



Outlook

---

## Public Comment: Plan Bay Area 2050+ Falls Short on Micromobility

---

From Ken Kershner <[REDACTED]>  
Date Sun 2026-03-08 12:46 PM  
To Plan BayArea Info <info@planbayarea.org>  
Cc SVBC general <svbcbikes@bikesiliconvalley.org>; Nash, Betsy <bnash@menlopark.gov>

You don't often get email from ken@triomotors.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

**\*External Email\***

To the MTC Planning Committee and ABAG Administrative Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Final Plan Bay Area 2050+. I write as an advocate for micromobility and active transportation infrastructure.

The plan has genuine strengths. The Bay Skyway — particularly the West Span bicycle and pedestrian pathway projected to carry 7,500 bicycle trips per hour — is a world-class, visionary project. The equity framing around communities like West Oakland, where 26% of households lack vehicle access, is exactly the right lens.

However, overall, Plan Bay Area 2050+ treats micromobility as a complement to cars and transit rather than as a primary mode in its own right. I urge the Commission and Board to address the following gaps before adoption:

1. **NO CYCLING MODAL SHARE TARGET.** The plan sets a goal of reducing solo car commuting to 33% by 2050 — but it does not include a headline target for cycling's share of trips. The Netherlands, where 27% of all trips are made by bicycle, achieved that through explicit, enforceable targets. We need the same.
2. **FUNDING IS INADEQUATE AND INSECURE.** The Netherlands invests approximately \$35 per resident per year in cycling infrastructure. The Bay Skyway itself has no identified funding source despite costs in the hundreds of millions. Active transportation deserves a guaranteed, ring-fenced allocation — not discretionary dollars competing against highway interchanges.
3. **PAINT IS NOT INFRASTRUCTURE.** The plan's "Complete Streets" approach largely retrofits roads with painted bike lanes. The Dutch standard — physically separated cycling infrastructure on every arterial — is what actually moves the needle on safety and ridership. The Bay Area should adopt that as the design baseline, not the exception.
4. **CONNECTIVITY GAPS REMAIN.** Isolated showcase projects do not make a network. Amsterdam and Utrecht saw cycling surge, specifically when they built continuous grids connecting homes to schools, shops, and train stations. Plan Bay Area 2050+ is still filling gaps in the Bay Trail rather than building a cohesive regional cycling grid.

Plan Bay Area 2050+ is ambitious by American standards — but American standards are not good enough. I urge MTC and ABAG to raise the bar: add a cycling modal share target, secure dedicated active transportation funding, adopt separated infrastructure as the default design standard, and prioritize network completeness over individual landmark projects.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ken Kershner  
Menlo Park, San Mateo County

--

Ken Kershner | Co-Founder & CEO



After nearly three years of public discussion, technical analysis and refinement, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) released the proposed final [Plan Bay Area 2050+](#) and the [Final Environmental Impact Report \(EIR\) for Plan Bay Area 2050+](#). Read the proposed final Plan Bay Area 2050+ and its supplemental reports at [planbayarea.org/finalplan](http://planbayarea.org/finalplan).\* The Final EIR for Plan Bay Area 2050+ also can be accessed online at [planbayarea.org/2050/environmental-impact-report-eir](http://planbayarea.org/2050/environmental-impact-report-eir).

This notice is provided pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21092.5, which requires that the lead agency provide a written proposed response to all public agencies that made comments on the EIR at least 10 days prior to certification of the EIR. The responses are now available at <https://planbayarea.org/2050/environmental-impact-report-eir>.

The plan and its related reports will be presented for review and consideration at a joint meeting of the MTC Planning Committee with the ABAG Administrative Committee on [Friday, March 13](#) before referring them to their respective approving bodies.

The ABAG Executive Board will consider adoption of the final plan and certification of the Final EIR at their [March 19 meeting](#). The Commission will consider certifying the Final EIR and adopting the final plan, Air Quality Conformity Analysis and 2025 TIP Amendment at their [March 25 meeting](#).

This release follows a 59-day public comment period for the draft plan and the Draft EIR that closed on December 18, 2025. The proposed final plan and Final EIR have been updated to reflect feedback received during the public comment period. All comments received on the draft plan and related supplemental reports can be found on the [Draft Plan Bay Area 2050+](#) page of the Plan Bay Area website. Comments received on the Draft EIR, along with responses, are available at <https://planbayarea.org/2050/environmental-impact-report-eir>.

## Tune In to the Meetings!

- [Joint MTC Planning Committee and ABAG Administrative Committee](#)  
**March 13, 2026 | 9:45 a.m.**  
At this meeting, the committees will consider referring certification of the Final EIR and adoption of the proposed final plan to their respective approving bodies.
- [ABAG Executive Board](#)  
**March 19, 2026 | 5 p.m.**  
At this meeting, the Executive Board will consider certifying the Final EIR and adopting the proposed final plan.
- [Metropolitan Transportation Commission](#)  
**March 25, 2026 | 9:35 a.m.**  
At this meeting, the Commission will consider certifying the Final EIR and adopting the proposed final plan.

Please visit the [ABAG & MTC Meetings](#) page on the [planbayarea.org](http://planbayarea.org) website to view the agendas, and information for participating remotely and in person. Additional information on participating also is available on the [MTC website](#).



---

## Public Comment: Plan Bay Area 2050+ Falls Short on Micromobility

---

From K Rennie [REDACTED]

Date Sun 2026-03-08 8:25 PM

To Plan BayArea Info <info@planbayarea.org>

[REDACTED]

\*External Email\*

To the MTC Planning Committee and ABAG Administrative Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Final Plan Bay Area 2050+. I write as an advocate for micro-mobility and active transportation infrastructure.

The plan has genuine strengths. The Bay Skyway — particularly the West Span bicycle and pedestrian pathway projected to carry 7,500 bicycle trips per hour — is a world-class, visionary project. The equity framing around communities like West Oakland, where 26% of households lack vehicle access, is exactly the right lens.

However, overall, Plan Bay Area 2050+ treats micro-mobility as a complement to cars and transit rather than as a primary mode in its own right. I urge the Commission and Board to address the following gaps before adoption:

1. **NO CYCLING MODAL SHARE TARGET.** The plan sets a goal of reducing solo car commuting to 33% by 2050 — but it does not include a headline target for cycling's share of trips. The Netherlands, where 27% of all trips are made by bicycle, achieved that through explicit, enforceable targets. We need the same.
2. **FUNDING IS INADEQUATE AND INSECURE.** The Netherlands invests approximately \$35 per resident per year in cycling infrastructure. The Bay Skyway itself has no identified funding source despite costs in the hundreds of millions. Active transportation deserves a guaranteed, ring-fenced allocation — not discretionary dollars competing against highway interchanges.
3. **PAINT IS NOT INFRASTRUCTURE.** The plan's "Complete Streets" approach largely retrofits roads with painted bike lanes. The Dutch standard —

physically separated cycling infrastructure on every arterial — is what actually moves the needle on safety and ridership. The Bay Area should adopt that as the design baseline, not the exception.

4. CONNECTIVITY GAPS REMAIN. Isolated showcase projects do not make a network. Amsterdam and Utrecht saw cycling surge, specifically when they built continuous grids connecting homes to schools, shops, and train stations. Plan Bay Area 2050+ is still filling gaps in the Bay Trail rather than building a cohesive regional cycling grid.

Plan Bay Area 2050+ is ambitious by American standards — but American standards are not good enough. I urge MTC and ABAG to raise the bar: add a cycling modal share target, secure dedicated active transportation funding, adopt separated infrastructure as the default design standard, and prioritize network completeness over individual landmark projects.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kevin Rennie



Private Citizen



---

**Fw: Final EIR for the PBA 2050+ plan**

---

**From** MTC-ABAG Info <info@bayareametro.gov>  
**Date** Mon 2026-03-09 12:56 PM  
**To** EIR Comments <eircomments@bayareametro.gov>  
**Cc** Plan BayArea Info <info@planbayarea.org>

Regards,

MTC/ABAG Public Information

---

**From:** Bill Mayben [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 9, 2026 12:40:47 PM  
**To:** MTC-ABAG Info <info@bayareametro.gov>  
**Subject:** Final EIR for the PBA 2050+ plan

\*External Email\*

Dear Bay Area Metro Staff;

Thank you for your efforts in producing these documents.  
Reading through them, I want to focus briefly on the overarching principle project perimeters.

If we are not planning to decentralize; within the coming 25 years and beyond we intend to mitigate and adapt Bay Area shoreline and low-lying development and infrastructure to projected Sea Level Rise; in the midst of increasing Severe Climate Events and an increasing population.

We intend to do this while incorporating location and structural engineering principles in preparation for continued Sea Level Rise and Severe Climate Events far beyond 2050.

It appears that this work is driven by our budget, engineering, and schedule to revise all vulnerable existing infrastructure, essentially one time; setting the stage for what is to come. This is necessary to maximize the duration of expensive and time-consuming foundational improvements.

Literally everything proposed hinges on effective SLR mitigation work.

Backup for our population is also dependent on establishing our ability to provide emergency shelter, food, water, sanitation, safety, medical treatment, and transportation; to prevent chaos in Severe Climate Events. Community ability to coordinate and recover is wholly dependent on this.

Presently, many major, parallel societal initiatives are cited. Without effective priority-setting, budgeting, contracting and sequential development, PBA can become chaotic. Given the factors we face, under-promising and over-delivering may be an effective principle.

Lastly, all physical mitigation going forward will be pursued in a progressively deteriorating climate. Over time, development will become more frequently subjected to unprecedented environmental conditions, creating weather and repair setbacks.

Heat, flooding, cold, drought, high winds, high seas will drive some of the coming meteorological, logistical and financial delays.

The locations and access to future critical public services; police, fire, public works, hospitals, electricity and gas, sewage, water, shelter, communication, transportation should be carefully evaluated now, considering all factors.

Yours,  
Bill Mayben



---

**Re: Response to your Draft Plan Bay Area 2050+ comments**

---

From Jim Stallman [REDACTED]  
Date Mon 2026-03-09 7:54 PM  
To Plan BayArea Info <info@planbayarea.org>  
Cc [REDACTED] District5@bos.sccgov.org <District5@bos.sccgov.org>;  
District1@bos.sccgov.org <District1@bos.sccgov.org>

**\*External Email\***

Thank you for your reply.

Maybe in spite of MTC, new rail service to the Santa Clara County border with our southern neighbor will commence in 2 years (and someone will figure out that the \$80M trainset can also serve Salinas, perhaps). It will cost 10 times what it should and provide economically pitiful levels of service but it is under contract to happen. The service will actually double what we have presently since there is only one trainset and it will have to return to the start to do the second commute trip. Of course, I wouldn't rule out the possibility of the train deadheading without allowing the public who paid for it to ride it. We'll see what happens.

In the meantime, my wife and I continue to submit scofflaw license plates we see to the CHP CHEATERS website to help bolster vehicle fee collections here in the Bay Area. MTC reporting \$200M a year lost to uncollectable tolls is real money.

On Mon, Mar 9, 2026 at 1:53 PM Plan BayArea Info <[info@planbayarea.org](mailto:info@planbayarea.org)> wrote:

Dear Mr. Stallman,

Thank you for participating in the Plan Bay Area 2050+ development process. We appreciate your suggestions regarding the Regional Transit Investments map (Map 4-4) and the discussion of future rail connections to Salinas and Monterey County.

Plan Bay Area 2050+ is fiscally constrained and focuses on projects anticipated to become operational within the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area over the 25-year planning horizon. Because the Monterey County Rail Extension Project lies outside the Bay Area's geographic and financial scope, it is not shown on Map 4-4 nor described in the plan at this time.

Regional rail service between the Bay Area and Monterey County is identified in the California State Rail Plan as a long-term vision (generally beyond the plan's 25-year planning horizon). Planning for the Monterey County Rail Extension is currently being led by the Transportation Agency for Monterey County. As project development advances, elements of the project that connect to or operate within the Bay Area may be considered in future Plan Bay Area updates.

Regarding your comment on Capitol Corridor, the South Bay Connect bypass is represented on Map 4-4 under regional rail as "New Service."



---

**Re: Response to your Draft Plan Bay Area 2050+ comments**

---

From Ken Kershner [REDACTED]

Date Tue 2026-03-10 9:02 AM

To Plan BayArea Info <info@planbayarea.org>

Cc SVBC Palo Alto Team <paloalto@bikesiliconvalley.org>; Nash, Betsy <bnash@menlopark.gov>

[REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

**\*External Email\***

---

Subject: Re: Plan Bay Area 2050+ – Requesting Specific Language Commitments

Dear Ms. Lara-Enríquez,

Thank you for your thoughtful response. I appreciate MTC-ABAG's acknowledgment of the micromobility sector and the significant investments outlined in Strategies T9 and T10.

However, I want to be direct: the plan's impact will be defined not by its dollar figures, but by its definitions.

\$9.4 billion spent on sharrows and painted bike lanes will not move the needle on mode shift. The Netherlands didn't achieve 27% bicycle modal share through encouragement — they mandated physical separation. I urge the final plan to include three specific, enforceable commitments:

1. Define eligibility. T9 funding on arterials over 25 MPH must require Class IV separated infrastructure — not paint.
2. Name micromobility. Include e-bike and e-scooter parking and charging in transit hub funding criteria.
3. Link density to protection. PDAs along El Camino Real should require protected corridor infrastructure as a condition of transportation funding.
4. Set a mode share objective for micromobility trips explicitly.

These are not radical asks — they are the minimum standards needed to deliver on the plan's own stated goals of safety, climate resilience, and equity.

I look forward to engaging further as the final plan is adopted and the next update cycle begins.

Respectfully,  
Ken Kershner

[REDACTED]

On Mon, Mar 9, 2026 at 2:24 PM Plan BayArea Info <[info@planbayarea.org](mailto:info@planbayarea.org)> wrote:



---

Re: Response to your Draft Plan Bay Area 2050+ comments

---

From David Stahlberg [REDACTED]  
Date Thu 2026-03-12 8:08 AM  
To Plan BayArea Info <info@planbayarea.org>

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

**\*External Email\***

I'm extremely upset to have heard from my union president that ,beginning April 12,2026, there will be no more # 101's running north of Novato into Sonoma County. This will place an extra burden on so many people especially, since gasoline prices are about to go through the roof. Shortsighted planning to put it mildly. Heartbreaking, to be honest.

On Mar 9, 2026, at 2:25 PM, Plan BayArea Info <info@planbayarea.org > wrote:

Dear Mr. Stahlberg,

Thank you for taking the time to provide comments on Draft Plan Bay Area 2050+. Your insights and concerns are greatly appreciated and were carefully considered by MTC-ABAG planning staff in determining refinements to the plan and accompanying reports.

The plan includes strategies to increase access to transit for residents and visitors across the region, including additional trips on Golden Gate Transit and operators in Sonoma County. The plan also includes the extension of SMART service to Healdsburg and Cloverdale to improve transit access in northern Sonoma County.

The need to expand transit services late at night and earlier in the morning is something we heard during public engagement for Transit 2050+ and Plan Bay Area 2050+. To comply with federal requirements, the projected costs of future investments cannot exceed our anticipated revenues over the course of the plan timeline. Because of this, it is not feasible to expand 24-hour service to the entire region, and it is not currently planned in Marin and Sonoma Counties. However, we continue to invest in 24-hour service in the more urbanized portions of the region, as well as expanding service hours throughout the region. Further increases to 24-hour service could be considered in a future plan.

Thank you again for your thoughtful comments. We hope you will stay involved in the regional planning process as we kick off the next plan update later this year.

Read the proposed final Plan Bay Area 2050+ and its supplemental reports at [planbayarea.org/finalplan](http://planbayarea.org/finalplan). The Final EIR for Plan Bay Area 2050+ also can be accessed online at [planbayarea.org/2050/environmental-impact-report-eir](http://planbayarea.org/2050/environmental-impact-report-eir).



---

**Re: Response to your Draft Plan Bay Area 2050+ comments**

---

From Bill Mayben [REDACTED]  
Date Thu 2026-03-12 1:28 PM  
To Plan BayArea Info <info@planbayarea.org>

**\*External Email\***

Dear Ms. Lara-Enriquez,

Thank you for your reply.

The 'Bins' you described are at the heart of my fear of dissolution of our core concerns; that the responsibility for physical sea level rise mitigation and adaptation construction can become lost in multi- jurisdictional agenda.

We want to permanently avoid flooding; all around the Bay.

The term "Exponential" in climate change is key. Humans think incrementally. Our global climate threat is increasing exponentially.

Most believe, based on their past experience, that we have much more time than we actually do.

We are, in fact, Bay Area wide; setting the stage for a sweeping, ongoing shift in our reality; while proposing to conduct business as usual in its midst.

While we have some preliminary studies; we apparently do not have a complete plan that allows us to confidently project even a rough start date for physical mitigation and adaptation work. Certain activities can proceed in parallel; others simply cannot.

If you were to reference preliminary flow charts of all the processes leading to the completion of entitlements; I will bet you find the main construction phase falling close to the shadow of Severe Climate Events.

That alone means delays and repairs. Costs.

The Final EIR cites a number of interdependent goals. A recitation of priorities and logistical sequence of events should help clear the air.

You may consider an empowered central, core construction project management; the success upon which each and every aspect depends.

There are preliminary accommodations; various stake-holder jurisdictions, permits, insurance, finance, multiple bidding and contract processes, laws and rules, access, traffic control, temporary facilities,

The tail end of 24 years from now will likely be progressively subject to climate related potential delays and repairs. We would prefer avoiding those.

I previously forwarded recent information from studies indicating that worldwide sea level calculations are off. Our 2050 effects could be 1-3' higher than we now project. There will be more surprises; so contingency planning is foremost.

Preliminary duration schedules from each "entity" could conceivably sequence a preliminary calendar; identify issues, and allow for periodic updates.

I am confident this is being done.

Yours,  
Bill Mayben

On Mar 9, 2026, at 2:27 PM, Plan BayArea Info <[info@planbayarea.org](mailto:info@planbayarea.org)> wrote:

Dear Mr. Mayben,

Thank you for sharing your thoughtful and detailed comments. We share many of your concerns about the significant fiscal, environmental and governance challenges the Bay Area faces.

We recognize that we are not operating within the same political or fiscal framework as the region's transportation strategies, which are constrained by specific funding allocations and regulatory frameworks. To begin addressing this, this plan categorizes estimated costs into broad "bins," which will help refine the scale of investment needed and highlight where new funding sources or mechanisms must be developed.

This plan is only the beginning of a longer, collaborative process with regional, local and state partners to refine the analysis and align on funding and implementation pathways to get projects built.

Plan Bay Area 2050+ aims to hold multiple concurrent risks in view, acknowledging that sea level rise is only one of several major regional challenges. Severe earthquakes, floods, wildfires, droughts, and periods of extreme heat or cold each pose unique risks to