

43. Fear & Loathing

Democrats in 2004 expected, foolishly, to regain White House on the slogan, “A New Age of Responsibility”, something nobody wanted to hear. Were it so! Responsibility deals with details. Constituents despise details, elect and expect candidates to handle them. Bicyclists thrive on details, all those efficient preplans, places to stop and turns to make. They complain bitterly when there aren’t ways to get where they want to go. But bicyclists adopt a defeatist attitude, say they, “Just want to ride.” They abhor community involvement. Nobody admires know-it-alls from good families and schools who feel compelled to take up “white man’s burden” of Third World eugenics. The downtrodden don’t need or want your sympathies. But that doesn’t mean you can’t create a supportive climate for them. Just do it, don’t shove their noses in it. Society doesn’t send donkeys to college, because everyone hates a smart ass, or anyone who’s smarter at all. People still must act responsibly toward each other irrespective of mental acumen or social class. This means defining together what share is fair, which issues are important, then divvying up resources, finding common ground. Ho hum. Yawn. Big stretch.

There’s so much to do. Lately days just flew by and Al felt he was getting old in a hurry. Kept getting invitations from AARP, and other discriminatory organizations with nothing to offer but eager to pick your pocket simply because of your age. Devoted what little excess energy he had toward improving local bikeability through a number of activities: arrowing club rides, attending town meetings, contributing to State’s guide to bicycling, mapping out potholes, pinpointing misaligned storm grates, raising awareness, staging protest rides, and writing letters to bureaucrats, Congressmen, and other advocates praising their efforts or taking them to task. Town meetings bore, yet fate of your community hangs in balance. More homeowners get this lately, and such gatherings are getting increasingly crowded. To fight them off, schedulers pick nights of climatic games or other events, making each a choice between duty to community or self, relying on selfishness to get their business passed without dissent. He knew he wasn’t wanted, but showing up to represent bicycling interests mattered in some miniscule way.

Biking and thinking, colliding and deriding, drinking and stinking, grooving and improving, all funneled into an urge to do more purposeful riding, killing 2, 3, 4 birds with 1 stone. Yet he found local advocacy rampant with automotive propaganda,

politics, ridicule and self-interest. That drive-thru will go in on your corner whether or not you lay in front of bulldozers, unless you can get everyone around to join you in class action suits. Failing that, you must decide between escaping or suffering.

Sent a series of brain drains to those who asked to stay informed. Got back, "Take your discussions to bulletin board. We're not interested. We're a team, and must back team's platform," whatever that might be, even if never articulated. Might as well proclaim, "We've an agenda, but we're not telling what it is. Back off." Any unsanctioned comment makes those who've spent a lifetime dabbling among such detail bristle, drop you, toss you out of their smug sandbox. Insecure. Well, he didn't get into activism to stew in silent acceptance; actually wanted improvements, could cite many good reasons. Bike commuting is probably the only way to simultaneously fight all 3 leading causes of death in America, he repeated to almost everyone who'd listen. He became a zealous bore, but it didn't matter. So-called advocates were worse and only protected their own paid purpose, not needs or will of bicyclists.

Laziness is wasting billions of dollars annually in tax funded health care, money he had to pay. He earned a right to speak. Bicycling, he felt, would address some of America's biggest problems: childhood obesity, deurbanization, environmental rape, high insurance rates, lack of regular exercise, petroleum dependence, resource depletion, and vehicular accidents resulting from overcrowding. An overcrowded highway forced one Pope Boy into a multi-car collision, survived to an inconvenient aftermath of car rental and increased insurance premiums. Locally, afternoon rush hour starts before noon. If you get sick, house catches fire, or require emergency assistance, you must do it between 12:00 midnight and 6:00 AM so emergency vehicles might arrive in time. Many say they'd bike instead if they could. Even transportation-challenged people want to be out and about, like his developmentally disabled neighbor who used to ride her adult tricycle.

Fear, inconvenience and laziness are the 3 main arguments against using bikes as their primary mode of conveyance. Can't do much to convince people who simply loathe pedaling. But you can nudge others by improving roads, mitigating dangers, and offering stuff that increases convenience. Nudges are attempts at control. Who did he think he was fooling? Did he really care if more got out on bikes? A few more riding might create economies of scale, reduce costs of cycling supplies, and run some interference for him against mo-ves, but did he really need any? He already rode anywhere. Any nudging was for their own benefit, not his. Their worst

fear is motorized transportation. Rightly so, people *should* be terrified, especially those hurtling around inside mo-ves. Anyway, a bike is small and elusive, body steady and bike wavering below, slashing around street stuff, man and machine in harmony with surroundings, perfectly free to leave road altogether.

Next, fears evolve from faulty surfaces, then terrain with descents into cracks and sand. Upon returning on a March day he realized he'd ridden on every available surface within space of a few hours: asphalt, brick, concrete, curbstones, expansion joints, flagstone, glass, grass, gravel, hard pack, ice, loose dirt, mud, natural (rounded) cobble, natural stone, plastic sheets, rumble strips, sand, sheet metal, sidewalks, snow, squared cobblestone, stairways, steel grates, tiles, train tracks, wood planks, and wood substitute. This is what happens when you cross several bridges, descend stairs, do a bikepath, and pass successively through a college campus and old town. Somewhere in city there were cider paths, which went out of style with burning coal, and rubberized pavement for running but not biking, but planning an itinerary that covered them as well would have been overtly compulsive. Yet leading a group along such a route might teach them that none were much to fear. Bikes can go practically anywhere.

Being accosted is an unreasonable worry, since even slow bicyclists coast faster than most muggers are willing to run. Criminals are almost defined by lazy and slow, will give up running within a block or chasing by car if you leave roadway onto a path that leads elsewhere. A car full of teens looking for trouble once accosted him at a bikeway crossing, but he ignored them. They drove around to next crossing expecting to intercept, but he'd already sped through; saw them get out, shaking in frustration, in his rear view. Bicyclists make poor targets anyway, don't carry much worth stealing. Road bikes are custom fitted, have weird tiny pedals, nurture entire nations of bacteria from dripping bodily fluids to filthy gutter spatter on every surface including rump hugging saddles, and possess practically no resale value. None of this helped a bicyclist who was recently robbed and stabbed not a few miles from home. Wondered if this incident didn't begin with road rage. "Get on the sidewalk," he was told in front of a bike shop. Dogs? Owners should know they're responsible for any damage their pets cause, not just bites. More and more he saw fences and leashes.

Good news? All such obstacles can be addressed—*if anyone wants to!* With right bags, bike, equipment, and scenarios, cars are hardly necessary. Biking isn't going to feed the hungry, solve most problems, or stop war—unless fought for fuel; which wars weren't?

Anyway, more people die from auto-related collisions and diseases than in wars—most people, in fact. Should oil consumption cause irreversible climate change, no telling how many it'll kill. If bicycling instead extends lives, economists might argue against extra bellies that need to be fed. Yet air pollution abatement would increase farm yields, a net wash. The more one thinks about its potential, the more sense bicycling means to you personally, if you can somehow get past its few perceived shortcomings.

Realities are stacked against. Bike commuters are a minority made smaller by bad traffic planning and lack of concern. Cars always get top priority, railroads second, pedestrians a distant 3rd, and bicyclists little to none. Since highways can't handle any more vehicles, can't be widened any more, can't even be maintained, traffic chokes every secondary, destroys pavement overnight, and suddenly increases obstacles. Soon there'll be nowhere to ride. By some miracle, advocates got Feds to fund greenways, "Give bikes, kids, strollers their own road!" Moms and motorists approved, "Get them off our roads." Incompetent motorists love bikeways.

Some counter, "Let cyclists ride existing roads!" This does nothing to mitigate bicycling specific dangers. Can hardly stop a determined bicyclist, anyway, who'll ride wherever, paved or not. Among his favorite shortcuts was an eroded bit of cemetery road which, to reach, you have to bunny hop a curb and cross a patch of lawn, not a route he'd recommend to anyone. Bike paths, good sight lines, grate and pothole repairs, intersection accommodations, lane stripes, shared roads, and signage *encourage* cycling. Those who seem to hate bike paths are a) kamikazes who ride as fast as possible in middle of road, b) local residents who don't yet know that bikeways nearby increase their property values, c) rude scofflaws who willfully violate polite conventions, d) self-appointed bike authorities who find bikeway successes detrimental to their fanatic pontifications on on-street riding, and e) selfish, tight-fisted tax haters, typically reactionary Republicans. These splinter groups might seem a minimal opposition, but their loud opinions seem to directly affect decision makers who in turn ignore normal bicyclists who just want to ride with few worries. As evidence, Mamie Peavish, current secretary of USDOT appointed by Dudbubba, denounced use of gas taxes for bikeways, since, in her estimation, bicycles are *not a form of transportation*, despite the fact that tens of millions of Americans use them for commuting every day. More than that would also if AMTRAK and FHWA weren't systematically eliminating every back road connection between communities through bridge removal and wider highways.

An unintended consequence of Peavish's pronouncement is it gives bicyclists the right to ignore traffic laws. If you want to get more to ride, don't tell them a bike is a *vehicle*. Tell them it is a *Freedom Machine*. A bike is more like a sneaker than a car. Bicycling and walking are identical legally, inalienable rights. Repeal any draconian laws in your state which classifies a bike as a vehicle, a thing you passively control rather than actively wear. Everyone is already entitled to use all streets not officially banned or closed. But motorists running down self propellers will always be criminal. Lane striping and signs are for motorist's benefit. They beat educational pamphlets that never get read, if you analyze effects to date.

Lean Sigma advises, "If you can't change the process, change the people." Some people do prevent progress—those who settle, those who theorize, too lazy to go and see for themselves or put any real effort in, and those who *designate themselves* as authorities, as if that could ever motivate people. For public policies, you have to deal with existing members of public. Posers sprung up like weeds after electronic publishing arrived. Expert books on bicycling are practically worthless for a disinterested populace, and little therein made any sense unless you've already discovered it for yourself. Unable to supplant them, a change he could undertake was a change of heart. He aggravated experts, challenged their assumptions, goaded them to get real. In particular, he questioned Lean Sigma practitioners, who hack and slash, toss out indirect processes with no understanding of how important they are. In his experience, all were managers who had no idea how to manage, so were *invited* to participate or risk dismissal.

There's a snooty group at Havayard with industrial ecologists from MITI who supposedly amassed a huge amount of metadata to prove that nothing needs to be done to facilitate cycling. Hypothetically, it's true, cyclists can simply take advantage of whatever pavement exists. All you need, they say, is to be able to go from 0 to 25 mph in 6 seconds independent of terrain. "Get out, go forth, and ride with the wind." Why then isn't everyone out bike commuting? Real fears, hills, inability, incompetence, really not compelled, after all. These experts want you to emulate their youthful agility. Why adopt a system that suits a small minority of twenty-year-olds hardly anyone can match? Shouldn't solutions be designed around majority, obese adults and kids averaging a fraction of that, and remaining two-thirds of Americans who don't yet ride? Their fantasies were a failure for 99% of potential cyclists. A strong point they make is that bicyclists represent a smaller group to retrain compared to motorists, but that just capitulates to their being

excluded by design and does nothing about dangers. Bad planning kills. Mo-ves kill. Bikes don't. To deny and revoke drivers licenses would do more, work better. No point arguing highbrow theories; nobody reads or understands them anyway. Yet governments run your world based upon some such expert's say-so. Amass all the stats you like, they don't negate truths.

Motorists appreciate roads clear of bikes, but are willing to tolerate cyclists who are considerate enough to move aside as they pass. Motorists fear unpredictability of cyclists, which is most often caused by unpredictability of road shoulders. More bikeways should be built, particularly in urban areas, and be maintained as well as roads year round, but not because motorists believe roads are theirs exclusively. Bikes belonged alright—either on bike paths or right of travel lanes—wherever there's public pavement, but not where they disrupt a free flow of commerce. Neither should mo-ves be parked 2 abreast nor motorists stop without pulling over. Paths in his area were constantly used, brought joy to those physically impaired as well as families with small children. Paths through cities, when well designed, ease congestion and increase bike commuting. Proprietors of local bike shops estimated that about 60% of their bike sales were directly related to bikeway use.

His writing campaign on area bulletin boards uncovered fractured viewpoints and seemingly little agreement. But bulletin boards never represent majority opinion, just those of persistent individuals with agendas, raging bulls shopping for china, sales-people spreading bull. Through club advocacy, he authored a survey and gathered almost 300 respondents, who collectively put in on average a half million miles per year. Group was split evenly between commuting and recreational riders, anonymous and self-identified. While actual number of respondents was only an estimated 5 to 10% of avid cyclists within area, 1% of total, their opinions *were* qualified by extensive time spent observing and participating. If developing an advocacy platform, their combined opinion ought to be a foundation upon which to build. It's was the sort of consensus he always babbled about, among an informed experienced demographic likely to carry weight, divergent perspectives aligned on important issues, respected magi, village elders that rationalists and zealots can't abide.

They clearly supported riding on both bike paths *and* roads. Not everyone is fanatical about riding alongside traffic as zealots preach. While commuting roundtrip 25 miles, he found bikeway to be a welcome change from gagging on petroleum miasma and unburnt carcinogens. He'd ride miles out of his way to enjoy its

shade in Summer and steady sailing on fine Winter days. Wasn't plowed after snowfalls, so still spent a lot of time on roads. Can't always use bike paths, since they don't necessarily pass places you want to go. But, like drivers choosing between interstates and secondaries, riders choose whatever's most efficient and suits their purposes. Club riders got together and rode bikeways on week-nights with lights, when there were no baby buggies about.

From his survey there was no clear unanimity about "bike racks" or "police support". Bike racks, signage and striping do raise bicycling awareness at low cost. Many riders choose to avoid cities, so, at least locally, they weren't of much interest. Police could serve bicyclists better by stepping up enforcement of laws governing motorists on secondaries: excessive use of horns, harassing or inciting violence against, illegal use of phones, passing on right, running stop controls, travelling in parking lanes, and whatnot. He supposed they did their best, but thrills of motoring brought out the worst in people, like Mr. Toad's Wild Ride. More than 50% of respondents choose routes to avoid busy or hilly streets, elect to ride on state or town roads, and prefer bike lane striping designed to "avoid dismounting". While flat, spacious roads are optimal, respondents tolerate some crowding, hills and traffic. Coasting thrills; climbing builds. About 55% are inconvenienced by "lack of bridge access" designated by prohibitive signs. Over 70% of respondents somewhat or strongly agree that bike paths "are justified by health", should be placed to "enjoy/conserves wildlife areas", and "spell tourism dollars". They disagree that bike paths are a "waste of money" even if they might not use paths themselves. Respondents wish that more be spent on *both* bike paths and road upkeep. Over 85% want roads swept more frequently, potholes filled, and storm grates fixed. He imagined if motorists were asked corresponding questions about highways, you'd probably get about the same responses. Main arteries are harder to keep in good repair due to heavier demands. This must be factored into shared use plans.

Respondents would commute more if there were "bike friendly traffic signals", such as chest-high, on-demand push-buttons or rollover triggers at crossings. Accommodations they'd like would consist of short path segments that bypass multi-lane, rotating control intersections. Respondents would use an "area-wide connected bikeway system of paths and roads". About 80% who agreed on infrastructure issues strongly recommend actual roads be part of any bikeway plans. State and towns should adapt quiet deserted roads for bicycles but divert mo-ves onto main roads. Over 90% strongly opposed being restricted to bike paths

according to existing state motoring codes that grant bicyclists full use of travel lanes. Among 24% of respondents who added comments, most often mentioned were (in descending order per capita): bike path ambivalence; better bike routes; poor road conditions; grant bridge access; unsafe feelings; educate drivers; more bike paths/lanes. Only one suggested how a bottle bill that rewards recycling would reduce glass in streets, perhaps because recycling was already mandated in most communities. You'd think among hundreds of bicyclists more would have made this connection, do something proactive about what causes most flats, something harder to miss than grates and potholes. Generally, those who participated enjoyed a chance to be heard, and said so.

Consensus among a vast community of avid cyclists who spend millions of hours observing while riding is something to rally behind, you'd think. They said they want statewide bicycling systems that takes advantage of existing roads. Cars sweep roads but heavy traffic causes potholes, so bicyclists seek lightly used roads when there's no nearby bikeway or bikeway's unplowed, unswept or unusable. Bikeways are a puzzle piece among many, and group supported them. Cul-de-sacs could be connected between adjacent communities by short paths or small bridges. Sidewalks can be converted into multiuse paths. Commercial developments can be forced to plan for bikeways before zoning approval. In most cases, existing roadways could be modified. Connected pavement that suits bicyclists can be designated by signs, especially flat stretches along rivers or tidal planes. Roads with 4 lanes can be repainted for 2 automotive lanes alongside bike lanes and parking spots, which is safer for motorists, too. Bicyclists gravitate to whatever's most convenient for them, as do motorists and walkers. To fairly share byways, traffic planners ought to sort out the flows better.

From survey results, he put together an action plan and set out by himself to accomplish it, not that it yet brought any intended changes, something only future would see. Few could disagree with its collective will and common sense. Checked entire state to see which roads did or did not accommodate bicyclists. You must actually ride to do this. You get a different perspective from behind wheel. Intersections might seem fine with 200 horsepower. How about 1/2 horsepower? Bicycling cartel's answer was to bike elsewhere. Nonsense. Why should bicyclists be held hostage by 1 bad intersection? It only takes 1 to rule out miles of roadway. One must ride purposefully to discover such spots then convince authorities to act upon them. You'll never personally profit from doing so, so never expect anyone to volunteer; fully support whoever does.

From experience and renewed research, he analyzed urban proposals, and offered many alternatives. Why pick streets with dozens of defects to repair when others have none? Somehow urban plan had to extend into outskirts, pass parks, playgrounds, public places, schools, and vistas then intercept existing bikeways. He marked up State's bicycling guide map with over 250 corrections, sent it in. Upon later review, almost all were made. Could see how errors might have previously occurred, made from memory rather than benchmarked immediately and referenced against topographical standards. He met with mayors and probed why roads couldn't be repaired and swept more often. Politicians all endorse bicycling, but you're on your own. City budgets were too stretched already. Unable to increase maintenance for all, you need to designate which roads you'd hold to higher criteria. Bike friendly traffic signals would only go where bikeways were being developed; a few, decades away, were being contemplated, whereas crosswalks and sharrows cost very little and could be painted by nighttime volunteers. Meanwhile, anyone could get behind agencies, events, or programs that foster increased bicycling. He attended Bike-to-Work Day and bikeway openings, drew ride maps, organized special charity and club rides, spoke at public meetings, tested routes for upcoming events in cooperation with National Park Service, wrote a series of articles about bicycling for publication, and wrote a successful nonprofit grant proposal. It was scattershot, but gradually his ideas began to worm their way into official documents and wound up on the ground, never to be credited, he knew, but what did that matter?

What states really need are bicycle infrastructure standards. You'd be hard pressed to find any, as no National Geospatial Standards yet exist, although MIT Press had independently published some by one of those self proclaimed experts. Road planners have been increasingly converting 2-lane undivided roads with parking shoulders into 4-lane undivided roads without. Their aim seems to be creating climbing lanes or shuttling mo-ves aside for turns; in any case, this caters to motorist impatience, pinches cyclists off, and triples unrelated motor collisions. Roads that retain shoulders do permit cycling but don't unduly restrict motoring. He spoke ambivalently about a plan to put stripes and signs on a particular boulevard but made no real accommodations for bicycling. Why settle for token recognition? Don't stripes encourage? You must start somewhere. He even spoke against a suburban bikeway which went nowhere, when a parallel street, suitably modified, would serve nicely. Anything that detracted from bicycling long distances

or diverted funding to wasteful infrastructure he was against. A \$15 million signature bridge his state had begun working on was worth less to bicyclists than 15 miles of bikeway or 100 bike-ped bridges, or, better yet, 900 instances of intersection adaptations at \$15,000 each. Cities and towns *all* need a bicycling plan that coincides with neighboring towns. Bike routes can't lead to *nowhere*; they must be continuous, may *bend*, but never *end*. No bicyclist wants to poke into unknown side streets, possibly find they don't go through, or re-climb a hill during a long difficult ride. Bikeways don't make good commuting legs if to complete trip you have to call a cab or wait an hour for a bus, many of either don't accept bicycles.

Streets get too busy by how traffic is flowed or quieted. Motorists mostly avoid twisty side streets, prefer brightly lit straight-aways with few controls, limited access, well marked, wide lanes. They'll take such roads in the country even when there are scenic byways adjacent. Speed is their chief concern. Automotive stations and strip malls pay a premium to crowd along traffic flows to gain exposure, which exacerbates situation. There are often quiet roads behind malls that bicyclists could use if there were pass-throughs, like open gates or stanchions, to permit *back door* access when sharing a highway isn't feasible. In general, he found 1-way designations only worked when there was a 2-way street close by. Often, instead, there's another 1-way parallel in the opposite direction. This creates in effect a big rotary. Real estate bound within is hard to get to, and, thus, seldom visited. Kills businesses and property values. These arrangements are particularly bad for bicycling. When frequently crisscrossed and paralleled by 2-way streets, 1-way streets suffer less flow restriction. You'd think urban planning courses might teach these things. While riding around, you notice what's been done and endured for decades and scratch your head.

He tried to get cities to just formalize routes that enhance bicycling and walking alternatives, but found few agreed or even grasped this concept. His vision was to enable biking along direct, flat seams. The least suitable roads for bicycling are those with multiple lanes, no shoulders, and parked cars. Since you can't unduly restrict commerce, these sometimes cannot be avoided. Therefore, closely paralleling roads could be designated instead, as long as they aren't 1-way or more than a single lane in each direction. Free, secure parking lots can be located alongside, so some motorists can drive near city, park, then ride remainder. Object would be to increase urban visitors in general, with frequent trolley loops to these lots from city center. This would in no way cut business to inner city lots, filled to capacity already and likely to

remain so for convenience they offer. On-street daylong, overnight and short term parking strategies could be worked out, and towing increased. Connecting bikeways with shared roads encourages using both. Just because few would use entire corridor doesn't mean you shouldn't have them. Motorists don't drive from Maine to Florida on I-95 every day either. Like a highway, they get on and off at exits they need to. A road's success is in its *continuity*.

Advocates have to decide what they hope to achieve, shoot beyond, then accept compromises. This fixation on motorized flow causes endless problems for bicyclists. In population centers active rail lines and interstates cut off numerous bike routes. Approaches and exit ramps are especially hazardous. Aptly named *gore area*, a restricted triangle, leads highway exiting motorists into merging traffic. More often it's where car-nage takes place, with an abundance of blood and gore. Sometimes bike banned highways are tolerable, if that means fewer motorists are using secondaries. Bridges and underpasses cost more than surface roads. While passengers cars represent the only shrinking group, mo-ves aren't going away. Fewer cars means more trucks, often chosen because drivers realize streets can't be maintained. Trucks wreck pavement. You can prohibit trucking through residential subdivisions; some already do, although enforcement is sketchy at best. If bicyclists could reclaim prohibited pass-throughs, they'd have something to gravitate to. They needn't be restricted to them, just be made aware of a better choice through signs and stripes. Minor accommodations cost a small fraction of what dedicated bikeways cost and invite little dissent. National cartel's board supports bike paths, racks, stuff designed to shout, "Bikes belong!" They also accept that certain roads are already closed to bicycling: dangerous bridges, interstate highways, limited access. Let planners ban a few roads; they're going to anyway. But ensure they maintain nearby workarounds for bicycling, leave options open, only fair.

Even though there's 1 bicyclist to 3 motorists nationwide, infrastructure funding for bikes is comparatively miniscule, 200,000:1. Bureaucrats recognize this. "There is no question that conditions for bicycling and walking need to be improved in every community in the United States; it is no longer acceptable that 6,000 bicyclists and pedestrians are killed in traffic every year... and efficient modes of travel have been made difficult and uncomfortable. United States Department of Transportation is committed to doing all it can to improve conditions for bicycling and walking and to make them safer ways to travel." Federal Highway Administration, January, 1999. Cities must provide some

accommodation for all forms of transportation on every street, but many can't even handle existing traffic. Mayors smother local vitality if they don't act to handle a requisite flux of employees, event attendees, municipal workers, and store patrons. Disney's Magic Kingdom daily swallows hundreds of thousands by offering huge parking lots and short monorail loops connecting parks with a Ticket and Transportation Center. Boston, Montreal, New York, Paris and Tokyo feature effective subways, without which their economies would collapse. Mayors don't question the impact of spending \$500 million taxpayer dollars for a single highway project. Why quibble over a few million for miles of bikeways? Energy abuse spills blood and easy money which government officials suck up.

When all roads are too narrow to add a bike lane, there are some options: a) Build a parallel separate bikeway, b) designate and improve at least 1 in 3 streets on a grid as bikeable, as long as cyclists can use all and at least 1 safe route connects all areas of city, c) have a bike lane on only 1 side, then use a different parallel street to designate another bike lane in opposite direction, or d) sacrifice on-street parking where necessary, but provide massive free parking lots on periphery of urban centers linked by bike/ped concourses and rapid transit. This is just good urban planning.

Already 10 years have passed and little has been done locally to comply despite federal funding and guidance. Maddening, since bikeways and minor improvements cost a small fraction of putting in expressways, which they do constantly whether communities want them or not, steam rolled over homesteads seized by eminent domain. Dialogue is how change begins. It's never too late to raise issues, unless you think developments for bicycling aren't worth discussing, as do most automotive lobbyists. Many disagree with bicyclists he surveyed. Advocates must hammer out a collective position. People who harp about safety sometimes hide selfish schemes of control and profit. They'll use it to support otherwise untenable arguments. Deal a few child-death cards, and their hand seems a winner, reasonable to many, transparent manipulation to him. Rural bikeways reward the rich. Urban bikeways, open and accessible to largest concentration of potential riders, poor and rich alike, would be a great way to conquer the fear and loathing that's pushed bicycling into boonies.

