



73 Belvedere Avenue  
Richmond, CA 94801  
Phone/Fax 510-235-2835  
[tracbaytrail@earthlink.net](mailto: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](mailto:dave.cortese@bos.sccgov.org) and incoming Chairman Jake McKenzie at [blumacjazz@aol.com](mailto:blumacjazz@aol.com). Also contact Cal-Trans Regional Director Bijan Sartipi at [bijan.sartipi@dot.ca.gov](mailto: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 cyclist's 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](http://www.MikesBikes.com)

[www.MikesBikesAfrica.com](http://www.MikesBikesAfrica.com)

[www.TeamMikesBikes.com](http://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 infinitely 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

<b>Name</b>
Dan Jeffris
<b>Email</b>
[REDACTED]
<b>Question or Comment</b>
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.

**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](mailto:damon@damonconnolly.com)" <[damon@damonconnolly.com](mailto: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 Gaspares. You got my vote, keep up the great work.

Best Regards,

Tom Royall

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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](http://www.facebook.com/SupConnolly)  
Supervisor Connolly's twitter account: [https://twitter.com/damon\\_connolly?lang=en](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](mailto: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](mailto:afremier@mtc.ca.gov)>  
Cc: "Amy Worth" <[atworth@comcast.net](mailto:atworth@comcast.net)>, "Randy Rentschler" <[rrentschler@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:rrentschler@mtc.ca.gov)>, "Randy Iwasaki" <[riwasaki@ccta.net](mailto:riwasaki@ccta.net)>, "Bjorn Gripenburg" <[bjorn@marinbike.org](mailto:bjorn@marinbike.org)>, "John Nemeth" <[jnemeth@wcctac.org](mailto:jnemeth@wcctac.org)>, <[lhuo@bayareametro.gov](mailto:lhuo@bayareametro.gov)>, "Bruce Beyaert" <[tracbaytrail@earthlink.net](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:bbreithaupt@marinij.com); [opinion@marinij.com](mailto:opinion@marinij.com); [jreed@tam.ca.gov](mailto:jreed@tam.ca.gov); Dianne Steinhauser  
<[DSteinhauser@tam.ca.gov](mailto: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](mailto: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.