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**Kate Fillin-Yeh** is Director of Strategy at NACTO, working on bike share, safety, and other policy issues. Kate has over a decade of experience in transportation policy and implementation. Prior to NACTO she worked at the New York City Departments of Transportation and of City Planning where she designed and implemented Citi Bike, the nation's largest and most heavily used bike share program. Also at NYCDOT, Kate was a lead author of Mayor de Blasio's Vision Zero Action Plan.

**Mayor Kendall W. Lane** was born and raised in Keene, New Hampshire. He graduated from Keene High School in 1965, graduated from The University of New Hampshire in 1969, and graduated from Boston University Law School in 1975. Kendall served in the United States Army from 1970 to 1973. He was admitted to the New Hampshire Bar in 1975 and practiced Law with his brother from 1975 to 2001, and became a sole practitioner in 2001 to present. He served in the New Hampshire Legislature from 1981 to 1984 and as delegate for the New Hampshire Constitutional Convention in 1984. Kendall has served as a City Councilor for the City of Keene from 1986 to 1993 and from 2007 to 2011, before being elected as Mayor.

**Tiffany Mannion** is the Bicycle Mayor in Keene, New Hampshire and the first Bicycle Mayor in the United States. She is a LAB Certified Cycling Instructor with a mayoral mission of getting more people on more bikes more often. Her two year term is focused on three areas identified as needs in the community: education, connection and creation. Since starting her bicycle blog and Instagram account in 2016, bellecycle, she has ridden over 5500 miles in seven different countries.

**Waffiyyah Murray** is a Philadelphia native with a love for walking and biking. She has a bachelor’s degree in Psychology from Temple University, and over fourteen years of experience working with different Philadelphia-based non-profit and community organizations. As Education Program Manager for the Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia, she worked with the City to support its Safe Route to School program, a national initiative promoting safety and physical activity in school age children through walking and biking.

Waffiyyah first arrived at oTIS as the Indego Community Coordinator, where she worked to connect communities to Indego programming and resources to ensure equitable access to Indego, the City of Philadelphia’s bike share system. In her current role as the Better Bike Share Partnership Program Manager, Waffiyyah works to address barriers to the use of bikeshare in low income communities and communities of color, and increase equitable access in bikeshare systems nationally.
Equity is achieved by intentionally, deliberately eliminating inequities and disparities adversely impacting marginalized people in a just and fair society. Equity is achieved when disadvantaged people have the opportunity to achieve optimal life outcomes, reach their full potential and no one is deprived from achieving their full potential due to their race, gender, sex, economic position or other socio-economic determinants. Equity is an answer to the historical and contemporary injustices experienced by people in a marginalized, disadvantaged position.

Equity ≠ Equality
Bicycle Equity is not the same as Bicycle Equality. Equality means everyone has access to the same resources. Equity, in contrast, means people receive resources based on their needs and their potential to benefit.

Distribution of Resources
Bicycle Equity requires the equitable, fair and just distribution of bicycle resources (funding, power, protected bike lanes, Divvy bike share stations, other transportation infrastructure, programs, services, etc.), prioritizing the communities and people who are in a disadvantaged position as those who should receive the most bicycle resources due their needing the most and their potential of benefiting the most.

Racism, Oppression & Privilege
Bicycle Equity necessitates the public acknowledgment of structural, institutional and systemic racism in our society and their role in creating bicycle inequity here in Chicago. Equity is a public, operational commitment to addressing, redressing and ultimately dismantling racism in a way which is direct and honest. Inequity experienced by some people is accompanied by unfair privilege for others who are not burdened by the same disadvantage and who benefit from a relative position of greater power than oppressed communities. Achieving bicycle equity requires the elimination of unfair privilege that has been gained via historical oppression and at the disadvantaged position of others.

Cycling as a Human Right
Bicycle Equity decrees the activity of cycling as a human right. Marginalized people have the human right to participate fully in the activity of cycling in Chicago, throughout the US and around the world. Disenfranchised people have the human right to fully enjoy the inherent personal and community benefits associated with the activity of cycling, especially as bicycle mode share increases at the local level. Disadvantaged people have the human right to engage in the activity of cycling in a manner which is safe and secure, free from the risk of interpersonal, vehicular or structural violence. People of color and low- to moderate-income people have the human right to fully access the complete range of mobility options, of their own free will accord, making the choice to safely and conveniently engage in cycling, walking, public transit, bike share, car share or driving.
Community Ownership
Bicycle Equity commands the ownership of the activity of cycling and bicycle advocacy as well as the broader transportation planning process move toward people who are the most adversely, disproportionately impacted by cycling inequities, healthcare inequities, unemployment, violence and the lack of mobility & livability in their communities. This shift in ownership creates meaningful opportunities for neighborhood residents to express an authentic voice in the decision-making process surrounding transportation infrastructure projects in their neighborhoods. Ownership at the community-level encourages respect for the needs, culture and history in neighborhoods. As a result of respecting neighborhoods and the people who live there, a greater level of engagement and investment from residents is achieved.

Diversity & Inclusion
Bicycle Equity demands a public commitment to intentional diversity and radical inclusion within the bicycle advocacy, transportation and urban planning sectors as well as the broader cycling community. Equity is the promise to reflect diversity in a way which is intentional, deliberate and operational. This means achieving real inclusion is something that is beyond the realm of normal effort and is the extra effort required to be inclusive of people who have traditionally been marginalized, disadvantaged and disenfranchised in our society.

Local Innovation
Bicycle Equity dictates the respect and recognition of local community leaders as national leaders, highlighting, elevating, energizing and investing in the bicycle organizing & advocacy work being done at the neighborhood level and their role in addressing problems at the national level.

Public Policy
Bicycle Equity compels the development and implementation of public policies and legislation designed to equitably direct bicycle resources where they are needed the most and where they will cause the most benefit.

Inequities, Disparities and an Equity Strategy
Inequities are the differences in life outcomes that are avoidable, remediable, unfair and unjust. Inequities are caused, in part, by social, economic, environmental conditions and the discriminatory, inequitable distribution of resources. Disparities are the differences in life outcomes among groups of people.

A bicycle equity strategy begins with, and operationalizes, an understanding of the root causes of cycling inequities. A bicycle equity strategy then works directly to eliminate avoidable inequities and disparities, requiring short- and long-term actions, particularly focusing on groups that have experienced major obstacles associated with socio-economic disadvantages as well as historical and contemporary injustices – people of color and low- to moderate-income people.

Bicycle Equity is the way forward to contribute to the creation of a society where we all participate, prosper and reach our full potential.
THE NEW MAJORITY
PEDALING TOWARDS EQUITY
Bicycling is on the rise across the U.S. Adults are capitalizing on the health and economic benefits of active transportation, while an increasing number of young people are forgoing drivers’ licenses to save money and embrace more walkable, bikeable lifestyles.

The new majority that elected a president — youth, women and people of color — is playing a key role in pedaling the country toward a more Bicycle Friendly America. These diverse communities are embracing bicycling at a high rate, redefining the face and trajectory of the bicycle movement and the way the nation addresses transportation. An increasingly powerful and growing constituency, previously underrepresented groups are cultivating new campaigns and bike cultures that address the needs, serve the safety and improve the health of all residents who ride — or want to ride. These new riders, leaders and organizations are making biking accessible and inviting to all Americans — while making the case for a safer and more equitable transportation system in communities nationwide.

For too long, many of these diverse populations have been overlooked by traditional organizations and transportation planners. In too many instances, people of color have been largely left out of transportation decision-making processes that have dramatically impacted their neighborhoods. Rising up in response to this disenfranchisement, new leaders are rallying against stark disparities in bicycling facilities — and safe streets. These organizations aren’t just engaging new communities in traditional campaigns, but opening new avenues of conversation — shifting the focus from bicycling itself to how bikes address the core everyday issues faced in their unique communities.

Red, Bike and Green chapters are using the bicycle as a means to address health, economic and environmental disparities that disproportionately affect the black community. In Los Angeles, Multicultural Communities for Mobility is working with immi-
grant worker populations, producing Spanish-language public service announcements and securing bike parking at a day laborer center. In Chicago, Girls Bike Club is making bicycling an integral part of the personal and social lives of young women of color. The Biking Public Project in New York City is giving voice to the often-invisible delivery bicyclist. And these are just a few examples.

But, while many communities are enjoying new opportunities because of the boom in bicycling, significant challenges persist in many underserved communities. While some residents of a city have access to a variety of transportation options, many communities of color in that same city are in transit deserts that lack safe streets for walking or biking. In fact, according to 2001 data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, compared to white bicyclists, the fatality rate was 23% higher for Hispanic and 30% higher for African-American riders.

To address these pressing issues, community groups are developing their own educational and advocacy material catering to the specific needs and cultural understandings of their members because of the lack of ability and interest of larger local, regional and national cycling advocacy to address these expressed needs. There are clear and potent opportunities for transportation planners, departments of transportation at all levels, bicycling advocates, and industry leaders to address the many issues highlighted by this new wave of grassroots leaders in a manner that advances the movement for transportation equity nationwide.

Safe infrastructure for biking will help bring the health, economic, and environmental benefits of biking to those who want to ride but don’t currently feel safe on the streets. These sorts of improvements along with the standardization of safe bike infrastructure design by the U.S. Department of Transportation and other agencies across the country are integral in implementing equitable access to safe infrastructure across jurisdictions.

This report showcases new data and analysis from the League of American Bicyclists and the Sierra Club, as well as compelling statistics and information that highlight the new face of biking in America.

THE FATALITY RATE FOR BICYCLISTS IS

- 23% higher for Hispanic than white bicyclists
- 30% higher for African-American than white bicyclists
Bicycling is an important form of transportation and recreation for a growing and diverse number of U.S. residents. In 2009 alone, African Americans took 461 million bike trips, Hispanics took 196 million bike trips, Asian Americans took 92 million bike trips and Native Americans took 91 million bike trips [1].

In fact, the fastest growth in bicycling is among the Hispanic, African American and Asian American populations. Between 2001 and 2009, those three groups grew from 16 to 23 percent of all bike trips in the U.S. [1]. Within those groups, the percent of trips taken by bike has grown much faster than in the white population (see chart I).

Diverse populations are commuting by bike, too. The average percent of commute trips by bike from 2006 to 2010 was higher for Native and Latino than white workers (see chart II) [2].

According to a September 2012 national poll by Princeton Survey Research Associates, 86% of people of color* and 82% of white respondents said they had a positive view of bicyclists [3].

**Chart I:**
Growth in the percent of all trips that are by bike (2001-2009) [1]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percent of All Bike Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFRICAN AMERICAN</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITES</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentage of People of Color* Who Have a Positive View of Bicyclists: 86%**

**Percentage of People of Color* Who Agree: 71%**

**Growth in Latino and Asian Bicycle Consumer Spending from 2000 to 2010: 43%**
According to the Outdoor Foundation, “road biking, mountain biking and BMX” was the second most popular outdoor activity for both Asian/Pacific Islanders and Hispanics (14% of respondents choosing it as their top activity) and third most popular for African Americans (10%) in 2010 [4].

In the PSRAI study, two-thirds of all Americans agreed with the statement: “My community would be a better place to live if bicycling were safer and more comfortable.” More than 30% of people of color said they “strongly agree” with that statement — 24% of white respondents said they “strongly agree” [3].

That support and interest in bicycling is showing up in the bike shops, too. According to the Gluskin Townley Group, between 2000 and 2010, the impact of Latino consumers grew 43%, Asian consumers 43% and African American consumers 12% — compared to 6% for white consumers [5].

In fact, the fastest growth in bicycling is among the Hispanic, African American and Asian American populations.

**CHART II: AVERAGE PERCENT OF COMMUTE TRIPS BY BIKE IN 2010**

* Note: The non-white category, as reported by PSRAI, is defined as Hispanics, African Americans, Asians, Native Americans, mixed or other race.
In Atlanta, leaders from bicycling organizations Red, Bike and Green, the Atlanta Bicycle Coalition, Metro Atlanta Cycling Club – alongside local bicycling councilmembers like Aaron Watson and Kwanzaa Hall – are working to ensure better access to bicycling infrastructure for all communities. One recent campaign surrounding the city’s historic Auburn Avenue successfully united neighbors, business leaders and advocates when the city overlooked the important African American corridor in the distribution of bike lanes. The petition not only forced planners to reconsider design plans for Auburn Avenue, but also re-focused funding in a new bicycling bill to improve infrastructure in low-income neighborhoods and communities of color.
Equitable access to safe infrastructure makes biking safer for those who are already riding and helps to get those who want to use a bike for transportation out on the streets. Unfortunately, there are still disparities in access to safe infrastructure for low-income and people of color communities across the country, including in cities like New York, Los Angeles, Washington, D.C., and many others [6].

One study in Portland, Ore. found that 60% of the population is interested in bicycling for transportation but is concerned about safety, and would try bicycling for transportation with better infrastructure [7].

Only 9% of Americans say they will ride on all roads and feel confident riding in traffic. Only 6% of women and 5% of African Americans feel confident riding on all streets with traffic.

However, 26% of people of color* said they’d like to ride more but worry about safety in traffic. The same was true for 19% of white respondents [3].

A strong and diverse majority of Americans say more bike lanes and trails would encourage them to ride more, including 60% of people of color* and 59% of those earning less than $30,000 per year [3].

It’s not just the polls that show that more people want to get out and ride — if they have access to infrastructure that makes them feel safe. In New Orleans, the installation of a bike lane on South Carrollton Street dramatically increased the number of diverse riders, including a 135% growth in youth, 115% rise in female and 51% increase in African American bicyclists [8].

In a national Princeton Survey Research Associates poll in March 2012, people of color were also more likely than whites to support more federal funding for sidewalks, bike lanes and bike paths, with 56% of people of color* and 44% of white respondents supporting increased investment for people who walk and bike [9].

Safe infrastructure for biking will help protect the communities that are already out there on their bikes, and enable those who want to ride to access the benefits of biking. In its capacity to ensure safety on the streets for everyone, the U.S. Department of Transportation should move forward to set design standards for safe bike infrastructure, and transportation agencies across the country should move forward to implement equitable access to safe infrastructure across their jurisdictions.

---

*Note: The non-white category, as reported by PSRAI, is defined as Hispanics, African Americans, Asians, Native Americans, mixed or other race.
ENGAGING NEW AMERICANS

Los Angeles is home to many Latino bicyclists who ride to work each day—but many of these riders are invisible. These “invisible” bicyclists, often without equipment like lights and helmets, ride out of economic necessity and come from immigrant or marginalized communities without access to safe bicycling education and disconnected from bike advocacy groups and resources. The formation of City of Lights (Cuidad de Luces), now know as Multicultural Communities for Mobility, is bridging the gap between the movements for Latino social justice and bicycle advocacy, bringing underrepresented immigrant bicyclists into the decision-making process and taking an active role in transforming the built environment in their neighborhoods to serve their transportation needs by becoming more bike-friendly.
Immigrants are twice as likely as US-born Americans to travel by bicycle. Those earning less than $35,000 and living in dense residential areas are more than 10 times as likely to travel by bike. Over four years, bicycle mode share among new immigrants drops from 1.8% to 0.4% — highlighting the importance of efforts to ensure bicycling remains a viable form of transportation for the health and greater mobility of these communities [10].

Data gathered by the Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition revealed that neighborhoods with the highest percentage of people of color had a lower distribution of bicycling facilities — and areas with the lowest median household income ($22,656 annually) were also the areas with the highest number of bicycle and pedestrian crashes [11].

According to the PSRAI poll, people of color* (39%) were more likely to indicate that “learning about safe riding skills” would increase their riding — far higher than white (20%) respondents [3]. In Minneapolis, for instance, 84% of participants in Cycles for Change “Learn to Ride” classes identify as immigrants — and 87% as people of color [12].

People of color* (47%) were also far more likely than whites (32%) to indicate that “plentiful, secure bike parking” would increase their bicycling. While 45% of those earning less than $30,000 per year, only 30% of those earning more than $75,000 per year indicate that bike parking would increase their riding [3]. A survey conducted by the Community Cycling Center in Portland, Ore., found that 57% of Hispanic respondents cited not having a safe place to store their bicycle as a barrier to bicycling [13].

People of color were also more likely than white respondents, in the PSRAI poll, to be encouraged by an active riding club or advocacy organization, including 36% of people of color* — compared to 21% of white respondents [3].

Events like CicLAvia in Los Angeles — with more than 150,000 participants on just a single day — are bringing communities together and uniting diverse bicycling cultures with open streets events that close roads to cars and open them to all forms of active transportation and recreation.

* Note: The non-white category, as reported by PSRAI, is defined as Hispanics, African Americans, Asians, Native Americans, mixed or other race.
GEARING UP THE NEXT GENERATION

In Chicago, the Girls Bike Club at West Town Bikes is changing the perception of biking in their community and getting more of their peers to hop on a bike for fun, building life skills and developing relationships with friends and their community. Working predominantly with underserved communities, bicycle co-ops and collectives like West Town Bikes are playing a key role in expanding the number and diversity of people who ride. Girls Bike Club was created by a group of female high school students participating in a summer apprenticeship who began meeting every week to form their own unique group. Creating a welcoming space within the often male-dominated shop atmosphere, the young women of color plan rides together, make jewelry from bike parts and even have time set aside for homework help – not only creating friendships, but also cultivating healthy lifestyles and job skills along the way.
The percentage of children walking or bicycling to school has dropped precipitously, from approximately 50% in 1969 to just 13% in 2009. Over the past 40 years, the percentage of children who are overweight and obese has grown to more than 33% [14].

This epidemic has hit hardest in communities of color: Close to 40% of Latino and African American children ages 2 to 19 are overweight or obese, compared to only 28% of white children [15].

89% of young adults — aged 18-29 — have a positive view of bicyclists and 75% agree that their community would be a better place to live if biking were safer and more comfortable [3].

Of all age groups, young adults (18-29) were the most likely (62%) to indicate that having “people to ride with” would increase their bicycling — nearly 20 percentage points above all other age categories [3].

African Americans were more than twice as likely as whites (38% vs 14%) to agree that their perception of bicyclists would improve if people on bikes represented a “broader cross section of Americans, such as women, youth and people of color” in their community [3].

In just its third year, the Youth Bike Summit drew 369 youth and adult attendees representing 23 states and four countries [16].

Young adults are pressing for better biking on college campuses: There are now 58 Bicycle Friendly Universities in 38 states [17].

* Note: The non-white category, as reported by PSRAI, is defined as Hispanics, African Americans, Asians, Native Americans, mixed or other race.
There are more than 6,000 restaurants in New York City that deliver food – and many of those deliveries arrive by bike. While present in great numbers on the streets, these riders are often overlooked by traditional bicycling advocates, bike counts, and transportation planners. The Biking Public Project is working to change that, expanding local bicycling advocacy discussions by reaching out to underrepresented bicyclists around New York City including women, people of color, and delivery bicyclists. The group has worked with NYC Department of Transportation to distribute bike safety equipment and material, as well as elevating visibility with a Bike Portrait Project that’s putting a face on the full diversity of bicyclists in New York, whether riding to an office at 9 a.m. or pedaling from a restaurant for a late-night delivery.
Bicycling is an increasingly important mode of transportation, with bike commuting rising 47% nationwide between 2000 and 2011. From 2007 to 2011, the number of women commuting to work by bike grew by 56% [2]. That growth was significantly higher in the largest Bicycle Friendly Communities, rising 80 percent over that same timeframe [18].

The nation’s poorest families spend the highest portion of their income on their commute, spending more than 40% of take home pay on getting to work. Nationally, the average family with an income less than $50,000 spends 28% of its annual income on housing — and 30% on transportation [19].

The annual cost of owning and operating a bicycle is $308 compared to $8,220 for the average car [20].

Residents earning less than $30,000 per year accounted for 28% of bike trips in 2009 — more than 1.1 billion bike trips overall [1].

Black and Latino male workers are the most likely to work non-day shifts — 28.2% and 22.5% respectively — often commuting during the off-peak hours of public transit schedules that are vulnerable to cuts due to inadequate budgets, if off-peak service exists at all. For these individuals and many others, bicycling provides a viable mode of transportation [21].

However, many communities are still disenfranchised from new public resources that make biking more accessible and convenient, including the growing number of bicycle sharing systems. Memberships in these systems are still overwhelmingly white — including 90% of Denver B-cycle members (2011) and 77% of Capital Bikeshare members in Washington, D.C. a majority minority city (2012). Ensuring that safe infrastructure reaches all communities, especially those communities who rely on bikes and public transit to meet their transportation needs, is essential.

Building better integrated bicycling and multimodal networks provides opportunities to reduce transportation costs and close gaps in job access for low-income families and individuals.

30% 56% $308

*Note: The non-white category, as reported by PSRAI, is defined as Hispanics, African Americans, Asians, Native Americans, mixed or other race.*
From higher rates of obesity to a greater prevalence of heart disease, African American communities suffer disproportionate health burdens across the United States. With a mission to “promote an appreciation of bicycling and its beneficial impact on health issues affecting those communities disproportionately affected by health disparities,” the National Brotherhood of Cyclists and many Major Taylor groups around the country are working to change that. Several Major Taylor clubs share beginnings in local health initiatives or health-related events. The Minneapolis Major Taylor Bicycling Club got its start when a group of black women looking to train for a local AIDS Ride approached two local black bicyclists, who found that more members of the African American community were interested in bicycling for reasons beyond just transportation. Members of the club work with city officials to inform health improvement and engagement strategies, while ensuring that people of color are involved in efforts around bicycling events and the city’s bikeshare program.
Infrastructure that helps people feel safe on the roads and get out biking can also have an impact on air quality, which is an important factor for good health. Currently, one in three children and more than 127 million Americans live in areas where air pollution levels are sometimes dangerous, meaning asthma attacks, hospital visits, and premature mortality [22].

Cars and trucks are a major source of this health-threatening pollution, particularly in urban areas with lots of traffic and few transportation options [23]. Low-income and people of color communities are disproportionately impacted by this pollution as busy roads pass through these communities [24].

Biking has well-established health benefits — as a part of an active lifestyle, biking can lower incidence of obesity, diabetes, and heart and lung disease, as well as health care costs.

One study in Nebraska discovered that for every dollar invested in trails, there was a medical costs savings of nearly three dollars [25].

A 2012 study by Quality Bicycle Products showed that its $45,000 investment in a robust bicycle commuting program resulted in more than $200,000 in employee healthcare cost savings [26].

Moving short trips from cars to walking, bikes, or transit is key to significantly reduce this air pollution, and part of making this shift possible is to have accessible infrastructure that makes people feel safe walking and biking on their streets.

CONCLUSION

Biking is on the rise across the country, especially among youth, women, and people of color. And, even more people want to get on their bikes and ride. Better, safer infrastructure, like dedicated street space including bike lanes and cycle tracks, means more people feel comfortable riding a bike and are therefore better able to access jobs, their communities, and the health benefits of bicycling.

But this issue is bigger than bike lanes. As the national demographic map shifts, so too is the way people are reaching places of work, school and play. This reality presents both an opportunity and challenge to ensure that bicycling is not just a safe transportation option, but also a multi-layered solution for communities burdened by significant social, health and wealth inequalities. The opportunity: The demand and interest in efficient transportation alternatives are increasing in the face of rising gas prices, public transit costs and sprawl. The challenge: Level the playing field when it comes to access to safe, efficient and well connected bike travel for all communities.

The time to prioritize equity is now – or risk marginalizing the new majority.

*Note: The non-white category, as reported by PSRAI, is defined as Hispanics, African Americans, Asians, Native Americans, mixed or other race.*
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AT THE INTERSECTION of Active Transportation and Equity

Joining Forces to Make Communities Healthier and Fairer
Section II: Transportation Inequities in America

INFRASTRUCTURE FOR BICYCLING

Bicycle friendly infrastructure is also harder to find in low-income areas. In Chicago, for example, the affluent north side of the city features significant bicycle-friendly infrastructure, including protected bike lanes and bike sharing stations, while neighborhoods in the south and southwest have hardly any protected bike lanes and no bike sharing stations.\(^{111}\) Similarly, in Los Angeles, data gathered by the Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition revealed that neighborhoods with the highest percentage of people of color had a lower distribution of cycling facilities.\(^{111}\) New York City’s bicycle network “is currently most built out in the city’s wealthiest neighborhoods.”\(^{112}\) Although similar disparities are found in other cities across the country,\(^{113}\) this pattern is not universal.

“The number of injured pedestrians, cyclists, and motor vehicle occupants would be greatly reduced in the poorest neighborhoods if intersections in these areas were similar to those in the wealthiest neighborhoods.”

Study of traffic injuries in Montreal, Canada\(^{114}\)

COMFORT AND ATTRACTION OF NEIGHBORHOOD ENVIRONMENT

Whether a walking or bicycling experience is pleasant, safe, and comfortable is affected by the neighborhood environment. When someone drives through a neighborhood, they pass through quickly, in a contained vehicle, without experiencing the small details. In contrast, a person walking or bicycling experiences the neighborhood differently, and is much more affected by small factors that influence their comfort and enjoyment.

Some low-income residential neighborhoods have been blighted by years of neglect, poverty, and lack of investment, compared to well-kept wealthier neighborhoods with tree-lined streets. Abandoned buildings and cars, litter, graffiti, and broken streetlights and windows create an environment that is unwelcoming to walking and bicycling.\(^{115}\) Not only is this level of blight physically unpleasant, but it signals that “no one really cares about or regulates” the public space, contributing to safety concerns and discouraging active transportation.\(^{116}\) One study of a project to clean, maintain, and create urban green space in vacant lots showed that these changes decreased stress in residents and increased physical activity, while also leading to lower levels of violent crime.\(^{117}\) In fact, stress responses were lower simply in response to walking in view of a greened vacant lot.\(^{118}\)

Other low income neighborhoods may not be blighted, but may simply lack many of the amenities that make a walking or bicycling experience actively pleasant—things like regular shade trees, landscaping strips that provide a buffer between someone walking and cars passing by, attractive yards to admire, seating to stop and rest, concealed locations for garbage cans and recycling, tended pedestrian access to nearby trails, and so on. Instead, a walk in these neighborhoods may be characterized by an abundance of concrete, gaudy signs advertising unhealthy products, parking lots and shopping strips interspersed among houses, and other features that may be unpleasant for walking.

AIR POLLUTION

When low-income people and people of color do walk and bicycle for transportation, they are far more likely to be subjected to unhealthy air along the way.\(^{119}\) Due to land costs and historical discrimination, refineries, coal plants, and other industrial facilities that spew toxins into the air are often sited near poor residential areas—but rarely, if ever, near wealthy ones. Study after study has found clear correlations between income, ethnicity, and the degree of pollution in the environment.\(^{120}\) The greater the concentration of Latinos, Asian Americans, African Americans, or poor residents in an area, the more likely that potentially dangerous compounds such as vanadium, nitrates and zinc are in the mix of fine particles they breathe.\(^{121}\)

“Children asthma is rampant in Clairton [a town in Pennsylvania that is home to U.S. Steel Clairton Coke Works], but a lot of families in the hardscrabble town don’t have medical coverage. In some homes, the whole family shares a single inhaler.”

Tom Hoffman
Western Pennsylvania Director, Clean Water Action\(^{120}\)
In fact, African Americans are 79 percent more likely than whites to live in neighborhoods where industrial air pollution poses high health dangers, and are three times more likely to die from asthma than whites. Living in a majority white neighborhood is associated with lower air pollution exposures, whereas Latino communities had the highest air pollution exposure levels.

“Evidence suggests that not only do people get hospitalized but they die at higher rates in areas with significant air pollution.”

Dr. John Brofman
Director of Respiratory Intensive Care
at MacNeal Hospital, Berwyn, Illinois.

Areas along major roads and highways are also exposed to higher levels of pollution. Traffic-related pollution most affects those within about 300 to 500 meters of a major road or highway. Studies have shown that people of color are also more likely to live within close proximity (150 meters) to major highways, putting them at higher risk of exposure to traffic-related pollution and resulting in higher rates of respiratory and cardiovascular diseases. A study in Portland showed that small detours of one block to lower-volume roadways significantly reduce pollution concentrations.

Further, the polluted air that low-income people and people of color are more likely to breathe, when they do walk and bicycle for transportation, takes a heavy toll on their health. Exposure to unhealthy air is linked to asthma, bronchitis, and cancer, and worsens existing lung and heart disease, all of which disproportionately affects poor people and people of color.

“People do not want to walk because they fear for their safety. They see drugs, gangs, dogs.”

Community Leader

Disparate Experiences Discourage Walking and Bicycling

In addition to the inequities described above, residents of low-income communities and communities of color often have negative experiences which discourage walking and bicycling. In this section, we describe some of the factors that can inequitably affect the experience of walking and bicycling: crime, racial profiling, harassment, slurs, micro aggressions, and discriminatory treatment by drivers, all of which are most likely to affect low-income people and people of color, potentially discouraging them from walking and bicycling or making those activities stressful, unpleasant, or dangerous.

“Modesto Sanchez told lawmakers of the Massachusetts Legislature about the day he and his friend rode their bikes down the street on which Sanchez lived, only to be stopped and frisked within minutes by Boston police officers. One officer asserted, ‘People in your hood ride bikes to shoot people.’ Modesto, who was 16 years old at the time, and his friend were found to be doing nothing wrong. Embarrassed, shocked, and hurt, Modesto asked for an explanation. The officer responded, ‘We had to stop you. You look suspicious.’”

Nusrat Choudhury
“People in Your Hood Ride Bikes to Shoot People”
Racial Profiling

People of color are also at higher risk of getting harassed by law enforcement while bicycling or walking than their white counterparts. Like the experience of “driving while black,” people of color are similarly targeted by police for “bicycling while black” or “walking while black.” Stop and frisk policies are centered around police officers’ stops of people walking. Many or most incidents of racial profiling and police brutality begin while someone is walking or bicycling, although the interference with transportation is rarely highlighted if and when the incident becomes public.

Stories of being stopped and harassed abound. New York City’s extensive and controversial stop and frisk program, the subject of court orders, involved more stops of black youth and men (168,000) in 2011 than the total city population of black men in that age range (158,000). In Chicago, in the summer of 2014, police made more than 250,000 stops that did not lead to arrest – making stops at a rates four times as often per capita as New York at the height of its stop and frisk policies. A full 72 percent of stops were of African Americans, though they constitute only 32 percent of the city’s population. The stops are most likely in communities of color, but are particularly likely to target African Americans in white neighborhoods.

Although not addressed in many analyses of racial profiling, youth and adults of color on bicycles are frequently singled out for particular attention by stop and frisk practices. Bicycle laws, such as registration requirements, sidewalk riding prohibitions, and helmet laws, are often discriminatorily enforced. For example, in Tampa, Florida, 80 percent of bicycle tickets given by police are to African Americans, who make up 25 percent of the population. Officers are encouraged to use these minor violations as an excuse to stop and search anyone they can in low-income black neighborhoods, even though 80 percent of the stops identify no criminal activity. In white neighborhoods, few tickets are given for bicycling infractions, and when tickets are given, it is often to individuals who are black. A similar situation exists in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, where an investigation found that 86 percent of tickets given for riding an unregistered bike were given to African Americans (who make up 31 percent of the population), while hardly any such tickets were issued in predominantly white or touristic sections of the city. Not only were people of color targeted for ticketing but in some incidents their bikes were confiscated, leaving them stranded.

Such patterns are found throughout the United States. In New York City, a study showed that 12 of the 15 neighborhoods with the most citations for riding on sidewalks were predominantly Latino or African American, while 14 of the 15 with the fewest were primarily white. In Dallas, Texas, an analysis showed that, excluding downtown, 96 percent of citations under a bicycle helmet law took place in census tracts with majority population of color. In 2006, a federal appeals court found enough evidence to go to trial in a case alleging that police were discriminatorily seizing the bicycles of black teens and targeting them for harassment when they rode through the white Detroit suburb of Eastpointe.

“[Stop and frisk] reduces your self-confidence. It’s no different than getting robbed. Getting put up against a wall, it’s no different than someone stealing your stuff. It can be traumatizing. For the police, they let you go, it’s no harm, no foul. But it can make children feel the community has given up on their chance to be successful.”

Gemar Mills
Principal of Malcolm X Shabazz High School, Newark, New Jersey

Harassment, Slurs, and Micro Aggressions

Racial micro aggressions are brief verbal or nonverbal communications that convey racial slights or hostility (intentionally or not) to a person of color. Many people of color experience such indignities while walking and bicycling. Examples include white pedestrians crossing the street to avoid walking by a person of color, white pedestrians markedly ignoring a person when passing on the sidewalk, and similar encounters. Lawrence Otis Graham, an African American lawyer and father, recently wrote about the effects on his 15-year-old son of having two adult white men in a car stop him and call him a racial slur while he was walking by himself in a leafy suburb near his boarding school. His son was frightened and hurt, but white school administrators minimized the incident, characterizing it as an unfortunate one-time event that should simply be forgotten. Yet the longer-term effects on the teen meant he no longer made eye contact with others when out walking, did not want to walk anywhere unaccompanied, and felt “vulnerable and resentful” whenever he had to walk somewhere by himself. Whether an isolated incident or a regular occurrence, this type of experience can create a hostile environment for walking and bicycling.
The Consequences of Inadequate Infrastructure

A heartbreaking news story in 2011 involved Raquel Nelson, a mother of three in Atlanta, Georgia, who was prosecuted for jaywalking and vehicular homicide after her 4-year-old son A.J. was struck by a car and killed when they were crossing the street. A.J.’s death occurred when the family was hit by an intoxicated hit and run driver while they were crossing a large arterial.106 The family had just gotten off the bus after a grocery shopping trip. Although their apartment building was directly across the street from the bus stop, the nearest crosswalk was three-tenths of a mile away, requiring an additional walk of more than half a mile with groceries and small children. Instead, like everyone else who had gotten off the bus, they crossed to the median to wait for a break in the traffic. Her son pulled out of her hand to cross when others ran ahead and was hit by an oncoming car.

Poor urban planning and a failure to provide for the needs of public transit riders caused A.J.’s death. But prosecutors charged and convicted Nelson of vehicular homicide for jaywalking. Nelson, an African American college student and working mother, was convicted by an entirely white jury without a single member who had ever relied on public transit for transportation.107 After a national outcry and appeals, most of the charges were eventually dropped.108

Effects of Transportation Inequities

The overall effects of the transportation inequities set out here are to discourage poor people and people of color from using active transportation. People are less inclined to walk and bicycle if there is little or no pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly infrastructure, the traffic is intimidating, they are worried about crime and micro aggressions or about harassment from officers, the air is polluted, and many destinations are located far away.132

At the same time, the United States has experienced an enormous increase in obesity, with low-income people and Latinos and African Americans suffering the highest rates.158 Obesity is linked to many serious diseases, including hypertension, multiple cancers, and type 2 diabetes. And children of color suffer the highest obesity rates of all, constituting “ground zero” of the obesity epidemic.159 The need to act in support of active transportation and equity is clear.

“[I’ve walked down the block from where I live and had a white woman cross the street and go to the other side and continue up.]”

22-year-old African American female participant in micro aggressions study156

DISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT BY DRIVERS

The effects of conscious and unconscious prejudice affect the safety and convenience of pedestrians of color in other ways as well. One small study sought to understand whether discriminatory treatment by drivers might bear some responsibility for higher pedestrian injury and fatality rates for people of color.156 Researchers found that there were significant differences in driver behavior to white and black pedestrians, with twice as many cars passing African Americans in crosswalks without stopping, and a 32 percent longer wait time. Further research is warranted, not only to better understand whether the same results are seen in different environments and regions, but also to explore whether similar behavior affects pedestrians who appear to be poor or homeless. Street infrastructure that signals more aggressively to drivers that stopping for pedestrians is not optional may assist in overcoming discriminatory treatment, but will likely only diminish it rather than remove it.
Gentrification and Active Transportation

A core topic related to active transportation and equity involves gentrification and displacement – the concern that new walkable neighborhoods, bicycle lanes, and transit-oriented development will lead to displacement of existing residents in low- to moderate-income neighborhoods. Will new bike lanes or even improved sidewalks make neighborhoods desirable to upper-income demographics, leading to significant changes to the community? Will the housing opportunities created by new developments be affordable to everyone who wants to live there, including long-time residents?

This issue often comes to the fore around new bike lanes. Many low-income communities perceive a bike lane as a symbol of gentrification, not as a tangible benefit to the neighborhood. This can come as a surprise to active transportation advocates, who see safety improvements and health benefits for local residents.
Gentrification and Displacement

The terms “gentrification” and “displacement” are often used interchangeably, but they can be distinguished as two different but related events that occur in communities as they become more attractive places to live. Gentrification refers to the process of communities changing socially and economically, typically with new residents and businesses moving into areas that were economically depressed or were home to industrial or other land uses incompatible with residential living. This can cause the culture of a community to change, leading some older residents to no longer feel at home. Displacement is the physical relocation of existing residents who lived in these communities, often because rents and the overall cost of living increases as these communities become more popular. In some cases, old apartment buildings and businesses are bought out by developers and converted into higher-rent units or storefronts, which forces existing residents out. Gentrification can cause displacement, but there is considerable debate about whether displacement occurs in all circumstances of gentrification.

Gentrification and displacement are products of large economic and social forces. After decades of neglect and disinvestment in urban areas, the new resurgence of urban living has drawn in development dollars, political interests, and a shifting kaleidoscope of interests. Mayors and young professionals see the economic growth, vibrant city life, and development activity as a sign of improvement. But from the perspective of local residents who have lived in underinvested areas, street infrastructure improvements can indicate rising rents and displacement. Bike lanes and improvements to sidewalks and crosswalks often signal that the community has gotten the attention of elected officials and developers as a “hot” neighborhood worth investing more public dollars in, and so current residents don’t see these features as a socially valuable investment intended to benefit them. But residents’ concerns about displacement are coupled with a desire to see and direct meaningful investments in their neighborhoods. Low-income residents want to see their communities flourish. Active transportation advocacy may not be driving displacement – but street infrastructure investments are a factor in a larger struggle for control over neighborhoods.

Gentrification and displacement also arise in conjunction with transit improvements. For the first time in decades, many regions are investing in upgrading their public transportation systems with modern technology like light rail and bus rapid transit. Transit investments can provide a significant boost to economic development and revitalize urban neighborhoods through what is known as “transit-oriented development” or TOD. Compact, mixed-use development creates an environment where walking and bicycling are safe and convenient ways to get around, which results in a greater demand for it. Yet transit and TOD can also have negative effects on surrounding neighborhoods, especially low-income communities. Greater demand for living in these neighborhoods can lead to the displacement of existing low-income residents and small businesses as rents increase, and low-income residents can experience other negative effects such as the elimination of bus routes that overlap with new transit lines and the shifting of resources away from communities farther from transit.

So what can be done? Real community engagement can go a long way toward avoiding a negative reaction to new active transportation investments. People want to see improvements that relate to the problems they experience in their neighborhoods, and they want to feel like the improvements are intended to benefit them. By bringing planning processes to churches, community centers, schools, senior centers, and street corners, planners and active transportation advocates can work with community members to develop proposals that meet local needs. In addition, active transportation proponents need to be involved in local communities and engage with concerns articulated by the community, particularly around affordable housing efforts. For those working in the space of equity and active transportation, affordable housing and anti-displacement efforts are a core part of the work.

Debates over Gentrification’s Effects

A recent Slate article claimed that gentrification was a “myth,” that it typically bypasses low-income neighborhoods with a high concentration of poverty, and that it generally leaves residents better off than they were before. The article created an intense debate online, demonstrating how sensitive the issue has become for many communities. An article in The Atlantic focusing on the economic revitalization of Minneapolis was countered a few days later in the same publication, with the rebuttal claiming the city’s gentrification only benefited a certain slice of the population.
**Addressing Crime, Fear of Crime, and Racial Profiling**

Crime and fear of crime create an environment that is hostile to walking and bicycling and detrimental to community well-being. Traditionally, crime has been considered primarily a safety issue for law enforcement to address. In recent years, however, there has been increasing recognition that crime is not just a safety issue; addressing crime is also a critical to public health and to successfully promoting healthy living, healthy eating, and active transportation efforts. Nor can crime be effectively addressed by police alone. Thus, community leaders are bringing together advocates, researchers, nonprofit and government agencies, and other stakeholders from many sectors. These stakeholders are coming together to take a comprehensive approach to crime—an approach that supplements traditional enforcement measures with prevention measures that aim to reduce the likelihood of crime happening in the first place.275

"Advocates in the field of healthy eating and active living have pivotal roles to play—recognizing the impact of violence, raising their voices to broaden advocacy efforts, and undertaking cross-cutting strategies to help eliminate the causes of violence and chronic disease."  

Prevention Institute276

Such a strategy involves engaging government agencies, youth, schools, businesses, and others to create opportunities to build community, provide alternatives to crime, and develop a more positive physical environment.277,278 This type of holistic approach, along with progressive police initiatives such as community policing, not only reduces violence but also helps achieve transportation equity by creating safer places for low-income people to walk and bicycle.

Making neighborhoods safer directly supports the use of active transportation; conversely, active transportation programs and infrastructure also improve safety. Everything from bike paths and bike parking to traffic calming measures and better sidewalks helps get more people out and about, and thus helps create a safer environment—especially when the infrastructure is designed with crime reduction in mind.279

Addressing racial profiling and police brutality are also crucial objectives related to equity and crime prevention. As discussed in the opening sections of this report, people of color and low-income individuals are exposed to racial profiling by police as well as vigilantes while walking and bicycling. Addressing this reality requires a multipronged approach that takes on unfair policing practices, community habits that contribute to profiling, and the potential complacency of white active transportation proponents. One arena for collaboration is in advocacy for the removal of unnecessary laws imposing requirements on bicycling. Because local bicycling restrictions vary widely and often are not based on sound evidence of safety or other benefits, such laws can discourage bicycling or impose unnecessary barriers, while also giving police an ever-present excuse to stop riders of color. Avoiding the imposition of burdensome or unnecessary laws on bicycling—not to mention other unnecessary laws—may assist in reducing racial profiling of riders of color. The Detroit-based story in the sidebar provides an example of how and why to work on such issues.

The Safe Routes to School National Partnership has produced a report on violence prevention and Safe Routes to School efforts. The report, Taking Back the Streets and Sidewalks: How Safe Routes to School and Community Safety Initiatives Can Overcome Violence and Crime, catalogues how Safe Routes to School programs have been structured to protect children from crime and decrease violence in communities, discusses related and more distant violence prevention initiatives, and highlights opportunities for greater partnership between safe routes proponents and violence prevention advocates.

"One of the things we created, and are launching as a non-profit right now, is a bike depot in a low-income community...It’s had a big impact [in] improving the feeling of safety on the street. It has also gotten more people out volunteering, working with kids, as well as bicycling in the community. It helped balance things out—people feel safer."

From Prevention Institute’s Addressing the Intersection: Preventing Violence and Promoting Healthy Eating and Active Living280
BUILDING EQUITY

Race, ethnicity, class, and protected bike lanes: An idea book for fairer cities

A report from PeopleForBikes and Alliance for Biking & Walking
Like so many Americans, many middle-class Black people see biking as transportation of last resort. In Denver, Councilman Albus Brooks is turning his peers on to the fact that biking in protected lanes tends to make you happy.

Fully converted to the idea that making biking a mainstream activity would be a huge boon to his city, its businesses and its residents alike, Brooks rode his bike to a meeting of other Black community leaders. 

So the councilman decided to do something about it. He started planning a series of rides that would get Denver’s Black leaders pedaling—on streets made temporarily comfortable by blocking car traffic completely.

“Greenway culture is a very American idea,” Brooks said. “In America, we make space for the cars, and we block the people. We need to shift to the people. To the public good.”

So when he got home Brooks, 35, went to a Denver shop and bought his first bike, a Danish-style city bike. Though he was back to his politician’s grind of late meetings and urgent calls, he discovered the physical sensation of happiness lingered.

“It’s just amazing what happens when you’re active,” Brooks said. “It’s after work, going to have a beer, and it’s going to ride and clear my mind. It’s almost like I found a whole new life.”

The reaction fit a familiar, false stereotype: that Black people don’t bike. But Brooks’ awkward moment did tap a deep truth about transportation in the United States: In communities where car ownership isn’t taken for granted (see chart), driving can be a particularly important source of pride and status—and choosing not to drive can be stigmatized. “These are people who don’t really see biking as an advantage for getting around downtown, or an economic advantage, or an advantage for health,” Brooks said.

He’s betting that a taste of low-stress biking will open their eyes, too, to the ways that comparatively cheap investments in comfortable riding could bring more health and happiness to many thousands of Denverites.

“People who walk and bike have a great role in the community,” Brooks said. “They’re engaging in social, economic, and political activity. They’re a sign of what our city can be.”

Like so many Americans, many middle-class Black people see biking as transportation of last resort. In Denver, Councilman Albus Brooks is turning his peers on to the fact that biking in protected lanes tends to make you happy.
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BRINGING JOY TO DAILY LIFE

Like so many Americans, many middle-class Black people see biking as transportation of last resort. In Denver, Councilman Albus Brooks is turning his peers on to the fact that biking in protected lanes tends to make you happy.

Albus Brooks had never owned a bike before joining a PeopleForBikes study tour of Copenhagen’s protected bike lanes. By the time he headed home, the Denver city councilman knew those days were over. “We biked every day, so I found myself, on a personal point, increasingly happy,” Brooks says, laughing. “I was a very happy person by the end of that trip.”

So when he got home Brooks, 35, went to a Denver shop and bought his first bike, a Danish-style city bike. Though he was back to his politician’s grind of late meetings and urgent calls, he discovered the physical sensation of happiness lingered. “It’s just amazing what happens when you’re active,” Brooks said. “It’s after work, going to have a beer, and it’s going to ride and clear my mind. It’s almost like I found a whole new life.”

Fully converted to the idea that making biking a mainstream activity would be a huge boon to his city, its businesses and its residents alike, Brooks rode his bike to a meeting of other Black community leaders.

Fully converted to the idea that making biking a mainstream activity would be a huge boon to his city, its businesses and its residents alike, Brooks rode his bike to a meeting of other Black community leaders. There he got a first-hand lesson in the size of the task he had decided to tackle.

“So the councilman decided to do something about it. He started planning a series of rides that would get Denver’s Black leaders pedaling—on streets made temporarily comfortable by blocking car traffic completely.”

“He’s betting that a taste of low-stress biking will open their eyes, too, to the ways that comparatively cheap investments in comfortable riding could bring more health and happiness to many thousands of Denverites.”

“‘The old-school of thinking was, let’s just build around the car,’ Brooks said. ‘I want to build our city around people. Around diverse interests and individuals in our city—not around vehicles.’

The reaction fit a familiar, false stereotype: that Black people don’t bike. But Brooks’ awkward moment did tap a deep truth about transportation in the United States: In communities where car ownership isn’t taken for granted (see chart), driving can be a particularly important source of pride and status—and choosing not to drive can be stigmatized. “These are people who don’t really see biking as an advantage for getting around downtown, or an economic advantage, or an advantage for health,” Brooks said.

So when he got home Brooks, 35, went to a Denver shop and bought his first bike, a Danish-style city bike. Though he was back to his politician’s grind of late meetings and urgent calls, he discovered the physical sensation of happiness lingered.

“It’s just amazing what happens when you’re active,” Brooks said. “It’s after work, going to have a beer, and it’s going to ride and clear my mind. It’s almost like I found a whole new life.”

So the councilman decided to do something about it. He started planning a series of rides that would get Denver’s Black leaders pedaling—on streets made temporarily comfortable by blocking car traffic completely.

“We’re going to go on cultural rides where we block off a couple miles of streets and try to introduce to leaders in the community what bike infrastructure is all about,” Brooks says.

Share of U.S. Households Without Motor Vehicles, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Share of U.S. Households Without Motor Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race/ethnicity is that of the household who took the survey.
Here’s a problem in U.S. bike infrastructure policy: We talk too much about Europeans.

For all the lessons Northern Europe’s cities have to share, focusing only on them obscures the broad appeal of protected lanes and other great bikeways.

The American advocates in this report are offering local responses to a global problem: how to fairly divide public space among private vehicles.

These stories from three continents show how universal these problems are—and suggest what large-scale change can look like.

It’s no coincidence that one of the core ideas of transportation equity emerged from Bogotá.

For decades, Colombia’s cities have been among the most unequal in Latin America. By the 1990s, a fifth of the population of the country’s capital was living in informal settlements near the urban periphery. Average daily commutes from these clandestinos took two and a half hours and required transfers among multiple informal transit services. The buses of the poor sat in streets clogged by the 22 percent of Bogotá’s population who owned cars.

Cars parked without restriction on sidewalks. A tiny fraction of a percent of the population commuted by bicycle.

Facing that situation, a pair of young Bogotano politicians began to make an interesting argument: if everyone is equal under the law, then public road space should be distributed to everyone equally.

“A city could find oil or diamonds underground, and it would not be as valuable as road space,” Enrique Penalosa, one of the politicians, explained in 2013. “A bus with 80 passengers has a right to 80 times more road space than a car with one.”

A pair of young Bogotano politicians began to make an interesting argument: if everyone is equal under the law, then public road space should be distributed equally.

A 2011 survey found that 53 percent of ciclorutas users were in lowest third of the country by socioeconomic status.

Bogotá raised its gas tax, restricted rush-hour car use, banned sidewalk parking, and enlarged ciclovías, the open-street events that clear city streets of cars on Sundays. Because the new rapid bus lines were popular, land prices rose nearby, but the city’s Metrovivienda program also created transit-oriented, income-restricted housing for working-class residents.

In the years that followed, biking rose to 4 percent of trips, one of the highest rates in South America. Citywide commute times fell 34 percent. Traffic fatalities fell 88 percent. A 2011 survey found that 53 percent of ciclovías users were in lowest third of the country by socioeconomic status.

Bogotá’s inequalities remain deep. But the principle they inform has spread around the world.

“A citizen on a $30 bicycle,” Penalosa says, “is equally important as one in a $30,000 car.”
PROTECTED LANES FOR EQUITY:
THE GLOBAL MOVEMENT
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It’s no coincidence that one of the core ideas of transportation equity emerged from Bogotá.

For decades, Colombia’s cities have been among the most unequal in Latin America. By the 1990s, a fifth of the population of the country’s capital was living in informal settlements near the urban periphery. Average daily commutes from these clandestinos took two and a half hours and required transfers among multiple informal transit services. The buses of the poor sat in streets clogged by the 22 percent of Bogotá’s population who owned cars.

Cars parked without restriction on sidewalks. A tiny fraction of a percent of the population commuted by bicycle.

Facing that situation, a pair of young Bogotano politicians began to make an interesting argument: if everyone is equal under the law, then public road space should be distributed to everyone equally. “A city could find oil or diamonds underground, and it would not be as valuable as road space,” Enrique Penalosa, one of the politicians, explained in 2013. “A bus with 80 passengers has a right to 80 times more road space than a car with one.”

A pair of young Bogotano politicians began to make an interesting argument: if everyone is equal under the law, then public road space should be distributed equally.

During the decade that Penalosa and his contemporary Antanas Mockus alternated mayoralities, this radical idea—democratizing space—became the basis for two initiatives that transformed Bogotá: the TransMilenio bus rapid transit system and the ciclorutas, a 180-mile network of protected bike lanes that integrate with and feed the bus lines.

In the years that followed, biking rose to 4 percent of trips, one of the highest rates in South America. Citywide commute times fell 34 percent. Traffic fatalities fell 88 percent. A 2011 survey found that 53 percent of ciclorutas users were in lowest third of the country by socioeconomic status.

Bogotá raised its gas tax, restricted rush-hour car use, banned sidewalk parking, and enlarged ciclorutas, the open-street events that clear city streets of cars on Sundays. Because the new rapid bus lines were popular, land prices rose nearby, but the city’s Metrovivienda program also created transit-oriented, income-restricted housing for working-class residents.

Bogotá’s inequalities remain deep. But the principle they inform has spread around the world.

“A citizen on a $30 bicycle,” Penalosa says, “is equally important as one in a $30,000 car.”
DENMARK: ENABLING CLASS MOBILITY

Denmark has used many tools in its fight to become one of the most egalitarian countries in the world. And though it’s rarely been seen in this way, one of them has been the bicycle.

People of all incomes bike in Denmark, but biking delivers its biggest advantages to the country’s neediest residents.

After embracing cars in the 1950s and 60s, Denmark took a U-turn around 1970 and began using protected bike lanes and low-speed side streets to make bicycle transportation an efficient, comfortable and dignified option. Today, this peninsula has the second-highest biking rates in the developed world after the Netherlands.

Because bikes are everywhere in modern Denmark, low-income residents can remain mobile in Danish cities without facing pressure to devote a huge share of their money to cars.

In most of the United States, by contrast, a huge share of jobs essentially drop out of reach for anyone without a working car. For 73 percent of Americans, the typical job would take more than 90 minutes to reach by public transit. Living carless in most American cities can mean being cut off from many of the family and friends who help people find work, feel happy, care for children or recover from emotional or economic bad fortune. This problem shackles millions of the poorest Americans, four in ten of whom never leave the lowest fifth of the economic ladder.

Things are different in Denmark. Three-quarters of people born into the poorest fifth of the country’s population improve their situation by middle age. About one in seven lands among the country’s richest adults, almost twice the rate in the United States.

Denmark has not eliminated poverty or racial discrimination. But it has made poverty much easier to escape. And one of the many ways it’s done this has been making it normal and comfortable to do the daily business of one’s life on a bicycle.
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In some Chinese cities, the rising wealth of many families came at a major cost to the others left behind.

Between 1995 and 2005, the estimated number of bicycles in China plummeted 35 percent. In 2004 the country’s largest city, Shanghai, responded to pressure from car owners and banned bikes from all major roads. “Police officials blame bicycles for causing traffic problems by ignoring traffic lights and occupying vehicle lanes,” the BBC reported at the time. “But while bikes may not be considered cool by the new middle classes, there are still a lot of them about.”

Meanwhile, 100 miles to the southwest, Hangzhou took the opposite strategy: it responded to rising transportation inequities by making it more safe and pleasant to use the modes that poorer residents used.

Hangzhou’s decades-old network of protected bike lanes was preserved. Today, bikes and cars are physically separated on 84 percent of the city’s main and secondary roads.17

Hangzhou responded to rising transportation inequities by making it more safe and pleasant to use the modes that poorer residents used.

As part of the Public Transit Priority policy Hangzhou launched in 2004, the city launched the world’s largest bike sharing system and began offering a free 90-minute ride with every transit ticket.

The result: bicycles remain central to urban transportation in Hangzhou. A 2014 study by Anne Lusk of Harvard and Xu Wei and Lijun Zhou of Zhejiang University found that 44 percent of middle-school parents who owned cars rode a bike at least once a week—just like 62 percent of the parents who didn’t.18

As poverty in Hangzhou has plummeted, biking rates have certainly fallen. They’re down from 61 percent of trips in 1997 to 31 percent in 2007. But the decline of biking was far sharper in Beijing—from 63 percent in 1986 to 18 percent in 2010.18 By prioritizing a fundamentally more equitable mode of transportation in its street system, Hangzhou avoided pushing bikes to the margins of its society and the gutters of its streets.
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The result: bicycles remain central to urban transportation in Hangzhou. A 2014 study by Anne Lusk of Harvard and Xu Wei and Lijun Zhou of Zhejiang University found that 44 percent of middle-school parents who owned cars rode a bike at least once a week—just like 62 percent of the parents who didn’t.

As poverty in Hangzhou has plummeted, biking rates have certainly fallen. They’ve dropped from 61 percent of trips in 1997 to 31 percent in 2007. But the decline of biking was far sharper in Beijing—from 63 percent in 1986 to 18 percent in 2010.

By prioritizing a fundamentally more equitable mode of transportation in its street system, Hangzhou avoided pushing bikes to the margins of its society and the gutters of its streets.
What Will It Take To Close The Gender Gap In Urban Cycling?

Women today make up fewer than 25% of the trips taken by bicycle in the United States. The solution starts with more and better bike lanes—it’s just as much about social stigma as it is about infrastructure.

BY EILLIE ANZILOTTI

Michelle Cook bought her first bike on something of a dare. Around six years ago, she was living in Needham, a hilly town on the outskirts of Boston, and a friend of her challenged her to take on the steep streets on a bike. She was around 40 at the time, and hadn’t been on a bike since she was a child growing up on Cape Cod, but she found an old bicycle at a garage sale for $25, cleaned it up, and took it out on the road.

She didn’t expect to get hooked, but she did, and began biking every day. “As I started biking, I realized that as a woman—particularly as a black woman—there weren’t many of us that bike,” she says. “Biking is one of the things that I do that people consider something that we don’t do.” The more she rode, the less she understood why that is. “It’s a great form of exercise, it’s fun, it’s way faster to get somewhere than waiting for a bus or a train,” she says. And biking, Cook adds, just made her feel good. She’s dealt with depression for much of her adult life, but on a bike, she says, she feels strong. A couple years ago, she founded the organization Roxbury Rides to encourage women of color to bike more, and to advocate for better infrastructure and education around active transit and public space.

I’m a woman cyclist myself—I bike every day in New York City—and for this article, I spoke to women in cities across the country. All have different experiences, different commutes, different bikes, different stories about how they first got into it, but what I heard described over and over again, and have sensed every day myself since I started riding, was the feeling of empowerment that cycling produces. It’s something about being able to independently transport yourself around your city on the strength of your own body. Something about learning the streets and routes and neighborhoods with an intimacy inaccessible to those passing by in a car. And something about being a part of a small minority of people who are doing a thing we’ve all been told we shouldn’t, or couldn’t, do.

Across the U.S., cycling as a valid form of sustainable transit is experiencing something of a renaissance. As cities face down issues of growing traffic congestion and systemic public transit failures, advocates and environmentalists are pointing to the bicycle—a mode of transit that originated in the late 19th century—as a zero-carbon, efficient way of making trips around a city, particularly trips under three miles long, of which around 72% are currently made by car. As cities across the world scramble for ways
to limit their carbon footprint in the face of rampant climate change, interventions like the shift to electric vehicles and improvements to public-transit infrastructure will be crucial. But with another 2.5 billion people slated to move into urban environments by 2050, we can’t overlook the issue of street congestion—and the fact that approximately six bikes can fit into the space taken up by a single car.

In order for cycling to become a truly competitive mode of urban transit, we also need to address its issue of gender inequity. Fewer than one in four trips on a bike are currently made by women. In recent years, data from ever-more-popular bike share programs has backed this up: Motivate, the company that oversees bike-share programs in New York, Boston, Chicago, and the Bay Area has found that just 34% of annual bike-share members are women, and together, they take only 24% of trips made on the systems. And even though the bike share boom has undoubtedly helped increase the sheer number of cyclists on city streets—Transportation Alternatives, New York City’s main bike and pedestrian advocacy nonprofit, has found that the number of daily cyclists in New York has risen from 15,000 in 2000 to 45,000 in 2015—the gender gap has held steady.

In recent years, advocacy organizations like the New York City-based Women’s Empowerment Through Bicycles (WE Bike NYC), Women Bike Chicago, and Cook’s Roxbury Rides have sprung up to address this gap by encouraging more women to bike. Motivate has been working with cities in which it operates bike-share programs to provide data around ridership. “One of the big benefits bike-share programs offer cities and policymakers and to the cycling community is insights into who is biking, where they’re biking, and when, which has traditionally been hard information to come by,” says Julie Wood, VP of communications at Motivate. Now that the data is accessible and incontrovertible, cities, advocates, the bike community, and individuals alike have some work to do to figure out why the gender gap exists—and how to close it.

THE CYCLING GENDER GAP: A HISTORY

There are very real reasons that all people—not just women—may be reluctant to bike in a city, and the main one is the built environment of the city itself. In the majority of U.S cities, the street design prioritizes cars over cyclists and pedestrians. Places like Copenhagen and Amsterdam, considered the gold standard for safe and user-friendly bike infrastructure, can point to a centuries-long history of public-space usage before the advent of the car. While both places, and many other European cities, briefly swung toward car culture in the post-World War II years, building parking lots and consigning their streets to automobiles, they have, since the 1970s, worked to correct that brief deviation by spearheading car-free weekend days and other cyclist and pedestrian-friendly measures. Today, they’re home to a robust cycling infrastructure that places the bike on equal—or sometimes higher—footing than the car.

The boom of U.S. cities like New York, however, co-originated with the invention of the car. “American cities came to be built almost exclusively for the automobile,” says James Longhurst, associate professor at University of Wisconsin, La Crosse, and author of Bike Battles: A History of Sharing the American Road. When cars started becoming popular in the early 1900s, the layout and design of U.S. cities was still in flux. Around that time, Fifth Avenue in New York was but a glimmer of the commercial corridor it is today, and it was relatively easy for the city, in 1908, to gut pedestrian space and widen the street for cars.

By the time the environmentalists of the 1960s and ’70s began to warn about the automobile and the pollution it produces, Longhurst says, there was virtually no space on urban roads for bicycles, which, he adds, had been relegated in the American consciousness to something of a toy, rather than a mode of transit. Those same environmentalists, Longhurst says, originated in the late ’60s what became known as the “bike boom,” where they began to push for cycling as a practical way of getting around cities. But
that boom, he adds, “really didn’t do much to transform American streets.” While a handful of advocates rallied for new infrastructure—mainly bike lanes—to support the growing number of cyclists, the bike boom tactic that won out in the end was something called “vehicular cycling”—the idea that cyclists should integrate themselves into urban traffic by essentially acting like cars. “What they were proposing didn’t cost cities anything,” Longhurst says. Almost all that changed was the addition of those little rectangular signs that say “bike route,” but do not correspond to any relevant infrastructure.

“So from the 1970s on, in most American cities, to ride your bicycle means to be confident enough and self-possessed enough and privileged enough to ride out into the road and demand your space,” Longhurst says.

**IF YOU BUILD IT, THEY WILL BIKE**

Around a decade ago, cities across the U.S. began to resuscitate the logic of the bike-lane advocates who were drowned out by the vehicular cyclists of the 1970s. New York City, for instance, has added around 54 miles of bike lanes to its 6,000 miles of roads every year since 2007; Chicago has added 27 miles to its 4,000 miles of road each year since 2011. There’s clearly room to do more, and the benefits of the new lanes are already apparent. In both cities—and in many other cities that have advanced similar infrastructure—death and injury rates have dropped by around half.

While these improvements are a step in the right direction, TransAlt has found that “the growth in cycling has leapfrogged the infrastructure.” In essence, bike infrastructure networks are still neither robust enough nor connected enough to ensure that commuters can feel safe along the length of their ride. “In order for cycling to feel safe in this city, and in all cities, there need to be serious changes in how we build and develop bike infrastructure,” says Rosemary Bolich, a New York-based cyclist. And when there’s a notable lack of quality infrastructure, it’s reflected most clearly in the number of female cyclists traversing the area.

In Midtown Manhattan, for instance, there is a noticeable lack of crosstown bike lanes on the streets north of 23rd all the way up to Central Park at 59th, and the handful of bike lanes on the north-south avenues are often clogged with cars or other obstructions. The New York City Department of Transportation (NYC DOT) worked with Motivate to map data on Citi Bike usage in Midtown, and found that the vast majority of Citi Bike stations in that swath of the city draw less than the average 24% of female usage. Stations south of 23rd, where bike lanes are more plentiful, see rates of female usage at equal to or over 24%—and are generally less congested with car and truck traffic. “If you see high numbers of women cycling, you are doing something right,” says Mikael Colville-Andersen, urban design expert and CEO of Copenhagenize Design Co., a Danish consultancy specializing in bike infrastructure. So significant is the percent of women ridership, he adds, that the gender split is something his firm measures in the Copenhagenize Index, which tracks the progress of cities on developing bike infrastructure.

Polly Trottenberg, NYC DOT commissioner, has watched the cycling boom take off and spread rapidly across New York, and across cities in the U.S. “We’re looking for ways to make the city more accessible and more sustainable, and that means switching to sustainable modes of transit: bikes, buses, pedestrians,” Trottenberg tells *Fast Company*, though she acknowledges that New York and other American cities have a long way to go before they reach “full Copenhagen status” in terms of both bike safety and gender equity—in the Danish city, over 50% of people commute by bike, and 55% of regular cyclists are women.
The key to Copenhagen’s success in both raising the number of overall bike commuting and closing the gender gap, Colville-Andersen says, “is infrastructure. There is no chicken or egg.” A robust network of interconnected bike lanes all across a city will lay the necessary groundwork to get more people cycling—and by adding bike lanes to lower-income neighborhoods, often underserved by public transportation, cities have a real opportunity to advance socioeconomic equity by increasing mobility and access.

From there, there are a number of smaller interventions cities can adopt to make cycling safer, and the most efficient way to get around, he adds. Design tweaks like “the green wave”—which ensures that on most major arteries into the city center, cyclists never hit a red light and can bike continuously without putting a foot down—increase both speed and safety. Small additions like trash cans tilted toward cyclists along bike lanes, and railings or footrests for cyclists, send the signal that cities are concerned with designing for bikers, Colville-Andersen adds.

**THE STIGMA OF BIKING**

Copenhagenize Design Co. is working closely with cities around the world to develop these infrastructural adjustments to support cycling. But we have yet to truly shake the hypermasculine association with biking that coalesced around the advent of vehicular cycling in the 1970s.

Vehicular cycling, as Longhurst says, essentially necessitates being unafraid to take up space; to cut people (in this case, drivers) off; to get vocal and at times get angry. These are all things that women are taught not to do, and the consequences of deviating from these expectations ramify—as the backlash against women speaking out about harassment, for instance, reminds us—across a multitude of public and cultural spaces.

There’s an ambient sense that cycling, even safely contained in a network of bike lanes, is antithetical to femininity. In 2014, the writer and bike advocate Elly Blue ignited a Twitter firestorm when she asked the question: “What does “feminine” mean? I’m serious. It keeps coming up in the context of things women can do to feel that way on a bike, + I’m confused.” For one, as cyclist Melody Hoffman commented in a CityLab article in response to Blue’s question: “Women are expected to show up to places already presentable.” In the summer, as a cyclist, you often arrive places dripping in sweat. In the winter, you have to peel off what feels like more layers than an onion. The aesthetics of cycling alone pose a formidable barrier to women’s participation. Angela Azzolino, a lifelong New York City cyclist and founder of the nonprofit Get Women Cycling, whose mission is evident in the name, runs an annual campaign, #ShowMeHelmetHair, in which women cyclists and hairstylists shared tips for how to prep your hair to survive a long ride under a helmet—or just to rock the slightly feral mess that emerges once you take the helmet off. “It’s a way to start dialogues and get people engaged in this conversation,” Azzolino says.

Because, she adds, “there’s a lot to address in this space.” Breaking down the stigma around being a woman cyclist goes hand-in-hand with the much larger societal project of breaking down the idea of what it means to be an “ideal” woman. And perhaps, when talking about biking, nowhere is the need to do so more evident than in the different ways our society—whether consciously or not—talks to men and women cyclists.

At least once a week, I will pull up to a red light on my bike and someone—usually an older man—will say to me: “I hope you’re being careful,” accompanied by some shake of the head. If not that, it’s someone asking me: “Aren’t you scared?” I have yet to meet a male cyclist who’s subject to the same constant questioning; most of the women I spoke with share my experience. Last year in the *New York Times*, Caroline Paul, a retired firefighter, wrote a piece called “Why Do We Teach Girls That It’s Cute To Be
Scared?” in which she describes facing the exact same questions and notes of caution about her choice of profession (just around 5% of firefighters are women).

Conditioning girls to be scared, to avoid activities deemed challenging or intimidating, Paul says, is something that begins in childhood, and carries through to adulthood. Watching a woman do something that she is not supposed to do—to echo Cook’s sentiment—or something that is unusual, that is daring or risky, sets off our collective alarm bells: Someone has slipped through the safety net, has stepped out of line. Is it not our job to usher her back to safety?

If “safety” in this sense means encouraging women to stick with the status quo—to refuse an activity because it has been categorized as one that requires a certain amount of guts—then that is absolutely not our job. As Paul writes: “By cautioning girls away from these experiences, we are not protecting them. We are failing to prepare them for life.” But that is not to say that we should just toss a helmet or a pair of cycling shorts at women and say, “Time to get on a bike!” There needs to be a concerted reckoning with why we caution women cyclists and encourage men. Moreover, there needs to be a concerted effort to build citywide bike systems that are less a cause for caution than the ones we currently have.

**CREATING A CULTURE SHIFT**

As cities and designers tackle the infrastructure, advocates within the bike community are working to close the gender gap in urban cycling from the inside out.

In addition to launching campaigns like #ShowMeHelmetHair, Azzolino’s organization, Get Women Cycling, is working close the gender gap in the bike retail and repair sectors, which are historically male-dominated. Azzolino, who has spent some time as a service floor mechanic at a Brooklyn bike shop, has witnessed both surprise at her presence, and the larger discrepancies between the way men and women are treated in shops. “Women tend to go into shops with a preconception of how things are going to be, and the preconception is that they are not going to be heard, or I’m not going to be able to find what I need,” Azzolino says. “And bike shops aren’t savvy enough to turn that around.” Get Women Cycling, Azzolino says, is growing a network of partnerships with New York-based bike shops to “act as the interpreter” between female clients and predominantly male mechanics and salespeople by educating the latter on how to better target their services to women, and to create an overall more welcoming environment. A recent uptick in the number of female and gender-nonconforming-focused bike repair classes also feeds into Azzolino’s work.

But really, “the thing that makes biking better for women is more women biking,” Wood says. Bolich agrees: “There is safety and strength in numbers,” she says. Bolich is a volunteer with WE Bike NYC, an organization that hosts rides and events for women and gender nonconforming people. “What we hear from a lot of people who participate in our rides is it makes them feel better,” Bolich says. “In some ways, for people who are new to riding in a city, it helps to sort of practice in a group, before setting out alone.” The cycling world, like the rest of the world, she adds, is very male-dominated, and there’s a part of it that’s dismissive toward people—especially new cyclists—who may be nervous about riding in traffic, or on unprotected bike lanes.

That attitude—layered on top of incomplete infrastructural systems—sets the barrier for entry into the urban cycling world way too high. Bike-share programs, Wood says, have been an effective way to lower that bar by enabling people to take shorter trips and not have to worry about maintaining and caring for their own bike. “It’s sort of a stepping stone that makes biking more accessible,” she says. But still, Motivate recognizes that just planting bike-share stations around the city is not enough to close the gender gap. Every September, the bike-share company hosts Women’s Bike Month, in which it
highlights female bike commuters in various cities, offers free bike share passes, and hosts group rides. “It’s all about putting a spotlight on the need to break down these barriers to entry and encourage more women to bike,” Wood says.

It’s not a thing that can be forced, and it’s not for everybody. If someone truly does not want to ride and doesn’t feel comfortable doing so, Bolich says, they shouldn’t be pressured to do so. But for many people, like Cook, who just decide to try it, it might click. “I can’t even describe the feeling—when you bike, it’s like you go into it thinking you can’t do something, but then you can,” she says. In October, Cook rode in a 25-mile fundraiser for her organization. It was the longest ride she had ever tackled, and it was hilly. “I hate hills and inclines, and by mile 11, I was ready to quit,” she says. Instead, she pedaled through. “The fact that I know I found something—biking—that’s good for my mind, and gives me this indescribable feeling of happiness and euphoria, that did it for me,” she says.

Instead of asking women cyclists, “Aren’t you scared?” what if what we asked them was: “How does biking make you feel?”
Projects tied to the city of Los Angeles’s Vision Zero program are sparking clashes from Playa del Rey to Northeast Los Angeles. Vision Zero aims to end traffic deaths in the LA—the nation’s deadliest city for pedestrians, bicyclists, drivers, passengers, and motorcyclists.

It’s the program’s methods, not its goals, that are dividing Angelenos. Under the plan, lanes dedicated to cars have been removed to slow down traffic (speed is a proven factor in roadway deaths) and to make room for bike lanes, pitting drivers against pedestrians and bike safety advocates.

Tamika Butler, who just departed her post as the executive director of the Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition, has had firsthand experience trying to bring the needs and interests of Angelenos who ride bikes to the forefront.

Curbed spoke to Butler about biking, issues faced by people who bike, her new role as executive director of the Los Angeles Neighborhood Land Trust, and how to continue to make LA a fun, safe, healthy place for all residents—regardless of how they get around. The conversation was edited for length and clarity.

You’re a big promoter of equity in biking and transportation. What does that look like? Are there examples we could see in play today?

For me, when we talk about equity, if you have to simplify it—which I hate doing, because it is complicated—but if you have to simplify it, it’s making sure those who have had the least, get the most.

I think that’s really uncomfortable for people, because it sometimes means that those who have had the most aren’t going to get as much. And in their mind, they think it means they’re giving something up.

I don’t identify as a cyclist. I identify as a person who loves to ride my bike. The more we think about that—that these are people on bikes—hopefully drivers will see those people.

When I first joined the Bike Coalition, I remember going to my first bike summit and going to a panel with people from the bike industry who were talking about marketing to women—how they market differently to women, why it’s important to market to women, why we need more women riding bikes, and for women to seeing themselves in marketing materials.

And I remember sitting in the crowd and hearing the whispers from some of the men in the room, and also a little bit on social media, how it was sexist that this panel even existed. For me, not coming from the bike world, that experience was kind of this rude awakening.
I realized that this is a world filled with a lot of straight white men who have been relatively privileged in different ways in their life, and for them, being a cyclist and identifying as a cyclist is something that is really important. It’s something that is part of their core identity, and for many of them, in their opinion, it is the way they’ve been oppressed.

And so to even start to have a conversation with them about why even identifying as a cyclist isn’t the most inclusive, to get from there to to equity has always been a stretch.

**Why don’t you like the term “cyclist”?**

I’m not a cyclist. I don’t identify as a cyclist. I identify as a person who loves to ride my bike. The more we think about that—that these are people on bikes—hopefully the more drivers will see those people as grandmas and mothers and kids trying to go to school. Is it going to solve all the problems? No. But sometimes folks put those labels on us, and it helps make us less than a person, just a cyclist.

**You came to LACBC toward the end of 2014, and July 14 was your last official day on the job. In that time, how have you seen biking change and improve in LA?**

If you look at the pictures from that most recent meeting about the street improvements in Mar Vista, it was a packed house, and it wasn’t just people who bike. It was our friends, it was family members, it was grandmas, it was folks in the Vision Zero Alliance with us. The visibility of people who bike and the sheer numbers have increased.

I think one of the hardest parts about me leaving is that, when you leave something, you like to sit back and think about all the ways in which it’s gotten better and you helped it get better.

And maybe with some time, some reflection, and a little bit of vacation I’ll be able to do that. But right now, I think when we have the last two weeks like we’ve had with Mar Vista, when folks are talking about the fact that a few extra minutes on a commute might be more important than lives, you really wonder if things have changed.

**What do you think happened there?**

When you dig deeper into these incidents of “bikelash,” what keeps coming up for folks is, that they say, “We want everybody to be safe, but where’s the community engagement? When did folks talk to us?”

That’s another thing that really ties to that equity point. Our government agencies or our nonprofits need to ask: Are we getting better at community engagement? I think we’d be hard-pressed to say we’re *not* getting better, but have we figured it out? Have we cracked the code? I don’t know that we have.

**A lot of the work you’ve done has been expanding the discussion beyond bikes at the Bicycle Coalition.**

Especially for bike advocates, there has been this need to singularly focus on bicycling. I totally get it. I talk to folks who have been doing this way longer than me, who have more battle scars, and what I’ve heard is no one cared about biking.

So many of the folks who started this work, or started biking even, did it as something that wasn’t mainstream, and there was a lot of pride in that identity. But I think many movements struggle with transitioning from being the outsider to saying, “Hey, we’re like everybody else!” And do you even want to do that?

I think bicycle advocacy has struggled with that. What’s our message? Who are we? What makes us unique? What makes us the same? What are we working for?

Again, this is something that happens when a movement matures. As someone who’s black, I think there are some folks who are a little older, who were part of the Civil Rights movement, who don’t understand Black Lives Matter. There are different tactics and different ways of doing things.
What’s been the response to expanding the discussion?

That’s what I’ve gotten the most pushback about, the most harassment about, the most bullying about. The issue is that the folks who have been the most vile and aggressive in their pushback think we’re talking about these other issues instead of biking. But we’re not.

One of my pet peeves is when people say that the Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition’s mission was to make LA County a safe, healthy, and fun place to bike.

The mission didn’t change. We’ve just had to realize that if you want LA County to be that safe, healthy, fun place, the people who are riding bikes have to be able to afford to live here. They have to have affordable housing.

If they’re homeless and they’re worried about where they’re going to sleep at night, then they’re not going to be in a place where biking is fun, healthy, and safe.

If they’re riding for fun, not transportation, and they want a bike path or a nice park to ride, but there are no parks or bike paths anywhere near their neighborhood, then they’re not in a place where biking is fun, healthy, and safe.

You have to understand intersection. As a queer black woman, I live at the intersections, and so I’m not able to see a world in which there aren’t multiple factors at play in everything that happens. Folks who say, “Why are you talking about more than bikes? This is the only issue,” are doing so because they’re coming from a perspective where they’ve been really lucky and privileged that they only have to think about one issue.

How does outreach have to change or improve to get everybody behind Vision Zero, and do you think it’s possible to get everyone behind it?

Something I learned long ago is that you’re never going to get everybody to 100 percent agree on everything. What you can do is, you can hear them. You can make sure they feel validated, and you can explain why you’re doing the things you do. At the end of that, there are still going to be people who disagree with you, and there’s only so much you can do.

For transportation to continue to be successful in LA ... we have to figure out how to talk about these issues in a way that people understand—and not just in terms of commuting.

Engagement takes time. Our structures set up this paradigm where we have to meet deadlines and get projects done, where community engagement might be a meeting that we can check off on a list.

We don’t really ask ourselves, did that meeting happen after work? Was that meeting in a convenient location for everyone? If a majority of the people in this neighborhood are non-English speakers, did we provide translation services? Did we make sure all of the materials were in those languages? These are the things that take more time.

I happen to think that the bar that many people use for community engagement presently is too low, and that we have to up our game and really be more creative about how we’re meeting people where they are.

I think there’s this tendency in this work to say, “We need to work with a nonprofit who’s going to talk to people in the community and train the people in the community to talk like we talk and understand the issues like we understand them.”

But instead, we should be saying, “You know what? The knowledge and expertise is in the community, so I’m going to go there. And I’m not going to go in there as a savior—saying here’s the plan, here’s what we’re going to do. I’m going to listen. I’m going to put in some time. I’m going to go to several meetings before bike lanes even come up.” I think folks who are doing this work need to set the bar for engagement much higher.
What are some of the biggest hurdles to creating a safer, better transportation environment for Angelenos?

We can’t ignore that in LA we are a car-centric culture. We can’t ignore in LA that the Hollywood industry has historically really pushed back against bike lanes. We have unique challenges in LA that there aren’t in other places.

To be successful, we’re going to have to do more engagement. We’re going to have to understand intersectionality way better.

For transportation to continue to be successful in LA—to ride the momentum of Measure M and make sure Measure M goes well—we have to figure out how to talk about these issues in a way that people understand—and not just in terms of commuting.

When Mayor Eric Garcetti was campaigning for Measure M, one of the things I heard him say all the time was: “Transportation is the prism through which we should see all other social issues.”

If you can’t get to school, you’re not going to get your education. If you can’t get to work, you’re not going to get your paycheck. As soon as we can get better at consistently talking about that and talking about transportation and mobility in a way that brings people together and not excludes people or keeps people out, I think the better off we’ll be in Los Angeles.

You’re moving on to work at the Los Angeles Neighborhood Land Trust, which focuses on bringing parks and green space to communities of color in LA. Is that a natural progression of your work with the LACBC, or is it a totally new direction?

At the end of the day, what I’ve always cared about is social justice, people and communities, and bringing people and communities together.

I could say about the LA Neighborhood Land Trust that it’s about making sure that LA is a fun, healthy, safe place to be, just like the LACBC was.

Some people don’t want a bike lane, because they think it’s the first sign of gentrification; they think that property values might go up, and they might get pushed out. The same thing happens with a park. This job is totally a natural progression of what I’ve been doing, and it’s something I’m excited about.

To touch on what you said about how some people fear improvements—a park, bike lanes, a renewed LA River—because, for them, those improvements mean the countdown clock has started until they have to move. This suspicion of what many would consider “nice things” looks strange to people who have never had that conflict.

As the paid advocates, we have to do better at understanding that there are real concerns, especially in LA, where everything you read talks about how much money you have to have just to live here.

Whenever changes come, whether or not it’s in our relationships or in our communities, there’s always this thought: “Is that change for me? Is that change for someone else? Am I going to benefit from this? Did I get to contribute to it? Am I part of this? Did I help build this?”

Sometimes, folks who have done this work, they assume that because they’re experts, people will trust them, and people will trust them to do the right thing. But for so many of us in this country, no one’s ever really cared about us, and trusting people in power hasn’t really gotten us too far. So if we don’t think about those historical and social contexts as we go in to do our work, then our work isn’t going to be successful.
In cities that are building protected bike lane networks, cycling is increasing and the risk of injury or death is decreasing. Pairing appropriately-scaled bike share with protected bike lanes increases ridership and is essential to equity and mobility efforts.

The connection between bike share ridership and high-quality bike lanes is clear: people ride more when they have safe places to ride. Less explored is the positive feedback loop between bike share, the creation of protected bike networks, and overall cyclist safety – and the importance of this feedback loop in helping to address the systemic inequities in the U.S. transportation system.

Over the six years from 2010 to 2015, there were over 62 million bike share trips in the United States and zero fatalities; an enviable safety record. There are many explanations for bike share’s safety advantage over general bicycling, but strong evidence is emerging that bike share is a tool for improving the safety of all riders. NACTO’s new analysis of seven major cities across the U.S. shows that, as cities build more bike lanes, the number of cyclists on the street increases, and the individual risk of a cyclist being killed or severely injured drops, often dramatically. The investment in bike lanes spurs additional cycling, increasing visibility and further reducing risk for all cyclists. Deployed across city neighborhoods at a meaningful scale, as NACTO has described in other reports, bike share can help increase overall bike ridership at accelerated rates and spur a city to develop more—and better—bike infrastructure. By increasing the number of people riding, bike share systems can directly make cycling safer for all, including people on their own bikes.
Cities across the country have demonstrated how to kick-start this process. Chicago and New York—like Paris and Montreal before them—began to develop a protected bike lane network years before launching a large bike-share system and subsequently have seen high and sustained bike share use from day one, as users immediately found safe places to ride. Riders in these cities have seen their risk of death or injury from motor vehicles decline steeply. A similar story plays out in Minneapolis—where the bike share system was matched with bike network expansions—and Portland, where the bike network and overall ridership have continued to grow.

These safety gains are particularly important for low-income people and people of color. These groups make up an increasingly large part of the cycling population but often lack protected bike lanes in their neighborhoods. They disproportionately bear the burden of fatalities and injuries from dangerous drivers and poorly designed streets. An analysis from the League of American Bicyclists found that Black and Hispanic cyclists had a fatality rate 30% and 23% higher than white cyclists, respectively, and similar racial/ethnic safety gaps are found for pedestrians. In focus groups and surveys, low-income people and people of color cite concerns about safety and lack of bike lanes as a main reason not to ride.

A myth pervades that people of color do not bike, but the data shows otherwise. Non-white householders in the Portland metropolitan area, for example, bike at a higher rate than white ones. Research conducted for PeopleForBikes in 2014 found that 38% of Hispanic Americans and 26% of Black Americans bike at least once a year and that the number of Black Americans biking increased by 90% from 2001-2009, faster than any other racial or ethnic group. Cycling is also a fact of life in many low-income communities. Analysis of national Census data by the Kinder Institute for Urban Research shows that 49% of the people who bike to work earn less than $25,000 per year. In 2014, PeopleForBikes reported that the lowest-income households—Americans making less than $20,000 per year—are twice as likely as the rest of the population to rely on bikes for basic transportation needs like getting to work.

Ensuring that people have transportation options that are efficient, convenient, and safe is fundamental to efforts to reduce income inequality in the United States today. Indeed, as found in an ongoing Harvard study and reported in the New York Times, “commuting time has emerged as the single strongest factor in the odds of escaping poverty.” Large scale bike share programs are part of the solution: they increase the reach of rail and bus transit, help people make short trips faster and more easily, are cheaper to implement than other transportation options, and cost the user pennies per trip.

But, for bike share to fulfill this role and for its benefits to be equitably distributed, bike share programs must be matched with extensive protected bike lane networks that offer people safe, comfortable places to ride, regardless of income level, ethnicity, or race. Safety benefits from bike share are greatest when cities pair appropriately scaled systems with an extensive protected

“PEOPLE OF COLOR ARE ACTUALLY VERY INTERESTED IN BIKE INFRASTRUCTURE AND BIKE SAFETY BUT THERE NEEDS TO BE RESOURCES ALLOCATED TO MAKE SURE THEY ARE ENGAGED.”

Rio-Jill Contreras
Multicultural Communities for Mobility
bike lane network built for people who are “interested but concerned,” strategically place on-street bike share stations in ways that calm traffic, and remove legal and regulatory obstacles to bicycling. Like offering inclusive pricing structures and payment mechanisms, or ensuring good service quality by maintaining a walkable distance between stations, providing people access to places to ride where they feel comfortable and safe is essential to larger equity and mobility efforts.

MORE CYCLISTS + BETTER LANES = REDUCED RISK

The combination of increased ridership and more bike lanes is a powerful recipe for safety. For this paper, NACTO collected data from seven cities across the U.S. on bike network mileage, number of cyclists killed or severely injured (KSI), and bicycle volume. The resulting analysis shows that cycling is on the rise in the U.S. and that there is a clear correlation between an increase in the number of cyclists on city streets, growth in the city’s bike lane network, and an improved safety rate for riders. In all seven cities studied, the risk per cyclist decreased as bicycling ridership increased, and the rate of growth in cycling far outstripped the rate of cyclist injuries or fatalities. Municipal policies that increase cycling, like implementing a large scale bike share system, when combined with significant enhancements to bike infrastructure, are associated with large decreases in the risk of injury or death borne by each person cycling.

In particular, New York, Chicago, and Minneapolis have made significant investments to build protected bike networks and their transportation departments have begun to aggressively target high-crash, high-volume locations and corridors. NACTO analysis shows that the risk of injury or death to cyclists in these cities has fallen dramatically from 2007-2014. The work of big cities, like New York and Chicago, is particularly impressive, reducing the risk to cyclists by more than half and bringing the overall cyclist risk rate more closely in line with smaller cities. Investments in cycling, and the resulting safety gains, can be largely credited to strong leadership from mayors and transportation commissioners. Since 2007, New York City has built an average of 54 miles of bike lanes each year, while Chicago has built an average of 27 miles per year since 2011.
Across the U.S., cycling is increasing and risk is falling. There is a clear correlation between increases in the number of cyclists on city streets, improved access to safe places to ride, and increased safety for riders. City policies that increase cycling, like implementing a large scale bike share system, when combined with significant bike network development, are associated with large decreases in the risk of injury or death borne by each person cycling.

Source: NACTO (2016)
In five of the seven cities studied—Chicago, Minneapolis, New York, Philadelphia, and Portland—the absolute number of cyclists killed or severely injured also declined from 2007 to 2014, even as cycling rates soared. Portland, which has been building bike infrastructure for decades and has seen corresponding growth in cycling, has cyclist fatality and injury rates well below that of comparably sized cities. New policies in Portland make protected bike lanes the default design for all separated bike lanes, which will further increase cycling safety and accessibility. NACTO analysis shows that even in the cities where the absolute number of cyclists killed or severely injured is increasing, the rate is rising at a slower pace than cycling itself. Taken together, this analysis shows that an overall reduction of risk to cyclists is correlated with the increased presence of cyclists on the road and municipal investment in bike infrastructure.

More cyclists on the road also increases the visibility and safety of cyclists overall, a phenomenon known as “safety in numbers.” As previous research has documented, the risk of a cyclist being struck by a motorist declines as the number of cyclists on the road increases. Put in simplest terms, a driver who sees 20 cyclists over the course of a few minutes is less likely to forget to look for cyclists than a driver who sees just one. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the increased awareness may extend beyond cyclists and that drivers looking for cyclists may be likely to look more for pedestrians too. Appropriately scaled bike share systems, conceived of as part of a transportation network, can dramatically increase the number of cyclists and help build political momentum for bike lanes. In New York City, for example, over 10 million trips were made on Citi Bike in 2015, significantly increasing the volume of cyclists. At rush hour on busy connector streets, like Jay Street in Brooklyn, there is a person on a bike for every two cars, a huge increase in cyclist visibility.

**Data and Methodology**

This analysis relies on three data sources collected from cities: the number of bike lane miles, excluding signed routes with no other enhancements; the number of cyclists killed or severely injured (KSI), as gathered by police; and the number of cyclists counted in standardized bike counts or American Community Survey (ACS) data where counts are not available.

Cycling risk was calculated by dividing KSI by the count of cyclists or ACS sample. All data was indexed to reflect percent change from a base year of 2007. Indexing focuses the analysis on overall trends rather than absolute numbers, illuminating whether cycling and cycling risk are increasing or decreasing over time, and by how much.
**BIKE SHARE RIDERS WANT BETTER BIKE LINES**

Building a connected network of on-street protected lanes is essential for cities considering bike share programs and should be a core component of a city’s overall equity and mobility strategy. Many bike share users are new to bicycling for transportation and want protected infrastructure in order to be willing to make even the shortest trips.

Concerns about safety and the lack of bike lanes are cited as a main reason not to ride among low-income people and people of color. In bike share focus groups in Philadelphia and Memphis with low-income and of-color residents, participants routinely cited the lack of bike lanes and a fear of reckless, “crazy” drivers as reasons they would be hesitant to use bike share. A recent PeopleForBikes report found that people of color are more likely to say that adding protected bike lanes would make them ride more. The Philadelphia focus groups found that women were more likely than men to cite concerns about safety and lack of bike infrastructure as reasons not to use bike share, another example of how the lack of safe places to ride limits cycling’s transportation potential for large segments of the population.

Protected bike lanes make cycling accessible to the majority of the population who have reason to ride but are concerned about safety, dramatically increasing the pool of people who might choose to use bike share. In follow-up research to Roger Geller’s influential categorization of potential bike riders, Jennifer Dill found that people who are “Interested but Concerned” about cycling, who make up around 60% of the total population, are strongly influenced by bike lane type. Fewer than 5% reported feeling comfortable or very comfortable on streets without a bike lane; in contrast, over 80% reported being comfortable and willing to ride on streets with separated or protected lanes.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong and Fearless</th>
<th>Enthused and Confident</th>
<th>Interested but Concerned</th>
<th>No Way No How</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1% 7%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the interested but concerned cyclists, percent who are comfortable on streets with:

- **No Bike Facility**: 8%
- **A Bike Lane**: 39%
- **A Separated Bike Lane**: 81%

Sources: Roger Geller (2005) and Jennifer Dill (2012)
The people want bike lanes

All across the country, people want better bike lanes. For example, in 2014, community members in Boyle Heights, a predominantly Latino neighborhood in Los Angeles, came out en masse to support proposed bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements along two major neighborhood corridors, Soto Street and Boyle Ave. The community wanted the city to make the streets safer for cyclists and pedestrians and help the neighborhood gain economic benefits from increased mobility options, while also addressing larger gentrification and police enforcement issues. The efforts of the Boyle Heights community were supported by the Multicultural Center for Mobility (MCM), which focuses on multi-lingual, “culturally-competent” safety and cycling advocacy particularly in low-income neighborhoods. MCM hired four born-and-raised Boyle Heights residents, called Promoturas, to gauge and build support from residents and businesses. While Los Angeles city planners and MCM organizers both say that the strong community support came because the bike lanes were packaged into a larger safety program, the Promoturas were essential to the process—spreading information, gathering feedback, and helping the people in the neighborhood identify additional measures that would address related community concerns such as police training around cycling and the desire for a cyclist warning-and-diversion program, rather than ticketing. MCM’s decision to hire and pay locals to engage their neighbors, rather than bring in outside consultants, further strengthened the feeling that the proposed lanes were a community benefit, not an outside intrusion. The Soto and Boyle Ave bike lanes are on the LADOT project roster.

To encourage riding, build better lanes

Across the U.S., cities are listening to local requests for safe places to ride and building more and better bike lanes. And in response, more people are riding. Bike count data shows that building lanes encourages more people to ride.

A 2015 study of Calgary, Canada found a 95% increase in the number of weekday bike trips in the three months after the introduction of a bike network, underscoring the importance of a robust, linked bike network as part of any city’s cycling strategy. A 2014 study of bike infrastructure in Austin, Chicago, Portland, OR, San Francisco, and Washington, DC showed that adding protected bike lanes increased ridership on that street by 21% to 171%. A 2015 report on the 300 South/Broadway protected bike lane in Salt Lake City found a 30% increase in cyclists, with anecdotal reports suggesting increased use by families and casual cyclists.

In New York City, in close consultation with community organizations, the Department of Transportation began a rapid expansion of the bike lane network in 2007, building 431 miles of bike lanes, including 40 miles of protected lanes, over the following seven years. The number of daily cyclists in New York City doubled over

---

Bike share riders prefer protected lanes.

Citi Bike riders as a percent of total riders by lane type:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lane Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Bike Lane</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprotected Bike Lane</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Bike Lane</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Peter Tuckel and William Milczarski, CUNY (2014)
that time period and increased four-fold from 2000 to 2013. In addition, the Citi Bike bike share program, which launched in 2013, adds up to 56,000 cyclists daily.

The reverse is also true. A judicial injunction in San Francisco halted bike lane development from 2006 to 2010. SFMTA bike count data shows that the number of people biking increased only slightly over that time period. When the injunction was lifted in 2010, cycling rates began to rise quickly and have almost doubled since.

When it comes to bike share, ensuring that there are safe places to ride is essential to ridership. Cities that invest significantly in cycling infrastructure prior to, or while, rolling out bike share systems have seen the largest increases in ridership. A 2011 study found that more people started trips from Capital Bikeshare stations near bike lanes and that ridership increased with the number of nearby lanes. A 2014 Hunter College study found that Citi Bike riders made up a greater share of the total cyclists on streets with protected bike lanes than those without. In a national survey by PeopleForBikes, almost half of respondents said they would ride more if high quality, protected cycling infrastructure existed in their areas.

**SMART STATION PLACEMENT CAN MAKE STREETS SAFER**

Even for people who will never ride a bike, bike share stations can help make streets safer. In cities like Austin, Arlington, New York, and Philadelphia, thoughtful station placement has helped create a safer environment for cyclists and pedestrians alike. For example, in Austin, bike share stations have been incorporated into painted bulb-out designs, helping to shorten crossing distances.
for pedestrians and demarcate sidewalk space. In New York City, stations placed in the buffer of protected bike lanes create high-comfort areas for people to start and end their bike share trips. In Philadelphia, stations placed along newly-created pedestrian space, such as road reclamations and painted plazas, help anchor the space and create a permanent buffer from vehicular traffic.

Using bike share equipment to further traffic safety goals allows cities to make their limited resources go further. For example, in New York City, community members in Battery Park City voiced concerns about frequent illegal U-turns and speeding on West Thames Street, an overly wide two-way street. Working with the Community Board, planners addressed these safety issues by placing a doubled-sided station in the painted median. The station immediately created a mid-crossing refuge space for pedestrians, helped define the travel lanes, prevented illegal U-turns, and calmed traffic. A full discussion of best practices in bike share station siting can be found in NACTO’s Bike Share Station Siting Guide.32

**MANDATORY HELMET LAWS REDUCE BIKE SHARE RIDERSHIP AND DON’T INCREASE SAFETY**

While questions about helmets are frequently raised in conjunction with bike share, data shows that mandatory adult helmet laws reduce biking and bike share ridership—and thus reduce overall cycling safety. A number of cities, such as Mexico City, Tel Aviv, and Dallas, TX, have repealed their helmet laws in preparation for launching bike share systems.33

The impact of mandatory adult helmet laws on bike share and general bike ridership is large and negative. Cycling in Sydney, Australia decreased 48% in the five years following the passage of their mandatory adult helmet law.34 A study in Melbourne, Australia found that 61% of people who did not use Melbourne’s bike share system cited difficulties finding a helmet or not wanting to wear one as their main reason for not riding.35 In Seattle, the only U.S. city with a mandatory helmet law, bike share ridership has been well below expectations, less than one ride per bike per day.

**Case Study**

**MAKING HELMETS AVAILABLE**

While making helmets mandatory for adults can reduce ridership, making helmets readily available to those who want them is good public policy. Many bike share systems, such as the Boston area’s Hubway and Salt Lake City’s GREENbike, offer free bike helmets with bike share memberships.

In New York and Chicago, the city wanted to encourage people to go to local bike shops rather than have their operator act as a helmet distributor. New York City and Motivate worked together to create a helmet discount for anyone who signs up for Citi Bike. The program launched with a few helmet providers, such as Bern, Nutcase and Bontrager, and is now available for seven different helmet brands in bike shops in all five boroughs. Depending on the helmet selected, the $10 discount represents up to 30% off the price of a helmet. NYC DOT also gives away bike helmets, targeting many of their give-away events in low-income areas. Since 2007, the city has given away 150,000 helmets.
Safety analyses from around the world suggest that mandatory adult helmet laws have limited safety benefits. While helmets can protect individual cyclists from head injuries in some types of crashes, mandatory adult helmet laws do not reduce the overall number of crashes (which may or may not involve a cyclist hitting their head) and may work against safety benefits conferred by increased ridership. In Australia, where mandatory adult helmet laws were introduced regionally between 1990 and 1992, bike count and safety data collected shows that “enforced helmet laws discourage cycling but produce no obvious response in percentage of head injuries.” 36

Mandatory helmet laws pose additional issues for communities aiming to address longstanding issues of racial disparity in policing. Reports from around the United States suggest that such laws often give police an additional reason to stop and question people and are disproportionately enforced against low-income people and people of color. A review of court and police records in Dallas found significantly uneven enforcement of the city’s helmet law, with 96% of citations outside of downtown being written in neighborhoods of color and 86% in areas with large numbers of households below the poverty line.37 Similarly, a study in New York City of citations for riding on the sidewalk found that communities where most residents are Black or Latino represented 12 of the 15 neighborhoods with the most citations. In contrast, predominantly white neighborhoods, many of which have large cycling populations, made up 14 of the 15 neighborhoods with the fewest citations.38 In Florida, the Tampa Bay Times found that 8 out of 10 bike citations in Tampa were given to Black people and concluded that “Tampa police are targeting poor, Black neighborhoods with obscure subsections of a Florida statute... Officers use these minor violations as an excuse to stop, question and search almost anyone on wheels.” 39

WHAT STOPS YOU FROM USING MELBOURNE BIKE SHARE?

- Don’t have/don’t want to wear a helmet
- Bad weather
- Safety concerns
- Price
- Prefer to drive
- Poor fitness/health issues

Source: Elliot Fishman (2014)
LESSONS FROM THE CITIES

» **Support bike share systems with significant buildout of bike lanes networks:** Ensuring that people have places to ride where they feel comfortable and safe is essential to larger equity and mobility efforts. The safety benefits of increased ridership are enhanced when growth in cycling is matched with construction of new, better bike lanes.

» **Design for the “Interested but Concerned:”** The majority of the U.S. public is interested in biking but concerned about safety. Their willingness to ride is highly influenced by the quality of bike lanes available to them. Matching convenient bike share systems with a protected bike lane network is a recipe for success.

» **Remember who is already riding:** Half of the people who bike to work earn less than $25,000/year. Years of highway building, car-based zoning, and exclusionary housing policies mean low-income neighborhoods are often separated from job centers by highways and dangerous streets with limited-to-no space for bikes or pedestrians. As cities build for more cyclists they should ensure that the bike lane network includes safe routes for existing riders.

» **Long term community engagement is essential:** People in all neighborhoods want safe places to walk, bike, and play. Building long-term, reciprocal relationships in neighborhoods and with locally-trusted community organizations is essential to spreading information, getting feedback, and building local support for projects.

» **Use bike share stations as tools for safety:** Bike share stations can be placed in ways that increase overall street safety. Planners should strategically place stations in ways that define and protect bike lanes and pedestrian space, narrow streets to reduce speeding, and create pedestrian refuge islands that shorten crossing distances.

» **Eliminate mandatory adult helmet laws which restrict and reduce cycling:** Mandatory helmet laws reduce the number people riding and negatively impact overall cycling safety. In addition, such laws can be prone to abuse and are often disproportionately enforced in low-income neighborhoods and communities of color.

» **Counting counts:** Measuring the growth in cycling is one of the best ways to tell if a city is working effectively to make cycling commonplace, easy, and safe for everyone. Cities should focus on the trend of cycling and cycling risk—is it increasing or decreasing and by how much—year over year to get a big picture view of the success of their bicycle program.
1 The first U.S. bike share fatality occurred on July 1st, 2016 in Chicago.


11 In Portland (pop. 609,000), from 2004 to 2014, an average of less than two cyclists were killed per year, a number below its similarly sized peers.

12 PBOT email from Treat, Leah, “protected bike lane as design standard.” October 19, 2015. Accessed via: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1bI8bdOkrKu7p705T2b0Z9pX8bY79TThr1cSwV1UJm5s/view


21 Interview with Rio-Jill Contreras, Programs Specialist, Multicultural Communities for Mobility. 7/1/16


26 To-date, Citi Bike’s peak day was Wednesday, July 13, 2016 with 58,286 trips.
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Learn more about NACTO’s Bike Share Program at NACTO.org

This paper is made possible by a grant from The JPB Foundation to further the conversation around equity in bike share.
The All Ages & Abilities Design Toolbox

Five major types of bikeway provide for most bike network needs, based on the contextual guidance chart.

This list is organized from more to less shared operation with automobiles. Each facility type is appropriate as an All Ages & Abilities bikeway in relevant street contexts. The NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide provides detailed guidance on bikeway facilities.

**Low-Speed Shared Streets** allow bicyclists to comfortably operate across the entire roadway. Shared streets target very low operating speeds for all users, typically no greater than 10 mph. The volume of people walking and bicycling should be much greater than vehicle volume to maintain comfort. Issues for bicycling in shared environments arise from conflicts with people walking, who may be expected at any point across the street’s width. Materials and street edges must be appropriate for bicycling; materials are often varied to delineate road space, but any seams or low mountable curbs must be designed to avoid creating fall hazards for bicyclists.

**Bicycle Boulevards (or neighborhood greenways)** provide continuous comfortable bicycle routes through the local street network. Bike Boulevards are characterized by slow motor vehicle speeds and low volumes. Sometimes these are present by the very nature of the street and its function (e.g. narrow streets with no major destinations), but sometimes design work is needed, such as adding traffic calming elements, filtering most motor vehicle traffic off, and/or prioritizing bicycles at major and minor street intersections. In this way, bicycling is made comfortable across the entire roadway. Directional markings and wayfinding signage provide riders with intuitive, coherent routing.
**Buffered & Conventional Bicycle Lanes** provide organized space for bicycling, and are often part of street reconfiguration projects that improve safety and comfort for all users. Bicycle lanes are an important tool to improve comfort and safety on streets where the number of passing events is too high for comfortable mixed-traffic bicycling, but where curbside activity, heavy vehicles, and lane invasion are not significant sources of conflict. Buffered bike lanes are almost always higher comfort than conventional bike lanes. In many cases, cross-sections with room for buffered bicycle lanes also have room for protected bicycle lanes.

**Shared-Use & Bicycle Paths** have in many cities served as the early spines of an All Ages & Abilities network. Paths can provide a continuous corridor, but usually do not take riders to their destinations. High pedestrian volumes, driveways, obtrusive bollards, sharp geometry, and crossings all degrade bicycling comfort, but often require long project timelines to eliminate. To become useful for transportation, paths work best when connected to an on-street network that meets the same high benchmark of rider comfort, and design provides bicycle-friendly geometry. Ideally, bicycles should be separated from pedestrians where significant volume of either mode is present, but where space limitations exist, multi-use paths are still valuable.
Choosing an All Ages & Abilities Bicycle Facility

This chart provides guidance in choosing a bikeway design that can create an All Ages & Abilities bicycling environment, based on a street’s basic design and motor vehicle traffic conditions such as vehicle speed and volume. This chart should be applied as part of a flexible, results-oriented design process on each street, alongside robust analysis of local bicycling conditions as discussed in the remainder of this document.

Users of this guidance should recognize that, in some cases, a bicycle facility may fall short of the All Ages & Abilities criteria but still substantively reduce traffic stress. Jurisdictions should not use an inability to meet the All Ages & Abilities criteria as reason to avoid implementing a bikeway, and should not prohibit the construction of facilities that do not meet the criteria.

### Contextual Guidance for Selecting All Ages & Abilities Bikeways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Context</th>
<th>All Ages &amp; Abilities Bicycle Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Motor Vehicle Speed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Target Motor Vehicle Volume (ADT)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any</td>
<td>Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 10 mph</td>
<td>Less relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 20 mph</td>
<td>≤ 1,000 – 2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 25 mph</td>
<td>≤ 500 – 1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 1,500 – 3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Speed Category</td>
<td>Traffic Volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 26 mph†</td>
<td>≤ 6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater than 6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protected Bicycle Lane, or Reduce to Single Lane &amp; Reduce Speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-speed limited access roadways, natural corridors, or geographic edge conditions with limited conflicts</td>
<td>Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low pedestrian volume</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*While posted or 85th percentile motor vehicle speed are commonly used design speed targets, 95th percentile speed captures high-end speeding, which causes greater stress to bicyclists and more frequent passing events. Setting target speed based on this threshold results in a higher level of bicycling comfort for the full range of riders.*

† Setting 25 mph as a motor vehicle speed threshold for providing protected bikeways is consistent with many cities’ traffic safety and Vision Zero policies. However, some cities use a 30 mph posted speed as a threshold for protected bikeways, consistent with providing Level of Traffic Stress level 2 (LTS 2) that can effectively reduce stress and accommodate more types of riders.

‡ Operational factors that lead to bikeway conflicts are reasons to provide protected bike lanes regardless of motor vehicle speed and volume.
Pittsburgh becomes first U.S. city to offer free bike share to transit riders
by: Stefani Cox

We’ve talked a lot about bike share discount programs, but Pittsburgh is now offering an entirely free ride to anyone with a transit card.

Last Thursday, Pittsburgh’s bike share program Healthy Ride announced the first six months of the project, where those who own the regional transit system’s ConnectCard can access bike share for free in 15-minute increments.

Coordinated technology paves the way

The integration of the bike share with other transit systems is made possible due to a shared technology system. Each bike is equipped with an RFID reader that uses near-field communication to deduct from the stored value on a card — the same mechanism is used for accessing local buses, light rail, and the funicular network.

Making the sign-up process as easy as possible was of key importance to those that designed the program.

“We’re doing it without requiring any registration on the customer’s part,” said David White, Executive Director of Healthy Ride.

To access the free 15 minutes of ride time, all an individual has to do is tap their ConnectCard on a bike share kiosk, input their phone number, and use the PIN number texted to their phone to access the bike. After the first use, the ConnectCard is linked to bike share, and all that is required is to tap the card on the desired bike.

There’s currently no limit on how many free rides can be taken. Someone could theoretically use the bikes all day, as long as they made sure to check the bike back in every 15 minutes. If someone does exceed their 15 minutes of free ride time, they will get a text asking them to register and pay for the overage before continuing to use the system.

Source: Healthy Ride.

Dreaming big for bike share

Such a bold step for bike share requires a big vision and a comfort with the experimentation process — both qualities that White possesses.

White notes that it is a bit of a risk to offer free rides to transit passholders without having much information on them. But it’s a risk that he is comfortable taking.

“The first phase is to prove that this tech exists and works and that we can have integration with transit. We want to show that bike share and transit are not competitors,” said White. “At the same time, we are analyzing the revenue impacts from our side. We plan to do a direct comparison of revenue we lose from people who are currently paying for our system who can now access it for free, versus how many
new customers we gain by having people try the 15 minutes — those who complete their payment profile and move on to additional rides.”

When asked about equity, and whether this program will help low-income riders access bike share, White said that equity principles underlie the entire program. The ability to use the existing transit card (which can be reloaded with cash), along with the free ride time, he hopes will be a big step forward in making the system truly accessible to all.

Ultimately White would love to secure funding to keep the program going, and perhaps to eventually expand the duration of free ride time from 15 to 30 minutes.

**Support from the bike advocacy community**

Healthy Ride staff themselves aren’t the only ones excited about the free ride program.

Bike PGH is the area’s bicycle advocacy organization, which originally worked to bring Healthy Ride to Pittsburgh in the first place.

“For over a decade, we’ve been trying to make that connection between biking and transit,” said Eric Boerer, Advocacy Director for Bike PGH. “We view bike share as public transit, and the free ride program is helping to make that happen. It especially helps address first mile, last mile connectivity.”

As an advocate, Boerer sees potential for the program to promote bicycling infrastructure throughout the city, as well as unity across local government and regional government institutions. The Port Authority, for example, generally manages transit, and the City manages bus stations and other infrastructure. Boerer mentioned that both the mayor and county executives were present at the press meeting to announce the free bike share ride program.

Of bike share itself, Boerer has optimism for a long future. “It’s really cool to see it all over the place,” he said. “People are really figuring out how to use it.”

**Source:** Healthy Ride.

**Getting the word out on free bike share**

While it’s too early to draw any conclusions about the success of the program, White noted that as of this Tuesday, about 100 people had linked their ConnectCard to bike share. All of those who linked their card then went on to actually ride a bike.

White said that by the end of this week, all 50 bike share stations should be on-line with the ability to link to the ConnectCard.

“The goal is to introduce people to the system without any cost to see how easy it is to get involved,” said White.

Healthy Ride has been advertising the free program on buses, at bus stations, and on the bike share kiosks themselves. The promotions feature suggestions for where to ride bike share, such as the baseball stadium or the South Side business district.

The free program comes ahead of a planned 2018 bike share system expansion, which will add 20 stations, a 40 percent increase overall. The expansion will include three lower-income neighborhoods that have been traditionally underserved by public transit.
Survey offers guidance for biking equity in Charlotte

Robert Boyer | Mar 13, 2017

More cycling in Charlotte is good for you, even if you never mount a bicycle. More butts on bikes means less congestion and noise on local roads, cleaner air, fewer traffic fatalities and ultimately a lighter burden on our health care system. Purchasing, operating, and maintaining a bicycle is also many times cheaper as a form of daily transportation than purchasing, operating and maintaining a personal vehicle.

Given these benefits, biking as a means of daily transportation in Charlotte remains depressingly rare. The U.S. Census estimates a paltry 0.25 percent of Charlotte residents use a bicycle as their primary means of transportation to work, compared to about 0.6 percent nationally. But before we dismiss cycling in Charlotte as a perilous novelty, a recent survey administered by the Charlotte Department of Transportation reveals a more active and dynamic bicycle community hiding behind those low census figures.

The survey, administered to 406 random Charlotte residents in June 2016, reveals that the majority of respondents (63.4 percent) would prefer to drive less and about half (50.7 percent) would prefer to bike more. The survey also asked two critical questions:

1. How often do you ride a bike for “recreation or exercise”?
2. How often do you ride a bike “to school, work, or for errands” – also known as utility cycling.

Data from these questions – combined with data about respondents' income, age, race, ethnicity, gender, and other variables – reveal some important trends about who bikes, and for what purpose in Charlotte. This information ought to initiate a local conversation about how build a bicycle system that is accessible, safe, and fun for everyone.

WHO BIKES? FOR WHAT PURPOSE?

First, many more people ride bicycles in Charlotte than the census reveals. One third (33.2 percent) of all respondents to the CDOT survey reported riding their bicycle for some purpose at least once a week.
Survey data from the Charlotte Department of Transportation show that almost all utility cyclists – those who ride to school, work or for errands – in Charlotte also ride for recreation at least once a week.

Unsurprisingly, twice as many respondents ride a bike once a week for recreation rather than for utility purposes – 32 percent versus 14 percent, respectively – and nearly all utility riders are also recreational riders (see diagram above). Why? You can ride a bicycle for recreation in more places, at more times, and with generally fewer restrictions than riding for utility, which typically involves a specific destination and time constraints.

If you decide to ride to work, for example, you probably have to arrive at a specific time, in specific attire, and you may or may not have access to changing facilities, showers and proper storage. Riding for recreation also allow us to choose the routes we find most comfortable, whether or not that involves structured bike lanes or greenways. All these factors make utility cycling more complicated to adopt if your day-to-day routine already revolves around the automobile.

Weekly recreational cycling (blue) vs. weekly utility cycling (red). Chart: Robert Boyer, from Charlotte Department of Transportation data

Dig a little deeper, and the data reveal interesting details related to age, gender, income, race, ethnicity, location and households with children. (A note for fellow data nerds: All reported figures below are statistically significant differences, with a p-value of 0.05 or less.)

- **Men ride more than women, for all purposes.** 40 percent of men ride weekly for recreation compared to about 25 percent of women. For utility purposes, it's 20 percent for men vs. 12.2 percent women.

- **Older respondents ride less for recreation.** Only 14.7 percent of residents over age 65 ride once a week for recreation, compared to 31.8 percent overall.

- **Respondents with children in the household ride more for recreation:** 43 percent of respondents with children at home ride weekly for recreation, compared to about 29 percent of respondents without children in the household.
• **Wealthy respondents ride more for recreation.** Almost half (49 percent) of individuals with an annual household income of $100,000 or higher ride weekly for recreation, but only 16.5 percent of individuals in the $25,000-or-lower bracket ride weekly.

• **Black/African American respondents ride less for recreation than non-black/African American respondents.** While utility cycling among black respondents is statistically on par with other race groups, 21.3 percent of black respondents ride for recreation versus 31.2 percent overall.

• **Latino respondents ride more for utility.** 31.1 percent of Latino respondents ride once a week or more for utility, compared to 14.9 percent of non-Latino respondents.

• **Residents who live in the center of the city ride less for recreation than residents on the spatial fringe.** Nearly 36 percent of residents living outside Charlotte Route 4 (the “inner loop” made up of Woodlawn-Runnymede-Wendover and Eastway) ride once a week or more for recreation, compared to 24.9 percent inside Route 4.

When these different variables are isolated statistically from one another, it is possible to understand the effects that each has on the odds of an individual cycling for different purposes. So, it appears as though the variables that predict recreational cycling most reliably are gender, income, and race. All other things equal, the odds of recreational cycling are higher among higher-income respondents and male respondents, while the odds are lower among black/African American respondents. The strongest predictor, by far, that someone will cycle for utility is whether that person cycles for recreation, lending some evidence to the story that recreational cycling serves as a “gateway” to utility cycling. It also appears Latino residents are more likely to ride for utility, and that the odds of utility cycling increases in neighborhoods with more bike lanes, signed routes, and greenways per square mile of land.

*Can recreational cycling be a "gateway" for cycling for work, to school or to run errands? Photo: Nancy Pierce*

**WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR BICYCLE PLANNING IN CHARLOTTE?**

In the past 15 years, bicycle planning in the City of Charlotte has accelerated from a virtual standing start. What began as a single mile of bike lane in 2003 has radiated to a 190-mile network of bike lanes, signed routes and greenways. The city and other local sponsors host regular promotional events like Bike Week, the Mayor’s Bike Ride and Open Streets 704, and recreational cyclists can participate in dozens of “social rides” matching their particular interests and abilities any night of the week.

Staff at the Charlotte Department of Transportation have recently begun circulating a [draft of the city’s next bicycle plan](#), Charlotte BIKES, which prioritizes “equity” among other values. The plan opens with an ambitious vision statement:
Charlotte will offer an inclusive cycling environment where people of all ages and abilities can use their bikes for transportation, fitness, and fun. The City will work to extend bicycle infrastructure, educational opportunities, and promotional events to all neighborhoods and households striving for equitable, affordable mobility options that improve city-wide public health, support the local economy, and reduce automobile dependency in the Queen City [emphasis mine].

The data discussed above offer the city a benchmark to determine what “inclusive” and “equitable” cycling means. For example, the city may want to begin its next steps of bicycle planning by asking, “How can plans for bicycle infrastructure, education, law enforcement, and promotional events both maintain levels of service for existing bikers and extend opportunities for underrepresented groups of cyclists?

Addressing these inequities may require deeper inquiry. For example: Why do men bike more than women? Why do low-income residents bike less for recreation than their wealthy fellow residents? Why do black residents bike less than non-black residents? And if biking for recreation is a gateway to utility cycling – as the statistics imply – then what can the city do to extend more recreational opportunities to low-income groups, women, and black residents who cycle less for recreation than others?

Research in urban planning and transportation engineering shows that “high-cycling” countries like Denmark, the Netherlands and Germany have cycling populations that more closely mirror the characteristics of the general population than “low-cycling” countries like the U.S., Canada, and the United Kingdom. In the Netherlands, for example, women and older residents ride bikes as much as, and sometimes more than, their young, male compatriots. Presumably, this is because riding a bicycle in “high-cycling” countries is not a niche activity, but accessible to all and embedded in day-to-day routines of the entire population. It appears, then, that bicycle system equity and broad bicycle system growth go hand-in-hand: increasing the general population of cyclists (and all accompanying environmental benefits) will require investments in programs and infrastructure that make cycling easy and fun for people of diverse genders, ages, races and incomes. CDOT now has the data to begin, with support from the City Council, addressing these inequities in a systematic and incisive way.
In 2011, the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) helped bring bike-share to Boston, and a year later, the system expanded into the surrounding communities of Cambridge, Somerville and Brookline. Now, in a move that echoes efforts in the California Bay Area and New Jersey, the MAPC will create a regional, rather than city-based, program with involvement from as many as 16 small towns and cities around Boston.

The municipalities interested in joining include Arlington, Bedford, Belmont, Chelsea, Concord, Everett, Lexington, Malden, Medford, Milton, Newton, Revere, Winthrop, Quincy, Waltham and Watertown, WickedLocal Concord reports. The system will likely include dockless bikes and e-bikes, but the company (or companies) running them have yet to be chosen — according to the website, MAPC plans to solicit proposals from bike-share companies in mid-November.

The council appears to be open to the venture-funded start-ups running most U.S. dockless systems. Those companies, like LimeBike and Ofo, have been successful in Seattle but are not universally beloved in U.S. cities, particularly those with already-established public-private partnerships behind their bike-share systems. Because they’re venture-funded, however, those companies can offer cities a private system with few upfront costs and no taxpayer funds.

“These recent rapid changes in the bike-share industry have created a unique opportunity for Boston’s suburbs to launch a large-scale regional bike-share system without having to raise large amounts of public capital,” Marc Draizen, executive director of MAPC, said recently, according to WickedLocal Concord. “Our goal is to have high-quality bikes that will be well maintained, in a system that is easily accessible throughout the participating communities — and we want a seamless experience for riders crossing municipal lines.”

Established P3 systems have also had some success with multi-jurisdictional expansions, like the Bay Area’s Ford GoBike, which has stations in the Oakland, Emeryville and Berkeley, as well as San Francisco, and New York’s CitiBike, which launched an interoperable system with Jersey City in 2015.

The Boston-area partnerships will no doubt be instructive to watch as smaller cities and towns begin to roll out bike-share systems. Those towns’ smaller size — combined with the fact that, often, multiple municipalities bleed together in more suburban counties — can create geographical boundaries that pose a real problem for connectivity.
Has Philadelphia Made A Bike Share That Can Get The Entire City Biking?

Its new program aims to get minorities and low-income residents to hop on bikes by placing stations more equitably and offering a way to pay without a credit card.

BY ANITA HAMILTON

Ever since Washington, D.C., launched the nation’s first publicly funded bike share program in 2008, some 70 cities have followed suit, from Savannah to Seattle. And while some systems have floundered financially—even D.C.’s original SmartBike system shut down in 2011 before its current Capital Bikeshare took off—biking in the U.S. is clearly on a roll. More than a dozen new networks launched in 2014, up from just four in 2010.

But Philadelphia will put a new spin on bike share this spring with the launch of its new Indego program in April. In a departure from other bike share programs around the country, fully a third of the 600 bikes in Philadelphia’s Indego system, with stations made by BCycle, will be located in low-income neighborhoods, and all residents will have the option of paying with cash if they don’t own a credit card. “We’re blazing some trails,” says the city’s bicycle programs manager Aaron Ritz. “We hope that this will be groundbreaking in a repeatable way.”

Despite their increasing success, one area where bike share programs have largely failed is in attracting a diverse ridership. As a rule, bike share users tend to be white, at least middle class, and more often male than female. Even in D.C, where half the residents are black, only 3% of its riders are black, according to a 2013 report on the program. In Boston, which launched its Hubway system in 2011, 80% of riders earn more than the city’s median income of $49,000. New York, which now has nearly 6,000 Citibikes in Manhattan and Brooklyn, has none stationed in the poorest minority neighborhoods.

Considering that most bike share programs are funded at least in part with public funds, such stark lack of diversity is particularly problematic. Philadelphia, for example, is paying for its Indego bike share with $3 million in city funds and $1.5 million from the state. The rest of the program’s $16 million total budget over the next five years comes from a corporate sponsor (Independence Blue Cross) and a nonprofit family foundation. “You can’t just have a lifestyle amenity that is funded by public resources,” says Adonia Lugo, a bicycle anthropologist at Bicicultures, an interdisciplinary research collaboration.
That’s why Philadelphia decided to design its bike share system, slated to launch on April 23, to appeal not just to tourists and wealthy residents, but to a larger slice of its nearly 1.6 million residents. That includes the 27% who live below the poverty line and the city’s majority minority population, which is 43% black, 12% Latino, and 6% Asian. “Our bike share will be accessible to underserved communities from day one,” says Carniesha Fenwick-Kwashie, grant manager of the Mayor’s Fund for Philadelphia. A $3 million grant from the JPB Foundation is paying for stations in low-income neighborhoods where the median household income is 150% of the poverty line.

While bike stations in poorer areas may not be as profitable as those near tourist attractions like the Liberty Bell or the Rocky Steps, “It was important for us to put the bikes not only in areas that would be a slam-dunk revenue generator,” says Ritz.

What’s more, Philly will be the first U.S. city to launch its bike share with a cash payment option available to any resident, regardless of income. (While Boston’s Hubway and Capital Bikeshare also have cash payment options, Boston’s is only allowed for residents under a certain income threshold and D.C.’s only for residents of certain areas.) They will need access to a computer and a permanent address to sign up for the 30-day membership, which costs $15 and includes an unlimited number of free one-hour rides. They will receive a key fob in the mail giving them access to the system, and can fund their account at 7-Eleven or Family Dollar stores. An annual Indego membership costs $10 plus $4 per ride, and nonmembers can pay $4 per half hour.

The big question going forward is whether Philly’s efforts to build a better bike share will actually work. “What makes bicycling accessible for people is feeling a sense of belonging or seeing people who look like them riding,” says Lugo. Because many low-income people grew up riding public transit, “riding bicycles can be seen as a failure,” adds Alison Cohen of Bicycle Transit, which will operate Philly’s network of bikes and stations.

To get the word out, the city is hiring 10 neighborhood “ambassadors” to show residents how to use the bike share and encourage them to do so. It has also teamed up with the Mural Arts Program to create public murals designed by local artists with help from local elementary schoolkids in low-income areas that will draw attention to the stations. A social media campaign called “Where Will Indego Take You?” will ask riders to take pictures of rides to their favorite parts of the city and share them on Facebook, Instagram, and other social media.

Philadelphia’s ambitions don’t end at its city limits, either. It’s teaming up with Drexel University’s School of Public Health to study the impacts of bike share on riders’ health over the next three years. And it is working with the national nonprofit People for Bikes to help other cities develop more inclusive systems and transform bike share’s image from a luxury for the rich into an affordable, healthy, and fun alternative for more city dwellers.
To: Minneapolis City Council
   Minneapolis Public Works Staff

From: Minneapolis Bicycle Advisory Committee

Date: January 25, 2017

Subject: Resolution of BAC priorities in equity, education, and encouragement

BAC Priorities in Equity, Education, & Encouragement

The Minneapolis Bicycle Advisory Committee approved a Work Plan for Equity, Education and Encouragement that is included in the Appendix.

APPENDIX

Equity:
The Minneapolis Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) will work with staff and partners to increase awareness of equity issues related to bicycling, and increase the use of equity as a factor when making decisions.

1. Create an equity statement and definition which will cover the role of the BAC in addressing equity.
2. Propose changes to the BAC processes and representation to address equity, based on the equity statement.
3. Support the City as they implement their Complete Streets policy.

Education:
The BAC will work with staff and partners to increase the reach of bicycle education both internally and externally to increase safety, comfort, and encourage more trips by bicycle.

1. Work with the Minneapolis Public Schools and partners to bring their existing bicycle education program to all Minneapolis Public School students.
2. Create and implement a standard for public educational outreach that is part of bicycle infrastructure projects. This educational outreach should be accessible on the city’s website and using temporary signage on the site.
3. Implement a standard city bicycle education system for city staff, which should be expanded in the future to neighborhood organizations and business associations.

Encouragement:
The BAC will work with staff and partners to encourage more trips by bicycle.

1. Lead or support public bicycle rides for bicycle detours and new infrastructure projects.
3. Thank decision makers for bicycle-friendly support.
4. Highlight existing encouragement programs and incentives that encourage bicycling.
5. Support new and existing policies that encourage bicycling.