January 30, 2010

Marin County Board of Supervisors

c/o Ms. Carey Lando, Senior Transportation Planner

VIA E-MAIL: clando@co.marin.ca.us

County of Marin
3501 Civic Center Drive
San Rafael, CA 94903

RE: Comments on the December 2009 Administrative Draft Mill Valley to Corte Madera Bicycle and Pedestrian Corridor Study

Dear Marin County Board of Supervisors and Mrs. Lando:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the December 2009 Administrative Draft Mill Valley to Corte Madera Bicycle and Pedestrian Corridor Study (“The Corridor Study”). Thank you also for all the effort that the County and the associated staff and consultants have made on the Corridor Study. Transportation Alternatives for Marin’s (“TAM’s”) detailed comments on the Corridor Study are attached. The comments also reference attached recommended Modified Figures, Best Practices documents, and other documents.

TAM agrees with the comments submitted by the Marin County Bicycle Coalition (“MCBC”) for the Corridor Study. In the spirit of eliminating redundancy TAM will defer all comments regarding the subject matter that the MCBC identifies in its report.

With the improvements recommended by the MCBC and the detailed improvements in TAM’s Comments, attached, the Corridor Study has the opportunity to meet the stated goals as outlined in the Corridor Study as well as the requirements originally stated by the Cities of Corte Madera and Mill Valley. (Those requirements, as outlined in City Council Resolutions, are attached as exhibits to TAM’s Comments on the Corridor Study).

Where there may be some concern about some of TAM’s recommendations meeting Caltrans and FHWA guidelines, for example with bicycle advance boxes, TAM requests the County and the Corridor Study TAC to provide alternatives for such segments that have innovated bicycle designs by using the experimental programs provided for by Caltrans and FHWA to improve this important corridor to provide safe passage for pedestrians and cyclists as part of Marin’s comprehensive integrated transportation system. By using the detailed recommendations TAM has submitted, all three routes in this corridor, can provide a future of safe and wide bicycle and pedestrian access for all user groups.
It is important that the cities of Mill Valley and Corte Madera as well as the County accept the final Corridor Study. The Corridor Study should provide a recommendation that describes such a process and the timelines for Mill Valley, Corte Madera, and the County to accept and update their pedestrian and bicycle plans to include the recommendations and designs outlined in the Corridor Study by a date certain, which can be included in the final copy of the Corridor Study.

Thank you again for your leadership in this project and the opportunity to make these comments.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick M. Seidler
President
## Transportation Alternatives for Marin (“TAM”) Comments on the December 2009 Mill Valley to Corte Madera Bicycle and Pedestrian Corridor Study: January 29, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COMMENTS/SUGGESTED LANGUAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Second full paragraph: “A Technical Advisory Committee composed of local staff responsible for transportation planning and improvements...”</td>
<td>Please see the MCBC’s comments (“MCBC Corridor Study Comments”) on the Mill Valley to Corte Madera Bicycle and Pedestrian Corridor Study (“Corridor Study”) for comments on the issues of transparency. TAM concurs completely with the analysis and the recommendations of the MCBC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement Concepts, Route A, Segment 1. The Corridor Study reads “Add a parallel pedestrian path along the existing corridor path and designate the existing bike path for bikes...”</td>
<td>The improvement concepts in the Draft Study should be modified to plan for a 21’ wide path for all segments where it is feasible. This coincides with the emergency services recommendations of 20’ paths. The details of the best practices 21’ path for pedestrian and cyclists are identified in the exhibits and specific recommendations below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Option to create sunken and raised pathway to “slightly reduce grades” of increased sense of separation from freeway.</td>
<td>The total altitude gain in this segment will not be changed whether the path is sunk and raised. The net energy expenditure for a human being to travel up the pathway will remain the same. The option to create the sunken and raised pathway is not necessary particularly for the cost and should be dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Route B Segment 7 reads: “Construct a 10’ wide bike path a parallel 8’ wide pedestrian path. See comments regarding providing a 21’ path in all places where feasible.” “Construct a 10’ wide bike path a parallel 8’ wide pedestrian path.”</td>
<td>These should all be changed to: “Construct a 21’ wide path delineated as provided in the detailed descriptions below in all segments where possible. See Modified Figure 2-5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>9A</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Reconstruct to widen existing 8’ sidewalk to a 12’ multi-use path...”</td>
<td>This should be changed to create a 21’ wide path wherever feasible following this specific detail as described below. See Modified Figure 2-5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td>Segment</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>COMMENTS/SUGGESTED LANGUAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>9B</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Construct bypass path around bus shelter at north end of existing path (absorbs a few existing parking spaces along Montecito Drive). Provide high visibility crosswalk at Redwood Avenue.”</td>
<td>This crossing of this high traffic volume street should provide for the same recommendation as the Segment 11A crossing of E. Blithedale Ave: “Potentially a future bike/pedestrian undercrossing or overcrossing at this point.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.3     | 1-5  | 10      |        | “Construct a 12’ wide path wide through the parking area to connect to the existing Sandra Marker Trail...” | • This should be changed to a 21’ wide path delineated as described in more detail below wherever feasible. See Modified Figure 2-5.  
• See also CROW Design Manual for Bicycle Traffic pages 28-29 Table 3 Paragraph 6. Bicycling, like walking, is a social activity and should be designed for two people to do it side-by-side. |
<p>| 1.3     | 1-6  | 11A     |        | “Short connection along E. Blithedale Avenue from the existing Mill Valley-Sausalito Path to Camino Alto (segment 11): no significant improvements.” | This section should be designed as specified below including bike advance boxes, skip stripping though the intersections, bike specific signalization and Class II provision for cyclists along each side of E. Blithedale from Camino Alto to the Mill Valley Sausalito Path. |
| 1.5     | 1-8  |         | 1-10   | Types of Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities | Please refer to the East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study, relevant pages attached as an Exhibit, for more comprehensive presentation of the different bicycle and pedestrian design options allowed under Caltrans design guidelines and FHWA. |
| 2.2     | 2-1  |         |        | | The Study objectives should include the definitive distillation of making mode shift from automobile to pedestrian and bicycling which is outlined in “At the Frontiers of cycling: Policy Innovations in the Netherlands, Denmark, and Germany,” by Professor John Pucher and Raf Buehler. In particular, see attachment of Professor Pucher article page 51. |
| 2.2     | 2-1  |         |        | | The study objectives and issues should also address all questions raised by Corte Madera in Resolution No. 3113/Dated August 1, 2000 and Mill Valley in Resolution No. 00-36/Dated December 4, 2000. These resolutions are attached for ease of reference. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COMMENTS/SUGGESTED LANGUAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement Concepts</td>
<td>Consider a complete ramped area in the sections on each side of East Blithedale where access to the bike path would allow a more porous entry for pedestrians and cyclists into the separated non-motorized zone. The ramps could be separated from the traffic areas protecting cyclist and pedestrians with bollards separating the sidewalk and the North South Greenway Area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2       | 2-7  | 11A     | 2-3    | Improvement Concepts | Improvement Concepts should be added to include:
- Bike advance box on Camino Alto for left hand turn on E. Blithedale and for forward bicycle traffic on Camino Alto.
- Skipped stripping should be added for cyclists heading from Camino Alto south to Miller Avenue, east on E. Blithedale and north on Camino Alto. The skipped stripping through the intersection would delineate for automobiles and cyclists where the bicycle traffic should be in traffic.
- Class II accommodation on E. Blithedale from Camino Alto should be provided on each side of East Blithedale.
- Street section drawings should be provided to show the current street alignment and to show possible alternatives to provide the Class II safe passage in this critical area since this is where currently most bicycle traffic is and it is likely bicycle traffic will remain until the Alto Tunnel is open. |
| 2       | 2-9  | 11A     | 2-3    |                         | • On Lomita Drive add an island in the middle of Lomita for pedestrian refuge and safety.  
• On Lomita Avenue add a bicycle advance box for left turns onto East Blithedale.  
• Provide skip stripping for the Class II bikeway on each side of East Blithedale though the intersection at Lomita Drive.  
• On E. Blithedale provide a pedestrian refuge island in the crosswalk connecting the bike paths across E. Blithedale.  
• Provide separated barrier in the intersection of the North South Greenway (Mill Valley Sausalito Bike Path parallel to Lomita Drive) in the areas where pedestrians and cyclists should not be drifting or crossing into the traffic on E. Blithedale. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COMMENTS/SUGGESTED LANGUAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Route Alternative A</td>
<td>2-10</td>
<td>11A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement Concepts: • “As increased use warrants, add a separated 8’ wide pedestrian path parallel to the existing 8’ paved path and designate the 8’ path for bike (see Figure 2-5)”</td>
<td>This should be changed to a 21’ path wherever feasible. See recommended improved cross-section through existing Mill Valley –Sausalito bike path with new pedestrian path. See Modified Figure 2-5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Route Alternative A</td>
<td>2-12</td>
<td>11A</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The new high visibility crosswalk width should be minimized by providing curb bulb-outs on each side of Lomita Drive. • There should be a left turn bike advance box on Ashford Avenue. • There should be skipped striping though the Lomita Intersection and across Ashford Avenue for cyclists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Route Alternative A</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>11A</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>• See Modified Figure 2-5 recommended improved cross-section for multi-use path. • See also pictures from Minneapolis for best practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Route Alternative A</td>
<td>2-14</td>
<td>2A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement Concepts: • “Add “Sharrows”- shared lane markings for bikes.”</td>
<td>• Note that all the work done on these sections should be designated as Safe Route Projects to be funded through County, State, and Federal programs. • Construct a Caltrans section 1003.5 multiuse path between the rows of car parking as shown in recommended Figure 2-6. • This section should be striped and Class II segment on each side of the road wherever feasible. Even if the travel lanes are reduced and it causes traffic to slow down in the unmarked center section of this road, Class II lanes would provide more safety. • Extend the proposed new path bypassing parking lot. • Increase bulb-out area on Lomita Drive where it turns in front of school to the east. • The existing path should have connector path around toward the school to allow for students to access the school grounds without crossing the parking lot and getting the students to their bicycle parking facilities at the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-16</td>
<td>2A</td>
<td></td>
<td>A new figure should be added to show the overview section of the Improvements Concepts in the critical area in front of the Edna Maguire Elementary School connecting Segment 2A to Segment 2B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td>Segment</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>COMMENTS/SUGGESTED LANGUAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unkwn</td>
<td>2-18</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement Concepts: “Add 5’ wide A.C. pedestrian pathway on north side of Lomita to extend sidewalk east in road right-of-way along frontage of open space (Figure 2-8).”</td>
<td>• Define a “A.C.”&lt;br&gt;• The 5’ wide A.C pedestrian pathway on the north side of Lomita should be increased to an 8’ wide Section 1003.5 multi-use pathway for students to get to school by walking or cycling.&lt;br&gt;• The separated path should continue to a place where school children can walk or ride to the school bicycle parking.&lt;br&gt;• The Improvement Concepts should show a road section cross section to the existing conditions.&lt;br&gt;• The Improvement Concepts should show road cross sections with suggested improvements.&lt;br&gt;• The road section widths should be done for this area too to see the feasibility of adding Class II bike lanes on each side or one side of the street.&lt;br&gt;• Parking should be removed in as many places as feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Route Alternative A</td>
<td>2-19</td>
<td>2-19</td>
<td></td>
<td>All of these picture boxes like on Page 2-19 in the Study should be numbered. For example: “Figure 2-D.” These figures are unlabeled throughout the Study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Route Alternative A</td>
<td>2-20</td>
<td>2-8</td>
<td></td>
<td>• See the recommended improvements to the Lomita Drive / Shell Road intersection in Modified Figure 2-8, attachment.&lt;br&gt;• The stop signs on Lomita at Shell Road should be removed in each direction.&lt;br&gt;• Bulb-outs should be provided on each side of Shell Road and on the north side of Lomita Drive to narrow the high visibility cross walk lengths.&lt;br&gt;• Stop signs should be added on Shell Road going onto Lomita Drive heading northbound and on Shell Road Court heading onto Lomita Drive heading southbound.&lt;br&gt;• The intersection here is an excellent opportunity for a speed table providing traffic calming (slow cars to 10mph) with a textured speed table and direct and non-stopping bicycle access through the intersection.&lt;br&gt;• The new A.C. path on the south side on Lomita from Shell Road heading east should be extended to an 8’ Section 1003.5 multiuse pathway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td>Segment</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>COMMENTS/SUGGESTED LANGUAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2 Route Alternative A | 2-21 | 2-10 | | | • See recommended modifications to Figure 2-9 and Figure 2-10.  
• The A.C. pathway should be increased to 8’.  
• Lomita Drive auto lanes should be decreased to 21’.  
• Parking should be reduced to 7’.  
• A Class II striping should be provided in this section where feasible. |
| 2 Route Alternative A | 2-22 | 3 | Improvement Concepts:  
“With current conditions this connection and the path it connects to would have approximately 10% grade, and would not be ADA compliant, however a compliant 5% grade may be possible with the “sunken/raised” path alternative described in the following pages.” | This section is ADA compliant because the pathway follows the contour of the mountain and the adjacent road. Please confirm. |
| 2 Route Alternative A | 2-34 | 4B | | | • The travel lanes should be reduced to 11’ in each direction.  
• See recommended modifications to Figure 2-18.  
• Add a stop sign on Meadow Valley Lane.  
• Remove stop sign in downhill direction.  
• Put curb bulb-outs on Casa Buena Drive Freeway onramp.  
• See recommended modifications to Figure 2-16. |
| 2 Route Alternative A | 2-41 | 5 | Improvement Concepts | This is one of the most complicated intersections in the entire study. Extra attention needs to be paid to this.  
• Please see recommended improvements to this section overview (Unlabeled Pictures page 2-41). The recommendations are described as follows but better seen with the overview.  
• The high visibility crosswalks on Sanford Street on the north side of Meadowsweet Drive should be narrowed with bulb-outs and squaring the corners of the intersections so that traffic slows.  
• Skipped striping should be provided through the Casa Buena Intersection and the driveway to Bank of America on Sanford Street at each side of the street up to Tamalpais Drive.  
• On Tamalpais Drive bulb-outs should be extended as shown the drawings on each corner of Tamalpais Drive.  
• Pedestrian refuge areas should be provided in each of the middle sections on each of the Madera Blvd sides of Tamalpais Drive and each of the Tamalpais Drive sides on Madera Blvd. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|         |      |         |        | • Left hand bike advance boxes should be put on Sanford Street turning left onto Tamalpais Drive and a bicycle box forward on Madera Blvd.  
|         |      |         |        | • A bicycle advance box and a forward box for cyclists should be provided on Madera Blvd. for cyclist turning left onto Tamalpais Drive and forward onto Sanford Street.  
|         |      |         |        | • Build a new curb median on Sanford Street extending from the edge of Tamalpais Drive almost through the high visibility cross walk.  
|         |      |         |        | • Provide a bicycle specific signalization at this critical intersection. |
| 2 Route Alternative A | 2-42 | 2-21 |      | The drawings provided on this page are simply not understandable. |
| Unkwn   | N/A  | 5      | N/A   | The alternatives analysis should provide an alternative continuing west on Meadow Sweet Drive turning right on Lakeside Drive and continue on Lakeside Drive to Manona Drive returning back to Madera Drive. This bypass allows a safe and less congested intersection bypass than Tamalpais and Madera Blvd. The section from Meadow Sweet Drive to the first intersection of Lakeside Drive and Mohawk Drive should be improved as follows:  
|         |      |        |        | • Class II bike lanes on each side of Lakeside Drive from Tamalpais to Mohawk.  
|         |      |        |        | • Intersection improved by pedestrian refuges in the median of Tamalpais Drive.  
|         |      |        |        | • Curb bulb-outs to reduce Tamalpais Drive pedestrian crossing.  
|         |      |        |        | • Skip striping through intersection for cyclists in both directions.  
|         |      |        |        | • Posted no parking on the east side of Lakeside Drive between Tamalpais Drive and Mohawk Avenue.  
|         |      |        |        | • Bicycle advance boxes on the south side of Tamalpais and Lakeside Drive, on the north side of Tamalpais Drive. Including forward skip striping through the intersection and left handed turns in each bike advance box.  
<p>|         |      |        |        | • Starting at Mohawk Drive and Lakeside Drive the alignment changes to a Class III routing from Lakeside to Manona, turning right on Manona Drive still Class III up to Madera Blvd. where Class II striping resumes on dash striping through the |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COMMENTS/SUGGESTED LANGUAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|         |      | 2-50    | 7      | Improvement Concepts:  
- “...they [emergency and maintenance staff] have requested an evaluation of a 20’ emergency access corridor. This would be further reviewed in the environmental review, right-of-way analysis, and final design stage of any project undertaken.” | TAM agrees with this comment however the path section widths should be increased to 21’ as detailed in the recommended figures provided and as shown in the Minneapolis Best Practices pictures. |
| 2       | 2-51 | 7       |        | Improvement Concepts:  
- “Construct A.C. paved path- 10’ wide for bikes with 2’ shoulders, 8’ wide for pedestrians (see Figure 2-3).” | • The multi-use path should be 21’ wide not the 10’ wide for bike and 2’ shoulders and 8’ wide for pedestrians.  
• See Figure 2-5 recommended cross-section width for a 21’ wide path.  
• See Best Practices from Minneapolis for width of multipurpose trails. |
| Route B | 2-52 |         |        | | |
| 2       | 2-56 | 8       |        | Improvement Concepts:  
- “Construct A.C. paved paths – 10’ wide for bikes with a 2’ shoulders, 8’ wide for pedestrians (see figure2-27).” | See TAM recommendation for Modified Figure 2-27 making 21’ wide path designated for pedestrians and cyclist as shown. |
| Route B | 2-60 | 9A      |        | | |
| Unkwn   | 2-64 | 9B      |        | Improvement Concepts:  
- “Construct 12’ wide Class I pathway from Segment 9A to Redwood Avenue by widening or placing the existing 8’ path south of Redwood Avenue (requires transitioning from the separate 6’ wide pathway and a 10’ wide path proposed to the south).” | • The path should be changed to a 21’ wide path with the section dimensions as shown in the previously referenced attachments.  
• The crossing of Redwood Avenue should have an alternative with a grade separated crossing preferably an underpass underneath the bus stops connecting the North South Greenway on each side Redwood Avenue and resurfacing in the middle of the parking lot and continuing to the North South Greenway.  
• The improved concepts regarding the Monticello bike route alternative and speed tables should be presented with a figure drawing and should narrow travel lanes on Monticello to 11 feet for automobiles and provide a minimum 6’ wide bike path. |
| Unkwn   | 2-68 | 10      |        | Improvement Concepts:  
- “As increased use warrants at a separate intersection for the left hand turn and a right turn onto the Class II system proposed for Madera Blvd. | This segment should be increased to a 21’ wide path as shown in the attached drawings. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COMMENTS/SUGGESTED LANGUAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>2-81</td>
<td>2-36</td>
<td>8’ wide pedestrian path parallel to the existing 8’ wide paved and widen existing 8’ path to 10’ and designate for bikes (see Figure 2-31).”</td>
<td>See Figure 2-36. The road should be widened 5-10’ to accommodate 6’ wide climbing bike lanes and 4’ wide descending bike lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unkwn</td>
<td>2-84</td>
<td>2-37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modified Figure 2-37 shows Class II lanes on each side of Camino Alto that are a minimum of 4’ wide in the downhill direction and 6’ wide in the uphill direction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2-4: Ashford access improvements between MV-Sausalito Path and Lomita/Ashford intersection
Figure 2-6: Maguire School Bypass Path Concept
Figure 2-8: Plan view of Lomita/Shell intersection area
Figure 2-16 Highway 101 on-ramp intersection improvements
Segment 5 Improvement Concepts
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Design manual for bicycle traffic
In most cases, there is more chance of making Accident statistics also show that
and the elderly not only experience comfort problems, they also run
risk in traffic.

design
A bicycle-friendly infrastructure
have to be well-versed in the techni-
calities and limitations of cyclist and
any are aware that cycling entails a
more or less conflicting characteris-
tical is muscle power, which
mattering speed limit. Although a
ed is required to ensure stability. On
add, the bicycle is vulnerable, while
as hand, it is highly manoeuvrable
e in traffic. Furthermore, bicycles
are and counted as slow traffic,
they are one of the fastest means
in the urban environment. Table 3
shows a number of typical characteristics of
the bicycle, cyclists and cycling.

The cyclist as a customer in the traffic and transport system
The properties and limitations of the vehicle
and its driver are recognised parameters for
the design of roads for motorised traffic. Comfort
and safety go hand in hand. A similar approach
is required for the design of facilities for bi-
cycle traffic. The cyclist can be regarded as
one of the customers within the traffic and
transport system as a whole. This customer has
preferences that can be seen as the quality
requirements to be set for the infrastructure.
It is the designer's responsibility to ensure that
these preferences or quality requirements are
expressed in the infrastructure as completely
as possible. Bearing in mind the bicycle-
cyclist system and the technical and physical
properties of bicycle and cyclist, the following
requirements are essential to achieving a bi-
cycle-friendly infrastructure:
- ensure the required section of free space;
- make it possible for two cyclists to ride side
  by side;
- minimise the resistance cyclists experience
  when riding;
- take the limits of physical and mental capacity
  into account (optimise the mental capacity);
- take the vulnerability of cyclists into
  account;
- take cyclists' perception into account;
- ensure a complete and comprehensible
  infrastructure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Characteristics of bicycle, cyclist and cycling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The bicycle is powered by muscle power. That is why a bicycle-friendly road design keeps energy loss to a minimum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The bicycle is unstable. Crosswinds, the slipstream and turbulence caused by lorries, bumps and holes in the road surface and involuntary low speeds determine the stability and hence the room required to manoeuvre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The bicycle has no crumple zone. Accident statistics are a clear indication of the cyclist's vulnerability. However, the road authorities are in a position to exert a great deal of influence on this situation. They can give cyclists a 'spatial crumple zone' to allow them enough room for evasive manoeuvres. Cyclists can balance on a strip of ground 0.20 m wide, but this amount of space is totally inadequate to be able to cycle comfortably. When a car door opens, additional space on the bicycle lane can save lives. Their vulnerability also means that cyclists cannot mix with fast-moving cars and intensive lorry traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The bicycle has hardly any suspension. A smooth road surface is a minimum condition when it comes to meeting the requirements of bicycle friendliness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The cyclist rides in the open air. This has both advantages and disadvantages. Shelter against wind and rain removes a number of disadvantages. The advantages must be retained in the design, so designers should take note of the attractiveness of the surroundings in which the cyclist rides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cycling is a social activity. That is why two cyclists should be able to ride side by side. This applies particularly if a lot of recreational cyclists can be expected. Furthermore, the option of riding next to each other gives parents the opportunity to escort their children safely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People as the key factor. The number of tasks a traffic participant can perform and their complexity are bound by limitations. Designers should respect these limitations, taking less experienced and less able-bodied road users into account.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2-5: Modified Cross-section through existing MV-Sausalito bike path with new pedestrian path
**Figure 2-9:** Modified Section through Lomita Drive at open space frontage
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**Figure 2-10:** Modified Section through Lomita Drive at open space frontage
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Figure 2-18: Modified Proposed condition - section through southern portion of Casa Buena
Figure 2-23: Best Practice Section through Multi-Use Path
Figure 2-27: Best Practice Section through Multi-Use Path
Figure 2-31: Section through Re-Constructed Planter and New Path

Figure 2-32: Best Practice Section through Existing Sandra Marker Path with New Pedestrian Path
**Figure 2-34:** Modified Section at Southern Portion Camino Alto

- Retaining Walls on East or West Side Where Required
- 6" Solid White Stripe
- 6" Solid White Stripe
- Guard Rail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4'</th>
<th>22'</th>
<th>6'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>Camino Alto</td>
<td>Climbing Lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2-37: Improved Section near top of Camino Alto

- Retaining Walls on East or West Side Where Required
- 6" Solid White Stripe
- 6" Solid White Stripe
- Guard Rail

- 4' Class II
- 22' Camino Alto
- 6' Climbing Lane

60'-65' Right of Way