

From: Chris Tufts [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2024 1:34 PM
To: MTC-ABAG Info <info@bayareametro.gov>
Subject: Public Comment - March 13th for BATA Oversight Committee - Agenda Item 5a

You don't often get email from tufts.christopher@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email

Hi,

My wife commutes on the RSR bridge twice every weekday and I ride it occasionally for recreation. We don't understand how moving the traffic chokepoint (and the emissions it generates) from one end of the bridge to the other is worth spending \$1 million while killing off access to green, active transportation, particularly as pedal-assistance bicycles proliferate and further enable the average person to ride the span.

Thanks,
Chris Tufts
[REDACTED]

From: David E [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 6:08 PM
To: MTC-ABAG Info <info@bayareametro.gov>
Subject: Public Comment - 3/13 BATA Oversight Committee - Item 5a

You don't often get email from david.epstein56@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email

I am writing in support of the RSR Bridge multi-use path on the upper deck. Our beloved Bay Area is plagued by automobile traffic from north to south and east to west.

And yes, the RSR Bridge upper deck approach suffers some hours every week also. And yes, I too have sat in said traffic waiting to cross over to Marin County.

Having said that, I think it would be sad to remove the lane, which would likely:

- encourage more auto usage (and traffic);
- discourage ... no. Actually eliminate any alternative forms of transportation over the bridge, a form of discrimination towards those without cars.
- kick the bottleneck "can" to the other end of the bridge where Hwy 580 continues with two lanes to Hwy 101 - either before the bridge or after bridge, there are two lanes.
- as mentioned, the entire Bay Area experiences auto traffic at different times. Trying to cure the several hours of traffic that occur on the RSR Bridge approach doesn't seem to have any positive impact on the Greater Bay Area
- and for a few hours of "traffic cure" it seems unbalanced and unfair to remove access to all forms of alternative transportation across the bridge.

Again, I support maintaining the status quo - keep the multi-use path.

Thank you,
David Epstein
[REDACTED]

From: DENISE ROSALES [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2024 1:40 PM
To: MTC-ABAG Info <info@bayareametro.gov>
Subject: Public Comment - 3/13 BATA Oversight Committee - Item 5a

You don't often get email from dmitidieri@comcast.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email

Please save the bike lane on the Richmond Bridge. I cross the bridge four days a week in my car only because I work too far from home making it impossible to ride my bike. I drive across the bridge during commute hours and have noticed several people on bikes or walking across the bridge everyday that I am on it. Everyone should have access to the bridge. It's good for the environment and good for the community.

Denise Rosales

From: Ella Morgulis [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 6:34 PM
To: MTC-ABAG Info <info@bayareametro.gov>
Subject: Public Comment - 3/13 BATA Oversight Committee - Item 5a

You don't often get email from emorgulis@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email

Hi,

I support the bike path - we use it routinely for rides to and in Marin. I see people walking, biking, and the number of riders and walkers increases. What can we do to keep this wonderful recreational path alive? Every time I drive across the bridge, I remember the excitement of riding it. We need more zones like this, safe for riders and pedestrians!

All the best,

Ella Morgulis, MBA, PCC
Life and Leadership Coach, [REDACTED]

The antidote to burnout is fulfillment.

From: Anna Froker [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2024 7:24:45 AM
To: MTC-ABAG Info <info@bayareametro.gov>; Andrew Fremier <AFremier@bayareametro.gov>; Kimberly Ward <KWard@bayareametro.gov>; Federal Glover <dist5@bos.cccounty.us>; BATA <Margaret.abe-koga@mountainview.gov>; Cindy Chavez <cindy.chavez@bos.sccgov.org>; BATA Committee <vfleming@srcity.org>; BATA Committee <bosdist4@acgov.org>; Gina Papan <GPapan@ci.millbrae.ca.us>; Hillary Ronen <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; BATA Committee <officeofthemayor@oaklandca.gov>; Richmond City Council Dist. 2 <Cesar@cesarzepeda.com>; Richmond Mayor <eduardo_martinez@ci.richmond.ca.us>
Subject: Richmond-San Rafael Bridge

External Email

Re: Westbound Richmond-San Rafael Bridge pilot bike/pedestrian lane program

We are Point Richmond residents who must regularly travel across the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge and who are extremely frustrated by the increase in westbound traffic congestion and pollution since the bike/pedestrian lane pilot program began. The data show that the cost to motorists far outweighs the benefit to cyclists & pedestrians. Therefore:

We are AGAINST continuing the bike/pedestrian path as it is currently configured. On the upper deck (westbound), the physical barrier erected for the pilot program forces maintenance crews to close the right lane to traffic when they need to do maintenance on the bridge. It also prevents disabled vehicles from pulling out of an active traffic lane. Both scenarios result in more severe congestion than if no barrier existed. According the PATH report, the cyclists (very few relative to the number of motorists) who use the lane do so for recreation/exercise, mostly on Saturdays and mostly during summer months. Ideally, an easily removable barrier could be installed so that the third lane could be opened to vehicular traffic during commute hours and blocked off for cyclists' use at other times, however, it is doubtful that an easily moveable barrier would be safe for cyclists or pedestrians. Thus, the obvious course of action for the greatest good is to eliminate the barrier and utilize the westbound third lane in the same manner as the eastbound third lane.

We are IN FAVOR of opening the westbound third lane to motorists during peak usage times. This would decrease congestion and pollution. (Note: The statement in the PATH report that peak morning weekday commute is limited to one hour between 7am—8am is false; morning commute traffic congestion begins earlier than 7am and ends later than 8am. In addition, weekend traffic congestion can be quite pronounced from mid-morning to early afternoon.)

We are IN FAVOR of continuing the opening the eastbound third lane to motorists during evening commute hours. From personal experience using the bridge, and from

reading the PATH report, we know that on the lower deck (eastbound), opening the third lane to afternoon commuter traffic has decreased congestion and traffic accidents.

Sincerely,
Anna and Dave Froker



From: John Goodwin <JGoodwin@bayareametro.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2024 9:40 AM

To: Anna Froker [REDACTED]

Cc: MTC-ABAG Info <info@bayareametro.gov>; Kimberly Ward <KWard@bayareametro.gov>

Subject: RE: Richmond-San Rafael Bridge

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Froker:

Thank you for your message. You may be pleased to know that the MTC-BATA staff expects to report to MTC's BATA Oversight Committee at the committee's March 13 meeting on a design alternatives assessment that would evaluate options for converting the shoulder of the westbound upper deck on the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge to a bus/carpool lane that could be used during peak travel periods. This will be a public meeting and you are welcome to participate and offer comment, either in person or via Zoom. The meeting is slated to begin at 9:35 a.m. A detailed meeting agenda will be posted on the MTC website at <https://mtc.ca.gov/meetings-events> at least three days prior to the meeting.

You also may be pleased to know that the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge will be the first of the state-owned toll bridges to transition to open-road tolling, and that this transition may take place by the end of 2025. The existing toll plaza and the now-obsolete toll booths will be removed, allowing for a comprehensive reconfiguration of the bridge approach. This holds promise for a significant reduction in congestion through the entire Richmond-San Rafael corridor. We appreciate your interest in the myriad challenges of travel through the Richmond-San Rafael corridor, and we appreciate you taking the time to share your recommendations with us.

John Goodwin

Asst. Director, Communications

Metropolitan Transportation Commission/Bay Area Toll Authority

375 Beale Street, Suite 800

San Francisco, CA 94105

415.778.5262 — office

510.384.7291 — mobile

MTC main phone number: 415.778.6700

www.mtc.ca.gov

From: James Kinney [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2024 1:51 PM
To: MTC-ABAG Info <info@bayareametro.gov>
Subject: Public Comment - 3/13 BATA Oversight Committee - Item 5a

You don't often get email from jameskinney@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email

Hello,

I am writing to express my opinion regarding the discussion around removing the multiuse path on the RSR bridge. I believe the path on the bridge is a huge asset to the North and East bay communities that should not be removed.

As an Albany resident, I use the RSR to ride my bike to work in SF 1-2 times per week and I ride in Marin recreationally at least 1 additional time per week. All of that brings me an immense amount of joy and is made possible by the RSR bridge.

I understand that the traffic on the bridge is bad at times and drivers would like something to be done about that. I do not think taking away the path is the solution. Would there also be an expansion of 580 in Marin or would this just move the bottleneck from the toll plaza to the western point of the bridge? I believe the study done in 2021 found that would cost \$70 to \$90 million. I also understand that there are concerns about air quality in Richmond due to idling cars. That feels like a very empty argument as if you were to expand traffic on the bridge and 580 in Marin, you would induce further demand, creating additional emissions from traffic. I think that spending time focused on moving the chevron oil refinery would be a more valuable idea if the issue at hand is local emissions. Lastly, we are living in a time in which the world is grappling with incoming climate change. Personal transportation is a large factor in carbon emissions worldwide and we should be planning for a future in which low emissions transportation such as bikes and public transit are central.

It takes time for demand to increase for the RSR bridge. I for one moved to the East Bay knowing that I would be able to ride the bridge to Marin. Leaving the path in place will yield others doing similar things and over time usage will grow. Kids will grow up knowing they can use the bridge. Bike groups will continue to lead rides on it. Please allow this great multi use path to continue to serve our community and draw new riders!

Thank you
James Kinney

From: James Lent [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 9:40 PM
To: MTC-ABAG Info <info@bayareametro.gov>
Subject: Public Comment - 3/13 BATA Oversight Committee - Item 5a

You don't often get email from lentamentalisk@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email

I ride across the bridge at least once a week (on an admittedly somewhat silly long ride from Berkeley to SF) and see a lot of people who have clearly purchased expensive e-bikes to enable them to ride to work every day. If we plan to ban bicycles on the bridge, my question to the committee is what plans have you put in place to buy back their bikes that they can no longer use? Will there be a program that allows them to trade in their bicycles for cars? People who clearly can't afford cars have laid down large sums of money on these bicycles to get to their jobs, and we're threatening to make them lose their jobs.

From: Madeleine M Levac [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2024 2:14 PM
To: MTC-ABAG Info <info@bayareametro.gov>
Subject: Public Comment - 3/13 BATA Oversight Committee - Item 5a

You don't often get email from madeleine.levac@berkeley.edu. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email

Hello,

I am writing in support of maintaining the multi-use pathway on the Richmond Bridge. I want to speak both to its personal value for me and its public value.

The Richmond Bridge provides the only direct access for cyclists and pedestrians to the North Bay, and also opens a route to San Francisco via the Golden Gate Bridge. During the pandemic, this bridge was a lifeline for me; I would escape every couple of weeks from the stress of my shared apartment in Berkeley, bike to the ocean, have a swim, and ride back. It's been the starting point of many glorious bike camping trips, both alone and with friends. It means that I can set out from the East Bay, spend the night somewhere as different as Samuel P. Taylor or China Camp, and ride back in time for lunch the next day. The bridge gives me such a sense of freedom, especially as someone who doesn't have a car.

I've passed many a happy cyclist or pedestrian on this bridge. I recognize that the number of people biking and walking across the bridge is lower than the number of people who drive. But to my mind this is not the central question. One needs to consider also the kind of service that the bridge provides to its various users, and the promise it holds.

The bike lane on the Richmond Bridge makes accessible parts of the Bay, enjoyable activities, adventures, cultural resources and forms of exercise that otherwise are not accessible. It *invites* members of our community to cross it by foot or by bike--that invitation is valuable however rarely or gradually they take it up. It represents hope for a different future and not a concession to the status quo--highways and bridges clogged by motor traffic, a worsening climate crisis.

When I moved to the Bay Area from Canada seven years ago, I came expecting to find an environmentally progressive, bike-friendly region. I was dismayed to find that the only way of crossing into SF or the North Bay was by BART or car. The installation of the Richmond Bridge multi-use pathway moved the Bay Area one big step closer to conforming with the image it projects of itself. I implore you to keep it in place!

Sincerely,
Madeleine Levac

From: marc@velofelo.com [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2024 10:08 AM
To: MTC-ABAG Info <info@bayareametro.gov>
Subject: Public Comment - 3/13 BATA Oversight Committee - Item 5a

You don't often get email from marc@velofelo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email

We know from good science (and MTC's own presentation) that adding more automobile travel lanes on the bridge will likely:

1. Worsen air pollution in surrounding communities.
2. Increase greenhouse gas emissions.
3. Produce congestion benefits that are short-lived at best.

Aren't these the very things that MTC is seeking to avoid? Let's keep the bike lane and educate the motoring public about the reality of the situation.

Thank you,
Marc Vendetti

On Mon, Mar 11, 2024 at 4:23 PM Warren Wells <warren@marinbike.org> wrote:
Hi there, Richmond-San Rafael Bridge advocates,

This Wednesday March 13th at 9:35 AM, there will be an MTC meeting about the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge.

TLDR: MTC is going to spend \$1M evaluating removing the multiuse path or returning it to a shoulder. You can email a comment [using this link](#) (send before 5 PM on 3/12), or [join the meeting by clicking here](#).

Long version:

You can read the [whole agenda item here](#), but I will summarize. At the conclusion of the four-year pathway pilot period in November 2023, MTC held a meeting on the pilot ([details and recording here](#)). Despite the fact that a formal evaluation of the pilot won't be complete until summer 2024, and 70 comments supporting the path, MTC Commissioner Glover asked staff to make preparations to evaluate other options for the westbound top deck.

The 3/13 meeting will be to sign a \$1M contract to evaluate the costs and benefits of a (A) shoulder, (B) HOV lane, (C) remaining a multiuse path. Each of these would be evaluated as a full-time or part-time basis. This evaluation process will be complete at the end of 2024, at which point one of the alternatives would be pursued.

We know from good science and MTC's own presentation ([see item 5](#)), that adding more travel lanes on the bridge will likely worsen air pollution in surrounding communities, will increase greenhouse gas emissions, and will produce congestion benefits that are short-lived at best. It was evident from the November meeting that MTC leadership is intent on moving forward with a plan to put more cars on the bridge, but we should make sure they hear why they should not.

As always, let me know if you have any questions, and thank you for your time and attention.

--

Warren J. Wells, AICP

Policy and Planning Director

Marin County Bicycle Coalition

cell: (415) 703.9898 | marinbike.org

pronouns: he, him, his



We're creating a healthy, connected, and sustainable Marin by promoting bicycling for everyday transportation and recreation. Love to ride? [Join us today.](#)

EXPERIENCE
25 MCBC
YEARS MARIN COUNTY BICYCLE COALITION

From: Margie Baer <membership@marincyclists.com>
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 4:58 PM
To: MTC-ABAG Info <info@bayareametro.gov>
Subject: Public Comment - 3/13 BATA Oversight Committee - Item 5a

You don't often get email from membership@marincyclists.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email

Please do not remove the multi use bike and pedestrian pathway from the RSR bridge. It is a vital link for non car drivers from the East Bay to the North Bay. Adding more car lanes is not a solution as cars will just back up on the other side of the bridge and there will be more pollution and congestion.



Margie Baer
Vice President
Membership Chair

PO Box 2611 San Rafael, CA 94912
membership@marincyclists.com
415.378.9371

Marin Century
2024



From: Molly Rose-Williams [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2024 10:52 AM
To: MTC-ABAG Info <info@bayareametro.gov>
Subject: Public Comment - 3/13 BATA Oversight Committee - Item 5a

You don't often get email from mrosewilliams9@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email

Please save the bike lane on the Richmond Bridge! The lane is an invaluable resource to the community that I use at least a few times a month. I can't express how devastating it would be to remove a truly emissions-free way of getting from the East Bay to Marin and back. If we're serious about moving into a green future, we need to take those steps in earnest, and that includes making bike travel possible throughout the bay. Save the multi-use path!

Sincerely,
Molly Rose-Williams

--

(she/they) | [REDACTED]

From: Philip Mooney [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2024 11:01 AM
To: MTC-ABAG Info <info@bayareametro.gov>
Subject: Public Comment - 3/13 BATA Oversight Committee - Item 5a

You don't often get email from philip.r.mooney@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email

Dear Members of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission,

I am writing to express grave concerns regarding the potential of removing the bike path and creating a shoulder or HOV lane on the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge. This decision, as outlined in your recent meeting agenda, has serious implications for both the environment and the well-being of our communities.

First and foremost, it is imperative to address the environmental impact of adding more travel lanes on the bridge. As highlighted in both scientific research and MTC presentations, such actions are expected to worsen air pollution in surrounding communities, increase greenhouse gas emissions, and provide only short-lived congestion benefits at best. These are clear and unambiguous outcomes to adding travel lanes. You should not disregard the harm this will cause.

Furthermore, the proposal to remove the bike path raises significant concerns about the impact on traffic congestion and air quality. Analysis of westbound traffic during peak morning commute hours has shown no significant change in congestion levels, despite traffic volumes nearing pre-pandemic levels. Additionally, the proposed westbound third lane may not improve air quality as expected, potentially increasing non-exhaust emissions associated with road dust, brake wear, and tire wear. It is essential to recognize the broader contributors to air quality concerns in the City of Richmond, including local refineries and traffic volume along I-80.

Moreover, the challenges associated with adding a westbound third lane on the bridge cannot be overlooked. Not only does this proposal conflict with the State's climate goals, but it also poses considerable environmental and financial challenges. Environmental clearance for such a lane would require a thorough VMT impact analysis and mitigation, potentially increasing project costs significantly. Additionally, the overall effectiveness of adding a third lane on the bridge is contingent upon complementary improvements in Marin County, which remain unfunded at present.

In light of these concerns, I urge the MTC to reconsider its decision and prioritize sustainable transportation solutions that benefit both our communities and the environment. Instead of focusing on short-term fixes that may exacerbate existing problems, I encourage the MTC to explore alternative options that promote multi-modal networks, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and improve public health through active transportation.

Thank you for considering these important points. I trust that the MTC will take appropriate action to address these concerns and prioritize the well-being of our communities.

Sincerely,
Philip Mooney
[REDACTED]

From: Sean Camden [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2024 4:48 PM
To: MTC-ABAG Info <info@bayareametro.gov>
Subject: Public Comment - 3/13 BATA Oversight Committee - Item 5a

You don't often get email from sean@seancamden.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email

No one thinks curing ourselves of car dependency is going to be easy. But we must.

We need fewer cars, not more. It's crazy that we're still doing this. More cars = more congestion.

We need transportation alternatives. By continuing to devote all the available space to cars, how are we ever going to give ourselves other options?

How about you use the \$1M to incentivize e-bike purchases? I'm pretty sure we could fit all of the daily bridge traffic onto the multi-use path if we could just get everyone onto bikes. And we would all be so much better off.

Sean Camden
[REDACTED]

From: Eris Weaver <eris@bikesonoma.org>
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2024 11:22 AM
To: MTC-ABAG Info <info@bayareametro.gov>
Subject: Public Comment - 3/13 BATA Oversight Committee - Item 5a

You don't often get email from eris@bikesonoma.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email

Dear Oversight Committee Members:

The Richmond-San Rafael Bridge is an important active transportation connection between the North Bay and the East Bay. I've ridden it several times, sometimes combining it with a SMART train ride. I've been able to attend a Calbike conference in Oakland car-free, as well as visit attractions like the Rosie the Riveter National Historic Park. The trip was not much longer than driving during rush hour, but was far more pleasant – and it was satisfying to know that I wasn't contributing to climate change!

Proponents of transforming the bike lane to a third vehicle lane have made spurious claims that the bike lane somehow creates more pollution than would their proposal. The research is clear: adding vehicle lanes DON'T decrease congestion and would increase pollution.

If we're to ever meet our climate goals, we HAVE to STOP this autocentric nonsense! The community would be better served by improved transit service across the Bay than by adding another vehicle lane; there is no convenient means

The Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition urges you to keep the bicycle/pedestrian pathway and reject the third vehicle lane option.

Thank you for your consideration.

Eris Weaver



Eris Weaver, Executive Director
Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition
eris@bikesonoma.org
707-545-0153 office • 707-338-8589 cell
www.bikesonoma.org
[Book time to meet with me](#)



I'm riding 120 miles to raise money
for SCBC – [DONATE HERE](#)

From: Susan Nawbary [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 5:07 PM
To: MTC-ABAG Info <info@bayareametro.gov>
Subject: Public Comment - 3/13 BATA Oversight Committee - Item 5a

External Email

Dear MTC,

As you are aware, adding more travel lanes on the bridge will worsen air pollution in surrounding communities, will increase greenhouse gas emissions, and will produce congestion benefits that are short-lived at best. Your very own presentation makes this clear, yet you continue to move against the grain of your own science by commissioning studies and pandering to the calls of those who wish to see an additional lane. https://mtc.ca.gov/sites/default/files/meetings/agendas/5835_A_Bay_Area_Toll_Authority_Oversight_Committee_23-11-08_Standing_Committee_2.pdf

I continue to be perplexed that MTC leadership seems so intent on moving more cars across the bridge instead of encouraging and expanding accessible and affordable transit.

Roadway congestion continues to grow as do the costs to the economy. Current estimates are that congestion costs the economy more than \$165 billion each year in lost productivity and wasted fuel. Transportation planning focuses on expanding highways, but this is largely unsustainable and cost ineffective.

Really, you should watch this video and ask yourself, why waste tax payer dollars on creating worse traffic? You would be far better off adding a ferry from Richmond to Larkspur to connect to the North Bay.



[More Lanes are \(Still\) a Bad Thing](#)
[youtube.com](#)

Here is more empirical evidence; i.e., something you already know but choose not to acknowledge <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF00166218>

APPENDIX B

INDUCED TRAFFIC AND INDUCED DEMAND

Douglass B. Lee, Jr.

“Induced” is a term implying that a particular condition is indirectly caused by another condition. In the case of traffic volumes, the term arose from the phenomenon that improvements to a highway -- especially capacity improvements -- seemed to result in more traffic choosing to use the road than would be the case if the highway were not improved. To an economist, this is an example of demand elasticity. Simply recognizing that travel demand is elastic, however, is not sufficient to reconcile the conflicting views of engineers, planners, and environmentalists. On one side are those who argue that transportation facilities are provided to serve land uses and support economic activity; on the other are those who claim that whatever capacity is provided soon fills up to the same level of congestion, gaining nothing. The truth can be better understood by defining induced demand in a way that uses the concept of elasticity.

This appendix describes the concepts guiding several modifications that were made to the HERS model for the 1997 Conditions and Performance report to Congress. With minor exceptions noted below, the model implements the concepts as they are described here.

Concepts of Induced Demand

Frequent references are made in transportation planning to the concept of induced demand, but the term remains ambiguous. The intent here is to define the relevant concepts, and show how they can be operationalized in representing demand for purposes of benefit-cost evaluation of capital improvement projects.

Acknowledgments: The author thanks Ross Crichton, William Goldsmith, and Anthony Rufolo for valuable comments and suggestions. Lisa Klein and Gregorio Camus were instrumental in the development of the algorithms.

[REDACTED] User of the RSR bike lane.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Tiff Chang [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 5:32 PM
To: MTC-ABAG Info <info@bayareametro.gov>
Subject: Public Comment - 3/13 BATA Oversight Committee - Item 5a

You don't often get email from tiffanychangdesign@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email

Hi there,

Even if not many people are currently using the bike lane on the Richmond Bridge, the long term solution to make everyone's lives better with a better transit ecosystem is to keep the bike lane.

The issue is not that the bike lane is a failure but that there isn't good enough infrastructure on either side of the bridge, not enough people with e-bikes, not enough ebike highways, not enough bike lanes in cities, not enough Bart in the North Bay, not enough good elevators on public transit, etc.

It should remain open. Don't the studies show that more lanes of cars (and I am a car driver, too!) don't speed up traffic very much?

We need long term solutions and visions and this bike lane is one of them. Don't use your precious energy on debating closing this bike lane - use it on improving the surrounding infrastructure and asking Rotterdam how they got to where they are now.

Best,
Tiff Chang

[REDACTED]

From: Tom Lent [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2024 4:23 PM
To: MTC-ABAG Info <info@bayareametro.gov>
Subject: Public Comment - 3/13 BATA Oversight Committee - Item 5a

You don't often get email from tom.d.lent@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email

Dear Oversight Committee:

I am deeply distressed to learn that you are showing indications of bowing to uninformed political pressure to make changes to the current pedestrian and bicycle path on the Richmond San Rafael Bridge in the face of your own staff findings that any such changes are likely to be detrimental to the health of Richmond residents. Many studies have shown that any car congestion relief, if it happens at all, is likely to just move west slightly and be very short lived. If the congestion reduction even happens, any health impacts will be overwhelmed by the effects of increased volume of traffic.

For one example of the analysis you should be following, look at your own MTC staff findings in this meeting' [item 5](#),

"Air Quality – Contributors to air quality concerns in the City of Richmond are not only from I-580, but also the local refineries and the traffic volume along I-80. The proposed westbound 3rd lane may not improve air quality since non-exhaust emissions (particulate matter associated with road dust, brake wear, and tire wear) could increase due to more Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). And although exhaust emissions (e.g., particulate matter from passenger cars and heavy-duty trucks) could decrease due to reduced congestion, this effect could be offset by non-exhaust particulate matter emissions, especially those from additional heavy truck traffic."

Do not let uninformed political pressures from people who have hopes about mythic congestion benefits that are not substantiated by the studies keep you from looking at the science and being forward looking, and making the best decision for both the health of Richmond residents and the future of active, equitable, climate friendly and environmentally sound transportation.

Don't mess with the RSR path. It is working.

Thank you

Tom Lent
E-bike Project Coordinator, [Walk Bike Berkeley](#)
[ClimateAction Center E-bike Guide](#)
[E-Bike 1000 MPG Study](#)