



73 Belvedere Avenue
Richmond, CA 94801
Phone/Fax 510-235-2835
tracbaytrail@earthlink.net

January 24, 2018

Via Email:

The Honorable Stephanie Moulton-Peters, Chair
Transportation Authority of Marin

Dear Ms. Moulton-Peters,

Referring to item 13 on your January 25 meeting agenda, TRAC, the Trails for Richmond Action Committee, requests that TAM refrain from asking the Bay Area Toll Authority to allow motor vehicles on the shoulder of the westbound upper deck of the Richmond/San Rafael Bridge (RSR) planned for a San Francisco Bay Trail pilot project.

The Contra Costa Transportation Authority has not made such a request, so the proposed letter to BATA is erroneous in stating that TAM "supports the Contra Costa Transportation Authority in our joint request". Such a request would not address the westbound traffic backup at the Richmond approach to toll booths, but would thwart the planned four-year pilot project to evaluate use of this shoulder as part of the San Francisco Bay Trail system linking the North Bay and East Bay.

Richmond Mayor and Contra Costa Transportation Authority Chair Tom Butt stated in his Tom Butt E-Forum:

"Some motorists frustrated by the westbound I-580 morning traffic back-up on approaches to the bridge are concerned about employing the right shoulder on the top deck for a barrier-separated walking and cycling trail. However, this morning backup normally is on the approaches to the bridge, rather than on the bridge itself, resulting from the confusion of motorists maneuvering for FasTrak vs. cash lanes in the midst of traffic merging from both the Garrard Blvd. and Castro St. on ramps just before the toll plaza. The pressing need is to eliminate cash toll collection as on the Golden Gate Bridge while finding a way to reconfigure the Garrard Blvd. and Castro St. on ramps."

"Even if there were an additional third running lane added westbound, traffic would still snarl up on the west end of the bridge at a bottleneck where there are only two lanes on I-580 before it merges with State

Route 101. Even the connection to Sir Francis Drake and 101 south has a single lane."

"If you want to urge BATA to make the Richmond – San Rafael Bridge FasTrak only, like the Golden Gate Bridge, contact current MTC/BATA chair Dave Cortese at dave.cortese@bos.sccgov.org and incoming Chairman Jake McKenzie at blumacjazz@aol.com. Also contact Cal-Trans Regional Director Bijan Sartipi at bijan.sartipi@dot.ca.gov.

If TAM deems it appropriate to involve itself in addressing the westbound traffic backup prior to bridge toll booths in Richmond, it could ask BATA to eliminate cash collection of RSR bridge tolls.

The Bay Trail provides pedestrian and bicyclist access across the Golden Gate, Carquinez Straits, Benicia & Dumbarton bridges, as well as the east span of the Bay Bridge. Please don't thwart the planned pilot project to evaluate closing the Bay Trail gap across the RSR Bridge.

Best Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bruce Beyaert". The signature is fluid and cursive, written in a professional style.

Bruce Beyaert, TRAC Chair

cc: Ms. Dianne Steinhauser
The Honorable Tom Butt
The Honorable Jake Mackenzie
The Honorable Amy Worth
Mr. Andrew B. Fremier
Ms. Laura Thompson

From: Ron Jacobs
To: [TAM Info](#)
Subject: Bicycles on Richmond Bridge
Date: Monday, January 22, 2018 4:17:54 PM

Dear TAM Commissioners, re Agenda Item #13 1/25/2018, proposed letter to MTC,

In the 1950s my parents would drive the car onto a ferry to go from Marin to Richmond. There weren't many other cars then. Now there are magnitudes more crossing the Richmond bridge. In the 1970s I bicycled from Greenbrae to work in downtown San Francisco. I didn't see many other cyclists then. Now there are magnitudes more. In the 1970s I crossed the Richmond bridge a few times with my bicycle on the bed of a tow truck. That was a service provided by the Richmond bridge. I doubt there were any other bicyclists crossing the bridge that way on most days. In the 1980s I sometimes took my bicycle with me on BART. That was a practice that BART was resistant to, but now there are magnitudes more bicycles being taken on BART.

I predict a bike/pedestrian lane on the Richmond bridge will lead to hundreds or thousands of bicyclists using that lane daily within a few years. (This would probably mean fewer automobiles on the bridge than if there weren't bicyclists.) I say install the bike/pedestrian lane and see what happens.

Ron Jacobs

Former Marin resident

Current Alameda County resident

From: Nancy Weninger
To: [TAM Info](#)
Subject: Letter to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission/Bay Area Toll Authority Regarding the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge (Action) – Agenda Item 13
Date: Monday, January 22, 2018 10:56:27 AM

Transportation Authority of Marin Board of Commissioners:

I am writing to express my complete disagreement with the intent of the proposed letter about the Richmond Bridge bike/ped lane.

This pathway over the Richmond San Rafael Bridge is part of the planned 500-mile, 9-county SF Bay Trail, currently over 70% complete. The Bay Trail is not only a recreational path, but is an important element of a growing alternative commute corridor, connecting jobs, housing, neighborhoods, BART, bus lines and ferries.

There seems to be a presumption that there is minimal value to completing the project. The third lane eastbound as well as the bike path on the top deck are both part of a four-year pilot project to see how both solutions affect traffic and operations. Let the pilot do its job as intended and show us how things work.

If you want to discourage cyclists from using the bridge pathway as a transportation corridor, I can think of no better way than to make it a less than 24/7 option. Who will be able to remember which hours and days the path is open to them? And what if it's open for one leg of your trip but not the return?

I have had personal experience with this kind of insecurity. My husband and I are bike tourists, and we extend our range by taking multimodal trips. One of our favorites is to take the Capitol Corridor train out of Richmond up to Sacramento and ride from there. To get across the bridge we ride to San Quentin and catch the bus. However, there is always the worry that the bike rack on the bus will be full. We would like to make this trip with friends for company, but can't because of the limited bike rack. How nice it would be to just ride across the bridge instead!

Even at my age (70) biking the bridge is quite doable. But I just bought an electric bike, which will make the crossing even easier. E-bikes are becoming more popular. They are a real and viable alternative to cars--isn't that what we're after?

The transportation sector is the NUMBER ONE contributor to greenhouse gasses, and yet you are proposing to turn the long fought for bike and ped path on the bridge into another car lane.

I respectfully request that you take the long view and envision and provide a transportation environment that provides equal facilities and opportunities to all modes of travel, with special encouragement for the long-underserved non-motorized modes.

Sincerely,

Nancy Weninger
Larkspur, CA

From: TAM Contact Form
To: [TAM Info](#)
Subject: New submission from TAM Contact Form
Date: Wednesday, January 24, 2018 3:08:31 PM

Name

Deb Waldt

Email

leave a comment

THANK YOU for your upcoming letter to MTC re: a 3rd lane for VEHICLES/COMMUTERS on the Richmond Bridge. It's insane that making strictly a bike lane was even considered in the first place. All transportation agencies need to reconsider their cozy relationships with the tyrannical bike coalitions around here. Until we ever get better 24 hr efficient public transportation in/out of Marin, cars will always be necessary & should NOT take a backseat to a very few bikes.

From: timoey@gmail.com
To: [TAM Info](#)
Subject: Richmond Bridge needs full-time bike path
Date: Thursday, January 25, 2018 10:44:24 AM

Dear TAM Board of Commissioners,

We need full-time bike paths around the entire bay, not part time ones.

We continue to suffer from too much car privilege. Cars automatically get what they need but not bikes. We need to get people out of their cars and have them walk, bike and use other more efficient modes of transportation. Biking improves health, improves our environment, and protects our world for future generations. Encouraging car traffic decreases health and hurts our environment. Not having a safe bike route 24/7 should be a huge red flag.

Would it be ok to have part time car access to Marin? Yes you can get to Marin on weekends but sorry you cannot get there during peak commute times by car? Yet that is what some would like for bikes -- ok for recreation but not ok to get to where you need to go during commute times.

Did you know sitting is the new smoking? Let's reduce sitting in cars and get more people on their bikes pedaling around the bay and across the Richmond Bridge. It is good for car drivers to be stuck in traffic and see bikes whiz by; it will encourage them to switch to biking instead of driving.

The Richmond bridge is a key part of the 500 mile, 9-county SF Bay Trail and is used by both commuters and recreational bicyclists. Our interstate highway system would not work if we had lots of little gaps in it that blocked transportation. We need a fully complete Bay Trail serving bicyclists to have a transportation network that actually works. Please make sure we have a full-time bike path on the Richmond bridge.

Thanks!

Sincerely,
Tim Oey
Full-time bike commuter

From: Michael Howe
To: [TAM Info](#)
Subject: Richmond San Rafael Bridge Multi-Use Path
Date: Wednesday, January 24, 2018 9:26:06 AM

To: TAM Board of Commissioners
From: Michael Howe
Date: 11/24/18

As a member of the TAM BPAC and Marin County BPAC I want to strenuously object to TAM's proposed position of supporting the installation of moveable barrier system rather than the approved multi-use path on the westbound upper deck of the Richmond San Rafael Bridge.

The rationale that is being used assumes that implementation of the multi-use path on the upper deck will not relieve some of the congestion. As a regular commuter over the Richmond San Rafael Bridge from Marin to Oakland for 13 years I have watched the flow. It is clear to me that the congestion simply will move to 101 north and south. The assumption that a significant number of commuters will not use the multi-use path to commute to Marin is preposterous in my view. With proper public outreach, users will use the multi-use path.

Over the years I have worked closely with NGO's in West Contra Costa County and know there are a large number of people who live in West Contra Costa and commute Marin that plan to use the multi-path to commute to Marin rather than drive - keep in mind the majority of folks commuting into Marin in the morning live in West Contra Costa. Given the proper support these numbers will grow over time.

Keep in mind there were many who believed that SMART was a waste of government funds, utilization of SMART continues to grow at a rate greater than expected. I believe staying with the approved plan to install the multi-use path will prove to be another example that reduces the traffic burden that folks presently fact commuting into Marin using the Richmond San Rafael Bridge.

Although I cannot attend the meeting on January 25th, I would be quite willing to discuss my concerns in more detail should you or TAM staff at some future date.

Michael Howe, Marin County resident since 1968, past Parks, Open Space and Cultural Commissioner and Chair.

From: Dwayne
To: [TAM Info](#)
Subject: Richmond/San Rafael Bridge
Date: Tuesday, January 23, 2018 2:44:04 PM
Attachments: [TAM comment_RSRBridge.odt](#)

Attached is a copy of my comments about the proposal to change the agreement on the Richmond/San Rafael Bridge bike/ped lane.

The .odt format is a universally recognized document, readable by all modern office systems including Microsoft.

Dwayne Price
Larkspur, CA 94939

Comments to TAM on Proposal to Alter RSRBridge Agreement

Table of Contents

The Bridge since 1955	1
No Bikes will use it.....	2
It costs too much for a bike lane	2
We need that westbound lane.....	2
We can't wait for something else	3
It's not safe.....	3
A step-by-step guide to get to \$25M.....	4

Most of us agree that the morning and evening commute traffic on the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge has gotten out of hand. We also agreed a few years ago to use the third lane on the lower section during the evening commute and to create a bike/ped lane on the upper section. There was a lot of discussion about how and why to do it, a lot of back-and-forth, before coming to the present conclusion. There is now talk of abrogating part of that agreement. “A decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires” (T. Jefferson, 1776) that if we are to do this, we must do it with the same amount of discussion and back-and-forth that was originally done.

So why do we now want to remove the bike/ped lane and replace it with an automobile commute lane? What can we do? Why should we do it? In this document, I will present my take on the issues we have been hearing about and why so much of what we hear is, well, just plain wrong. But first, some history...

The Bridge since 1955

This bridge was opened in 1955 to replace a rather inconvenient and creaky automobile/railcar ferry. For the next 40 years, there was so little traffic that it was frequently used by the young folks hereabouts as a raceway to see just how fast that new car could go. Not until the 580 freeway was built did traffic volumes suddenly surge.

Had an initial 'demand study' been made prior to construction, would that multi-billion dollar (in today's dollars) project have gone ahead? Yeah, it probably would have but only because it would provide a basic connectivity. And, yes, some people were also looking far ahead to the time when that freeway would be built.

No Bikes will use it

How does anyone know that? (Actually, I know just the opposite because I know that I will occasionally ride it and I have friends that will.) Until we do what we said we would do, build that bike/ped lane, we just won't know. That was the agreement.

But let's make this easy. Let's do an experiment. Take down those signs that declare it illegal to ride or walk across the bridge. Make sure there are no obstacles on the bridge or its approaches. That's all. If you are really worried about safety, put in some yellow pylons.

Now let's see how much usage it gets. Then multiply that usage by one or two orders of magnitude to get the usage after we put up good directional signage, advertise its availability, build proper approaches, and install whatever safety equipment is deemed necessary to keep the autos corralled.

You might also note that it took 40 yrs to get significant auto traffic but it did come. Bike/ped traffic might not be immediately overwhelming but it won't take 40 yrs to get there. Just as a change in the world (the freeway addition) started the auto traffic on a steep upward trajectory, other changes (e-bikes come to mind) will do the same for bikes. I would posit that a great many of those auto commuters who now suffer through that corridor would turn to e-bikes.

BTW, if everyone is so convinced that no one will ride/walk this bridge, why do we bother to make it illegal? We occasionally hear about some cyclist being picked up and ticketed, bike thrown into the cruiser, and taken back. Why not just do the same but without the ticket and in the cyclists destination? After all, it won't happen often. Right? Right?

It costs too much for a bike lane

The cost, though specified as required for a bike lane, is actually for the automobile lane. CalTrans wants to install a moveable barrier like that on the Golden Gate Bridge to prevent automobile drivers from drifting out of their assigned lane and into the bike lane – NOT vice versa. We have to make sure those drivers don't do something stupid like drive on a shoulder or in a designated bicycle lane, hit someone, and get sued. Really, no one is worried about a cyclist riding into the auto lane and taking out an automobile driver.

To see more about how much it would really cost see **A step-by-step guide to get to \$25M.**

We need that westbound lane

Why? Apparently, the westbound morning commute is getting just as stuck as the eastbound evening commute. However, the former happens in the morning and latter in the evening. We need only one lane to alleviate both problems, westbound in the morning, eastbound in the evening. While we are putting together all the apparatus to create a commute-only lane, seems it would be quite easy to make it change directions.

Such an arrangement is, indeed, a kludge, a temporary fix. But then so is just about everything else we have been planning here. However, it should suffice until realistic long-range solutions are implemented – see the next topic.

And one more question: Why can't we have three auto lanes AND a bike/ped lane (along with appropriately lowered speed limits)? Perhaps that moveable barrier could narrow the bike lane during the morning commute only. Sure, these lanes would be narrow but, again, this is a kludge until we get realistic.

We can't wait for something else

Right. We have a problem now which needs to be fixed. But if all we do is 'fix' this and go back to business as usual, we will be in for it again. I have suggested some intermediary fixes and I'm sure others can come up with more. But, we must get on-board with longterm planning in that corridor and that means primarily one simple thing: bringing BART to San Rafael.

It will be a long process and, though basically a simple one, it won't be cheap. We have got to start now, however, before everything blows up again and we go back to applying those makeshift kludges. Actually, it will be ultimately cheaper than continually doing catchup. And your children will thank you for it.

When I think about how long-range planning pays dividends, I think about the 580/101 interchange. In the last 20 yrs or so, there have been at least three multi-million dollar projects to 'improve' it. None of those improvements tackled the fundamental problem that we did not have a freeway-to-freeway interchange. Had we just created, back in the 1980s when the 580 freeway was being planned, the vision to do so and started acting on it, we would probably not be in such a tight corner now.

And speaking of long-range planning, another project would be to build a bike/ped installation off of the side of the bridge. Eliminates all your problems with bikes/peds but does require vision and planning. Many examples of such facilities abound around the world. Applying that \$25M to such a project would pay a significant amount of the cost.

It's not safe

Again I have to ask the obvious question: safe from what? No cyclist or walker is going to veer into the automobile lane, or somehow fly off the side of the bridge. Once again, the problem, friends, is the automobile drivers. But is it really such a problem?

Consider: Bicycles are allowed to use the 101 freeway shoulder on the Richardson Bay bridge just out of Sausalito with no extra provisions made, no extra striping nor any significant signage to alert motorists. I have occasionally biked this facility in both directions without incident or any feeling of danger. The biggest problems are the noise and the road trash.

I see no difference with the bridge traffic. Worried? Put in a few flashing lights.

A step-by-step guide to get to \$25M

The following was submitted to the IJ as a letter to the editor. It was printed after being heavily edited:

Why does a bike lane on the Richmond/San Rafael Bridge have to cost \$25,000,000? The short answer is that it doesn't. To open that bridge to bicycles, we need only remove the signs declaring it illegal for

cyclists to ride across. It's that simple and I guarantee cyclists will be on the bridge within an hour of those signs coming down. To complete the project, put a few extra signs on each end of the bridge directing cyclists to the appropriate lane. Sounds like we may be talking \$2,000, mostly for the new signs, four orders of magnitude less than the above quote. Shucks, it won't cost CalTrans a dime if they allow me and some friends to collect the funds by holding a bake sale - I'm not kidding.

"But those bicyclists are in danger!" OK, paint some stripes to create a buffered bike lane and make it obvious to all motorists. The cost now goes to about \$20,000 or three orders of magnitude less than the original quote.

"But it's too easy for an errant motorist to drive right over painted lines and into the bike lane!" OK, install some hefty bollards that, though not preventing a motorist from entering the bike lane, would definitely alert them to their transgression. We are now up to, maybe, \$200,000 or two orders of magnitude less than the original.

"Still not enough protection." OK, put one of those monstrous 'K rails' every 500 ft. or so. Presumably, every motorist will now be aware of the very personal consequences of inattention and will stay in their own lane. Getting up there now, probably to \$2,000,000, but still an order of magnitude less than our comparison amount.

"That barrier has to be continuous and it has to be removable." And that's why it costs \$25M.

If you have been following closely, you will notice that after the first \$2K, the rest of the money is spent on keeping the motorists from doing something stupid. In other words, it doesn't cost \$25M dollars for a bike lane but it does cost \$25M to keep those motor vehicles in their own lane. So let's be clear that, actually, we are paying \$25M for an automobile lane, not a bicycle lane. Bicycle lane cost: \$2,000. Automobile lane cost: \$24,998,000.

"But if we just ban the bicycles, we won't have to pay for anything." True, of course, or we could just ban the automobiles. And, likewise, if we ban wheel chairs from public sidewalks we won't need those expensive curb cuts. However, in all cases we are talking about basic accessibility to a significant segment of the population and about improvements that will continue for generations. It's the kind of thing a society does to provide for its people. But, we'll have to save that conversation for another time.

PostScript:

Bicycles are allowed to use the 101 freeway shoulder on the Richardson Bay bridge just out of Sausalito with no extra provisions made, no extra striping nor any significant signage to alert motorists. I have occasionally biked this facility in both directions without incident or any feeling of danger. The biggest problems are the noise and the road trash (if you keep an eye out you can score some nice stuff there). Actually, I am more concerned about riding through a parking lot because of the compromised sight lines and driver distractions.

From: TAM Contact Form
To: [TAM Info](#)
Subject: New submission from TAM Contact Form
Date: Wednesday, January 24, 2018 8:11:12 PM

Name

Ken Eichstaedt

Email

Phone

leave a comment

Dear Commissioners: My purpose in contacting you is to urge you to support bicycle and pedestrian access on the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge (that my father worked on). It is a vital link for the Bay Trail and can show Marin County as a leader in the Bay Area promoting non-motorized transportation.

As a registered civil and traffic engineer born and raised in Marin and having traveled to the Netherlands with Supervisors John Kress and Steve Kinsey (2000) to view their transportation system, I see a great value in providing non-motorized and public transportation in our community.

I hope you will be a strong promoter for developing this critical link in the transportation future of the Bay Area.

Regards, Ken
Olema, CA

From: Matt Adams

Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2018 3:41 PM

To: Dianne Steinhauer <DSteinhauer@tam.ca.gov>; smoultonpeters@comcast.net

Cc: Denise Merleno <DMerleno@tam.ca.gov>

Subject: Possible changes to Richmond Bridge Multi-use path

Hello all,

I've recently been made aware that the planned multi-use path pilot program on the Richmond could be under threat. I think it would be a terrible mistake if the path project did not go forward. We operate 2 stores in Marin and our admin offices and distribution center are in Novato. With the challenging housing costs in Marin, many of our employees commute in from the East Bay and Sonoma County and often our recruiting efforts are directed in those areas. Traffic and commuting pose barriers for us to hire the right people for us to operate our business and serve our customers effectively. I was thrilled when the SMART Train began operating because it now gives our employees from up north a good alternative to driving. And I'm equally excited at the prospect of our EB employees and future employees being able to ride a bike to San Rafael from Richmond and beyond. With the growing popularity in electric bikes, riding across the Richmond Bridge is even more of a viable alternative to driving. Just look at the number of riders that cross the GGB each day.

Also, it would seem the main cause of westbound traffic is the toll plaza so a third lane would not be of much benefit. So please don't go backwards and not allow this important connector to be built. Please let the pilot program move forward so we can see the positive benefits. My 75-ish employees in Marin need alternative transportation options and my business needs good employees to continue to serve Marin. Thank you.

Matt Adams

President

Mike's Bikes

Twitter: [@mmadams](https://twitter.com/mmadams)

www.MikesBikes.com

www.MikesBikesAfrica.com

www.TeamMikesBikes.com

Roll with us on [Facebook](#) and [Twitter!](#)



Sears, Kathrin

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 22, 2018 7:50 AM
To: Sears, Kathrin
Subject: Bicycle path to Nowhere. San Rafael/Richmond bridge

Nick Javaras would like information about:

Supervisor Sears, Spotswood is right in his Sunday column in the IJ. It is time for our supervisors to recognize the needs of the Marin silent majority and back Damon Connolly up on this Richmond/San Rafael bike lane fiasco. We need political leaders who lead and not remain unresponsive to the will of their constituents. To do this you actually have to make a public statement supporting this position. It is a win/win politically as it is just common sense. The majority of people in this county support the elimination of this wasteful spending.

We will be waiting to see if you are the person we thought you were. You had no problem taking a firm and public position on San Geronimo. That one will remain contentious but this has much wider public support. We are all affected by the horrid traffic on this bridge. This is a no brainer move but you actually need to VOICE your opinion

Thanks for listening.

Sears, Kathrin

From: DanielMeltzer <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 22, 2018 1:32 PM
To: Sears, Kathrin
Subject: New submission from Contact Kathrin Sears

Name

Daniel Meltzer

Email

[REDACTED]

Question or Comment

PLEASE RESIST ANY AND ALL ATTEMPTS TO SCRAP OR DELAY THE BICYCLE-PEDESTRIAN PATH ON THE RICHMOND-SAN RAFAEL BRIDGE.

I am a Mill Valley resident and property owner. I personally know numerous people who live in the Richmond/El Cerrito area and work in Southern Marin County including Mill Valley and currently commute into the area by car. I know a number of people who are just waiting for the bicycle lane to open so they can stop driving and commute over by bicycle. Contrary to the opinions you will hear from the opponents of the project, it is neither that far nor that difficult to bicycle over the bridge, if the infrastructure is there. The bridge should have never been build without it. Of course correcting this mistake costs money, but we will all benefit from the project for the rest of the life of the bridge. Please fight for an alternative to the car culture which is destroying our quality of life. With modern electric bicycles it will be downright simple to commute over to Southern Marin. Don't we want to do something about climate change? And about getting people out of cars? You are the Supervisor for my district, I am counting on you to resist the forces of evil who are attacking this very necessary project at the eleventh hour.

Sears, Kathrin

From: BrettThurber <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, January 22, 2018 3:48 PM
To: Sears, Kathrin
Subject: New submission from Contact Kathrin Sears

Name

Brett Thurber

Email

[REDACTED]

Question or Comment

Hello Supervisor Sears,
I know you have heard from me already once this week, but I must email again in the name of long term thinking:

I am emailing to voice my support for the Richmond-San Rafael bridge bicycle path. It is short sighted to curtail this project now before it has even begun. As is the case with so many projects - from BART, to SMART - it is consistently underestimated how many people will use new public infrastructure. What you may not be able to appreciate at this moment is that this new bicycle corridor combined with the growing movement towards electric bicycles not only makes trips from the East Bay to Marin or visa-versa by bicycle possible, but also infitely practical. On an electric bicycle one can travel from downtown San Rafael to downtown Berkeley in under an hour, easily and sweat free.

I would love the opportunity to run a workshop for you and your colleagues on electric bicycles. I think you will have a much more optimistic view of the Richmond Bridge bike lane pilot program once you experience this revolutionary bit of technology that is already dramatically changing the way people are commuting - and staying fit and healthy - around the world.

Best,
Brett Thurber

Sears, Kathrin

From: JamesThomas <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, January 22, 2018 4:10 PM
To: Sears, Kathrin
Subject: New submission from Contact Kathrin Sears

Name

James Thomas

Email

[REDACTED]

Question or Comment

The long planned bike Lane over the Richmond San Rafael Bridge should not be scrapped. We have waited so long for this to come to fruition and to eliminate this vital route is a great disservice to cyclists in both the east bay and Marin County. Having grown up in El Cerrito while my elderly Uncle was living in Mill Valley, I know how truly close we are. More and more people both commute by e-bikes to work and also ride our Marin county roads recreationally. This long planned path will help reduce car commuting and provide a direct route for the recreational riders without having to drive here first, then ride. Many, many people in San Francisco do that already. To be able to connect the east bay with a direct bike route is a win/win for both of our counties. Please support the retention of this long promised bike route!

Sincerely,
James Thomas
Mill Valley, Ca.
94941

Sears, Kathrin

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 22, 2018 3:40 PM
To: Sears, Kathrin
Subject: Upcoming TAM meeting Richmond bridge

Matthew Weeder would like information about:

PLEASE RESIST ANY AND ALL ATTEMPTS TO SCRAP OR DELAY THE BICYCLE-PEDESTRIAN PATH ON THE RICHMOND-SAN RAFAEL BRIDGE.

This critical link of car free infrastructure in the Bay Area needs to become a reality.
Thanks for your time

Matthew Weeder
Mill Malley

Sears, Kathrin

From: DanJeffris <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, January 22, 2018 5:38 PM
To: Sears, Kathrin
Subject: New submission from Contact Kathrin Sears

Name
Dan Jeffris
Email
[REDACTED]
Question or Comment
Ms, Sears, I live in Mill Valley and I urge you to approve the San Rafael-Richmond Bridge bicycle path pilot program. It is an important addition to the Bay Area's evolving transportation needs and offers an opportunity to study the positive impact bicycles can have on our roadways and environment. Thank you.