

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

	Commenter	Received	Comments	Response
1.	Joerg Blischke	2/19/20	Recommendations described in Section 4 are not that clear to me. Is there a public hearing planned where the proposed prioritized measures are explained in more detail perhaps in an illustrative and interactive fashion? And is part of the recommendation to install good lighting throughout the length of the trail? This is something that is very important to me...several close calls at night where I only saw bicyclists and pedestrians in the very last moment as they did not have accompanying lights.	County staff responded directly on 2/20/20
2.	Wayne Mortensen	2/22/20	Perhaps solar lighting on those sections of the trail which are dark for the purpose of crime prevention/safety for evening use of the corridor? I understand that in some residential areas you would not want to have lights shining into residents homes.	The study recommends adding lighting throughout the corridor. Solar lighting is recommended where utility connection is not feasible or where alternative energy sources are desired (see page 46).
3.	Sylvia Benzler	2/24/20	We are responding to the Contra Costa County proposal for motorized vehicles on the Iron Horse Trail. Bikers –most going quite fast--rarely stop. There are substantial feasibility issues such as user parking, narrowness of the trail, the necessarily slow speed of the trail electric vehicles due to numerous cross streets, capital and operating costs, existing and parallel CCCTA bus service, and mitigating traffic problems. etc.	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on bicycle and pedestrian improvements, it includes a section on SAVs because the corridor is a former transit corridor.
4.	Drew Bolger	2/29/20	I'm writing to relay my objection to some of the proposed "improvements" suggested for the Iron Horse Trail...potential for construction, lighting and overall increased noise the overall lack of involvement from those who live on the trail. If the following changes were enacted we feel that our life and others daily users of the trail in Alamo would be adversely affected: increased lighting, bike super highway, other e-vehicles/SAVs, environmental impact.	The study makes preliminary trail improvement recommendations for corridor's managing agencies and local agency consideration. Ultimately, if the local agency decides to proceed with implementing study recommendations, additional public outreach would occur to settle specific improvements and design.
5.	Marc Mazer	3/1/20	If you widen it and encourage use of electric vehicles, scooters, and also insert the traffic issues of kiosks....it will significantly impact the safety and beauty of this resource. Please don't.	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on bicycle and pedestrian improvements, it includes a section on SAVs because the corridor is a former transit corridor.  The study recommends implementing a scooter pilot program before any major policy changes are made.
6.	Lori White	3/1/20	Do not change a thing. Don't spend any more tax dollars and time on plans for mini-buses (should be strictly on Danville Blvd), or motorized nonsense. Even expanding the trail to help bicyclists will invite hoards more, which is not in the interest of most residents.	Comments are noted.
7.	Andrea Konkoly & Scott Everett	3/1/20	Disappointed to hear that the Alamo Improvement Association wasn't made aware of this. Outlining a walking lane and biking lane, I support that but when there are talks about rental bikes and scooters (have you seen LA?!) and an autonomous electric vehicle carting up to 20 people, it's a big no.  What does this mean for safety? Who is responsible for policing this commuter corridor? What environmental impact does this have?	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on bicycle and pedestrian improvements, it includes a section on SAVs because the corridor is a former transit corridor.  The study states enforcement as an important decisions point for future implementation.

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

			<p>What will this do to property values?  Where are these commuters going to park?  What is this going to do to traffic as commuters will have the right of way?  I vote that this goes in front of a public hearing, let the people decide.</p>	<p>Projects are subject to environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). If an actual project is designed and funded it will be evaluated under CEQA (including traffic).</p> <p>Several research studies actually show trails improve property values.</p>
8.	Marilyn Bailey	3/1/20	<p>I am appalled. Just now hearing about this study...bad idea for our communities. We DO NOT WANT OR NEED anything more. Certainly not electric vehicles or lighting along the way! If someone wants to improve the Trail, then add more benches, water. Clean up the weeds more than annually, run a stripe down the middle.</p>	<p>Creating separate lanes, adding amenities such as benches, and improved maintenance capabilities are some of the study's recommendations.</p> <p>The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on bicycle and pedestrian improvements, it includes a section on SAVs because the corridor is a former transit corridor.</p>
9.	Lindy Marich	3/1/20	<p>We don't want any motorized vehicles. Every home along this trail would lose value.</p>	<p>The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on bicycle and pedestrian improvements, it includes a section on SAVs because the corridor is a former transit corridor.</p>
10.	Mark and Linda Uhrenholt	3/1/20	<p>Vehemently oppose the concept of using the Iron Horse Trail as a transportation corridor...would be a travesty.</p>	<p>Comments are noted.</p>
11.	Gabriela Odell	3/1/20	<p>Unclear to me what exactly the problem is that this proposal is trying to solve--is it traffic congestion on 680 or improvement for the current walkers, bikers and other users? Proposal to potentially allow autonomous vehicles on the trail is a non-starter. I have never observed any problems on the trail that require fixing other than street crossings that are hazardous. These "improvements" will ruin the environment for the people whose houses run along the trail.</p>	<p>The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on bicycle and pedestrian improvements, it includes a section on SAVs because the corridor is a former transit corridor.</p>
12.	Kathy and Dan Hugens	3/2/20	<p>Against any changed use for the Iron Horse Trail into an Active Transportation Corridor.</p>	<p>Comments are noted.</p>
13.	Rina Shah, M.D., F.A.A.P.	3/2/20	<p>Adding more transport will serve to make the community less healthy, increase pollution and noise without providing an alternative for all of us who use the trail multiple times a day. Adding a trolley and allowing people to walk or bike doesn't provide the same benefits as allowing folks to walk in nature.</p>	<p>Comments are noted.</p>
14.	Patrick Moore	3/2/20	<p>Why were the many residents in close proximity to the Iron Horse Trail not better informed of the expensive study, and possible future work, undertaken last year?</p>	<p>The study relied on local agency contacts and community organizations to advertise outreach activities. Several commenters indicated this approach fell short and recommended using platforms like "Nextdoor" and other social media platforms, which will be utilized in future planning and design phases.</p>
15.	John Schaeffer	3/2/20	<p>Allowing commercial/municipal traffic and vehicles on the Iron Horse Trail is one of the singularly worst ideas I have ever heard.</p>	<p>The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study</p>

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

				focuses on bicycle and pedestrian improvements, it includes a section on SAVs because the corridor is a former transit corridor.
16.	Erin Cox	3/2/20	Strongly in favor of widening the trail, where possible, to segregate cyclists from walkers/joggers. The area between Livorna in Alamo and downtown Danville is particularly crowded and it appears there is room to widen the trail there. Similarly, the area between Ygnacio Valley Rd. and the crossing with the Canal Trail near Walden Park is heavily used and difficult to bike on.	No response. Supportive of the recommendations.
17.	Jo Ann Frink	3/3/20 3/11/20	The trail in the Alamo area is heavily used. Putting a 'super lane' on the trail will not increase the amount of commuters, it will only serve to decrease the number of walkers, runners, skaters, and school kids that use the trail. Danville Blvd is already set up as a transportation corridor...put a 'super lane' in that will accommodate bikes and other electric vehicles. Bus from the Walnut Creek BART station to Alamo during rush hour and there were only 8 people on the bus including my friend and me. This is a good bus system that is vastly underutilized. The county needs to look at this option. Our community has been blindsided by this proposal.  If you are going to redo the trail to accommodate adult fast bikes (regular and e-bikes) along with motorized skateboards, etc, put in two paved lanes with a median in the middle. One paved lane will be for pedestrians, and the on the other side of the median will be the lane for adult bikes. The report mentioned the possibility of linear parks, so I thought our area would be perfect for that.	The study recommendations are consistent with this recommendation.
18.	Gene Yates	3/3/20	Unacceptable. Widening the trail to 22 feet, effectively making it a road in semi-rural areas like Alamo, Danville, and San Ramon, will ruin.	Proposed improvements are based on existing land use context and demand. In more rural areas like Alamo, trail improvements are being proposed to improve safety and access to the trail while maintaining a rural and natural look and feel.
19.	Lisa Lutz	3/3/20	Safer trail for both bikers and walkers, yes. Autonomous vehicles, no! if you have shared Autonomous vehicles in Walnut Creek and San Ramon it's just a matter of time before these two will be connected. All improvements to manage congestion should be kept to I680! There should be no diversion of traffic onto the east bay regional park district's iron horse trail!	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on bicycle and pedestrian improvements, it includes a section on SAVs because the corridor is a former transit corridor.
20.	Donna & Richard Treffers	3/4/20	Information was virtually non-existent to most of us, were it not for the Nextdoor website. County Connection busses that run daily through this corridor as well. The busses are not heavily used. Can you please do a "Study" to determine why? Or why not? We do not feel that this Iron Horse corridor proposal will solve this problem here.	Several commenters indicated this public outreach approach fell short and recommended using platforms like "Nextdoor" and other social media platforms, which will be utilized in future planning and design phases.  The Contra Costa Transportation Authority ("CCTA") and local transit service providers are typically responsible for studying transit capacity in the I-680 corridor. CCTA's "Innovate 680" project is the latest project to address this issue.
21.	Diane & Mark Stevenson	3/4/20	(Re: Alamo MAC meeting) In the future it may be a positive gesture for MAC & your reps to proactively help make space for the probably 50+ people in the overflow. It sounds like there has virtually been no information collected about the success/failure/results of the most current transportation improvements to 680, bus use/routes on Danville Boulevard. Recommend/require biking/motorized bikes/scooters for the purpose of commuting (or otherwise simply going fast) use	The Contra Costa Transportation Authority ("CCTA") and local transit service providers are typically responsible for studying transit capacity in the I-680 corridor. CCTA's "Innovate 680" project is the latest project to address this issue.

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

			the Danville Blvd bike lane. I see the buses from my window and they are usually ¼ full or less...why isn't a "bus bridge" a priority approach?	
22.	Lawrence L. Hoenig	3/4/20	Break the analysis and study into three parts, northern end of the Corridor and let WC, PH and Concord figure out their solutions as a group. Second break off the Southern end and let SR and Dublin (all the way to the BART station, hopefully) figure out their solutions. Leave Alamo and Danville to take less significant and less expensive steps to improve the Trail if residents actually want the same. Favor widening the Trail to 20-22 feet and separating it into 2 or 3 lanes separated primarily by speed of user, and changing the rules to make cars yield to Trail traffic on at least the local road intersections. On local and collector road intersections, we also favor finding some other solution to the bollards, which we have very narrowly missed hitting on occasion while riding the bikes.	Future improvements to the trail will be based on multijurisdictional coordination. Because this Study is a County-led effort, it looks at the corridor as a whole as well as individual jurisdictions along the trail.
23.	Catherine Reichhold	3/4/20	We oppose development of the Trail for other than the current uses. We oppose transit use other than as currently permitted for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians. I had no knowledge of your study and gave no input to it. My first notice was from the AIA.	Comments are noted.
24.	Nancy Sway	3/4/20	Litina Drive, NOT Litina Avenue like you have on the Study Map (no such street). There is a stop sign on the trail that bikers, rollerblader's, skate boarder's and pedestrians are supposed to observe, but rarely do. Will the bikers etc. have to stop? Or would we still have the right of way?	Updated to Litina Drive.  Specific intersection improvements, including user right-of-way, will be determined by local jurisdictions.
25.	Beth Jersey	3/5/20	Dismayed to learn of the prospect of electric vehicles being permitted to be driven on the Iron Horse trail as part of your IHC Study findings. Record my no vote on that particular part of the plan.	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on bicycle and pedestrian improvements, it includes a section on SAVs because the corridor is a former transit corridor.
26.	Susan Putvin	3/5/20	Please consider this a vote against modifying the iron horse trail.	Comments are noted.
27.	Warren Tighe	3/4/20	This study appears to be a good opportunity to advance the concept of an east-west class I trail connecting downtown Walnut Creek to the canal trail a third mile or so east of John Muir Hospital.	The Study does not preclude connections. While it is not within this study's scope to look at connections, the County encourages local agencies to look into connections to planned and existing Class I paths.
28.	Steve Cloudsley	3/5/20	Entirely inconsistent with the desired small town atmosphere in Alamo. \$80M hard cost for the proposed improvements is a lot of money for a trail system that already works with ongoing maintenance funded by existing and well established sources. Proposed project would encumber tax payers with significant additional taxes and ongoing O&M costs. A 24/7 transportation corridor will increase traffic and congestion in our quiet neighborhoods. Alamo has no street lights or sidewalks for a reason...we like country living. County's proposal would transform our community into a "city" style environment that is neither welcome nor desired. The increased traffic will bring unwanted crime and traffic into quiet neighborhoods that are already targeted by thieves who use the highway as an escape route. Proposal does not have my approval or support.	Proposed improvements are based on existing land use context and demand. In more rural areas like Alamo, trail improvements are being proposed to improve safety and access to the trail while maintaining a rural and natural look and feel.

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

			As a follow-up to my email below, I would like to propose the following improvement alternative: CC County could issue a bond of appropriate size (say \$20M?) to (i) repay \$10.6M State of California pledge and obtain release of AB 1025.	
29.	David and Ann Flinn	3/5/20	We strongly oppose motorized vehicles.	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on bicycle and pedestrian improvements, it includes a section on SAVs because the corridor is a former transit corridor.
30.	James Chow	3/5/20	Totally against this proposal that would change what is already very much desire and love by the community without having to spend even more tax dollars and possibly causing irreversible damage. Can you share who is the driving force pushing for this study to be done? If this came from the public, can you share these statistics?	This study is authorized by Assembly Bill ("AB") 1025. AB 1025 also relinquished the County from the obligation of operation mass transit (bus or rail) in the Corridor.
31.	John T. Malone	3/6/20	Strongly opposed to ANY change to the trail.	Comments are noted.
32.	Sue Halverson	3/7/20	This project has been very hidden and slow to come out to the public. Proposal takes away one of the last comfortable, easy, and safe ways to move up and down the valley. There are already other options (bike lanes) for people to travel to work safely. Your proposal will actually make that corridor unsafe for countless school children, recreational bikes (without motors), dog walkers, and friends who need a safe place to enjoy the area.	Comments are noted.
33.	Tom & Joan King	3/9/20	We don't believe any of the numerous people who currently use and enjoy the benefits of the trail would support these changes or consider them an improvement.	Comments are noted.
34.	Marilyn Bailey	3/10/20	So much of any change on the Trail will impact those of us who live in Alamo. The lack of publicity about this study was appalling. The wishes of Alamo residents is that there will never be any type of automated vehicle on the Trail. If the County has to do something, maybe make the Trail a bit wider with a dividing line, so people understand which side to ride/walk on! Would be nice to have bicycles actually STOP at the stop signs	Proposed improvements are based on existing land use context and demand. In more rural areas like Alamo, trail improvements are being proposed to improve safety and access to the trail while maintaining a rural and natural look and feel.  The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on bicycle and pedestrian improvements, it includes a section on SAVs because the corridor is a former transit corridor.
35.	David & Cynthia Bogolub	3/10/20	I see no safety issue on the trail at present, with one exception. The addition of electric bikes has made the trail less safe. I believe that your study for future development was poorly done. Changes you propose will have a large negative impact.	Comments are noted.
36.	Nancy Morra	3/10/20	this corridor between Walnut Creek and San Ramon is best used by pedestrians and bicycles and prefer that this trail be left alone...steer your study to look at alternative routes for higher speed bikes/scooters/vehicles...a dedicated and protected bike lane along 680. I request that the community outreach and comment time be extended. I request that this study be tabled temporarily due to the Urgent Notice just received from Contra Costa County limiting gatherings to under 50 attendees due to the Corona Virus.	Comments are noted.

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

37.	Marci K. Dublin	3/11/20	Opposition to the proposed changes. Fear that a higher volume of "commuters" on the trail would lead to an increase in crime...reduce my property value. Only portion of the proposed changes that I support would be allowing electric scooters and bikes to use the trail during daylight hours. I do not support autonomous vehicle traffic, widening of the trail or any additional paving, changing of the intersections, extension of the trail hours, and I especially oppose LIGHTING on the trail.	Comments are noted.
38.	Tony Cristiani	3/11/20	Prefer to leave the trail exactly as it exists now. locate along 680 Freeway or Danville Blvd. to allow for high speed electric buses etc...place electric buses, ebikes etc. on one side of Danville Blvd. and the other side there would be a traditional bike lane with a cement barrier wall to separate automobile traffic from bicycles, construction of a 22' paved surface from South Walnut Creek to Sycamore Valley Road is not needed. I possibly could see a wider trail than the existing 10' paved surface, possibly a 16' wide paved trail with a broken line down the middle to allow for safer bicycle passing of pedestrians and also to accommodate higher usage in the future.	Comments are noted.
39.	Robert 'Nick' Bowles	3/11/20	What a horrible idea! I can't believe this is a serious proposal. And the study was a total waste of money. Community input should have been obtained before the study started. Preserve the trail for pedestrians and bikes. Further, bikes should be required to use the trail (at very low speed) and prevented from using Danville Blvd. Trail should be vehicle free.	Comments are noted.
40.	Cyndi Dresser	3/12/20	The existing buses that run have very few people in them. Why do you think your transportation method is any better? So many people enjoy using the trail for exercise. Why take that away?	The study's vision is to provide a transportation option while preserving the trail as a recreational resource. It would not preclude people from using the trail for exercise or recreation.
41.	Lisa Inserni	3/12/20	<b>(form email duplicated by several commenters)</b>  Strong objection to the Iron Horse Trail Transportation Corridor Study, and its recommendations. Introducing the recommendations proposed will result in a dramatic shift to the usage of the Iron Horse Trail and the identity of our community in the following ways: Increased traffic, increase crime, vandalism and transients, trail will become a sterile environment, compromise safety and privacy of residents, home values will fall. The proposal of SAV's, while only for segments near downtown Concord and Bishop Ranch, is concerning. It will only be a matter of time until a proposal will be made to connect all segments of the trail for SAV use.  Disappointed in how this study was created with limited community input, and not socialized in an effective manner to the communities impacted.	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on bicycle and pedestrian improvements, it includes a section on SAVs because the corridor is a former transit corridor.  Several commenters indicated this public outreach approach fell short and recommended using platforms like "Nextdoor" and other social media platforms, which will be utilized in future planning and design phases.
42.	Stacey Judd	3/12/20	Oppose any changes to the trail which add any high speed or motorized and would remove any trees and beauty.	The study recommends adding additional plantings, shade trees, and linear parks along the trail, and does not recommend removing any trees.  The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on bicycle and pedestrian improvements, it includes a section on SAVs because the corridor is a former transit corridor.

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

43.	Beverly Barker	3/12/20	Opposition to turning this from a "trail" to a "transportation corridor" for electric vehicles. adding a component of high speed bikes/scooters and electric bikes will GREATLY reduce safety.	Comments are noted.
44.	Richard and Terri Delfosse	3/12/20	(see form email above)	
45.	Linda Stern	3/12/20	(see form email above)	
46.	Brian Calbeck	3/12/20	Reviewed the transportation study and overall I think there are a lot of great benefits to expanding its use...implementing many of the ideas would improve its accessibility and add value to our community. Love the idea of separating pedestrians/runners from bikes and other high speed traffic. I think providing a protected lane for cyclists, e-bikes, motor scooters and electric skateboards makes everyone safer. Concerned with the prospect of closed vehicles using the trail.	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on bicycle and pedestrian improvements, it includes a section on SAVs because the corridor is a former transit corridor.
47.	John Salyer	3/12/20	Want to express our strong objection to the Iron Horse Trail Transportation Corridor Study, and its recommendations.	Comments are noted.
48.	Sandra McMullan	3/12/20	Vehemently opposing any form of transportation on the trail. Put public transportation on the freeway where it belongs. Elevate a track, get rid of the pay lanes (privilege drivers) but NOT IN OUR BACKYARDS!!!	Comments are noted.
49.	Valerie Jo Remley	3/12/20	Ridiculously little publicity of this outrageous plan for putting motorized vehicles on the Iron Horse Trail. Luckily, I saw something on Nextdoor about it and am expressing my absolute opposition to anything other than regular walking and bicycling on this trail. No scooters or anything else	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on bicycle and pedestrian improvements, it includes a section on SAVs because the corridor is a former transit corridor.  Several commenters indicated this public outreach approach fell short and recommended using platforms like "Nextdoor" and other social media platforms, which will be utilized in future planning and design phases.
50.	Deborah Donovan and Howard Weisman	3/12/20	We are supportive of proposed improvements for Iron Horse Trail- especially the lights. While we use lights on our bikes- lights on the trails would be much safer.	No response. Supportive of the recommendations.
51.	Aaron Long	3/12/20	(see form email above)	
52.	Pat and Kristen Kratus	3/12/20	Against the redevelopment of the Iron Horse Trail. The proposed electric vehicles will ruin the trail	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on bicycle and pedestrian improvements, it includes a section on SAVs because the corridor is a former transit corridor.
53.	Nan Ronchetto	3/12/20	Very much against changing the Iron Horse Trail from what it is today.	Comments are noted.
54.	Colleen Gregerson	3/12/20	Excited to see some of the recommendations for the trail, including improving safety at intersections and improving access to other forms of transit (BART, bus stops) and improving access	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study

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

			<p>points into commercial areas. Further improving the trail and enhancing access points would drive more use and I am fully in support of that.</p> <p>On the other hand, I wanted to share that some of the statements were not consistent with my daily experience of using the trail. For example, page 5 notes, "the trail often runs into capacity issues as it exists today." That is simply not the case in the stretch of trail from downtown Danville to downtown Alamo, the trek of the trail we use daily.</p> <p>Strongly object to the possibility of shared autonomous vehicles and e-scooters on the trail. Electric forms of transportation should not be part of the Iron Horse Trail given the safety concerns for all the children commuters on the trail.</p>	<p>focuses on bicycle and pedestrian improvements, it includes a section on SAVs because the corridor is a former transit corridor.</p> <p>The study recommends implementing a scooter pilot program before any major policy changes are made.</p>
55.	Gordon & Carolyn Sanderson	3/12/20	(see form email above)	
56.	Kristi Novelli	3/12/20	<p>strong objection to the recommendations outlined in the Iron Horse Trail Transportation Corridor Study. We have empty transit buses running up and down Danville Blvd. Why isn't a study done to figure out how to increase ridership on those? The proposed changes would reduce safety due to increased traffic and high speed bikes/scooters, even with the widening of it. There would be an increase in crime, vandalism and transients in our community. Property values would plummet.</p>	<p>The Contra Costa Transportation Authority ("CCTA") and local transit service providers are typically responsible for studying transit capacity in the I-680 corridor. CCTA's "Innovate 680" project is the latest project to address this issue.</p>
57.	Theresa Calestini	3/12/20	<p>I was the person that suggested putting a bike lane on 680 similar to the one they put on the Benicia and Golden Gate Bridges, the causeway between Davis and Sacramento and I'm sure there are other locations. The type of changes that are being proposed are not appropriate for our area. I think battery operated bikes should be banned from the trail altogether and redirected to using the above mentioned bike lane on 680.</p>	<p>Comments are noted. Additionally, East Bay Park District authorized the use of e-bikes on the Iron Horse Trail in 2017.</p>
58.	Carol Weldin	3/12/20	(see form email above)	
59.	Sandra Fink	3/12/20	<p>Extend the public comment period as this was not presented at many public meetings. What is missing in the study is an explanation of how you can treat each section separately and yet have it be a transportation corridor. The public has serious doubts about the lack of explicit information. e.g. What are "amenities"? We were told that SAV's will not be used in the Alamo section. What guarantee do we have of that?</p> <p>Existing bike lanes on Danville Bl that are heavily utilized and that should be improved instead. Existing bus service from Walnut Creek BART through Danville is underutilized and a study of improvements to that service might be a better investment.</p> <p>The Danville plan of separated lanes should be used rather than a 22' wide "roadway". Since we already have water fountains, benches and Hemme Park with bathrooms and recreational facilities that are accessed from the trail, no further "amenities" are needed. In addition, I feel that Alamo would be a good place to put a linear park especially since we have R-7 funds that might be used.</p> <p>EIR should be done on the whole study.</p>	<p>Potential amenities are described in pages 54-59. The study corridor was segmented to focus potential improvements, but continuity is maintained throughout the study corridor.</p> <p>Danville Blvd. and the Iron Horse Corridor are considered part of the local transportation network. Improvements to either facility would be intended to benefit the other.</p> <p>Planning studies are statutorily exempt under CEQA section 15262.</p>



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

60.	Paul & Preeti Gill	3/12/20	(see form email above)	
61.	Greg Shay	3/12/20	Converting this particular trail is a terrible idea. Adding in a new line on the East side where there's Significant open space makes some sense, but sending commercial and high occupancy transport within feet of people's backyards, on the top of highly explosive jet fuel, is a bad idea. I strongly reject the idea of making any changes to the trail.	Comments are noted.
62.	Jeanine Newman	3/12/20	Sincere hope that the proposed changes I have only heard about very recently will not happen. Our safety while using the trail must outweigh the reasons these changes have been considered and plans have been made without our consent. Turning our peaceful trail into a commuting corridor will bring in crime and vandalism, put children and the elderly at risk	Comments are noted.
63.	Jon Savell	3/12/20	I would be enraged to see autonomous vehicles on the Iron Horse trail. This proposal is deemed offensive.	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.
64.	Kathy Sharpe	3/12/20	(see form email above)	
65.	Lucia and George Foster	3/12/20	Some of the proposals might be good ideas, especially if they enhance the safety of pedestrians, who are increasingly at risk from reckless cyclists. However, in our area, SAV's would not be appropriate. The number of grade crossings throughout Alamo would require overpasses, huge expense, and a grotesque change to the character of our community. We value the trail, use it nearly every day, and welcome improvements which will make it safer. We don't welcome mass-transit vehicles which will not be safer.	Proposed improvements are based on existing land use context and demand. In more rural areas like Alamo, trail improvements are being proposed to improve safety and access to the trail while maintaining a rural and natural look and feel. An SAV route in Alamo is not under consideration.
66.	Terri Perez Tom Scholer	3/12/20	(see form email above)	
67.	Joleen R. Lafayette	3/12/20	The crossing (Del Amigo) has lights and stop signs on both sides. I would actually like to ban bike riders or put gates at each crossing so the bikers have to stop to get thru. Someone is going to get seriously hurt one day at the street crossings, if they make them wider it is going to be worse.	The Park District typically gates trail heads to only block vehicular access. It would be unlikely for bicycles.
68.	Jerry and Laura Raney	3/12/20	(see form email above)	
69.	Val and Sue Eding	3/12/20	Changes to the Iron Horse Trail is a bad idea. Also concerned about the complete lack of communication of this proposal.	Several commenters indicated this public outreach approach fell short and recommended using platforms like "Nextdoor" and other social media platforms, which will be utilized in future planning and design phases.
70.	Geri DeVilbiss	3/12/20	Injuries that will prevail by adding another mode of transportation. It is just not a safe idea. If this does take place, will the county be responsible for the injuries that occur due to the new transportation added to the mix? If so get ready for a big law suit the injuries will be many.	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.

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

71.	Scott and Amy Crissman	3/12/20	(see form email above)	
72.	Holly Eckwall	3/12/20	The people who comprise the Alamo community are intelligent, informed and civic minded. They are also generous, charitable and most of all hard working. They are committed to preserving the best of their neighborhoods for the generations to follow. Their voice is important. County leaders will be well served to thoughtfully listen to them.	Comments are noted.
73.	Donita Romero	3/12/20	(see form email above)	
74.	Stuart Donalson	3/12/20	Please do not allow this beautiful landmark enjoyed by so much of our community to be turned into a thoroughfare that will endanger our children and those of us who love it here.	Comments are noted.
75.	Carol Saltzman	3/12/20	Opposed to any expansions to our beautiful Trail and certainly not a big or huge increase of people or the SAVS impacting our Trail. Our security and maintenance on the Trail would be greatly impacted. We also have GAS lines that run along the Iron Horse Trail. Has this been greatly considered in the Study?! This is very concerning.	Utility considerations have been added to the text on pages 26 and 27.
76.	Brooke Schroeder	3/12/20	Vehemently oppose the county study which proposes changes to the Iron Horse Trail. It is understood that the county is looking to make the trail more commuter friendly, however it completely overlooks the community in which the trail passes through. I am shocked that the county was able to conceal such an in depth study. Stop packaging "improvements" as a benefit to the community when they will only make it dangerous for our children, increase crime, and create a sterile environment.	Comments are noted.
77.	Angela Hueckel	3/12/20	(see form email above)	
78.	Silvia Belotz	3/12/20	I oppose this.!!	Comments are noted.
79.	Traci Smyth	3/12/20	Do not change it from a safe neighborhood bike and jogging trail to a busy thoroughfare of strangers who don't care or contribute to our community. I will never use it again to run.	Comments are noted.
80.	Rayne Mahaffey	3/12/20	It was evident during the MAC meeting that the citizens of Alamo are not in favor of the study. People are losing faith in government bodies as the citizens were never included to give feedback during the study, only after a crazy amount of money was thrown away to conduct the study.	Comments are noted.
81.	Kate Huberty	3/12/20	I do NOT want the iron horse trail to be expanded and I do NOT want motor vehicles on it.	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.
82.	Lisa Gartland	3/12/20	While I love the idea of making the Trail wider and more accommodating for the current load and future increased load of users, I have significant concerns in the following categories: collisions (user separation methodology for this portion of the Trail seems like a disaster), noise/light pollution (micromobility users and e-bikes should be limited to "quiet" technology), increased traffic on the Trail, SAVs.	The intent of separating users by speed is to reduce conflicts and the potential for collisions. The study does state further public input would be recommended if considering lighting.

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

				The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.
83.	Jim Farrell	3/12/20	I am in total agreement with each of the points made in her (Sandra Fink) email. I would add is a concern that the “vision” for the trail creates increased concerns for safety and crime (indeed it could actually enable increased crime) - And, with all the extra attention and traffic, it can become a magnet for homeless encampments.	Comments are noted.
84.	Adam Shelly	3/12/20	I am writing to express my whole-hearted support for the Iron Horse Trail Transportation Corridor Study.	No response. Supportive of the recommendations.
85.	Evelyn Boetes	3/12/20	I adamantly oppose the recommendations/proposals outlined in the Iron Horse Trail Study. Lastly, I want to note I am disappointed in how this study was created with limited community input.	Comments are noted. Several commenters indicated this public outreach approach fell short and recommended using platforms like “Nextdoor” and other social media platforms, which will be utilized in future planning and design phases.
86.	Shelly Smith	3/12/20	To say I’m disappointed with you would be an understatement. You are trying to ruin a good thing.	Comments are noted.
87.	Victor Cautis	3/12/20	We enjoy the Iron Horse Trail in its current configuration and we are opposed to any changes to it. Especially any changes that would result in increased traffic.	Comments are noted.
88.	Annelise Mahaffey	3/12/20	Please leave the Iron Horse Trail as it is.	Comments are noted.
89.	David Harris	3/12/20	(see form email above)	
90.	Norma Andres	3/13/20	<p>There’s been no mention about concerns regarding the potential negative aspects of expanded trails and greater use/access thereof. Below is a list of recommendations on how to address concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community involvement and support is necessary for trails to be both utilized and a positive force in the community</li> <li>• There must be a system in place to promptly address issues and problems experienced by neighbors</li> <li>• There should be transparency of the visioning process to community members</li> <li>• A clear plan for maintenance and addressing issues that arise is needed and can solve many of the negative effects including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Litter</li> <li>o Illegal use of trails</li> <li>o Disruptive noise</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Do amenities like benches, restrooms, water fountains, trash receptacles, staging areas for users of various transportation modes, lighting offer the potential for misuse? Of course - like everything</p>	<p>Added a section on Safety Call Boxes on page 47.</p> <p>The study states community involvement in developing maintenance and crime prevention strategies are necessary in future implementation. Future trail improvements and the aforementioned protocols will be discussed by the East Bay Regional Park District and Iron Horse Corridor Program Management Advisory Committee, which is currently the corridor management entity for the County.</p> <p>Adopt-a-trail programs are included as a potential resource in the implementation chapter on page 103.</p>

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

			<p>else. But what needs to be in place are well designed measures to prevent/discourage the likelihood of this.</p> <p>How about having safety-call boxes dispersed throughout, and use of Webcams in the higher destination areas, as I understand the San Tomas Aquino Creek Trail has?</p> <p>With the increased use, are there plans to have crime prevention strategies along the IHT?</p> <p>Adopt-a-trail clean ups similar to Santa Clara University Civil Engineering Departments participation in an adopt-a-creek program.</p>	
91.	Mary Dunne Rose	3/13/20	Please do not change the Iron House Trail. No cars, no elect scooters, no motorcycle etc. usage of any type on the Iron Horse Trail.	Comments are noted.
92.	Sandra Peterson	3/13/20	Please do not allow motorized vehicles to have access to the Iron Horse Trail. Promote buses on 680 instead.	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.
93.	Denise and Edward Rusnak	3/13/20	(see form email above)	
94.	Beth Colonias	3/13/20	Adding vehicles to the trail, this a horrible idea!!!!!! Thank god for the Next Door App in letting us know. Whomever thought of this idea should be ashamed of themselves!!!!!!	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.
95.	Chip Burkert	3/13/20	Let us vote. Let us vote CCC on the Iron Horse Trail Proposal.us	This is a planning study, not a project or funding measure.
96.	Brian Gregory	3/13/20	I am writing with STRONG OBJECTION to any plans that would change the Iron Horse Trail from its existing recreational use.	Comments are noted.
97.	Greg Wiener	3/13/20	I served on the Iron Horse Trail committee and I find it hard to believe that the IRON Horse Committee was not a participant in the study. The suggestion that the trail can be widened is very questionable. Don't do it.	The Iron Horse Program Management Advisory Committee has received updates on the study.
98.	Larry Grabel	3/13/20	Have lived here 37 years, please do not ruin our trail. Kids used to go to school on it. Place to relax and exercise. Please leave it alone.	Comments are noted.
99.	Sara Wasserbauer MD	3/13/20	(see form email above)	
100.	Matt & MaryJo Materazo	3/13/20	(see form email above)	

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

101.	Janette E. Drew	3/13/20	I am a resident of Alamo and am requesting an extension of time (minimum 30 days) for comments on the study to develop the Iron Horse Trail (Corridor).	The public comment deadline was extended from February 2020 to March 2020.
102.	Athan Poulos	3/13/20	Changes that allow any type of motorized vehicles or heavy traffic on the Iron Horse Trail would be a major safety issue and take away from the quiet and pleasant atmosphere of the Trail. Please don't make any changes!	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.
103.	Lindsay Archer	3/13/20	I am vehemently opposed to any change in the current use of the Iron Horse Trail Corridor. As a neighbor, we already have seen robberies and crime in the area. With this proposed change the ease of access in and out of our communities could drastically raise the amount of crime. We need to keep our neighborhoods safe! Not only would I fear accidents with them trying to travel amongst bikes and vehicles going at a high rate of speed, but this would also increase the risk of assault and abductions due to the ability to flee the area quickly.	Comments are noted.
104.	Andrea Scott and David Peck	3/13/20	(see form email above)	
105.	Sally Powers	3/13/20	The trail is a wonderful place to walk. Please do not add any motorized or autonomous vehicles to the mix!!	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.
106.	Bgx	3/13/20	Please do not change ANYTHING about the current Iron Horse Trail. It is already crowded with people, dogs, and bicycles. As a senior it can already be dangerous to walk on due to fast-moving bicycles. It should be left for recreational purposes rather than a commute alternative.  If you want to do anything, please develop more parking for those of us who do not live directly on the trail, add water and restroom facilities along the Trail, enforce dog waste pickup rules, and provide safer - for both motorists and Trail users - at public street crossing points.	The study recommends separating fast and slow user groups to improve safety for all users. It also recommends making intersection improvements to make crossings safer for all users.  Parking is not part of this study's scope. Plans for additional parking will require local jurisdiction review and approval.
107.	Kelly Dawes	3/13/20	I am strongly opposed to any changes to Iron Horse trail allowing electric bikes/scooters. Please maintain as pedestrian only.	Electric bikes are already permitted on the Iron Horse Trail. The study recommends implementing a scooter pilot program before any major policy changes are made (see page 103).
108.	Todd and Lisa Nettleton	3/13/20	(see form email above)	
109.	Jan	3/13/20	I oppose the plan of converting certain part of iron horse trail into multi line vehicle trail that allows scooters or electric vehicles to ride on.  We don't need "upgrade" of the trail, people can use all the different roads that's been developed. We want to keep the trail a safe place for kids and families to hike and ride bike on.	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.

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

				Electric bikes are already permitted on the Iron Horse Trail. The study recommends implementing a scooter pilot program before any major policy changes are made (See page 105).
110.	Karen Gustafson	3/13/20	It is my understanding that the County wants to convert the Iron Horse Trail into a mass transportation corridor with electric bikes, scooters, and autonomous vehicles. This will change the Iron Horse from a quiet recreational trail to something else entirely, hurt property values, change neighborhoods, likely bring in more crime, leave children without a safe way to ride bikes to/from school, etc	<p>The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.</p> <p>Electric bikes are already permitted on the Iron Horse Trail. The study recommends implementing a scooter pilot program before any major policy changes are made (see page 105).</p>
111.	Kristine Hamm	3/13/20	I am opposed to changing the Iron Horse Trail. I believe the outlined changes would significantly negatively impact the value of our house and jeopardize the safety of pedestrians on the trail and pave the way for more traffic and noise.	Comments are noted.
112.	Nancy Mellen	3/13/20	I just want to let you know of my opposition of opening the iron horse trail to a mass transportation corridor.	Comments are noted.
113.	Eddie, Diana, and Victoria Gonzalez	3/13/20	We are alarmed at the changes proposed to the Iron Horse Trail. We join in the concern of our neighbors in raising alarm both at the changes proposed, and the manner in which these changes are seeking to be enacted. We seek to support the trail to continue to be a place for recreation, free of noise, crime, and vandalism that changes proposed could cause.	Comments are noted.
114.	Tiffany Jaber	3/13/20	Please protect our beautiful Iron Horse Trail and oppose any mass transit changes.	Comments are noted.
115.	Garrett Dailey	3/13/20	I write to strongly oppose the proposed "transportation corridor" planned for the Iron Horse Trail.	Comments are noted.
116.	Ian McNeill	3/13/20	I am sure any widening of any sort of the existing Iron Horse Trail will be built to exacting requirements that dictate an expensive base build, drainage, edge of payments borders, safety signs, every article as to be found on a full blown street. In doing so, the atmosphere of the Iron Horse Trail will be eliminated.	Comments are noted.
117.	Christie and Joe Gallo	3/13/20	We have heard the County is considering converting the Iron Horse Trail into a mass transportation corridor with electric bikes, scooters, and autonomous vehicles. Our home backs directly to the Iron Horse Trail and we are strongly OPPOSED to this.	<p>The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.</p> <p>Electric bikes are already permitted on the Iron Horse Trail. The study recommends implementing a scooter pilot program before any major policy changes are made (see page 105).</p>

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

118.	David Jaber	3/13/20	I am opposed to changing the use of the Iron Horse Trail. It is an unusual gem and would be disappointed to lose a space that promotes exercise and health.	The study's vision is to provide a transportation option while preserving the trail as a recreational resource. It would not preclude people from using the trail for exercise or recreation.
119.	Chris Rayner	3/13/20	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The authors seem to have decided that Alamo needs little attention and there seems to be to be very little change other than removing bollards at intersections. The business district is misrepresented, and lack of attention to Alamo is apparent</li> <li>2. The changes to the rest of the trail would inevitably affect Alamo causing more through traffic from north and south. If the vision is implemented the trail must be upgraded in Alamo to handle these changes.</li> <li>3. E-bikes are already seen more often on the trail, and whether or not the study "vision" is implemented may soon become a hazard. In my opinion, a means to separate e-bikes from foot traffic may soon be necessary.</li> </ol>	<p>Trail improvements were determined based on potential user demand. Alamo's future commercial growth is projected to be minimal, however the comment is noted.</p> <p>Agreed. Higher user demand throughout the corridor is inevitable as surrounding populations increase.</p> <p>Agreed. The study attempts to address the anticipated increase in e-bike usage by proposing improvements that could reduce potential conflicts with non-motorized users.</p>
120.	Victoria Jasinski	3/13/20	We want NO CHANGES to the Iron Horse Trail! Continuing foot traffic, casual biking and horses is acceptable on this family-friendly trail. Stop trying to change, destroy and ruin the current character of Our East Bay Trail. We don't need, nor do we want an ugly "mini freeway" on our currently peaceful, tranquil family-friendly trail in the East Bay. This is an outrageous proposal which will result in the destroying of the current beautiful character of our East Bay Iron Horse Trail.	Comments are noted.
121.	Kara Murphy	3/13/20	Very concerned about the trail being used for mass transportation. Many people's homes have a direct view of the trail! This would be terrible to look at mass transportation, and noise prevention measures would have to be put in place.	Comments are noted.
122.	Richard Lyding	3/13/20	<p>I am not aware of the need for widening, in this area (Alamo). The local users and homeowners are likely not going to favor this type of expansion.</p> <p>Due to constraints with existing bridge crossings, running the SAVs across Treat and Ygnacio, as an alternative, would seem to defeat any intended time-saving and traffic flow benefit. Seems impractical.</p> <p>From a bicycling standpoint, by far the most difficult crossing on the entire Iron Horse trail is at the intersection of Broadway and Newell.</p>	Comments are noted.
123.	Joanne McAndrews	3/13/20	Separating cyclists and including speed lanes will be an improvement. I'm not sure about the autonomous vehicles- perhaps that is a step too far. Disappointed that you communicated with only a few hundred trail users. I am concerned about is if the improvements to the trail will increase the amount of crime in the area.	<p>The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.</p> <p>Several commenters indicated this public outreach approach fell short and recommended using platforms like "Nextdoor" and other social media platforms, which will be utilized in future planning and design phases.</p>

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

				Several studies indicate crime does not increase with “new” trails, and in some cases actually decreases. The study also suggests considering Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (“CPTED”) principles throughout the corridor.
124.	Kurt Johnson	3/13/20	<p>Concern regarding what I believe to be a particularly bad idea, turning the Iron Horse Trail into "an active transportation spine that supports the region’s mobility goals". I strongly believe this will destroy "a treasured recreational resource for users of all ages and abilities". The two goals are mutually exclusive.</p> <p>There is plenty of capacity on the trail already for people that want to commute. Commute hours are generally lower demand hours on the trail.</p> <p>If the intent is ultimately to have autonomous vehicles up and down the entire corridor including through residential areas, don’t do it.</p> <p>Having powered vehicles on the trail, expanding the trail infrastructure, reducing greenery, and lighting the trail at night will ruin the atmosphere of the trail, lower property values, disturb neighbors, and increase crime.</p> <p>I am also very concerned by the way this study is being performed with limited public knowledge or input and most importantly how this plan might be implemented without it going on the voters’ ballot to let voters decide what should be done. Therefore, I am asking you to discontinue your plans to make these changes to the Iron Horse trail we love and enjoy in its current form.</p>	<p>The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.</p> <p>Several commenters indicated this public outreach approach fell short and recommended using platforms like “Nextdoor” and other social media platforms, which will be utilized in future planning and design phases.</p> <p>This is a planning study, not a project or a funding measure.</p>
125.	Jeanine Smalley	3/13/20	I am opposed to changing the Iron Horse Trail.	Comments are noted.
126.	Jaime Drake	3/13/20	I live on the trail and am very opposed to changing the Iron Horse Trail. I support foot traffic, casual bike riding, and happy families on this trail. I do not support cars, electric scooters, etc.	<p>The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.</p> <p>Electric bikes are already permitted on the Iron Horse Trail. The study recommends implementing a scooter pilot program before any major policy changes are made (See page 105).</p>
127.	Ron Stansbury	3/13/20	<p>My wife and I strongly oppose the proposed change in use of the Iron Horse Trail. Regarding your survey, who conducted it? When? What was the sample? Where are the results posted? Why weren’t all the homeowners adjacent to the trail notified of this proposal?</p> <p>Your proposal of a fourteen-foot motorized use path and a six-foot pedestrian path is not realistic. How safe do you think this is?</p>	<p>The survey was conducted on-line and advertised through the local agencies and various community organizations. Several commenters indicated this public outreach approach fell short and recommended using platforms like “Nextdoor” and other social media platforms, which will be utilized in future planning and design phases.</p> <p>Parking is already a concern at some trail heads. This would need to be evaluated if specific projects are designed.</p>



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

			<p>Parking, there has to an expectation that usage of the trail will substantially increase to propose such an expensive endeavor. Where will these people park? Will our residential neighborhoods have increased vehicle traffic, noise, pollution?</p> <p>According to the proposal, these families with small children on bicycles will have to use the motorized path. How safe will this be with motorized vehicles traveling at 20MPH? Safety?</p> <p>What is to prevent the use of gas powered motorized vehicles? What is a “shared mobility device?” An autonomous vehicle, what is your definition?</p> <p>Do you think that someone “commuting” on the trail will be patient enough to stop at each intersection and follow the CVC rules before proceeding? There are bicycle lanes already in existence along our public roads. These provide an expedient lane of travel, they currently exist, and there is no additional cost to the taxpayer for their usage. How is your proposal better than this?</p> <p>Is there an existing environmental impact study? Are you planning on paving over the existing gas lines buried along the trail?</p> <p>Who is going to “police” the trail and enforce speed limits and proper conduct? Do all the police departments have sufficient staffing to monitor and enforce the rules and laws?</p> <p>How is the cost of implementing such proposed usage offset by motorized bikes, scooters, and skateboards? Who is paying for this?</p> <p>And those living along the trail who are adversely impacted should be granted a reduction in property taxes due to devaluation of their property. What will the lawsuits arising from the above cost the taxpayers?</p>	<p>The study recommends separation of trail users by speed in order to prevent potential conflicts.</p> <p>The East Bay Park District prohibits the use of motorized vehicles on the trail (except e-bikes). Definitions for “autonomous vehicle” and “shared mobility device” are provide in Section 3 of the study.</p> <p>The Iron Horses Trail is an existing Class I bicycle facility and is already heavily utilized by bicyclists.</p> <p>Planning studies are statutorily exempt under CEQA section 15262.</p> <p>The study recommends enforcement protocols be established with future implementation efforts.</p> <p>Section 5 of the study provides potential funding sources.</p> <p>Several studies show trail facilities actually increase property value.</p>
128.	Maddy Jaber	3/13/20	Please protect our beautiful Iron Horse Trail and oppose any mass transit changes.	Comments are noted.
129.	Richard Hunter	3/13/20	This is a bedroom community and having a "transportation corridor" run next to our property will lower the value of our property and make many of the homes almost impossible to sell. The lighted pathway will encourage late night travelers and infringe on our peace and quiet in the evening and long into the night. I strongly object to the "transportation corridor" proposal.	Comments are noted.
130.	Esther Hunter	3/13/20	I strongly object to the plans to strip us of our peaceful, safe, quiet, unlit trail and replace it with a "transportation corridor". If any changes are to be made, please look into improving the bike lanes and bus systems that are already in place.	Comments are noted.
131.	Bruce Gates	3/13/20	Do not change the trail.	Comments are noted.
132.	Jen Gates	3/13/20	We are in STRONG opposition of the proposed changes that would allow motorized scooters & bikes, and autonomous vehicles.	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study

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

				<p>focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.</p> <p>Electric bikes are already permitted on the Iron Horse Trail. The study recommends implementing a scooter pilot program before any major policy changes are made.</p>
133.	Christina Madrid	3/13/20	This will all change in a negative way if what is proposed passes. The community that lives on and uses the iron horse trail OPPOSES changing the trail.	Comments are noted.
134.	Philip Wallbridge	3/13/20	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Iron Horse Trail is completely unsuitable for Shared Autonomous Vehicles. I recommend that all references to SAVs be removed from the report.</li> <li>2. The map showing the current and proposed cycle routes in Concord on page 74 needs to be improved. It makes no distinction between existing trails, such as the Monument Corridor between Monument Boulevard and Clayton Road, and trails that are unlikely ever to be built, such as the Mokelumne Aqueduct trail south of Solano Way.</li> </ol>	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.
135.	Sharyl Anderson	3/13/20	I OPPOSE converting the iron horse trail into a mass transportation corridor. It will not be good for our community or safe for our children.	Comments are noted.
136.	Paul Crawford	3/13/20	Please do not make any access changes to the trail without holding a vote about it. Allowing traffic on that path sounds like a bad idea to me, thank you.	Comments are noted.
137.	Susan and Michael James	3/13/20	<p>We strongly object to the study and its recommendations. Even though you are suggesting a widened trail - we believe it will be taken over by the speeders and make it far less enjoyable again for the recreational bikers, runners, walkers, children, people walking dogs, etc.</p> <p>On top of that, having bright lights will be very disturbing to all who live on or very close to the trail. I believe this will put great pressure on home values</p> <p>I also am shocked that this has not been socialized a great deal more with the residents</p>	<p>The study recommends separation of trail users by speed in order to prevent potential conflicts.</p> <p>The study recommends further community input if lighting were to be implemented.</p> <p>Several commenters indicated this public outreach approach fell short and recommended using platforms like "Nextdoor" and other social media platforms, which will be utilized in future planning and design phases.</p>
138.	Robbie Holtzinger	3/13/20	I am vehemently opposed to making changes to the iron horse trail. Please do not change it.	Comments are noted.
139.	Andrea Vomund	3/13/20	I just found out about the possibility of adding electric bikes, scooters and small golf like vehicles on the iron horse trail that runs from concord to Dublin. I can't beg you enough to halt this and move on to something else. Please do NOT change the trail to include electric vehicles, etc. this would absolutely ruin the whole purpose this trail	<p>The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.</p> <p>Electric bikes are already permitted on the Iron Horse Trail. The study recommends implementing a scooter pilot program before any major policy changes are made.</p>
140.	Jen Juroff	3/13/20	Please No cars, no elect scooters, no motorcycle etc. usage of any type on the Iron Horse Trail. Continuing foot traffic, casual biking and horses is acceptable on this family friendly trail. Again, no changes to our Danville trail.	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study

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

				<p>focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.</p> <p>Electric bikes are already permitted on the Iron Horse Trail. The study recommends implementing a scooter pilot program before any major policy changes are made.</p>
141.	Sandi Grove	3/13/20	Please keep the iron horse trail as is!	Comments are noted.
142.	Joanne Eide	3/13/20	I oppose changing the iron horse trail. Leave it the way it is, so the community can continue to enjoy it.	Comments are noted.
143.	Lori Dennehy	3/13/20	Love the trail as it is! Please keep it open and safe for all the walkers and bikers as it is.	Comments are noted.
144.	Marina Kol	3/13/20	As it is with bikes it can be a safety hazard for walkers. Too many bikes can make it an obstacle course. Motorized bikes and vehicles would make it impossible for walkers and especially with pets. This is not a safe option at all!	<p>The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.</p> <p>Electric bikes are already permitted on the Iron Horse Trail. The study recommends implementing a scooter pilot program before any major policy changes are made.</p>
145.	Drew Iacone	3/13/20	Normal speed E-bikes are one thing. These other uses are bad for the users of the Iron Horse Trail. Bad for kid safety. Bad for home values along the trail.	<p>The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.</p> <p>Electric bikes are already permitted on the Iron Horse Trail. The study recommends implementing a scooter pilot program before any major policy changes are made.</p>
146.	Nichole and Jason Pera	3/13/20	(see form email above)	
147.	Lisa Wood	3/13/20	I'm writing to express my concern about using the iron horse trail as a thoroughfare for electric vehicles. I am strongly opposed to this idea.	<p>The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.</p> <p>Electric bikes are already permitted on the Iron Horse Trail. The study recommends implementing a scooter pilot program before any major policy changes are made.</p>
148.	(unknown)	3/13/20	I strongly disagree with the use change for this trail. Autonomous vehicles belong on the highway.	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study

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

				<p>focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.</p> <p>Electric bikes are already permitted on the Iron Horse Trail. The study recommends implementing a scooter pilot program before any major policy changes are made.</p>
149.	Kara Chizever	3/13/20	<p>The proposed changes to the trail are unacceptable for many reasons, not the least of which is the change to the character of the trail itself and the sense of community and enjoyment of nature it promotes. The benefits of adding shared autonomous vehicles and speed lanes are far outweighed by the cost to the trail's users.</p>	<p>The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.</p> <p>Proposed improvements are based on existing land use context and demand. In more rural areas, trail improvements are being proposed to improve safety and access to the trail while maintaining a rural and natural look and feel.</p>
150.	Liz Claytor	3/13/20	<p>Please do NOT open up the Iron Horse Trail to autonomous or motorized vehicles of any kind.</p>	<p>The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.</p> <p>Electric bikes are already permitted on the Iron Horse Trail. The study recommends implementing a scooter pilot program before any major policy changes are made.</p>
151.	Cami Bebart	3/13/20	<p>It's extremely upsetting to hear that our beautiful trail might be changed into a thorough fair for vehicles.</p>	<p>The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.</p>
152.	Robin Heuer	3/13/20	<p>We are opposed to the trail being repurposed for expansion and electric transportation. This should be a vote for all effected, especially the neighboring properties. I feel that you have failed to give us due process and our voices without taking away our property and decrease in community services.</p>	<p>The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.</p> <p>Electric bikes are already permitted on the Iron Horse Trail. The study recommends implementing a scooter pilot program before any major policy changes are made.</p>
153.	Teri Killgore	3/13/20	<p>this plan goes too far in several ways.</p> <p>First, lighting the trail fundamentally changes it's use and the neighborhoods quiet feel. We bought where we did because we appreciate the dark night sky and the quiet.</p>	<p>The study recommends further community input if lighting were to be implemented.</p> <p>The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study</p>

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

			<p>Second, any sort of automated vehicle or high speed biking should be prohibited from the Trail. These devices can operate on Danville Boulevard.</p> <p>Third, too much space is dedicated to fast moving scooters and bikes, and the space for walkers is greatly reduced. Mixing kids with fast moving bikers and vehicles is dangerous, and this plan does not do enough to separate them.</p> <p>Fourth, adding CCTA to a governing structure further diminishes the importance of property owners voices. They come with money, but it is at too high a cost.</p> <p>I encourage the Board to recommend the study be denied in it's current form and returned to the community for additional and tangible public outreach.</p>	<p>focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.</p> <p>Electric bikes are already permitted on the Iron Horse Trail. The study recommends implementing a scooter pilot program before any major policy changes are made.</p> <p>Assembly Bill 1025 contains a provision to add a CCTA representative to the Iron Horse Corridor Program Management Advisory Committee, which also consists of representatives of local agencies along the trail.</p>
154.	Bob & Mary Thompson	3/13/20	We feel that allowing motorized vehicles on the trail will ruin it for the current use and endanger current users.	<p>The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.</p> <p>Electric bikes are already permitted on the Iron Horse Trail. The study recommends implementing a scooter pilot program before any major policy changes are made.</p>
155.	Nathaniel Thompson	3/13/20	I am excited about many of the proposals in the study that are aimed at improving access and safety. These especially include intersection improvements, trail dividers to separate direction of travel and walkers/riders. However, I do not believe that the IHT is an appropriate place to accommodate autonomous vehicles.	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.
156.	Jennifer Lyons	3/13/20	to add vehicles of any kind would be not only less safe but would ruin the peaceful atmosphere there!	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.
157.	Kim & Rob Hensley	3/13/20	It is not okay to make it for bikers only. I do not understand how these changes are even possible without discussing it in a public forum that has been well advertised. OUTRAGEOUS!	This study does not recommend making the trail only available to bikers.
158.	Dayle Hall	3/13/20	I'm writing to register my support that the iron horse trail should be kept as is with pedestrians and bikes and not opened for multiple electric conveyances	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.

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

				Electric bikes are already permitted on the Iron Horse Trail. The study recommends implementing a scooter pilot program before any major policy changes are made.
159.	Niki Hall	3/13/20	I under there is a plan to put elective scooter and other vehicles in iron horse trail. This will be a big mistake. 1. It will change the safety of the trail, with little kids often learning to ride their bikes on it and it's being a family friendly path which many kids use to ride bikes to elementary school . 2. A lot of home's back onto the path, as such it wasn't meant to be a Public transportation thoroughfare and 3. We all love the trail for what it is today.	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.  Electric bikes are already permitted on the Iron Horse Trail. The study recommends implementing a scooter pilot program before any major policy changes are made.
160.	Theresa Vodopich	3/13/20	I object to the possible change regarding the trail. Please keep it the way it is for all to enjoy.	Comments are noted.
161.	Rachel Gonsalves	3/13/20	I want to express my opposition to conversion of the IHT into a transportation corridor.	Comments are noted.
162.	Patrice King	3/13/20	I wish to stress my extreme displeasure at the thought that you would even consider utilizing the Iron Horse Trail for anything other than what it is! How dare you try and disturb such a beautiful little piece of our community. Stop what you are doing! It is not wanted	Comments are noted.
163.	Nancy Daetz	3/13/20	Given the amount of people and homes the proposed changes and suggested superhighway would affect (425,000 people) <i>it is statistically flawed to base survey results on .001% of the effected population.</i>  Why ruin a public recreational trail when you can provide a superhighway for commuters down the parallel thoroughfare of North Main and South Main in Walnut Creek to Danville Boulevard and San Ramon Valley Boulevard where the speed limit is already 35 miles per hour?	The Iron Horse Trail is an existing Class I bicycle facility already heavily utilized by bicyclists, and is part of the transportation network which includes the aforementioned road facilities. The trail provides an option for bicyclists who do not want to contend with high-speed road traffic.
164.	Michelle Storm	3/13/20	A note to let you know that I oppose the possible use of iron horse trail for anything other than normal bikes, walkers, runners and anything else on feet.	Comments are noted.
165.	Carol Northing	3/13/20	I strongly oppose the usage of IHT to serve as a commuting option as it will negate the atmosphere of the park.  I choose not to use the IHT between Rudgear Rd and Prospect Avenue. This is because there are too many stops for cross-roads along the IHT corridor in this section. I encourage you to do a census and survey on utilization of the IHT vs Danville Boulevard for this section of the trail and gather input before making any decision to move forward with the creation of a dedicated bike lane. I think that you will find that most recreational cyclists and commuters prefer to use the bike lane on Danville Boulevard as it will be quicker and allow for greater speeds. I recommend against developing the IHT for commuter cyclists due to these reasons and recommend against creating a separate lane for cyclists.  I do not believe that the creation of 2 separate paved areas on the trail without a physical safety barrier will help with safety.	Dedicated lanes for people walking and people biking are proposed. This is a change from the existing condition of a shared use trail to a separated use trail.

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

			Overall, my input is that we should leave the trail as-is.	
166.	Mike Abel	3/13/20	<p>The proposition of widening this trail, lighting it and creating a place where the road bikers will be more encouraged to speed up and down, will diminish the special nature of the trail in my opinion.</p> <p>Lighting the path causes a lot of concern to our neighbors as well. It would encourage people to the path at night and that is sure to bring up crime rates in the area.</p> <p>I am very disappointed that more community feedback wasn't obtained prior to spending \$350K on this study. I know that you set up tents and had feedback sessions along the trail, but that was after the study had already been in the works. There is no way that this feedback could have been taken without a skewed bias</p> <p>our community strongly opposes to these "improvements" to the Iron Horse Trail.</p>	<p>The study recommends further community input if lighting were to be implemented.</p> <p>Several commenters indicated this public outreach approach fell short and recommended using platforms like "Nextdoor" and other social media platforms, which will be utilized in future planning and design phases.</p>
167.	Abid C. Mogannam	3/13/20	I would be strongly opposed to any use of the Iron Horse trail for transportation purposes. I would like it left the way it is.	Comments are noted.
168.	G. Blake Peterson	3/14/20	I'd like to express my strong interest in keeping Iron Horse Trail "motor free". For our safety, please do not allow motorized vehicles on our beloved trail.	<p>The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.</p> <p>Electric bikes are already permitted on the Iron Horse Trail. The study recommends implementing a scooter pilot program before any major policy changes are made.</p>
169.	David Fama	3/14/20	<p>Regardless of whether changes are made in my section or not, I feel any changes will greatly impact my home and changes elsewhere will eventually result in changes in Danville by a certain later proposal will be made to connect all segments of the trail for SAV use.</p> <p>I'm also concerned about crime and vandalism. Presently my home has a gate to the trail and I haven't experienced any problems- and want it to stay that way. Crime and homelessness is certainly on the rise and the changes noted in the study- particularly widening and lighting- result in a trail that would be more susceptible to those social ills. The County does not have the resources or inclination to have the sheriff's office patrol the trail and the current light need for patrols would create a greater need- which would be unmet.</p> <p>I also object to the lack of community outreach and impact- it seems there has been an effort to keep the study under the radar of citizens.</p> <p>I also object to the lack of community outreach and impact- it seems there has been an effort to keep the study under the radar of citizens...increase community outreach when the matter goes to</p>	<p>Several studies indicate crime does not increase with "new" trails, and in some cases actually decreases. The study also suggests considering Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design ("CPTED") principles throughout the corridor.</p> <p>Several commenters indicated this public outreach approach fell short and recommended using platforms like "Nextdoor" and other social media platforms, which will be utilized in future planning and design phases.</p>

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

			the Contra Costa Board of Supervisors so opposition can be known and efforts via a petition or lawsuit can be organized to stop the proposal from going forward.	
170.	Jen & J.C. Herrera	3/14/20	I am opposed to the proposed changes to the trail. There is already difficulty in sharing the space and we'd hate to see it changed from something recreational (which our community has too little of already) to something commercial. Also, the increased foot traffic near our neighborhoods by strangers is concerning.	The study's vision is to provide a transportation option while preserving the trail as a recreational resource. It would not preclude people from using the trail for exercise or recreation.
171.	Candice Newburn	3/14/20	I oppose the changes for the Iron Horse Trail. I oppose cars, electric scooters, motorcycles, or any changes to the current usage of the Iron Horse Trail. Please continue foot traffic, and casual biking.	The consideration of SAVs on the trail is in its very early stages, and any next steps would include robust community engagement and further study. Provided clarification on this on pages 38-39 and in the Next Steps section on page 105. While this study focuses on pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it includes an SAV section because the corridor is a former transit corridor.  Electric bikes are already permitted on the Iron Horse Trail. The study recommends implementing a scooter pilot program before any major policy changes are made.
172.	Coni Donnelly	3/14/20	Opposed to converting iron horse trail	Comments are noted.
173.	Darlene Baker	3/14/20	No trail amenities are needed. Adding restrooms, benches and shelters will increase the migrants and that will be followed by more crime.  The current trail needs maintenance. The portion between Rudgear and Newell is a major safety hazard. If it has been YEARS since this area has been properly maintained, why would we think a major, very expensive expansion would ever be properly maintained?  (Walnut Creek) would be one of the most recommended areas to increase trail traffic due to population density, yet it is also one of the most restricted given the apartments/streets/canal. Why create a major traffic corridor on either side of this bottle neck?  This will decrease property values due to additional noise and vandalism, along with less peace and beauty. There will be increases in vandalism, crime, theft, rape. It is proven that Bart lines bring in more crime to the Bart route. Adjacent property owners would need to be compensated for this illegal taking of their wealth due to decrease property values.	Comments are noted.
174.	Tiffany and Sean Price	3/14/20	We are opposed to any public transportation on the trail. Putting a mass transportation hub on the iron horse Trail not only reduces property value but creates noise pollution and brings in unwanted people in our neighborhoods. We strongly oppose this and will fight to the bitter end that this does not happen in our community.	Comments are noted.
175.	Eileen Perez	3/15/20	If the trail could be wider with a bike trail separate from a walking zone could make it safer. If we are paying for the bond and or if we are affected by the traffic & safety of our town we should have a say by voting!	The study recommends separating users by speed, which includes separating fast bicyclists and pedestrians.



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

176.	Kathleen Nelson	3/15/20	The Iron Horse Trail is meant for walks, saying hello to those in the community who enjoy this peaceful scrap of space. The IHT is a huge asset to our community and the proposed changes would be ruinous. I am very opposed to these changes.	Comments are noted.
177.	Sarbani Chakrabarti	3/24/20	I do support having a separate trail for bikes and scooters, but do not support the concept of a bike "superhighway", which will increase non-foot traffic considerably, also making it hazardous.	A bicycle superhighway would allow fast user groups to travel more efficiently. Pedestrian impacts would be minimized by creating a separated path for pedestrians.
178.	Art Cunningham	3/24/20	I work and live near the trail and fully support this alternative use. We feel it is generally underutilized and would be of greater benefit to pursue alternative uses to fully permit (especially) ebikes and the ilk.	No response. Supportive of the recommendations.