

**From:** [Todd Edelman](#)  
**To:** [CBSC@DGS](mailto:CBSC@DGS)  
**Subject:** Proposed Building Standards Comments (Bicycle Section)  
**Date:** Monday, July 1, 2024 11:05:44 PM

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from a NON-State email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you are certain of the sender's authenticity.

## Proposed Building Standards Comments (Bicycle Section)

1.

There's nothing about *time-to-defeat*. What's that? It's not a standard on its own, but it seems like it could be. The idea is to see how long it takes to defeat a lock using an angle grinder. Locks which can be cut with non-electrical tools or by picking are not part of it. They are too numerous etc.

But unlike the Dutch [Art](#) system and the British [Sold Secure](#) system - both connected in the respective countries to the ability to get theft insurance - it's parking equipment in a room, inclusive of the room itself.

There's no US-equivalent of those two systems, just ratings that companies give to their own products! (Of course, US-based brands like Kryptonite market their locks in Europe with mentions of those two systems.)

This is a long discussion, and I have not done any research in the insurance industry in the USA.

So I will just suggest that it needs to be sorted out how every rack (etc) should be as tough as the very toughest of locks: It should take 5 min to cut with a good angle grinder.

The symmetry is nice BUT also serves the Commons: It means that potentially everyone at regulated housing, at commercial centers or institutions etc have the same security level. Now, obviously this can be context specific! That means that, for example, a "5 min rack" is not the same in all places, so-called "high risk areas". US companies - in addition to their e.g. "15/15" being their very best lock, also mention things like if a lock is sufficient for whatever the user defines as high risk or medium risk and so on, I don't think it is possible to go this far.

OK, so the racks are great BUT people don't want to spend [\\$200](#) to [350](#) for a lock! Well, that brings us to....

2.

Rental housing and businesses need to make high quality locks available to tenants for use while their lease is active and while they are employed or working. Housing management should make them available for a reasonable fee, perhaps take a deposit etc. A reasonable rate might be 0.5% of rent, so a tenant who pays \$1500 monthly would be charged \$7.50 extra for a month, or perhaps can pay an annual fee, pro-rated if they move out. That seems like a deal for a lock that costs \$350.

3. Ground level parking is strongly implied in the short term parking ask in CalBike's letter, but there's no mention of it in relation to long term parking. For short term you rightly ask for something that is as spatially-relevant as possible, i.e. no parking hidden out of the way. But what about for long-term? One idea is that it's a short path from the street, and similar to ADA provision and that it's close to the residential destination (for example, long term parking should be near an elevator OR the elevator should accommodate bikes if parked upstairs e.g. in large parking structures. It should be closer than cars, and further only than ADA. What's best for someone with four bags of groceries, or that and two children?
4. Charging needs to be in lockable cabinets, as chargers are WAY more "diverse" than EV charges. This also provides a share of extra fire safety.
5. There's nothing about orientation of racks. Vertical racks are only optimized for tall people with light bikes, i.e they are ableist, often sexist and don't really match the needs of heavier bikes used for transportation.
6. There's nothing about lighting.
7. There's something about cameras, but nothing about monitoring.