

From: Sandy Barron
To: [TAM Info](#)
Subject: Richmond Bridge-Upper Deck 3rd Lane
Date: Friday, February 09, 2018 9:03:34 PM

I am writing as a private citizen and as a San Rafael employer to express my support for a full-time third vehicle lane on the top deck of the Richmond Bridge.

It is very difficult to recruit and retain entry-level employees willing to commute into Marin. I manage a staff of 15 employees and several of my team commute over the Richmond Bridge. The morning commute is becoming increasingly problematic causing them to consider looking for employment elsewhere. The almost-completed third lane on the lower deck will improve the evening commute but the morning commute is almost as bad.

Converting the upper deck lane into a dedicated bike lane, while well-intentioned, is not going to do anything to ease the commute for working people. I have heard some say that it will encourage people to bike to work. Very few of us have the luxury of having a shower in the office. Nor will many be able to afford \$5-10,000 for an electric bicycle with the range and power to make the long and hilly round-trip over the bridge.

Admittedly, the lane would be a great recreational addition to the community but we have a greater need to provide needed relief to the tens of thousands who commute over the bridge daily .

Thank you,
Sandy Barron
San Anselmo, CA

Sent from my iPad

Sackett, Mary

From: Damon Connolly <damon@damonconnollylaw.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 10, 2018 9:24 PM
To: Connolly, Damon
Subject: Fwd: Richmond Bridge

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Thomas Royall [REDACTED]
Date: Sat, Feb 10, 2018 at 8:24 PM
Subject: Richmond Bridge
To: "damon@damonconnolly.com" <damon@damonconnolly.com>

Hello Damon,

I am a neighbor of yours down the street and worked with Just Kai on several issues and attended Gasperes on your election night years ago.

I want to say first off you have lived up to your promises and more, I have been very impressed. You walk the walk and really listen to your constituents. I haven't noticed any type of selfish political personal gain type of behavior, I am unable to say that of others who seem to have an agenda, stubborn, big ego, or wrapped up in local special interests.

I would like to address the bridge and the top deck bike path. I think it's great you are taking pause and thinking things through, instead of quickly red stamping the bike lane.

I would implore you to really evaluate the practicality of a bike lane that ends up in an industrial area and the weather conditions on the bridge. I just don't see how this bike lane will pay for itself in abating traffic or just recreation. I know the bike coalition has a lot of sway, so it makes things tough for you with a strong lobby group and other interested parties.

The IJ said 27 million one time now it is reported at 13 million with a 1 million dollar contingency. I could be a pessimist on all fronts, but the way government projects go is that the contracted company to do the work or Caltrans almost always comes in way over budget and misses it's deadline, you read about it all the time. Doing a movable barrier will make things very expensive with special concrete forms, special zipper truck, payroll for the operator etc. The money could be better spent on putting that towards the pension woes that are looming or our local streets or even towards completing the bike lane on the bay bridge that one DOES make sense since a lot of younger folks live in Emeryville and work in downtown SF, but I digress.

I just think the cost to benefit isn't and will not be there. There will be a very very small amount cyclists, mainly the real enthusiasts riding it, not families or commuters(there may be some that work a Chevron), but if you really think about it, with the spans length, almost consistent poor weather, (high winds during summer or winter from the exposed San Pablo bay and the deafening noise of cars, how many people are seriously going to utilize that 27 million dollar bike lane?

Anyhow, that is my .02 I will see if I am able to make it to your reelection party at Gaspare's. You got my vote, keep up the great work.

Best Regards,

Tom Royall

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Sackett, Mary

From: John Palmer [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, February 11, 2018 11:35 PM
To: Sears, Kathrin; Rodoni, Dennis; Rice, Katie; Arnold, Judy; Connolly, Damon
Cc: Stephanie Moulton-Peters; Dick Spotswood; Brad Breithaupt
Subject: Richmond Bridge 3rd westbound lane

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Moulton-Peters

I am writing in support of Supervisor Connolly's plan to use the 3rd westbound lane for automobiles, not bicycles, at least during peak morning and afternoon commute hours.

Honestly, I'm puzzled that anyone living here for the past few years, particularly those charged with promoting the public welfare, would choose to condemn those who commute to and from Marin to continue to remain stuck in endless traffic jams, away from family, and polluting the air with stop and start traffic, so that a few bicyclists could use a multi-million third lane. It is important that you consider the practical reality of our current commute patterns and use the resources we have to alleviate the most pressing transportation issues we face, rather than be mesmerized by the demands of the few at the expense of the many.

And I am particularly concerned that you as a board continue to fund major bicycle projects with no real cost/benefit analysis, before or after construction. Have you ever demanded or received bicycle use counts for the Cal Park Tunnel? Does anyone have any idea how many cyclists would actually use a westbound 3rd lane on the Richmond/San Rafael Bridge, versus the automobile counts, which are easy to ascertain?

I find Supervisor Connolly's plan to be eminently reasonable, and hope that you join those other TAM members who believe that the best solution is one which promotes the general welfare in supporting his proposal. Thank you.

--
John Palmer
Montgomery Partners
100 Shoreline Highway Suite 160B
Mill Valley, CA 94941
[REDACTED]

Sackett, Mary

From: Robin Stelling [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 06, 2018 5:14 PM
To: Connolly, Damon
Subject: My 2 cents re Richmond Bridge, Marijuana etc

Hi Damon

Seems like you are doing a great job as President of the Board of Supervisors. Congratulations!

Regarding the Richmond Bridge—I totally agree that the first priority is for improving car traffic! I am always surprised by the amount of influence the bike coalitions have in Marin. Their bike path on the bridge is too expensive at this time and will be underutilized

Marijuana—it seems like we are missing out on lots of tax revenue by not allowing the opening of retail locations in Marin —there must be some places people would not object to —maybe on the east side of 101 in the business park area of Paul Drive, Redwood etc

How do we battle the top-down housing legislation coming out of Sacramento? I AM in favor of some more housing but not without taking many things into consideration—traffic, water, schools, etc I don't want to see stack and pack but would like to see new ideas

Emergency preparedness in case of earthquake or fire seems like it should be a high priority

The ferry—there was a proposal a few years ago for a multi story parking garage that I believe was defeated by the bike coalition—seems like something to reconsider again with SMART taking away parking spaces

Thanks for listening!

Robin Stelling
[REDACTED]

Sackett, Mary

From: Damon Connolly <damon@damonconnollylaw.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 06, 2018 3:24 PM
To: Connolly, Damon
Subject: RSR Lane Feedback

Jennifer Leathers left feedback on Contact about 4 hours ago

I think the idea of a bike lane on the Richmond Bridge is absolutely ridiculous. And I am a bike rider. I am one of the few people who has been on the bike path from San Rafael to Terra Linda (always empty!). No one will commute on a bike path across the bridge. Please alleviate traffic problems first.

[REDACTED]

Sackett, Mary

From: Kathleen Gaines [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 06, 2018 9:09 AM
To: Connolly, Damon
Cc: Clark, Susannah
Subject: Richmond bridge bike lane: NOT!

Hi Damon:

This is just to chime in on the proposed bike line on the Richmond San Rafael Bridge. Ray and I think that it's a bad idea in this limited resources world. The bridge needs a third lane for traffic to alleviate the constant back-ups. And not only at standard commute hours; we've run into significant back-ups even on Saturday afternoons and evenings.

The possible few dozen daily bikers across the bridge do not warrant the expense, especially since they would mostly be crossing for recreation when people need to get back and forth for work.

Thanks for continuing to advocate on this issue.

Kathie

Kathleen Gaines
San Rafael, CA
[REDACTED]

Sackett, Mary

From: BrianCoyne [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 3:27 PM
To: Connolly, Damon
Subject: New submission from Contact Damon Connolly

Name

Brian Coyne

Email

[REDACTED]

Question or Comment

Dear Supervisor Connolly,

I'm writing about the planned biking and walking path on the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge. I'm deeply disappointed to learn that TAM is drafting a letter asking BATA to consider curtailing the planned bike and pedestrian access to the bridge in favor of an additional part- or full-time car lane. Such a move would violate TAM's mission and vision statements, would treat people biking and walking as second-class road users, and would be a waste of scarce publicly resources. More specifically:

From TAM's Draft Strategic Vision Statement: "Promote equity by providing transportation that is accessible, affordable, and convenient for all residents and workers in Marin County." From TAM's mission statement, "creating an efficient and effective system that promotes mobility and accessibility by providing a variety of high quality transportation options to all users."

These statements are entirely incompatible with the position that people biking and walking should be denied access to the bridge merely to save a few seconds of possible delay for drivers. As you're no doubt aware, low-income people and people of color are statistically less likely to own cars, both in Marin and throughout the Bay Area, and this makes even worse any effort on your part to obstruct access for people who don't drive.

Any change to the studied, approved, and funded 4-year pathway pilot would require an entirely new and costly environmental clearance process. Moreover, a large share of the expense of the third eastbound car lane currently under construction is from the widening of the highway in Richmond, east of the bridge. A third westbound car lane would require similar construction on the Marin side in order to do anything besides move traffic congestion by a few miles.

Lastly, the access improvements to the RSR Bridge have been framed from the start as a balanced grand bargain, one additional lane for drivers and one for people walking and biking. The Bay Area's biking and walking communities supported the plan on this understanding. For TAM to attempt to undercut this bargain now would be a bait-and-switch and, quite frankly, a slap in the face to the San Francisco Bay Trail project, Bike East Bay, and the Bay Area's bicyclists. If you're willing, I'd be very happy to discuss the issue further by email, phone, or in person.

Sincerely,

Brian Coyne
[REDACTED]

Sackett, Mary

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 9:33 AM
To: Connolly, Damon
Subject: Richmond - San Rafael Bridge traffic solution

Jeff Schriebman would like information about:

Hi Damon,

The issue with a lack of lanes on the Richmond Bridge isn't a lane problem it is a lane allocation problem. There is enough capacity during off hours, which is East bound in the morning and West bound in the evening, to accommodate traffic flow. The solution for the other times is to make one lane switchable to be East bound or West bound in the AM and PM. One lane of the lower deck of the bridge should be reserved for bikes. The lower deck makes sense because there is less vertical change and it is less windy. One lane of the upper deck should be made switchable. It would be made East bound in the PM and West bound in the AM. With this change we would have 3 lanes in each direction when it is required. A fixed barrier would need to be put on both the upper and lower decks to isolate the bike lane as well as the switchable car lane. I'm sure CALTRANS can work out the details. I hope this helps.

Sincerely,

Jeff Schriebman

Sackett, Mary

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2018 7:47 PM
To: Connolly, Damon
Subject: Richmond/San Rafael Bridge

Clazina (Chris) Jennings would like information about:

Supervisor Connolly, Thank you for your strong stand regarding the Richmond/San Rafael Bridge use. Anyone outside of the Bay Area would quickly assess the situation and make a distinction between a need and a wish - the need for traffic relief and the wish for a continuous Bike Trail in the Bay Area. The Bicycle Coalition is a very strong, vocal group constantly putting on pressure for their cause. They have not, nor has anyone else put forward a guess how many cyclists would traverse this windy bridge. Even the idea of a movable barrier seems extravagant at this time since the need for traffic relief is so pre-eminent. Have bicycle groups ever offered a plan for their paying a toll or a fee to go along with their demands? Again, my thanks for your strong voice.

Sackett, Mary

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2018 12:21 PM
To: Connolly, Damon
Subject: 3rd lane for for cars on upper deck of San Rafael Bridge

Michael Yu would like information about:

I Support your push for bringing back the third lane for cars on the upper deck of the SR Bridge. Thousands of commuters would benefit from this. How many bicyclist will ride across that bridge a day? 100?

Set up a van shuttle service for bicyclists. I use to use the bicycle van shuttle to get across the bridge back in the 1970s. It worked just fine.

It was built for 3 lanes of car traffic, we should keep it at that.

Thank you for your efforts.

Michael

Sackett, Mary

From: Randy Georgi [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, January 28, 2018 10:15 AM
To: info@bayareametro.gov
Cc: Mark Prado; Connolly, Damon; Stephanie Moulton-Peters; Steinhauser, Dianne; Molly Graham; Sears, Kathrin
Subject: Proposal re; Third Lane, Richmond-San Rafael Bridge

Re: *Richmond-San Rafael Bridge westbound third lane gets support*
<https://www.eastbaytimes.com/2018/01/27/richmond-san-rafael-bridge-westbound-third-lane-gets-support/>

After reviewing several articles on this topic, none cites a statistic of how many bicycles use the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge, as compared to cars and trucks. This usage number should be made public.

PROPOSAL

To enable bicycles to traverse the bridge while providing a 24/7/365 third lane for motor vehicles, it seems both economical and common sense to simply **provide a shuttle vehicle for bicycles**, perhaps limited to specific hours and for a toll charge (to cover the operating cost). A shuttle can go back and forth for 6, 8, 10 hours a day on a scheduled basis, transport bicycles and cyclists, while freeing up the bridge for full capacity vehicle traffic, benefiting thousands of drivers, workers, etc. and greatly reducing travel time, pollution, etc.

If demand warrants, several shuttles could be operated. A shuttle could be a publicly or a privately operated service (contract it out?). An app could be devised to reserve shuttle space, matching supply and demand. The wait for a shuttle to arrive (in its round-trip) would be several minutes, comparable to or less than the crossing time for riding a bike, at much less effort. A bicycle shuttle is equivalent to the ferry boat system prior to the Bay Bridge.

This solution solves the third lane problem while serving bicyclists needs of crossing the bridge.

R. Georgi
Mill Valley

Sackett, Mary

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, January 27, 2018 4:25 PM
To: Connolly, Damon
Subject: Richmond/SR bridge

Nick Clark would like information about:

You are on the right track in supporting auto traffic on the bridge. Bicycles are great recreation but contribute essentially nothing to economic activity. Auto and truck traffic are the major contributors to working and economic benefits. Large amounts of money should not be spent to allow a very few bicycles displace many cars and trucks; the economy will suffer.

Sackett, Mary

From: Sackett, Mary
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2018 2:39 PM
To: Connolly, Damon
Subject: Phone call in support of shared use on 3rd lane

Christian Thompson... Mill Valley. Support shared use, especially on weekends. He wants to be able to ride his bike to Mt Tam and Mt Diablo, without driving and parking.



Mary M. Sackett
Aide to Supervisor Damon Connolly
District 1, Marin County Board of Supervisors
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite 329, San Rafael, CA 94903
Direct Tel: (415) 473-7354

Supervisor Connolly's newsletter: <https://www.marincounty.org/depts/bs/district-1/newsletters>
Supervisor Connolly's facebook updates: www.facebook.com/SupConnolly
Supervisor Connolly's twitter account: https://twitter.com/damon_connolly?lang=en

Sackett, Mary

From: Bjorn Gripenburg <bjorn@marinbike.org>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2018 6:37 PM
To: Steinhauer, Dianne; Connolly, Damon
Cc: Dave Campbell; Jim Elias
Subject: Fwd: Bike East Bay Letter to BATA on RSR Bridge Pilot.pdf
Attachments: Bike East Bay Letter to BATA on RSR Bridge Pilot.pdf

Hi Dianne & Damon,

Dave Campbell, Bike East Bay's Advocacy Director, asked me to forward the attached letter on his behalf. My understanding is that this does not need to go to the Board in advance of tonight's meeting.

We (MCBC) would happily participate in any forthcoming discussions between the relevant agencies, stakeholders, and advocacy organizations.

Best,
Bjorn

----- Forwarded message -----

From: "Dave Campbell" <dave.campbell62@gmail.com>
Date: Jan 25, 2018 18:20
Subject: Bike East Bay Letter to BATA on RSR Bridge Pilot.pdf
To: "Andy Fremier" <afremier@mtc.ca.gov>
Cc: "Amy Worth" <atworth@comcast.net>, "Randy Rentschler" <rrentschler@mtc.ca.gov>, "Randy Iwasaki" <riwasaki@ccta.net>, "Bjorn Gripenburg" <bjorn@marinbike.org>, "John Nemeth" <jnemeth@wcctac.org>, <lhuo@bayareametro.gov>, "Bruce Beyaert" <tracbaytrail@earthlink.net>

Andy

Please find attached as a pdf a letter from Bike East Bay regarding the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge Pilot Project. We have discussed with Commissioner Amy Worth our request in the attached letter for a meeting and she has agreed to facilitate setting up a meeting to discuss TAM's concerns and their proposal to alter the pilot for bike access in the RSR Bridge. We are happy to work with Commissioner Worth moving forward on this, but please consider this letter our due diligence with BATA in opposing TAM's request.

Please let me know if you have any questions and we look forward to moving forward on the pilot while considering any reasonable concerns TAM may have.

Dave Campbell
Advocacy Director
Bike East Bay


sent from my iPhone



January 26, 2018

Bay Area Toll Authority
Bay Area Metro Center
375 Beale Street
San Francisco CA 94105

Re: RSR Bridge Access Project and Regional Measure 3

Dear BATA Commissioners:

In response to pressure from the Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM) to limit bicycle and pedestrian access along the Bay Trail segment of the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge, we hereby request a meeting to discuss this issue. Our organization is working in partnership with MTC/BATA and other stakeholders to fulfill a pledge to the public to complete the Bay Trail on the RSR bridge and make the Bay Area an enjoyable community for walking and bicycling for all types of trips. The four-year pilot for bike-ped access on the RSR Bridge designed to meet these goals and has to be given a full opportunity to succeed in order to give commuters options in these congested times and fulfill long-standing public policies in support of walking and bicycling.

We understand drivers' frustrations being stuck in traffic. Our members are equally frustrated when BART cars are crowded and bike racks on buses are full at commute hours and bikes cannot be accommodated, requiring commuters to wait for the next BART train or bus—the equivalent of being 'stuck in traffic.' For these reasons, we advocate for multimodal solutions on congestion corridors, discussed as part of an open and inclusive process, as is happening with the RSR Bridge Project and the agreed upon four-year pilot.

TAM has requested that bike-ped access on the RSR Bridge be eliminated during rush hour, when it is most needed during the week. We were surprised to see Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) mentioned in TAM's letter of January 25 in support of the request. It is our understanding that this reference to CCTA is in error. Regardless, our organization opposes TAM's request for many reasons. Still, we are always willing to sit down with key stakeholders such as TAM to discuss their concerns.

In advance of such a meeting, we reiterate:

1. The four-year pilot needs to be given a full opportunity to succeed, as agreed to previously, and thereby provide commuters options and in turn reduce the number of cars on the road. Going forward, major commute corridors need to be multimodal, with good options for transit, carpooling and bicycling. Such an approach addresses Bay Area goals to reduce air pollution, while also addressing congestion concerns. The four-year pilot will provide much needed information for achieving these goals on the Richmond-San Rafael corridor;
2. TAM's request reopens the environmental document and BCDC permit for the RSR Project, which will introduce the overlooked issue of needed transit options, and further delay the entire project, both for cars and bikes;
3. While the RSR Project improves bike-ped access on Francisco Blvd in Marin and connects to Castro Street in Richmond, the project does not complete needed bikeway connections to the cities of San Rafael and Richmond, population centers where bike-ped trips on the bridge originate and end. In Marin, a path extension is needed northwest into downtown San Rafael. In Contra Costa, a pathway extension is needed from Castro Street to the Richmond Greenway terminus at 2nd Street. No evaluation of the RSR Bridge pilot project is useful or fair until these connections are complete. We are asking that the first monies from the Regional Measure 3 project for access improvements to and from the RSR Bridge be directed at completing these pathway gaps. Then the four-year evaluation can start;
4. TAM's proposal includes no consideration of bike accommodation at rush hour, which would require increase bus services and shuttles, the very issue overlooked in the EIR;
5. Performance measures for the bike-ped pilot on the RSR Bridge are still being worked out and should be part of all discussions and agreements going forward. As a preview, we ask that performance measure discussions include the following impacts:
 - a. Traffic safety on local streets and at freeway overcrossings
 - b. Air pollution in nearby neighborhoods
 - c. Noise level changes due to increased traffic
 - d. VMT reduction as required by Plan Bay Area.

We are formally asking you to facilitate a meeting to discuss the issues we raise in this letter, to include representatives of TAM and the CCTA, and do so before any consideration is given to TAM's letter. We look forward to working with you, TAM, CCTA and local stakeholder groups to improve the RSR Bridge Projects, both the current project and the related RM3 projects.

Sincerely,



Dave Campbell
Advocacy Director
Bike East Bay

cc: Randy Iwasaki, Contra Costa Transportation Authority
Dianne Steinhauser, Transportation Authority of Marin
Amy Worth, BATA Commissioner

John Nemeth, West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee
Bjorn Gripenburg, Marin County Bicycle Coalition
Bruce Beyaert, Trails for Richmond Action Coalition Chair

Sackett, Mary

From: Gary Marsh [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2018 11:52 AM
To: Connolly, Damon
Subject: bikes on weekends only

Hey Damon. Keep fighting the good fight. I've been following the Richmond Bridge news. It make an abundance of Common Sense to have the added expanse accommodate cars during the week – much need! And make that added portion of the span a great recreational amenity for Bay Area residents and visitors on weekends. I'm visiting with Robin at MEF the first full week of February and I will bring it up to her as something to consider in her community communications. Have a great weekend! Gary

Gary Marsh

Principal of Marsh Marketing & Pipkin Marsh Advisors
SIOR Foundation Trustee & SIOR Associate Member

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
<http://www.marshmarketing.com/>

<http://www.pipkinmarsh.com/>

<http://www.sior.com/>

Sackett, Mary

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2018 10:24 AM
To: Connolly, Damon
Subject: Third westbound lane on rsr bridge

David Dolberg would like information about:

While I appreciate your concern and do recognize that problem with the morning commute, the fact of the matter is that, barring accidents, the traffic on the bridge during the morning commute generally move along at the limit. The problem is getting ONTO the bridge as the toll booth is a bottleneck. The problem could be mitigate somewhat if the tolls were totally automated as on the GG bridge

Sackett, Mary

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2018 3:04 PM
To: Connolly, Damon
Subject: 3rd lane on Richmnd Brdg

Deb Rice would like information about:

wow! finally a supervisor that's showing some spine when it comes to the bikes v. vehicles on the Richm Bridge! Thank you Supv Connolly! And you're even on the MTC which I pretty much despise overall. Thank you for listening to the COMMUTERS of Marin. The bike coalitions cozy relationship w/MTC et al is sickening. I'm in Supv Arnold's district & altho she's come thru on other issues, I wish I'd heard the same from her on this one & much more quickly. .

Sackett, Mary

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2018 9:58 AM
To: Connolly, Damon
Subject: san rafael bridge third lane

brendan burke would like information about:

I was glad someone noticed how preposterous using the third lane for bikers would be. Even more absurd is the estimated cost of a barrier to protect the bikers. I remember something like 46 million to protect the bikers with a barrier!!!. One solution might be to build pre-made sections of bike path and bolt these on the outside of the bridge. The other answer is to hire a truck and driver to ferry riders on request. Nice public relations move on unwanted affordable housing law. Agendize is a joke, real action is a county lawsuit over jurisdiction or just say it won't be implemented. Affordable housing is not affordable for tax payers. Taxpayers pay to build it at market rate, then no infrastructure money paid moving forward. Lastly the quality of life for current residents is reduced pollution, traffic and density of people, school access constrained. It's a lose lose for taxpayers. I am opposed to most of the budget Marin County puts way too much into health and human services. Cut those drastically and reduce our taxes. Taxes in this state are way too high, so illegals and deadbeats can play the system. Finally MTC the cornfed incompetents who can't open a third lane even for a few critical hours a day. In 1989 a third lane opened one week after the earthquake!!!!?. MTC wants all this affordable housing hypothetically to reduce greenhouse gases but thousands of cars sit trying to cross the SR bridge daily?. Also 2 lanes are essential from Larkspur landing to bridge in both directions. Many out of county residents commute through Marin to not pay the toll. Tolls should be collected going each way at half the current rate.

From: Frank Smart
To: [TAM Info](#)
Cc: dconnolly@marincounty.org
Subject: FW: 580 Bridge Issues for our meeting at 3 PM 2/16/18
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2018 11:34:17 AM
Importance: High

Hi Molly,

Below are the issues reviewed with Damon on 2/16/18.

Please add to your list of reasons not to support this program; however, since it is going forward anyway where are the controls for justifying and evaluating a four year pilot program plus there needs to be a usage counter installed to verify the number, date and time folks cross over the bridge. The results are going to be rather embarrassing for anyone who supported this recreational program at the expense of thousands of toll paying tax payers in endless daily commute grid lock polluting the our air while idling for extended periods of time.

Cheers,

Frank

From: Frank Smart
Sent: Friday, February 16, 2018 2:14 PM
To: 'dconnolly@marincounty.org'
Subject: 580 Bridge Issues for our meeting at 3 PM 2/16/18
Importance: High

Dear Damon,

The following are the key points I would like to review with you concerning the feasibility of opening the third lane to bicycles.

1. Why a four year probation period, seems extremely long plus there should be a way to shorten it if there is minimal usage and or increased vehicle traffic warrants it?
2. Should use Fast Track data for determining vehicle demographics and other toll gate issues.
3. Usage for commuting will be greatly affected by the calendar months

due to rain, wind, temperature and sunrise; making usage seasonal at best.

4. Should conduct a practical two week pilot program prior to the start of the bicycle lane construction by opening the third lane to see what affect it has on the toll gate congestion.
5. The amount of polluting emissions by the thousands of cars in grid-lock on the East side of the toll gate, during the daily morning commute can only be offset by an equal number of commuting bicyclist, which isn't going to happen.
6. A usage counter should be installed on this new system to collect data, since the MTC will not provide any usage estimates to justify this project in the first place.
7. The Cal Park tunnel cost \$28 million and they estimated it's usage at 2,150 trips per day. I don't believe there are 200 per day.
8. How much money will be spent by increasing the cost to do maintenance on the bridge when this lane is lost.
9. Break downs on the bridge are going to create terrible traffic jams.

Let's face it, this is only another link in the Bay Trail program being promoted by a small minority who have links with folks in the right places of the MTC and BATA. It has nothing what so ever to do with folks traveling between Marin and Contra Costa counties for work and never will. It is purely for leisure time and recreation at the tax payer's expense and the continued inconvenience for the toll paying folks who need to seriously cross the bridge for work and other related purposes. The sad thing is when the novelty wears off, which will not take long, it will be vacant most of the time! I guarantee you there will be considerable attention brought to bear by the folks who have been waiting on the east side of the toll gate to find that there are no cyclist on the span with them.

There are probably many more comments; however, these are ones that I haven't read much about.

Cheers,

Frank

From: [TAM Info](#)
To: [TAM Info](#)
Subject: FW: E-bikes
Date: Thursday, February 15, 2018 8:56:03 AM

From: [robtcasper](#)
Sent: Saturday, February 10, 2018 2:59 PM
To: bbreithaupt@marinij.com; opinion@marinij.com; jreed@tam.ca.gov; Dianne Steinhauser
<DSteinhauser@tam.ca.gov>
Subject: E-bikes

John Reed of Fairfax is why us car commuters sit in traffic. He's the problem. He is the Fairfax representative on the Transportation Authority of Marin board. His idea to solve the traffic problem is not to widen the roads. not to add lanes on 101 or the Richmond bridge, his solution is for us 146,000 car commuters should buy an E-Bike. Imagine that. But his letter is filled with false facts.

His first misrepresentation is that TAM has been "focused" on helping the traffic on the San Rafael side of the Richmond Bridge. Nothing is being done but building another bike lane. Then he falsely said E-Bike will help relief the car traffic. But this isn't funny.

Guys like Mr. Reed promised us that if we spend \$800 million on Smart train, traffic would be lessened. That was a lie. Then he said if we constructed bike paths, bridges, tunnels, bikers would use them and relieving traffic on 101. Well, Mr. Reed, thanks to you, TAM and the supervisors, we wasted \$79 million on these bike projects and only a handful use them. It has made not even a dent in the traffic on 101. Now Mr. Reed said the E-Bike will do that.

I see no E-Bikes on the street and I see few electric cars. I do see 146,000 cars on 101 each day. I see no help from TAM. But Mr. Reed I am sure isn't one of us 146,000 who sit in traffic each day. But Mr. Reed needs to get out of Fairfax drive to Petaluma, CA at about 7 AM. Then turn around and drive to Fairfax. You will see no bikes on the bike path from San Antonio Rd to Novato. You will see no bikes using the Puerto Suello Bike Path and no bikes using the bike bridge over Drake Blvd.

Then after resting, get into your car at 4:30 PM and drive from Fairfax to Petaluma. Tell me how that will take. Then do it every day. Mr. Reed is the problem and no bike will fix that problem. We need to rid TAM of Reed and all the rest of the environmentalists and get people who serve us and not a handful of bikers. Imagine telling us a E-Bike will help our traffic problem. Wow.

Robert A. Casper, SR
San Rafael, CA

From: [Molly Graham](#)
To: [TAM Info](#)
Subject: FW: New submission from Dianne Steinhauser
Date: Monday, February 12, 2018 10:34:51 AM

Begin forwarded message:

From: BrianCoyne <>
Date: February 1, 2018 at 3:24:00 PM PST
To: dsteinhauser@tam.ca.gov
Subject: New submission from Dianne Steinhauser
Reply-To:

Name

Brian Coyne

Email

Question or Comment

Dear Director Steinhauser,

I'm writing about the planned biking and walking path on the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge. I'm deeply disappointed to learn that TAM is drafting a letter asking BATA to consider curtailing the planned bike and pedestrian access to the bridge in favor of an additional part- or full-time car lane. Such a move would violate TAM's mission and vision statements, would treat people biking and walking as second-class road users, and would be a waste of scarce publicly resources. More specifically:

From TAM's Draft Strategic Vision Statement: "Promote equity by providing transportation that is accessible, affordable, and convenient for all residents and workers in Marin County." From TAM's mission statement, "creating an efficient and effective system that promotes mobility and accessibility by providing a variety of high quality transportation options to all users."

These statements are entirely incompatible with the position that people biking and walking should be denied access to the bridge merely to save a few seconds of possible delay for drivers. As you're no doubt aware, low-income people and people of color are statistically less likely to own cars, both in Marin and throughout the Bay Area, and this makes even worse any effort on your part to obstruct access for people who don't drive.

Any change to the studied, approved, and funded 4-year pathway pilot would require an entirely new and costly environmental clearance process. Moreover, a large share of the expense of the third eastbound car lane currently under construction is from the widening of the highway in Richmond, east of the bridge. A third westbound car lane would require similar construction on the Marin side in order to do anything besides move traffic congestion by a few miles.

Lastly, the access improvements to the RSR Bridge have been framed from the start as a balanced grand bargain, one additional lane for drivers and one for people walking and biking. The Bay Area's biking and walking communities supported the plan on this understanding. For TAM to attempt to undercut this bargain now would be a bait-and-switch and, quite frankly, a slap in the face to the San Francisco Bay Trail project, Bike East Bay,

and the Bay Area's bicyclists. If you're willing, I'd be very happy to discuss the issue further by email, phone, or in person.

Sincerely,

Brian Coyne

From: TAM Contact Form
To: [TAM Info](#)
Subject: New submission from TAM Contact Form
Date: Wednesday, February 07, 2018 4:41:08 PM

Name

Bob and Betty Cople

Email

Phone

leave a comment

We strongly support Damon Connolly's proposal to allow 3 lanes of car and truck traffic going west during the a.m. rush hour on the Richmond-San Rafael bridge ASAP! Please, let's not wait 4 years for this to happen.

From: TAM Contact Form
To: [TAM Info](#)
Subject: New submission from TAM Contact Form
Date: Wednesday, February 14, 2018 8:33:54 PM

Name

Kathy Flores

Email

leave a comment

12/10/18 IJ comment about the Richmond Bridge:

I find paying for and having a movable barrier on the Richmond Bridge in either direction to be a ridiculous suggestion. The idea of riding and commuting an E-Bike/manual bike and taking up a lane that cars could drive on (yes people still and will continue to drive cars) is ludicrous!.

I can not talk about traffic from the East Bay in the morning but let me ask these questions:

1. Can E-bikes/bicycles ride on freeways? How will they get from the East Bay to the Richmond Bridge or from Larkspur to SF?
2. Do you find yourself planning your day so that you are not on North 101 from Mill Valley or on SFD 2:00pm - 7pm?
3. Does Marin County really have that many jobs so that E- Bikes/bicycles from the East Bay can ride on the side streets once they cross the bridge?
4. What is the cost of this moveable barrier? Many, many millions of dollars?
5. Can you imagine 60-70yr old men & women riding their bikes across the Bridge to work in either direction?

Where will they go when they get to the other side?

I think we could find a better way to use our Tax Dollars.

From: TAM Contact Form
To: [TAM Info](#)
Subject: New submission from TAM Contact Form
Date: Tuesday, February 06, 2018 2:22:23 PM

Name

roger kirk

Email

Phone

leave a comment

As someone who drives over, has transited under the RSR bridge for 40 years on ships and also enjoy a bicycle for pleasure, I urge you to not waste resources on a bike lane. The winds alone are reason enough. Observe the Carquinez and Bay bridge use and You'll rarely see even a lycra clad diehard. If you need proof, hire a Lyft van to be on call between Chevron and San Quentin, they'll feel like the Maytag repairperson of Yore.
Captain Roger Kirk

From: TAM Contact Form
To: [TAM Info](#)
Subject: New submission from TAM Contact Form
Date: Saturday, February 17, 2018 12:36:30 PM

Name

roger kirk

Email

Phone

leave a comment

Thank you for the public comment time at Mondays meeting. As I stated then, a small Marin transit or Whistle Stop bus with bike racks could gauge usage on a trial basis at anytime. By adding a gps sending device that was smart phone accessible, with talk to text for the bus driver, bike riders could request a pick up in advance while enroute to Richmond parkway/hwy 580 underpass or at Marin rod and gun club on the west end. Also adding emergency type arrows on the busses grill alerting drivers in the right hand lane to make room, the trip could be expedited.
Bike, phone chargers and H2O on busses and at portals could sweeten the trip for a much lower financial and carbon cost.