



Memorandum

2560 9th Street Suite 212
 Berkeley, CA 94710
 (510) 540-5008 phone
 (503) 540-5039 fax
 www.altaplanning.com

Date: March 19, 2010
To: Jim Moore, Planning Director, Town of Fairfax
From: Ian Moore, Alta Planning + Design
Re: Response to Comments, Cross Marin Bikeway Feasibility Study

This memorandum presents Alta’s responses to comments on the Public Review Draft of the Fairfax to San Rafael Cross Marin Bikeway Feasibility Study.

***Fairfax to San Rafael Cross Marin Bikeway Feasibility Study:
 Public Review Draft Comment Responses***

Comment	Source	Response
Quick		
Section 1.1, Page 1-1: Paragraph two, second sentence refers to “Marin North/South Bikeway at San Rafael Transit Center...” Bikeway should read “Greenway.”	Transportation Alternatives for Marin (East west study comments chart (24Nov09).pdf)	Change made.
Section 5, Page 5-1: Bikeway Design Standards - This is the best presentation of Bikeway Design Standards in any Marin County Study, document, report or plan that has been put forward to date. Compliments go to the consultants for doing such a fine job in putting that section together.	Transportation Alternatives for Marin (East west study comments chart (24Nov09).pdf)	Comment noted.
Page 3-21: On Title of section, please state the limits of the 2nd Street project corridor.	Leslie Blomquist, City of San Rafael Department of Public Works via email dated 11/23/09 (RE East-West Bikeway Public Review Draft	Change made.

Comment	Source	Response
<p>Page 3-21, Traffic Operations and Safety Section, Paragraph 2: Please clarify the first sentence. It is unclear if these counts are for vehicles traveling on Seconds Street or not.</p>	<p>Comments Extension) Leslie Blomquist, City of San Rafael Department of Public Works via email dated 11/23/09 (RE East-West Bikeway Public Review Draft Comments Extension)</p>	<p>Change made.</p>
<p>Page 3-23, Figures: In general, if an item varies in width, than a specific width should not be listed. A median cannot be both 4'2" wide and vary in width. Please revise all locations.</p>	<p>Leslie Blomquist, City of San Rafael Department of Public Works via email dated 11/23/09 (RE East-West Bikeway Public Review Draft Comments Extension)</p>	<p>Figures 3-19, 3-20, and 6-10 updated.</p>
<p>Page 5-7: Please state that this is not an approved facility type and is considered to be experimental.</p>	<p>Leslie Blomquist, City of San Rafael Department of Public Works via email dated 11/23/09 (RE East-West Bikeway Public Review Draft Comments Extension)</p>	<p>Change made.</p>
<p>Page 6-40, Figure 6-23: Remove the sharrows from the middle of the intersection of 2nd/G.</p>	<p>Leslie Blomquist, City of San Rafael Department of Public Works via email dated 11/23/09 (RE East-West Bikeway Public Review Draft Comments Extension)</p>	<p>Change made.</p>
<p>Page 6-46: These dimensions do not meet City of San Rafael minimum parking stall dimensions and needs to be modified.</p>	<p>Leslie Blomquist, City of San Rafael Department of Public Works via email dated 11/23/09 (RE East-West Bikeway Public Review Draft Comments Extension)</p>	<p>They are the dimensions of a compact parking space, as defined by Section 14.18.100 of the San Rafael Municipal Code.</p>
<p>Page 1-1: More commonly, short-term, medium-term, and long-term are used; short- and near-term can get very confusing; there is no confusion</p>	<p>Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)</p>	<p>Updated to use “short-term” and “medium-term.”</p>

Comment	Source	Response
with short-, medium-, and long-.		
Page 1-2: The correct spelling is Andersen, which is correct in the text; however, I can't search in the figures.	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	Figures 1-1, 3-1, and 6-31 updated.
Page 3-4: Missing the Class I bike path that goes southeast from this intersection to Broadway; you reference it on page 3-9.	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	Change made.
Page 3-9: Class I bike path is not shown on Figure 3-2.	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	Change made.
Page 3-16: Not sure where this [Bank Street (south)] is, since there is no Bank St. on the map. Maybe the map indication for Tunstead Ave. is what you have as Bank St. South?	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	Change made.
Page 3-19: Not noted in the text is that it is one way eastbound between SFD and Lincoln Park. Figure 3-12 has it.	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	Change made.
Page 3-21: Can't figure out how you can be talking about Second St. from Second St. to West End.	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	Change made.
Page 3-21: A lot of experienced cyclists do this [ride on the narrow sidewalk on the south side of Second Street] as well.	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	Change made.
Page 3-23: Already stated 2 paragraphs before. [For one block, from E to D Street, First Street is one-way westbound...]	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	Change made.
Page 4-3: Is a commuter bicyclist another name for utilitarian?	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	A commuter bicyclist is an example of a utilitarian bicyclist.
Page 4-5: Where to you get 70%? [It is also assumed that 70 percent of bicyclists in the corridor are trying to connect between cities.] Would guess that it would be a lot higher than that, especially along the SA to SR corridor	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	We used our best estimate of the number of bicyclists who ride locally versus between cities. We do not have exact information for the number of these bicyclists so we

Comment	Source	Response
where there are considerably fewer places to go than on the Fairfax to SA corridor.		estimated conservatively based on trip purpose and length of trip survey results in Marin County. We compared this information with similar data gathered from other locations nationwide, arriving at 70-percent of trips occurring between cities.
Page 6-1: Is Wayfinding a standard term? I've never heard of it. Definition or another term may be in order.	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	Wayfinding is a standard term and refers to improvements that assist bicyclists with orientation and navigation.
Page 6-13: Please show where School St. & Bank St. are on this drawing; they are referenced in the text.	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	Unfortunately, this would require exporting a new aerial and trying to match them up. The neighboring streets are labeled and it is not ambiguous.
Page 6-22: I count 3[raised intersections]; where do you get 14?	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	Change made. Raised intersections are along Lansdale Avenue/San Anselmo Avenue, not just Lansdale Avenue.
Page 6-27: This is Bridge Ave. [not Street] as you correctly said in the 4th next bullet.	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	Change made.
Page 6-30: [As referenced above...] Where is above?	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	Change made.
Page 6-30: Possibly changing the wording here to include a partnership with the Flood Control projects to get solutions that would benefit both cyclists & flood control; this sounds like a cyclist solution could be detrimental to the flood control, which might not be the case.	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	Change made.
Page 6-33: Would be nice to have an arrow showing back in parking and a bicycle boulevard.	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	Comment noted.
Page 6-33: Suggest that you have the section lines on figure 6-17 to show where this is.	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final	Comment noted.

Comment	Source	Response
	Draft DM.pdf)	
Page 6-38: Based on other places in San Rafael where we have tried to get rid of parking for bike lanes, this is an almost impossible task. Many of these residences won't have anything close to adequate parking if this is removed. If you want to state this, might want to put in a qualifier such as "possible".	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	Based on TAC dialog, we agree that this is the appropriate recommendation.
Page 6-40: Suggest referencing these sections with A, B, & C in figures 6-23-26	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	Change made.
Page 3-10: In the Existing Bicycle Facilities section, the first sentence says, "Class II bicycle lanes are striped on Broadway between Bank Street and Pacheco Avenue". There are no bicycle lanes in this area; this sentence needs to be changed/deleted.	Marin County Bicycle Coalition (EW-Comments-Final.pdf)	Incorrect reference removed. There are no Class II bicycle lanes on this street segment.
Page 3-11: Under the heading, Pedestrian and Transit Access the first sentence says, "There is no bus service on Broadway Boulevard." This is not correct. Westbound buses use Broadway for the downtown Fairfax bus stop located across from the intersection of Bolinas Road and Broadway Boulevard.	Marin County Bicycle Coalition (EW-Comments-Final.pdf)	Change made.
Page 4-1: Photo caption should read "Center Boulevard" not "Center Street".	Marin County Bicycle Coalition (EW-Comments-Final.pdf)	Change made.
Page 6-8: Table 6-4 notes the use of 50 sharrows along a 0.93 mile section of road. Is this the proper number of sharrows for less than a mile of roadway?	Marin County Bicycle Coalition (EW-Comments-Final.pdf)	We have revised the standard to a 500 foot interval. This results in approximately 26 sharrows for this corridor segment, including both travel directions.
Page 6-22: Table 6-9 indicates 14 raised intersections along Lansdale Avenue. We are aware of a total of 5 intersections on Lansdale Avenue (Pastori Avenue, Alder Court, Baywood Court, Hooper Lane and Forrest Avenue/San Anselmo Avenue); where are the remaining 9 intersections? A list of intersections or	Marin County Bicycle Coalition (EW-Comments-Final.pdf)	Change made. Raised intersections are along Lansdale Avenue/San Anselmo Avenue, not just Lansdale Avenue.

Comment	Source	Response
<p>a graphic that shows intersections along Lansdale would help clarify this number in Table 6-9.</p>		
<p>Page 6-30: We believe that this section of the document should make specific note of the Flood Control Tax for the Ross Valley. Below (in bold italics) is recommended language that follows the report language at the bottom of page 6-30. “These precedents offer clear guidance to Marin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District and each of the towns and cities along the East-West Bikeway. For example, all floodway management planning for Flood Control Zone 9 (Ross Valley – Corte Madera Creek) as carried out by County staff and the Zone 9 Advisory Board should consider potential bikeway projects along the creek channel and through Downtown San Anselmo.” Such potential bikeway projects should be part of discussions of the use of any Flood Control Tax funds that come to Ross Valley.</p>	<p>Marin County Bicycle Coalition (EW-Comments-Final.pdf)</p>	<p>Change made.</p>
<p>Page 6-41: The captions for Figures 6-25 and 6-26 are unclear. Figure 6-25 indicates that the graphic represents an area “East of Ida Street Intersection”; the caption for Figure 6-26 indicates, “West of G Street Intersection”. These are the same block. Please can you clarify how this is possible? Are they two options for the same block or are they different parts of the same block? If these captions refer to the “section” lines on Figure 6-23, please label the “section” lines and make reference in the captions to which of the section lines are associated with their respective figures.</p>	<p>Marin County Bicycle Coalition (EW-Comments-Final.pdf)</p>	<p>Change made.</p>
<p>Page 6-42: First bullet point beginning with “Miramar Avenue...” lists First</p>	<p>Marin County Bicycle Coalition (EW-</p>	<p>Change made.</p>

Comment	Source	Response
Street as “Fist” Street.	Comments-Final.pdf)	
Page 6-44: Paragraph above Table 6-18 has the word “coupled” and “couplet”. It is not clear what is being stated here. A couplet is commonly a musical term and it is not clear what “one-way coupled” means. Please can you re-word and explain the options more clearly here.	Marin County Bicycle Coalition (EW-Comments-Final.pdf)	Changed to “couplet.”
Page 6-47: In the Project Need Summary” paragraph, First Street is incorrectly noted as “1st Street”.	Marin County Bicycle Coalition (EW-Comments-Final.pdf)	Change made.
Page 7-5: Lists potential funding sources; many have hyperlinks to online documents – some are “clickable” in the PDF document, while others are not. We recommend consistence of link format between Pages 7-7 and 7-11 (it is no longer necessary to type/include “http://” – today’s browsers add that automatically. For consistency you can add the http:// to or remove it from all of the links.	Marin County Bicycle Coalition (EW-Comments-Final.pdf)	Change made.
Page A-9: Photographs are distorted.	Marin County Bicycle Coalition (EW-Comments-Final.pdf)	Comment noted.
6) It’s good to hear of the retention of the three travel lanes on Broadway.	John Reed (JR's comments and changes to final draft jr.doc)	Comment noted.
10) fig 6-19 has no bikes shown in illustration (on sharrows) as there are in similar ones... no big deal but you might want to for consistency.	John Reed (JR's comments and changes to final draft jr.doc)	Change made.
Note: Section lines in Plan drawings such as fig 6-23 should be numbered or lettered, so that Section drawings such as fig 6-25 can refer to the appropriate section line.	John Reed (JR's comments and changes to final draft jr.doc)	Change made.
The group would like you to call the study the “Fairfax to San Rafael Cross Marin Bikeway.” And they would like to refer to the “short and near” term projects as the “short and medium”	Bicycle TAC Meeting 12/4/09 via letter from Jim Moore dated 12/9/09	Study title changed to “Fairfax to San Rafael Cross Marin Bikeway Feasibility Study.” References to the study title throughout the report also updated. Document text updated to

Comment	Source	Response
term projects – and have definitions of both in the text.		use “short-term” and “medium-term.” Definitions of the terms are presented in a text box on page 1-1.
<p>Project 8:</p> <p>1. On the Landsdale Avenue/San Anselmo Avenue short term project, a total of 14 intersection speed tables are called out, however, it is not clear where they are proposed. Please add a table listing the proposed location of each speed table.</p>	San Anselmo Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force via Steve Myrter email dated 11/16/09	Change made. Raised intersections are along Lansdale Avenue/San Anselmo Avenue, not just Lansdale Avenue.
<p>Project 9:</p> <p>2. The short term project at the hub calls for creating a path through the Hub by removing existing dedicated turning lanes on both Center and Greenfield (fig 6-16). It is understood that is only conceptual but there should be a foot note at least stating that before any modification to traffic lanes through the hub could be considered a comprehensive traffic study would have to be performed of the hub to ensure that the level of service in not adversely impacted.</p>	San Anselmo Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force via Steve Myrter email dated 11/16/09	Change made.
Vision		
<p>Section 1.1, Page 1-1: First paragraph, last sentence states: “... this feasibility study focuses on closing gaps in those facilities, improving existing facilities, and improving north-south connections to the East-West corridor.” This statement is accurate. And, the Feasibility Study sets forth a safe and separate East-West bikeway through this corridor that connects Fairfax, San Anselmo and San Rafael.</p>	Transportation Alternatives for Marin (East west study comments chart (24Nov09).pdf)	Change made.
<p>Section 1.1, Page 1-1: In the process, Alta turned up historic plans for the East-West bicycle corridor. This bicycle corridor has been planned for a long time. Alta has documentation on the Cross Marin Trail, of which this corridor is a part. Further, the 1974 County Bike Plan describes a cycling corridor through this area. We need to incorporate examples of the</p>	Transportation Alternatives for Marin (East west study comments chart (24Nov09).pdf)	Change made.

Comment	Source	Response
<p>original vision to illustrate the community’s long term intent for these bicycle facilities, and that such intent is a part of the purpose.</p>		
<p>Section 1.3, Page 1-3: Second paragraph: “The overarching vision of this project is to provide safer access for bicyclists with a range of skill levels in the East-West corridor between Fairfax, San Anselmo, and San Rafael (the Ross Valley Corridor).” The vision should be modified to read: “... safe and separate bicycle accommodation in the East-West corridor where feasible. Accommodation should be equivalent to the North-South Greenway.”</p> <p>This is a primary route for transportation and recreation. Accommodation of cyclists needs to provide maximum safety. Separate facilities would accomplish that.</p> <p>The word “safety” appears numerous times throughout the Feasibility Study. Please see our further comments in Section 4 (User Needs Analysis).</p> <p>In 2007, Professor John Pucher from Rutgers University published a comprehensive analysis of cyclist preferences, what encourages them to ride more and the most effective bicycle transportation systems. We have submitted a copy of “World Transport Policy & Practice” with these comments and, in particular, direct you to page 51 of Professor Pucher’s article.</p> <p>Cyclists want extensive systems of separate cycling facilities, well maintained, fully integrated paths and lanes, connected off-street shorts such as mid-block connections and continued passage through dead-ends for cars. A list of cyclist priorities should be included in Section 4 and the goals and objectives of the Feasibility Study should reflect the reality that cyclists want safe and</p>	<p>Transportation Alternatives for Marin (East west study comments chart (24Nov09).pdf)</p>	<p>Vision updated to read:</p> <p>“... safe and separate bicycle accommodation in the east-west corridor where feasible. Accommodation should be equivalent to the North-South Greenway.</p> <p>Objective 5.3 added to Goal 5, which reads:</p> <p>Objective 5.3: Pursue opportunities to develop safe and separate facilities specifically where existing adopted standards do not provide for a design solution consistent with the overall project vision.</p>

Comment	Source	Response
separate accommodation. [The above suggestion to have safe and separate accommodation “where feasible” allows the different city agencies the ability to handle their sections with flexibility].		
Section 6, Page 6-1: Proposed Improvements: First sentence, first paragraph. Should be modified to include the vision: “Safe and separate bicycle accommodation where feasible. Accommodation should be equivalent to the North-South Greenway.”	Transportation Alternatives for Marin (East west study comments chart (24Nov09).pdf)	Change made.
Most importantly, the Feasibility Study fails to show a continuous separated facility through the Fairfax, San Anselmo, San Rafael corridor. This flaw must be resolved to advance the Feasibility Study. TAM has provided several alternatives for the sections currently lacking separated bicycle facilities, which would make the East West Bikeway virtually continuous.	Transportation Alternatives for Marin (J Moore re EastWest Feasibility Study(25Nov09) V8 0.pdf)	The substantial revisions to the study required to advance additional separated path segments are not possible under the current study due to timeline and budget considerations. Additional concepts can be advanced as the project continues.
<p>Proposed background recommendation:</p> <p>This is a background piece for the Fairfax to San Rafael sections of the Cross Main Trail being planned as part of the Non-Motorized Transportation Pilot Program (“NMTTP”).</p> <p>The NMTTP is a federal program designed to promote non-motorized transportation and to demonstrate the extent to which bicycling and walking can carry a significant part of the transportation load, and represent a major portion of the transportation solution.</p> <p>The County’s and numerous City’s Pedestrian and Bicycle plans refer to three primary pedestrian and bicycle networks in Marin County:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The North-South Bikeway (this is the passage on the west side of 101 from Novato to the top of Puerto Suello Hill for bicycles. This is the 	MCBC and TAM letter dated 2/12/09	Background section added to section 2.1.

Comment	Source	Response
<p>primary North-South route in the County) from Novato to Puerto Suello Hill.</p> <p>2. The North-South Greenway (this runs from Novato to Sausalito primarily along the North Western Pacific railroad right-of-way from Sausalito to Larkspur Landing there is only the Greenway, no current rail service. From Larkspur Landing to the northern Novato/County border the Greenway runs parallel to the SMART railroad tracks.)</p> <p>3. The Cross Marin Trail (from San Rafael to Fairfax through San Anselmo and then to West Marin, primarily along the railroad right-of-way). There are two primary segments of railroad right-of-way in the Cross Marin trail region:</p> <p>a. One is on the northern leg of the railroad right-of-way, which runs primarily from the San Anselmo Miracle Mile on Fourth Street to the North-South Greenway in Central San Rafael; and</p> <p>b. The southern leg starts at the Hub in San Anselmo along Sir Francis Drake parallel to SFD along the old railroad right-of-way across College of Marin, Larkspur, and then connecting to the North-South Greenway at Larkspur, at the Baltimore Park Train Station.</p> <p>The purpose of this plan is to identify short term and long term design and infrastructure improvements for non-motorized transportation (cycling and walking) for the Cross Marin Trail from Fairfax to San Rafael through San Anselmo which will provide continuous and safe routes for non-motorized travelers. Ideally, most sections of the Cross Marin Trail would provide pedestrians and cyclists separate accommodations from automobiles. A continuous and safe integrated Cross Marin Trail is the top</p>		

Comment	Source	Response
priority in building the Cross Marin Trail to completion.		
Local Government Adoption		
TAM concurs with the MCBC that the Town of Fairfax should include a staff report in the Feasibility Study that describes a process and timeline for accomplishing this and then to secure a Resolution of Support from each of the Cities by a date certain, which can be included in a final copy of the Feasibility Study.	Transportation Alternatives for Marin (J Moore re EastWest Feasibility Study(25Nov09) V8 0.pdf)	Updated to recommend plan review by local elected officials in Section 7.1.
<p>Finally, we strongly recommend an important process point, which should be included in the document:</p> <p>It is critically important for each of the three jurisdictions included within this study (San Rafael, San Anselmo and Fairfax) to “accept” this report. We urge the Town of Fairfax to include in this study document a staff report that describes a process and timeline for accomplishing this, and then to secure resolutions of support from each agency by February 28, 2010, which can be included in a final bound (and electronic) copy of this report.</p>	Marin County Bicycle Coalition (EW-Comments-Final.pdf)	Comment addressed above.
Cost Estimate		
Page 6-42. The cost for the barrier separated bike lane is extremely low. Does this consider the civil work that will be needed to install the barrier? Will any work need to be done toward the creek?	Leslie Blomquist, City of San Rafael Department of Public Works via email dated 11/23/09 (RE East-West Bikeway Public Review Draft Comments Extension)	Updated to include 1’ wide curb and metal barrier.
Page 6-4: The SR BPAC's reaction to the cost estimates for the projects was that they were unbelievably low. An architect said that the unit costs are not correct. I can't believe that we can get many of these projects done at what you have estimated. Something is wrong somewhere, either in the unit costs, the units, or missing things that need to be done for the projects.	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	Several of the planning level cost estimates were low due to inadequate consideration of potential utility relocations and modifications. Additionally, several structural elements had low unit costs and contingencies that are updated in this version. Unit costs and contingency amounts are increased in this final study in response to comments

Comment	Source	Response
		regarding low cost estimates.
Page 6-38: If you can get someone to bid this wall @ \$45K, let's get him started. This is the most blatant examples of under estimated costs for projects in this report.	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	Updated to include 2,250 square feet of retaining wall, from 450 square feet.
<p>12) East bound class 3 lane is very narrow – especially at the section indicated at Ida, in fig 6-23. Where to acquire the needed Right-of-way from is the problem. As others have indicated, the cost estimates for gaining it from a retaining wall to the south are very low (as are other cost estimates, SR DPW has indicated that estimation help from them is available)</p> <p>The only place for gaining ROW short of carving off the hill (and putting in a retaining wall – note: there is also a pedestrian ROW leading down this hill which would need to be accommodated) appears to be from the frontage street between G and Ida, in conjunction with the triangle of land to the west of Ida, also fronting the north side of second. This area largely services the parking needs of the adjacent restaurant, “Arrivederci’s”, located in the old train station. The entrance to the restaurant parking lot may be able to be moved so as to allow no loss of parking.</p>	John Reed (JR's comments and changes to final draft jr.doc)	Comment addressed above.
Medium (Design)		
Section 6.15, Page 6-37: Project 12: Second Street (Second Street / Fourth Street Intersection to Miramar Avenue) - General comment that the consultants did a fine job to show how a safe and separate accommodation can be provided. TAM recommends that this section illustrate the thinking that could facilitate the connection in Sections 10 and 11. Please see the attached proposed modified cross section for Section 12. TAM recommends that the sidewalk /	Transportation Alternatives for Marin (East west study comments chart (24Nov09).pdf)	Updated to address narrowing of vehicle travel lanes and lane removal.

Comment	Source	Response
<p>multi-use path be increased to 17'. The modified cross section illustrates how this could be easily accommodated. This is for the section Second Street / Fourth Street Intersection to Miramar Avenue. We have also provided a cross section relevant to page 6-39 that also provides a 17 foot sidewalk / multi use path from Second Street / Fourth Street Intersection to Miramar Avenue.</p>		
<p>Section 6.15, Page 6-41: Please see our attachments that respectively show a 16' and 14' separated facility for pedestrians and cyclist for Project 12 east of Ida Street intersection and West of G Street Intersection.</p>	<p>Transportation Alternatives for Marin (East west study comments chart (24Nov09).pdf)</p>	<p>Updated to address narrowing of vehicle travel lanes and lane removal.</p>
<p>Page 6-38: The City of San Rafael does not install ladder crosswalks at signalized intersections. Footnote 1 refers to Municipal Code 5.36.101. This section does not exist in the San Rafael Municipal Code. Please do not include a ladder crosswalk at this location. Please reanalyze the cost analysis of this option. Total cost seems extremely low.</p>	<p>Leslie Blomquist, City of San Rafael Department of Public Works via email dated 11/23/09 (RE East-West Bikeway Public Review Draft Comments Extension)</p>	<p>Reference to Municipal Code 5.36.101 removed.</p>
<p>From San Rafael BPAC meeting held on 10/28/09: Increase all sidewalks to a 4 foot wide minimum. Several locations show in existing and proposed, sidewalks with less than 4 feet.</p>	<p>Leslie Blomquist, City of San Rafael Department of Public Works via email dated 11/23/09 (RE East-West Bikeway Public Review Draft Comments Extension)</p>	<p>Figures 6-7 and 6-8 updated to increase sidewalk width to 4' and decrease planting strip width. Given this reconfiguration, the design must address how to conserve existing street trees given the limited right-of-way and slope on the south side of Sir Francis Drake Boulevard.</p>
<p>Page 6-22: Add remove stop signs as a short-term project.</p>	<p>Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)</p>	<p>The stop signs along Lansdale Avenue were installed as a neighborhood request and did not originally meet warranting standards. Removal of the stop signs will require neighborhood outreach by the City of Fairfax, analysis by the City traffic engineer, and consideration of design alternatives, such as raised intersections, as recommended in this feasibility study.</p>

Comment	Source	Response
Page 6-45: Looks like this parking should be angled; there is an exit behind Safeway along Andersen Dr.	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	The existing parking configuration is 90 degree and is preserved in the proposed design.
5) Merwin / Broadway intersection speed table needs access ramp for cyclists Broadway WB. Currently this downhill section works for bike movement, but I worry that having and abrupt surface level change at the bottom of this short steep section would cause bicycle accidents. If a small “bike lane” sized and located section of the speed table had a long transition to it (an access ramp if you will), this condition would be avoided.	John Reed (JR's comments and changes to final draft jr.doc)	Change made.
Figure 6-9: the additional ADA ramp shown is located badly (eastern ramp on south side of parkade) – as it eliminates 6 or 7 car parking spaces. If this ramp has to be there, use lost parking area for bike parking instead? This would be OK	John Reed (JR's comments and changes to final draft jr.doc)	The Parkade design was modified by Town of Fairfax and W-Trans and the updated design is incorporated in this study.
8) Is it possible to have raised intersections <u>instead</u> of stops on Lansdale Ave? These stops were put in as a result of neighborhood requests for traffic calming and not as warranted controls, I believe.	John Reed (JR's comments and changes to final draft jr.doc)	The stop signs along Lansdale Avenue were installed as a neighborhood request and did not originally meet warranting standards. Removal of the stop signs will require neighborhood outreach by the City of Fairfax, analysis by the City traffic engineer, and consideration of design alternatives, such as raised intersections, as recommended in this feasibility study.
Future Opportunities: Page 6-30 Add wording to Colorado examples, to indicate possible implementation of this approach utilizing creek under-crossing of SF Drake south of Bank street. Access would be via the small street (unnamed in map) to east of and parallel to SFD, south from bank street, to the bank of creek. Descend bank of creek, cross under Drake,	John Reed (JR's comments and changes to final draft jr.doc)	Further analysis of this topic is beyond the scope of this project and not provided for in the available budget.

Comment	Source	Response
climb bank of creek ending up in parking lot running along creek to west. This would connect to routes described above near bus station, without any need to cross through the hub intersection.		
Fig 6-23 Skip-dashed lanes through the G street / 2 nd street intersection would be excellent in raising awareness of connectivity in this important intersection. Currently there are sharrows indicated, which SR DPW has indicated it will not allow.	John Reed (JR's comments and changes to final draft jr.doc)	Sharrows removed from Project 12. Figure 6-23 updated. The request for skip-dash lanes is unclear given the intersection configuration.
Project 8: 3. Regarding the intersection speed tables...I believe there are two intersections that have stop signs as well. Is the intent to remove the stop signs and replace them with speed tables instead?	San Anselmo Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force via Steve Myrter email dated 11/16/09	Comment addressed above.
Project 9: 1. Is the draft suggesting that the west bound Bank Street crossing at SFD to be made two way per figure 6-15? There needs to be more clarity accessing down town areas . From fig 6-16 it is not clear what approaches to the hub from Bridge Street or San Anselmo Ave are intended.	San Anselmo Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force via Steve Myrter email dated 11/16/09	Updated Figure 6-16 to show short- and medium-term eastbound bicycle route through The Hub.
Medium (Non-Design)		
Section 4, Page 4-1 and 4-2: Recommend that Tables 4-1 and 4-2 be modified to incorporate Professor Pucher's information. If not, we request the consultants provide us with their reference documentation for the assertions made in a peer reviewed article on the facilities needed and preferred by experienced cyclists and people who will ride bicycles as desired by the Non-motorized Pilot Program. The Pucher article is a definitive resource for such needs and preferences.	Transportation Alternatives for Marin (East west study comments chart (24Nov09).pdf)	Section 4 updated to include information from Pucher's study.
Rail History. In preparation for the public meetings, Alta developed a	Transportation Alternatives for Marin	Discussion of the rail history in the project study is incorporated in

Comment	Source	Response
<p>historic background on the use of the corridor, in particular in relation to its rail history. Most all of the current transportation elements of the Fairfax, San Anselmo, San Rafael corridor were shaped by the rail history and natural topography. Since Alta has already done the work and has the information, TAM recommends including a couple more paragraphs of detail in the alignment (perhaps a map) in Section 3.1, Introduction, of the rail history. This is a relevant place to include such information, particularly given that the research has been done. Including such information in the Feasibility Study helps memorialize this important history and natural history.</p>	<p>(J Moore re EastWest Feasibility Study(25Nov09) V8 0.pdf)</p>	<p>Chapter 1 and 3.</p>
<p>Historic Plans. The Feasibility Study should include reference to the 1974 County Bicycle Plan and the 2001 County Master Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan (I am mailing a copy of the 1974 Plan to Jim and to Ian). Both historic Plans include references to the East-West corridor. As well, during the process Alta came up with a good history on the Cross Marin Trail, of which this corridor is a part. This Cross Marin Trail history should be recorded in the Feasibility Study. Alta already has the information, the Cross Marin Trail history needs to be memorialized.</p>	<p>Transportation Alternatives for Marin (J Moore re EastWest Feasibility Study(25Nov09) V8 0.pdf)</p>	<p>Comment addressed above.</p>
<p>9) fig 6-16 currently indicates nothing south of the area around the transit station. San Anselmo DPW has indicated that he has a problem with eliminating the two right turn escapes from the hub, please be sure to check with him about the final wording, etc to be sure it passes his muster before finalization. The path to south of this area, connecting to the Bank street crossing, as well as the possible connections to the creek under-crossing (see below in “future opportunities”), should be indicated as</p>	<p>John Reed (JR's comments and changes to final draft jr.doc)</p>	<p>Comment addressed above.</p>

Comment	Source	Response
well.		
<p>At the west end of the transit station, there are grade change problems leading to and at the bridge. An alternative indicated on the map makes sense, though it does pass over a private sidewalk, passing between two private buildings located over the creek. An additional problem that should be noted is that these buildings are major source of flooding. Perhaps the best way to handle this is to note the problem, and recommend that in the longer term the bike connectivity problems be addressed at the same time as the flooding ones. Perhaps with a dedicated bicycle bridge or right-of way over the creek to be constructed at the same time as the buildings' constrictions of water flow being addressed?</p>	<p>John Reed (JR's comments and changes to final draft jr.doc)</p>	<p>Comment addressed above.</p>
<p>Also, a reference to possible class 1 south of and parallel to Red Hill Ave, as a longer-term project in conjunction with reconfiguration of Red Hill would be good. This would be important in the future as support for a continuous class 1 along this corridor, which all are agreed, should be the long term goal.</p>	<p>John Reed (JR's comments and changes to final draft jr.doc)</p>	<p>The alternatives discussed in this comment should be advanced in further studies specifically focused on the operations of Red Hill Avenue. The range of alternatives evaluated and advanced in this current study preclude the Town of Fairfax and consultants from further analysis of Red Hill Avenue.</p>
<p>15) Connectivity with North South Greenway (as well as intersection work indicated) should be co-coordinated, Patrick Seidler gave an update in our meeting as to the path of the greenway intersecting at the north end of Mahon.</p>	<p>John Reed (JR's comments and changes to final draft jr.doc)</p>	<p>Updated to stress the importance of this connection.</p>
<p>Connectivity Notes: 1. Butterfield Road Connector: San Anselmo Ave is called out as class III, and there is documentation of SF Drake being bad, especially at the intersection of Butterfield. Please include a note that San Anselmo Ave connects through across Drake to Morningside, then on to Butterfield, avoiding the dangerous SF Drake /</p>	<p>John Reed (JR's comments and changes to final draft jr.doc)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This alternative has not been analyzed from a traffic engineering perspective and provides a good opportunity for future study. 2. Based on input from Steve Myrter and David Parisi, the traffic engineering consultant, this alternative is not feasible. 3. G Street is addressed in Project 12

Comment	Source	Response
<p>Butterfield intersection. Crossing SF Drake is the only impediment to this route, and could be achieved by a user-signalized crosswalk across Drake.</p> <p>2. Red Hill Shopping Center Connector: At Sais, signalization is noted as not warranted. Given neighborhood and connectivity use, a user-signalized crosswalk at Sais could function well to allow connectivity for pedestrians and bicyclists, especially with a center refuge island. Please include this language.</p> <p>3. Hilldale Ave Connector: The Sun Valley Neighborhood is listed as an additional neighborhood being served by this intersection as it does have a route leading to this area. It may be worth noting additionally that the Sun Valley neighborhood also connects east via 5th street and G street to the East-West Bikeway, for those traveling in the eastern direction. That particular direction is extremely well used by schoolchildren as well as commuters. Perhaps this connectivity issue should be treated separately under a heading entitled “G street Connector”, as connectivity there is being addressed in section 12, and you can point to that fact.</p>		<p>as noted.</p>
<p>Since this [contraflow bike lanes] is experimental, I would prefer not to include it in the plan, and at a later time, if the City determines they would like to pursue this option then these guidelines can be used. However, it does not seem appropriate to include this item in a report such as the one we are doing, especially if this is to go to City Council for adoption/approval. I think it could pose some severe concerns and may delay adoption of this plan and ultimately the San Rafael bike plan as well.</p>	<p>Leslie Blomquist via email dated 10/21/09 (RE contraflow bicycle lanes Santa Cruz and Berkeley)</p>	<p>Comment noted. All other project stakeholders wish for this facility to be included.</p>
<p>Project 8:</p>	<p>San Anselmo Bicycle</p>	<p>Updated Chapter 5 to include</p>

Comment	Source	Response
<p>2. These speed tables appear to be a very expensive traffic calming measure...are there alternatives? Why was this measure chosen? The concern is to install these at great expense and then remove them to install the storm term project say 5 years later.</p>	<p>and Pedestrian Task Force via Steve Myrter email dated 11/16/09</p>	<p>additional explanation of raised intersections and their alternative.</p>
<p>Project 9: 3. "Back-in" parking is proposed on Center Street as part of this concept. Since this is a very new concept to this county please include a paragraph and pictures of where it has been used successfully (preferably in California). The paragraph needs to discuss the benefits and some of the concerns that would need to be mitigated should such back-in parking be implemented.</p>	<p>San Anselmo Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force via Steve Myrter email dated 11/16/09</p>	<p>Updated Chapter 5 to include additional information on back-in-angle parking.</p>
<p>Project 10: 1. Again, fig 6-17 shows back-in parking proposed along the north side of Greenfield. As noted above (Project 9-comment 3) please include a paragraph discussing the benefits / concerns to implementing such a new concept (at least to this county). The Town intends to repave Greenfield this coming summer so many of the short term improvements could be implemented at that time. One concern is that how do you keep east bound traffic on Greenfield crossing over and parking in these slots front-in? It would be helpful to know how other cities that have implemented this measure have gained public acceptance (or did they?).</p>	<p>San Anselmo Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force via Steve Myrter email dated 11/16/09</p>	<p>Comment addressed above.</p>
<p>Project 10: 2. Raised intersections are proposed as a traffic calming measure. How is street surface drainage mitigated with these measures? Are there examples of this measure successfully implemented in other jurisdictions?</p>	<p>San Anselmo Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force via Steve Myrter email dated 11/16/09</p>	<p>Comment addressed above.</p>

Comment	Source	Response
Medium (Graphics)		
<p>Page 1-2: Expand this to include 1st St., Community Center, and Andersen Dr.</p>	<p>Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)</p>	<p>Comment addressed with map revisions. Figures 1-1, 3-1, and 6-1 updated accordingly.</p>
<p>Page 3-8: The Figures 3-4 and 3-5 do not fully depict the actual conditions indicated in their respective captions. For example, Figure 3-4 shows a 50% slope West of Azalea Avenue; this may be true for a small segment (near the building at 200 Broadway) but not for the remaining stretch of road beyond that area heading West. Figure 3-5 shows a sidewalk from Azalea Avenue to Claus Drive on the South side of Sir Francis Drake Boulevard. There is a sidewalk only on a very small percentage of this stretch of road (in front of First Federal Savings and Loan at 2009 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard)- the remaining (and majority) of this section has no sidewalk. The captions should specify in more detail what areas they are depicting along this stretch of roadway, as there are many varying conditions there.</p>	<p>Marin County Bicycle Coalition (EW-Comments-Final.pdf)</p>	<p>Updated captions to indicate accurate location of sections. Figure 3-4 (now Figure 3-6 with updated numbering) is Sir Francis Drake Boulevard at Azalea Avenue. Figure 3-5 (now Figure 3-7) is Sir Francis Drake Boulevard at Merwin Avenue.</p>
Large (Design)		
<p>Section 6.13, Page 6-31: Project 10: Red Hill Avenue/Greenfield Avenue (Lincoln Park to Hilldale Drive) San Anselmo - Project definition needs to be modified to include a multi-use path, a Class 1 facility, or a bi-directional bike path that starts on Greenfield at the Hub intersection and travels between Greenfield and Red Hill Avenue from the Hub all the way to Hilldale. TAM has been in the field and has measured the area and believes that a continuous passage could be put through this section that is safe and separate from automobiles, removes minimal parking and has adequate space provisions. There are two alternatives to accomplish this.</p>	<p>Transportation Alternatives for Marin (East west study comments chart (24Nov09).pdf)</p>	<p>The alternatives discussed in this comment should be advanced in further studies specifically focused on the operations of Red Hill Avenue. The range of alternatives evaluated and advanced in this current study preclude the Town of Fairfax and consultants from further analysis of Red Hill Avenue.</p>

Comment	Source	Response
<p>(1) There is significant space in the median between the two directions on Red Hill Avenue. Further, there is space between Greenfield Avenue and Red Hill Avenue. The Feasibility Study should show how a two way bike path could be set in the median between Greenfield and Red Hill.</p> <p>(2) Alternatively, Greenfield could be made a one way street heading east and the separated bicycle facility could go on either side of the auto traffic.</p>		
<p>Section 6.14, Page 6-34: Project 11: Red Hill Avenue/Greenfield Avenue/West End Avenue (Hilldale Drive to the Second Street/Fourth Street Intersection) - This section needs to be modified. The short term improvements to this section need to be added to show a separated bicycle facility starting at Greenfield and Hilldale on the south side Red Hill. Directly crossing Red Hill directly to the east there is space on the south side of Red Hill Avenue for a separated facility. Right now a culvert is there. Heading east on Red Hill there is sufficient space in the median boulevard between Red Hill on each side to move Red Hill to the north and have the separated facility on the south of Red Hill to get to the Greenfield/Red Hill intersection near Fourth Street. Starting at Red Hill moving east there is sufficient space in the median barrier between West End Avenue and Red Hill Avenue and in the space between the two directions of Red Hill Avenue to add a separate accommodation for cyclist between West End Avenue and Red Hill Avenue from Greenfield Avenue to Marquard Avenue.</p>	<p>Transportation Alternatives for Marin (East west study comments chart (24Nov09).pdf)</p>	<p>Updated to address narrowing of vehicle travel lanes and lane removal.</p>
<p>Section 6.17, Page 6-46: Project 14: First Street (B Street to Anderson Drive) - Please see attached cross section that provides a 16' two-way bicycle facility between the parking</p>	<p>Transportation Alternatives for Marin (East west study comments chart (24Nov09).pdf)</p>	<p>Updated to address narrowing of vehicle travel lanes and lane removal.</p>

Comment	Source	Response
lots in Project 14.		
<p>Figures Updated in the Alternative Plans PDF:</p> <p>Figure 6-18</p> <p>Figure 6-19</p> <p>New Section</p> <p>Figure 6-21</p> <p>Figure 6-23</p> <p>Figure 6-25</p> <p>Figure 6-26</p> <p>Figure 6-30</p>	<p>Transportation Alternatives for Marin (east_west_bikeway_alternative_plans.pdf)</p>	<p>Updated to address narrowing of vehicle travel lanes and lane removal.</p>
<p>From San Rafael BPAC meeting held on 10/28/09: Experienced bicyclists will want to use the roadway even though a wider sidewalk on 2nd Street may be present. BPAC suggests also having Class II bike lanes on 2nd Street.</p>	<p>Leslie Blomquist, City of San Rafael Department of Public Works via email dated 11/23/09 (RE East-West Bikeway Public Review Draft Comments Extension)</p>	<p>According to David Parisi, the traffic engineering consultant, class II bike lanes on 2nd Street are infeasible.</p>
<p>Page 6-2: I don't recall discussing Bank St.; need to add change timing on signals; cyclists wait forever here. All the discussions I heard were @ Red Hill, which is not mentioned by name.</p>	<p>Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)</p>	<p>Updated to include signal timing analysis and bicycle signal detection in Project 9.</p>
<p>Page 6-7, Figure 6-2: I thought that we discussed putting Option B @ Olema Rd. intersection where Option A is; much more practical for cyclists.</p>	<p>Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)</p>	<p>Updated to remove Option A. Figures 6-2 and 6-3 updated.</p>
<p>Page 6-10: We discussed a 3 way Stop for this intersection; although it may not work with the present traffic patterns, it may work in the future and would like to have it documented; this would change this entire intersection for cyclists, and could slow down traffic which is what Fairfax wants on this stretch of road (25 mph speed limit).</p>	<p>Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)</p>	<p>As discussed in the TAC meetings, according to David Parisi, the traffic engineering consultant, a 3-way stop at the Olema Road and Sir Francis Drake Boulevard intersection is infeasible.</p>
<p>Page 6-26: Don't recall this being discussed; signal timing needs to be improved if you are making this a real</p>	<p>Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final</p>	<p>Comment addressed above.</p>

Comment	Source	Response
cyclists crossing.	Draft DM.pdf)	
Page 6-27: I think you mean [install sharrows] on Bridge Ave between San Anselmo Ave. and Center Blvd; I believe that sharrows are only for streets with parked cars (see page 5-6 which describes sharrows and their use). This section is a poor candidate for a 2 way Class III; maybe one way north.	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	Sharrows on that segment have been removed.
Page 6-34: We talked about this Class I on the south side of Red Hill Avenue (not Drive) from Hilldale to Greenfield/West End in San Rafael; this would undoubtedly require acquiring some right of way and/or using part of the median.	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	Updated to address narrowing of vehicle travel lanes and lane removal.
Page 6-41: Cyclists? I know it's only 8', but they have to be somewhere, and west bound they can't get from 1st St. to the class III travel lane on the other side of the street. [Referencing the south sidewalk on Figure 6-26]	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	Figure 6-26 updated.
Page 6-42: This contra flow lane makes no sense from a safety or practical viewpoint. Eastbound cyclists would have to cross from the south side of 1st St. through the E St. intersection to get on this lane, and then cross back through the D St. intersection. We talked about changing the one way direction to east bound for this street, and then cyclists would have a logical contra flow lane on the north side. Another option is to make it a local street (ala Berkeley); motorists would then use Francis to connect from D to E St., which is a normal and safe street.	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft D M.pdf)	Figure 6-27 and narrative of Project 13 updated to reverse one-way vehicle travel and contra-flow bicycle lane direction.
Page 6-45: I remember talking about making this a contra flow bike lane on the south side; probably would require parking removal.	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	Comment addressed above.
Page 6-47: The design of this project is complete, and there is nothing in it for new connections to Andersen Drive; major reason is they didn't	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final	Updated Project 15 to include narrative description of alternatives for connection to the Mahon Creek

Comment	Source	Response
<p>know how to connect to the East-West Bikeway. We talked about putting a Class I/cycle track on the south side of Andersen Drive from the SR Community Center (Project 14) to the Lindaro St. intersection, and then having cyclists cross to the Mahon St. bike path or continue east on Andersen. This is not noted anywhere.</p>	<p>Draft DM.pdf)</p>	<p>Path.</p>
<p>Page 6-17: In the section Near-term Project Definition the first bullet indicates the removal of a lane on Broadway. There was extensive discussion about this area in meetings about the NTPP Parkade Study and there was consensus that removal of lanes was probably not feasible considering the traffic conditions in this area, especially with regard to auto traffic heading West turning left onto Bolinas Road.</p>	<p>Marin County Bicycle Coalition (EW-Comments-Final.pdf)</p>	<p>This land removal on Broadway was modified by Town of Fairfax and W-Trans and the updated design is incorporated in this study.</p>
<p>Page 6-18: Similarly, other near-term recommendations for this section are ones that the technical advisory committee discussed and thought could be significantly improved. For example, the widening of sidewalks on Broadway Boulevard is not the best plan considering the already limited roadway width for potential Class 2 bike lanes between Bank Street and Pacheco Avenue, and the removal of onstreet parking may not be feasible at this time.</p> <p>The Marin County Bicycle Coalition is yet to see any useful product for the Parkade area from W-Trans, which was contracted to study this area under a \$25,000 NTPP-funded contract with the Town of Fairfax.</p> <p>It is our understanding that W-Trans was to submit revised documents/plans, which included TAC/staff recommendations for this area. We have not seen any such revised documents. Overall, the information in the W-Trans study</p>	<p>Marin County Bicycle Coalition (EW-Comments-Final.pdf)</p>	<p>Discuss with Jim Moore, Re; Status of W-Trans work.</p>

Comment	Source	Response
<p>contained within this document is out of date, inappropriate based on TAC recommendations, and needs to be replaced with something that should be vetted by the TAC, at least over email. We are very much looking forward to seeing something useful for the Parkade that meets the needs of all users of the Parkade and Broadway Boulevard; the current content does not fit this need.</p> <p>The Marin County Bicycle Coalition submitted preliminary comments to Kathy Wilkie on May 1, 2009 regarding the Parkade Study. In those comments we included some vision statements for that Study. In addition to including revised W-Trans documents into this report, we would like to see a “Future Opportunities” section similar to what is included on page 6-30 for the Hub in San Anselmo. In this section we would like to see our visioning ideas that were included in our Parkade Study comments referenced above, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A park-like atmosphere for some portions of the Parkade, preferably on the Broadway side away from Sir Francis Drake Boulevard. • An extension of the park atmosphere to a portion of the north side near the bus stop and to a crosswalk at Taylor Dr. or between Taylor Dr. and Perry’s Deli thereby creating continuity to North side businesses. • A Class 1 multi-use pathway throughout the length of the Parkade for bicyclists and pedestrians. • Parking for bicycles 		
<p>Pages 6-31 through 6-36: Projects 10 and 11 lack any mention of a Class 1 separated bikeways, despite TAC discussions about opportunities for these Project areas. We recognize that there are some challenges in these</p>	<p>Marin County Bicycle Coalition (EW-Comments-Final.pdf)</p>	<p>Updated to address narrowing of vehicle travel lanes and lane removal.</p>

Comment	Source	Response
<p>Project areas but would like to see discussions and drawings that show potential Class 1 facilities, regardless. If Class 1 solutions are designed and built for these two Project areas, we could have Class 1, safe and separate facilities that stretch from Fairfax to Anderson Drive in San Rafael (with just a few small exceptions).</p>		
<p>Page 6-49: We realize that the scope of this project did not emphasize work on the “Regional Connectors”. If possible it would be helpful to have some additional graphics (maps, aerials, etc.) in this section that show the three areas discussed (Butterfield Road Connector, Red Hill Shopping Center Connector and the Hillsdale Avenue Neighborhood Connector).</p>	<p>Marin County Bicycle Coalition (EW-Comments-Final.pdf)</p>	<p>The project budget does not provide for creation of additional graphics.</p>
<p>1) The center refuge island shown in option B of Figure 6-2 could alternatively be placed to the west of option A, thus negating it’s impact on bus turning movements under option A. This would serve to help protect crossing cyclists from EB traffic, and also as a traffic calming device. By extending it as far west as possible, and perhaps adding welcoming signage, traffic speed on SFD EB would be slowed considerably from it’s current accelerating rate.</p>	<p>John Reed (JR's comments and changes to final draft jr.doc)</p>	<p>Comment addressed above.</p>
<p>13) Contraflow proposal requires traffic to switch sides of the street on either end of the block, a dangerous situation. Alternatively, car traffic direction could be changed to one-way in opposite direction of that currently, to eastbound. Two way bike traffic would be then on the correct sides of the street. Westbound through auto traffic (originating from northbound Avenue D) could be routed via parallel street one block to the south of first (don’t know name)</p>	<p>John Reed (JR's comments and changes to final draft jr.doc)</p>	<p>Comment addressed above.</p>
<p>14) Fig 6-29 Illustrated class 1 route would ideally be continued through park and along south side of</p>	<p>John Reed (JR's comments and changes to final draft</p>	<p>Comment addressed above.</p>

Comment	Source	Response
Anderson, to Lindaro intersection. Connectivity to class 2 lanes southbound on Anderson as well as to Class 1 along Mahon creek achieved through intersection improvements at Lindaro (timing, striping, wayfinding).	jr.doc)	
Other		
Please setup future documents so that page no. in .pdf is the same as page no. in the document; takes a lot of time to find things by 1-6, etc.	Don Magdanz (East-West Bikeway Feasibility Study Final Draft DM.pdf)	Comment noted.