

Date of Hearing: June 29, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

Lori D. Wilson, Chair

SB 569 (Blakespear) – As Amended June 24, 2026

SENATE VOTE: 38-0

SUBJECT: Bikeways: reversions and modifications

SUMMARY: Prohibits a local or regional agency from reverting a bikeway it constructs using moneys from the state General Fund to a nonactive transportation use or modifying it in manner that reduces the safety, accessibility, or mobility of nonmotorized users, to 20 years or its useful life, whichever is less. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Defines active transportation as a use that encourages increased use of active transportation, such as walking and biking.
- 2) Prohibits a city, county, regional, or other local agency using moneys from the state General Fund, in whole or part, to construct a bikeway from reverting the bikeway to a non-active transportation use or modifying it in a manner that reduces the safety, accessibility, or mobility of nonmotorized users for a minimum of 20 years from the date of the allocation or its actual useful life, whichever is less.
- 3) Requires any modification to a bikeway to be consistent with an active transportation use and subjects it to both of the following:
 - a) A duly noticed public meeting to discuss an intent to modify a bikeway and;
 - b) A duly noticed public hearing where the final design of a modification is considered by a city, county, regional or other local agency.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Defines and distinguishes a bikeway as follows:
 - a) Class I bikeways (off-street, paved) provide a completely separated right-of-way designated for the exclusive use of bicycles and pedestrians with crossflows by motorists minimized.
 - b) Class II bikeways (striped lanes) provide a restricted right-of-way designated for the exclusive or semi-exclusive use of bicycles with through travel by motor vehicles or pedestrians prohibited, but with vehicle parking and crossflows by pedestrians and motorists permitted.
 - c) Class III bikeways or “sharrows” (shared roadway) provide a right-of-way on-street or off-street, designated by signs or permanent markings and shared with pedestrians and motorists.

- d) Class IV bikeways (separated lanes) provide a right-of-way designated exclusively for bicycle travel adjacent to a roadway and which are separated from vehicular traffic. Types of separation include, but are not limited to, grade separation, flexible posts, inflexible physical barriers, or on-street parking (Streets and Highways Code (SHC) §890.4).
- 2) Requires California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to establish, and local governments to use, minimum safety design criteria for the planning and construction of bikeways and roadways where bicycle travel is permitted. The criteria must include factors such as design speed, minimum widths and clearances, and grade (SHC §890.6).
- 3) After January 1, 2025, prohibits the installation of Class III bikeways on road with posted speeds above 30 miles per hour; prohibits the use of Active Transportation Program (ATP) funds to construct Class III bikeways with some exceptions (SHC §891.9).
- 4) Establishes the ATP within Caltrans to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation, such as biking and walking, and expresses the intent of the Legislature that the program achieve goals such as increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking and increase safety and mobility for nonmotorized users (Streets and Highways Code (SHC) §2380).
- 5) Requires the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to develop ATP guidelines and project selection criteria in consultation with an ATP Workgroup; the guidelines must include topics like project eligibility, application timelines, application rating and ranking criteria, project monitoring, reporting, and transparency, and project performance measurement (SHC §2382).

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown

COMMENTS: *According to the author,* “Protected bikeways physically separate cyclists from motor vehicle traffic, improving safety and increasing ridership. California law requires engineering assessments when local agencies build bikeways, but imposes no equivalent standard before one is removed or downgraded. Recent local decisions to remove bike infrastructure have raised serious safety concerns and in one case forced a city to repay \$435,000 in transportation funding.”

State funding for bike projects. The Active Transportation Program was created by SB 99 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review), Chapter 359, Statutes of 2013 to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation, such as walking and biking. The goals of the ATP include, but are not limited to, increasing the proportion of trips accomplished by walking and biking, increasing the safety and mobility of non-motorized users, advancing efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals, enhancing public health, and providing a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of users including disadvantaged communities. In 2017, the Governor signed Senate Bill (SB) 1, also known as the Road Repair and Accountability Act. SB 1 directs \$100 million annually from the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account to the ATP, significantly augmenting the available funding for this popular program.

Statewide programs like the ATP and other highway programs Caltrans administers have funded as of 2025, over 2,800 miles of bikeways (approved, constructed or ready for construction) since as early as 2014. In addition to funding that flows through Caltrans, the state General Fund has also provided small allocations for specific projects. Cities and other local governments also invest their own funds in bike and pedestrian infrastructure.

In 2024, Caltrans committed to invest nearly \$1 billion as part of the 2024 State Highway Operation and Protection Program funded by SB 1 and federal funding over four years in bike and pedestrian infrastructure statewide, including 265 miles of new and enhanced bike lanes. Moreover, as early as 2011, local governments have been obligated to plan for the multimodal needs of all road users, including bicyclists, when updating their general plans.

Demand for non-vehicle alternatives continues to exceed available funding. As a result, ATP has been chronically over-subscribed. Program funding has fluctuated significantly but on average available funding ranges from \$500-600 million a year from state and federal sources. According to the CTC, in its 7th and most recent cycle (2025), one of the most competitive since inception, it received 277 project applications from local, regional and tribal governments requesting \$2.5 billion in funding, about 15 times available funding, which was significantly lower than average.

Growing pains as bike infrastructure is more widely developed. As local governments have built more comprehensive bikeways, some have experienced challenges balancing competing demands for limited road space. Desktop models or studies during the design phase of bike projects may not reliably capture potential user conflicts or vehicle congestion as a result of road narrowing, converting lanes, or removing vehicle parking to accommodate bikeways. As a result, community opposition to new bike and pedestrian infrastructure can motivate local leaders to respond accordingly and in limited circumstances, this has resulted in the removal or downgrading (e.g., converting a separated bikeway to a shared or striped one) of a bikeway.

The author of this bill provided four examples to the committee where cities have downgraded bikeways (Vista, Culver City) or are considering downgrading them (Encinitas, San Mateo). For example, due to concerns that road narrowing and angled parking increased safety risks and vehicle congestion, including the inability of first responders to expeditiously travel along a corridor, the City of Encinitas recently approved designs that reduce the separation of a bikeway, reverting it from a Class IV to a Class II bikeway. The Vista City Council voted to remove recently installed berms separating bikeways from certain roadways citing safety risks to vehicles and bicyclists though the decision was disputed and not unanimous. Culver City converted a separated bikeway to a shared bike/bus lane. However, the City of San Mateo is no longer considering relocating or replacing a bikeway to restore parking spaces.

These examples, a small subset in the context of several thousand miles of bikeways approved or constructed in the past decade, highlight the challenges associated with developing bike infrastructure on existing roadways and the actual or perceived creation of unintended safety risks or conflicts between vehicles and cyclists. Changes to roadways may be met with opposition as local governments pursue alternatives to vehicles and consider mechanisms to increase the safety of nonmotorized alternatives. However, the growing pains some communities are experiencing may not persist as they learn how to develop active transportation infrastructure that balances competing roadway uses. Moreover, it takes time for users of the new facilities to adapt to new infrastructure.

Rules of the bikeway. Modeled after ATP requirements, this bill prohibits a local government, on a going forward basis, from converting a bikeway to a non-active transportation use for the lesser of 20 years or the useful life of a bikeway should they accept state General Fund monies to develop a bikeway.

This bill also prohibits the modification of a bikeway if it reduces the safety, accessibility, and mobility of nonmotorized users. This conditional prohibition is intended to accommodate changed circumstances or the ever-evolving nature of roadways that may need to be re-designed to adapt to things such as utility re-locations, emergency access, construction or intersection upgrades, and safety issues. In these circumstances, a modification must be consistent with an active transportation use and provide the same or similar level of safety, accessibility and mobility of nonmotorized users. For example, converting a protected bikeway or a portion of the bikeway to a less protected one could be offset with greater protection for bicyclists in other areas of the same bikeway corridor.

This bill also requires a local government to consider a modification at a public hearing to maximize transparency. First, a local government must hold a public meeting to initially disclose its intent to modify a bikeway, inform the public of the need and justification for the modification, and invite public input. Adoption of the modification's final design must occur at a duly noticed public hearing.

Writing in support, the California Bicycle Coalition states, "California communities are investing significant public dollars, staff time, and political will into safer streets. These investments help people bike, walk, and roll with more confidence, and they are especially important in communities where safe, affordable, and sustainable transportation choices have too often been delayed or underfunded. When state general funds are used to build a bikeway, the public should have confidence that the project will not be hastily reverted to a non-active transportation use or weakened in a way that reduces safety, accessibility, or mobility for nonmotorized users."

Writing in opposition, the California Association of Bicycling Organizations states that, "The bill also prohibits an existing bikeway from being reverted to a nonactive transportation use or modified in a way that reduces safety, accessibility, or mobility. Because these are independent criteria, even minor changes—such as rerouting a Class III bike route to nearby streets—could trigger the bill despite no net loss of bicycle access. The requirement to determine whether a change reduces safety, accessibility, or mobility raises additional concerns. These judgments are often subjective and depend on professional engineering and planning expertise, yet the bill provides no clear standards or decision-maker. It is also unclear why bikeways should be uniquely locked in place for twenty years despite changing conditions and transportation needs."

Related legislation. SB 1216 (Blakespear), Chapter 788, Statutes of 2024, prohibits the installation of Class III bikeways on road with posted speeds above 30 miles per hour; prohibits the use of ATP funds to construct Class III bikeways with some exceptions.

AB 1193 (Ting), Chapter 495, Statutes of 2014, requires Caltrans to establish and local governments to use minimum safety design criteria for the planning and construction of bikeways and roadways where bicycle travel is permitted. The criteria must include factors such as design speed, minimum widths and clearances, and grade.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

California Bicycle Coalition

Opposition

California Association of Bicycling Organizations

Analysis Prepared by: Dan Chia / TRANS. / (916) 319-2093