

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Urban Studies and Planning Faculty
Publications and Presentations

Nohad A. Toulan School of Urban Studies and
Planning

2016

Creating an Inclusionary Bicycle Justice Movement

Aaron Golub

Portland State University, agolub@pdx.edu

Melody L. Hoffman

Anoka-Ramsey Community College

Gerardo Francisco Sandoval

University of Oregon

Adonia Lugo

California State University, Los Angeles

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/usp_fac



Part of the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Citation Details

Golub, A., Hoffman, M., Lugo, A., & Sandoval, G. (2016) Introduction: Creating an Inclusionary Bicycle Justice Movement. In: Golub, A., Hoffman, M., Lugo, A., & Sandoval, G., eds. (2016) *Bicycle Justice and Urban Transformation: Biking for All?* Routledge.

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Urban Studies and Planning Faculty Publications and Presentations by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

1 Introduction

Creating an inclusionary bicycle justice movement

*Aaron Golub, Melody L. Hoffmann,
Adonia E. Lugo and Gerardo F. Sandoval*

Introduction

For much of the past century, the bicycle was not taken seriously as a means of mass mobility – overshadowed by the car almost as soon as the bicycle became affordable due to mass production in the early 1900s. After smaller waves of interest over the past century, a recent and seemingly sustainable bicycling boom in the U.S. and in many cities worldwide has caught the attention of transportation planners, policymakers, and the public as more people turn to the bicycle for mobility and exercise. Even though rates of cycling in the U.S. remain relatively low, especially when compared to other Western countries, there has been a noticeable increase in people using a bicycle for transportation. Growth in the number of bicycle commuters in the U.S. is now far outpacing the growth of other modes; between 2000 and 2012 when the total number of workers grew by 9 percent, bicycling to work grew by 61 percent while driving to work grew by 10 percent (Pisarski, 2013). In some cities, the growth was much greater; between 2000 and 2009, cycling to work more than doubled in Chicago and Portland, while cities like San Francisco and Minneapolis saw similar increases during the 1990s (Pucher et al., 2011).

A panoply of factors contribute to this growth in ridership, including improvements in cycling infrastructure in many cities, recognition of the health benefits of active travel, a cultural turn toward reduced environmental impact and petroleum dependence, and significant demographic and economic shifts which challenge traditional patterns of car ownership and licensure especially among younger age groups. A new profile of urban cycling has emerged, one associated with the middle-class whiteness that was once more at home in suburbs and SUVs, but is now venturing, mostly by choice, back into the city riding buses, trains, and bicycles. But this mediated profile of the upwardly mobile bicyclist is misleading. The greatest share of bicycle commuters in the U.S. fall into the lowest U.S. Census income bracket, Latinos have the highest rates of bicycle commuting, and African Americans doubled their rate of bicycling between 2001 and 2009 compared to only a 22 percent increase for whites (McKenzie, 2014; League of American Bicyclists and the Sierra Club, 2013). There are thus striking contrasts between the widely touted cycling renaissance as a signifier of

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5

1 being hip and the bicycle's more realistic utilitarian character as a low-cost trans-
2 port mode for a broader range of riders and needs.

3 Bicycle advocates promote the bicycle as a form of freedom or emancipation
4 from the doldrums and dilemmas of a car-dominated life—a choice made among
5 various transportation alternatives often linked to larger displays of lifestyle or
6 politics. But for many people in the U.S., the bicycle is not an emancipatory
7 tool—it is not a statement about style or politics – but an outcome of oppression,
8 leaving the bicycle as the only reasonable travel option due to inadequate
9 public transportation, complex travel needs, or low wages and high transporta-
0 tion costs. Furthermore, street harassment and crime, sexual solicitations, and
1 police violence are likely experiences that marginalized communities suffer
2 from when they need or choose to ride a bicycle (Minnesota Healthy Kids
3 Coalition, 2015; see also Coates, 2015). Common infrastructure tools used to
4 lure new bicyclists such as off-street trails and protected bicycle lanes cannot
5 address these common threats and vulnerabilities many experience in the public
6 realm everywhere and every day. Thus, bicycling has varying potentials to be
7 both an emancipatory and oppressive practice. Coming to understand how
8 individuals, communities, and experts locate bicycling between these extremes,
9 and how this shapes their own practices, sheds light on what “bicycle justice”
0 could mean and how community advocates can strive to achieve it. That is the
1 goal of this book.

2 Indeed, many communities are defining “bicycle justice” for themselves and in
3 recent years a diverse range of people and projects have broken new paths toward
4 making bicycling inclusive and accessible to all. The case studies collected in this
5 book call attention to overlooked riders and what their invisibility means for
6 bicycle advocacy, planning, and policy. Their lived struggles connect bicycling
7 with larger issues of inequality in health, wealth, voice, and security. The dismissal
8 of these struggles as irrelevant to bicycle advocacy and planning has allowed this
9 affordable and flexible technology to become a symbol of urban gentrification,
0 whiteness, privilege, and choice. This introduction continues with a framing of
1 the overall issues and tensions at play in the process of broadening the voices and
2 beneficiaries of bicycle advocacy and planning. We then describe the challenges
3 of developing inclusionary and emancipatory bicycle justice and argue that
4 it is vital to contextualize bicycling within a broader justice framework if
5 public investment in the practice is to serve all street users equitably. We then
6 present an overview of the chapters, and conclude by delineating themes and
7 highlighting problems and solutions.

8 9 **Transportation and the dimensions of injustice**

0 Contemporary issues of bike planning and street design need to be understood in
1 a context of uneven urban development which excludes and oppresses along class
2 and racial lines. Transportation planning, policies, and investments shape and
3 are shaped by these uneven and exclusionary processes and impact the geogra-
4 phies of opportunity for many communities and individuals. These transportation
5

impacts are often racialized, with people of color routinely bearing the brunt of the exclusion. For example, freeways, integrated into other processes of “urban renewal,” created concrete physical barriers in communities of color, facilitating the suburbanization of whites while destroying thriving neighborhoods and displacing entire communities (Gibson, 2007; Mohl, 1993). East Los Angeles was reshaped by the construction of multiple freeways and was “encircled, cut up, and glutted by freeways” (Avila, 1998, p. 18). Despite bicycle advocacy’s inherent opposition to the automobile “system” and all of its injustices, inefficiencies, and externalities, many transportation justice advocates still connect bicycle planning with whiteness and privilege and thus see it as a continuation of this history of injustices, rather than a break with it (Maus, 2011–2012).

The pragmatic actions illustrated by some of the case studies in this book emerged in the context of and in response to these unjust urban processes. In fact, the U.S. Civil Rights movement emerged in part around transportation inequalities and injustices. In the early 1950s, African Americans in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, staged the nation’s first successful bus boycott to protest their unequal treatment to whites on busses. From Rosa Parks to the Freedom Riders in the 1960s, to modern transportation justice movements such as the Bus Riders Union in Los Angeles or the national Transportation Equity Network, justice activists have demanded that transportation systems end their practices of discrimination against low-income and minority communities (Bullard et al., 2004; Grengs, 2002; Transportation Equity Network, 2015). The Bus Riders Union relied on the 1964 Civil Rights Act to prove that the Los Angeles County transit authority was actively discriminating against bus riders, overwhelmingly people of color and low-income, through the disparities they experienced in quality of service and subsidy levels compared to whiter patrons of rail systems in the region (Grengs, 2002). This case made it clear that transportation systems, including the outcomes of plans and investments and the planning processes themselves, are important civil rights issues.

While transportation justice movements were successful in elevating transportation as a civil rights issue, including bicycling in this framework has been complicated by images of bicycling as a lifestyle choice, by the delineation of bicycle advocacy as a white and middle-class space, and by the entanglement of bicycle investments in processes of real-estate upgrading associated with displacement and gentrification. An inclusionary and socially just bicycle justice practice will have to overcome these hurdles which we distill into two key challenges: (1) the othering of certain riders within organized bicycling, and (2) disparities in the benefits of bicycle investments.

The othering of certain riders within organized bicycling

In the U.S., bicycling takes place both where it is welcomed by attitudes and infrastructure and where it is not. Many bicyclists have cycled with or without the bicycle lanes, signals, and markings that advocates and planners view as crucial to luring drivers out of their cars (League of American Bicyclists and the

1 Sierra Club, 2013). Largely invisible or maligned in popular imagery, professional
2 practice, and the mainstream cycling movement, these actually existing cyclists
3 are generally poorly understood by the dominant trifecta of advocacy, engineer-
4 ing, and policy (Koeppe, 2005; Fuller and Beltran, 2010; Zavestoski and
5 Agyeman, 2015b). It is also troubling that the pro-bicycling cultural and demo-
6 graphic shift occurring in U.S. inner cities is structurally linked with the gentri-
7 fication and displacement of inner-city residents who are low-income and people
8 of color, the exact population that is dependent on cycling as an affordable
9 mode of transport. Through bicycle justice, we focus specifically on these othered
0 riders and challenge the bicycle advocacy and planning norms which focus on
1 white and middle-class commuters.

2 Understanding the socio-cultural elements of bicycling today can be a chal-
3 lenge amidst the various efforts to associate cycling with predominantly white,
4 middle-class urbanism and lifestyles. Scholars have tracked the promotion of
5 bicycle gentrification in Los Angeles and Minneapolis (Hoffmann and Lugo,
6 2014), Portland (Lubitow and Miller, 2013), and Memphis (Smiley et al., 2014),
7 and the San Francisco Bay Area (Stehlin, 2015). “Bicycle gentrification” refers to
8 the process through which bicycle infrastructure contributes to or accompanies a
9 neighborhood’s property value increases and resulting displacement effects, and
0 the trend where key figures use bicycle infrastructure strategically to rebrand
1 areas of the city in preparation for real-estate investment or redevelopment.
2 Additionally, there has been a proliferation of bicycle iconography in U.S. adver-
3 tisements and consumer goods and controversy about urban bicycling in the
4 news media (Furness, 2010). These images, whether evoked positively or nega-
5 tively, work to establish a hegemonic understanding of who bikes and who does
6 not. Dominant images include the scofflaw bicycle messenger, the lycra-clad
7 racer, or the bicycle commuter dressed in professional attire. The promotion or
8 condemnation of these subcultural stereotypes as bicycling mascots skews public
9 perceptions of who is actually using bicycles for transportation.

0 The gap between bicycling as image and as practice can be explained in part by
1 the racial and socioeconomic homogeneity of professional bicycle advocates and
2 planners. Promoting bicycling is a networked practice that includes the act of
3 advocating and participating in transportation planning process and also partici-
4 pation in conferences, email lists, consuming and creating bike-related media,
5 and coordinating advocacy activities across many cities. The result is what we
6 here call *organized bicycling* in order to differentiate it from the basic physical
7 activity of riding a bicycle. Organized bicycling could be a catalyst for social
8 inclusion of diverse community needs, but in the past its push to “normalize”
9 bicycling has tended to “other” bicycle users who do not participate in organized
0 bicycling’s self-selecting and exclusive social spaces. Currently, most of its efforts
1 simply do not account for the economic and discriminatory challenges still faced
2 by many in the U.S., including individuals for whom bicycle transportation is a
3 survival strategy and not an enthusiastic choice. Within organized bicycling,
4 there has been discussion about socially marginal “invisible riders” for some time
5 (Koeppe, 2005). What we suggest here is that continuing to mark some bicyclists

as a separate category of users does not disrupt exclusion. Instead, we draw attention to organized bicycling's process of othering that consequently produces outside riders. By confronting this problematic categorization, we hope this can be a site for change in bicycle advocacy work.

The production of outsider bicycle users in organized bicycling can be seen in data collection. Bicycle advocates who want to increase investments in bicycling rely on quantitative methods that do not capture existing diversity among bicycle users. For example, bicycle counts, a popular model for tracking the rate of bicycling in U.S. urban spaces, uniformly do not record a bicyclist's race, ethnicity, or income. The count methodology assumes that a street user's gender can be ascertained visually but avoids guessing other statuses. Aside from this small concession to monitoring the gender gap in bicycling, the methodology posits that all bicycling bodies are equal. This flattens diversity among bicycle users, turning their bodies into a data point that experts use to lobby for changes derived from their own qualitative experiences of bicycling. It is not a method for gathering data on lived experiences of bicycling which are often mediated by class, gender, and racial inequities. Furthermore, counts are often made only in main, radial, commute corridors into and out of central activity centers and not in peripheral areas or on key connections to major low and medium skilled job centers such as airports, suburban shopping malls, or light industrial sites. This further biases planning and investments toward already privileged commuters (often traveling in corridors already served by the best public transit services). In these ways, othered bicycle users become invisible to official processes, even as organized bicycle enthusiasts struggle to gain recognition for bicycles in mainstream planning practice.

The homogeneity of today's organized bicycle enthusiasts stems from a more formal history of racial exclusion within bicycle advocacy. For example, the League of American Bicyclists is an influential national bicycle organization with one of the largest memberships among U.S. bicycle organizations today. It also has a sordid history of excluding people of color (Furness, 2010). In 1894, at the peak of the bicycling boom when it was known as the League of American Wheelmen, the organization instituted a ban on "colored" members. The League did not formally remove this language until 1999. In the same public statement striking the color bar from their bylaws, the League also posthumously awarded Marshall "Major" Taylor a League membership. Taylor is the most famous African-American cyclist in history, due in part to his relentless pursuit of breaking colorlines in professional sports at the turn of the 19th century (Ritchie, 2009). Major Taylor Cycling Clubs, currently active across the U.S., are named in his honor. Even within studies of the bike movement, this lesser-known racialized history is usually only footnoted for completeness, or ignored altogether. It has not been treated as a formative feature of bicycle culture and advocacy.

We argue that racialized exclusion within organized bicycling does matter, because planning processes are shaped by powerful forces such as racism, sexism, classism, and white supremacy (Pulido, 2000). Planning scholar Bent Flyvbjerg

1 (2001) argued that it is normal rather than exceptional for planners and advo-
2 cates to draw on their own perspectives in developing their recommendations.
3 So, while it is not unusual for bicycle expertise to overemphasize white, middle-
4 class norms if its practitioners are white and middle class, we question whether
5 this homogeneous group of experts can produce solutions that will improve
6 biking for all.

7 Bicycling is not a homogeneous practice; it takes on novel meanings in
8 different social and geographic situations (Horton et al., 2007). Researchers have
9 identified the assemblage character of bicycling, where the particular com-
0 binations of individuals, physical environments, and machines produce different
1 effects (Hoffmann, 2016; Lugo, 2013; McCullough, 2013; Vivanco, 2013;
2 Furness, 2010). Despite this critical attention to the potential for diversity
3 in bicycling, bicycle research tends to record little deviation from organized
4 bicycling's in-group norms. It is likely that this is because researchers who
5 study bicycling are usually also bicycle enthusiasts, working from a personal expe-
6 rience of vulnerability while riding a bicycle. Like many bike advocates, they feel
7 threatened and want to do something about it; many may know people who were
8 killed while riding. The effects of this embodied vulnerability on research design
9 and findings deserves further study, but it is clear that it gives bicycle activism an
0 emotional urgency that both bonds like-minded cyclists together and tends to
1 villainize car dependence. Add to this mix the conviction that everyone must
2 transition to low-resource "sustainable" lifestyles to prevent ecological disaster
3 (Horton, 2006) and the result is advocates who can come across as self-righteous
4 crusaders rather than collaborators in equitable social change.

5 The recent "bike equity" turn in organized bicycling shows that advocates are
6 aware of this negative image (League of American Bicyclists and the Sierra Club,
7 2013). However, their moves to correct it tend to tokenize bicyclists who are
8 people of color rather than investigate the roots of othering in organized bicycling.
9 Trying to make themselves respectable in the eyes of their own white, middle-
0 class culture still takes precedence over integrating more diverse perspectives
1 deeper within advocacy strategy.

2 The project of trying to change the dominant culture (as symbolized by the
3 car) lies at the heart of bike activism, which explains in part why it has been
4 difficult for participants in organized bicycling to examine how they produce a
5 dominant culture within bicycling itself. The current era of bicycle advocacy
6 efforts operating under the banner of ecological security and street safety began
7 in the 1970s in culturally influential places such as New York City and San
8 Francisco (Furness, 2010). Their direct action approach to calling the public's
9 attention to the need for a more humane streetscape culminated with the almost
0 spontaneous invention of Critical Mass bike rides in San Francisco in 1992.
1 Critical Mass rides are now found around the world and have been a catalyst for
2 bike movements in numerous cities (Furness, 2010; Carlsson et al., 2012).
3 Another significant innovation of this direct action approach to bicycle promo-
4 tion is the bicycle recycling and repair model for popular education. The earn-
5 a-bike program for children was developed at Transportation Alternatives in

New York and became Recycle-A-Bicycle, while the repair education model was developed at Bikes Not Bombs in Boston. Today bicycle repair cooperatives are bike movement hubs in cities around the world, and as community centers they attract a more diverse group than do mainstream bicycle advocacy organizations.

However, organized bicycling has largely turned away from supporting and participating in direct action approaches such as Critical Mass, and while advocacy organizations may coordinate with local community bicycle education centers, lessons learned in those diverse spaces rarely trickle upwards into bicycle advocacy work. Instead, advocates look to national organizations and intercity professional networks to select new trends for promotion to elected officials and planning agencies. Prominent bicycle organizations focus on building legislative and political support for infrastructure and contracted systems such as bike share. Starting in the 1980s, the policy and funding advocacy efforts focused on accessing public funds for highways in order to pay for bicycle projects (Mapes, 2009; Wray, 2008). This pushed advocates to pay more attention to building top-down political will and working behind the scenes to secure legislative wins, de-emphasizing the importance of integrating the broader cycling public. Although active transportation consulting firms such as Alta Planning + Design, Alta Bike Share, and Toole Design Group have been able to expand through increased public spending on bicycling, it is unclear whether other riders have benefited from the political legitimization of organized bicycling.

Sharing in the benefits of bicycle investments

As several case studies in this volume illustrate, moving beyond race, class, and gender tokenism in bicycle advocacy and planning is a central struggle for social justice activists participating in “bicycle equity.” Instead of working to further their own urbanist preferences, bike advocates could consider how their work broadens, or not, the beneficiaries of investments in bicycle infrastructure across boundaries of race, class, gender, language, or national origin.

Professional bicycle networks train advocates to value innovations coming from Northern European countries such as Denmark, Sweden, and the Netherlands. That built environment interventions will lead to a more civil street culture is assumed as fact in bicycle advocacy, though this cause and effect relationship has been questioned (Oosterhuis, 2014). The possibility that Northern Europe’s prized public spaces and transportation investments reflect a much broader social and political commitment to equality and dignity does not come up in the pitch for U.S. bike infrastructure. Instead, the benefits for efficiency and optimization are highlighted as advocates push for molding U.S. streets in a European image. This design-determinism does not connect to the civil and human rights projects of correcting the social exclusion existing in the urban U.S. today. It is unlikely that street designs from Copenhagen can themselves remedy the effects of the freeway program on urban Black communities or reduce the insecurity of Black bodies in public spaces (Coates, 2015).

1 The rise of cycling and related planning runs counter to now 100 years of
2 transportation planning paradigms that prioritize the automobile, which them-
3 selves are intertwined with broader social changes, including the rise of the mass
4 consumption society (Norton, 2008; Golub, 2015). On U.S. streets, bicycles
5 have long been grudgingly allowed a marginal existence, with the general under-
6 standing that people in cars “deserve” more road space. Understandably, as the
7 only “first class” mode, access to cars has been an important project for the trans-
8 portation justice movement, the drawbacks and injustices of the automobile
9 system notwithstanding (Gilroy, 2001; Bratman and Jadhav, 2014). The car is a
0 central element of the mass consumption society and an important symbol of our
1 mass belief that we are all middle class in the U.S.; for white people with economic
2 security to promote bicycling throws a harsh light onto the struggle by many to
3 even enter the mainstream of our consumer society. Advocates ignore the fact
4 that significant segments of the population were met with discrimination in
5 employment, wages, housing, and access to credit and education – fair access to
6 road space was at the bottom of their list of concerns (Massey and Denton, 1993).
7 Advocates who succeed in funneling resources toward bicycling should be aware
8 that challenging transportation hierarchy reveals their own privilege much more
9 quickly than it extends it to others. (Similar dynamics also play out internationally
0 as members of the middle class in developing world cities reject the status quo
1 drive for automobility in their quest for lifestyles of health and sustainability—
2 see e.g. Anantharaman (2015).)

3 Formal transportation planning processes aided these processes of social
4 exclusion and segregation in three ways: (1) unequal access to participation in
5 the planning process, (2) unequal exposure to localized environmental burdens,
6 and (3) unequal distribution of mobility benefits from transportation invest-
7 ments (Denmark, 1998; Golub, 2015; Golub et al., 2013). The confinement of
8 minorities to central cities and the common placement of freeway facilities
9 proximate to those communities mean that urban minorities are often dispro-
0 portionately exposed to resulting environmental burdens and safety risks (Bullard
1 et al., 2004; Golub, 2015; Hilton, 2006). In this light, transportation justice is
2 about overcoming these barriers to broader social integration and focuses more
3 on creating mass mobility through improved public transportation and access to
4 automobiles, jobs, and housing than a concern over the rights to the bicycle more
5 specifically. Additionally, transportation justice conceives of its target popula-
6 tions not as user groups defined by transport mode, but as racialized and classed
7 groups defined by historical disempowerment. Even though these racialized and
8 classed groups have encountered similar disenfranchisement in bicycle infra-
9 structure planning, transportation justice largely ignores bicycle issues. We argue
0 that transportation justice needs to encapsulate bicycle advocacy due to the
1 exclusionary nature of organized bicycling as well as the real material potential of
2 the bicycle for mobility.

3 The current neoliberal era is characterized by a pattern of reinvestment in
4 inner-cities as cheap property values attract developers while long-standing
5 communities are priced out (Smith, 2002). Automobiles remain the dominant

and prioritized form of transportation in these cities, but the lure of built environment interventions such as bicycle infrastructure allows car ownership to be a choice, not a necessity, for the re-urbanizing upwardly mobile. While there are real needs for alternatives to the automobile, the processes of recent urban market-based upgrading and rebranding have recast new investments in public transportation or cycling as tools to attract investment rather than to create broader solutions (Golub, 2015; Grengs, 2004). This places the emergence of planning for cycling in a messy conundrum: it joins a set of development processes which are more about attracting growth and less about serving mobility needs for existing residents. As stated earlier, white, upwardly mobile people are not the majority of bicyclists in the U.S. today, and they will likely not be in the future due to other demographic shifts. They are, however, a desirable group to attract to gentrified urban cores, which is why real-estate marketers, city boosters, policymakers, and bicycle advocates continue to focus on their preferences.

Inclusionary, equitable bicycle justice

In a broad sense, bicycle justice is achieved through projects located closer to the emancipatory pole of an imagined continuum from oppression to emancipation. By this we mean to acknowledge directly that for some people bicycling and land use strategies embedded in related advocacy work can actually be oppressive; cycling is slow, dirty, unsafe, and relegated to a marginal status on most streets, in most cities. Whether they feel positively about bicycling or not, the choice to ride for some indicates their economic and social vulnerability rather than their travel preferences. An emancipation framework, by contrast, works toward including all bicyclists, especially those currently othered as “invisible cyclists,” within organized bicycling and its design goals. This would transform cycling into a public good, rather than an object of consumer or lifestyle aspiration.

Emancipatory bicycle justice considers how power influences the development of transportation policies and programs along dimensions of race, class, gender, and language. Iris Marion Young (2011) argues that equity means making institutional amends to historically discriminated groups by broadening access to decision-making power. Hence, emancipatory bicycle justice is not only a distributional paradigm but one based on representation and empowerment.

The editors of this book define bicycle justice as an inclusionary social movement and practice based on furthering material equity and recognizing that a diverse range of qualitative experiences should influence public investment in transportation. Bicycle justice transforms oppressive, exclusionary transportation planning practices into inclusive equity initiatives. It creates emancipatory outcomes that support safe and affordable access to resources such as social services, education, employment, urban amenities, housing, and connections to other modes of transportation such as buses and light rail.

The resilience of organized bicycling as a movement where white, middle-class norms are taken for granted has limited the field’s ability to address the emancipation/oppression dichotomy. This volume builds on the work started in

1 *Incomplete Streets: Processes, Practices, and Possibilities* (Zavestoski and Agyeman,
 2 2015a), which focused on exclusion within the emerging transportation planning
 3 innovation, Complete Streets. There are many innovative, creative, and new
 4 ways to encourage people to ride bikes that are different from mainstream bike
 5 advocacy. But today, those who seek to make bicycling a truly equitable form of
 6 mobility continue to encounter racism (Sulaiman, 2015a, Sulaiman, 2015b).

7 The chapters of this book conceptualize and illustrate equitable bicycle
 8 advocacy, policy, and planning and suggest how to operationalize bicycle justice.
 9 In synthesizing the projects of critical cultural studies, transportation justice, and
 0 planning as applied practice, this book reveals the relevance of civil rights and
 1 social justice concerns to public interventions intended to increase cycling. Bike
 2 movement and transportation justice perspectives on bicycling continue to
 3 diverge in important ways. For bike advocates, giving people more transportation
 4 options provides avenues away from car-dependent lifestyles that have been
 5 destructive to population and environmental health, especially for communities
 6 of color. For transportation justice advocates, giving people more transportation
 7 options includes continuing the fight for access to a driver's licenses and cars
 8 because they are still seen as the best avenue to mobility in the U.S. and abroad.

9 In mediating both of these approaches, this book documents how people have
 0 used bicycling in service to social justice, and what structural constraints stand in
 1 the way of using the bicycle to meet community needs. There is more to the
 2 question of equitable access than street design, as illustrated through projects that
 3 interpret bicycling through more nuanced cultural lenses. Bicycle justice is an
 4 ongoing critical and transformative project intended to shed light on community
 5 realities where it will take more than infrastructure investments to make bicycling
 6 into the positive transportation and health solution a growing chorus of experts
 7 would like it to be.

8 9 **Chapter overview**

0 This book contains 17 contributed chapters covering a variety of practices,
 1 methodologies, and vantage points. Contributing authors were challenged to
 2 focus on addressing these key questions:
 3

- 4 1 What are the structural, political, and economic forces that shape bicycling
 5 transportation systems and who currently benefits from these systems?
- 6 2 How have marginalized bicyclists organized, operated, and formed community
 7 outside of mainstream bicycle advocacy and related sites where whiteness is
 8 typically centered?
- 9 3 How can these existing alternative perspectives inform a justice-focused
 0 planning practice in order to address a wider range of bicycling needs than
 1 previously considered in the mainstream dialogue?
 2
 3

4 The editors of this book have situated much of the bicycle equity discussion in
 5 the U.S. but the chapters in this book extend beyond the U.S. and include

analyses of bicycle advocacy in Mexico, Brussels, and South Africa. Themes of visibility, voice, and borderlands repeat as they become important theoretical underpinnings to help readers understand that bicycle justice can be as diverse as its intended community.

Conceptualizing and theorizing bicycle justice

The book's first chapters deconstruct the politics of current bicycle practice and conceptualize a rights-based framework for bicycle justice. Aaron Golub begins this section in Chapter 2 by exploring the conflicts between the broader transportation justice movement and the bicycle movement. He asks: why are the two movements so separate, and why is bicycle transportation not a key issue for the transportation justice movement? He dissects the emerging bicycle movement as a socio-technical system and contrasts it with the transportation justice framework, developing a list of tensions and synergies which may keep the two movements separate for some time. To be complete, we challenge the reader to consider how the chapter does not question the normative framework of the transportation justice movement. Doing so would confront the uneasy reality that perhaps that framework, in its fight for broader participation in the mainstream economy, is also limited in its potential and that bicycling, in some ways rejecting mainstream consumptive society with its own history of oppression, may actually offer emancipatory potential.

How does bicycle infrastructure spur gentrification? This is a question that rightfully plagues urban planners, bicycle advocates, and community members. Perhaps this question has played out most publicly in Portland, Oregon—home to a large but homogeneous bicycle advocacy community. In Chapter 3, Cameron Herrington and Ryan Dann address this question by tracking the movement of educated white people into communities of color and the correlation of that process with new bicycle infrastructure and increased bicycle use. The authors found that an area's increase in whiteness and educational attainment predicted large increases in bicycle use at the neighborhood level, suggesting that the celebration of Portland's bicycle success is, in at least some neighborhoods, a celebration of displacement and gentrification.

Shifting from this U.S.-rooted rights perspective, in Chapter 4 Gail Jennings notes a shift in South Africa's mainstream bicycle advocacy that addresses the concerns laid out in this Introduction. Jennings argues that the bicycle advocates who now promote social justice are the same "privileged minority" that formerly argued for the bicycle's green, low-cost, and sustainable possibilities. Her chapter chronicles an emerging tension: as the modernizing and socially integrating republic emerges from decades of apartheid, its dream of motorized mobility for everyone conflicts drastically with the push to encourage more sustainable modes. This is similar to the questions raised in the U.S. case in Chapter 2, to which her chapter offers few easy answers.

In Chapter 5, Christopher Le Dantec, Caroline Appleton, Mariam Asad, Robert Rosenberger, and Kari Watkins, using an example of a project where

1 crowdsourced bicycle user data relied on self-selection into bicycle advocacy,
2 argue that with better procedures, such data could be used to advocate for the
3 needs of a great diversity of bicyclists. The authors argue that the democratic
4 potentials of new forms of technology are not exempt from the barriers to
5 participation present in existing models.

6 In a less practice-oriented piece, Chapter 6 authors Karel Martens, Daniel
7 Piatkowski, Kevin J. Krizek, and Kara Luckey ask the basic distributive justice
8 question: when are publicly produced cycling interventions, at the expense of
9 other investments, warranted on the basis of justice? Using liberal-egalitarian
0 theoretical perspectives, most specifically the capabilities approach, they derive
1 conditions which should be met for cycling interventions to be warranted on
2 the grounds of justice (even as they may be promoted for other reasons). This
3 approach differs from the focus on social processes of power and exclusion used in
4 the other chapters in this book, and as such offers an interesting twist to consider
5 for bicycle justice policy design.

6 7 ***Othered bicycling and community knowledge*** 8

9 In this section, authors speak to how race and class status can directly impact
0 perceptions of bicycling and related amenities such as bicycle lanes and bicycle
1 share. These chapters point to the tendency for the middle-class bicyclist to be
2 held up as the preferred, desirable, and morally superior user of bicycle amenities.
3 When bicyclists are categorized in this way, it others and marginalizes bicyclists
4 that fall outside of the preferred user category.

5 In Chapter 7, Tara Goddard uses social psychological theories to argue that a
6 person's implicit biases may impact and predict their behavior towards "vulnerable
7 road users." For example, Goddard suggests that the reasons why Blacks and
8 Latinos are disproportionately killed in traffic crashes may relate to people's
9 implicit biases toward these populations, mixed with people's understandings of
0 the social-cultural context and physical environment.

1 In New York City, Latino and Asian immigrant food delivery cyclists are often
2 criminalized for behaving in ways similar to those of their white, male bike
3 messenger counterparts. In Chapter 8, Do Lee, Helen Ho, Melyssa Banks, Mario
4 Giampieri, Xiaodeng Chen, and Dorothy Le complicate the "invisibility" of these
5 workers by arguing that the term "invisible cyclist" is synonymous with being a
6 "bad" bicyclist and thus highly visible to disciplinary surveillance. Through their
7 work with these invisible/visible delivery bicyclists, the authors highlight parti-
8 cipatory action research as potential means to foster public knowledge, created by
9 the cyclists, as a "means to provide counter-narratives and a basis for more
0 equitable policies and restructurings of the street landscape in the pursuit of
1 bike justice."

2 In Chapter 9, Alfredo Mirandé and Raymond Williams apply the Mexican
3 concept of *rascuachismo* to the cycling scene. They discuss the idea of the bicycle
4 as an object that enables *rascuache*, youth, the poor, and subordinated persons to
5 transcend geographical, psychological, social, economic, cultural, and spiritual

borders. They also take a critical view of legal and public policy attempts to regulate the urban landscape. The authors argue that significant policy changes are needed with respect to justice and sustainability in urban transportation to avoid the criminalization of rascuache bicyclists.

Joanna Bernstein explores in Chapter 10 how typical outreach tactics to encourage bicycling will fail to entice “unauthorized immigrants.” Bernstein illustrates that biking as a deportable human being produces an experience of fear while biking that has not been included in street safety discussions. Bernstein tells the stories of three undocumented Guatemalans living in Pittsburgh who bike because it is their best transportation option. Though biking is not what they would choose, their livelihood in this country depends on it. At the same time, biking exposes them to more risk than they would otherwise encounter if they were to walk or take public transportation to their destination. Sharing the poignantly intimate stories of Diego, Jeremias, and Jose, Bernstein hopes to start a much needed dialogue within the bike community, as well as between bike- and immigration-oriented agencies and organizations, surrounding the differential experiences of undocumented cyclists and the social, legal, and physical risks that they disproportionately face as a result of having no choice but to bike. This chapter lays out culturally specific outreach methods that advocates can utilize to build trusting relationships with unauthorized Latino cyclists and other marginalized communities.

In Chapter 11, Daryl Meador describes the work of the Doble Rueda bicycle collective in a Mexican border town that is plagued by violence and state corruption. Residents of Matamoros participate in Doble Rueda group rides as a demonstration of their presence and vitality, as a form of safe mobility at night, and as a communal mode of transportation to traverse the city. The authors argue that the collective’s desire to make Matamoros a more humane city, through cycling, may set an example for bicycling communities in conflict zones and violence-ravaged cities across the world.

In Chapter 12, Nedra Deadwyler introduces Civil Bikes, a bicycle tour company which works to challenge people’s perceptions of bicycling in the City of Atlanta while exploring and preserving the city’s unique history of segregation and the Civil Rights movement. Civil Bikes uses a racial-, income-, gender-, and age-inclusive outlook, offers programs that are woman-centered and empowering and participates in regional advocacy for transportation solutions which address the needs of citizens across a range of neighborhoods. This work powerfully connects past processes of racial exclusion and civil rights activism with current processes of neighborhood change from gentrification and displacement.

Opening organized bicycling

How can grassroots knowledge impact institutional agenda-setting and address inequity in mainstream bicycle advocacy? We can do this by integrating the lived experiences highlighted in the previous section into bicycling professions. Adonia Lugo establishes this section in Chapter 13 with a discussion about

1 exclusion and inclusion in bicycle advocacy. Lugo uses the history of U.S. bike
2 advocacy to explain how organized bicycling continues to be racialized, and
3 argues that diversifying bicycle advocacy, policy, and planning will have inclusio-
4 nary effects on public investment in alignment with the federal government's
5 commitment to environmental justice.

6 Community bicycle workshops are explored in Chapter 14 as another possible
7 form of bicycle advocacy outside of mainstream efforts. Simon Batterbury and
8 Inès Vandermeersch argue that a Brussels bicycle workshop challenges the invis-
9 ibility of bicyclists and creates new spaces of socialization and cultural exchange
0 in a city with a dense population of immigrant communities. Bike repair spaces
1 offer an avenue for building demand for bicycling, alongside more “supply-side”
2 interventions such as infrastructure projects.

3 Although bicycle share, in its third generation, is a booming form of U.S.
4 bicycle investment, it has also been associated with neighborhood turnover and
5 the upwardly mobile, white bicyclist community that already receives the greatest
6 share of bicycle infrastructure and amenities. In Chapter 15, James Hannig looks
7 at two Midwest U.S. bicycle share programs to investigate how underserved
8 populations perceive this amenity. Through his interviews with bicycle share
9 operators, users, and critics, Hannig concludes that for bicycle share to resonate
0 with underserved populations, equitable practices need to be explored and
1 implemented to the greatest extent possible, particularly through community
2 inclusion and engagement.

3 The importance of representative bicycle advocacy work is operationalized
4 in Chapter 16 through the community work of the Pima County REACH
5 Coalition, who led the ten-year-long development of a bicycle program in a
6 dense, low-income, Latino neighborhood on the Southside of Tucson, Arizona.
7 Authors Martha Moore-Monroy, Ada Wilkinson-Lee, Donna Lewandowski, and
8 Alexandra Armenta discuss how a community-led approach to improve the
9 access to cycling resources and infrastructural improvements for Latinos built on
0 the community's assets. The success of this project was primarily due to the coali-
1 tion's strong commitment to community-led participatory action and attention
2 to making the program and approach replicable.

3 One sector of organized bicycling bucks the tendency toward racial homo-
4 geneity: organizations that serve youth. Youth participants in organized bicycling
5 tend to represent U.S. diversity, with many young people staying involved with
6 urban community bike organizations after graduating from earn-a-bike programs.
7 The Youth Bike Summit is a growing U.S.-based meeting space for youth leaders
8 and their bicycle organizations to discuss their advocacy and educational work. In
9 Chapter 17, Pasqualina Azzarello, Jane Pirone, and Allison Mattheis discuss how
0 the Youth Bike Summit has become a “generative space for collective youth
1 voice” and perhaps the most advanced model of what a bike justice movement
2 could look like.

3 In Chapter 18, Amy Lubitow argues that community engagement is needed
4 to address neighborhood concerns over gentrification and bicycle infrastru-
5 cture. Lubitow suggests that, although community engagement around urban

infrastructure decisions may have limited utility in stemming rapid gentrification, community-led economic development projects can dramatically alter the experiences and perceptions of local residents. A community-led bike shop in Humboldt Park (a Puerto Rican neighborhood in Chicago) has allowed local residents to become empowered both economically and politically in ways that impact broader decision-making processes in Chicago. Lubitow highlights the importance of the community leading its own bicycle development projects rather than being folded into existing projects brought in by outside interests.

Moving forward: toward a just bicycle practice

The voices documented in these chapters show that organized bicycling does not have to go far to find new solutions. The editors of this book have been impressed by both the limits of the mainstream bicycle advocacy system and the triumphs of subaltern, othered, and alternative bicycle advocates in engaging and recruiting a diversity of bicyclists on the road, in urban planning, and in advocacy work. Our concerns, and those of the authors of this book, include the status quo of bicycle advocacy and connected urban planning that continues to prioritize those with societal, cultural, racial, class, and gender privilege. Our concerns also include infrastructure-based displacement, barriers to community and grassroots involvement in advocacy work, the isolation of people of color-focused bicycle advocacy, and the need for marginalized bicyclists to create their own spaces to promote bicycling. Just bicycle practices that emerged in this book emphasized five themes; we address each of these briefly here. In reality, many actions will cut across these domains, addressing multiple concerns.

1 Recognition of and planning for the diversity of cyclists and cycling travel patterns and uses

Mainstream planning and engineering approaches emphasize and count those cyclists who are privileged. But the majority of cyclists in cities are low-income, bike-dependent, and remain invisible. They are undercounted by the institutional regulatory and legal frameworks of transportation biking policy. Biking justice recognizes the importance of informality and the transcendence of geography as demonstrated by Rascuache cyclists (Chapter 9) and the Doble Rueda bicycle collective rides in Matamoros (Chapter 11).

The media, advocates, and the public should better understand and portray the reality of who is really cycling, as this recognition is a first step toward forming a more inclusive bike movement. Better understanding of the diversity of biking populations should shed light on the disconnect between current strategies and the actual needs of these populations. For example, biking justice problematizes the gentrification debate as demonstrated in Chapter 3. Biking infrastructure should not be a tool for displacement and the consequent changing of a neighborhood's economic class or ethnic makeup.

2 *Creating inclusive participation and grassroots advocacy*

Deep democracy and participation looks and feels differently in different communities. Communities differ in how they congregate, communicate, and participate in public life and this is an important fact that bicycle planning (or all planning) processes must appreciate. Grassroots activism, as a response to top-down biking infrastructure, is a helpful response to pushing for more community-based biking justice projects. This means that a more robust biking planning process should be adaptive to community practices and needs, to the differing abilities to participate (whether because of time constraints, a lack of “technical” knowledge, or other modes of exclusion), and more open to diverse voices and kinds of knowledge. Youths, “non-experts,” elders, and locals all have specific and important knowledge about community conditions and needs which should be part of a truly just planning process. This broader participation can lead to better outcomes, stronger and more sustainable and community-relevant solutions, in more effective ways, as illustrated in Chapter 18.

3 *Making investments in existing communities*

There is evidence that cycling infrastructure is used to “brand” and “spruce up” neighborhoods in an effort to ready them for investment or development. Many existing communities are in need of different improvements and have been requesting them for years, sometimes decades. Planners and advocates must ask, therefore: for whom are we making this improvement? Is it for some expected or desired newcomer, or for a community in need of safety improvements but unlikely to draw in new investments or growth? Who was involved in the decision making? Are the investments part of a rebranding effort? This will lead to a better understanding of the broader needs of a community which may not include bicycling infrastructure at this point in time. These questions should be asked for infrastructure, but also for services such as bike share. Whose transportation needs are bike-sharing systems designed to serve? Are these bike-share systems implementing strategies to become more accessible to low-income residents?

4 *Responding to the diverse meanings and experiences of “safety” and “security” for different communities*

For many communities, public spaces are places of danger due to racial profiling, police intimidation, or other street violence. The lack of bicycle lanes may not be the main barrier to cycling—and solutions to the needs of cyclists in these communities may come in the form of advocating for safer public spaces. This can be manifested in various ways depending on the type of marginalization various groups are experiencing. For example, some groups are marginalized via racialization as Goddard suggests in Chapter 7 and this affects traffic safety for Black and Latino cyclists. Other groups are marginalized via their legal status. In Chapter 10, Bernstein argues that bike justice advocates should be working with immigrant rights groups to create safer public spaces for undocumented

cyclists who place themselves at greater risk every time they ride their bikes. Advocates and planners need to recognize and respond to these diverse understandings of public spaces, and how solutions to safety, such as increased surveillance or policing, can make matters worse for many potential cyclists.

5 Integrating cycling into broader community development processes

Meaningful biking justice investments need to tackle community concerns that go beyond transportation infrastructure. Community concerns need to be tackled simultaneously with biking issues, such as poverty, violence, community health, housing affordability, and safety. In many important ways, communities already understand their own needs related to bike issues, and biking justice advocates just need to learn to listen. Taking an assets-based approach, such as the participatory outreach done by the REACH Coalition in Chapter 16, highlights the importance of integrating broader community development processes into biking justice practice. Biking justice advocates can focus on how bike projects further community benefits and further establish a mechanism for encouraging community ownership of the biking justice process. Chapter 18 highlights a community-led economic development bike project that actually led to community benefits.

These chapters taken as a whole highlight new directions for biking justice theory and practice. The authors connect the discourse and practice of civil rights and social justice to public interventions intended to increase cycling. We hope this book can be used as a critical guide for advocates in building a more equitable bicycle movement. There is a long-standing social justice project in the U.S. bike movement as well as in urban planning practice, but these approaches remain in tension. We hope that bicycle practice can be a useful site for advocacy planning, but we also propose that in some cases, it may not be about the bicycle, or infrastructure, or investments of any sort, but more about creating a just process, wherein multiple voices and concerns can finally be heard.

References

- Anantharaman, M. (2015) *Elite and ethical: The defensive distinctions of new middle class bicycling in Bangalore, India*. Working Paper.
- Avila, E. (1998) The Folklore of the Freeway: Space, Culture, and Identity in Postwar Los Angeles. *Aztlan: A Journal of Chicano Studies*, 23(1), pp.15–31.
- Bratman, E. & Jadhav, A. (2014) How Low-Income Commuters View Cycling. *Citylab Blog*. [Online] Available from www.citylab.com/commute/2014/07/how-low-income-commuters-view-cycling/374390/ [Accessed November 3, 2015].
- Bullard, R., Johnson, G. & Torres, A. (eds) (2004) *Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism and New Routes to Equity*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Carlsson, C., Elliott, L. & Camarena, A. (eds) (2012) *Shift Happens! Critical Mass at 20*. San Francisco, CA: Full Enjoyment Books.
- Coates, T. (2015) *Between the World and Me*. New York: Spiegel & Grau.

- 1 Denmark, D. (1998) The Outsiders: Planning and Transport Disadvantage. *Journal of*
 2 *Planning Education and Research*, 17(3), pp.231–245.
- 3 Flyvbjerg, B. (2001) *Making Social Science Matter: Why Social Inquiry Fails and How It Can*
 4 *Succeed Again*. Sampson, S. (trans.). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- 5 Fuller, O. & Beltran, E. (2010) The Invisible Cyclists of Los Angeles. *Progressive Planning*
 6 *Magazine, Planners Network*. [Online] Available from [www.plannersnetwork.org/2010/](http://www.plannersnetwork.org/2010/07/the-invisible-cyclists-of-los-angeles/)
 7 [07/the-invisible-cyclists-of-los-angeles/](http://www.plannersnetwork.org/2010/07/the-invisible-cyclists-of-los-angeles/) [Accessed November 3, 2015].
- 8 Furness, Z. (2010) *One Less Car: Bicycling and the Politics of Automobility*. Philadelphia,
 9 PA: Temple University Press.
- 0 Gibson, K. (2007) Bleeding Albina: A History of Community Disinvestment, 1940–2000.
 1 *Transforming Anthropology*, 15(1), pp.3–25.
- 2 Gilroy, P. (2001) Driving While Black. In D. Miller (ed.) *Car Cultures*. New York: Berg.
- 3 Golub, A. (2015) Moving Beyond Fordism: “Complete Streets” and the Changing Political
 4 Economy of Urban Transportation. In S. Zavestoski & J. Agyeman (eds) *Incomplete*
 5 *Streets: Processes, Practices, and Possibilities*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp.36–53.
- 6 Golub, A., Marcantonio, R.A. & Sanchez, T.W. (2013) Race, Space, and Struggles for
 7 Mobility: Transportation Impacts on African Americans in Oakland and the East Bay.
 8 *Urban Geography*, 34(5), pp.1–30.
- 9 Grengs, J. (2002) Community-Based Planning as a Source of Political Change. The
 0 Transit Equity Movement of the Los Angeles’ Bus Riders Union. *Journal of the American*
 1 *Planning Association*, 68(2), pp.165–178.
- 2 Grengs, J. (2004) The Abandoned Social Goals of Public Transit in the Neoliberal City of
 3 the USA. *City*, 9(1), pp.51–66.
- 4 Hilton, J. (2006) *Race and Ethnicity in Fatal Motor Vehicle Traffic Crashes 1999–2004*.
 5 Washington, DC: US Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety
 6 Administration.
- 7 Hoffmann, M. (2016) *Bike Lanes are White Lanes: Bicycle Advocacy and Urban Planning*.
 8 Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- 9 Hoffmann, M. & Lugo, A. (2014) Who Is ‘World Class’? Transportation Justice and
 0 Bicycle Policy. *Urbanities*, 4(1), pp.45–61.
- 1 Horton, D. (2006) Environmentalism and the Bicycle. *Environmental Politics*, 15, pp.41–58.
- 2 Horton, D., Rosen, P. & Cox, P. (eds) (2007) *Cycling and Society*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate
 3 Publishing Company.
- 4 Koepfel, D. (2005) Invisible Riders. *Bicycling Magazine*. December.
- 5 League of American Bicyclists and the Sierra Club (2013) *The New Majority: Pedaling*
 6 *Towards Equity*. League of American Bicyclists and the Sierra Club.
- 7 Lubitow, A. & Miller, T.R. (2013) Contesting Sustainability: Bikes, Race, and Politics in
 8 Portlandia. *Environmental Justice*, 6(4), pp.121–126.
- 9 Lugo, A. (2013) *Body-City-Machines: Human Infrastructure for Bicycling in Los Angeles*.
 0 Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Irvine.
- 1 McCullough, S. (2013) *Mechanical Intuitions: The Origins and Growth of Mountain Biking*.
 2 Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Davis.
- 3 McKenzie, B. (2014) *Modes Less Traveled: Bicycling and Walking to Work in the United States*
 4 *2008–2012*. American Community Survey Reports. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census
 5 Bureau.
- 6 Mapes, J. (2009) *Pedaling Revolution: How Cyclists are Changing American Cities*. Corvallis,
 7 OR: Oregon State University Press.
- 8 Massey, D.S. & Denton, N.A. (1993) *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the*
 9 *Underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Maus, J. (2011–2012) ‘The Williams Ave Project’ Blog Series. *Bike Portland*. [Online] Available from <http://bikeportland.org/tag/williams-avenue-bikeway-project/> [Accessed November 3, 2015].
- Minnesota Healthy Kids Coalition (2015) *Active Transportation: From Our Own Perspectives And Voices*. [Online] Available from http://media.wix.com/ugd/783cdd_40f03a3ca55a4c738d14ebf9ca0bbb58.pdf [Accessed November 10, 2015].
- Mohl, R.A. (1993) Race and Space in the Modern City: Interstate-95 and the Black Community in Miami. In A. Hirsch & R. Mohl (eds) *Urban Policy in Twentieth-Century America*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, pp.100–158.
- Norton, P.D. (2008) *Fighting Traffic*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Oosterhuis, H. (2014) Bicycle Research between Bicycle Policies and Bicycle Culture. *Mobility in History*, 5, pp.20–36.
- Pisarski, A. (2013) *Commuting in America 2013: The National Report on Commuting Patterns and Trends*. [Online] Available from <http://traveltrends.transportation.org/Pages/default.aspx> [Accessed November 10, 2015].
- Pucher, J., Buehler, R. & Seinen, M. (2011) Bicycling Renaissance in North America? An Update and Re-Appraisal of Cycling Trends and Policies. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 45(6), pp.451–475.
- Pulido, L. (2000) Rethinking Environmental Racism: White Privilege and Urban Development in Southern California. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 90(1), pp.12–40.
- Ritchie, A. (2009) *Major Taylor: The Fastest Bicycle Rider in the World*. San Francisco, CA: Van der Plas/Cycle Publishing.
- Smiley, K.T., Rushing, W. & Scott, M. (2014) Behind a Bicycling Boom: Governance, Cultural Change, and Place Character in Memphis, Tennessee. *Urban Studies*. [Online] Available from <http://usj.sagepub.com/content/early/2014/10/24/0042098014556590.abstract> [Accessed November 30, 2015].
- Smith, N. (2002) New Globalism, New Urbanism: Gentrification as Global Urban Strategy. *Antipode*, 34(3), pp.427–450.
- Stehlin, J. (2015) Cycles of Investment: Bicycle Infrastructure, Gentrification, and the Restructuring of the San Francisco Bay Area. *Environment and Planning A*, 47(1), pp.121–137.
- Sulaiman, S. (2015a) Filed Under: Ugly Things You Find on the Interwebs. *StreetsBlog LA*. [Online] Available from <http://la.streetsblog.org/2015/01/14/filed-under-ugly-things-you-find-on-the-interwebs/> [Accessed September 10, 2015].
- Sulaiman, S. (2015b) Are You Supposed to be Here?: Officer Harasses Black Cyclists during MLK Day Parade. *StreetsBlog LA*. [Online] Available from <http://la.streetsblog.org/2015/01/20/are-you-supposed-to-be-here-officer-harasses-black-cyclists-during-mlk-day-parade/> [Accessed September 10, 2015].
- Transportation Equity Network (TEN) (2015) Homepage. [Online] Available from www.transportationequity.org/ [Accessed November 20, 2015].
- Vivanco, L. (2013) *Reconsidering the Bicycle: An Anthropological Perspective on a New (Old) Thing*. New York: Routledge.
- Wray, J.H. (2008) *Pedal Power: The Quiet Rise of the Bicycle in American Public Life*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Young, I.M. (2011) *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Press.
- Zavestoski, S. & Agyeman, J. (eds) (2015a) *Incomplete Streets: Processes, Practices, and Possibilities*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Zavestoski, S. & Agyeman, J. (2015b) *Invisible Cyclist Blog*. [Online] Available from <http://invisiblecyclist.com/> [Accessed November 3, 2015].