

Public Correspondence Received
Ahead of the December 21, 2023
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory
Committee Meeting

Vanessa Castro

From: Mark Lange
Sent: Friday, October 20, 2023 12:14 PM
To: Vanessa Castro
Cc:
Subject: Making our streets safer

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

I write in reference to last night's agenda item (10. Safe Shared Streets) — earnestly encouraging the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors to support a Safe Shared Streets Video Pilot Program.

While I couldn't be at last night's meeting, I write you because this is a literal matter of life and death for people who deserve equal protection under the law. Specifically, citizens who cycle on our streets, leaving no trace but being put at grave risk of serious injury or death by inattentive, distracted, careless and, as a sad result, dangerous people behind the wheel who violate the 3 foot safe passing law.

If City and County attorneys and law enforcement have an obligation to enforce existing laws in support of public safety... and if video evidence generated (at no cost, voluntary) by citizens has been admissible as evidence for decades (see Rodney King) and in the prosecution of every other category of criminal violation (petty theft and shoplifting?)... why would driver "privacy" concerns prevent video evidence from being considered when a motorist uses a vehicle to put another human being at grave and mortal risk? To threaten, harass, intimidate and even knock another human being to the pavement at high speed?

I personally know — or should say, knew — two human beings who are dead now, after irresponsible drivers ran into (and in one case, over) them as they rode quietly, responsibly, and — you would think, as they did, safely — on the edge of the right side of the road, obeying the law.

Their families lost them not because cycling is an "inherently dangerous sport," but because inherently dangerous drivers did not respect the law. And why were those drivers inherently dangerous? Because, fundamentally, that law is not being adequately enforced.

A pilot program to generate and consider accurate, objective, high-resolution video evidence of near-miss and collision incidents on San Mateo County roads, in support of public safety, is simply common sense.

The San Mateo County Board of Supervisors should see Dr. Salinger's letter on this subject. It is clear, salient, and enumerates the positive benefits of a video evidence pilot program for the County.

Thank you for all of the work you do to make this community a better and safer place to live. It can't be easy — and I appreciate what you do to help us. Your support on this issue would have a material impact on the equal protection and adequate enforcement of the law that every citizen in the County should be able to count on. Help us on this, please.

Best regards,

Mark

Mark Lange

(Grateful resident since 1996)

Vanessa Castro

From: Rob Waring
Sent: Friday, October 20, 2023 2:09 PM
To: Vanessa Castro
Cc: CyclistVideoEvidence.com
Subject: Please make our streets safer

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

I write regarding last night's agenda item (10. Safe Shared Streets) — begging the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors to support a Safe Shared Streets Video Pilot Program.

I couldn't be at last night's meeting, so I write you because this is a matter of life and death for people who deserve equal protection under the law. Specifically, citizens who cycle on our streets are at grave risk of serious injury or death by distracted, careless, impatient, or angry motorists who pass cyclists in a reckless manner.

City and County law enforcement have an obligation to enforce existing laws in support of public safety. If video evidence generated by citizens has been admissible as evidence for decades (see Rodney King) and in the prosecution of every other category of criminal violation (petty theft and shoplifting?), why would driver "privacy" concerns prevent video evidence from being considered when a motorist uses a vehicle to put another human being at grave and mortal risk?

A pilot program to consider accurate, objective, high-resolution video evidence of near-miss and collision incidents on San Mateo County roads in support of public safety is simply common sense. In Britain, video evidence from cyclists is an important law enforcement tool, and citations issued as a result are a significant source of revenue.

The San Mateo County Board of Supervisors should review Dr. Salinger's letter on this subject. It is clear, salient, and enumerates the positive benefits of a video evidence pilot program for the County. People who are afraid to ride on public roads cite motorists' behavior as the number one reason.

Thank you for all of the work you do to make this community a better and safer place to live. Your support on this issue would have a material impact on enforcement of laws intended to protect vulnerable road users and increase the use of bicycle transportation as an alternative to motor vehicles.

Sincerely,
Robert Waring
Redwood City, CA

Vanessa Castro

From: Mike Swire
Sent: Tuesday, December 19, 2023 5:44 PM
To: Vanessa Castro
Cc: Elaine Salinger
Subject: Public comment for BPAC

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear SMC BPAC,

Thank you for your service in making the County safer for those on foot and bike.

The BPAC does a great job of providing input on projects that can influence safety and comfort for people on foot and bike. Usually most of these projects - e.g., Canada Road, Woodside Road - are smaller/local in scope. Today, you will hear from Caltrans on their plan for (isolated) improvements throughout the County - medium in scope?. I don't know, however, that the BPAC is addressing issues that will have a massive impact on the safety of people who walk and bike throughout all of the County.

One such megaproject is the proposed widening of Highways 101 and 280 in San Mateo and San Francisco Counties. SMCTA and C/CAG are currently sponsoring a several hundred million dollar project that may widen Highway 101 in SM County from four to five lanes. This megaproject could add thousands of cars to our roads each day. The incremental traffic won't be confined to 101; drivers will need to speed through town to get to the widened highways, passing schools, parks, and senior centers on the way. This increase in traffic will undoubtedly increase the number of deadly car vs. pedestrian and cyclist crashes on our roads, regardless of the number of small or medium projects that the BPAC, SMCTA, C/CAG or municipalities implement in the near future.

I am thus writing to beg the SMC BPAC, which speaks for people who walk and bike in SM County, to write to SMCTA, C/CAG, and the County Board of Directors, asking them to oppose the unnecessary, expensive, and deadly widening of Highways 101 in SM County. Please put this on your next agenda.

The proposed 101 widening makes no sense for several reasons:

- [Widening highways doesn't reduce traffic](#); it simply increases the number of cars on the road.
- More cars mean more air pollution, especially in the [lower income and diverse neighborhoods adjacent to the highway](#).
- More cars mean more greenhouse gases. [Transportation is responsible for 60% of GHG in SM County](#) and 101 is our busiest road, even before widening.

- More cars means more traffic violence for people who walk and bike in neighborhoods adjacent to the highway. This will [disproportionately impact lower income residents and people of color](#).
- The widening (and Express Lanes) will largely benefit wealthier residents who can afford their own cars for longer commutes. [Lower income residents](#) are more likely to use public transportation or bike as the cost of a new car in the US is now over [\\$48,000](#) plus [\\$12,000](#)/year in operating costs.
- SM County residents think it is a waste of money, as demonstrated by [this informal poll that I conducted online](#). In addition, Sierra Club, Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition, San Mateo Climate Action Team, TransForm, and others ([p. 22+](#)) have opposed the widenings.
- Our scarce transportation dollars are better spent addressing [Caltrain's fiscal cliff](#), the maintenance needs of the [current roads that are in disrepair](#), or the long backlog of projects that will save the lives of those who walk and bike in our cities.

Please note that several members of the SM County Board of Supervisors will ultimately vote on whether to proceed with the widening. The SMC BPAC has a duty to let them know that the negative consequences of the proposed 101 widening will dwarf the positive, but smaller projects that the BPAC and SM County are pursuing. You will not be alone in opposing this project. In October, the [SMCTA Citizen Advisory Committee](#), the liaison between the public and the Board of Directors, [voted against consideration of this project with a widening option](#). Unfortunately, the SMCTA unanimously rejected the Citizen Advisory Committee's recommendation. This is an uphill battle and we need the BPAC's support to let our transportation funding agencies know that we want our precious taxpayer dollars spent on safety on existing roads instead of making it easier for people to drive.

Thank you for your consideration and I hope that the BPAC will take this very important step given the massive impact that this project will have on the safety for those who walk and bike in SM County. Please let me know how I can help.

Sincerely,

Mike Swire

Appointee, SMCTA Citizen Advisory Committee
Appointee, C/CAG Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee
(speaking as an individual, not on behalf of these groups)