

**Draft Iron Horse Corridor Active Transportation Study
Public Comments Summary (Round 2: February 13 to March 13, 2020)**

Commenter	Received	Comments	Response
Alamo Improvement Association ("AIA")	2/28/20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Voters and property owners were not notified; study should "start over" with active participation from voters and property owners. • The Study is not exempt from CEQA. • Street crossings make use of the Corridor impractical and dangerous as a commuter route. • Concerns future trail improvements will attract homeless and crime. • Improvements such as separating users by speed and grade separated crossings are ok. 	<p>Additional outreach will occur during future planning and design phases.</p> <p>Planning studies are statutorily exempt under CEQA section 15262.</p>
Luz Gómez, MPH, RD Building Healthy Communities Manager Contra Costa Health Services	3/4/20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg. 6 – (typo) last paragraph...“planning-level” • Pg. 7 – Wonderful that Equity is a consideration. I noticed there are few bike lanes or connectivity from the Monument Corridor area of Concord to the IH Trail. Here's a map of the area where we see more health and socio economic vulnerability: http://monumentimpact.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Monument-Map-.jpg. Can we plan to enhance this neighborhood's connectivity to the trail? Especially along Monument Blvd, Detroit Ave. • Pg. 10 – Was there outreach/engagement done in other languages? • Pg. 10 – (regarding in-person engagement events listed) How many people were reached during each of these events? • Pg. 20 – (regarding Table 2 trail convenience legend) My eye wants to make the empty green circle the "least convenient" and the filled green circle the "most convenient" 	<p>Fixed the typo on Pg. 6.</p> <p>Pg. 7 – we have also noted the connectivity challenges of this neighborhood with 242 and Walnut Creek being barriers to the existing trail. The study is proposing new bicycle/pedestrian bridges to connect the residential neighborhoods east of Walnut Creek to the trail.</p> <p>Pg. 10 - Outreach was done in both English and Spanish. Feedback from 260 people was captured during the three events (see page 10).</p> <p>Pg. 20 – Because the table on page 30 shows variables by highest need, the circle is filled in to indicate need.</p>
Jeffrey Peckham President Walden District Improvement Association	3/9/20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in analyzing causes of traffic-related accidents as trail users, it has been our observation that the vast majority of accidents are the direct result of trail users, particularly bicyclists, failing to observe posted stop signs at intersections. It is not clear to us how the engineering improvements suggested in the study will address unlawful behavior on the trails. Therefore, your proposal to give preference to bike traffic at intersections is encouraged by some, however others will question the advisability of legitimizing the current situation in which bicyclists already ignore traffic signals at interchanges. • Generally throughout the Segment proposals, the separation of pedestrians from bikes, etc. with a 'rolling path' is highly desirable, including for safety, especially in high traffic segments. One amendment to this idea would be to put some kind of low barrier between the paths to prevent juveniles from skipping from one path to the other inappropriately in high traffic segments. • Segment 2, p.75: proposed overcrossing at Monument should be a high priority as it will not only improve safety but will facilitate traffic at that intersection which is heavily saturated and significantly impacted by trail users crossing as pedestrians. • Segment 4, p.76-77: proposed improved access to BART at PH needs to be evaluated against cost. Access to BART from the IHT is already quite adequate in our opinion and any attempt to connect the users of the IHT to the proposed Class II bike way should be removed. The conversion of any lanes of Treat Boulevard into bicycle paths is an unnecessary expenditure of millions of dollars of funds as existing parallel alternatives already exist and are being used. 	<p>Specific intersection improvements as well as who is given the right-of-way at intersections will depend on direction given by local jurisdictions. Added note on page 50.</p> <p>A separated use trail is proposed throughout the corridor.</p>

Draft Iron Horse Corridor Active Transportation Study
Public Comments Summary (Round 2: February 13 to March 13, 2020)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Segment 5, p79; The proposed bicycle roundabout at the CC Canal Trail is a great idea. So is the improvement proposed at the intersection of Walden Rd and Westcliff. • Segment 13, p.83: If this segment is at all heavily used, priority should be given to Alt 2: overcrossing at Sycamore Valley Rd. However, it does not show as a most heavily used segment on p.87. 	
<p style="text-align: center;">Contra Costa Transportation Authority</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">3/12/20</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 6 – There is a footnote regarding AB 1025. Consider adding additional narration regarding how the passage of the Bill affects the implementation of the Study recommendations, or how this Study is related to the future studies of “...new and emerging technologies in the corridor...” as identified in the Bill. • Page 77 - The Authority request additional clarification. Previously, the Authority was of the impression that a separated bikeway alternative (i.e., Class IV) was being considered by the County along Treat Blvd. has the stated Class II-type facility been formally adopted as the preferred alternative? • Pages 81 – 85 - Upon reflection, the Authority concurs with the concept of assigning trail space by speed, as that could reasonably allow for inclusive use by multiple modes simultaneously (i.e., e-bikes alongside SAVs). That said, the Authority also considers this concept raises the question of how speed differentials will be enforced, and whether there has been participation and/or input by the responsible enforcement agenc(ies)? • Appendix C - The Authority requests several edits for informational accuracy, as well as to affirm agency objectives and goals in the area of SAV testing and related mobility innovation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 2 – The Authority continues to also test at Concord Naval Weapons Station, and the (correctly) identified ADS grant will also include additional testing at said Weapons Station (in addition to locations already cited in this document). • Page 3 – City of Walnut Creek is also preparing to “reboot” its shared mobility program in 2020. • Page 5 – Insofar as the IHT corridor intersects and/or adjoins Caltrans R/W, then Caltrans should also be named as a potential interagency partner. • Page 7 – “*No cost” associated with dockless shared mobility services is very unlikely to be tenable in a suburban context. This much we learned at the Dec. 2019 CCTA Micromobility Forum. Therefore, we strongly recommend indicating some level of public & private investment would be required to attract a minimum, sustainable level of service for such program on IHT. • Page 10 – The Authority also strongly recommends that this conclusion speaks to potential for rapid SAV technological advancements, and that any future study of SAV systems on IHT take anticipated (and as-yet-unknown) advancements and capabilities into consideration as well. As currently written, the Authority expresses concern that the potential for SAV operations on IHT are static. • Pages 67 - 90 (Chapter 4)- We presume added cost and/or formatting constraints precluded our original suggestion. Fortunately, maps are provided in alternative corridor concepts in Chapter 4. Thank you. 	<p>Pg. 6 – The footnote was added at the request of Contra Costa County. No changes made.</p> <p>Pg. 77 - The Contra Costa County Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan identifies Treat Blvd as a proposed Class II facility.</p> <p>Pg. 81-85 – Speed enforcement is not discussed in this study but does state enforcement needs to be considered if such improvements are to be implemented.</p> <p>Appendix C – Completed all edits.</p> <p>Pg. 103 – Completed suggested edit.</p>

Draft Iron Horse Corridor Active Transportation Study
Public Comments Summary (Round 2: February 13 to March 13, 2020)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 103 – The original comment appears to be only partially addressed. While the Authority appreciates naming Measure J as a potential funding source for future IHT project and programmatic improvements, it does not consider it accurate to categorize the countywide transportation sales tax measure as a “bond measure”. On the contrary, the latter is traditionally defined as a fixed-income debt instrument and that does not apply to the Measure J funding program, as approved by Contra Costa voters. Likewise, the Authority suggests reconfirming with EBRPD the same categorization for Measure WW. <p>Thus, the Authority suggests re-titling this section to be “Local Sales Tax Measures Supporting Countywide Mobility”.</p>	
County Public Works	3/12/20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety would be a serious concern with no physical separation between users of different speeds. Destinations (i.e. Walnut Creek Safeway shopping center) are physically separated from Corridor. Study should focus more on these areas and whether providing access would preclude interest in using trail as commute route, and if removing these barriers would increase mode shift. Dividing the Corridor into 15 segments leads away from creating a consistent corridor improvement, which would be confusing for users. The goal should be providing uniformity. Study says SAVs would require dedicated travel lane. Figure 1 conflicts with this statement. Are proposed intersection improvements considered the minimum improvements necessary to make intersections safer? The study does not address the goal of determine the feasibility of moving forward with a bicycle superhighway. Study should incorporate potential improvements in a conclusion of whether or not Trail could safely accommodate a bicycle superhighway. Cost estimates to not accurately reflect reality (i.e. unit costs and total costs will actually end up being much higher). Cost estimates should be removed all together. Park uses would not be compatible with “high speed” Corridor. Legends for maps 3-6 should clarify the black lines with small line weight are existing Class I facilitates. 	<p>A separated use trail is proposed throughout the corridor.</p> <p>Figure 1 (now 2) illustrates neighborhood electric vehicles (NEVs) instead of SAVs, which are human-operated and do not require a separate lane.</p> <p>The proposed intersection improvements represent some of the possible improvements that could be made to make them safer. Local jurisdictions will ultimately play a role in deciding the types of improvements that should be made at specific intersections.</p> <p>Added conclusion re: bicycle superhighway on pages 8-9.</p> <p>Updated legends for maps 3-6</p> <p>Cost estimate was updated for trail corridor and intersection improvements based on the unit pricing provided by the County.</p>
Danville Preservation League	3/13/20	<p>We strongly oppose any changes to the Iron Horse Trail’s existing recreational use.</p> <p>The Iron Horse Trail improves the quality of life in our neighborhoods. It is a quiet outdoor space. The proposed changes will negatively affect trail use and all of the surrounding neighborhoods.</p>	<p>The commenter’s opinions are noted.</p>
Town of Danville	3/13/20	<p>Trail Design Segments (Chp. 2, pg. 14) Please list the Trail Design Segment endpoints (as provided in Table 6, pg. 30) in conjunction with Map 2 to better-identify the segmentation.</p> <p>Intersection Safety (Chp. 2, pg. 22) The narrative describing intersection safety and collision history analysis should be expanded to identify types of collisions (i.e. involved with other vehicle, solo collision, etc.)</p>	<p>Added trail design segment endpoints to the map</p> <p>Intersection Safety – This level of collision analysis was not included in the study. Appendix B includes collision history in more detail. Alta has provided the County with the spreadsheet of collision data.</p>

Draft Iron Horse Corridor Active Transportation Study
Public Comments Summary (Round 2: February 13 to March 13, 2020)

	<p>Intersection Treatments - Local Roads (Chp . 3, pgs. 50-51) Staff supports the proposed guidelines for treatments at IHT intersection crossings for collector and arterial roadway crossings. However, staff does not concur with universally prioritizing trail user right-of-way at local roadway intersections through reorientation of stop sign controls (requiring motorists to stop at all IHT crossings). This proposal has potential to exacerbate any existing safety issues and have potential to create unexpected conditions that may not be consistent with other trail networks.</p> <p>Proposed Improvements - Danville Projects (Chp. 4, pgs. 82-83)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Segment 11" (Wayne Ave to Love Lane) - The proposed additional IHT access points at SRVHS should be further vetted with the SRVUSD to address potential safety issues, existing policies and regulations. • "Segment 12" (Love Lane to San Ramon Valley Blvd.) - Additional details and cost analysis should be provided regarding the recommendation to improve the intersection at San Ramon Valley Blvd./ IHT where there is an existing traffic signal. • "Segment 13" (San Ramon Valley Blvd. to Fostoria Way) - Per previous comment, access points to John Baldwin and Greenbrook Elementary School should be further vetted with SRVUSD. Please provide additional details on the recommendation to "incorporate micromobility at major intersections ." Please incorporate planning-level cost estimate for "Alternate 2: Overcrossing at Sycamore Valley Road" listed in Table 11, page 97. 	<p>Intersection Treatments – Local agencies will play a key role in determining specific intersection improvements appropriate for their jurisdictions, which includes who has the right-of-way at these intersections. Added note on page 50.</p> <p>Proposed Improvements – Added language on page 56 to clarify that any new access points should be implemented in coordination with local jurisdictions, school districts and adjacent landowners.</p> <p>Additional details and cost analysis of specific intersection improvements will be completed in future studies.</p> <p>Additional text re: micromobility is provided on pages 57, 59 and in Appendix C.</p>
--	---	--