

ADAPT SA LEGISLATION TO PROMOTE CYCLING

Lance Burger

Cape Town

lance.burger@mweb.co.za

ABSTRACT: ADAPT SA LEGISLATION TO PROMOTE CYCLING

The paper presents a comparative analysis of road traffic legislation and whether the legislation in each instance promotes or hinders cycling as a mode of transportation.

A comparative analysis will be made of traffic regulation in South Africa, United Kingdom, Netherlands and various states of the USA.

The following issues and the effect thereof will be considered:

1. Stop signs and traffic lights.
2. Prohibition against cycling two or more abreast.
3. Compulsory helmet use. Requirements for use in various countries will be compared.
4. Compulsory use of cycle paths and lanes.
5. Sidewalks
6. Freeways
7. Electric power assist.
8. Discussion of the lack of traffic enforcement in South Africa.
9. Short discussion of the civil and criminal penalties applicable to motor vehicles for causing accidents in South Africa.
10. Compensation scheme for vehicular accidents.
11. A brief consideration of building standards (requirements for bicycle parking, shower and changing facilities).
12. Possible legislation for cycle path standards (to prevent bad design by local authorities in instances where they have inadequate knowledge of cycling).
13. Taxation and use fees. (Income tax deduction for bicycle use, congestion charge, employee transport subsidies)

Conclusion: Legislation and enforcement thereof can have a significant effect on the use or non-use of cycling as a means of transport. South Africa can significantly improve legislation to promote cycling as a means of transport

INTRODUCTION

1. Legislation differs from state to state. Legislation often reflects the values of the community to which it relates and the particular circumstances of that community. Legislation is also used as a tool to achieve political goals and to implement policy decision by the government. Legislation can be an effective tool to achieve goals for the benefit of society. Legislation, without enforcement, is often irrelevant. There is no point in introducing ambitious legislation where such legislation will not be obeyed or enforced. Such legislation simply breeds contempt for the law.
2. A comparative analysis of legislation should not be done simply by comparing legislation. One should consider legislation from different jurisdictions against the background of demographics, physical environment, cultural values and many other facts.
3. This paper deals primarily with road traffic regulation. It must be remembered that there are legislative fields that can promote or hinder cycling as a means of transportation, such as taxation, building codes and zoning. I will return to this later.
4. This paper seeks to compare legislation that affects cycling as a means of transportation in some states of the USA, UK, Netherlands and South Africa. These jurisdictions were chosen because of the relative ease of obtaining access to its legislation. It would have been preferable to obtain information from more jurisdictions and particularly more diverse jurisdictions, such as Latin America, Central Africa, the Middle East and the Far East. Unfortunately such legislation is not readily accessible to me.
5. The background to the jurisdictions considered will be discussed below.
6. The first jurisdiction (or rather group of jurisdictions, as each state is separate) is the USA. I will examine primarily the considered legislation from the State of Idaho, because of the progressive nature of its legislation relating to cycling, but also consider some other states as well. Idaho has the fourth highest percentage of bicycle use of all the states of the US: 1.13% compared to the national average of 0.44%. (USA: Bikeleague statistics.) Legislation in the USA should be considered against the background that the automobile is king, gasoline is inexpensive and there are huge vested interests in the automobile and oil industries with very extensive lobbying powers. In spite of this decided bias against cycling and in favour of motor cars, (as

shown by the extremely low percentage of bicycle use of 0.44% mentioned above) it is refreshing to see some progressive legislation coming from the USA as it is realized that cycling must be promoted as a means of transport.

7. In Europe, (including to some extent the UK) cities are more compact and have more efficient public transportation systems. Governments (including local governments) have recognized for a number of years the need to promote cycling as a means of transportation. As such some European countries have built infrastructure to encourage cycling and, to a lesser extent passed legislation to promote cycling. The extensive cycling infrastructure has lessened the need for legislation. The country with the highest bicycle use is Denmark: 893 km/ year per inhabitant compared with the Netherlands 853 km/year per inhabitant. (SWOV).
8. Most of South Africa's population is poor and can benefit particularly from the use of bicycles as a means of transport. There is unfortunately a bias in favour of motor cars. Before 1994 all decision makers (the affluent white elite) drove motor cars and did not cycle as a means of transportation. Traffic Regulations since then simply continues the anti-cycling policy without consideration of what regulation promotes preferred means of transportation and what is safe.

SOURCES OF MATERIALS

9. In any comparative analysis one should consider the original source legislation. Unfortunately this is not available to me in most jurisdictions. In some cases I have only a paraphrase of legislation available or have inferred what the legislation is from commentary on legislation, which introduced the inherent danger of inaccuracies. If anyone has original legislation of the topics considered in this paper available please send me a copy.
10. Even for some of those jurisdictions that are discussed in this paper I have been unable to obtain the primary source material, i.e. the actual legislation. For example, the U.K. Highway Code, does not appear to be the actual legislative enactment. Similarly the Dutch "Reglement verkeersregels en verkeerstekens 1990" also appears to be a paraphrasing of the actual legislation.
11. I will now deal with the various issues mentioned above.

STOP SIGNS AND RED TRAFFIC LIGHTS

12. The first issue that will be considered is the requirement to stop at stop signs and red traffic lights.
13. In South Africa the law is that traffic must stop at a traffic light (Section 58 read with Regulation 285(2A) and the Schedule to the Regulations). In practice, partly due to lack of enforcement this is often ignored by cyclists and motorists alike (probably by a higher percentage of cyclists than motorists). The position is similar with stop signs, except that motorists have even less regard for stop streets.
14. In Idaho the provision regarding stop signs reads as follows:

49-720. STOPPING -- TURN AND STOP SIGNALS. (1) A person operating a bicycle or human-powered vehicle approaching a stop sign shall slow down and, if required for safety, stop before entering the intersection. After slowing to a reasonable speed or stopping, the person shall yield the right-of-way to any vehicle in the intersection or approaching on another highway so closely as to constitute an immediate hazard during the time the person is moving across or within the intersection or junction of highways, except that a person after slowing to a reasonable speed and yielding the right-of-way if required, may cautiously make a turn or proceed through the intersection without stopping. [Emphasis added]

15. The provision regarding traffic lights is similar: Idaho Code, Title 49-720 (2):

(2) A person operating a bicycle or human-powered vehicle approaching a steady red traffic control light shall stop before entering the intersection and shall yield to all other traffic. Once the person has yielded, he may proceed through the steady red light with caution. Provided however, that a person after slowing to a reasonable speed and yielding the right-of-way if required, may cautiously make a right-hand turn. A left-hand turn onto a one-way highway may be made on a red light after stopping and yielding to other traffic. [Emphasis added]

16. These provisions make sense for the following reasons: The primary purpose of traffic regulations is to prevent injury (and to a lesser extent damage to property). Bicycles are not dangerous to other road users, they could not kill or even injure motorists and the amount of damage that a bicycle can inflict on a motor vehicle is minimal. A cyclist is much more likely to be injured than any motor vehicle that he or she collides with. For this reason cyclists, even those that ignore traffic regulations, will avoid collisions if at all possible and are careful in intersections. In short, cyclists (unlike motor cars) are not dangerous to other road users. There is therefore no need to restrict the efficient

movement of cyclists for the safety of other road users, unlike the case with motor cars which does pose a significant risk to other road users.

17. In many instances it is safer to ride to the front of a line of cars waiting at a traffic light (as happens with traffic marking in London), proceed through the red traffic light when it is safe and away of the motor cars. In that way the cyclist is ahead of the motor vehicles where they can be seen.
18. Cyclists instinctively know this, and for that reason some of them ignore red traffic lights and stop signs, regardless that it is illegal.
19. The provision requiring cyclists to stop at stop signs and the provision prohibiting cyclists from proceeding through a red traffic light after stopping are unnecessary and do not benefit either motor vehicles or cyclists. Doing away with these provisions will enhance the efficiency of bicycles as a means of transportation without making it less safe (in practice, making it more safe for cyclists).

CYCLING TWO (OR MORE) ABREAST

20. South Africa prohibits any cycling next to each other in Regulation 311(2):
Persons riding pedal cycles on a public road shall ride in single file except in the course of overtaking another pedal cycle, ...
21. UK: Rule 51: "You should .. not ride more than two abreast."
22. Netherlands: Artikel 3.2
Fietzers mogen met zijn tweeën naast elkaar rijden. Dit geldt niet voor snorfietzers.
Translation: Cyclist may ride two abreast. This does not pertain to scooters.
23. Idaho:
49-718. RIDING TWO ABREAST. Persons riding bicycles upon a highway shall not ride more than two (2) abreast except on paths or parts of highways set aside for the exclusive use of bicycles. Persons riding two (2) abreast shall not impede the normal and reasonable movement of traffic and, on a laned roadway, shall ride within a single lane.

This working is the same as the Uniform Vehicle Code on Bicycles.

24. Washington State:
RCW 46.61.770
Riding on roadways and bicycle paths.

(2) Persons riding bicycles upon a roadway shall not ride more than two abreast except on paths or parts of roadways set aside for the exclusive use of bicycles.

25. As far as I have been able to ascertain no other jurisdiction, other than South Africa, have the restrictive practice of prohibiting cyclists from riding two abreast. The prohibition is unnecessary: if the intention is to prevent cyclists from obstructing motorised traffic, then it is unnecessary, other regulations deal with that situation. The regulation prevents all cycling next to each other, including those social rides (in the absence of all motorized traffic where people have a conversation. It also prohibits an adult to ride on the road side of a young child to shield the child from traffic.
26. This regulation, in particular, is simply anti-cyclist without a rational basis.

COMPULSORY HELMET USE

27. The use of a helmet by cyclists became compulsory in South Africa on 5 October 2004 by virtue of the amendment to Regulation 207(2). There is little indication that helmet use has changed since then: The (generally affluent) people that use bicycles for sport might have increased their helmet use slightly, but there seems to be no increase of the use of helmets by people using bicycles as a means of transportation.
28. Other jurisdictions require the use of helmets only by children, typically under the age of 16 years.
29. Helmets are not compulsory in the Netherlands and in fact very few cyclists (probably less than 1% of cyclists) wear them. It is significant that the Netherlands have one of the lowest injury and fatality rates, which seems to indicate that there is either no connection or an inverse correlation between the compulsory use of helmets and safety.
30. Having said that, it is clear that there is a safety benefit to using a bicycle helmet. The question is not whether it is safer, but whether it should be made compulsory under all circumstances. There are cost implications to requiring helmets to be worn at all times, including the person who cycles at low speed to do a bit of shopping, and does not wish to be bothered with a helmet. In most instances the people in South Africa that use bicycles as a means of transportation (as opposed to using it for sport) can scarcely afford a bicycle, never mind the cost of a helmet on top of that. In practice, in spite of the current legislation, they do not use helmets.
31. It is again a situation which breeds a culture of disregard for legislation.

- 32. It is surprising how often people (especially women) also do not want to cycle because the helmet will mess up their hair.
- 33. It is submitted that helmet use should be strongly encouraged, but should not be made compulsory, as it acts as a deterrent to the use of bicycles as a means of transportation.

COMPULSORY USE OF BICYCLE PATHS / LANES

- 34. The South African regulation requires a cyclist to use a bicycle path or lane:

Reg. 311(7) Whenever a portion of a public road has been set aside for use by person riding pedal cycles, no person shall ride a pedal cycle on any other portion of such road.

- 35. Legislation in other jurisdiction are similar:

- 35.1 Netherlands:

Reglement verkeersregels en verkeerstekens 1990

Plaats op de weg: Artikel 5.1: Fietzers gebruiken het verplichte fietspad of het fiets/bromfietspad.

Translation: Place on the road: Cyclists use the compulsory bicycle path or the bicycle/scooter path.

- 35.2 Wyoming State:

31-5-704. Riding on roadways and designated paths.

(c) Whenever a usable path for bicycles has been provided adjacent to a roadway, bicycle riders shall use the path and shall not use the roadway.

- 36. Other jurisdictions do not make it compulsory to use a bicycle path

- 36.1 Washington State: RCW 46.61.770

... A person operating a bicycle upon a roadway may use the shoulder of the roadway or any specially designated bicycle lane if such exists.

- 36.2 United Kingdom Highway Code, Rule 37.

- 37. One finds a wide range of skills and speeds between various cyclists, from toddlers to very fast commuters. Bicycle paths and lanes are very often badly designed, slow and dangerous (most often they are designed by non-cyclists). Forcing a fast, skilled and regular cyclist onto a bicycle path that is interrupted at every intersection is to slow an expert cyclist to such an extent that cycling becomes unfeasible. In South Africa it will

result in the law, once again, being simply ignored. In those instances where bicycle paths are well designed the cyclists would use them because they are fast and safe.

38. Forcing cyclist on badly designed bicycle paths discourages cycling and is dangerous. Cyclists should be encouraged to use bicycle paths by the proper and good design of the bicycle paths themselves, not by legislation.

SIDEWALKS

39. In South Africa it is debatable whether cycling on sidewalks is prohibited or not.

Regulations 308(5) states:

No person shall drive, pull or push a vehicle upon a sidewalk: Provided that the provisions of this subregulation shall not apply to a perambulator, invalid chair, baby cart or child's play vehicle.

"Vehicle" is defined as

means a device designed or adapted mainly to travel on wheels or crawler tracks and includes such a device which is connected with a draw-bar to a breakdown vehicle and is used as part of the towing equipment of a breakdown vehicle to support any axle or all the axles of a motor vehicle which is being salvaged other than such a device which moves solely on rails.

This definition probably includes a bicycle. A person riding a bicycle, however, does not "drive, pull or push" it. Regulation 311 which deals with "pedal cycles" uses only the verb "ride" in connection with pedal cycles. This seems to indicate that it was not contemplated that one is prohibited from riding a bicycle on the sidewalk. This interpretation does result in the anomaly that that one can ride a bicycle on the sidewalk, but not push it. However, the plain meaning of the words must govern.

40. Cycling on sidewalks is also prohibited in the UK: Highway Code Rule 54.
41. The use of sidewalks appears to be prohibited in the Netherlands by Article 5.1 (quoted above). The situation in the Netherlands is different, however, as ample provision is made for proper bicycle paths and because of the regard that motorists have for cyclists. Because of this the prohibition to using sidewalks do not act as a deterrent to cycling as in other jurisdictions.
42. Other jurisdictions expressly permit riding on sidewalks and quite correctly regulate the conduct in this regard as set out below. Such regulation is preferable.
43. Idaho Code 49-721 provides:

49-721. BICYCLES ON SIDEWALKS. (1) A person operating a bicycle upon and along a sidewalk, or across a highway upon and along a crosswalk, shall yield the right-of-way to any pedestrian, and shall give an audible signal before overtaking and passing a pedestrian or another bicyclist.

(2) A person shall not operate a bicycle along and upon a sidewalk or across a highway upon and along a crosswalk, where the use of bicycles is prohibited by official traffic control devices.

(3) A person operating a vehicle by human power, or operating a motorized wheelchair or an electric personal assistive mobility device upon and along a sidewalk, or across a highway upon and along a crosswalk, shall have all the rights and duties applicable to a pedestrian under the same circumstances.

This follows the Uniform Vehicle Code on Bicycles.

- 44. There are many situations where the only practical and safe route or the safest route is to cycle on a sidewalk. This is particularly so for elderly people, children and bicycle messengers. Cycling in a city can be frustratingly slow with one-ways, and cars blocking traffic. Bicycle messenger services provide a much needed efficient service which reduces congestion. The benefits of allowing cyclists on sidewalks outweighs the disadvantages, provided that it is clear that cyclist must yield to pedestrians at all times.
- 45. Prohibiting cycling on sidewalks in effect prevents many people from using bicycles as a means of transportation, such as young children cycling to school on busy roads and people accompanying them.

FREEWAYS

- 46. South African legislation prohibit bicycles on freeways:
Regulation 323 (1): No person shall operate on a freeway-
...
(b) a pedal cycle.
- 47. The United Kingdom prohibits bicycles on motorways but not on dual carriageways:

60: Dual carriageways. Remember that traffic on most dual carriageways moves quickly. When crossing wait for a safe gap and cross each carriageway in turn. Take extra care when crossing slip roads.

227: Prohibited vehicles. Motorways MUST NOT be used by pedestrians, holders of provisional car or motorcycle driving licences unless exempt, riders of motorcycles under 50cc, cyclists and horse riders. Certain slow-moving vehicles and those carrying oversized loads (except by special permission), agricultural vehicles and most invalid carriages are also prohibited.
- 48. The Netherlands prohibits bicycles on freeways:
Artikel 41.1:

Het gebruik van die autosnelweg is slechts toegestaan voor bestuurders van een motorvoertuig waarmee met een snelheid van ten minste 60 km per uur mag en kan worden gereden.

Translation: The use of freeways is only permitted for drivers of a motor vehicle which can and is permitted to maintain a speed for 60 km per hour.

49. The Netherlands, however, provide for sufficient alternative paths for cyclists that there is no real need for cyclists to use freeways.
50. In some places it is permitted to ride on freeways. I have been unable to obtain the relevant legislation, but have ridden on a the shoulder of a freeway in Nanaimo, British Columbia which was the only possible route for a bicycle and which was in fact indicated as a bicycle route.
51. Due to the complete lack of consideration of bicycles in infrastructure planning in South Africa there is often no practical alternative to using freeways. In many instances it is the safest way, having a wide shoulder within which to cycle, rather than on a narrow road with motor vehicles trying to squeeze past a bicycle. It is no wonder then, that cyclists choose the safer and quicker (but illegal) route of taking a freeway.
52. Once again the illogical legislation is, to a large extent ignored, and breeds a culture of disregard for the law.
53. There are two alternatives: build proper, with the emphasis on proper, bicycle paths, or change the law to allow use of bicycles on freeways.

PASSING DISTANCE

54. I understand that many countries in Europe requires motorist to leave a gap of 1.5 meters when passing a cyclist. I have been unable to obtain a copy of such legislation.
55. Such legislation makes cycling safer and also increases the perception of safety for cyclists, which encourages bicycle use. Without such legislation motorists pass far too close to cyclists and sometimes misjudge the distance.

ELECTRIC POWER ASSIST

56. I have been unable to find a copy of legislation, but understand that in Europe bicycles fitted with an electrical motor are regarded as bicycles from the perspective of traffic

regulation, i.e. it does not require the use of helmets nor are they are they required to be licensed. I understand that the electric motor may not provide motive power when it is not pedalled, may not provide power when the bicycle reaches 25km/hr, and cannot provide more power than 150 watt.

- 57. This legislation serves a very good function: It allows for weaker riders that would not otherwise use bicycles, to use bicycles and avoid the use of cars. These electrically assisted bicycles are no more dangerous than bicycles, as the power output is less than the average cyclist.
- 58. The only criticism of this concept is that it should allow a higher power output for goods delivery vehicles. This criticism is valid, as it could result in much more cargo being moved by human power (occasionally electrically assisted) than would be otherwise. One thinks particularly of delivery of grocery items over relatively short distances.
- 59. In South Africa the promotion of goods delivery by human power would have the additional benefit of providing additional employment rather than investment in expensive motor vehicles.

TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT

- 60. Regulation without enforcement does not change behaviour, except to a relatively small group of people.
- 61. The enforcement of traffic regulations in South Africa is minimal. The result is that traffic rules are regularly ignored by motorists, particularly minibus taxi drivers. Speeding limits are generally ignored and only obeyed by drivers who wish to obey them, rather than because drivers do not wish to be caught, as the risk thereof is so low. Red traffic lights are often ignored and stop streets are treated as yield signs.
- 62. Road blocks to test for drinking and driving are virtually non-existent.
- 63. There does not appear to be any willpower by the enforcement authorities to do effective policing.
- 64. In those cases where prosecutions do result is often that matters are repeatedly postponed, as a result of which witnesses do not show up. Prosecutors are often unprepared because of work loads and insufficient training. The result is that prosecutions are often unsuccessful.

- 65. In the cases where prosecutions are successful the penalties are regularly paltry: a fine and possibly a suspended sentence.
- 66. Driver's licenses are normally not cancelled after an accident where a driver is convicted of reckless driving: The simple statement that a driver's license is required for work will normally prevent a magistrate from revoking a license.
- 67. The result is that there is very little disincentive to drive carefully for motorists (except those that have a suspended sentence hanging over them): There is no serious downside, such as a meaningful penalty or civil liability for damages.
- 68. A significantly bigger effort in enforcement can go a long way towards making road safer and would be revenue positive as well.

COMPENSATION SCHEME

- 69. This issue is a vast field with very many permutations beyond the scope of this paper.
- 70. Different jurisdictions have different compensation schemes for injuries. In South Africa the state, through the Road Accident Fund, provides compensation for personal injury and death resulting from motor vehicle accidents. The Road Accident Fund is funded by a levy on fuel sales.
- 71. The system has worked relatively well in the past in that it has ensured compensation to injured people, so that one does not end up without compensation after being injured or maimed by a careless motorist. The disadvantages of the scheme are that
 - 1. there is no disincentive to reckless behaviour, as one's insurance premiums do not go up with having more accidents, and
 - 2. the negligence of local authorities in the bad design of bicycle paths or the lack of safe cycling facilities is never considered, as cyclists will invariably sue the Road Accident Fund rather than the local authority where a motorist is also involved in the accident.
- 72. The other alternative, of having a compulsory motor insurance liability scheme, where the insurance market will judge the behaviour of drivers and price accordingly, could work in South Africa, but only if there is effective enforcement to ensure that a high percentage of motor vehicles do carry liability (often referred to as third party) insurance.

73. Recently a new bill has been introduced to amend this legislation. This legislation will cap damage awards, but still prohibit an injured party from bringing an action against the wrongdoer for the balance of his damages. There is also a limit to the amount of lost income one could claim. This legislation is a major and significant departure from the principle that a person is entitled to be compensated for damage caused negligently by another person. The end result is that this legislation unfairly favours motor vehicles as motor vehicles do not fully pay for the damages caused by them directly or indirectly (through fuel levies).
74. This is another piece of legislation that favours motor vehicles over bicycles.

TAXATION

75. There are many tax incentives that can be provided to encourage people to use bicycles as a means of transportation. For example, taxpayers can be allowed to deduct costs associated with bicycles as a means of transportation, such as providing bicycles to employees to commute to work and for bicycle parking. They could also be allowed to deduct (up to a limit) payments made to employees for every commuting trip that an employee makes.
76. I understand that such legislation exists in the Netherlands and Belgium. In the United Kingdom certain such expenses are allowed to be deducted as well.
77. Import duties on bicycles can also be waived, whether they are for commuting and cargo bicycles only, or for all bicycles.

OTHER LEGISLATION

78. Zoning legislation which encourages people to live within a reasonable commuting distance from their employment encourages cycling. Such legislation is a complex issue and is beyond the scope of being properly dealt with in this paper.
79. Similarly building regulations can enhance the use of cycling. One of the three most common reasons as to why people do not cycle to work is that people do not have a place to shower and change and to store their bicycles at their place of work. Building regulations should provide that every building with more than 25 people working in the building should have shower and changing facilities. Every building providing parking

for motor vehicles should provide free lock-up parking for bicycles within sight of any security provided.

BICYCLE PATH STANDARDS

80. I have not been able to obtain copies of legislation, but understand that there are legislation or policy guidelines in place in the Netherlands that sets standards regarding the construction of cycle facilities, including the smoothness of bicycle paths.
81. Such legislation can help significantly to promote cycling, as it will prevent local authorities without the necessary expertise to build dangerous and sub-standard cycling facilities that will act as a deterrent to cycling use.

GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES / COMPULSORY SPENDING ON CYCLING PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

82. This is a major way, if not the most important way, in which cycling as a means of transportation can be promoted. In certain jurisdictions a percentage of funds for roads are set aside for cycling facilities and / or pedestrian facilities.
83. Such legislation (as long as the percentage is set high enough) will ensure that an appropriate percentage of funds are set aside for cyclists.

CONCLUSION

84. There are many ways in which legislation can promote or hinder the use of cycles as a means of transportation. South African legislation is one of the most anti-cycling of all jurisdictions surveyed.
85. The reason for this anti-cycling attitude is partially due to historical reasons. The anti-cycling policy continues in present legislation, probably because (as was the case before 1994) the people who make legislation drive cars and only consider transportation from their viewpoint.
86. The large number of poor people in South Africa who spend disproportionately high percentage of their income on transportation would particularly benefit from more cycle-friendly legislation.

REFERENCES

South Africa

1. National Road Traffic Act, 1996
2. National Road Traffic Regulations 2000

United States of America

3. USA Bikeleague Statistics: <http://www.bikeleague.org/educenter/census.xls> [28 December 2005]
4. Idaho Code, Title 49
5. Wyoming State, Title 31-5
6. Washington State: RCW 46.61

Netherlands

7. SWOV Ref: http://www.swov.nl/nl/kennisbank/index.htm?nl/kennisbank/40_vervoerwijke/1_langzaam/inhoud/fietsen.htm [28 December 2005]
8. Netherlands: "Reglement verkeersregels en verkeerstekens 1990"
9. UK Highway Code.
10. USA: Uniform Vehicle Code on Bicycles.