

From: [Nicholas Davies](#)
To: [Transportation Commission](#)
Subject: RE: 86772 - no to Frogger
Date: Sunday, January 19, 2025 11:50:19 AM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear Transportation Commission,

The crash history bears out that an RRFB alone was not the solution to the safety problems at W. Wash and the Southwest Path.

The viable options I see are:

1. Keep a lane reduction in place, and replace the RRFB with some other type of pedestrian-activated lighting/signal.
2. Replace the RRFB with a full traffic signal system, with or without a lane reduction.

What I absolutely do not want to see is a return to the days of cyclists and pedestrians playing Frogger across four lanes of vehicle traffic. The burden should not be entirely on us to value our lives and wait for a gap. There has to be some give from the vehicle traffic as well, to alert drivers to their responsibility under state law to stop for people crossing. Safety is not a one-sided responsibility that falls entirely on the victim.

Weighing these options, these points stick out:

* Regardless of what type of signal drivers are given to stop for cross traffic, some speed awareness feature (rumble strips, speed humps, tabletops) could bring traffic speeds down to where they're better able to react in time when needed. **If the lane reduction is filling this role today, that is a good thing!**

* W. Wash is already one lane each way north of Bedford. This is just because the section south of Bedford has not yet been improved in the same way, not because Bedford contributes a lane's worth of traffic.

* A lane reduction at the path crossing can make the path crossing's operations faster for everyone involved, because of the shorter crossing distance, and only having to wait for one vehicle at a time to stop.

* Driver compliance is typically higher with red/yellow/green traffic signals (although far from perfect) than with an RRFB or something equivalent.

* A traffic signal doesn't rely on driver consensus to provide path users with an opportunity to cross, so a traffic signal could work with or without a lane reduction.

* A full traffic signal would have a longer cycle, because it has more phases to go through. The lane reduction could help reduce the total cycle length though.

* If we could operate the rail crossing's crossbeams, that could improve driver compliance quite a bit. (These block the on-street bike lanes, but not the sidewalks.)

My conclusion: the lane reduction is the important piece to keep. Beyond that, we're essentially talking about what type of light drivers will respond to better/worse, and about that, I'm in favor of whatever works.

Thank you,

Nick Davies
3717 Richard St