

**Draft Iron Horse Corridor Active Transportation Study
Public Comments Summary**

Commenter	Received	Comments	Response
Andrey Vityuk	1/22/20	The plan looks great. I especially love the plan to add lighting along the trail and improve the safety of intersections.	No response. Supportive of the recommendations.
Katelyn Walker	1/22/20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Particularly like the ideas in there regarding widening the trail and providing marked, separated use areas for different user types (fast bikers vs. walkers, etc.) Concerned about the mention of shared autonomous vehicles on the trail. consider including the potential for bike share docking stations along the trail, including electric bikes more detail on some of the intersection improvements called for in the plan (page 72-88). Some intersections have specific proposals (for example, Monument Blvd). But others give no details (particularly arterial intersections like Newell Ave and Danville Blvd, as well as the connection to Pleasant Hill BART). 	<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 107.</p> <p>Added a reference to electric bike share docking stations under the Mobility Hub description on page 59.</p> <p>While the County is leading this regional plan, the actual intersection treatments will be further studied by local jurisdictions. This document sets parameters for potential improvements but does not provide additional detail.</p>
Matt Dussing	1/22/20	The ambiguous section on shared autonomous vehicles using the trail stood out to me as a bad idea for several reasons.	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 107.
DOUGLAS MEDLIN	1/31/20 2/15/20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I commute on my bike daily along the Iron Horse Trail, between Montevideo and the Dublin-Pleasanton BART...trail maintenance along this entire stretch is very poor. disappointed at the lack of discussion of plans or coordination for the segment of the Iron Horse Corridor between Alcosta and the Dublin/Pleasanton BART supportive of the philosophy to widen the trail and implement different strategies for separating different types, speeds, and experiences of trail users would like to see the point made much stronger in the document. The standard should be that the landscaping draw primarily on Native California plants appropriate for our region and that there be a systematic and sustained effort to remove and eradicate non-native vegetation and invasive weeds. very negative about proposed expansion of the use of motorized vehicles on the IHT. As work proceeds on the planning and implementing the IHT improvements there should be further efforts also to increase connections to mass-transit. in places where the IHT parallels the back of commercial areas it would be helpful to work with property owners to formally provide connectivity across this private property IHT planning should work with the local cities to find ways to either incentivize or require commercial establishments within range of the IHT to provide increase bike locking facilities. love the idea of creating a "linear park" along segment 14...Shade trees should be planned not only for Segment 15, but also for Segment 14. I wasn't clear what was meant by "opportunities for green stormwater infrastructure" for Segment 15. Montevideo and Pine-valley: Speed bumps should be installed on Montevideo and Pine-valley ...priority should go to trail users (both pedestrians and cyclists). 	<p>Added clarification on page 72 that any improvements will require ongoing coordination with Alameda County.</p> <p>Discussion regarding the use of native plants is included on page 56 of the study.</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 107.</p> <p>Added language on page 73 to clarify that the County should work with adjacent property owners to provide access to the trail.</p> <p>Shade trees are considered to be part of the linear park recommended for Segment 14.</p> <p>Details on green stormwater infrastructure is included on page 46 of the study.</p>

Draft Iron Horse Corridor Active Transportation Study
Public Comments Summary

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Alcosta: I was disappointed that improvements to the Alcosta intersection are not included in this plan. In my view, this is currently a very awkward and dangerous intersection. (1) Auto drivers exiting the Walmart shopping center and turning right are often is oblivious to bikers crossing Alcosta going north. I have seen too many near collisions here. (2) On the North side of the Alcosta, the trail diverts briefly (for about 10 feet) onto a narrow segment of sidewalk creating a dangerous pinch-point and leading to many near collisions between pedestrians and cyclists. 	
Jay Burns	1/31/20	For years I have suggested that a yellow line be painted down the middle to separate pedestrians and bikers going in different directions.	No response. The Study recommends creating separate lanes for different user groups.
Christy Campbell	2/1/20	Putting in separate lanes for bikes and electric bikes make sense to me.	No response. The Study recommends creating separate lanes for different user groups.
Michael Steinbrecher	2/1/20	I support fewer road crossings, separated paths, and room to pass slower trail users. In particular, I support paths separated by user type, by speed, or by experience.	No response. The Study recommends creating separate lanes for different user groups.
Don and Trudi Copland	2/7/20	Alamo resident and I am concerned about...possible electric 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.
Denise Dauphinais	2/8/20	I oppose adding a lane or more 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.
Garrett & Lynn Dailey	2/9/20	residents of Alamo...project as proposed would drastically alter the character of the trail and our neighborhood...rural feel of our community and...give it a Big City feel. Please put us down as strongly opposed.	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.
Heidi & Dick Alef	2/10/20	live in Walnut Creek. This is a bad idea.	Proposed improvements will not preclude the use of the trail for exercise and recreation. The improvements are intended to create a safer trail that can accommodate current and future user demand and serve as both a recreation and transportation corridor.
Lou Plummer	2/10/20	residents of Alamo since 1949...1. Extend this deadline for public input, 2. create an actual viable, and realistic plan of information dissemination/discussion, 3. actually reach a representative sample of the thousands referred to above.	No response. The deadline for comments has been extended.
Kris Hunter	2/10/20	one thing this study misses, is the number of animals, especially deer and fox, beaver, etc. that use these corridors to move safely through busy urban areas to open space. It is equally important to keep an area for those owning horses on these larger properties to continue to have access on these trails to get to trails in open space.	Equestrians are considered to be an existing and future user group on the trail. They are described on pages 9, 34, and 35.
Nancy Quintel	2/11/20	resident in Alamo I am extremely concerned about...this project potentially reducing our property value. Those of us living in Alamo greatly value our privacy and want our town to remain small without improvements. 1. Why was this idea ever started? 2. The cost of this project, \$80 million, is outrageous. Money could be used for other needs in our county.	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

		<p>3. Our property taxes are already so high and this will only increase them.</p> <p>4. Residents want less visibility and privacy.</p> <p>5. Widening segment 8 from 10' to 22' is very concerning and will cause much more noise which will affect our peace and quiet. Unfair to current homeowners.</p> <p>6. Will this project be put to a vote? We should have a say in whether this project moves forward or not.</p> <p>7. The thought of autonomous vehicles driving behind our home is incredibly upsetting and should not be allowed under any circumstances.</p> <p>Widening the trail will be disruptive, noisy and change things.</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 107.</p>
Diane & Mark Stevenson	2/10/20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can you please advise why adding SAVs (and related cost/maintenance, etc.) is a solution to be considered over or in addition to other functioning public transportation like buses? • if the SAVs were implemented, what are the anticipated management, maintenance & security costs? 	<p>The original email was sent to Supervisor Andersen and her office responded to commenter directly.</p>
Lyle Hendricksen	2/12/20	<p>plan looks good. We need the corridor, and the improvements outlined very much. I am concerned about ongoing and daily maintenance.</p>	<p>Strategies for daily and ongoing maintenance are described in Chapter 5.</p>
Bob Podlech	2/12/20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • live in Walnut Creek...one place on the trail is particularly dangerous. This is at the south end of the Treat Blvd bridge and the connecting sidewalk along Jones Road (just before the trail leaves the side of Jones Road). I drive Jones Road daily and feel that this short stretch of sidewalk is in need of a barrier between the sidewalk and Jones Road. Persons descend the bridge too fast and are suddenly on a narrow crowded sidewalk area right on the street with heavy car traffic. There is a lot of foot and bike traffic in this stretch • other areas that catch my eye up this way are the North end of the Treat Blvd Bridge and the South end of the Ygnacio Blvd Bridge. Many of the same issue of crowding and excessive speed exist there as well. 	<p>While the Study does not address these issues specifically, the Study does discuss and recommends treatments for pinch points along the trail that could be considered at bridge landings.</p>
David Beals	2/12/20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I'd like to see a dividing line painted on the Iron Horse trail; I think it could be a good reminder to people to keep to one side; • trail is posted as being closed between 10 pm and 5 am, but I ask that access be unrestricted...These closure hours make no sense for using the bike trail as a regular commuting road, and they're not enforced • when the trail has to be temporarily closed for tree or utility work of some kind, please have the workmen post a detour route. • When I used a narrow-tired road bike, it was very jarring to cross all the roadways in the Alamo through Dublin area where the trail-road junction had a squared-off concrete lip that a bike has to bump over. I ask that the trail to road transition be smoothed. 	<p>This Study recommends creating separate lanes for different user groups.</p> <p>The decision to open the trail 24 hours a day is not up to the County, but rather it is up to the agencies responsible for maintaining the trail. Because this is a County-led plan, this recommendation is outside the scope of this Study.</p> <p>Added language on page 100 that recommends providing formal trail detours in the event of a trail closure.</p>
Tim Tinnes	2/14/20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • this project must be put on hold until there is thorough comment by the residents who, after all, are the principal "stakeholders"...40 year resident of Alamo 	<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.</p>