA Non-Motorized Pilot Program demonstrated the power of combining infrastructure with non-infrastructure programs to achieve increased walking and biking.

---

Multimodal Access should also include bicycle and pedestrian needs in the planning and design of highways and roadways.

---

Revise ending of Connected Network strategy by adding "incomes" to state, "...for all ages, abilities, and incomes" to reflect the CSBPP Vision. Under Multimodal Access, please add "roadways". Under Statewide Trails, please add "transportation".

---

I'm not sure what 'facilities' are (in the first & fourth point), as this is the first time the term's been used. Other parts of the plan intro refer to 'streets' or 'roadways' or 'systems' as the concrete manifestations of the plan. There's a lot of various nomenclature. Quality Design--design of what? Facilities, systems or services might all be part of 'bicycle and pedestrian design.' It would be good to mention the subject of the design activities. The last point (trails) is superfluous to the core purpose of addressing 'everyday transportation needs.'

---

Frankly, all of these are important!

---

---

## MOBILITY STRATEGIES

---

We need a high-quality connected network of cycle paths. We need it yesterday.

---

While statewide trails would be great from a tourism perspective, they don't address any of the equity or sustainability needs of the state. In fact, including that here perpetuates the idea that bicycles are primarily for recreation.

---

Quality design is key. More should be done to implement best practices being done now in other parts of the country and the world.

---

Multimodal access would be my second priority

---

I would love to be able to take a route parallel to 1, 101, 33, or 99 by bike or foot. However, 99% of my trips are within Alameda County, and 70% of my trips are within Oakland. Design should focus on day-to-day activities.

---

The connected network should allow for more routes in disadvantaged communities since there is already a higher portion of bike and pedestrian users there.

---

Please prioritize projects that push for more protected bicycle lanes everywhere!

---

High-quality design can set California apart from other US states. Design that puts us on par with European cities such as Amsterdam will have a huge influence in encouraging people to bike and walk.

---

the most important thing is to allow cycling and walking to be a primary mode of transport. don't focus on recreational walking and cycling – that belittles the daily interactions of people who commute, shop, and above all, live without cars.

---

This is a bike ped plan - why multimodal access? Why only rail and transit systems?

---

Separate, Protected bike pathways are crucial to getting more people on bikes.

---

A lot of work to do. I don't believe there are any quality designs in California currently. Also, the focus should be on transportation and not necessarily recreation as in the last point. Leave recreation up to the parks department; long distance bicycle transportation is necessary.

---

I would like to see a high standard developed so that California municipalities employ the best possible bike and pedestrian treatments (based on research and trial conducted elsewhere in the US and also abroad in the Netherlands and so on).

---

Still need to encourage Caltrans engineers to look at the context of where a design is being proposed and why. Many times, only the HDM standard is considered.

---

The first three (Connected, Multimodal, and Quality) are hard to distinguish as separate strategies.

---

We should NOT give priority to bicycles on the road. Cars are more important on the road than bicycles.

---

some of the strategies could be more specific. add statements such as assure where possible that there is separation/barriers between vehicles and bikes/walkers.

---

Again all the strategies are important.

---

Statewide trails might help to keep bicycles safe and out of traffic lanes

---

Weak "improve[ment]" won't solve our serious safety problems for cyclists sets and pedestrians. Why not more specific strategies?

---

A lack of sufficient multi modal capacity is a very real current issue that deters many potential bikers from full embracing alternate transportation options.

---



---

## MOBILITY STRATEGIES

---

Thank you for addressing pedestrian needs and not just bicycles. Thank you for addressing rail as a transit mode.

---

Bike networks, when present, are well utilized. These can easily be linked to tourism (for example, offer bicycles at hotels) to encourage usage and be profitable for hotels.

---

These need specific timelines.

---

These seem all interlinked, so prioritizing does not seem useful. The only real distinction I see here, is between local, commuter transit and recreational transit.

---

It is imperative that cyclists and pedestrians have a safe and connected network of well-designed infrastructure so that they are able to transport themselves safely without the use of fossil fuel or massive amounts of material (e.g., electric cars).

---

As access is available, people will use it and there will be more to promote further use and development.

---

I would just add to be sure that adequate signage is a part of your strategies.

---

Multimodal access should not be just about rail and transit but about streets and highways too.

---

Vague. Pedestrian and cyclist safety and needs should ALWAYS ALREADY be considered in the planning and design of transit.

---

What's needed is a fundamental shift in priorities. Everyone, from engineer to planner to user of the system, needs to consider the reality of bicycle riders and pedestrians. Most still dismiss the fact that there are actually people out using bicycles for transportation now, despite so much evidence to the contrary, because 1) bicycles and walkers take up so much less room than cars and 2) they can't imagine doing it themselves--because cars are too easy, convenient, common and walking and biking are still seen as "dangerous" and only for the super brave or idiot weirdos.

---

Mobility strategies currently seem ad hoc. Cycling and public transportation need to become a higher priority over increasing freeway lanes.

---

more class I bike paths

---

When designing routes please remember not all people ride traditional two wheel bikes. There are three wheelers, cargo bikes, bikes with trailers, pedicab etc. Route design and accessibility should take all styles into consideration

---

The standards for "bike lanes" vary widely and it would be helpful to have state standards.

---

Multimodal Access: Include bicycle and pedestrian needs in the planning and design of rail and transit systems and services This is not only important for rail and transit. Multimodal access should be between all modes. There are many more miles of roadway than there are of transit service- how do we make sure that non-motorized users are safe on ALL of our transportation network, not just near transit.

---

I just hope that too much money won't be spent on the planning phase, tired of pockets getting lined at the taxpayers' expense.

---

Whatever plan is implemented it needs to be convenient, if it is viewed as something out of the way pedestrians will take shortcuts. Walking an hour to get somewhere right across the highway from home is ridiculous.

---

---

## MOBILITY STRATEGIES

---

We should distinguish between a quality network and a safe network. We can build networks much quicker if we're less concerned with superficial aspects of streetscaping.

---

Very nice to see focus on networks - doesn't matter that you have 10 miles of protected bike lanes on your commute if the last 0.1 mile is a highway overpass with not even a marked bike lane

---

Mobility strategy should be to add to current rail and Transit systems and to increase access for those of all abilities

---

Disregard my last comment! You nailed it here!

---

Bicycle and pedestrian facilities must have barriers to reduce ingress by heavier vehicles and enhance survivability.

---

Fix Roads instead

---

A State-wide safe corridor for cyclists both on and off pavement would be excellent! Off pavement (i.e. gravel, dirt trail) transportation corridors exist and are used by cyclists and pedestrians. The State can do more to link corridors for people not on paved streets, offering other options besides busy streets and freeways.

---

I'd say that multimodal access and a connected network should be the same thing.

---

I would rank the mobility strategies as follows. 1. Connected Network - people won't use facilities if they don't go to useful places and work well for many different trips. 2. Quality Design - people will more readily use facilities that have a high subjective safety and actual safety. 3. Network and Travel Data - the most effective locations and types of facilities can be determined by studying existing trends and collecting data on actual use. 4. Multimodal Access - good bicycle and pedestrian access can help to solve the last mile problem of transit, making transit improvements more valuable and effective. 5. Statewide Trails - recreational trails are desirable but less of a priority than utilitarian infrastructure. I would also recommend that land use be considered as an important factor in mobility plans. The single-use zoning system currently in place makes all destinations farther apart than they would otherwise be, hindering the practicality of active transportation and transit for everyday trips. Promoting mixed use and transit-oriented development will make it easier to create a connected network of active transportation facilities that are useful for more people and less expensive to implement.

---

The orientation of options suggests that this questionnaire is skewed towards a preferred outcome based on pedestrian and bicycle use. It should include automotive, the main choice for many.

---

slippery slope, depends what region of the state, partnering local agency and current networks available to bring networks to work with one another.

---

Please see previous comments. It's very simple. Make clean ride-able paths and they will come. Stop your Nanny State Control laws.

---

"Connected Network" and "Quality Design" strategies are vague.

---

A significant fraction of resources should be devoted to areas lacking networks and multimodal access options.

---

The connected network and multimodal access are the most important to me. I think they are crucial.

---

---

**MOBILITY STRATEGIES**

---

connecting trails and streets from all directions (N,S,W, and E) is essentially to Complete Streets directive. and be sure to include the California Coastal Trails is a part of this networked system.

---

None.

---

Bicycles should be illegal where there is no defined bike lane. Especially Highway 1 through Big Sur in Monterey County - they are a menace to safety and efficiency of the highway. Large bicycling groups in particular should be barred from Highway 1. I seriously doubt that your plans include widening Highway 1 through Big Sur to accommodate bicyclists, therefore I and most of my fellow residents here have zero motivation to support any of the undoubtedly expensive public works projects pertaining to bicyclists that you are proposing.

---

What is a pedestrian facility? Whoever wrote this needs to take a cold shower

---

Bike and Ped trips and transit accessing/egressing are very short; don't think of average trips.

---

The better the data, the better foundation for implementing strategies.

---

Data needs to be quantifiable, collectable, and automated as much as possible.

---

If you build safe bike paths people will use them. Right now, cyclists are endangered by the lack of safe bike paths.

---

"High quality" or "comfortable" or "improving the quality of" in reference to what the strategy(ies) might be to accomplish these goals are vague and may or may not imply strategies to be prioritized. One cannot really answer questions applied to such vague and generalized "strategies". It makes this survey meaningless.

---

Not sure what the Statewide Trails strategy implies -- would this be on public land only or include private property? If includes private, is it proposing condemnation? If so, I oppose it and believe that it is unwise. Trails on public lands are fine if properly designed and maintained. Maintenance is absolutely essential.

---

Integrating a high quality physical network with rail and transit is important to overall mobility. It should be built using best practices that have already been demonstrated to work.

---

This survey obviously leans toward the spandex queens and their agenda.

---

Multimodal need to include interaction with automotive modes (rental cars, uber, parking, last mile connection,,,) )

---

Road Infrastructure has been designed for motor vehicles only !! Anything else has always been a poor after thought.

---

Connected network--include safe Multimodal Access--include streets and airports

---

Connected network & quality seem similar. There is already a connected network: its \*possible\* to walk or bike from any point to any other point, really; the quality just needs to be improved (so that there are bike lanes, sidewalks, etc)

---

They look great.

---

what does the "quality of design" mean? what criteria (just "safety"?)

---

multiple modes of transportation need to have the ability to be used in a safe environment

---

"state-wide" I hope includes trails from city to city.

---

---

**MOBILITY STRATEGIES**

---

Nearly every location in a community can be accessed by walking or biking. Making it "safer" won't increase use of these transportation options. "Unsafe" is just an excuse people use not to exercise. Don't waste taxpayer money trying fix a claimed problem that won't change peoples behaviors. The idea of providing long distance routes is really stupid. That is a HUGE burden on the many for the enjoyment of the very fewest. By nature, humans want shortest routes. Providing long distance routes is a gigantic waste of money.

---

Caltrans should not waste resources on any of this

---

Keep bikers off small country roads and direct them to only road way that provide adequate bike paths. Major roads that need to be purged of bikers are Adelaida Road in Paso Robles & Vineyard Drive Templeton. NO bike paths on these roads. Too DANGEROUS

---

Actually use the accurate date to determine what plan to implement. There are more vehicles than bikes. do not prioritize biker needs over cars.

---

The City of Santa Barbara recently had a report to Council stating after over 20 years they still could not get close in living residents to walk 5 minutes (and this is where there is full infill and connected sidewalks for downtown. With the increase in illegals having driver licenses there has been a decrease in all "alternative" transportation modes as is clearly seen in north county Santa Barbara bus use, and the declines in south county as reported to SBCAG.

---

What I feel should be a priority that can effect all forms of transportation are proper lighting, more marked crosswalks, and enforcement of laws concerning mobility of us all.

---

Locals need a way to have access to areas within their community via safe pathways.

---

What is meant by "pedestrian design"?

---

The first step should be planning, and the rest will follow.

---

Communication is sporadic and not easily found.

---

Connected Network and Statewide Trails seem the same.

---

Quality design, could be revolutionary design or improve design. Seems like many other countries have much more advanced designs

---

We need to commit to safe bike travel on all caltrans roads.

---

Please get a life!!! Who ever is behind this plan is a 'leftist' religious idiot! We need common sense solutions. Autos come first and bikes come second and pedestrians come next. Think about what groups use our roads most . . . bikers? Bull \$hit! Cars are the most users on our roads. You can try to make bikers the most but 'think' . . . think hard, what demographic group is going to be our major group in Santa Barbara . . . the elderly or the bikers? Please get a life!!! Use your head!!!

---

Get on a bike and go out there and ride and then make notes of where it is "life threatening" to ride a bike - those are the places that need more work.

---

i think highest priority would be for bikes, but I'd love them to be multi-functional

---

Why are cars and trucks not included in this strategy? Do you think everyone can walk or ride a bike?

---

---

**MOBILITY STRATEGIES**

---

again how do we pay for it? its also is that where we want money to go, if only a certain segment of population will actually use it are there more pressing needs? Bridge repair, roads, etc

---

Wheelchair , strollers and bike stands

---

Strategies ignore realities of narrow twisty roads not engineered for 21st century

---

Generally clear but may not relate exactly to where I live. We could use better transit/rail services so while I support it I am not it applies that well. Overall improved trails, facilities, and overall design would be wonderful.

---

Lofty goals - but how to acheive them?

---

to "multimodal access" i would also add motor vehicular systems and services too the list of those that should be included in the planning of bike and ped needs

---

PCH is a good ex what is working - there is a side area for bikes to ride - no need to further tide down free flow of traffic. Pay to play should be Caltrans motto. (Try walking on Golden Gate Bridge - the bike riders hit pedestrians and pedestrians can't use the other side of the bridge.)

---

Road repair/paving projects represent a very cost effective opportunity to update a road's bicycle and pedestrian safety features - such improvements should receive a priority for funding.

---

Rail and transit systems need to be developed and improved first as they are completely inefficient in most areas, then an effort to link active transportation would be appropriate.

---

Close Hwy 1 from Big Sur State Park down to San Simeon. Make it a State Park. Allow tour buses. Allow new parks and a couple of luxury destinations. Big parking lots at either end. It would become the highest used State Park in the Nation. Tons more money to be made by all including the existing destinations along the route. Emergency vehicles and homeowners would have access and would require special training to drive along the route.

---

Connected Network - What does "high quality" and "comfortable" mean?

---

Buses or after-market add-ons should be designed and implemented which make it easier and allow more people to take their bicycles with them on transit systems.

---

All strategies are good and worthwhile.

---

low income and communities of color need to be considered and given access

---

Again, as someone who is involved in transportation, these strategies are clear. Making certain to describe the "how" along with the "what" will support the goals in the plan.

---

My assumption is that by building a connected network, we will ultimately incorporate the statewide trails strategy to accomplish that.

---

In each case, data should be prioritized to help evaluate all of the other strategies.

---

Make sure bikes and peds are not in competition.

---

A strong local network will encourage frequent commute and recreational use. Increased ped/bike commuting increases overall mobility. The inter-regional and statewide ped/bike system development encourages recreational travel and tourism.

---

Do we really need more data on bike and ped use??

---

---

**MOBILITY STRATEGIES**

---

Gaps completely null and void entire networks for the major group of "interested but concerned riders". Broader support and understanding for projects that look to improve these gaps/network failures.

---

Summary: Park and Ride lots are in metro areas and should be considered a point of multimodal connection by not just car to bus mode choice. Consider walking and biking access and storage at park and ride lots for carpooling and commuter buses. Example: If anyone was at ITE 2016 Annual Meeting in Anaheim check Tuesday Session detail of "Is a Round Peg Right for a Square Hole?" Alex Ariniello gave US 36 presentation from Superior, CO. This interchange project provided for local multimodal movement as well as multimodal regional access. Regional bike trail and sidewalk access provided to park and ride as well as a transit only underpass to bypass bus crossing local street at grade to access park and ride.

---

Add roadways under Multi-modal access. Adopt new standards for retrofitting existing built out areas to accommodate bikes and ped improvements

---

" Improve the quality of bicycle and pedestrian design in California" What is pedestrian design? Does bicycle design mean bike frame design?

---

Single out commute routes for bicycles

---

Don't forget maintenance. Investment in the capital improvements without a commitment to maintain them is a disaster a few years away.

---

See above. Caltrans must recognize that the current system is not equitable for women.

---

Intentionally vague to avoid accountability, perhaps?

---

Bicycle locking stations need to be incorporated into city parking plans

---

N/A

---

see previous comment on including ped/bike lanes on any new or redo roads

---

Again, asking about my "highest priority" and allowing me to select all answers is not prioritizing. I feel like you are simply trying to get people to support all the suggested strategies. That's fine. But it's not prioritizing.

---

other states have better state wide trails than CA.

---

Language is hard to understand

---

These strategies are also incomplete. The orientation of the plan must directly address the socially and environmentally destructive nature of our current network, and how redesigning for cohesive, equitable, and active communities will empower people over cars for the first time in over a century.

---

Is local development included in this? If housing is built in areas that make biking & walking more accessible and safe, that plus all of these mobility strategies should help

---

my answer is no because there is no DATA. You cannot do anything without DATA. I selected network DATA because you better have a detailed comprehensive plan that incorporates DATA first.

---

---

## MOBILITY STRATEGIES

---

Per Caltrans' Highway Design Manual, "Trails are generally, unpaved multipurpose facilities suitable for recreational use by hikers, pedestrians, equestrians, and off-road bicyclists." Given the CSBPP Vision: "By 2040, people in California of all ages, abilities, and incomes can safely, conveniently, and comfortably walk and bicycle for their everyday transportation needs", the CBSPP should focus on facilities built to utilitarian safe, secure and convenient transportation standards.

---

If biking is not made easier, and more connected; people will continue to see bicycles as something extra, not something necessary. In truth, it is driving a car around town that is extra and not necessary usually.

---

Mobility strategies: we applaud the "Statewide Trails" strategy proposal. And, we suggest inclusion of particular examples recognized in State legislation, e.g., the California Coastal Trail (CCT), as mentioned by State Coastal Conservancy staff in the webinar. Similarly, the CCT is considered to be a networked system, addressing the needs of differing modes (bicycle and pedestrian in particular) for access along the coast, as well as the need for public access TO the coast.

---

Statewide trails is equally important

---

Tell city council members to get out of the way of progress.

---

Additional statewide trails should be included other than the Coastal Trail. The Coastal Trail does not help connect all Californians and its use will primarily be for recreation purposes.

---

LA is jumping on this bandwagon way to late. They should look to cities that are bike friendly such as Vancouver. Vancouver is ahead of the game because they thought out the plan as the city grew. Unlike LA that is totally car dependent and now has no space to work with.

---

Educate statewide to promote public understanding of the need for "AAA" All Ages and Abilities connected networks so politically people agree to cede street space and time, and fund networks.

---

Data is very important.

---

Use current data

---

You need to hire people who are disabled to test the routes. People with zero mobility or visual issues will not notice the areas that don't "connect". For example when you take a walk or use your wheelchair to get from one area to an another, frequently there are problems with eh sidewalks that make it dangerous and UN passable to people.

---

I would like to see public information about places that DO NOT paths. Ex: State Hwy. 16 (Cache Creek) that should not have any bike riders on it, it is a dangerous road. You come around a blind corner & there's a bike rider with no where to go or you the driver have to swerve in other lane, if there is no car coming.

---

As before, none of these will work independently, these each support the others. I do support shared roads for bike routes as long as they are clearly designated; bicycling options should not be limited to separate, shared with pedestrians and low speed.

---

A connected network and multimodal access go hand in hand, because much of the connections (especially at longer distances) are made by transit systems

---

---

**MOBILITY STRATEGIES**

---

If Multimodal is designed correctly, more drivers can leave their cars at home, and use bikes/trains/busses to get to any part of Los Angeles.

---

Include bicycle and pedestrian needs in the planning, design and construction of projects on the SRS also - especially where state highway is a main street and at freeway interchanges.

---

Not very clear...wordy.

---

statewide recreation trails add significant value - improves fitness sport options and promotes tourism. everybody wins

---

I think connected network and quality design should go hand in hand. It's hard to choose which is highest! They all need to be done

---

CA should look for "best case" examples (places with very high active transpo percentages, like Copenhagen) and learn from their successes.

---

high quality -> high-quality

---

The same as i said before, I feel sorry for the cyclist that trust the bike path, and they encounter a car exiting Coronado Cays in a green light, and the cyclist in the crossing street with a yield sign, that is absurd. Ready for an accident. The solution is a traffic light for the cyclist not a yield sign. Who will yield? a group of 10 cyclists coming at 40 miles p/h and finding a car exiting the Coronado Cays in a green light. The car will not stop as he is in a green light... will the 10 cyclists stop? NOOOOO

---

What, the mobility strategies don't mention motor vehicles. Who the hell made this questionnaire and left off the highest majority of travel in the state, motor vehicles!! C'mon people and what about disabled citizens traveling?

---

The two I checked are a good start. We need them all but, we need to focus. More connections from residential to commercial/industrial are sorely needed.

---

It is idiotic that the San Diego Trolley doesn't have bicycle facilities.

---

Focus on commute trips

---

Have bike and pedestrian trails along rivers like the river in Lodi and support Rails to Trails.

---

All good, all a priority

---

Local trails need to developed that can be connected into future Statewide trails.

---

The strategies do not include protection of the environment. Creating statewide trails is a good goal, but no trails in open space should be paved. We need places to get away from pavement. Also all trails should be carbon neutral and made with permeable surfaces.

---

The connected network must be SAFE! Comfort is not safe. The mobility strategies are not strong enough to achieve the goals we need to achieve.

---

Let California's travel and tourism agency collect data. This will avoid delay in immediately constructing the necessary transportation system at current expense levels rather than spending money to collection information while construction costs climb.

---

Both a connected network and multimodal access with quality design are equally important.

---



---

## MOBILITY STRATEGIES

---

The data needs to include all roads open to bikes even those without designated bikeways or shoulders. You need also to collect exposure data. Crash data is not useful without knowing the exposure. Exposure is calculated for motor vehicles to calculate crash rates

---

Once again. Hard to prioritize. All needed.

---

Order (with comments)" Connected Network (start with the existing street and highway network-- everything else is supplementary) Multimodal Access Network and Travel Data -- to identify areas that need strengthening Quality Design -- badly designed facilities are u=wiorse than useless ' Statewide Trails -- As a supplement to the full network and to provide shortcuts

---

The emphasis on developing a "network" of bicycle "facilities" and developing data on bicycle "facilities" is muddled and misdirected. Aren't all roads bicycle facilities? If so, why is there a need to develop a "network"? Will data be developed on roads open to bicyclists without designated bikeways (where bicyclists simply use the traffic lane, or simply use the road on an unlaned road)? Will the "quality design" strategy apply to making roads that don't need designated bikeways safer for bicycling?

---

It is difficult to separate these different mobility goals, they all need to work together in order for it to be complete

---

No matter the quality of design, miles of recreational trails or data collected, bicycling and walking will not be viable transportation options without network connections. Being able to get only halfway to a destination by bike means I won't be biking there (unless I can maybe connect to public transit)

---

Although I chose it as my priority, I'm not fully sure what you mean by "facilities." The term sounds like it means buildings with services being offered to pedestrians and bicyclists -- which I'm not interested in -- but when I googled the term, it looked as if it mean things like better road design, signal planning, surfaces, bridges, etc. -- which I consider crucial. But the term itself doesn't communicate clearly.

---

The strategies are a bit vague. Would the data be accessible to anyone? Would the local network and the statewide trails be interconnected seamlessly?

---

Bicycle parking is an issue that could be included in strategies. Also, strategies to level the playing field reduce subsidies for driving could be considered. Addressing free automobile parking, especially at workplaces, would be helpful.

---

Excellent (covering my previous comments before this page). All of these are extremely important, and they all relate directly to increasing bike/ped comfort and access. Connected networks don't work if there isn't rapid transit for the middle miles, people won't ride the short trips if they have to detour due to lack of connectivity or they're discouraged by poor design. Network and travel data directly impacts the visibility of such a connected network. Statewide trails are also important as a symbol of the possibility of biking everywhere but aren't as important as an immediate step. That's not a license to let land that could be used as a corridor get developed, however. Side note related to data: I've been flabbergasted that effective multimodal Bike/Transit planning does not exist in California. See Portland's opentripplanner implementation, and use that for 511!

---

---

**MOBILITY STRATEGIES**

---

Rights of cyclists to use all roads (except some restricted access freeways) should be very high priority. Facility improvements that degrade cycling safety and convenience for on-road cyclists should not be planned or built.

---

Land use strategies - planning for generally denser development - are the most effective at encouraging bike and pedestrian modes, and can't be ignored.

---

Multitude access should already be incorporated in planning. If it's not you guys are really bad at your job

---

How will success be defined?

---

Development needs implementation.

---

As a Walnut Creek resident, the Iron Horse trail and other trails are a huge success in my mind for cycling, walking, and general activity. The number of users is large from my observations. Expansion of such trails and making them connected is a great plan. Quality design helps with good multi-use trail designs that allow all users to easily use them (bike lanes + gravel shoulder + designated walking only zones on multi-use trails). Also, bike lanes on roads that are continuous and do not end. Bike lanes that are positioned properly to avoid right-hook and other accidents. Protected bike lanes and bike lanes that avoid the 'door zone' of parked cars.

---

connected network or nothing

---

I think the Statewide Trail network should be viewed as a subset of the Connected Network.

---

Again Question #6 "highest priority" and "check all that apply" is a poorly constructed questionnaire framework -- who drafted this so badly?

---

I would love to see more signs. For example, Fremont has some great bike routes/lanes, but few signs indicating how to get to the BART station or other areas of interest.

---

In high use facilities pedestrian and cycle uses are not really compatible. No more than pedestrian and motor vehicle uses are compatible on freeways.

---

At this time again there is no safe infrastructure for vulnerable road users in Los Angeles. The State should be given the power to force localities like Los Angeles to design, plan, and build only the latest first world type of infrastructure for vulnerable road users otherwise State and Federal Highway Grants reimbursements must be withheld i.e. the Hyperion Bridge, North Figueroa Street Infrastructure Improvements and all bike lanes and crosswalks.

---

Statewide trails for transportation are needed desperately, not just for tourism and recreation. In other words, please do not make the trip take longer just to make a prettier route. Also please don't spend all resources on tourist areas such as the wine country.

---

Shouldn't all bike projects be safe & have trails that lead to strategic locations that are connected?

---

I have an idea of what these Mobility Strategies should look like, but I have no clue if my ideas match the actual plans whatsoever. Lots of great talk, so far very little information on actual actions.

---

---

**MOBILITY STRATEGIES**

---

A connected network is critical. There are places I can't reach due to gaps in the current network.

---

The connected network provides facilities to the greatest number of users. Routes of regional importance for motorists are routes of regional importance for bicyclists, too. All the other points are a subset of the connected network. Utility cyclists and commuters are trying to get somewhere when we ride our bicycles.

---

The "multimodal Access" item needs either better definition or better expression.

---

You need a connect networks in order to make active transportation a choice people will make.

---

Regional and statewide trails are poorly supported by current planning and funding programs.

---

Multimodal access should include additional modes

---

"Comfortable facilities" ? Come-on! What are you going to do put roofs over bike/walking trails to keep people from getting wet in the rains? Multi-modal access is already very good. Number of trails/bike lanes in many areas is not.

---

Although it is alluded to under connected network/multimodal access, it is also important to include planning and designing bike and pedestrian networks to connect to transit and rail networks.

---

I would like to stress/reiterate the importance that connectivity should include quality facilities that are comfortable for ages and abilities

---

A lot can be learned from the Dutch CROW manual and Dutch "Sustainable Safety" strategies.

---

Statewide Trails: Include regionally significant.

---

A missing strategy is education. Education, of motorists as well as cyclists, on how to use our existing roadways cooperatively and safely.

---

"facilities for all ages and abilities" means what exactly?

---

Mobility can also be confused with mobility of a person/ADA and their ability to move around or access infrastructure. Are ADA strategies included?

---

If you ask for my highest priority it can only be one answer, not check all that apply. I don't get "Improve the quality of bicycle design in CA"

---

Please contact us re the Policies and Plan Metro Los Angeles has developed.

---

Ensure that the California Coastal Trail is a component of the connected network.

---

A statewide trail network would be an aspirational goal for Caltrans to set.

---

A protected, connected network. "High quality" is vague and unhelpful; "protected" means something.

---

All mobility strategies are key. Share the road does not work.

---

---

## MOBILITY STRATEGIES

---

Again, emphasis by Caltrans on "facilities" will support and promote segregation, which supports discrimination and discourages acceptance of bicyclists as legitimate users of limited road resources. Have you learned nothing about CA's motorist/ bicyclist tribalism, are you blind to it, or just dismiss it? Caltrans staffers clearly don't know how to ride safely on our streets, are fearful of doing so, and have therefore fallen for all the pro-segregation utopia nonsense your consultants are selling you. The only "facility" which actually makes new bicyclists and promotes cycling across age groups is Class One multiuse trails-- that's proven across the US. Build those, connect those which exist. But be skeptical of "Quality Design" claims for intersections, segregated Class 4 sidepaths, etc. which suck up public funds better used to improve roads for everyone.

---

The strategies sound good, but I am not able to grasp how a statewide system will be implemented. Not sure a one size fits all approach works statewide. It has been my experience that statewide strategies do not always work for various types of communities, such as rural and metropolitan types. As long as some flexibility is allowed in strategies then a statewide plan may work.

---

Please add "safety" to the connected network strategy: Connected Network: Develop a network of local and regional high quality, SAFE, and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian facilities for all ages and abilities

---

A truly interconnected system would be wonderful. Currently we just have individual segments of bicycle trails often separated by miles and miles of narrow roadway

---

Not sure of priorities here

---

connecting population centers with destinations for work and recreation

---

Trails are for more than just tourism and recreation -- they can serve as a trunk line for commuting an on-road network.

---

Good Cycling surface needed on all highways shoulders and bike lanes not just the vehicle travel lanes.

---

Statewide trails often times are also used for commuter purposes. Why are those trails being limited to tourism and recreation purposes?

---

In order to achieve higher levels of walking and bicycling, these travel modes must be 1) safe, 2) pleasant, and 3) convenient. A city can attain some modal increase with one or two of these prerequisites but to thrive all three must be present.

---

No mobility strategy is needed

---

We have the most spectacular coast in the world. I would prioritize a coastal bicycle - pedestrian route from north to south as a tremendous tourist attraction. In addition, it would serve commuters and recreational cyclists.

---

All of them are important strategies that need to be implemented sooner rather than later

---

A connected network with local infrastructure is very important to provide access to all (especially the lower-income neighborhoods)

---

Replacing vehicle lanes with bike lanes in already congested areas is very poor planning.

---

---

## MOBILITY STRATEGIES

---

What is a bicycle and pedestrian facility? We can't plan off-road trails everywhere and expect bicycles to only use trails to go everywhere they need to go, and I don't know if that's the intention of this objective or not. But every road that is designed and constructed needs to be safe for all users, period. That does not mean that every road needs a bike lane, but every road needs to be designed for safe enough speeds that people using all modes and people of all ages can use that road without taking their life into their hands. It's as simple as that. And these strategies don't say anything about that.

---

In multimodal access, also think that in using public transportation, if the time to get from A to B is MUCH longer than if the person uses a car, that is a non-starter.

---

A focus on changing how people commute (get them out of their cars and onto bikes) would be worthwhile effort.

---

These are good descriptions of needs, but not strategies. They do not describe how to achieve results. Who will take ACTIONS, and how?

---

I'm not sure what improve "bicycle and ped. design" means. I don't think you are suggesting redesign of bikes and people. Do you mean "pathways"?

---

Include connections of various characters of experience; i.e., urban to wildland.

---

In Colorado, when roadways are reconstructed, the state is mandated to construct bike paths.

---

Add efficient to the Connected Network strategy

---

Clearly, district policies don't follow these ideals. Please communicate down to district employees

---

Some local improvements such as "Smart Streets" have not traditionally considered non-motorized users. Just a comment.

---

Would support all of the above and difficult to make one a priority

---

Act as agent to connect adjacent agencies and cities to work together

---

Develop the facilities for safe bicycle travel. Everything is now just an afterthought.

---

Paint the bicycle lanes green in high traffic areas. Include bike lanes in past, current and future road plans.

---

Check out the Paris Metro for a truly multi-modal mobility plan. The lattice-like system with many stops is ideal for people like me. Even if it seems to take a bit longer it is actually incredibly efficient for time and energy.

---

Networks all too often have gaps or designs make zero sense - like a class 2 bike lane on a 6-lane 50 mph arterial. Would you ride with your kids in a bike lane like that? Probably not, which tells you it's not a reasonable design.

---

question #6: all of the above. add: wayfinding.

---

Connected Network and Statewide Trails could essentially be combined into a single strategy since you really cannot have one without the other, at least in locations with trails.

---

What do you mean by 'quality'? A lot of bicycle and pedestrian 'design' is poor and ineffective such as most of all of some bike lanes being in the door zone for parked cars. What kind of data? Usage patterns? What are the key metrics for performance? Recurring riders vs unique riders?

---



---

**PRESERVATION STRATEGIES**

---

L.A. reverses Fed., bike safety rules ... threatens the very small 'every last bit of nature 'at hand' ... ( L.A.River nature paths in many places )

---

Program Integration might still need more explanation.

---

The "Program Integration" strategy is not clear to me. It seems to be less specific than, and overlap with, the "Quality of Condition" strategy

---

I think that follow-up should be included in the preservation strategies. I've seen failure in implemented programs where there is lack of follow-up.

---

measures are too vague and subjective

---

What is this and what does 'preservation' mean in relation to the

---

Needs to be a statewide effort (i.e., all counties and cities, not just the State).

---

Will you be upgrading your sidewalks that were never completed directly adjacent to freeways? For instance my neighborhood has freeways cutting right thru it. The sidewalks adjacent to the freeway are not to ADA standards, nor are they even concrete! They're just 18" of asphalt within a curb. They constantly attract dumping, weed growth and are not safe places to walk.

---

Isn't program integration a potential means to the other goal of quality conditions?

---

I can guess what these might mean, but concrete examples would help a lot. I'm guessing it's supposed to mean we have minimal existing infrastructure to cross highways and other barriers. These are often steep and hidden. Sometimes they feel unsafe. As for external partnerships, are we talking "adopt a bike bridge?" That's a reasonable idea, but I think the #1 "preservation" goal should be of accessible rights of way. An example of failure in this area is the highway 87 bike expressway in San Jose. There are hardly any exits on the trail portion and the rest is just bike route (don't remember even a lane) on nearby streets. When we turn an accessible road into a freeway, we have an opportunity to create world-class bikeways. Instead, we end up with large barriers to biking (perpendicularly).

---

Goals not very specific.

---

It is important to establish maintenance standards before pursuing partnerships aimed at addressing maintenance issues.

---

See previous comments.

---

Quality & condition are helpful. Can't have integration when nobody (drivers) understands the purpose of a separate bike lane when all it means to them is that there are fewer parking spots or less manageability for racing through the streets/highways/freeways. Californians do NOT want to get out of their cars. Look at the uproar the Shoreline bike path created in Alameda, CA.

---

This goal is good, but feels very government-speak. Make the language more accessible to the everyman.

---

It's unclear what "programs" and "preservation activities" refer to

---

Very lofty and general. Specifics need to be articulated.

---

It's a 5E's formula for a reason, but the built environment is most important in this complex conundrum.

---

Up keep is super important. On trails, if someone is injured it may not be like the highway where plenty of people are around to call for help, or go to help. Keeping trails in good working order, and having call boxes is great. The for thought gives me hope.

---

Again, a separate paved path would be best for cyclists.

---

---

**PRESERVATION STRATEGIES**

---

You are speaking an arcane "professional" dialect here. Make things less bureaucratic, or wonkish, and thereby more easily comprehensible.

---

Replace clumsy language "Establish and meet an expected quality of" with "Improve" & pluralize condition

---

this is not clear and does not address operations and maintenance strategies - it is very generic

---

For sure maintenance has to be brought up to speed. We have a lot of "bike paths" in our area that are in such bad repair that people ride on the adjacent street instead of the path.

---

Whatever is done, please speed the process up. I might be dead by 2040 and not be able to enjoy all of this!

---

What does quality mean in this context?

---

Paved dedicated bike trails!!

---

I don't expect the current quality of conditions to be preserved, because they currently are quite bad. I expect them to be improved.

---

Preserve what? The deplorable condition we have now?

---

i haven't a clue what either of these things mean, given the one phrase included for each.

---

Without program integration the quality of condition preservation strategy is less effective

---

Maybe use an example so it's clear such as pavement smoothness and consistent rumble strip standards.

---

These make sense to me from within the organization, but not from a user's perspective

---

Not clear about Quality of Condition. Does this mean establish standards? There are numerous standards, but too many interpretations...

---

Safety safety safety

---

Roads and road condition standards that are compatible with the limitation of a high performance road bicycle need to be established and enforced. In Santa Clara valley, many expressways have gaps and ridges in the pavement that are a nuisance for motorists, but dangerous for cyclists. Fixing these problems should be fast and inexpensive but because there are no requirements to fix them, the repairs are not done. This is complicated by lack of agency responsibility (is it the city of Santa Clara, the city of San Jose, or the county that is responsible for the repair?). For a clear example of this, examine the San Tomas Expressway overpass over US-101, which has pieces owned by each of the 3 above agencies, has been worked on several times in the last 10 years, and yet the cyclist hazards have not been addressed.

---

Yes...bicycles need to be considered when highway and other road work is planned. Consider the ultimate impact of the work on rider safety. I.e., widening shoulders and ensuring they are paved and free of rumble strips (which can be positioned on the white lines). Also, as mentioned earlier, please consider bicycles during pilot car operations.

---

Partnerships is a very vague term.

---

Need more specifics on what quality of condition for infrastructure means. Same comment for partnerships.

---

The most common complaint I hear about building bike paths is that they are not maintained because there isn't grant funding for maintenance, only construction.

---



---

**PRESERVATION STRATEGIES**

---

I personally hate rideing the pathway from hilltop to turtle bay . too many scum people in the area and down in that hole. I will not ride up hill to hilltop anymore. I will take cypress instead.

---

Putting condition cart before infrastructure horse. Get the network in place. Optimize connectivity, then improve quality. Cyclists and pedestrians are perfectly capable of fjording a small flood, trailblazing around fallen branches, etc. for a few yards. Unlike choke points on a highway or other infrastructure, te issue is not the weakest link in the chain causing problems, it is the lack of an expansive network that is robust enough to provide a viable alternative.

---

Meet with the bike and ped activists. Incorporate Vision Zero strategies.

---

Stop passing the buck to external partnerships. It just doesn't work very well.

---

Program integration is vague

---

not at this time

---

Program Integration is not explained well enough. External partnerships? Is that code for pushing State responsibilities onto NGOs?

---

i assume you mean historic preservation? if so, make sure that historic preservation doesn't interfere with providing pedestrian and bicycle access like the glendale-hyperion bridge project in los angeles that is proposed by the city of la to only have a sidewalk on one side of the bridge.

---

Integration strategy is not clear.

---

Internal and external partnerships? Are these public/private partnerships? Bike infrastructure is a public responsibility.

---

Explanations are too vague

---

Preservation of the infrastructure, roadways, pathways, improvement of bus stops? What's the point of preserving a system that is barely used.

---

not sure what program integration means

---

Not really sure what Program Integration means

---

Both choices seem to be on the outskirts of the overwhelming amount of money CA devotes to motor vehicle-serving infrastructure

---

this section needs editing, too vague

---

Not sure what is meant here.

---

quality of condition? you mean, absence of potholes--or what?

---

This is certainly a "if you build it they will come" situation. Improving the quality of cycling infrastructure will spawn programs around it.

---

Non-profits and input from citizens for program integration would be beneficial for both design quality and from a financial standpoint.

---

With whom are you integrating?

---

preservation and maintenance are the keys to quality of conditions. Both very important.

---

Program integration explanation doesn't make clear what it is. Is this about sharing funding streams? Public money vs private money? I can't tell what this is about.

---

Too vague

---

What are external and internal partnerships? Are you looking for federal and local funding or something else? Be specific!

---

---

**PRESERVATION STRATEGIES**

---

What exactly are preservation strategies? Maintenance? Where does Education fall into this/ can it?

---

Be more specific about "expected quality" and "internal and external partnerships".

---

This is a very biased survey.

---

Not sure what program integration would involve.

---

quality less imp., but safety from cars most important

---

Bicycling and pedestrian infrastructure are adequate as they are.

---

The term "quality of condition" is not very clear.

---

another tough question to understand and conceptualize

---

Maintaining conditions for bicycles and pedestrians should be the focus - how this is done - through internal/external partnerships should be the way that this strategy should be accomplished.

---

Program integration wording should be stronger, and differentiate between internal and external. External partnering/communications with local advocates is key, +1. Internally, you need more than 'partnership'. You need strong incentives to change institutional behaviors. For example, our local CalTrans just installed rumblestrips in the shoulder on a major bike commuter/recreational route, making it completely unridable. ANY outreach to the community would have shown them this is a mistake, but apparently no effort was made and clearly there is no understanding/acceptance of top-level CalTrans priorities - it's just 'vehicle business as usual', and this is just one example. They have subsequently agreed to re-pave and move the rumblestrip onto the fog line, but what a waste of time and \$\$\$ to do it twice!!! Maybe wording should be "Pursue eternal partnerships and incentivize internal behaviors to address bicycle and ped needs in maintenance and preservation activities"?

---

I think we need to call out FUNDING in these strategies, especially dedicated resources to ensure that walking and biking receive the appropriate level of commitment from both public and private funding resources.

---

deferred maintenance should not be allowed on these facilities. fix it now fix it right keep it safe and useful... always

---

Stop bicycling period for adults and only allow kids to ride bikes on sidewalks and bike/hiking trails.

---

Public/Private preservation strategies are great--as long as everything goes well; it's more important to ensure adequate funding from governmental resources to build and maintain infrastructure.

---

Bicyclists should pay for Preservation strategies. Quit using my tax dollars to pay for bike paths, etc. Use my tax dollars to pay for upkeep of our crumbling roads.

---

Again I think your language is not clear cut - what infrastructure or you wanting to implement? I have a Masters degree and I am still not sure what your message is intending here. I'm sorry, I really want to understand. I understand maintenance, but preservation? Are we wanting to preserve what you set in place?

---

Internal and external partnerships is too vague for me. Who are the partners we're talking about?

---

---

## **PRESERVATION STRATEGIES**

---

It's not clear what the Quality of Condition strategy looks like in practice. A more compelling strategy would be to tie road rehabilitation funds to minimum standards and improvement of adjacent bike/ped infrastructure.

---

It is really unclear what partnerships would accomplish for program integration. This should be reworded to clearly state what you're trying to get at.

---

The phrasing of "expected quality of condition" is a bit awkward. Is there a better way to say this?

---

These strategies are too abstract. How is a 'quality of condition' defined? How are conditions to be assessed against expectations, as opposed to something more concrete like a standard or model employed elsewhere? With whom will partnerships be made? Is CalTrans to be actively involved in maintenance activities, or just in discussing qualities, needs and partnerships?

---

The description of Program Integration doesn't mean anything to me. I don't understand what you're getting at.

---

I can't tell what it is you're trying to "preserve".

---

The description of "Program Integration" is not obvious to people not familiar with the process of implementing programs. Too much jargon.

---

A dedicated source of funding is fundamental

---

Not sure what program integration means

---

Quality of condition: most roads in California are in poor condition. Is repaving roads - which cyclists use - included in those strategies?

---

I do not understand what you mean by Program Integration. Do you mean partnering with local cities on repaving programs? I do support standards and requirements for pavement quality for bicycle infrastructure.

---

The quality and design of pavement for bike lane needs to be re-examined. It's hazardous to have seams and ruts and uneven surfaces, paint "bike lane," and assume the work is done.

---

Need more information

---

I am not sure what "program integration" means in this context. Who are the internal and external actors?

---

Would like to know more about how Caltrans, given extremely limited staff resources, intends to develop true partnerships and move forward projects in a timely manner.

---

any statements on what level of government or other organization would be involved?

---

Who are the internal and external partnerships? Does this refer to alliances with specific communities? Private donors?

---

People who chose to ride their bicycles on our roads should not be given any special considerations or priority over vehicles.

---

Not sure what preservation means? maintenance of the improved bike/ped infrastructure?

---

Not at all clear. Why use government-speak? Can you just say that maintenance will be commensurate with modality? Bikes need smoother roadway compared with cars. Your Preservation strategy is not clear.

---

Expectations need to be defined. Perhaps use a standard in effect somewhere in the world or define what 'expected' conditions are. Too vague.

---

---

**PRESERVATION STRATEGIES**

---

In a state where there are millions of bicyclists and active people on our roadways it seems that there is a lack of bike lanes/walking lanes so that people can be safer.

---

how do you pick which of these are highest priority? these don't seem mutually exclusive. Do both of these.

---

Existing funding mechanisms (like ATP) are inadequate to come close to meeting goals.

---

You have to define what quality means. I've been to Amsterdam and seen the quality of their bike infrastructure, ideally you are measuring against their infrastructure as they've figured it out,

---

I have never heard the term "Quality of Condition" and I don't know what it means. I cannot tell what actions would be required to implement this strategy.

---

Education is also key for sustaining quality pedestrian and bike experiences.

---

Is this referring to partnerships with private or non-profit entities?

---

Sharing among user groups and agencies develops awareness for other agencies and user groups. Quality of condition has to be maintained with financial or manpower resource, and when there is a financial bind quality is neglected. Example; State Parks has trails and access for public to its resources, but financially cannot keep all of it maintained to the extent it has to be closed or left in dangerous condition.

---

How is quality defined?

---

Sound similar, program integration leads to be quality, and better quality may require internal and external partnerships.

---

Tackling integration first will allow better/faster achievement of quality of condition.

---

What does Program Integration even mean? sounds like more bureaucracy.

---

Not sure why it's an either/or

---

Want to know more about integrating programs--even on local level it seems impossible. Nice newly paved streets--which won't be repaved again in my lifetime--are already being dug up for utilities (in bike lane, of course). How to fix that?

---

Where does local and state government have a plan?

---

blurry line between these. of course, strong direction and outreach to local governments to ensure they include bike ped facilities in their maintenance and preservation projects is huge.

---

I don't really have any idea what either of these means.

---

It's unclear what the partnerships would look like. And what exactly preservation means. Does it mean keeping existing bikeways or pedestrian crossings versus improving them?

---

I'm not sure what these are referring to

---

These are all "lead in questions" When do I get to choose between riding a bike or driving a car?

---

I don't understand how pursuing partnerships would ensure that the needed work would be done.

---

internal and external to what? and what are "needs in maintenance and preservation activities"?

---

My opinion is that bicycle use remains largely a recreational option. Those (such as myself) that are fortunate enough to walk or ride to work are a minority whose numbers change with the seasons.

---

---

**PRESERVATION STRATEGIES**

---

This is a priority! In Santa Barbara, the Obern Trail/UCSB bike path is in serious need of repaving.

---

The second strategy is very confusing.

---

I guess I need an example of what these strategies would entail.

---

Without forced choice ranking, this survey doesn't get at actual priorities.

---

Again, motorists are too in a hurry these days and do not pay attention to walkers / bikes.

---

Internal partnership is more important than external partnership. Internal will always be there & external won't.

---

They are fuzzy and indefinite. They need to include quantifiable measures and timelines.

---

You will have to invest for this to work.

---

They could be better explained. Preservation is often associated with historic resources. In this context, I believe you are associating it with maintenance.

---

Quality of condition is vague and jargony

---

They are clear but (as written) are purposefully vague and open ended. Is the quality and condition right now on the existing highway infrastructure? Is it providing safe and segregated Ped and bike facilities that provide safety for all and efficiency of all modes of transportation? Who knows?

---

I don't really understand the integration strategy.

---

Why is there no mention of the rights of drivers?

---

Your engineers and planners need months of experience walking and biking ... at a minimum.

---

My concern: who or what entity will be responsible for creation and upkeep of every bikepath/walkway (who to sue).

---

Don't spend a dime on this until you start taxing and licensing cyclists to pay for it

---

Examples would help us understand these concepts and they would help guide implementation.

---

What partnerships?

---

So far these are loaded questions to further the agenda and not elicit the mood of the public and realities on the road. Teaching in college I know how to "push - pull" and this is definitely such a document.

---

More money on road maintenance, less money on providing welfare for those who are able, but not part of the workforce. We need an equal to the California Conservation Corps. (CCC) to enable, improve, and maintain our transportation facilities.

---

Like to see more cooperation with Cal Trans and local government entities with local cycling/pedestrian groups. Without a 'big' shout, input from these groups can be too often ignored.

---

Program Integration is another way of saying... let someone else pay for something the government is trying to establish in your area. All pathways do not need to be 20' wide... but a consistent safe 6' wide pathway would benefit walkers, bicyclists and wheelchair riders.

---

These strategies are too vague and need clarification.

---

What does this actually mean in practical terms? What are some examples of "Quality of Condition" and "Program Integration"?

---

Need education.

---

Bike path maintenance need to improve. Please raise the standard level of service

---

---

**PRESERVATION STRATEGIES**

---

This is a \$ullshit survey . . . is this a push poll? You do not want my opinion . . . you want me to support you political agenda . . . do you not care about us? We cycle to work for many reasons - most of my cyclists lost their drivers license because of a DUI . . . are you really trying to support them? I call \$ullshit! You are not interested in their problems . . . so back off!

---

We pay taxes for infrastructure maintenance - with all the cracks, potholes, and poorly marked traffic lines, what is that money being spent on?

---

Preservation of What? Highways? Roads? Have you tried to do grocery shopping on a bike?

---

I wish this survey was relevant to all stakeholders but the only options are predetermined outcomes. How about if offering choices like do you think this should be priority? With Caltrans and the states limited budgets what should our priorities be and offer options.

---

Local towns have specific needs and locations for healthcare facilities and pharmacies . Walking will improve health issues

---

Hunh? What's program integration mean.

---

Not sure quite what this is referring to, but a higher quality of infrastructure that is honestly strived for would be better than simply outsourcing because I think some businesses may have ulterior motives. Set the bar than have everyone try to meet it together.

---

Need more info.

---

1. Need to improve pedestrian experience where roads cross under freeways. Trash, unclean sidewalks, bums, urine odor, tagging, inadequate lighting, and other quality of experience issues are typical in the urban areas.

---

Stop the nonsense

---

The term Preservation is not obvious in terms of what it means.

---

Quality of condition should also include minimum standards, such as adequate width for bike lanes, and adequate width for shared use facilities (separating out users by speed, i.e. bike and ped)

---

A good and functional infrastructure needs to be installed before it can be preserved. A focus on the installation of such systems needs to be addressed first.

---

Create a usable system of bike/pedestrian paths and trails that meet the needs of the public and they will be used. That use will create the interest to support proper maintenance.

---

Need to be re-worded.

---

I'm not sure what the "expected quality" is for the condition of infrastructure. What I expect and what someone else might expect are likely not the same.

---

All infrastructure should meet an expected quality of condition. However, in the absence of adequate funding, those needs have to be balanced with other needs, such as clean waster and air,

---

The program integration language sounds like it will result in working group meetings that end up with all talk and no action. (Where is the money to do anything?)

---

what agency is going to meet quality of condition the State of California? Use first person.

---

I am not sure what these mean

---

I can infer what (and appreciate) what "program integration" sounds like it is intended to mean, but the definition which follows the colon sounds more like "interorganizational collaboration". I think both things are important, but they are two different strategies. I think of "program integration" more as ensuring consistent quality bike/ped infrastructure across jurisdictions.

---

---

**PRESERVATION STRATEGIES**

---

Both are valuable, but there should definitely be synergies between pavement maintenance/preservation and the installation of new or improved bike/ped facilities.

---

Program Integration is full of unclear words: e.g., pursue, partnerships, activities.

---

Make it easier for users to report maintenance issues to the right agency.

---

Partnerships are also crucial for system completion and system upgrades.

---

It sounds like you're saying you'll stop there and that program integration is a way to not devote funds for operational programming.

---

I don't understand the Program Integration strategy language.

---

Ditto.

---

Not sure what kind of partnerships ... examples would be helpful.

---

N/A

---

The wording describing both strategies is bureaucratic and vague. I guess "quality of condition" refers to things like smooth pavement. But who knows? Re program integration, what are internal and external partnerships? Is this internal and external to Caltrans?

---

Consultants, lawyers and politicians must have drafted this survey. It's not written for the layperson or even someone with a graduate degree to comprehend.

---

Both are EXTREMELY VAGUE. Give me a break.. no one has any idea on what they are voting for here. Please look into removing the total # of vehicles on California roads before anything else. To even begin discussions on bikes and pedestrians without 1st acknowledging that California has surpassed an allowable vehicle capacity on our roads is not smart. Address the problem...Don't look for ways that will only provide short term solutions. If you focus on removing CARS you will help solve the real problem. Getting more people onto bicycles sounds great, but what if then the roads were less congested? What would that do? Give California the opportunity to squash MORE vehicles onto our roads? California needs to address the REAL problem. Total # of cars.

---

Preserving our existing Multimodal Transportation System is insufficient; it needs much improvement. Caltrans continues to damage the multimodal utility of our current system with construction & maintenance that degrades rather than improves walking & bicycling safety & utility. Maintenance of pedestrian & bicycling facilities is typically poor compared with motor vehicle facilities. Include standards, processes & funding for maintenance in the CSBPP. Include & implement a process to require re-reimbursement of the construction funding for bicycling & pedestrian facilities that are not adequately maintained.

---

Suggested strategy: To assure that each new bike or ped facility will be adequately patrolled and maintained, each new facility should have a management plan in place prior to opening. A pothole, gravel pile or mud in the bike lane could spoil your whole day. And, pedestrians are not likely to use a pathway if it is strewn with litter & graffiti. Regular patrols and maintenance are needed for it to feel safe. If it does not feel safe, it won't get used.

---

"Pursue internal and external partnerships" is vague.

---

PRESERVATION STRATEGIES very unclear

---

Program Integration is equally important.

---

Infrastructure should be built well and maintained.

---

What kind of partnerships will help to address bicycle and pedestrian needs in maintenance and preservation?

---

---

**PRESERVATION STRATEGIES**

---

Caltrans needs to take responsibility for funding preservation and maintenance.

---

See my earlier comments on crosswalks, education, hiring disabled people to test the routes.. etc.

---

I am not sure what the quality of condition really means.

---

I would like to see less litter by bike riders. Tires, rims, old bikes, a turn-in metal program would be great to generate revenue to help with costs of path maintenance/signage.

---

Program Integration seems vague, but Quality of Condition seems like the minimum basis for having these kinds of goals. If you're not going to maintain them, why build them?

---

Need to provide more education to property owners also about their responsibilities for maintain sidewalks and clearing brush.

---

The phrase "quality of condition" is a generic phrase and doesn't hold a lot of meaning.

---

All DOT documents should name the mode that is being discussed. Pretend at least that everyone won't automatically assume that the conversation is about motor vehicles, as it is now.

---

I explained it before. Whoever made the bike path, should have a way of hearing the complaints of residents in the area that are seeing a problem every day, and that are in the risk of hitting a cyclist, and they should go and check the complaint and seek a solution immediately.

---

Once again, it's a one-sided argument with no one. Someone actually gets paid for this stuff, unbelievable.

---

I have no idea what type of partnerships would work for this, or what you have in mind.

---

My cynical response is - Based on the condition of our roads, I think we have a long way to go before we can expect high quality from bike/ped infrastructure.

---

Define internal and external partnerships, and how they will be identified and recruited.

---

First we have to designate and secure the corridors we intend to preserve. Then we can determine their quality, condition, and maintenance needs.

---

I think that current planning, leading to very near term "quality of condition" might be old and suboptimal in the more distant future. Therefore, partnerships can provide better input.

---

My expected quality is not your expected quality. Addressing needs is not satisfying needs. Quality of modes should be equal to motor vehicle mode quality.

---

"Quality Establishment" implies that decision makers are inherently stupid and unable to learn from established high quality systems. How about, "Within 10'days, identify and implement a quality level proven to provide the same high quality infrastructure as... Amsterdam, Antwerp, Brussels (maybe?)."

---

There should be standards of quality for all facilities and these standards need to be maintained in safe condition. Maintenance must be planned into any project

---

preservation? Who wrote this anyhow. Don't have an idea what it means. I'm a daily cyclist, tour cyclist, bike club member....????

---

Eliminate some car lanes to make room for bicyclists. Too many people are dying.

---

Not entirely sure. In order to meet quality, all providers must be included.

---



---

**PRESERVATION STRATEGIES**

---

What is bicycle "infrastructure"? Does it include traffic lanes? Unlaned roads without bike lanes? Caltrans quietly removed bikeway (and presumably roadway) surface quality standards for bicyclists from the HDM a few years ago because it didn't want to be responsible for preventing longitudinal and transverse lips or cracks that could make bicyclists crash. Is it now going to reestablish a condition quality STANDARD, or is it just going write nice words that are ignored? Are partnerships going to be merely "pursued", or "established"? How will this effort be measured?

---

All the various forms of transportation in their agencies need to be working together

---

Actively prune eye level branches before they become a hazard. Anticipate that branches will droop when wet.

---

I am not sure which item to mark because the short descriptions don't make clear what's at stake in either option. It sounds like both of them have to do with maintaining bike/pedestrian infrastructure, but by different means??

---

"Quality of condition"? What does this mean? Bike/pedestrian pavement? Routes? Very unclear.

---

"Quality of condition" is vague.

---

Maintenance and preservation activities need to be defined, perhaps with examples.

---

It makes no sense to ask for my 'highest' priority and then ask me to select 'all that apply'. There can be only one 'highest'.

---

Specifically integration: I feel like this is referring to the ability of a user to report a problem and not have it tied up in "jurisdiction limbo." However, that's not exactly clear as written. It is simply not clear what that refers to.

---

Unclear on what's being "preserved".

---

The "Program Integration" strategy needs to be more specific.

---

Define quality of condition

---

Maintenance alone could take the entire budget, many existing facilities would serve many more with proper maintenance.

---

Maybe "internal and external partners" could use some definition. For example: Does internal partners mean a city planning department and a city public works department? Does external mean a city public works department and a county public works department or Caltrans?

---

Is there even one example of partnership? This effort seems like the full employment act for bureaucracy

---

I am not familiar with the "preservation" term in this context.

---

No idea what partnerships are internal or external.

---

Not sure what this is means. What are these partnerships?

---

No, do not understand what is meant by "expected quality of conditions" means in reference to Los Angeles City as it has no quality and safe streets for vulnerable road users at this time.

---

Bad pavement is annoying for drivers of cars. For someone on a bike, it can be deadly, and as such, condition of the infrastructure is critically important.

---

Could use more clarification

---

Why aren't they integrated?

---

Not sure what these would mean in practice

---

---

**PRESERVATION STRATEGIES**

---

I understand what the definitions of the elements of the Preservation Strategies mean, but without any concrete examples of how that will be achieved in the Inland Empire I cannot truthfully say that the Preservation strategies are clear and understandable to me.

---

I have no idea what program intergration is.

---

It seems to me that actually spending energy to provide Quality of the physical Condition of the bike facility (including on-street) is way more important than making a list of what we need and want (although such a list is an important first step).

---

"Preservation" ... of ...?

---

Clear, but slightly vague

---

I think that both of these strategies really go together and both should be pursued equally.

---

Local partners consistently identify costs associated with maintenance agreements for sidewalks on the SHS as a deterrent to implementing active transportation in rural areas.

---

Many local groups support development of bike/pedestrian infrastructure. Let locals know that you are ready to help build infrastructure in the near term and the ideas and priorities will quickly follow.

---

Program Integration: sound like a bureaucratic thing. Sounds like it could be a sexy P3 thing instead...

---

I do not understand the preservation strategies. Perhaps provide examples?

---

What is quality of condition?

---

Neither of these preservation strategies are clearly worded or have an adequate amount of detail.

---

Quality of condition is a lofty goal considering it seems difficult to keep the existing roads for cars in decent shape in this state.

---

There is no meat here. We need concrete steps to preserve, not establish and pursue.

---

What Partnerships are being referred to

---

This can be left out, it is just words

---

Increase investment in quality standards for bicycle and pedestrian uses.

---

How can Caltrans enforce standards of Condition on other other agency/city infrastructure? In Orange County OCTA can't/won't do so. And Caltrans is trying to give SR1 to local cities to divest responsibility....

---

Preservation strategies should include enhancements such as development of sunlight shading measures that increase the comfort of infrastructure users and reduce the deterioration rate of asphalt pavement

---

partners need funding sources

---

Presevation of existing conditions and design is not exceptible.

---

They could be better explained because they seem related yet unrelated.

---

This language is very technical. More user friendly language is needed.

---

Pavement condition is the second-most desired action in Berkeley. The roads are dangerously deteriorated, leading to unsafe and uncomfortable rides. This is true for many other cities.

---

What is an expected quality of condition?

---

The strategies are too broad and vague. I don't see how these strategies will help to preserve this infrastructure.

---

---

**PRESERVATION STRATEGIES**

---

Cities seem to push back on organizations engaged in developing pedestrian - bicycle opportunities because of lack of funds. Figure out a way to make the partnership stronger through financial support.

---

Caltrans working with the local agencies is crucial for a future viable bicycle network.

---

We need to design these facilities so they can be maintained easily and efficiently. Look at the maintenance problems we have now. Work with local to develop partnerships with them.

---

I am not quite sure what the Program Integration entails.

---

Everyone expects that auto parking will be available--at work, at shopping centers, everywhere. Bike parking is less available and generally not secure enough. Changing this, and making it a requirement, can help encourage bike use.

---

These items may be necessary conditions for success, but these do not describe how to achieve them. How will participants get resources when resources are scarce and there are many competing demands? Who is going to do what? Preservation and maintenance hard, and have not been high priorities in the past. How will you change that?

---

Program Integration is not clear

---

Would it be possible to define infrastructure under quality of condition? Does it include roadways, bikeways, buses with bike racks, etc.

---

Maintenance of these critical facilities is important and we need to prioritize getting these in place in existing and low income communities

---

Think I understand but vaguely. Think they could be more simply written.

---

Who is going to be responsible to implement the preservation strategies? How would bicyclists and pedestrians contact this person? Is there ANY accountability proposed?

---

Define expected quality of condition. Replace address with deliver and replace needs with outcomes in the Program Integration strategy.

---

Please tell district employees to get on board with multi modal programs and projects

---

I'm not clear what this means. I'm sure you establish standards for all work whether performed by caltrans or contractors.

---

In high use areas cycle and pedestrian uses are NOT compatible.

---

Both strategies are important; hard to choose just one over the other.

---

None

---

Work to get something actually done and implemented instead of just wasting time on talk.

---

Penalize local government agencies that do not comply.

---

The program integration strategy isn't clear

---

Identify problem areas and try to work towards a viable solution of preserving existing infrastructure with an end goal of interconnecting these paths so more people would use them.

---

What is program integration?

---

The minute quality is NOT a main priority it will start to deteriorate horribly.

---

both. integrate first, drawing on local bike orgs knowledge, then maintain or improve the condition

---

Each CT district should develop a bike/ped committee to review all maintenance and preservation plans.

---

**PRESERVATION STRATEGIES**

---

What would be the expected quality of condition, who determines it, and who will be responsible for maintaining the infrastructure up to that quality? To me, any bike path should be free of debris, clean, and smooth for riding. It should be clearly marked and relatively separated from motor vehicle traffic. Roadways, intersections, and signals should prioritize pedestrians first, bicyclists second, transit third (railways, then buses), and drivers last.

---

---

## **SOCIAL EQUITY**

---

The stress on a small minority (bikers - I was one ) misses the greater need to keep more nature for the greater 'non-biking' population

---

The first and third strategies are a bit vague and don't guarantee improved equity with Facilities. They only promise more "engagement" and more "opportunity to participate"

---

community support is greater than disadvantaged communities. Equity lens should be applied to all projects.

---

Make disadvantaged community a partner for better buy in and feeling they have a voice

---

I grew up in a disadvantaged community, and I raised my child in a similar community. There are many streets that do not have sidewalks, proper paving, curb and gutters, and I would hope that you would partner with Counties, Public Utility Districts, and Community Councils to seek an overall transportation improvement.

---

this is good - do outreach in marginalized communities before carrying out projects - find out what they actually want, communicate projects in ways that appeals to their own experiences, not the health and safety perspective that some bike advocates normally push without thinking about it - acknowledge that people are not biking and walking by choice

---

It is essential that traffic enforcement be done with a focus on equity. Low-income people of color are disproportionately victims of crashes, but police enforcement of traffic violations too often focuses on jaywalking, wrong-way bicycle riding, and other infractions that pose little danger to other road users. Police and the highway patrol must focus on the factors that really matter: high vehicle speeds and distracted/intoxicated driving.

---

Regarding Access to Funding: As stated earlier, any guaranteed minimum funding for disadvantaged communities must not be any higher than 25% as currently exists in the Active Transportation Program.

---

Why is this important

---

What are the actual strategies?

---

Helping disadvantaged communities can be a challenge but is also a big opportunity. I recommend watching what people do (improvised paths, unsafe crossings, where people bike and walk \*or don't\*) and then asking them why and what they think could be done and what they think of things that have been done elsewhere.

---

Goals not very specific.

---

"Addressing social equity" cannot be effectively done without "Strengthen[ing] engagement with disadvantaged communities by proactively seeking input on needs and providing technical guidance."

---

Unless you're having this program led and executed by the same people you're trying to help, you have no business making these attempts. That being said, the above statement is not meant to detract from the fact that Equity needs to be on the forefront moving forward with any progressive transit plan.

---

Social Equity strategies are clear. Problem already lies in the fact that garbage, glass and hazards line and litter the streets already. You have to confront and deal with the current problems that already impinge development before developing new problems then solutions. If there're unsafe roads right now because of municipal apathy, then there will continue to be the same problem.

---

The wording is unclear, it could pretty much refer to anything.

---

Let's see an implementation plan.

---

Input, input, input, but ultimately you are doing the planning and need to understand everyone you are building for. We have historically cut disadvantaged communities off from opportunities and segregated them by design. Time to make it right.

---

---

**SOCIAL EQUITY**

---

This is everything. Helping people so they can help themselves.

---

Poorer communities rely on bicycles more than rich ones, and for different reasons. Some poorer families cannot afford a car, or to repair the one they have, leaving the bicycle the only mode of transport.

---

Why are we talking about "social equity" here? Isn't the issue safe bicycle paths and walkways? Must we make this a "social equity" issue? Why?

---

Equity lens seems redundant since Community Support engages with "disadvantaged" communities."

---

I have no idea what this means. Shouldn't the State be helping the disadvantaged communities?? It is not clear how disadvantaged communities would need different facilities than anyone else, if the State is the one funding and executing the project. If the community has to kick in funding, that's a different story as there is less funding. That really needs to be clarified.

---

how is equity lens different from the other two - seems to me it is redundant - also under social equity the key word is equity and not disadvantaged since the definition of disadvantaged is subjective

---

I would hope we would include this population in any planning and decisions.

---

connection to enforcement; work with community so that strategies to improve safety don't turn into discriminatory and ineffective profiling and fines punitive for low-income

---

Downtown San Jose can be so bike and pedestrian friendly!!

---

What do you mean by disadvantaged communities? There are financially disadvantaged, there are transport disadvantaged, there are food deserts, there are communities which are disadvantaged because they have to work multiple jobs. So what you focus your lense on is not clear. Most communities with money are also transport challenged and transport uneducated.

---

Let's not spend more resources on any one community over others. Allocate resources equally regardless of perceived "disadvantages".

---

It seems that Equity Lens covers it all - i marked it as most important but I'm actually not sure that needs to be stated at all. I see it as a part of the Vision/Goal more than a strategy. Also - since social equity is defined as a goal, I would like to see the theme more through. Limited space in these bullets, but there's an aspect of equity that could be brought to each.

---

Social equity is crap..how about treating all communities equally?

---

Minorities need better representation in urban cycling Pedestrian design, they are the majority - make it safe, make it accessible and make it easy to navigate

---

Specify how 'disadvantaged communities' will be determined

---

Studies of the causes of problems need to be done before anything is built.

---

Cities should be the hub of design and action regardless of the current income level. However, it must be implemented equally across the board.

---

The lack of any mention of Safe Routes to School is troubling. Should be included as a strategy in this survey.

---

Should add consideration for environmental health measures like San Francisco DPH's Epidemiologists' environmental health measures for land use plans

---

Strengthen engagement with the Native American disadvantaged community, please include in statewide planning

---

It's all about the funding.

---

---

## **SOCIAL EQUITY**

---

equity strategies. ugh . I love riding on all the improved trails bicycle lanes , just wished all the scum of the earth didn't tread and illegally live along the pathways. I never did like the pathways on 299 from hilltop towards Shasta college though

---

Disadvantaged communities also need more access to HPVs in addition to the trails to ride on. Bike share, earn-a-bike, etc. should be incorporated into those plans.

---

Give it more than lip service.

---

Free bike helmets for disadvantaged communities riders

---

This should be for everyone, not just special groups.

---

Active transportation efforts and investments should be prioritized to target disadvantaged/vulnerable communities

---

not at this time

---

great job on these strategies

---

Social Equity not a high priority for me.

---

This is very important to address engaging disadvantaged communities and not implement damaging strategies in their communities.

---

All communities should benefit from these strategies.

---

Generally understandable; more clarification on point is needed.

---

Yes! Please engage and consult with the communities. Too often people start seeing change in their communities without being able to share their thoughts. If communities don't feel invested and heard, facilities and infrastructure might run the risk of not being used.

---

Very Important. All communities need to be included equally.

---

of most important is how aware are these communities that these services are available or that they have an input on how these funds benefit the community as a whole.

---

"Equity lens" won't happen without significant funding shifts. Such shifts are unlikely as long as "community support" is defined in terms of "technical guidance" and "access to funding" is defined as "opportunity to participate".

---

This is a tough one because they're all so important

---

I'm not sure what this section really means. What I do know is bike infrastructure is quite lacking through lower income areas. This has a ripple effect for every area around it as people biking from other communities with better bike routes will either not ride to their intended destination or ride completely around the low income area. Neither of these options are doing the low income area any favors.

---

I hope input from disadvantaged communities is being addressed - they may not have access to surveys such as this one online. Volunteers should be on the streets engaging in general dialogue to see what people want and need.

---

equity should be the number one goal.

---

All of these are great and should happen.

---

Austin TX was experimenting with "bike trains" in low income elementary schools. 2 adult cyclists taught the children bike safety and when the students were ready, they were allowed to keep the bike, helmet, and lock. Each day adult cyclists rode the school route picking up students in the "train" and ensuring a safe ride to and from school.

---

"Disadvantaged communities" should get no special preference when it comes to bicycle and ped improvements. All communities should have equal access to the strategies.

---

---

## **SOCIAL EQUITY**

---

Definition or standards for equity lens would be helpful. Potentially include explanations of the relationship between equity and bike/ped improvements.

---

I don't know what they mean except it looks like trying to connect all neighborhoods together which isn't always desirable.

---

The best way to address social equity is to educate about buses and other forms of mass transportation.

---

tough

---

In the intercities bikes are main transportation it probably is wise to incorporate them and community in data

---

We all need access to safe streets.

---

While I, in theory support equity in design, study indicates a need to get a critical mass of cyclists or peds to increase safety. Closer in areas tend to be "low hanging fruit" and increases in bicycle and ped infrastructure creates a high likelihood of use by many cyclists. It also creates a useable network. If one focuses too much on equally serving all neighborhoods, you get a patchwork of infrastructure that really doesn't go anywhere. Start with areas where this will work. This is less income based than geography. In Sacramento, for example, Land Park and Oak Park and even del paso (as long as routes from del paso to Midtown are improved under flood conditions) are equally ripe for improvements, while granite bay would be less so. Focus on usable routes that people will use rather than building useless narrow bike lanes on large suburban streets 25mi from the core. Eventually a usable network can spread to those areas, but breaks in sidewalks and bike lanes discourage use as much as not having them.

---

I would add seeking input on needs by working with community groups. Ensure community input prior to decision making processes so input is actually valued.

---

social equity has nothing to do with bike & ped trails.

---

Please take geography into account. This is surely a fact CalTrans is already aware of, but advantaged communities are often concentrated in outer, car-dependent areas rather than dense inner urban ones, as was perhaps historically the case.

---

"Equity Lens" is not intuitive. Simplify by saying "Ensuring Equity". Access to funding should not be limited to disadvantaged communities. All potential sources of funding should be explored to benefit ALL communities in CA.

---

Equity means equity... disadvantaged areas should not receive anything at the expense of 'advantaged' areas, and vice versa. I've seen how schools Chapter One program can ignore a site that has no Chapter One designation while another gets 'everything' simply because the funding is easy. Equity equity equity.

---

Poorer people have the worst infrastructure, little or no training as to how to ride in traffic safely, and subsequently, have the greatest number of fatalities. That's a no-brainer.

---

Help the poor, but let the rich bicyclists pay for these Equity strategies.

---

The equity lens strategy is both too vague and redundant. This is really built into the other two strategies.

---

Those using services should be the primary ones paying for them. "Freebies" are generally not adequately appreciated.

---

I get all of this - is equity lens really the latest term?

---

Transit, a vital link in transportation, does not have the funding it needs. We seem to fund transit centers but not buses on the road or trains.

---



---

## **SOCIAL EQUITY**

---

Access to and oversubscription of funding streams remains the most significant barrier to increasing bike/ped mode share. This applies both to disadvantaged communities screen, and those which may not meet definitions, but are still underserved.

---

Access to Funding: This should be slightly reworded. It's not about having the opportunity to participate in funding programs, but about being able to participate competitively--in other words recognizing historical patterns of disinvestment and discrimination that have left these communities without resources to even apply to state funding programs in many cases.

---

How will "disadvantaged communities" be defined? Was there a concerted effort to reach out to disadvantaged communities during all CSBPP phases to date, or is this geared towards implementation only?

---

These all seem like things that should be baked into programs at all levels.

---

All of the strategies in this questionnaire were rather vague. Yes, the words are understandable, but what do they really mean? It sounds like planner-speak, without really getting to the meat of the issues. "Establish", "develop", "ensure"...those don't sound very strategic to me. Just buzzwords. I bike and I walk, and both can be quite hazardous to one's health in this state. I don't need to be assured or engaged, I need changes and I it would help if Caltrans stopped being so car-centric. Sorry, but this survey seems pretty insufficient -- it's not clear what is the point of the whole survey.

---

Community support is vital. Input is needed from people who will utilize these services (bike lanes, sidewalks, active transportation) daily.

---

Please list specific ways you will address social equity with implementing all strategies from this plan.

---

regardless of location, enable cycling and walking to be easier in areas where there is already a critical mass of people doing it. it is much more efficient to focus on areas with that seed already growing than to try to convince people who have decided for some reason or another that they just don't care about walking or cycling.

---

Unclear what disadvantaged communities means in this context.

---

I would like to see more people from disadvantaged communities brought in and involved in the process so that they are not excluded. Funding is also important. The "Equity Lens" strategy sounds very vague and overlapping with the others, so I am not sure how effective it is as a strategy.

---

Caltrans seems to do a fairly good job of putting together plans and strategies. However, there sometimes is a disconnect when it comes to implementation and building projects sooner.

---

how does social equity differ from community support strategies?

---

Community Support and Equity Lens are not really different strategies.

---

Again, I'm not sure how you will actually implement these strategies. Disadvantaged communities are, by definition, going to have fewer resources to contribute to your plan (and fewer existing resources to build upon).

---

Social equity and disadvantaged communities should NOT be given any consideration regarding transportation funding programs. Cars are basic, and should NOT have to contend with bicycles on our roads. Bicyclists should NOT be given any special consideration.

---

kinda of need all 3 to make strides here.

---

Simplify this messaging. There is an implied bias towards the undefined 'disadvantaged' community. Simply ensure that all Californians are included in the input opportunity.

---

No place in this state should be labeled as "disadvantaged"----funding should be equal for all.

---

---

## **SOCIAL EQUITY**

---

I don't understand how you will factor this equity lens into priority of projects. I think you should focus on serving the greatest needs of all by focusing on the best and most impactful projects, if they happen to be in low income areas great, but if not, I don't think it makes sense to start there as opposed to say a busy commercial area that may attract pedestrians and cyclists safer to use for those choosing to commute in low carbon ways.

---

Bicycling needs an image change to be accepted as a standard mode of transit. For this to occur, all communities need to be heard.

---

Yes, extra consideration for disadvantaged communities, but CSBPP should build network and connect all of CA.

---

There is no definition of a disadvantaged community

---

More focus on rural parts of the state, especially the Sierra

---

Equity shouldn't be address at the back end with implementation. Rather it should be an important planning metric at the onset of planning.

---

Disadvantaged communities often need technical guidance before they can successfully engage in grant programs. This has been a clear message in the grant programs funded with Greenhouse Gas Reduction Funds.

---

Caltrans should ALWAYS engage with all of the communities it serves. And if disadvantaged communities are paying taxes/higher fares for public transit, they need to get their money's worth.

---

Please include best practices on public engagement--so many wrong ways to do this, but so many good practices and learning going on. Reach out to equity advocates now to find those best practices, get their input.

---

Difficult to get community engagement from people working 3 jobs. Not because they don't care but because they don't have even the 15 minutes for a survey

---

Equity Lens meaning is unclear

---

This is a super heinous question. I live in the Central Valley, it is all disadvantaged. The whole thing. We need our roads resurfaced.

---

I think all three equity strategies are important but would rank them as follows: 1) Access to Funding, 2) Community support and 3) Equity Lens.

---

What does it mean to "participate in active transportation funding programs"?

---

The most productive social equity strategies are likely to come from a bottom-up process of engaging with disadvantaged communities to understand their transportation needs and patterns first, and then providing incremental support to improve facilities. It is also important to understand how bike and pedestrian improvements can look like the thin end of the wedge of gentrification, and work to address these concerns within the communities.

---

Sorry, but this sounds a lot like Karl Marx

---

need a "by" in the Equity Lens and Access Funding ones.

---

I think most people need to understand more about social equity. Define the term somewhere, as you did at the beginning of the questionnaire.

---

At least 50% of funding should go to nonwhite low-income areas.

---

All communities should participate, otherwise this plan is a failure.

---

high priority on connecting underserved/disconnected communities to networked trail systems. Give them a choice to get out of their cars/buses into a safe transit mode.

---

---

**SOCIAL EQUITY**

---

Living in a small community, 24K population, I know transportation funding programs not always are enough to get the goals completed.

---

Make access to funding less complicated, but still distribute across many communities.

---

"proactively"? Ugh, your whiteness is showing. Make the goals understandable. These are just a bunch of wonky words tossed together that have vague, general, ambiguous meaning, if any meaning at all.

---

I work with disadvantaged high school students. Most of them walk, skateboard or if they have a bike (that hasn't been stolen) they cycle. We see a lot of skateboard accidents. I think the bike routes should be open to skaters.

---

The language on this page looks like it was stolen from a comic strip. Dilbert, or perhaps Doonsberry.

---

This survey is one-sided and unfair! You should be ashamed of yourselves.

---

which disadvantaged communities do you mean? Probably not non-motorized groups...

---

Should be AT TOP: "Access to Funding: Ensure that disadvantaged communities have the opportunity to participate in active transportation funding programs."

---

access to funding: most "communities" are not actual groups of people who know each other -- such as people with walkers, skateboarders, bicyclists. Funding must be used by governmental structure somehow; private funding would simply invite scams.

---

Equity requires that you do all things WITHOUT CONSIDERATION OF DISADVANTAGE/ADVANTAGE. You must seek input from all communities equally without practicing favoritism, such as to "disadvantaged" communities. Asking people what they want, even asking them what they will use, is like asking people what their New Years resolutions are, what they tell you and what they end up doing are likely to be hugely different. So, again, using large amounts of money to benefit the few is contradictory to social equity.

---

This is a valid consideration. The economically disadvantaged are the ones who need better transportation alternatives. They are the ones walking and biking by necessity instead of as a leisure activity. But emphasizing bikes and walking doesn't help the mother with three kids or the elderly man trying to get to his doctor appointment. We need real public transportation options in California that are efficient and user-friendly. Building bike lanes is nothing but a recreational subsidy to the rich Californians riding around on their \$5000 bikes and spandex riding gear.

---

equity lens is unclear

---

As previously stated this is a "social planning" item not questions about what people want or use. Again it mentions the disadvantaged. How more obvious can this be in its prejudice? It is amusing to read and relate the lower bike and walking numbers as illegals gain more and more access to automobiles.

---

I would only approve of this if less concern is placed on separating people by culture, and more concern is engaged in unifying all of us as Americans.

---

Statement is a bit vague as to who and what your addressing

---

My community doesn't qualify as disadvantaged, and yet the county gives us the short end of the stick on many programs. Our community is just as deserving as the county seat.

---

Partner and empower the communities.

---

Let's not spend all the money on hell holes

---

Please address more money sources for bike paths

---

Please . . . I went to an Ivy League college and this 'poll' stinks of \$ullshit"

---

Find the path of least resistance and it will serve you well . . .

---

Not sure what Equity Lens is even after reading the definition.

---

---

**SOCIAL EQUITY**

---

the more people that are included the more apt the plans will be accepted in the communities. bikes are less expensive then cars to get to work with, that would be advantageous to disadvantaged communities

---

What are disadvantaged communities? What is social equity in this context? Where will the money come from for Access to Funding?

---

Again this survey is not a real survey it offers no options other than the predetermined outcome

---

Pretty condescending lingo

---

Once again these are somewhat confusing and limited but sure equity would be my strongest priority I believe.

---

Why is this an issue?

---

Need more info.

---

Equity across all modes

---

The Equity Lens strategy is not understandable to me.

---

there is no equity. The tax payers for vehicles pay for gas, license and street maintenance as well as toll roads. Unilt the bike riders do the same and get a license, common sense is out the window.

---

The terms Lens sounds like jargon and is unclear

---

The current definition of "disadvantaged communities" should reflect economic disadvantage only - CalEnviroScreen is a poor tool to evaluate economic disadvantage and should not be used. Also, focus of funding on construction costs rather than project development costs means that low revenue communities cannot often compete for funding.

---

Create the bike/pedestrian infrastructure that ties where people work, shop and live. All the people.

---

The state as a whole is disadvantaged by the lack of alternative transportation facilities.

---

why don't you just use plain English?

---

I would drop "disadvantaged" from Community Support, maybe substituting "all". I don't know what this means. #1 and #3 should cover needs of disadvantaged communities. And all pedestrian and bicycle facilities are inherently accessible by everybody (as are roadways).

---

Education should be a component of social equity strategies. In addition, system design and system access is an equity issue. Socially and economically disadvantaged communities are often under serves and local facilities are less likely to exist or be of high standard in those communities.

---

Reaching out to disadvantaged community of all ethnic backgrounds voices matter.

---

One of the goals adopted from the CTP is to foster livable and healthy communities and promote social equity; how is health being addressed in this strategy or other strategies?

---

I can only recognize that as a relatively privileged person I have many blinders to many of these issues. I would suggest, as I have heard suggested by others more knowledgeable than I on this topic, to seek partnerships with existing organizations in the disadvantaged communities already involved in these or similar matters.

---

I'm not really sure what "social equity" means in this context. So much jargon in this survey.

---

Social equity is fine, but your over-riding objective is MOVING people. Make sure social equity investment isn't at the expense of investment in mitigating congestion...where the people are, or where the demonstrated interest and commitment is.

---

What does "social equity" mean? Just disadvantaged communities? Then it is not complete. See prior answers.

---

What a crock!

---

N/A

---

---

**SOCIAL EQUITY**

---

Please refer to previous set of comments.

---

need to have vouchers to help offset the costs of bikes

---

The community support and funding access strategies should include language about how they are dependent on the other. Their separation seems strange, as both strategies have to be heavily invested in.

---

Vague....very very Vague.

---

Wording is vague. People in disadvantaged communities often lack the time & resources to engage; find a way to compensate them for their costs (time, travel, etc.) so that they can engage. Keep track of input, so that people don't have to repeat the same input over & over. Disadvantaged communities often lack the resources to successfully compete for funding. Clarify, measure & report on progress toward disadvantaged communities achieving active transportation results that are equitable with our most advantaged communities.

---

To proactively assure that equity goals are met with specific community-level commitments--beyond mere planning platitudes--an appropriate strategy that might well be considered for the BPP would be to earmark at least 10% of all available funding for non-automotive public access modalities. Coupled with existing programs such as "Complete Streets" and "Safe Routes to Schools" such funding would address specific community needs. In many cases, this will likely mean provision of safe crossings, and fostering the perception of safety through project design, adequate patrol & maintenance of non-automotive facilities.

---

Access to Funding is huge.

---

Don't forget to force the rich to accept the plan too. They are the ones who will stand in the way. Try to find a safe bike lane in Beverly Hills.

---

The plan needs to strive for equity for all Californians. Bicycle and pedestrian travel is important in all areas of California, regardless of income.

---

Rural agencies struggle to receive funding to implement active transportation improvements. Our schools don't even have sidewalks, let alone can we afford bicycle lanes.

---

Good plan equity lens but how does it get funded?

---

Low income areas need to be able to use public transportation. They are the ones without cars. Many disabled people live in low income areas because they are on SSI. Seniors are a population that is also a high percentage of low income areas and not using cars. When areas are not able to be used with public transport, then those people have less options or have to remain housebound.

---

These are all incredibly important, but the first step should always be a seat at the table. There is a difference between subject matter expertise and assuming you know what everyone wants.

---

Nice things cost money. Only when society (and politicians) make it a priority with that change.

---

The state's definition of disadvantage for C&T, using CalEnviroScreen is too broad and results in more active transportation in communities with high pollution levels where being outside can be dangerous. Use definition set up for ATP instead.

---

There should be an "education" component, in multiple languages.

---

Cars on the street, bikes on the sidewalk. Problem solved.

---

Ideally all projects would have community involvement, Those that are disadvantaged may need incentives to get involved. It's tough to work 2 or 3 jobs, raise a family and go to meetings.

---

Support bike parks (BMX) in low income communities utilizing vacant lots.

---

---

## **SOCIAL EQUITY**

---

Most of our "social Equity" issues are rooted in the fact that since the 1940's California has built for cars not people. Aiming relatively small amounts of money at selected communities will not come close to fixing the problems. The laws have been changed to give states the option to fund streets and roads as "complete streets" for all transportation needs, including walking and bicycling. This section needs to be revised to reflect this change in thinking by the primary funder the federal government.

---

Social equity means having a variety of informational events and meetings that happen at different times of the day and evening, including Saturdays/Sundays when people have the opportunity to attend. Too many of these meetings are for agencies only or take place when most people are working.

---

Need of pedestrians, people who bicycle, and transit rides must be included in every project. EVERY project.

---

These strategies strongly suggest the state considers low income areas unworthy of the same quality transportation infrastructure as other areas. To the contrary, these areas require the same quality (perhaps superior quality) infrastructure as other communities. One need only briefly reflect on the cost of insurance, licensing, maintenance and fuel for a vehicle to understand how important other modes of transportation can be for these identified areas.

---

Concrete example questions would have been better.

---

Order: Equity Lens Community Support Access to Funding

---

Will this be meaningful collaboration, or just window dressing of Caltrans "meeting" with the public then doing what Caltrans wants?

---

Equal OPPORTUNITY, yes; but do not confuse this with equal OUTCOMES. Build and enable cycling/walking where it will be maximally utilized and provide the most value.

---

The decision to invest in disadvantaged communities should be a local decision.

---

Safe cycling routes will benefit communities of need. Equity lens and community support should be, at best, secondary considerations.

---

The equity lens is fairly well defined at this point. What needs work is the outreach so those communities know they have the opportunity to improve, and the funding outline. I know that some communities simply don't have the staffing power to even apply for those grants because they can't write the grant or get an engineering proposal out in time.

---

All of these are critically important.

---

What is a disadvantaged community? Could it include small cities that have few resources available to chase grant funding for bike/ped improvements?

---

Government is poor at fighting social equity issues.

---

Yes to all of these. People from these communities need to be involved in all levels of this project.

---

In Los Angeles City equitable funding is sabotaged again and again by the City Councilmember's for instance CM LaBonge and O'Farrell pushing through a Hyperion Bridge design that is missing a sidewalk on its southern side, this is a fatalities and serious injuries that are waiting to happen on a State and Federally funded bridge, CM Cedillo's canceling of the \$18 million North Figueroa project, CMs Koretz and Price's removal of bike lanes from the proposed Westwood Blvd and Central Avenue planning. All of these projects would have served disadvantaged communities.

---

Seems a little vague...

---

Why is community support different from access to funding

---

It seems important to build infrastructure everywhere, not just where there are "squeaky wheels" of connected and powerful bike and pedestrian advocates

---

---

**SOCIAL EQUITY**

---

I understand what the definitions of the elements of the Social Equity strategies mean, but without any concrete examples of how that will be achieved in the Inland Empire I cannot truthfully say that the Social Equite strategies are clear and understandable to me.

---

Everybody gets equal access to facilities near their homes. Some are more equal than others. This must be accounted for when constructing facilities.

---

"Disadvantaged" needs to be clearly defined. Am I disadvantaged if I lack a bicycle? Or if I lack a car?

---

Regional as well as social, environmental, and economic equity need to be equal factors. CalEnviroScreen misrepresents low income rural areas in equity analysis.

---

Have community member representatives on the advisory committee and/or conduct focus groups that include local residents (at each step/phase).

---

All communities should have EQUAL opportunities to participate in the creation and use of this infrastructure. So-called "disadvantaged communities should receive equal, not special treatment.

---

equity strategies that don't include design and planning?? how will equity lens be applied? what does access to funding mean? is this an off-the top funding consideration?

---

Regardless of the social standing of a community, all should be treated fairly. I think it is just as important to provide for the safety of someone who lives in a socially higher community as it is for us to think about those who live in a depressed community.

---

Emphasize disproportional impacts to disadvantaged communities by addressing existing deficiencies.

---

These statements are too broad to develop an opinion on.

---

Equity Lens could be more detailed.

---

"Address social equity when implementing all strategies from this plan"?

---

Any shift of resources from driving (which is expensive) to cycling/walking (which is inexpensive) should be seen as socially progressive.

---

While not PC, the most important Equity your Lens should focus on is equality of motorists and non-motorists. Regardless of race or economic status, all People in CA should be accommodated on public ROW. The job of moving this cultural needle is beyond Caltrans' ability as your vision is only through the motorists lens.

---

All communities should be treated "equally"

---

It is important that underserved and emerging segment needs be met, not just traditional/minority users

---

Transportation facilities must be applied equally everywhere not just in specific social and or economic conditions.

---

no comments

---

Also use education to empower disadvantaged communities to advocate on their own behalf.

---

What is social equity?

---

Social equity is a nonsensical phrase - designing and building quality infrastructure affects and serves all equally.

---

As a commuting cyclist, I feel "disadvantaged" and marginalized by the motorist community. I understand that I do not fall in the normal category of disadvantaged; I am white, 60, and higher income level.

---

I'm not sure you can apply an equity lens independent of seeking community support.

---

We must provide access to lower income communities.This can lift them out of poverty rather than pushing them out to somewhere else. Caltrans can be a leader in making this happen.

---

---

## **SOCIAL EQUITY**

---

Again, why is the focus only on separate "active transportation funding programs"? This State must be spending billions of dollars a year on transportation facilities, and every single one of them should be designed to be safe for active transportation users. Period. Especially in the disadvantaged communities.

---

I don't think a focus on "disadvantaged communities" is going to be beneficial, except at the expense of a larger, better picture. Don't focus merely on one group or region, or on one economic strata. Work on the whole state! Work for everyone, not just the ones who earn less money, and not just the ones that earn a lot of money. Additionally, the above "social equity strategies" are so vague as to be meaningless. Without better definition, these will become great wasters of your time and money.

---

These items express good intentions, but nothing happens without decisions and actions. The "Equity Lens" is the most actionable. The usual actors - Caltrans and the local and regional agencies - can include the Lens in their processes. But who are "disadvantaged communities"? Most are not entities with organization, power, influence, or resources. So, usually, others act on their behalf.

---

Equity Lens is not clear

---

Priority needs to go to DAC areas and funding as well. Funding also should allow for other necessary infrastructure as payoffs the project (led street lights, lid drainage improvement, etc)

---

Community support and Access work. Equity Lens is more like pushing just to be politically correct.

---

The Regional Transportation Commissions, the County Health Departments, and the City Governments should all be included in dispersing the goals and related access to funding.

---

Definition of equity lens is ambiguous

---

Too much jargon (equity lens?), ill-defined action statements

---

Please engage local district employees in this new vision

---

None

---

Keep affected communities involved.

---

Cap and trade dollars currently subsidizing electric cars should also be used to subsidize and build bicycle infrastructure and also subsidize bicycle commuting and underwriting regular and electric bike leases and purchases for commuters

---

Crimes against cyclists are a real concern in some isolated areas near compromised communities.

---

Cycling seems to be more prevalent in affluent areas. I believe because it's safer, more accessible, paths are better maintained, and there is more respect between vehicles and cyclists. Look around, the depressed areas appear to have more people struggling with obesity in both adults and children. - They could really use the exercise!!

---

Equity = access to resources

---

There is no true equity for rural counties. Access to funding has been controlled by the urban areas who have the all the votes and write all the rules.

---

not having to own a car = fewer transpo dollars spent. Bike/ped/transit is important for disadvantaged communities

---

If you achieve the prior connected network strategy then this is not necessary - it'll happen anyway.

---

Meetings, surveys, etc. and information about them should be made more open and easy to access for people and have clear indicators on how to engage and impact whatever discussion or impact is to be had.

---