1. Horse Hill Route, north segment — while it may appear technically feasible to widen on the inside of the bikepath adjacent to Mrn-101 behind our guardrail, this widening would cause the loss of maintenance access to the guardrail from behind and is problematic. Ground mounted signs would also have to be relocated. On the other hand • if right-of-way is purchased on the outside, retaining walls would be needed due to cuts into the hillside.

2. Horse Hill Route, south segment — there is a downhill intersection of the bikepath near Meadow Valley and Casa Buena where there has been a number of accidents. A stop sign on the bikepath seems warranted there.

3. Tamal Vista - Routes 9B and 10 are superior to Madera/ Tamal Vista as TAM has proposed significant improvements to the Sir Francis Drake to Tamalpais segment of SR 101 in both the nb and sb directions. It seems to us that widening of Tamal Vista to four lanes and the projected growth of traffic along Tamal Vista will make route 10 and 9B superior over the long run.

I support the findings in the report, especially as it relates to the outrageous costs identified in today's dollars, and knowing these costs a bit better now, that the other two alternatives being ONE-S1XTH the cost, makes far more sense for the larger number of people who would use it.

The obvious concern for anyone would hopefully be the outrageous costs associated with the tunnel entirely being rebuilt. But, more importantly SEVEN parcels of land having to be bought? SEVEN homes, or even 6 or even 5, having to be purchased from people at a price, is outrageous at many levels.

I would consider the tunnel as an option if this was the ONLY alternative. However, between the cost (which is probably way under-estimated because those figures are in today's dollars, not the 10 year from now dollars (at least, with all the lawsuits that would ensue), the displacement of people from their homes and the risk of so much potential harm to people who enter that tunnel (whether via a natural disaster because there are not emergency exits or a prime place for someone to get robbed, raped or worse), it just seems like the other two alternatives just makes the most sense for everyone. How can anyone truly argue two other far less expensive alternatives for one bloated alternative (knowing that the other two still need to be addressed since they already exist), if not for the purpose of just ‘winning'? I honestly think that there is a momentum and hysteria that has built with many who are advocating ONLY the tunnel and their only goal now is to win — not to be open to more reasonable options and that is disappointing.

I am concerned that there is a political motivation in pushing this tunnel for several of our local politicians — and that is NOT in the best interest of our towns, but rather in support of their own political career.

If money is to be spent, spend the 116th dollars on Camino Alto and Horse Hill and use the rest of the money to make other incredibly necessary road improvements in the City of Mill Valley. The streets are falling apart. There are much wiser places to use that money. The City of Mill Valley is not in support of the tunnel re-building. I support the position of the City of Mill Valley.
Public E-Mail Comments w/out Identifiers
Mill Valley to Corte Madera Bicycle and Pedestrian Corridor Study
December 9, 2009 through January 31, 2010

I am forwarding this to you so that you can be prepared for the reaction to your Study from MCBC. I have my own comments and things to talk about, but overall I found the Study thorough and helpful. Needless to say, I disagree with most of the MCBC critique, but I would particularly like to point out that I know most of the owners of the 7 private parcels across or under which the tunnel route would have to run, and not surprisingly, they are the very people most opposed to its reconstruction.

I ask that if the Bicycle Coalition is given an opportunity to meet with you in other than a noticed public setting, collectively or separately, to plead their case about why they don't like the results of the Study, that we on the other side of the tunnel debate get to give our own brief about why we agree with most of the findings. If their opposition is by letter only, of course, we will submit our comments accordingly.

I have read both the Study and the appendices and could not find any reference to the ability of the reconstructed tunnel as imagined to withstand earthquakes of varying degrees of magnitude. Could you please refer the following questions to the appropriate party? Thank you.

Q. In your estimate of the steel and other reinforcements required to re-construct the Alto Tunnel, and the corresponding cost estimates, were any calculations made of the relationship between the amount of such reinforcements and the ability of the re-constructed tunnel to withstand earthquakes of different intensities? If so, do these estimates appear in the Study and I just missed them or were they not included? If not, would these engineering calculations including variables be included in the next level of geotechnic study of the tunnel, were this option to be explored further?

First, I am pleased with the thoroughness of the study and all the good info in it. Should be very useful to the county decision makers.

For Horse Hill — I would like to propose dumping the current segment 3 (the path next to the freeway) and replacing it with a path thru the open space that begins where the current open space fire road entrance is on Lomita, but follows a shallower grade thru the use of switchbacks, not getting closer than 200 yard from freeway until the very north end, where it would connect with Meadowsweet at the spot where your proposed new alternate path entrance is to avoid the u turn for the current path.

Using the open space has these advantages: 1. More pleasant (no cars, noise or exhaust smell), 2. More users than using segment three could ever get. 3. Allowing a near constant manageable grade up to Meadowsweet. 4. Allowing a full 12 foot wide path for this section. 5. Avoids the tricky Shell Road/Lomita intersection. 6. Avoids the steep windy southern entrance to current segment 3.

So, please include my comment that the county should consider a switchback path in the open space as an alternative to segment 3.
I am a 56 year old with chronic injuries, but one who would like to avoid my car (for sustainability/carbon emissions reasons) in getting from the Triangle neighborhood in Mill Valley (very central) to Larkspur. I find that buses can adequately serve my needs when I want to get to San Rafael, Corte Madera shopping centers, or San Francisco, but will not enable me to get to Larkspur or to such places as Marin General, College of Marin, or even downtown Larkspur. These are the places that I need to go. There are no shuttles.

In this situation, I am simply NOT going to take the Corte Madera Grade. It is too dangerous (even with your suggested improvements) and I am not strong enough. The Horse Hill option takes me out of my way goes East to Horse Hill and then I'd have to head back West from Corte Madera to Larkspur. Because of my limited physicality, given the extra length and the grade (even with a "leveling"), I can't imagine that I would use this for alternative transit.

This leaves the Alto Tunnel as the only viable option for me. I would use that. I understand that the Alto Tunnel is expensive and also that there are issues of private and/or unsettled property rights involved in reopening the Alto Tunnel. I also imagine that it would take the longest of the three to complete. But it is the only option I would realistically use.

SUGGESTION: SUPPLEMENTAL SHUTTLE

I would therefore like to make a suggestion: Mill Valley folks are truly stuck if they want to avoid their cars to go to downtown Larkspur, Marin General, College of Marin. We have no bus service that goes there. (I just tried to convince Marin Transit to coordinate bus connections that would allow infra-city transit; even with high level supporters, but that did not come to fruition). We have no reasonable bike route and, especially if the Alto Tunnel isn't reopened, may never. How about an open air, very bike friendly (but not exclusively for bikers) SHUTTLE that runs along Camino Alto and connects the two bike route legs (one in Mill Valley to the one in Corte Madera). It would be even better if that shuttle could continue on and take people to Marin General, COM, etc.

Again, this shuttle seems like it would be a good idea to supplement any bike route. From my perspective, however, it would be less needed if the Alto Tunnel is reopened, because those of lesser physical ability can use the Alto Tunnel route. Even with the Alto Tunnel selection, because that will take so long to build, it would be nice to at least temporarily have a shuttle.

My largest frustration with the report is that they did not explore other routes and low cost alternatives. I know the area, live in Mill Valley bike commute to the San Francisco almost daily and understand what preferred bike commutes are about. My frustration is I think there is some very simple repairs to existing routes that could be done at minimal costs, quickly. Why people aren't going after this "low hanging fruit" in these tough economic times is beyond my understanding. See the attached E-mail string I sent a while back, that seems to have gotten no consideration.

As to the Alto Tunnel I have not read the report. The $ for the tunnel upgrade don't surprise me. Even if it is $20 plus mil, it's still a huge nut. Technically I am not an expert on tunnels, but do a lot of excavation, shoring, some hand tunneling. It would not surprise me that the upgrade is as or more expensive than a new bore. In my opinion a new bore would be better served at the Horse Hill route, shorter, less expensive, and out of the neighborhoods. In any regard I do feel alternative surface routes are more cost effective, practical and realistically achievable in the near term.

I appreciate all your groups efforts, just wish some of this energy could be put towards solutions that are lower cost and achievable in the near future.
Here are some of my thoughts based on commuting by bike from San Francisco to San Anselmo a couple of times per week for the last couple of years.

- Adding bike lanes on straight roads increases safety for bikers, non-separated bike lanes on windy roads are usually ignored by car drivers on the corners. For an example of where this has been implemented and where it is not working is the windy part of Anderson Drive where it connects to Sir Francis Drive near San Quentin and 1580.

- Camino Alto is especially scary to ride at dark and the striped bike lanes are far less effective at night and Camino Alto is a very dark road with no street lights.

- On the Marin part of my from SF to San Anselmo, Camino Alto is the least safe stretch by far, my wife does not want me to ride there but I currently have little choice. Making a better alternative available would be wonderful. Adding bike lanes to Camino Alto is only marginally going to improve the situation and it is going to remain the least safe part of my particular ride.

Please acknowledge our opinions in your crafting policy, plans and funding. Please respond with your comments by email.

1. The tunnel option is too expensive. Have a conscience. It is dark, unsecured, a nuisance destination, very expensive to maintain, simply unrealistic, Eliminate from further unrealistic, wasteful studies and remove from options.

2. Camino Alto is a vehicular traffic, fire and EVA corridor route. First. It is also one of the last remaining scenic southern Marin county by way corridors, Second. It is a very significant regional Fire Break for MT Tam, MMWD lands and abutting landowners, Third. Time of use for vehicles should never be curtailed for sole enjoyment of bike and peds only. Any expansion of roadbed x section will greatly impact the existing corridor's definition, in almost every way. Be careful for what you wish. There will be many trade-offs and many undesirable results.

3. The existing dedicated 101 corridor is the preferred and logical route. Close proximity and good orientation to regional, and county open space and trails, on the 101 transit corridor with modest to gradual grades, with light vehicular traffic existing, both with great community and neighborhood accessibility and visually apparent corridor that is more secure, hazard-free - A lot less expensive to construct and maintain.

I am writing to express my support for the project to open the Alto tunnel to cyclists. I would ride it a lot. It is absolutely necessary to provide safe routes for non-motorized transportation.

I am writing in support of the Alto Tunnel option. Although I live in San Francisco we have family in Marin - specifically a brother-in-law in Corte Madera. When we are invited to family events in Marin we prefer to ride our bicycles and opening the Alto Tunnel would make it so much easier and more pleasant for us to do so.
I am strong enough, now, at age 45, to handle the hill - although that will probably change as I get older, but I hate the fast car traffic I have to deal with. Although most drivers are fairly respectful of cyclists, all it takes is one impatient driver to ruin my ride and terrify me. I bike for transportation so I'm a steady cyclist, but that hill can be a an insurmountable barrier. I admit that I lobby to drive when that hill is involved in a family visit. My nieces in Marin love the fact that my husband and I ride our bikes over to visit them, and they have asked to ride with us - but I cannot imagine taking children over that hill, and horse hill is just awful with the loud freeway noise and the bad access.

Please give us the safe convenient routes which car drivers take for granted. Cars are not superior transportation devices, they have simply been made more convenient with all the infrastructure devoted to them. Give me better infrastructure and I will continue to bike for transportation, and more people will make that same choice. If you open that tunnel you will be amazed at the number of cyclists who suddenly appear. People who are not currently cycling will; the numbers will much higher then those noted in the report.

I could not find an answer to two questions I have after that meeting and after reviewing the draft of the project. (I left this message on your voice mail and then thought it might be better to email you.)

1. Where does the funding come from to complete any of the proposals?
2. What is the likelihood of obtaining such funding and how much can be anticipated? Thank you in anticipation of your reply.

I wanted to take a moment and thank you for last evening. It was really nice to see that the concerns many of us presented at that follow-up meeting earlier this year were taken into consideration and were included as part of the presentation last evening.

I know you have much to do on this and other projects for which you are responsible, so I just wanted to thank you and I will email the signatures in support of Horse Hill and Camino Alto to you in the next 3o days. If you know when that final cut-off date is, could you let me know? I want to make sure I have it in no later than that date.

I've been reading the news reports and getting updates on the Alto tunnel from MCBC and just wanted to take a minute to express how valuable I think the Alto Tunnel will be to myself and my bike commute but also the thousands of bicyclists and future bicyclists in Marin. I sincerely hope this project is given the green light and we can see it opened for public use asap.

The Draft Report was well prepared and organized, however, I question the actual cost of the tunnel option. Further cost estimating and cost reduction investigation should be done to see if there are possible reductions available.

I feel strongly that the considerable cost to complete a bike/ped tunnel is money well spent. The interstate highway system cost billions. A similar commitment and investment MUST be made to alternative transportation in Marin. The existing tunnel is a resource that should not be wasted. If the existing tunnel is not feasible to retrofit, bore a new one.
I have lived in Mill Valley for almost 25 years and I am an avid cyclist, both mountain and road. I have ridden my bike over Camino Alto so many times that I could not begin to count the number. I have also ridden over the Horse Hill Path many times. I feel that I understand the challenges that you and your office are facing in your proposals. To follow are my thoughts and comments:

If your true objective is to get as many people, both riding bikes and walking, to move between Corte Madera and Mill Valley, only one scenario will work... the tunnel. Yes, it is very expensive and there are a number of other problems associated with opening up a dormant easement who's immediate neighbors have been able to quietly enjoy the right-of-way since the 1970's.

The Horse Hill Path, while a relatively gentle grade, is too far to the East and would not be used because of it's proximity to the freeway. People are not going to go out of their way to walk next to freeway with it's noise, fumes and dust. Bikers, by their past behavior, have shown that they would rather ride over the Camino Alto grade than go out of their way to go over the Horse Hill Path.

The Camino Alto "grade", while dangerous, is a pleasant and relatively quick way to get over the hill if you are an experienced cyclist. A dedicated bike path would be fantastic and far better than any option over at Horse Hill, with a safe bike path over the grade, more cyclist would ride over the grade, but you would not get the truly recreational riders or many, if any, walkers.

A path over the grade is a big compromise when compared to the Tunnel route. Having said that, I would personally love a well designed bike path going over the grade and I would use it regularly.

The tunnel is the only scenario which would deliver a path that would meet your objectives. Recreational riders and walkers could easily travel from one town to the other on a level path through the tunnel. The tunnel would be the only option which promotes commuting by bicycle for the common man/woman. The projected costs seem too high and should be reexamined. The tunnel is there and should be utilized by the communities for the good of the communities.

The following are my comments on the Route Alternatives Evaluation Matrix included in the Draft Corridor Study (I have also attached a Word File of my comments):

Review of Route Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

Emergency Access and Response:
The Horse Hill and Alto Grade routes with steep hills, traffic, curves and blind driveways will require response to many more accidents than will the straight, level, and traffic free tunnel route. The tunnel will also provide emergency access to and from Mill Valley and shelter from wild fires or even radioactive fallout in the event of the unthinkable. The tunnel is no more inaccessible than the path along Horse Hill. Enhanced emergency access can be easily provided by stationing an inexpensive electric or propane powered small vehicle at each end.

User/Public Safety — separation from traffic:
Horse Hill dumps cyclists onto Sanford and Madera Streets, which are heavily traveled and dangerous, and are unsuitable for casual cyclists or children. Alto Grade is steep, windy, and will not have standard bike lanes or pedestrian paths. The sense of personal safety is less when walking riding on the Horse Hill bike path or on the shoulder of Camino Alto than in a vehicle free, well lighted tunnel with call boxes and cameras. Pedestrians can be separated from bikes in the
tunnel by providing a raised pedestrian path. The other routes do not even provide for pedestrian or disabled person use.

Bikeway and Community Connections:
The Horse Hill route is definitely not a "good" connection. It routes users off of dedicated paths and dumps them onto dangerous and out of the way streets. Camino Alto is totally unsuitable for kids and casual bicyclists, and is not a reasonable pedestrian route. Neither route provides for pedestrian or ADA use.

Functionality/ Efficiency- Bicycles:
The Tunnel is the only route that is will result in Transportation Mode Shift. The other routes are only suitable for experienced bicyclists who already use these routes. They are not suitable for children, the elderly, or casual cyclists.

Functionality/ Efficiency- Pedestrians/ Persons with disabilities:
The Tunnel is the only route that is ADA and pedestrian useable. Horse Hill and Alto Grade are practically impossible. Neither the uphill or the downhill is feasible. The disabled and pedestrians would experience impossibly steep hills and vehicular traffic on either the Horse Hill or Camino Alto routes.

Mode Shift/ Use Levels:
The Tunnel is the only route that will result in significant Mode Shift. Very few cyclists or pedestrians will use Horse Hill's out of the way route on dangerous roads. Only fit and relatively experienced cyclists will use steep and curvy Alto Grade. The Tunnel will connect 70 miles of multi-use paths and will result in a major increase of both bicyclist and pedestrian users.

Roadway Crossings and Intersections:
Analysis of crossings and intersections must include the abundant private and commercial driveways on both the Horse Hill and Alto Grade Routes. Neither of these routes can reasonably be rated as "Fair".

Right-of Way Availability Issues:
The Horse Hill route requires long, difficult, and perhaps impossible negotiations with Caltrans, particularly if the path is to be lowered or widened. Alto Grade widening and landslide repairs for even a sub-standard bike path would require encroachment onto private properties and would require property acquisitions and perhaps condemnation.

Environmental Issues:
The Horse Hill and the Alto Grade routes cross landslides which will make improvements much more extensive and expensive than envisioned. Landslide repairs and path widening on both routes will require removal of mature trees and vegetation, construction noise and activity, and safety and community impacts. On the Alto Grade route, dozens of mature oaks will need to be removed. The vegetation along the tunnel route is mainly brush and small trees that have spouted since the railroad was abandoned. Much of the work on the tunnel route will need to be performed even if the tunnel is not reopened in order to address continuing tunnel collapse, discharge of polluted water, and draining of standing pools of polluted and mosquito ridden water. Reopening the Tunnel Route will actually result is less net negative environmental issues than will constructing the other routes.

Adjacent Property Issues:
The homeowner next to Edna McGuire School will almost certainly object to the path being relocated adjacent to his house. Increases in bike usage on the roads along the Horse Hill or Camino Alto routes will significantly impact adjacent properties and on drivers. The consultants met with property owners near the tunnel route, but there is no evidence that they met with affected property owners along either the Alto Grade or Horse Hill route's roads. The consultants did not interview homeowners adjacent to existing Marin County multi-use trails, or review Rails to Trails data showing that residents adjacent to multi-use trails generally view the trails as positive assets. In any case, the benefits to the projected 850,000 annual users must be balanced against any negative impact on several dozen residents.

Cost:
The cost of the sub-standard Camino Alto and Horse Hill routes do not take into account the cost of land acquisition and construction related to landslides. Many of the cost associated with the tunnel reopening will be necessary even if the tunnel is not reopened in order to address the extraordinary liabilities associated with continuing tunnel collapse and
discharge of polluted water. The estimated Tunnel Cost include unrealistically high contingencies. The tunnel estimate also includes unnecessary items such as a ventilation system (The tunnel didn't require a ventilation system when trains used it, and the vehicular tunnel at the GGNRA doesn't require a ventilation system). The amenities included in the tunnel estimate provide a much higher level of user experience and safety than is being provided for in the other options. The Horse Hill and Alto Grade improvements will have a very limited life, while the reconstructed tunnel will have a useful life of well over a hundred years. Money to repair damage and to settle lawsuits resulting from continuing tunnel collapse will probably come out of local budgets. Much of the funding for reopening the tunnel will likely come from Federal Transportation Funds. These funds will either be spent on the Tunnel or on some project elsewhere in the Country. The question is whether the funds will be spent on a beneficial Transportation Mode Shift Project in MarM County, or on a less deserving project elsewhere.

Permitting and Agreement. Requirements:
Lowering the Horse Hill route has the potential to undermine the freeway, and it will be very difficult to obtain necessary permissions from Caltrans. Condemnation may be required to obtain the property necessary to repair landslides and to widen the Alto Grade or Horse Hill routes. Landslide repairs and widening would require construction in natural areas and will require environmental review and mitigation. The "wetlands" are the result of polluted seepage from the tunnel, and must be corrected regardless of whether or not the tunnel is reopened.

Consistency with Local Plans: OK

Maintenance and Operation Requirements:
Landslides, debris and vehicular traffic damage will require considerable maintenance of both the Horse Hill and Camino Alto routes. Other than maintaining a closed circuit TV, lighting, and emergency call box system, the tunnel will require no more maintenance than either of the other routes which will not have these safety features. Reconstructing the tunnel will eliminate the risk of costly damage and liability related to continuing collapse of the tunnel. Draining the stagnate and polluted pools of water at the portals will eliminate the mosquito abatement required by the existing tunnel seepage. The tunnel will not require employing one additional maintenance, police, fire or paramedic staff member.

In summary, the Study is severely biased against the tunnel option. The tunnel option is the only option which results in significant Transportation Mode Shift and which provides a long term asset to the community Many of the costs associated with the Tunnel will be required to correct ongoing collapse and seepage regardless of whether or not the tunnel is reopened.

Four brief comments in questions regarding the Alto Tunnel alternative:

1) Is there an evaluation of the chemistry/ quantity of hazardous materials within that corridor and the concomitant estimate of onsite evacuation/treatment and/or off-site transportation/disposal costs?

2) Is there an assessment of earthquake risk to the tunnel and an estimate of structural protection in the face of that risk?

3) Is there an estimate of maintenance costs — replacement sinking fund, security, insurance, lighting, structural depreciation/repair, code changes — for the proposed life of the tunnel?

4) What is the assumed operational longevity of the tunnel; what is its total replacement cost compared with the alternative corridors?

Alto Tunnel Bike Path - If you build it will they come?
typically ride my bicycle from corte Madera to San Rafael two to four times
per week. Z usually take the sandra marker bike path for much of the way but, while see many pedestrians and dog walkers, Z don't see many fellow bicyclists. most bicyclists, particularly on the weekends, are riding on magnolia. You have done surveys to try to anticipate how many bicyclists and pedestrians would use each of the alternative routes. I think you also need to do a survey on why so many bicyclists forgo the straight, level and uninterrupted Sandra Marker bike path so that they can ride with the cars, the stop signs and the traffic signals on magnolia. whatever incentives are causing bicyclists to take Magnolia over the sandra marker bike path may also cause bicyclists of the future to choose amino Alto-corte madera Highway over a 50 million Alto Tunnel route.

strongly recommend the alternative of improving amino Alto-Corte Madera Highway with an 8 foot climbing lane on the uphill portions. Z sometimes ride my bicycle on this route when Z am going to Mill valley or when Z am just looking for exercise. The grade on both sides is nice and steady and easily handled by a bicycle with multiple gears (as almost all bicycles are these days). A climbing lane would greatly improve safety and provide a sense of security for slow moving bicyclists climbing the hill. Drivers would also benefit from not getting caught behind slow moving bicyclists on a road where safely passing is very difficult.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft study.

A recent article in the MV Herald suggested writing to you with any feedback we have about the ideas for creating a better car-free way from Mill Valley to Corte Madera. I am strongly in favor of opening the Alto tunnel. As an older person, I would never bike over what we've always called the "Corte Madera Grade", but I would love to do my many errands, classes, etc. by bike rather than car. The Horse Hill option is too close to the freeway, which I often avoid even when driving. I find that I go to CM, Larkspur, and the College of Marin 2-3 days a week, and I would be thrilled to get some exercise while helping the environment...on a bike!

When I was in junior high school at Edna Maguire, we sometimes walked through the tunnel to do window-shopping in CM. It was so convenient! But even then, a bike path would've been so much nicer and quicker.

Anyway, just wanted to let you know it's not just the younger Bike Coalition people or the newbie families who would favor the opening of the Alto Tunnel.

ALTO GRADE

while it's a good idea to create decent shoulders, where possible, it is unrealistic to expect cyclists to descend within the proposed new bike lanes. Only the more experienced, competent riders will ever use Alto Grade, and these are the type of riders who will "take the lane", proceeding close to the speed of traffic. They do this in obedience to the laws of bicycle physics, and because they know that descending near the center line helps them avoid vehicles pulling out from driveways.

Alto Grade is not now, and cannot be made to be, an appropriate route for the average rider; none of them will use it no matter how many bike lanes are painted on the road.

HORSE HILL

To expect cyclists to ascend steep Casa Buena while breathing deeply of freeway exhaust is antithetical to any notion of respiratory health. In addition, the traffic noise is horrible, discouraging use. AS for Meadowsweet, it's steep enough and long enough to discourage the majority of average riders, and going downhill is scary due to the frequent driveways. Every time I descend there I'm constantly scanning right and left, on high-
adrenalin alert.

ALTO TUNNEL

Unlike the other two routes, the tunnel is the only means to serious transportation mode shift. Just as the county tries hard to make driving feasible for the average motorist, we need to make cycling and walking equally comfortable and a matter of everyday routine.

I strongly support the re-opening of the Alto Tunnel. I have lived in Marin County for 36 years (growing up in Ross and now, for the last 5 years in Larkspur on Monte Vista Avenue, one block off the bike path). I have been a cyclist since I was 10 years old. I have been riding over Camino Alto to Sausalito, San Francisco, etc and back my entire biking career. I have ridden back many times via the Horse Hill Route.

Firstly, the Horse Hill Route, riding along the freeway for that short while, is a pretty unpleasant a riding experience whether on Meadowsweet or along Casa Buena. More importantly, it is really circuitous and out of the way. It is totally out of the mind of most people and has always been really bad at drawing riders. I strongly believe that even if significantly improved it will fail to improve ridership/runnership much at all.

The tunnel, as the study points out, will dramatically increase ridership. This is something that seems to be at the heart of the ethic here in Marin and part of our desire to improve the environment. The tunnel will draw the ridership/runnership of hundreds, if not thousands of people that wouldn't otherwise even get on their bikes.

It seems this discussion is about two things: increasing ridership/runnership and safety. An increase in safety is pretty much a moot point if you fail to get even the present riders/runners to commit to these other routes. Many dissenters talk of the waste of money, but the way I see it the amount of money we spend on the present routes will be the true waste. They also speak of their neighborhood being inundated by people. I can speak from experience, considering I live on the path, that it is absolutely terrific having it my back yard. Being a real estate agent, I can vouch emphatically that it will actually substantially increase the value of all homes in its proximity.

Re-opening the tunnel represents a significant increase in the quality of living in Marin County. Having ridden with my father from Ross to Sausalito/San Francisco my whole life, and wanting to do the same with my daughter, I believe re-opening that tunnel is a tremendous gift to future generations.

Doesn't the county have better use for $48 million than to attempt to open a tunnel when there are two other viable less expensive options. Z would not want to see my tax money wasted like this. And yes I am an avid bicyclist and yes Z bike to mill valley and use Chapman Drive to the top and go down camino Alto. It is not a problem and if bike lane(s) were added, it would be better but we're
talking about 1 mile here. $48 million?? Z could think of lots of things better suited for the money to help the marin county community.

I live in vasco court in Mill valley, about 50 yards from the path. I ride a road bike 1-2x a week into sausalito or on the "tiburon loop." I also ride the path with my autistic 15 year old, and often jog on the path. I have lived at 55 vasco since 1995 and have seen a huge increase in racing enthusiasts on this path. Like the vast majority of homeowners in scott valley. I strongly support expanding camino alto for bikers and am strongly opposed to the idea of "reopening" the alto tunnel. Besides the huge cost differential, rebuilding the tunnel would attract many more non-resident racing enthusiasts, crowding out/endangering neighborhood users who use the path for jogging, dog walking, leisure bike riding, and family walks. Additionally, there is the safety issue of policing a lengthy tunnel 24 hours a day, to prevent nightly loitering by teens/others. Given the less expensive options of expanding camino alto and/or improving the horse hill path, think the city/county should pursue the first or maybe both improvements and cease studying the tunnel option.

I am opposed to the tunnel. I would rather have funds spent on more bike paths within Mill Valley so my kids and I can safely ride to the MV Library and Downtown (we live in Scott Valley). It would also be great if my kids could ride to their soccer or softball practices from Scott Valley to Tam Valley. I love to ride my bike. When I ride to Corte Madera, I either take Camino Alto or the bike path along the freeway. I don't mind the freeway route — I believe I'm only on it about four or five minutes at the most before getting onto the roadway. A connecting path from the end of the bike path into Corte Madera, to the both the Town Center and the Village would be great. My husband is a world champion mountain bike rider. He rides seven days a week. He would never use a tunnel, or the freeway route. He loves the Camino Alto route. I am frustrated that so much money and time is being spent on studying the tunnel — it seems obvious that more people would ride bikes if there were safer routes within and around Mill Valley. Having a tunnel does not seem like it will increase bike ridership as much as more bike lanes would. How many bike lanes can you build for the cost of a tunnel?
I live and own a home in Mill Valley. I have lived here for a long time. Would love to ride my bike or hike north without having to get in a car to go around hills. My son would love to ride his bike but he does not always have the energy to go over the hills. Please request the county consider all long-term options and considerations for the Alto Tunnel. There are so many various populations that would make use of the Alto Tunnel.

Every effort should be made to open the Alto Tunnel to pedestrian and bicycle traffic. I am an avid cyclist, but you will not find me competing with autos on Camino Alto. I value my health and life too much for that. Alto Tunnel is the key link from the Ross Valley communities to Mill Valley. It was worth the trouble more than a century ago for trains and it is worth the trouble today.

I am a long time cyclist, and it is my chosen method of transportation, far above the car. I also race on occasion, so riding over hills, such as Camino Alto and Horse Hill is not a big deal to me.

There are drawbacks to both for recreational cyclists and pedestrians, including kids, and older folks, whom you never see on either of these passage ways.

In Horse Hill’s favor is that it is off a main thoroughfare, so one not need deal with traffic and aggressive drivers; however, there are a few sections that are steep, and even the most fit of cyclists need to stand in parts.

It's also close to the freeway, and for pedestrians, it's not an option, as it's got to add miles to a trip that could be much shorter through the Alto Tunnel.

I am partial to riding over Camino Alto, because it is not quite as steep and is a more direct route, but the drawbacks there are that cars pass very quickly, and drivers can be aggressive and hostile.

These are my primary reasons for supporting the Alto Tunnel. Unless you are very fit and comfortable in high traffic situations, neither Horse Hill nor Camino Alto present much of an option for those who would simply like to get from Point A to B. The projected usership is way off, because having a flat means of travel without threats from traffic would bring even more people out.

I would take the number of people living on that hill in Corte Madera and Mill Valley, and add that to the projection numbers, as those are the people that tunnel would most directly benefit.

I used to live in Corte Madera on that very hill, at the end of Sausalito Street, and long wished for that tunnel to be open. Back then, I'd ride a mountain bike through the dirt to get to Mill Valley. I can understand why that would not be an option for most people.

These are two wonderful neighborhoods in close proximity to one another, and it'd be nice if they were connected.

I am a Resident of Larkspur, a father of a 3 year old and a bicycle commuter to San Francisco. I am shocked and a bit dismayed that a study would find that only half of the bicycle users on either side of a tunnel would use the tunnel and that the tunnel would not increase bicycle activity in the area. "Conservative" is one way to describe this finding, pessimistic, rote and unsophisticated is another. The Corte Madera ridge is a looming barrier to travel for all but the most serious cyclists. It prevents families, tourists, adults and bicycle commuters from exploring all of Mill Valley and Sausalito safely and conveniently and vice versa. It prevents bicycle commuters to reach their local jobs or their work in the city of San Francisco. Improving Camino Alto Road would not affect this greatly as the...
physical challenge of ascending and descending this ridge is significant. Improving Horse Hill would also not achieve the intended result due to its tremendous highway noise and remote, out of the way location.

As a resident of Larkspur who lives directly on the bike path, I can attest to the great number of young riders and older riders who cherish the small strip of safe pathway which exists between the twin cities wrapping around palm hill. Access to the Mill Valley and Sausalito trails would increase 10 fold the amount of safe areas for families and others to ride safely. The area would likely become a destination for San Francisco cycling families and other safety concerned cyclists. Please do not underestimate the power of creating a long and safe trail for persons to ride. Please require a proper response and redressing of these concerns before

I am submitting this public comment to support a more critical reading of the Alto Tunnel Corridor Study as suggested by MCBC.

The Alto Tunnel is a Good Thing. I am a middle-aged, full time working mom who commutes from Tiburon to S.F., often by bike. I am also a recreational road bike rider on the weekends. Expanding safe routes for bikers, like the Alto Tunnel, is a critical way to encourage more people to ride bikes rather than drive cars for work and recreation.

The Study Under-represents Potential Users. On any weekend, there are hordes of recreational riders coming through Marin from the city and other parts. These cyclists regularly ride over Camino Alto to Camino Alto or use Horse Hill. These riders would almost all prefer to use the Alto Tunnel instead. These potential outside users appear to be undercounted in the study. In fact, local riders from Marin riding through Mill Valley for training loops were not adequately represented in the Study.

The Study Underestimates Attracting New Users or Increased Usage by Current Cyclists. Also, the Study does not adequately account for the fact that the tunnel would create even more use by both locals and outsiders looking for safer routes. With increased bike access through the tunnel, people like me who do their errands by car on the weekend would be encouraged to use the bike instead to run errands knowing that we could rely on increased safe route connections to Corte Madera.

Purported Maintenance Costs Can Be Decreased. I also support the idea of 24 hour use of the tunnel to eliminate the projected cost of maintaining night closures.

I support the comments regarding the Alto Tunnel study made by Marin County Bicycle Coalition.

A proper travel demand analysis begins with the number of people currently using the corridor by all modes; via Camino Alto, via Highway 101 over Alto Hill, via transit. It then estimates how many would use the tunnel having in mind the convenience and travel time bicycling or walking this shorter, nearly water level route. MCBC notes that when bike facilities are connected travel increases. This is true for all modes. It was true when the Redwood Highway (now 101) over Alto Hill was built, shortening the previous highway route. If the study authors believe otherwise, they should explain. Simply using the volume of biking and walking the present disconnected paths and then dividing by two, as the study does, says nothing about the demand for travel that presently exists between the two areas. Let alone the potential travel that opening the tunnel could encourage.
Using CalPark Tunnel as a basis for estimating costs of Alto Tunnel raises several problems. First, CalPark needed strengthening both to resist collapse due to vibration from Highway 101 above it, and to vibration from the SMART trains that will use it. Alto does not. Second, CalPark's substantially additional width required even more support work, including the interior wall that now separates it into halves. Alto does not. Third, CalPark requires ventilation for SMART whereas Alto does not as a bike/ped trail. These are major differences in construction.

I walked Alto Tunnel while it was still open. I appreciate that reopening it will be expensive. Please ensure that the study properly evaluates both the benefits and the costs.

I am writing in support of the Alto Tunnel option of the Mill Valley/Corte Madera Corridor Study. I believe this is the only option that will achieve the objective of the NTPP, which is to make a shift from cars to walking and bicycling. The other two options, even with the proposed improvements, will not in my opinion create a measurable shift from cars to bike/ped, they would only enhance the routes for those who already use them.

I would like you to reevaluate the cost of construction and the estimated use of the tunnel. The latter, in particular, seems way off the mark. With the opening of the Lincoln Hill Pathway and Cal Park Hill Tunnel, combined with the future openings of the SMART Train Pathway and the Central Marin Ferry Connection Project, this bicycle and pedestrian corridor should see a substantial increase in use.

One thing missing from the study is the fact that the tunnel will most likely need to be reinforced in the future if it is not retrofitted for bicycle and pedestrian use. This will cost the County and neighboring towns millions of dollars. Also, it's possible that the bicycle and pedestrian route the tunnel will provide could be used by Mill Valley, Corte Madera and the County to meet the requirements of SB 375. SB 375 requires communities to create specific State certified plans to reduce carbon emissions due to vehicle miles traveled. I think this fact should be mentioned in the Alto Tunnel option. Below are a few paragraphs taken from the SB 375 fact sheet that you should include in the study.

"Just as the railroad transformed California, and decades later our freeway system did the same, SB 375 will be responsible for reshaping the face of California's communities into more sustainable, walkable communities, with alternative transportation options and increased quality of life.

Practically, this will mean envisioning and, planning for communities that rely less on automobiles and get Californians out of their cars for routine trips such as to work and the grocery store. Spending less time on the road is the single-most powerful way for California to reduce its carbon footprint.

It will also mean a higher quality of life. SB 375 provides incentives for creating attractive, walkable, sustainable communities and revitalize existing ones. It will also encourage the development of more alternative transportation options. By doing so, this law will promote healthy lifestyles and reduce traffic congestion so Californians can spend less time on the road."

I am writing to you after reading the MCBC response to the above-mentioned study. They make a valid and convincing argument that the study was flawed, and that it presented misleading facts and erroneous conclusions which are biased against the tunnel. I live in San Rafael, and as a pedestrian and bicyclist, I wholeheartedly endorse the reconstruction of the Alto Tunnel. As they noted, 24 hour access is the prevailing policy for all other tunnels in the US; such access for the Alto Tunnel would both reduce maintenance costs and increase tunnel usage (that is, preventing the situation where a tunnel user decides against making a trip for fear of being locked out on the way home).

While an option, the current Horse Hill route is inconvenient, noisy, and pollution-rich. The Alto Tunnel already exists - I strongly support its reopening.

I would love it if the tunnel were open! It does not appear there is any funding for it now given the wretched state of state and local government finances, and the fact that taxes are at the max in California, so I am also realistic and would like to see safety as the first priority.

I currently use both of the existing routes. I would hate to see improvements that could enhance the safety of those routes held hostage during what appears to be a long planning and funding
process involved in reopening the tunnel.

While waiting for the tunnel project I think the Horse Hill route is the easiest to make more hospitable to bikers and the climb is not that bad. Less able bikers could walk the relatively short steep part of the that route. This route seems underutilized, and it could even be promoted by MCBC. I hear folks say they don't like riding along the freeway, but that is what I will be doing when the work is done through central San Rafael, and what I do when I go north of St. Vincent's Drive. It don't really pay attention to the freeway. Horse Hill is the way I go when I want to appear at my destination sooner and less sweaty, and is also more convenient for certain destinations than the alternatives. There is much less traffic on the Horse Hill route than Camino Alto.

The Camino Alto route is mostly traveled by more adept bikers. However, the most dangerous situations I encounter is when they are riding 2 abreast. Signs to alert riders to ride single file would be very helpful. I also like the idea of adding a bike lane for the uphill portion only if that is all that can be done now. A downhill bike lane can always be added later. Resurfacing of that road would also make it much safer.

I don't want to abandon the plan to reopen the tunnel, but I also don't want to become a statistic during the wait.

I would like to express my support for a safe, flat route between Sausalito and Corte Madera. For years I have ridden my bicycle between the two. Initially I used Camino Alto but there were some car/bicycle accidents, including as I recall at least one fatality, on a busy narrow route that together dissuaded me. I now use Horse Hill which has its own problems.

For some bicyclists I know in the area, the hill and the other problems discourage them so they just drive their cars using Highway 101.

The study that was done is reportedly not up to the usual standards of the consulting firm, with numerous erroneous assumptions and conclusions. Perhaps they had a less experienced or distracted consultant doing the work and on reexamination will correct the errors. That may, and I suspect will, change the conclusions reached in the report.

Please add my voice to those concerned that the Corridor Study is seriously flawed and seriously underestimates the use increase that will occur should Alto Tunnel be opened to pedestrian and bicycle traffic. In my opinion, use will at least double, from its current flow. I am a life long Mann resident and live presently in Sausalito, where the bicycle traffic has increased exponentially since Bridgeway Blvd. was improved to include a dedicated bike path.

There are several other serious financial flaws in the analysis that lead me to wonder if money was well spent on the consultants who produced this study.

The opening of Alto Tunnel, in conjunction with other improvements to a dedicated, relatively level bike/pedestrian route through Mann, will enhance not only the experience of pedestrians and cyclists, but also the entire corridor neighborhood, as those neighboring the paths will have easy access to all parts of the North Bay, not just those areas bordered by unpassable hills and grades.

It's time to do the right thing—open the tunnel!!!

I live in the County and regularly ride my bike in the County. One of my favorite rides is San Rafael to the Golden Gate Bridge. This ride takes me thru Corte Madera and Mill Valley. The Camino Alto Rd. between Corte Madera and Mill Valley is just plain unsafe. It's too narrow, too steep and cars are going too fast both
I want to go on record again stating that I and my family want to use the Alto tunnel to bike safely to Corte Madera. I hope they decide to do it & do it in a timely manner. Is it looking like it's probably going to happen? Please give serious consideration to the comments of the Marin County Bicycle Coalition regarding the Alto Tunnel.

In my opinion, opening the Alto Tunnel to bicycles and pedestrians would be an amazing civil engineering project in Marin ... one that everyone will be proud of for generations to come.

Bicycle riding in Marin is exploding. As just one example: In the last few years, a new tourist industry was created simply by renting bicycles to tourists to ride from San Francisco into Marin. Many of them spend money in Sausalito, Mill Valley, and Tiburon and then take a ferry from Sausalito or Tiburon back to SF. The number of bicycles is so great that we often read news stories in the Marin LI about how Sausalito has had to adjust to accommodate the bike traffic. With the Alto Tunnel, these tourists would also have a viable option of touring Corte Madera and Larkspur and commuting back via the Larkspur Ferry.

Please do not underestimate the number of people that will use this tunnel. If you open it, they will come ... and you will be proud of yourself for having been a part of making it happen.

I was very disappointed to read the MCBC comments regarding the problems with this study (copied below). I was expecting a factual, un-biased study that could provide data on which to base sound decisions on, but instead the study appears to contain many errors and areas that need further clarification. I hope that the serious issues brought to light by the careful analysis of the study done by MCBC will be given due consideration in the process.

Living in Mill Valley and biking to work to Marin Country Day School on Paradise Dr. in Corte Madera, I am very interested in the Alto Tunnel. Riding over Horse Hill often and rarely Camino Alto, I believe these two routes are inferior to the proposed Alto Tunnel because they are more dangerous, more physically difficult because of elevation gain, less appealing because of the cars, trucks, and unhealthy because of the smelly exhausts they create. The Alto Tunnel is a no-brainer for bikes and bike commuters. It will attract healthy bike riders to the area and make it easier for people like me and my friends and co-workers.

I'm also concerned that the recent Mill Valley to Corte Madera Bicycle and Pedestrian Corridor Study is flawed. The number of bikers and bike commuters will go up with an easy connection between Mill Valley and Corte Madera not down! Below is a
paragraph from the Marin Bike Coalition that I believe is more accurate than the 'official study.

Number of Alto Users is Underestimated: The report seriously low-balls the number of people who will use Alto Tunnel: To project use, it examines the current number of people riding bicycles and walking on pathways on either side of the tunnel and then divides this number in half to estimate the number of people that would use the tunnel (so their estimate reflects 50% less than the current number of bicyclists and pedestrians in the area). Based on other studies throughout the United States,'it is well known that bicycle and pedestrian numbers increase (not decrease) when facilities are connected. Over the past 10 years in Marin County, bicycle use has more than doubled even with an incomplete network. In addition, bicycle use in Portland, Oregon increased four-fold over the past 15 years because they are building an inter-connected system: Opening Alto Tunnel could potentially have the same affect on bicycle and pedestrian use in Marin County. Use numbers for the Alto Tunnel need to be representative of industry standards and should be presented as a range, as are the report's cost estimates. There are A variety of methodologies used for estimating use numbers; the report should justify the methodologies used.

Please do what you can to Insure that the Mill Valley to Corte Madera Bicycle and Pedestrian Corridor Study is corrected. And please support this timely and important part of our future as a healthy community. Let's build the tunnel!

I am a frequent bike rider over Camino Alto Hill on my way to work. 5:45 am over the top and 5:30 pm on the way home. I need the exercise, so I love riding. I am turning 50 this year, and would love to have the tunnel option as Camino Alto is very unsafe and in the afternoon packed when 101 backs up.

We have a group of 20 that crosses the over the hill almost everyday, twice a day, all of us would love to get the tunnel open. We have not seen anyone counting us at 5:45 in the morning. Come out and ride with us, and you'll realize how important this tunnel would be to a healthier and happier Marin.

As for the cost estimates, it's totally out of wack. In this economy we are seeing bids come in 75% of the estimated real costs. I saw the write up of the costs, please get someone in there that can do the job right. I have several engineer friends and riders that will get the real $. Call me if you want their names.

I am a lifelong Mill Valley resident. I work in San Rafael, and try to bike commute as much as possible. The opening of the Alto Tunnel would facilitate and therefore encourage people to get out of their cars and onto bicycles. In my opinion, we need to start paving the way to a greener tomorrow for our children and the voiceless plants and animals of the planet.

I am concerned with your draft report re potential use of the tunnel. I believe it greatly underestimates the ultimate usage of that tunnel.

It would be wonderful to have a tunnel to ride bikes or walk from Mill Valley to Corte Madera!
I am providing input into the *Mill Valley to Corte Madera Bike and Pedestrian Corridor Study* prepared by Jacobs Associates. I live in a home just above the north portal of the tunnel.

- I feel the costs to open and reconstruct the Alto Tunnel are underestimated, I recommend that the costs indicate in a wider range to incorporate the worst and best case scenarios to address all potential environmental remediation, legal fees associated with easements and property rights, and compensation to residents/owners through whose property the tunnel runs. The estimated $1.5 million is not sufficient to purchase one of the properties (which may be required due to the significant change in conditions and/or value) or other means of proper compensation. For example, the serene, natural and open setting of my home was the driving force behind my choice to live in this home and I will insist on being properly compensated for changes to these important features resulting from the tunnel.

- The issue of liability for the structures over the tunnel have not been completely assessed and recognized in the study. It is my understanding that the railroad owns the portals and, hence, holds completely liability for the structures above the tunnel. During past conversations, the railroad indicated that they would not permit the tunnel to be opened for public use unless the cities of Corte Madera and/or Mill Valley agreed to take full liability for all nearby structures and other damage. This should be investigated and discussed in the report more appropriately.

- The negative impacts to the ecosystems north of the tunnel have not been fully assessed. Many migratory birds use the ecosystem, especially during the wet season, as a place of refuge. As I am sure you are aware, migratory birds benefit from special federal protections. These issues were not reflected in the study and should be properly addressed and discussed.

- The negative impact to the neighborhood north of the tunnel have not been fully assessed or addressed. While the noise and impact to adjacent properties may be known, the study did not recognize the current use and value of the unfinished (dirt) portion of the walking path between the tunnel and Tamalpais Avenue. This area is used daily by local residents as a dog walking, playing area, strolling children, a meeting ground, a walk way or other casual forms of recreation and social gathering. The impact of bicycles riding by — at times at high speeds — would significantly inhibit, if not completely prevent, the community's ability to continue to use this area in such ways. Likewise, a study should be done to assess the impact that commute riding would have on small children using the bike path on either side of the tunnel as a means to ride their bikes to school. In the latter study, it should be recognized that grade school aged children's awareness to their surroundings can be limited and
their ability to ride in a straight line is inconsistent. These realities result in more dangerous conditions should fast commute bikers share the bike lane with these young riders.

- The tunnel does not significantly improve safe bikes to routes. There are many other areas in Mahn that could benefit from improved, safer routes to school— including addressing the lack of safe crossing from east Corte Madera to west Corte Madera.

- The study did not appear to assess how the various options would link to public transportation (e.g. ferries) and the Bay Trail.

The disruption and accommodations to residents during reconstruction of the tunnel are grossly underestimated. It is unreasonable to expect that residents such as myself will be able to live in our houses safely and without undue disturbance during reconstruction activities. I have a business license to work from my home and would not be able to conduct business during construction activities. I would not be comfortable living in the structure during construction with even the slightest possibility of my home's collapse.

- Damage to houses — e.g. cracks in finishing surfaces, landscaping, etc. - above or adjacent to the tunnel should be factored into the study, including costs to repair such damage.

- Security and policing of the tunnel during and after hours of operation have not been appropriately addressed in the study.

Thank you for considering the above comments. I look forward to reviewing the revised study that properly incorporates my and others' comments.

I am a resident of Mill Valley and I use my bicycle for transportation instead of my car whenever possible. I do this for a few different reasons.

I enjoy the fitness benefits that cycling provides, I do what I can to minimize the harmful effects that I have on the environment, and I save money by cycling. I am very enthused about the prospective re-opening of Alto tunnel for pedestrians, cyclists and emergency vehicles.

As it stands, the Executive Summary is little more than a list of improvement concepts and final cost estimates. Without any context, this information obscures rather than clarifies nature of the 3 alternatives.

The Executive Summary should be explicit regarding assumptions and methodology used in estimating costs and usage: 40% contingency used for Alto Tunnel vs 20% for Horse Hill and Camino Alto Routes and usage estimates for the Alto Tunnel at 50% of current Sandra Marker-Mill Valley Trail usage versus the 110% and 125% used for Horse Hill and CaminoAlto-CM Avenue routes.

The Executive Summary should also include an improved Evaluation Matrix. The Matrix
should footnote the, cost and usage methodology noted in the text.

In the absence of using economic benefit as a performance criterion in the Matrix, the report should reference the extensive literature on this subject some of which is listed at http://www.americantrails.org/resources/economics/index.html.

While it is probably not feasible to add a new performance criterion, the report text should address a) how well the improvement concepts for each route address the constraints itemized in Appendix I Route Inventories, and b) what new problems may be anticipated with increased usage on each route. For example, improvements for the Casa Buena segment that traverses the Hwyl 01 onramp includes stop signs placed at the bottom between two hills. The Horse Hill route dumps cyclists into the Tamalpais-Sanford intersection, which is known for gridlock. What problems may be anticipated at the Redwood-Tamalpais crossing to the Sandra Marker Trail from the Alto Tunnel?

Finally, Section 5.4 Funding Sources needs to be fleshed out with specifics. The source of funding is a major concern of Marin County citizens. It does them a disservice to require them to dig up the County Bicycle Plan to find out how transportation infrastructure is typically funded. As it stands, this Section reminds me of a term paper in which the student just got tired of writing.

Appendix G ROW needs further clarification. As it stands, the 5th paragraph refers to research being done by an expert right-of-way agent and/or real estate research specialist attorney and then later by a title company. Which is it? And what exactly will need to be negotiated? Easements, purchase of property or ?

Section 5.7 of Appendix B Tunnel Feasibility needs expansion. What are the risks of leaving the Tunnel as is? What is the exact nature of the County’s liability if it were left sealed as is?

Please consider these suggestions in the spirit of improving the final Report for the ultimate end users: Marin County citizens and their representatives.

After reviewing the study on the three routes for cyclists from Mill Valley to Corte Madera I must say that it is not complete and is not sufficient for one to make an educated decision on funding.

The study indicates that the cost will be around $50 million to re-open the tunnel. The Cal Park Tunnel cost just under $20 million. The Alto Tunnel has only 30 percent more surface area than the Cal Park Tunnel. What is missing from the report was why the cost is 300% of the Cal Park Hill Tunnel.

That being said, the study did mention the cost to repair the currently deteriorating tunnel to be around $11 million. This figure should be considered as part of the cost of the overall costs of the MV to CM Corridor improvement costs, either by subtracting from the tunnel cost estimates or adding it to the cost estimates of the other routes; the tunnel will need to be stabilized sooner or later.

The Study should have given a view of what we would experience as a society by having a safe flat route that children, commuters, and disabled could use. Questions that come to mind are:

1. What do healthy travel choices do for a population as far as clean air and staying fit is concerned? (People who would never be able to climb horse hill and Camino Alto or those who simply choose never to try but would make the choice if the route was flat)
2. Would the source of funding to open the tunnel benefit our community economically?
3. Would the cost to repair the tunnel come from local dollars and if so how does that effect our economy?
4. How did the projected number of people using the trail come to be figured?
5. Does reducing pollution locally help us with future federal funding and ultimately economic growth?
6. Have the long term costs of each route been considered with safety in mind?

Please take these points into consideration and ask that the Study be revisited for further research.

I am writing to join in the discussions concerning the Alto Tunnel matter.

My family and I moved after fifty (50) years in San Francisco to Marin County (Greenbrae) about one year ago. It has been a real life-style change in many ways, almost all for the better. Probably the most important for us this past year has been in the area of transportation. We are now able to walk to the market and other shops. One of the first things I did was buy a bike which I use for shopping, transportation and pleasure/exercise. I ride my bike to the Larkspur ferry to go to San Francisco. Our car stays in the garage much of the time.

I am 81 years old, almost 82, and love the biking for the renewed energy and sense of well-being it gives me. I find that I am going farther and farther afield on my bike, seeing and exploring many different parts of Marin. I have a real problem with many of the hills, however, where usually I have to dismount and walk. I cannot handle Horse Hill or Camino Alto because of the steepness and safety issues which are daunting to me. I am afraid of vehicle traffic and I avoid steep and narrow roads. I am thus unable to go from my area of Corte Madera to connect with the bike path to Sausalito.

My daughter, also a bicycle rider, works parttime in Sausalito and we often talk about great it will be when the Alto tunnel is opened and we can then get together on a regular basis.

We hope that those persons who will make the decision on this issue will remember that an investment-like the rehabbed Alto tunnel will provide health, safety, and transportation (and commuting) benefits to so many people in Marin who want to walk and use bicycles; that these benefits will provide long-term gains to Marin County itself and even to car users who do not walk or bike; and that these benefits should not be denied because some people think the Alto tunnel may be a more expensive alternative. I am a Marin County taxpayer and I do not think that the decision should be based primarily upon financial considerations.

As a Mill Valley (MV) resident, I am fearful that public monies will be spent unwisely.

Simply put, if you want to improve pedestrian and bicycling access between MV and Corte Madera (CM), there is only one solution and that's re-opening the Alto Tunnel. It may be the most expensive alternative, but it is the only solution that meets its intended goal. If you have ANY doubt, try getting a bag of groceries between CM & MV using human power and ask yourself, given the option, who wouldn't choose their car. I'm a hiker and cyclist and I know that I'd use my car every time.

If you want people to choose human power, it needs to be a flat route that is free of traffic, period.

The final kicker to me is that if reinforcing the tunnel is an inevitability due to its possible collapse putting my neighbor's homes in jeopardy, then why waste the funds on the other 2 options that won't be used??

The Draft Report of the Mill Valley — Corte Madera Corridor is inadequate because
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1. It doesn't address the landslides along the Alto Grade and the Horse Hill routes,
2. It doesn't address the liabilities, costs and impacts of addressing the on-going risk of collapse if the tunnel is not reconstructed, and
3. It doesn't address Corte Madera resident's fervent opposition to widening Corte Madera Avenue.

A meaningful discussion of route benefits and impacts requires that a California Registered Certified Engineering Geologist map the landslides that exist along the Alto Grade and Horse Hill routes. The Corridor Study should address the need to repair or accommodate these slides in order to develop the necessary bike lanes. The Study should note areas where improvements or slide repairs will encroach onto adjacent properties, and should include an estimate of the repair and land acquisition costs involved.

Several previous geotechnical reports conclude that the timbers supporting the tunnel are decaying, that the tunnel has experienced multiple collapses, and that continuing collapse can extend to the surface. These reports conclude that if the tunnel is not reconstructed, it should be filled with gravel or grout placed through holes drilled from a temporary road constructed above the tunnel alignment. This work will not be required if the tunnel is properly reconstructed for bicycle and pedestrian use. Tunnel reconstruction can be performed from the portals, and would not require constructing a disruptive road above the tunnel alignment. It is important that the Alto Grade and Horse Hill options include the liability, costs and disruption involved with stabilizing the tunnel if it is not reconstructed.

The Alto Grade option should include a discussion of the feasibility of widening Corte Madera Avenue in light of the adjacent homeowner's fervent past opposition to roadway widening such as would be required to construct even a substandard bike lane in this area.

It took so long to get the funds to do this study and from reading it they did not seem to do a very good job on addressing the costs and benefits for the best way to improve transportation in that area. I was hoping to see a study that gave more specifics on how they reached their conclusions and the total impact on re opening the Alto tunnel would give for making a much easier way for people to walk or ride bicycles to move around Marin.

I am sure you have looked at MCBC's report on recommending changes and looking at omissions in this report. The point of the study was to answer questions so an informed public and administrators could have a foundation to make the right decision. I would like to see a report that addresses MCBC's questions and comments.

I want the Alto Tunnel open to pedestrians and bicycles !

To get its money's worth and to fulfill the stated purpose of the Study, MCBC respectfully requests that the County of Marin instruct consultants Alta/LandPeople to conduct a major revision of the Study and to address and answer all of the comments and questions raised in the MCBC Report. We should take advantage of the opportunity and get the Study completed properly.

The MCBC looks forward to continuing to work with the County of Marin to make Marin a model bicycle and pedestrian community for the nation. This will improve public health, reduce traffic, increase safety, decrease greenhouse gas emissions, and benefit communities, residents, and the economy throughout Marin.

Mill Valley is my hometown; I still work there and presently live in Stinson Beach.
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I am writing in support of the Alto Tunnel being opened for pedestrian and bicycle access. I actually think all three alternatives should be built, but specifically support the Alto Tunnel as it is the only alternative being considered that would provide safe access for people of all ages and ability.

I am a recreational cyclist. I am not brave enough or fit enough to ride my bike over Camino Alto. Horse Hill is out of the way and not an easy climb. The Alto Tunnel would provide level access and a necessary alternative that would serve the greatest majority of users.

The value of opening the Alto Tunnel in terms of equal access, investment in our future, a move towards sustainability, energy independence, improved health and enhanced communities should be weighed in the analysis.

Thank you for your consideration.

Alto Tunnel route....
....must be reviewed. The study I read did not make sense. Comparing it directly to the Cal-Park Tunnel is faulty because the latter has SMART.

The tunnel is desperately needed for alternative transportation. Both Horse Hill and Camino Alto are too steep and/or narrow as a viable walking or biking route for most people.

Please re-do the study in a less biased manner. Going into the future we need alternatives to automobile or even bus transportation.

I think it is an absolute outrage that you would advocate wasting money on this project. There are plenty of ways to get between mill valley and Corte madera by bike - especially casa Buena drive - which is very safe for children to use. It is time you stop wasting money on things that are not necessary - these are difficult times for all of us - we all need to tighten the belts.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the recent County study of the Alto Tunnel transportation corridor. This study's conclusions, and its incomplete assessment of the benefits -- economic, social, recreational and health -- that would be possible with a viable Alto Tunnel transportation route, are disappointing and should not be finalized by the county. Instead, the study should be revised to ensure that it provides the most complete and useful analysis for the county and the citizens of Marin to make a very important decision:

Whether there is sufficient justification to pursue funding to rebuild this transportation corridor for the use of pedestrians and bicyclists in the years to come.

In this time of fast-growing awareness of the costs to society of global
climatic change and unsustainable living practices, it would be highly unfortunate for Marin County to miss this golden opportunity to give full consideration to the creation of a key non-motorized transportation corridor. This tunnel route would be safe and attractive for families and individuals alike, and would almost certainly become a shining star nationally among old railways converted to modern bike-ped facilities. Imagine the appeal of this route to residents, visitors and tourists; think of the kids who will enthusiastically ride and walk from Mill Valley to Corte Madera or the other way; and consider how this will provide a new, off-street pathway of considerable length for safe, healthy recreation by kids and adults -- and one can quickly understand the value of this re-opened corridor.

It can be of course be expected that the up-front costs for this project would be significant. But in time, they will be far overshadowed by the multiplied value of the new corridor's many benefits. Urge you to hold onto this vision as you navigate the preliminary studies and decision points, even in a difficult fiscal era for the county and its residents.

The draft bicycle and pedestrian corridor study has insufficiently assessed the corridor's benefits, and should be revised. Following that, the county should make every effort to speed this process and move forward with plans to construct a spectacular bike-ped route in the heart of Marin. Thank you for considering my comments.

I live on the Corte Madera side of the Alto tunnel, and I enthusiastically support its re-opening. I'm a bicyclist, but I'm primarily a mountain bicyclist, because I'm scared of cars. Several times I've been hit by cars, and the route over the hill is way too frightening for me. The tunnel would be safe, quick, and very easy, since it's flat.

I believe that reopening this tunnel to bikes and pedestrians is an essential part of making Marin less dependent on the car. Though there will always be some bike traffic on Camino Alto, because some just enjoy that route, a lot of folks will use the tunnel, and that will also help reduce the bike traffic over Camino Alto, which is dangerous due to the narrow shoulders and blind turns. There is no downside that I can see in improving our infrastructure to include improvements that allow more people to get around the county without their cars.

At 60, I have stayed off bikes because there are no safe shoulders in my neighborhood to ride on. I am near the access to this bikeway and I would love to use this safe route when it's opened up and extended beyond Mill Valley. The tunnel would do that, without people having to ride the way out to the freeway, and breathe all the pollution while exercising, then having to ride back to get onto Magnolia. We have a booming bike culture here in Marin. Let's keep it going and set a good example for the younger generation by investing in safe routes that make sense to tie our county bike accessible routes together.

I have to agree with the MCBC on this one.

After reading the report and MCBC's correctly perceived omissions and mis-calculations/assumptions in the study, I hope that the County goes back to Alta for a revised study... otherwise, not only will the $225k be a big waste (and a rip off job by Alta!), but we will not be able to fairly/evenly analyze the route options.

And yes, conceptually, I like the idea of a tunnel, I am open-minded about the route options pending costs (although I really don't like the Camino Alto Class II option... too
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steep/dangerous for non-regular cyclists: for example my wife would never use it and I would never dare pull my son in a trailer/trail-abike along that route... and needless to say we take our son on many all errands/car trips, many of which could be replaced if there was a safe bike alternative).

I look forward to seeing an apples-to-apples comparative study.

General Comments:
We look to this study to provide a balanced and objective analysis of the route alternatives, however the draft report seems to present findings that are too subjective and not well supported, and that subjective estimates are not applied evenly across the alternatives. Specifically, the cost estimates seem to overestimate the risks and costs associated with the Alto Tunnel route, and underestimate the costs and risk with the other alternatives. The methodology for the cost estimate is different for Alto Tunnel route that the other alternatives. There are also significant items in the Alto Tunnel route cost estimate that were carried over from the Cal Park Hill Tunnel project costs that are not needed in Alto Tunnel. Between the different methodology for Alto Tunnel alternative and the unnecessary items, the Alto Tunnel cost estimate may be inflated by many millions of dollars.

The report's use projections, also through faulty methodology, underestimates the potential use of the Alto Tunnel route by using overly conservative methodology; and over estimates the projected use of the Camino Alto alternative through a very liberal estimate. Again, we cannot compare alternatives if the methodology is so different.

I would like to see better tools in the report for comparing the alternatives on an equal basis where we can judge the relative value (cost and benefit) of each alternative and not just on cost alone.

Specific Comments:

Page 1-14 Use Projections:
You have based the use projections on the assumptions that Horse Hill will see a 10% increase, Camino Alto will see a 25% increase, and Alto Tunnel will see no increase in the use (basing the projection on half the current use on either side). This seems to be an uneven and illogical application of subjective criteria. The topography of the Camino Alto route will not change. It will still be a challenging physical climb. Are there really 25% more fit cyclists that will use this route? Use will still be limited to fit cyclists. Older cyclists, families with children, and disabled cyclists will not be helped by an improved Camino Alto route.

Where as a new Alto Tunnel route will serve a much wider spectrum of the community including the fit cyclists as well as the older cyclists, families with children, and disabled cyclists. The Alto Tunnel route opens travel between Mill Valley and Corte Madera to a large portion of the population that is not likely to use either Camino Alto or the Horse Hill route. Doesn't this fact show great potential for Alto Tunnel to have a large percentage of increase in current use levels? I would argue that the potential increase is much greater for Alto Tunnel than for Camino Alto. If we accept the 25% increase for Camino Alto, I would suggest at least a 35% to 40% increase for the Alto Tunnel estimate. It is only logical that Alto Tunnel provides the most potential for increased use and for meaningful mode shift from vehicles to bicycles for short trips.

It should also be noted that this is not simply a question of numbers of users, but more importantly Alto Tunnel will serve a much larger spectrum of the community.

Page 2-26 — Horse Hill Route Sunken/Raised Path Concept
This concept does not identify the active landslide on this hill as a potential issue. Landslides have closed or narrowed the existing route in recent years (and it took way too long for the situation to be repaired). The sunken box through the top of the hill is likely to be filled or destroyed by the next landslide.
Page 3-8 — Route Alternatives Performance - Cost
Much of this evaluation is subjective, in particular where cost is evaluated as "good, fair, or poor." This is not a proper evaluation of cost, in fact cost alone should not be evaluated. Cost and benefit should be factored together and then evaluated as value. Value should be assessed over a period of years and I will suggest that the value of Alto Tunnel as a long-term investment is greater than the value of the two other alternatives. So to rate the other alternatives as good or fair, and Alto Tunnel as poor is not a correct assessment and is based on poor methodology.

Another problem with this evaluation is that the costs seem to be exaggerated for Alto Tunnel and under estimated for the other alternatives, resulting in incorrect data. See my later comments on the cost estimates.

Page 3-8 — Route Alternatives Performance — Right of Way Availability Issues and Adjacent Property Issues
The issue of right-of-way has not been properly evaluated. The question of ROW issues for Alto Tunnel is not yet known, but it may be that there are no issues if the entire ROW is controlled by the County. The Camino Alto route will require acquisition and re-engineering of up to 40 properties some of which may include garage structures. The potential ROW issues for Camino Alto have been under estimated (both in cost and public opposition) and the potential issues for Alto Tunnel have been likely over estimated. Again, this is an inconsistent application of criteria and poor methodology. The report does not provide enough information to make the assessment that, for ROW, Camino Alto is "fair" and Alto Tunnel is "poor." The report should investigate this issue further so an informed assessment can be made.

Page 3-8 — Route Alternatives Performance — Environmental Issues
Again the impacts of Alto Tunnel have been over stated and the impacts of Camino Alto have been under stated. If we compare the relative values, both as habitat and scenic values, of trees to be removed, I believe the negative impacts of Camino Alto are greater. How many native oaks, redwoods, and buckeyes will need to be removed for the Camino Alto improvements? I believe that these trees have a much greater value that the trees to be removed by the Alto Tunnel alternative. Again, the report fails to provide data to make these judgments. How many trees and of what species are to be removed for each alternative. Without this information the consultants are guessing and I believe that they have guessed wrong. We deserve better data and better evaluation.

Page 3-8 — Route Alternatives Performance — Permitting and Agreement Requirements
For the reasons stated above and the potential impacts of the Camino Alto, this evaluation unfairly lists Alto Tunnel as poor and Camino Alto as fair. The Camino Alto alternative's large amount of grading, removal of trees, and impacts to adjacent property owners will make permitting and agreement requirements difficult. The wetlands associated with the Alto Tunnel are artificially created wetlands and the impacts can be mitigated.

Page 4-1 — Cost Estimates
If the report is trying to compare relative costs between the alternatives, then the same contingency factor should be used for all alternatives. Alto Tunnel has a construction contingency of 33% (although the report says 40%) plus a "Cost Estimate Accuracy Allowance" of another 20%. That is a total factor of 55% additional costs whereas the other two alternatives have only a construction contingency of 20%. How can we be expected to compare costs when the methodologies vary so greatly between the alternatives?

The cost estimate for Alto Tunnel was a direct adaptation from the Cal Park Hill Tunnel Although the re-construction of the tunnel structure may be comparable on a unit cost basis, Cal Park was constructed for dual use with the pathway and diesel SMART trains. Fire suppression, ventilation, and CCTV/communication systems that are required for Cal Park Hill Tunnel are NOT needed at Alto Tunnel. These costs are unnecessary and have inflated the cost of the Alto Tunnel alternative.

The cost estimate for Camino Alto does not take into consideration the extensive impacts to private properties that may require acquisition and reconstruction of garages and other structures. This has underestimated the costs for the Camino Alto
alternative.

Detailed Cost Estimates Page 8
- Item 2 — Rails were previously removed. This cost should be deleted.
  Item 11 — High Visibility Crosswalk at Vasco Court: Trail crosses Vasco Court once — quantity should be 1 not 3.
  Item 12 — One curb ramp already exists at Vasco Court. Estimate should only include upgrade for current ADA guidelines.

Detailed Cost Estimates Page 9
- Item 2 — Rails were previously removed. This cost should be deleted. (And if rails were present, cost should be reduced by value of scrap steel)

Detailed Cost Estimates Page 14 — Alto Tunnel Cost Estimate
  Remove Existing Tracks — tracks were previously removed — delete this item of $177,604.
  Domestic and Fire Water System — This item is not needed in Alto Tunnel. It was included in Cal Park Hill Tunnel because of dual use with diesel SMART trains. Delete this item of $600,850.
  Communication and CCTV — This is way overkill and is not needed for Alto Tunnel. This was included in Cal Park Hill Tunnel due to dual use with diesel SMART trains and pathway. SMART will also have a control center to monitor CCTV. Alto Tunnel will not have anyone to monitor CCTV as this is unnecessary. No other existing rail-trail tunnel in the US has CCTV monitoring. Delete this item of $576,900.
  Fan Control Room Excavation and Support — Again this is a left-over from Cal Park Hill Tunnel which need a ventilation system due to diesel SMART trains. Alto will NOT need a ventilation system and no other rail-trail tunnel in the US has a ventilation system. Delete item of $69,690.
  Tunnel Ventilation — NOT needed for Alto Tunnel. Delete item of $95,076.

The above unnecessary items total $1,663,800. When you add the contingencies and design fees used by the consultants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw construction cost</td>
<td>$1,663,800.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction contingency 34%</td>
<td>565,692.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Estimate accuracy Allowance 20%</td>
<td>332,760.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey/design engineering 12.5%</td>
<td>207,975.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental analysis/permits 8.3%</td>
<td>138,595.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Administration 8.3%</td>
<td>138,595.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management 8.3%</td>
<td>138,595.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Unnecessary Costs: $3,186,012.

Construction Cost Contingency — Although Page 4-1 of the main report says that a construction contingency of 40% was used for Alto Tunnel, the contingency used on the Alto Tunnel Cost Estimate on Page 14 of the detailed cost estimates calculates to 34%. This is still excessive and destroys the comparability of the three alternatives. Change the construction contingency to 20% as was used on the other alternatives.

Cost Estimate Accuracy Allowance — An ADDITIONAL 20% was added to the Alto Tunnel Estimate. THIS WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE OTHER ALTERNATIVES' COST ESTIMME. If the report is going to compare costs between alternatives, then the consultants must at least use the SAME METHODOLOGY to calculate costs for all alternatives. This was not done. This is a $5,000,000 to $6,000,000 item that inflates the cost of Alto Tunnel and is NOT factored into the costs for the other two alternatives.

I know there has been a lot of comment about the Bike / Ped study between Mill Valley and Corte Madera. I'm sure you've heard every argument for and against many times over by now, so Z won't belabor this.
Trying to use my car less, I ride regularly up to San Rafael (2-3 times / week) as well as into the City. Because Camino Alto is both hard & harrowing, Z normally use the Horse Hill Path. It's easier than Camino Alto, but certainly no breeze and it is not only unsightly, but also unhealthy along the freeway. Nothing would make me happier than to re-open Alto Tunnel. It would be flat, direct and accessible to everyone - bikes, pedestrians, babes in prams and adults in chairs. Also, as an active member of CERT, I know that opening the tunnel would provide emergency access to and egress from our communities.

I've reviewed the study online and the estimated cost seems to me enormously inflated, way more than the Cal Park tunnel that will eventually accommodate the SMART train. However, even if the estimate is true, in the long run it's cheap at the price and how would like to spend my taxes. We know we'll have to get out of our cars in the future. The time is now to invest in alternatives. Z strongly urge you to do everything possible to reopen Alto Tunnel between Mill Valley and Corte Madera.

I attended the public workshop on 12/9 and examined the commissioned study. I have been a bicycle commuter, riding all or partial sections to/from San Rafael to the Financial District of San Francisco through Mill Valley, for many years. I have an intimate experience of the current options of the routes in and around Mill Valley. I share a vision with many others of a Marin County that offers non-motorized pathway options to a wide range of Marin residents. Therefore, I have these strongly held beliefs about the results of the study and the proposed improvements to one or more of the bicycle routes.

**Corridor Study**

1. The study appears to be inadequate in its methodology and weighting of factors in determining the attractiveness of the various route alternatives. These inadequacies include:
   * poor study of the potential hazards and liabilities associated with a possible Alto Tunnel collapse
   * little weight to the public safety, and emergency egress issues and benefits of an operable Alto Tunnel
   * subjective weighting of criteria in analyzing various routes
   * unsubstantiated costing estimates

2. The study seems to me to have been quite costly for the results it produced.

I, therefore, add my voice to the many others requesting that the consultants make significant revisions to the depth of the study and at no additional cost.

**Specific Route Comments**

1. **Horse Hill Route** - There is only one group of MaNn residents that will benefit from Horse Hill improvements - cyclists. I fall in that group but am opposed to any expenditures to improve this route. Nothing can be done to flatten the hill that must be CLIMBED FROM EITHER SIDE.
significant improvements will be made to the experience of riding alongside a highway. Elevation and an unattractive highway conditions will keep all but cyclists from using the route.

2. **Camino Alto** - Similar to the Horse Hill route, any improvements to the Camino Alto will do nothing to flatten out the elevation gain which makes it undesirable to a larger population of potential non-motorized users. It is also a very dangerous route that will be extremely difficult to make safe.

3. **Alto Tunnel** - An operable Alto Tunnel will benefit ALL types of non-motorized users: School children. Families. Wheel chair users. Tourists. Hikers. Walkers. Workers. Shoppers. And of course, Cyclists. The list of advantages to the Alto Tunnel are extensive. It would be most residents' preference were it not for the question mark of cost and where to find the funding.

**Summary Comment on Specific Routes:** I trust that the citizens and leaders of Marin County have the wisdom to pursue the Alto Tunnel as the most sensible solution to offering County residents and its visitors a non-motorized route between Mill Valley and Larkspur.

I'm a Corte Madera resident and a member of the Corte Madera Bicycle Plan Advisory Committee who attended both public meetings regarding the Mill Valley / Corte Madera Pedestrian Bicycle Corridor Study. I have a few comments regarding the Draft Study:

As part of the Non Motorized Transportation Pilot Project, I thought that the purpose of the study was to identify projects that would be most likely to result in people using non motorized transport.' don't believe that the draft report addresses this issue, at least not directly. Rather, the study seems to examine the two possible routes (Horse Hill and Camino Alto) and how they could be "tweaked" to improve bicycle access and then makes a few cost estimates for the "tweaks". The third alternative (Alto Tunnel) is given a much more speculative examination and a much more speculative cost estimate. While this may be justified by the nature of the alternatives (two are in use while the other is largely unknown), I don't believe the purpose of the study is fulfilled. In short, we did not get our money's worth.

Based on the criteria of most motorized trips deferred, the Camino Alto route should have been eliminated in the initial part of the study, leaving only the Horse Hill and Alto Tunnel alternatives. Most people that would use Camino Alto are already using it, so NO motorized trips would be deferred. It's just too steep for any but the most committed cyclist.

Of the remaining alternatives, the Horse Hill "tweaks" outlined in the Draft Study would, in my opinion, make the route more convenient and attractive to regular cyclists, but would require major changes to produce the kind of mode shift envisioned by the NMTPP. The Horse Hill route suffers from two flaws. First, the part of the route running next to H is very unpleasant and unattractive (noise, exhaust, visually unappealing). Second, it is a major detour from the existing bicycle/pedestrian paths. A true cost estimate of the changes required to correct these flaws would probably approach the Alto Tunnel estimate.

The Draft Study greatly underestimates the pedestrian and bicycle traffic that would use the Alto
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Tunnel. A safe, level connection between Mill Valley and Corte Madera which aligns with the existing paths would produce the kind of transportation mode shift that the study was supposed to examine.

The Draft Study does not proved the basis for any decision except the decision to pay for another study. In its present form it should be rejected. It should provide a clear evaluation of the alternatives based on the NMTPP goals. Please ask the Alta/Land consultants to revisit the study and produce the results we paid for!

Even if only one or two of MCBC’s concerns regarding the Alta/Land People study of the Alto Tunnel are true, then this study really needs to be revisited. A couple of things got my attention.

First, the very first sentence of the study’s introduction begins “Marin County commissioned Alta/Land People to conduct a corridor study of three specific bicycle/pedestrian routes...” It is disturbing, and very telling, to me that this opening sentence implies that the Camino Alto alternative is considered to be one of the potential “bicycle/pedestrian routes”. How did this study fail to take into account the complete lack of practicality - including perilous traveling conditions, lengthy travel times and a long distance over a hill presenting challenges to all but the most physically fit - of Camino Alto as a transportation route - either for bicycles or pedestrians? I therefore find it amazing that Camino Alto should even be considered as a non-motorized transportation route to be studied alongside Alto Tunnel - the ideal non-motorized route connecting Corte Madera and Mill Valley which would be a very prudent investment of tax dollars. It’s like studying the most practical transportation route between the mainland and Hawaii - a jetliner or a raft.

Second, MCBC’s contends that “The Study fails to adequately address the potential for the Alto Tunnel to further collapse if it is not repaired, and how this could create major damages to homes, roadways and utilities.” At the second meeting at Edna Maguire School, I talked to a resident who says she (or a relative, I forget) lives on the hill above the tunnel. I asked her how anybody could object to what amounts to a free seismic upgrade to the land they live on. She insisted that the hill is stable and was even more worried about something to do with “liability”, in regards to construction work on the tunnel, about which she was quick not to elaborate. I think this is a good example that it’s safe to say that residents of this area not rely upon this study for the best available accurate information.

I respectfully ask that this study be reevaluated accordingly.

During my four years of living in Marin County I have become a cycling convert, some might even say an advocate. I choose cycling (or running) as my transportation of choice because I enjoy the personal health benefits that are associated with it and feel good about the small but important difference these modes make for the environment. I try to limit my cycling and running to safe routes. In my experience, I have found that although not perfect, Marin County enjoys a generally strong, safe set of route options for cyclists and pedestrians/runners. I know that reopening the Alto Tunnel is under consideration. I have read the MCBC comments on the consultant analysis. It seems to me there are a number of important items to review and revise in the consultant's report. I personally am in full agreement with a great many of the points made in the MCBC document. I hope the decision of whether or not to open the tunnel is carefully and fairly evaluated. I trust you will review the MCBC document and each of the points contained within it carefully...I am hopeful that an affirmative decision to reopen the tunnel is made. This would give me the opportunity to bring my elementary school aged girls with me to Corte Madera (since for obvious safety/difficulty reasons I would never consider bringing them on Camino Alto or Horse Hill routes).
Subject: Please reopen the Alto tunnel

I bike from San Anselmo to Sausalito regularly as a bike-to-work commuter. Having the Alto tunnel open would make my commute to work much more convenient, safer, and more enjoyable.

I write to provide my comments to the draft study, as a resident of Mill Valley, and to voice my support for serious consideration of the Alto Tunnel route as the best solution for non-automotive transportation between Mill Valley and Corte Madera.

As a recreational bicyclist and as a parent, my primary concern is the creation of a route between Mill Valley and Corte Madera that can be practically used by casual bicyclists, families with children on bicycles and in trailers, as pedestrians, and by persons with disabilities. I would like for my family to be able to ride our bicycles to Corte Madera for shopping or eating out, so that we don't always have to take the car. And I suspect that families in Corte Madera, Larkspur, and beyond would like to be able to ride to Mill Valley and Sausalito for the same reasons. In my opinion, only the re-opening of the Alto Tunnel will provide such a route, because it is the only proposed route that is level (flat) enough for all constituencies to use - casual bicyclists, children, pedestrians, and the disabled.

For avid bicyclists, there is a lot to be said for the Camino Alto route. Its uphill elevation change and dramatic curves have long been a magnet for experienced bicyclists, despite the hazardous conditions for bicyclists and motorists alike. Personally, it's way above my level. No doubt it could be made safer for bicyclists and motorists by widening its shoulders, creating bike lanes, and other improvements. However, none of these improvements will make it a viable route for a parent on a bike with a bicycle trailer, a child on a bike, and certainly not for someone in a wheelchair. It is simply too steep and too curvy.

The Horse Hill path (with Sweet Meadow) is the route I have to use to bicycle to Corte Madera and Larkspur in the absence of any alternative. It's a strenuous uphill climb in both directions, and for exercise, I enjoy the challenge; but I know that it's too much for most casual bicyclists. Because of the steep uphill elevation change, it is not a practical option for bicycles with trailers, children on bikes, or wheelchairs, and thus it is not a practical option for most families to travel north or south between Mill Valley and Corte Madera (and beyond) outside of their cars. Sure, you can push your bicycle up the hill, and I occasionally see people doing it, but I doubt that they would do it twice. It's just not a route most people are going to tackle, no matter how wide or improved.

It seems obvious that the Alto Tunnel is the only route in this corridor that is flat enough for the great number of families who are not avid bicyclists or looking for strenuous exercise. Its wide, level path is ideal for non-automotive multi-use, and the re-opening of the tunnel would open a whole new path for families and others on both sides. Like the bike path leading up to it from Mill Valley, the Alto Tunnel would permit and attract casual bicyclists, bicyclists with family trailers, younger children on bikes, pedestrians, and wheelchairs.

If we want to have a practical non-automotive route between Corte Madera and Mill Valley that most residents could use, then the Alto Tunnel is the only solution. It's the only route that doesn't require a strenuous uphill climb, which is insurmountable for most of us. When you really get down to it, it's the Alto Tunnel or drive your car - those are the choices.

Re-opening the Alto Tunnel would provide many other benefits. It would greatly lengthen the popular Sausalito-Mill Valley path, for those who want the outdoor exercise. It would promote non-automotive trips to the Corte Madera malls and other attractions in Corte Madera and Larkspur (from the South) and to Mill Valley, Marin City, and Sausalito (from the North),
encouraging commerce and enjoyment without the automotive traffic and carbon emissions.

And particularly interesting for those of us who are south of Corte Madera, it could actually open up a practical and economical route to the future SMART train and multi-use path. It seems a shame that we in Mill Valley would have to drive a car to the SMART train and path, when its whole point is to get us out of our cars. Moreover, if we could bicycle to SMART, it would also reduce the need for additional parking, which is already a concern.

We can't expect that people will give up their cars, but we can make it possible for a lot more people to make the non-automotive transportation choice from time to time. As we've seen in other cases in the Bay Area, for example the calming of Market Street in San Francisco, if you invest in making regular routes easier and safer for bicycles and pedestrians, there will be a significant increase in their usage and less automotive traffic.

I understand that re-opening the Alto Tunnel will involve substantial expense, but from what I have read, I am not convinced that the price tag is nearly as high as some opponents have alleged. It's important that the cost estimates be accurate, and the study needs to make sure that they are. I also urge that, in finalizing the study, you be enumerate the significant financial as well as social benefits that the people of Mill Valley, Corte Madera, and beyond would gain from re-opening the Alto Tunnel - non-automotive access to stores and services north and south increase will promote commerce, less car traffic means less wear and tear on the roads and less need for parking, and more bicycling and walking brings both environmental and health savings. It seems to me that this is part the chain of paths and tunnels between all the towns of southern Marin that we all benefit from and should all support.

I can also understand the concern that some local residents have about the construction that would be necessary to re-open the Alto Tunnel. My residential street was repaved not long ago, and the disruption was an annoying aggravation, to be sure. But it's over, and it wasn't as bad as we thought it might be. These projects don't last forever, and now we have the benefit that far outweighs the aggravation and inconvenience. I suspect that the same would be true for the construction necessary to re-open the Alto Tunnel.

In conclusion, I believe that the Alto Tunnel is the only route that would permit practical non-automotive travel between Mill Valley and Corte Madera for most residents. It would provide substantial benefits and non-automotive access to a much larger world for most of us, and it would be well worth the effort and cost.

First let me say that bike safety is very important to me. With the increased population in Mill Valley and increase in popularity of cycling there is a real problem with safe bike riding. However I think that walk/bike Marin is actually a misnomer as it seems it is mostly preoccupied with cycling and less with walking. I attended the last public meeting at Edna Maguire School and was quite taken aback at the aggressiveness of the biking community and the decision that met any opposing views of theirs. I really don't think any of the three plans would benefit walkers.

Most of the people, of which there are few, tend to walk along the existing bike path near the freeway if they are trying to get to Corte Madera. The only improvements I see for walkers would be to put a sidewalk in along Lomita as it becomes a very narrow road at the crest as it runs along Marin Open Space, and continue up the hill towards the freeway. The corner by the freeway up to the continuation of the bike path is very precarious as it is hard to hear any advancing vehicles or bicycles due to the ambient car noise. This route, while not very nice along the freeway, works well as a bike and walking path as it is protected from vehicles and continues on low traffic neighborhood streets to Corte Madera. This is actually a fairly safe route and could do with some improvements to make it a bit nicer.

The route over the Camino Grade is used a lot by more experienced riders and bike commuters as it is more direct. I can't say I ever see walkers on this road. This road would greatly benefit by having some pull out or climbing bike lanes so those cyclists who are going uphill at a much slower speed than the cars would have some safety areas. It seems that downhill isn't so much of a problem as the cyclists generally go at a pretty good clip.

The last route, reopening the tunnel, seems to me to be way too expensive to serve which will primarily be the biking community. If the tunnel had just been closed 5 to even ten years that would be one thing, but this is an ancient tunnel that's been closed over 30+ years. There are just too many unknowns. The tunnel that is being reopened
by the Larkspur Ferry terminal at least will serve commuters as it connects to public transportation. As a model it seems a good representation of what to expect when estimating the costs involved in the CM MV tunnel. It is, however, already over budget.

As a bike route, of course it would be a lot better than either Camino Alto or the existing bike path, but it comes at too great a cost. I don’t believe walkers would use it either, I think the estimate is way over stated on how many walkers would use the tunnel. For one thing a recreational walker wouldn’t go through there, they would go along the path near the marsh or on the fire roads above Corte Madera. There is no real connection for walkers, neither side of the tunnel leads to a center of town or destination that is attractive to a walker. Even once you exit the tunnel on either end it’s quite a way to any commercial area. Safety of walkers is another issue, the tunnel is almost a half mile long, any walker would be quite a target for crime. Cameras will do little good as you can’t have them everywhere, and who is going to monitor them anyway?

My family and I really appreciate the path that runs parallel to Lomita from Edna Maguire ball fields to E Blithedale as it is currently being used. There is plenty of room for ambler, kids, walkers who like to stroll and converse. There is a great dirt path for horses to use, so they aren’t on the pavement or down on the street and have plenty of line of sight for people, dogs, or cyclists on the path. If the tunnel were to reopen it would become a very different stretch of path. There aren’t any tunnels now that people walk thru that I can think of so I don’t really think walkers have an idea of what it would be like. At the next public meeting I think it would be a good idea to have a model, much like they do with story poles when new houses or additions are planned, to represent the tunnel.

You could take some sort of flexible material to make the upper curve of the tunnel roof for the height and mark on the pavement a certain length of ground that represents a fifth or whatever is available of the length and actually stripe out the pavement paths for the bikes, walkers, ada users. Then everyone can walk the length and know how many times they would have to multiply it to get the actual half mile or so length. For a cyclist a half mile of a tunnel is not much but for a walker I think it would be a strange experience.

I am a resident of Larkspur and live about 3/4 mile from the north entrance of the Alto Tunnel. Presently I find myself driving “over the hill” A LOT to attend classes and other activities at the Mill Valley Rec center, visit our doctors on Camino Alto etc. Around Larkspur and Corte Madera we walk or bike EVERYWHERE- to school, to dine, to parks, to shop. It is so disheartening that there is no way to get to Mill Valley walking or biking. The opening of the [Camino Alto Tunnel will change lives as we will finally be able to connect with towns south of hill as we currently can (and do) with Ross, Kentfield and San Anselmo.

Expanding the path on Horse Hill or Camino Alto will NOT provide any additional access for recreational bikers pulling trailers with their children and pets as it will still be TOO HARD to get over the hill. Additionally my cleaning person takes 2 buses to my house and then bikes from the highway. He would then be able to ride directly to our house from his apartment in Mill Valley.

I often think that if I were a wealthy philanthropist this is exactly the kind of project I would take on, as it would benefit so many individuals, grow our communities in a positive way and bring us all closer together.

PLEASE VOTE TO OPEN THE ALTO TUNNEL.

I have been walking, cycling, and driving around Marin County for over 50 years. I count on, and expect, the hard-working public servants of this county to make transportation facilities as useful and safe as possible. I encourage you to carefully review the MCBC’s comments on the MV to CM Bicycle and Pedestrian Corridor Study. MCBC has raised some very valid points, not the least of which is the high cost of a defective study. The Alto Tunnel route would be the safest and least complicated to use, albeit the most expensive to build and maintain. But a good decision on this
issue cannot be made if the factual basis of the decision is flawed. Send the consultants back to the drawing board (without further compensation) to try to get it right this time.

As a resident of the area and a 40-year Marin resident, I'd like to state that I'm very much behind the effort to re-open the Alto tunnel for bike and pedestrian use. I drive up Camino Alto daily to get home and I have seen numerous bicycle/car accidents on the road. It's extremely dangerous to have so many cyclists and cars share an undivided, steep, curvy road, with a narrow-to-non-existent shoulder. There are many packs of 20 or more cyclists going up that road most weekends of the year, and they do not ride in a narrow line. It's no wonder there are so many accidents.

As a former cyclist myself, I can tell you that efforts to steer cyclists towards that path alongside highway 101 are doomed. That route is too far from the Mill Valley bike path, it's alongside a freeway (think high noise level and car exhaust — just what cyclists love), and it drops cyclists into Corte Madera too far from Magnolia, which is where they want to be en route to Larkspur, Ross, San Geronimo, and so on.

I believe the costs associated with the Alto Tunnel project are exaggerated, and would encourage you to reexamine the assumptions that were made that led to the estimate.

I am an avid bike rider and aware of plans to reopen one or both tunnels to cyclists / pedestrians. I think this is a wise use of funding and want to convey my full support for this important initiative.

The Alto Tunnel is a major component of Marin's future transit system, providing an essential link between southern and central Marin. For people to drive less, we must provide viable alternatives to the automobile. Biking, walking and public transit are alternative modes that must be promoted through planning and constructing the infrastructure that serves them. Biking over and around Horse Hill may work for a limited number of athletic types, but are routes that will never serve the vast majority of the public. Improving these, existing trails will promote safety for a few, but not appreciably change driving habits of many. Spending money on projects having limited benefit is short-sighted. We must raise the money necessary to fund solutions we know will work.

The Alto Tunnel should be rebuilt, ideally built to be double-wide, like the Cal Park Tunnel, so one lane would serve trolleys and one for bikes and pedestrians. If the funds obtainable limit the rebuilt tunnel to a single lane, than the tunnel should be designed and constructed to serve as a future trolley route and used for bikes and pedestrians until it can be converted to a trolley route, after which, bike riders and pedestrians could hop on and off trolleys at each end of the tunnel.

We support the Marin County Bicycle Coalition's position that the December, 2009 Draft Study underestimates the popularity of a re-opened Alto Tunnel. Basing their projections on current bike and foot traffic is flawed, because there is sufficient evidence to indicate that non-motorized traffic increases when the facilities that serve them are improved. We opine this is especially so for the Alto Tunnel, given the serious grades one must climb now without the tunnel.

We ask that you direct the Alta/LandPeople consultants to revise their draft report before publishing The final document so that it includes the following:
1. Re-evaluate and, if appropriate, adjust their projection figures for the number of people who will likely use the Alto Tunnel, not based on today's figures, but shown as an increasing rate as Marin's full non-motorized transportation system is put in place.

2. Determine if and what additional measures would be required for a rebuilt Alto Tunnel to serve a future streetcar route, and what the additional cost would be to construct a double-wide tunnel to serve both trolleys and bike/peds.

3. Obtain a number of cost estimates from Tunnel Contractors for the tunnel reconstruction effort, instead of just applying the Cal Park cost figures.

4. Evaluate the public benefits of an opened Alto Tunnel to the impacts on residential property owners who have chosen to purchase land along a public transit right-of-way, along with suggestions on mitigation measures that could reduce such impacts.

Lastly, we ask that the Study's Technical Advisory Committee be expanded to include a wider range of stakeholders, including representatives from MCBC, Transportation Alternatives of Marin and Marin Trolleys.

This Study is too important to Marin's future to not get it right. The $225,000 fee for producing the report should be sufficient to produce a complete and accurate study. We look to the BOard of Supervisors for leadership on this crucial transportation matter.

Thank you for your consideration of this

I have lived in Scott valley for twenty five years and travel the "back pass" daily. my concern is for safety and the earliest possible improvement of the Alto, adding width and integrity to the shoulders. NO on the tunnel.

The Alto Tunnel would be an amazing opportunity for me as a biker and hiker...to get to my destinations either way, with no dependence on a car. The visual of a car free route along many miles in Marin county is very exciting in that it IS possible.

This would allow people of all types, disabilities, ages, to safely get around to schools, grocery stores, destinations, and what an example we could set in the Bay area. Just the beginning opening up the Alto Tunnel would let people see how fantastic it would be to have more and more of car-free possibilities. Once that is accomplished, there would be no doubt that other wonderful possibilities could come to fruition.

I rode my bike on the road with cars for many years. I have noticed a huge increase in the danger of this due to bigger cars, more frantic drivers than ever before, and more impatience, and carelessness. I no longer feel safe sharing the road. But bicycling is a very healthy alternative, and I do not want to stop. As is hiking. We need safe routes. I fully support the opening of the Alto Tunnel.

I am seven and I love to ride my bike. I hope the tunnel can be opened so we all can have somewhere more to go. It is a small space in Mill Valley. The hills are too big so it is like being in a cage. We want to go further and to more places. My friends like the park in Corte Madera and the shopping center with the REI. It's not far if we have the tunnel.
Mom says your study says less people will use the tunnel than use the path. I know my friends parents and my friends who have never used the path would start using it if the tunnel was there cause then there would be a place to go to.

I'm writing to beg the county PLEASE to commit to opening the Alto tunnel for bicycles between Mill valley and Corte Madera. commute by bike and also ride for recreation, and would love an alternative to either slogging up Horse Hill or up [amino Alto, or, worse, around Paradise Drive.

I'd love to see more bicycles used for transport and not just sport in marin, and believe that having a flat and car-free route between mill Valley and Corte Madera would open a wonderful bicycle corridor all the way through marin, linking in so many of the bike paths we already have in existence.

Trust me, I think about this every time groan my way up Horse Hill! Thank you for your time.

First I want to thank everyone involved for their efforts in pursuing and driving this important initiative. A first class bike corridor through all of Marin would truly enhance our lives and could set a precedent for bicycle commuting throughout the entire country.

As I've mentioned in earlier E-mails, I bike commute from Mill Valley to San Francisco regularly and have a perspective that needs some mentioning in the study. Within the bicycling community, there is different levels of riders and abilities. In the last year I've seen a growing number of experienced bicycle commuters. There is clearly a growing population of riders who are looking for higher speed bike corridors, those that average 15 to 25 miles an hour on open roads and paths. Although we all love to ride, we are really trying to get to work as quickly as possible. One of the real benefits of the Mill Valley to San Francisco run is that with the wide straight paths and bike lanes it allows for both high and low speed biking. In the report under the "evaluation criteria" section, there should be two added categories, one for viability of higher speed riding and another for attributes to get people out of their cars and on their bikes. If bike commuters were surveyed, I think you will find straight higher speed capabilities are what entice people to bike commute, not windy narrow cutup bike ways.

On another note I understand this study was only focused on the 3 alternatives studied. I think it should be stated even in the executive summary how these particular routes for study were arrived at. Seems there are other routes to consider such as:

1. Add bike lanes to East Blithedale from the bike path to Tower Dr that may be a more useful than the Lomita Dr route, out of the neighborhoods and provide a connection to both Horse Hill and Tiburon, maybe more bang for your buck.
2. The grade is quite wide on the Camino Alto-Mill Valley side, not so on the Corte Madera Ave side. A nice slower paced climbing alternative is to use Chapman Dr and go through the neighborhoods from Corte Madera to the peak.
3. A more significant alternative that I wonder if it was even thought about is to do an underpass tunnel under the highway at Horse Hill and ultimately connect by surface roads to the existing graded train levy of the NWR RR right of way west of the Nordstrom shopping center. This puts those bike commuters out in their own area much like the Bothin Marsh Preserve in Mill Valley, and is a direct connection to the proposed bridge over the creek to the new Cal Tunnel. With the expense of the Alto Tunnel this could be a very viable alternative for that commuter corridor.

I'm sure there are others, I do think these and any others should at least be mentioned even if not studied. Again would appreciate some dialog in the report about how these 3 routes were chosen for
study.

As to the Alto Tunnel cost estimate. The costs don't surprise me, but it is open to a lot of criticism because it's so high and it includes a lot of contingencies. This being a preferred solution deserves some more study and accurate cost analysis.

I strongly suggest you get an independent estimate from a separate source, as a second opinion. I'm in the commercial construction business and there are independent estimating consultants out there who have the resources draw from a broad range of projects. There cost opinions are typically much more site specific and analytical. These services are not very expensive, especially at this preliminary level.

At the Mill Valley library I came across a study "Alto Tunnel Scoping Study 8/31/89 (I think) by Jacobs Associates" within a report by Brady and Associates, Inc Planners and Landscape Architects dated November 1994 Subject Marin County North-South Bikeway Feasibility, recommending an exploratory tunnel for further study. I see no mention of that exploratory work, time line or cost estimate in this report to do that exploratory work. Seems it would be a necessary step to determine Alto Tunnels real viability. Also, it talks compares the cost of a new bore, that should be updated and mentioned in this new report.

The current corridor study discusses plans the towns have in place to improve Camino Alto and the Corte Madera Ave. In the "2008 Update - City of Mill Valley Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan" it discusses waiting for the completion of this corridor study before seeking funding for improvements to Camino Alto. That's disappointing, this route should be improved regardless of the outcome of the other alternatives, they are heavily used, currently dangerous, most practical to improve quickly and will always be used whether the other alternatives are done or not.

In short in the draft corridor study I'd like to see; 1. some more criteria based around that more experienced commuter, 2. discussion on other potential routes, 3. a check cost estimate done on the Alto Tunnel alternative, and 4. clearer discussion.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Mill Valley—Corte Madera Pedestrian and Bicycle Corridor Study. I have had the chance to review the study as well as the assessment prepared by Marin County Bicycle Coalition. Rails-to-Trails Conservancy would like to comment due to the critical nature of the study in determining the investment focus for the County in improving connections between southern and central Marin County. I share the concerns of the Marin County Bicycle Coalition that this study may not fulfill its purpose and give decision makers enough information to select a preferred route.

1. Given that the County would likely need to secure underground tunnel easements for the Alto Tunnel route, at least some discussion of the political feasibility for the route is needed. That may be outside the scope of the study for the consultants, but some measurement of the political appetite for acquiring these easements is critical to determine if Alto Tunnel is even a possibility.

2. Some discussion of the county wide funding context is needed for decision makers. What amount of funding is expected to be available over the near term for improvements on this corridor? If the much more expensive Alto Tunnel route is selected, what other projects in the County would need to wait or not be constructed? This comparison may follow the study, but some discussion would be helpful in the study.

3. Use recommendations for Alto Tunnel are lower than I would have expected. The study says that a conservative approach was used to project the number of users for the Alto Tunnel route, but instead of being conservative the study should project the most likely number of users. Since the Alto Tunnel would be an important new linkage between southern and central Marin County, I would expect the route to generate increased bicycle and pedestrian use in the area and through the tunnel. The study should look at similar linkages to determine if user numbers increase after the linkage is made. For example, San Jose’s Trail Count 2009 reported that the number of users increased 86% after a gap closure on the Guadalupe River Parkway. Portland has also generated a significant increase, by opening bridge linkages. The numbers for the Alto Tunnel may not be as high as San Jose and Portland because the long tunnel may deter some users and current bypass routes exist, but there should be some increase factored into the use rates.

4. Contingencies in the Alto Tunnel Construction Cost are much higher than the other routes. The contingency adds 33% to the base cost and then another 20% Cost Estimate Accuracy Allowance is added to that total. It may be appropriate to retain these contingencies in the high range so that a worst case scenario can be seen, but contingencies in the low range should echo the other routes at 20%.

5. The MCBC assessment points out other cost concerns that merit explanation. The lion’s share of the cost is tunnel rehabilitation,
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and it is unclear if rehabilitating the 13 foot wide tunnel should
cost the same as the 31 foot wide Cal Park tunnel on a lineal foot
basis. The cost to stabilize the tunnel if the Alto tunnel trail is not
built is considerable and more information on whether it is
required of the County is needed.

While it is exciting to see the concepts for linking Mill Valley and Corte Madera move forward with
well thought out ideas and detailed plans, we would like to see the process move forward without
further studies needed.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Mill Valley
Corte Madera Pedestrian and Bicycle Corridor Study. Rails-
to-Trails Conservancy (RTC) would like to comment due to
the critical nature of the study for improving connections
between southern and central Marin County. RTC is concerned that this study does not fulfill its purpose and
does not give decision makers enough information to select a
preferred route.

1. The right-of-way summary in Appendix G focuses only on the Alto
Tunnel route and does not take the needed step of title research. The study should include
specifics on right-of-way impacts for all three routes,
and determine the number of parcels affected
with a discussion of the costs associated with
acquisition of property or easements. For the
Alto Tunnel, the status of railroad easements is
important to determine such cost, and the title
research should be completed with this study.

2. Use recommendations for Alto Tunnel are lower than I would have
expected. The study says that a conservative
approach was used to project the number of
users for the Alto Tunnel route, but instead of
being conservative the study should project the
most likely number of users. Since the Alto
Tunnel would be an important new linkage
between southern and central Marin County,
RTC believes that this route would generate
increased bicycle and pedestrian use through
the tunnel. The study should look at similar
linkages to determine if user numbers increase
after the linkage is made. For example, San
Jose’s Trail Count 2008 reported that the number of users increased 86% in a single year after a gap closure on the Guadalupe River Parkway. Portland has also generated a significant increase by opening bridge linkages and its steady stream of infrastructure investments has resulted in a 250% increase in bicycle commuting since 1996.

Contingencies in the Alto Tunnel Construction Cost are much higher than the other routes. The contingency adds 33% to the base cost and then another 20% Cost Estimate Accuracy Allowance is added to that total. It may be appropriate to retain these contingencies in the high range; but please show best-case scenarios too, and please provide estimates that reflect significantly reduced bids for projects because of the current economy.

3. The cost to stabilize the tunnel if the Alto tunnel is not reopened is considerable and more information costs for rehabilitation and what the implications are if nothing is done should be detailed in the final study. While it is exciting to see the concepts for linking Mill Valley and Corte Madera move forward with well thought-out ideas and detailed plans, we would like to make sure this study is complete and comprehensive such that the County can move the next phase of environmental clearance and engineering for the routes and improvements ultimately selected.

We live near the tunnel opening and would use it often and would reduce the need to use a car for trips to Mill Valley, Sausalito and Southern Marin. My wife and I encourage our children to consider bicycling and walking when ever we can in lieu of driving.

The old railway bike path is a huge asset to us and really improves our living experience. We are able to walk or ride or bike many places safely and easily. I could not imagine not having the bike path and almost on a daily basis wish that we could use the tunnel. We walk to the opening often and my kids refer to it as the end of the world. Also getting the bikes off Carhino-Alto will make driving over the hill less dangerous for both the cars crossing the double yellow line and the cyclist who are crossing their fingers the car approaching does not run them over.

The more I learn about the possibility of opening the tunnel the more it makes sense. Horse Hill and the current Camino Alto are not practical options for us and connecting central Marin to the southern part of the county will make walking and biking more sensible.
1. The "use methodology" for each alternative does not take into account latent facility demand or best-practice methodologies for forecasting the use of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
2. The cost section of the Study does not include narratives to accompany the budgets, shows several different cost numbers for Alto Tunnel, and doesn't use consistent contingency figures for each route.
3. The Study fails to adequately address the potential for the Alto Tunnel to further collapse if it is not repaired, and how this could create major damages to homes, roadways and utilities.
4. The Study analysis fails to analyze several critical issues including emergency egress, health, the cost of roadway collisions, and more.

As I ride myself, the Alto Tunnel makes so much sense and will have a positive impact on the community. And I hope that you include MCBC and other stakeholders in the Study's Technical Advisory Committee.

I did attend the meeting for the 3 pedestrian and bike alternatives, held at Edna McGuire School in December 2009. I was surprised with the report from Alta Planning, and felt there were emissions and errors in the facts they stated. As an avid bicyclist, I disagree with the implied conclusion that Horse Hill would be the better of the ways. For one thing, it would be very difficult to make this ADA compliant-and traveling through the neighborhood, with busy driveways and a circuitous route seems unpractical. Not to mention, traversing a heavily trafficked freeway with much exhaust is unhealthy.

The second alternative, over Camino Alto, is very dangerous, and it would be doubtful if the neighbors there would be keen on shortening their driveways to make a wider road, as well as nearly impossible to expand certain areas. This will always be a steep grade-most unsuitable for many: children, elders, beginner and light recreation commuters/bike-riders-and certainly, wheel chairs.

Alto Tunnel is surely the most reasonable, in the big picture. It is a Marin treasure-flat, protected, away from traffic-and already existing. Examples from all over point out that tunnels, (never really more that a 3 percent grade), are an excellent solution. Look not only to Rails to Trails in our Country—but also Europe-Switzerland, particularly. In addition, a new Climate Change Community effort has begun in Mill Valley—and this tunnel could be a major answer to many of the problems.

Please have Alta Planning take another look at this study and fix the mistakes. That was a lot of money for a feasibility study that was incorrect. It is owed to the taxpayers of Marin to have a fair and reasonable evaluation of a proper Corridor Bicycle and Pedestrian study, stressing the attributes of the Alto Tunnel.

I am writing today in strong support for the movement to re-open the Alto Tunnel permitting safe alternative passage between Corte Madera and Mill Valley. There are numerous reasons why the County of Marin should authorize this project:
− Supporting the rapid growth of non-motorized transportation
− Offering the safest way to complete the missing link of the North-South Greenbelt
− Creating local jobs
− Foster and promoting a healthy community of active citizens
− Open a safe emergency escape route for our next natural disaster - Reinforce and secure the land above the route

As an active cyclist and driver, I strongly believe for many reasons extensive modifications of the existing Horse Hill or Camino Alto routes are not the solution.
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There is a tremendous amount of misconception, rumors, false statements, anger, and confusion from the opponents of this project. While some of these objections are understandable due to a lack of communication and examination of the facts, the amount of anti-cycling, pro-vehicle, NIMBYism rhetoric is sad, disturbing and dangerous. It is great to know The County is taking a careful and thorough evaluation of the merits of this project. Like the Cal Park Tunnel to the north, the re-opened and renovated Alto Tunnel will be an endearing gem of Marin County for generations to come.

Please spend money WISELY!
Spending money to build the Alto Tunnel is a waste of over FIFTY MILLION DOLLARS, not to mention that people can potentially lose their homes! There are two incredibly reasonable and viable options that already exist - Camino Alto (for those who really like the challenge) and with a little improvement, Horse Hill. This is a tunnel for RECREATIONAL use. There are PLENTY of more important transportation issues we have to tackle than this. This needs to become an issue as to what is BEST for the community, not something that is being done to put a feather in the cap of local politicians.

No Alto Tunnel please!!!
i bicycled in marin county for many years; i feel the alto tunnel proposal to be a colossal misrepresentation of costs and considerations and strongly believe more practical alternatives exist

I believe this would be an incredible waste of taxpayer money.

I am a Scott Valley resident and I support Horse Hill and Camino Alto modifications. I DO NOT support the Alto Tunnel.

The idea of opening the tunnel is appealing but impractical. The horsehill option makes good sense from the financial and logistical standpoints.

I am an avid bike rider -- I ride seven days a week, and hold many championship titles. I would rather see this money spent on more bike baths throughout the streets of Marin County — not a tunnel. I speak for many of my fellow riders when — we WOULD NOT USE A TUNNEL. We ride for exercise and pleasure, which means the tunnel is useless. I would like to know what percent of riders you see every day and on weekends support the tunnel. I imagine that number is negligible — they would rather see more bike paths.

14. In Support of Improving Camino Alto & the Horse Hill Multi-Use Path

We need better bike/ped paths in Mill Valley. Many Mill Valley residents can not currently bike safely to the multi-use path. Also many kids ride, walk, scooter etc every day to Edna Magurie and other schools on Lomita and to Middle School that would not be safe on a bike path / a lot of speeding adults, as well as the many other current users of the path- moms w/ strollers and little kids, dog walkers, pedestrians who get pushed off the path when packs of bikers race by.

I have not studied or verified all of the costs mentioned, but assuming they are fairly accurate, this
solution appears to be much more practical. The horse hill and camino alto improvements choice makes more sense fiscally as well as practically.

The estimated costs for the tunnel do NOT include the potential costs for providing security not only at night but also during the day. Would you enter this tunnel if you were alone? Who pays for the security and lighting? Who is going to pay for maintenance? Not Mill Valley. we can barely meet our budget problems

I personally think the Camino Alto road should be banned to bicycles because it is so unsafe. Realizing this is probably never going to occur, this petition is the best alternative though I think the Paradise "Loop" should be rerouted to the Horse Hill Path for the weekend warriors who totally make Camino Alto unsafe for drivers and cyclists alike.

I believe this the correct way to go. Opening the tunnel is a waste of money. We are in need of funds for more important items such as schools, road work and items to improve living for all residents.

the tunnel option is too expensive...this issue needs to be addressed. camino alto on the weekends is an absolute mess--dangerous for both bicyclists and drivers.

STRONGLY support a pedestrian/bicycle bridge over Blithedale. This is an extremely unsafe intersection for pedestrians and school children walking/biking to school. It is only a matter of time before a serious injury or fatality occurs.

Everyone will have a different idea as to what is most cost effective. Mine - - Spend all the money to provide wide shoulder on Camino Alto! Doubt if freeway path could ever be made into a pleasant route. Tunnel sounds great -- if you have no other more important ways to spend $40 million dollars.

In a time of financial crisis, public expenditures should be carefully monitored. This proposal reduces costs significantly - 4.3 to 5.5 m. is much less than 48 - 59 m. Moreover, the Horse Hill route will have greater use and visibility. This approach parallels the design of bike paths in northern Europe.
Probably 90 percent of residents near the path strongly oppose the reconstruction of alto tunnel. I bike weekly, and frequently see speeding bike enthusiasts scare/ endanger both elderly neighbors (the Redwoods retirement center is adjacent to the path) and children walking on the existing path. Given the much cheaper alternative of improving the horse hill and/or camino alto bike paths, these options make considerably more sense than rebuilding the alto tunnel for furthering the quality of life for recreational bikers (most of whom do not live in Mill Valley or Corte Madera)and residents alike. Scott fearon. 55 vasco court, Mill Valley

We live 1/2 block away from the proposed Alto Tunnel and are worried about the cost of the reconstruction. We cannot be at the meeting, but are strongly in favor of improving the Horse Hill bicycle route.

The cost of the tunnel puts it out of the running as a reasonable option in these hard economic times.

There are so many other less expensive options than to open the Alto Tunnel. Please show there is still some common sense in government.

In addition to multiple legal-issues concerning the access to the tunnel: rights of way, property ownership, easements, etc., the 2001 the Rails-toTrails Conservancy completed their Tunnels on Trails survey of 78 tunnels in use as bikeways on 36 trails in the United States, including rural, suburban, and urban locations. According to this report and based on criteria specifically outlined per the Marin County Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (Page 82), the feasibility of reusing any of the tunnels is dependent on eight factors: 1) local jurisdictions willing to take on the cost and responsibility of building and operating the facility; 2) local neighborhoods being willing to accept these revitalized corridors; 3) the lack of reasonable, less costly alternatives; 4) the expectation that they will significantly increase bicycling and walking; 5) there are no geological, drainage, or other physical problems with reconstruction; 6) the property owners can come to an agreement with local agencies; 7) the cost of reconstruction is within reason; and 8) safety and security issues can be effectively addressed.

By my count:
#1: Questionable.
#2: Negative. Neighborhoods (both Scott Valley and Mill Valley Meadows Homeowners associations) are Negative
#3: Negative. Other reasonable and less costly alternatives are available
#4: Probable
#5: Questionable
#6: Doubtful / Negative
#7: Doubtful / Negative
#8: Doubtful / Negative

Camino Alto and Horse Hill options certainly are the most viable, cost effective and wise choices for a multitude of reasons.
I agree totally that the cost to re-open the tunnel is prohibitive, and that improvements to the Horse Hill path and to Camino Alto are superior options all around. I also think Lomita Drive (where I currently have a real estate listing) should be enhanced with a bike lane and real sidewalks (not asphalt curbs which currently exist. This neighborhood deserves some enhancements to make the pathway between school and the shopping center safer and more functional for pedestrians and bicycles. Thank you!

The tunnel is extravagant and in these times maximize benefit with minimum cost is prudent.

Please do not spend that much money on a small bike route when there are so many other needs.

I do not support the reopening of the Alto Tunnel in my neighborhood. A waste of tax dollars.

Please take the more sensible approach to improving safe bicycling routes in Southern Marin than opening up the Alto Tunnel.

I am a Scott Valley resident. This is fiscally irresponsible and the tunnel option should NOT be considered further.

I am a Scott Valley resident. I do not support the rebuilding of the Alto Tunnel. It is environmentally irresponsible to bore a hole through the mountain in order to create a bike path. I am fully in favor of improving the Horse Hill and Camino Alto routes which will improve the natural environment.

Hardly appropriate for such a small minority

The tunnel plan is extremely wasteful and benefits a very small number of people.

Seems like a waste of money when other options are available, not to mention the hardship on the homeowners directly in the path of the tunnel.

The tunnel is not a good use of money. Prefer to see it used for improving Camino Alto and Horse Hill.
The cost for the proposed tunnel is too high in contrast to making improvements to the Camino Alto and Horse Hill frontage roads. As a longtime resident of Mill Valley, my observation is that bikers prefer a route with scenic beauty, and therefore will continue to prefer the Camino Alto route. In addition, as someone who has had some experience with construction projects, it is my opinion that the final cost of such a complex engineering and construction project will exceed the estimated costs. The funds would be better utilized to provide improvements that will benefit a greater number of residents and users, and avoid damage and/or the taking of private property.

I live in Corte Madera and I work in downtown Mill Valley. I have biked to work using the Horse Hill bike path and it is very easy to use for commuting. I support improving the Horse Hill path and the Camino Alto path, rather than reopening the tunnel. The reconstruction of the tunnel is too expensive an alternative, and the Horse Hill route will be more beautiful if the landscaping is improved.

While a bike rider myself, this proposed project appears to be an inappropriate use of funds. If this project is to be considered, are bicyclists willing to legally ban non-motorized vehicles from going over the hill. This is a safety issue for drivers as well as riders. Have the ongoing and recurring costs of public safety, electricity, emergency call boxes, ongoing maintenance, etc. been identified, costs calculated and publicly released?

Do not open the Tunnel - it is way too costly and does not make sense when two other viable options are available.

fix the existing routes (Scott Valley resident) don't take private property

That Alto Tunnel would cost way too much. There are already 2 options for going from Mill Valley to Corte Madera. this makes no sense. Maybe build a new school instead. Or feed the hungry. there are much better uses for this money (and I am an avid cyclist).

The unbelievable difference in cost, as well as the strong opposition of the Scott Valley property owners were the deciding factors for me.

NO Discard the tunnel option! abandon the tunnel proposal! save the houses!

Dear Marin County Board of Supervisors:

Thank you for the time and effort you and your staff have devoted to the Mill Valley to Corte Madera Bicycle and Pedestrian Corridor Study (the Study). Our Homeowner's Association Board has read the Study and offers the following comments.

In general, we find the Study to be balanced, thorough as to its mission, and filled with useful information. We have sponsored a petition, presented under separate cover, which briefly discusses some of the points covered in the Study, and which goes on to ask the Board to fund the improvement of Camino Alto and the Horse Hill route, and to permanently discard the Alto Tunnel (the Tunnel) option.
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Our primary concern is the safety of the citizens of Mill Valley and Marin County, pedestrians, bicyclists, automobile drivers and passengers alike, who all use these routes. That is why we see the improvement of Camino Alto as the top priority for transportation spending in this corridor. Secondarily, we believe that improving the existing multi-use path over Horse Hill, when combined with improving Camino Alto, offers the easiest and most cost-effective solution for promoting bicycle use and thereby reducing vehicle miles travelled by automobiles; we therefore urge that the next pot of available transportation dollars allocable to this corridor be dedicated to this project.

1. In support of those recommendations, we would like to begin our in-depth comments on the Study by focusing on a few points which the Study did not fully address, specifically:

1) The issues surrounding the seven private parcels for which the County would have to acquire access rights in order for the Tunnel to be a feasible option at all;

2) The extent to which reconstruction of the Tunnel, if funded, would siphon off funds which would otherwise be available for other worthy bicycle and pedestrian projects;

3)

4) The economic context of the three proposals, namely, the financial condition of city, county, state, and federal governments which would have to fund construction and maintenance of any of the options.

We realize that exploring these issues in depth is beyond the scope of the current study, but we feel that it is important to highlight them in order to place the three options in a broader context.

1. Before any further studies of the Tunnel are conducted, the issue of the County's need to acquire the proper rights to access it must be examined in depth. This should be the first order of business if the Tunnel option is to be given any further consideration, because if the County cannot acquire these rights, or chooses not to because of the complexities and costs involved, any further study of this route would be a waste of time and money. In fact, we believe that the County will not be able to acquire these rights without condemnation or purchase of at least two of the seven private homes/parcels that sit above the tunnel route.

One of our officers, an experienced commercial property owner and manager, has done an in-depth analysis of the easements, deeds, and access issues on just two of these parcels, the ones directly above the Tunnel's two portals, and has made a narrative and copies of all relevant deeds available to you. The deeds show that at one time, the railroad owned the parcel over the south portal of the Tunnel, which is one of two parcels now comprising the property known as 34 Underhill Road; however, when the adjacent parcel was sold to private owners after the home on it was rebuilt and expanded by the railroad following its condemnation and the collapse of the entrance to the Tunnel in 1981, the two parcels were combined, and any and all railroad easement rights for both parcels were included in the transfer. Today, no former or current easement for the benefit of either the County or the railroad is recorded against the property, or referenced as an exception in its title policy. Recreation versus transportation uses of the three routes;

Simply put, 34 Underhill is now privately owned with no easement rights whatever for anyone to access the portion of the tunnel which lies just a few feet below it. Some of the structural elements stabilizing that property, which were put in place in 1982 to protect the home from further damage, would have to be removed in order to access and rebuild the southern portal. These are the facts.
Here is our point of view on these facts. It is inconceivable to us that the family occupying this home would be able to remain in residence during a reconstruction of the Tunnel for a host of reasons, not least of which concerns the liability the City and County would assume for the welfare of the family, their possessions, and the home itself. Based on our knowledge of the family and their position on the issue, we conclude that the County would have to attempt to take the home from this family and to relocate them in order to gain the scope of access to the Tunnel necessary to reconstruct it. To accomplish this, the County would have to work with the City of Mill Valley, which would be drawn in either directly or indirectly, to condemn and purchase the home, which is in excellent condition and probably worth at least $2,000,000. Any attempt at such a taking would meet with strong opposition from our Association and from residents in the other surrounding neighborhoods. Since such a taking would involve the Mill Valley City Council, which holds jurisdiction over this neighborhood, the County would have to secure such participation in advance; it's safe to say that our Association would actively oppose any, such participation by the City.

The issue on the northern portal is even more complicated, in that there is an easement recorded against the property which has been abandoned for decades and has long since expired according to its terms. We provided a copy of this easement, which states "provided also that the lands so conveyed shall be used for the purpose of a right of way for said Railroad and for no other purpose, and if not so used and the Railroad maintained, then this agreement shall be null and void", to your staff in the earlier packet of deeds referenced above.

In order to reinstate this easement, the County would have to go to court to modify its terms, which is not only not a sure thing, but which would again draw in the local jurisdiction, the Town of Corte Madera. Any such attempt to force a reinstatement of this easement would no doubt spark strong opposition from the Chapman Meadows Homeowners Association, which has been vocal in opposing the reconstruction of the Alto Tunnel.

It is also difficult to imagine that the Town of Corte Madera and the County would want to assume the liability involved in trying to remove the existing structural supports of the northern portal, and to shore up the underpinnings of the multi-million dollar property directly above that entrance, with occupants in residence. We can't imagine that the occupants would want to live in the home through the construction process in any case.

We disagree with the Study's conclusion that no homes would have to be taken in order to secure access rights and that "Tunnel excavation and support can be carried out without having to condemn or acquire properties adjacent to the Tunnel and portal" (Appendix B, Sec. 5.1.1, page15). This conclusion, which comes from Appendix B, a section of the Study prepared by Jacobs Associates, rests on faulty assumptions and an overly optimistic interpretation of the facts it so carefully lays out. Furthermore, it is somewhat in conflict with the Study's Appendix G, a section prepared by Alta/Land Pedple, which identifies the seven private parcels from whose owners access rights would have to be acquired. This section opines, with admirable understatement, that "if property owners prove difficult, the negotiation process may be lengthy".

In addition to these two homes, the Study has identified five other privately-owned properties which are sited farther away from the portals, and therefore not as sensitive to construction issues, from which the County would have to acquire access rights in order to control all the land needed to reconstruct the tunnel. Given the complexity of the issues involved, and the certainty of organized opposition to any possible taking of any of the aforementioned rights, we believe that the figure of $500,000 to $1,500,000 cited in the Study (Appendix G, page 2) is far too low. A more realistic figure would at the least exceed the value of the two homes which sit directly over the tunnel's portals, plus legal/litigation costs, plus an estimate of the cost of securing the rights to the other five privately held parcels on the route. We venture to say that $5,000,000 is the lowest realistic figure to acquire all these rights, and it could be higher.

On Tuesday, January 26, the Marin County Bicycle Coalition (MCBC) presented a 64-page letter to the Marin County
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Board of Supervisors, criticizing the methodology used to prepare the Study and requesting detailed further examination of several matters covered in the Study. This letter is currently posted at the MCBC website: www.marinbike.org.

Among other inaccuracies in that letter is one germane to this issue. On page 14 of the MCBC letter we find a claim that access rights to the seven (7) privately-held parcels could be obtained for as little as 1% of the fair-market value of those properties. The MCBC letter goes on to cite a document entitled "A Practical Guide to the Condemnation of Aerial Guideway Easements and Tunnel Easements", prepared by the law firm Graham & Dunn of Seattle, Washington as the authority for this claim. The entire report can be found on the Graham & Dunn website, and the link is cited in the MCBC letter as Appendix F.

The MCBC claim is based on an incorrect reading of the Graham & Dunn report, which clearly distinguishes between shallow tunnels and deep tunnels on pages 19 and 20.

The two most prominent homes we have referenced, the ones directly above the Alto Tunnel's two entrances, clearly qualify under the "shallow tunnels" classification in the Graham & Dunn report because they are very closely sited only a few feet above the Tunnel's entrances. The .1% valuation for the taking of an easement pertains only to tunnels sited "well below the surface" (page 22).

For shallow tunnel easements, page 19 of this report states, "Shallow tunnel easements have the potential to create a variety of physical impacts on the burdened property", and "Shallow tunnel easements may also bring with them significant construction impacts, particularly where the tunnel is constructed from the surface of the burdened property. In such a case, the condemning authority should consider a full take of the subject property during the period of the construction, with a full right of first offer (or first refusal) granted to the property owner upon completion of the project."

The report goes on to say that the condemning authority can re-sell the property after construction, either back to the owners from whom it was taken or to new prospects.

This Graham & Dunn report actually confirms what we have been saying all along — that the two most affected properties will most likely have to be taken before any proposed construction can begin.

In light of the foregoing, before any further studies are done or consideration given to the option of reconstructing the Alto Tunnel, we request that the access issues raised here should be examined in depth by the County's legal and real estate staff and/or expert outside consultants, and that their findings, recommendations, and estimates be published for all to see. This process shouldn't be lengthy or expensive, but all such information is critical to the task of deciding whether or not to proceed any further with this option.

2. **Even if the estimated $52,000,000+ needed to reconstruct the Tunnel (which does not include the costs involved in securing access rights) could be found and allocated for this purpose, Camino Alto, a vital transportation corridor for local residents, commuters, and recreational bicyclists, would still be unsafe.** At both public meetings focusing on this Study, many cyclists expressed their preference for continuing to use the Camino Alto route regardless of whether the Tunnel were to be reconstructed, and the Study confirms this finding based on many such comments received (page 2-73).

If the $32,000,000+ were to be allocated to reconstructing the Tunnel, there would be no benefit to Safe Routes to Schools, a vital bicycle/pedestrian program which not only protects our
children, but also has the potential to alleviate automobile congestion at several choke points in Mill Valley and the rest of the County. (The improvement of the Horse Hill route, on the other hand, would greatly benefit bicycle and pedestrian access to Edna Maguire School.) We believe that such an allocation for the sole purpose of reconstructing the Tunnel without any consideration to assist this program would be a misuse of transportation funds.

There is a backlog of many other worthy projects in various City and County plans to safely promote bicycle and pedestrian use, the completion of which would surely be relegated to the distant future should such a massive amount of capital be allocated to a single route of less than 1A mile.

3. Another point not considered in the Study is the difference between transportation and recreational uses, and the extent to which each of the three options actually would stimulate alternative transportation uses versus encouraging new recreational uses. While we recognize the many benefits derived from recreational cycling, we also note that improvement of both Camino Alto and the Horse Hill route would primarily encourage alternative transportation uses, which is in alignment with the goals of the Transportation Authority of Marin, and that the Alto Tunnel option benefits recreational users at least as much as it encourages alternative transportation uses, if not more.

Both the San Francisco Chronicle and the Marin Independent Journal have noted the dramatic increase of commercial ventures profiting by renting bicycles to recreational users, primarily tourists from San Francisco on weekends, with Southern Marin County as a prime destination. Those of us who live in the eastern end of Mill Valley frequently encounter vans full of tourists from several of these for-profit companies, parked in local parking lots, and discharging their customers into the neighborhoods with rental bikes and maps to various destinations. The City of Sausalito has found the massive influx of bicycles into town to be a mixed blessing at best (S.F. Chronicle 3/22/09, Marin Independent Journal (I.J.) 3/13/09), with cyclists leaving bikes all over the parks, blocking doorways of commercial enterprises, riding on sidewalks, etc. We are certain that a reconstructed Tunnel would draw even more of these commercial users through Mill Valley's and Corte Madera's quiet residential neighborhoods.

Allocating massive amounts of money to a use which would dramatically benefit for-profit firms, while neglecting the safety of local residents (Camino Alto) and our school-age children (Safe Routes) is clearly a misuse of public transportation funds.

4. The City of Mill Valley, Town of Corte Madera, County of Marin, State of California, and the U.S. Government are all grappling with massive losses of revenue, with no end in sight.

The City of Mill Valley currently furloughs its employees for one day every two weeks. The town of Corte Madera recently announced a $2,000,000+ deficit in a $14.8 million budget (Marin I.J., 12/27/09) and is thinking of instituting a program of furloughing its employees. The County's deficit is projected to be at least $15,000,000 per year for the next five years (Marin 1.41/12/10). In the January, 2010 issue of Marin Magazine, Judy Arnold, Marin County Supervisor for District 5, was asked "What is Marin's most pressing issue?", and replied "... our budget shortfall. It could be as much as $20 million". Former Supervisor Gary Giacomini answered the same question by saying "the virtual bankruptcy of local school districts, cities, and the County of Marin itself. ... It will be a financial Armageddon for local schools and governments that will virtually devastate their budgets and cripple their services". The State of California's financial woes are well-documented, with $20+ billion deficits looming for years to come, and the U.S. Government is so deep in debt that no one knows whether its obligations can ever be repaid.

Neither the County, nor Mill Valley, nor Corte Madera are in any kind of financial condition to assume the ongoing costs of maintaining, insuring, and policing the Tunnel.

The Tunnel is far from a "shovel ready" project, with complex and expensive access issues threatening its very viability. The Study notes (Appendix F, page 24) that in order to proceed with the Tunnel option, ten different new studies are needed, mostly to deal with environmental and construction issues, in addition to which an El R
and other work to satisfy Federal requirements would most likely be required. The cost of these additional ten studies is pegged in the Study at $165,270,000, but a thorough EIR, for which the local neighborhood associations would lobby aggressively, and a study to satisfy Federal environmental requirements, would add considerably to that total.

Factoring a few years of inflation into the already outrageous current estimated cost to reconstruct the Tunnel, it becomes apparent to us that this option remains a distant and tenuous proposition, which, if pursued, would leave Camino Alto still unsafe for all users, and Mill Valley and Corte Madera with no improved connection for cyclists and pedestrians.

II. There are many issues discussed in the Study and its Appendices which we would like to highlight and for which we have comments. We do not claim to be experts in the methodologies used to arrive at the various projections, use statistics, and cost estimates which appear throughout the Study. However, a couple of the statistics nearly leaped off the page at us.

1. COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS. First, the combined estimated cost of improving Camino Alto and the Horse Hill route would be less than 1/5 the cost of reconstructing the Alto Tunnel (Table 4.1, page 4.2), yet would produce nearly the same result in terms of reducing Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMTs) (Table 1-2, page 14), with a reduction 75% as large as the Tunnel option.

Reducing VMTs is a primary goal of the Study and of the Transportation Authority of Marin, and is clearly a transportation benefit. In raw terms, using the statistics in the Study, improving the existing routes would have a cost/benefit advantage over the Tunnel option of 375% (75% of the benefit for 1/5 the cost or 500% cost benefit x 75% of the VMT savings). Table 3-1 on page 3-6 through 3-9 graphically supports our positions on each of the three routes with regard to a cost/benefit analysis.

2. CONNECTIVITY. Section 2.2 on page 2.1 states "Improving bicycle and pedestrian connectivity is the primary objective of the study ". In this regard, the Alto Tunnel is clearly the frontrunner. However, the next sentence states, the "Avoiding or minimizing impact on adjacent land uses is a parallel objective". In this regard, the Tunnel option fails for the Mill Valley side, where the Tunnel route cuts across a quiet cul-de-sac and flanks the back yards of a couple of dozen homes, and fails even more dramatically in Corte Madera, where it cuts through a quiet box canyon full of homes and flanks the front yards of many others. Additionally, on the Mill Valley side, it crosses sensitive. wetlands and wildlife habitat, where deer, foxes, possums, owls, coyotes, wild turkeys, and raccoons are frequently seen.

Turning these quiet neighborhoods and habitat into a "Bicycle Freeway", as the Marin County Bicycle Coalition labeled this route, would certainly violate the referenced parallel objective.

On the other hand, Camino Alto and the Horse Hill route, which lies alongside Marin's main north-south artery, Highway 101, are already transportation corridors. Improving connectivity on these two routes would be far less disruptive, since they both are already used for exactly that purpose.

The City of Mill Valley has a wish list, developed to help alleviate potential automobile choke-points and traffic jams in anticipation of the opening of the new Whole Foods store on Lomita Drive, of sidewalk and street improvements for that corridor, which is directly contiguous to the multi-use path which provides the access to the Horse Hill route. The City would like to encourage bicycling and walking all around that area, and all the neighboring homeowners' associations have supported these improvements in recent public meetings. Several of these wished-for improvements could be undertaken in conjunction with the improvements cited in the Study for the Blithedale/Lomita...
intersection, which, by the way, are "shovel ready" in that local groups already support them and there are no access issues to overcome.

Additionally, as noted previously, improving the Horse Hill route could greatly benefit Safe Routes to Schools, and would also improve connectivity between Mill Valley and the shopping districts of Corte Madera, which are also sited along the freeway.

The Tunnel, on the other hand, empties out well above the main commercial districts of Corte Madera, with better connectivity to Larkspur and points away from Marin's primary transportation and shopping corridor.

3. STEEPNESS. On page 2-5, the Study points out that the steepest section of Horse Hill is only a 10% grade, which is nowhere near as steep as Camino Alto; however, this section is very short. On page 3-1, the Study notes that the Tunnel route has a 5% grade, and that the approaches to the Cal Park Tunnel are considerably steeper than the Alto Tunnel route. In fact, the graphic 3-2 on page 3-2 of the Study shows that the Cal Park Tunnel's approaches are almost as steep as the steepest sections of the Horse Hill route, although shorter. It strikes us that local bicycle activists, recreational riders and commuters alike, are justifiably proud of their success in the reconstruction of the Cal Park Tunnel yet claim that the Horse Hill route, at an almost identical degree of steepness, is too steep for the same purposes.

4. SAFETY AND STABILITY. On page 2-48, the Study states that "the Tunnel is not wide enough to accommodate conventional emergency response vehicles, such as an ambulance or fire truck". Since the Study does not include costs for widening the Tunnel, the condition would presumably remain if the Tunnel were to be reconstructed. Any accident or medical emergency, such as a jogger suffering a heart attack, for example, would therefore require emergency responders to enter on foot, perhaps by bicycle, but in any case, evacuation would be difficult, as this is a fairly long tunnel at nearly 1A mile.

Since emergency vehicles require a wide area in which to turn around, the Study notes on page 1 of Appendix E that turnarounds are not feasible near the portals, and would have to be located elsewhere. There are no areas close to the portals on either side which are suitable for this task, so the turnarounds would have to be located well away from the portals, which would make any evacuation even more difficult. In a real emergency, smaller responding vehicles could drive on the multi-use paths and then back out in reverse, but we would like to know "Do the responders have such vehicles, and have they been consulted on the logistics of such evacuations?" (Question 1.)

In Appendix A, on page 3 in Section 2.1, the Study notes that the San Andreas fault is 10 kilometers away, but does not mention the Rogers Creek fault, which actually runs through Mann County on the bay side. An article in Scientific American in the 12/16/04 issue posits a "hidden fault" under Mt. Tam based on seismic activity recorded in the area. Whether the existence of such a fault is ever proven, one point remains clear: the Bay Area is known for seismic activity, and the Tunnel, if reconstructed, must be designed to withstand a major earthquake in order to be viable. There is no mention in the Study of the structural capabilities of the Tunnel as budgeted at $48-32 million; in other words, for that cost, we ask "What Richter level would the Tunnel be able to withstand before failing?" (Question 2.)

The Study mentions the potential instability of the center section of the Tunnel in its current condition, but does not discuss earthquake safety after reconstruction. Since the Tunnel was originally constructed (in 1884), there has been no major settling above the route except for the collapse of the southern portal in 981. In fact, one of Jacobs Associates' engineers told the author of this letter that he walked nearly the entire length of the Tunnel to determine whether there was any actual physical evidence of settling above the Tunnel route other than over the southern portal, and found none — no dips in the land, no sinkholes, etc. The theories expressed by Tunnel advocates to the effect that not reconstructing the Tunnel would lead to damage to homes above it are conjecture and are not supported by any
physical evidence.

Section 3.2.2 of Appendix B of the Study, a section prepared by Jacobs Associates states "The Tunnel section between the backfilled plugs is supported by 125-year-old timber supports that have outlived their design life. Further instability and collapses in the Tunnel are likely if no action is taken, possibly leading to unacceptable ground settlement or even sinkholes to the ground surface, similar to what was experienced at the Cal Park Tunnel". This statement seems to be at least somewhat in conflict with Section 3.2 of Appendix A, also prepared by Jacobs Associates, stating that after inspecting the MMWD Water pipeline tunnel, which is parallel to the Alto Tunnel, and which can be observed (and was for the study) by lowering video cameras into it, "Where observations were possible, it can be surmised that the (MMWD) tunnel is stable at the shafts and adjacent tunnel sections".

While we do not doubt that an earthquake could damage homes along the route, we would like any further engineering studies, which again should not be undertaken until all access issues have been resolved, to study the matter of stability in much greater detail. We do not believe that it is necessary to spend $11,000,000 as envisioned in Appendix B, Section 5.7 and 6.2 to stabilize the center section of the Tunnel, which, according to Jacobs Associates, has the best rock in the area, considering that about 1/3 of the Tunnel, the sections that actually are under homes (in some cases, very far under) is already filled in.

5. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES Appendix F discusses the environmental issues on all three routes. Since Camino Alto and the Horse Hill route are already widely used transportation corridors, discussions of the environmental issues involved in improving these two routes were fairly straightforward, with budgets of $56-87,000 for seven additional studies needed for the Horse Hill route (page 21), and $96-151,000 for similar studies needed for the Camino Alto route (page 28). This section of the Study, which was prepared by LSA Associates, seems to view these additional studies as routine and does not anticipate serious adverse conclusions from them, as evidenced by its conclusion that neither of these routes would require an EIR; it also goes on to say that both would qualify for both a Mitigated Negative Declaration and for an "Exclusion for compliance from NEPA" (the National Environmental Policy Act). As to the Tunnel, however, this Appendix lists more than two full pages (page 22, 23, 24) of "Potentially Significant Environmental Impacts" which would require detailed further study, and goes on to state that "an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) would be the appropriate level of environmental review for compliance under CEQA'. It further states that "It is possible, though unlikely, that the project could be addressed by a Categorical Exclusion... to satisfy the requirements of NEPA (both quotations on page 24).

In addition to these two reports, the Study recommends that ten other surveys or studies on the Tunnel be completed, and estimates the cost of these ten studies at $165-270,000, a figure which does not include the EIR and NEPA reviews which it also recommends.(page 25). It is therefore clear that the environmental hurdles required to clear the Tunnel option are significantly higher than those of the other two options, and that the studies required would be far more expensive and time-consuming.

Of paramount importance to our Association are bullet points #1 and #2 on page 22 of this Appendix, which constitute just a fraction of the "Potentially Significant Environmental Impacts" of the Tunnel option.

#1. COMPATIBILITY WITH LOCAL PLANS. We will discuss this in Section 6 below.
#2. COMMUNITY IMPACTS.

The Study says it well: "Implementation of the project could result in a substantial increase in bicyclists and pedestrians using the proposed corridor. Increased use of the proposed corridor may alter the character of adjacent residential neighborhoods and downtown Corte Madera through which the corridor passes. This impact may be significant and unavoidable".

That last sentence defines the concerns of hundreds of homeowners who live adjacent to or near the proposed routes. What Tunnel advocates seem to forget or choose to ignore is that the last time this route was a transportation corridor, there were no homes along, above, or in the canyons around it. Literally hundreds of homes have been built very near this route since the trains stopped running over four decades ago. There are quiet residential neighborhoods which would be changed forever by having a Bicycle Freeway built through them. Why not improve the two existing transportation corridors, already in use for exactly this purpose, which, combined, would cost 1/5 as much and deliver 3/4 of the benefit, representing an enormously greater cost/benefit ratio for whatever precious transportation dollars are available here? Why dramatically change or destroy two entire neighborhoods when much cheaper, nearly as efficient options, which are infinitely less complicated to improve, exist in close proximity to the outrageously expensive, disruptive option?

In addition to the previously-referenced safety and emergency issues involving the Tunnel itself, we are concerned about the safety issues which would arise from a dramatic increase in recreational, commercial, and commuter bicycling through the affected neighborhoods in Corte Madera and Mill Valley. The routes which access the Alto Tunnel would cut across city streets and through cul-de-sacs in these quiet neighborhoods, directly in front of a number of homes and directly behind the back yards of many others, alongside schools, and alongside and through parks which have heavy cross traffic (Bayfront Park, Alto Field, Edna Maguire baseball fields, etc.), and through downtown Corte Madera. A dramatic increase in bicycle traffic on these routes would not only have profound impacts, but would also raise accompanying safety issues, which would need to be studied fully (see #6 of Resolution 00-36, attached below).

Of course, we are concerned about many of the other impacts listed on pages 22-24 of Appendix F as well, but we don't believe it is necessary to comment about all of them in depth here.

6. COMPATIBILITY WITH LOCAL PLANS

This is bullet point #1 referenced above, which we feel does bear an in-depth examination here.

Pages 3-4 of the Study quotes extensively from the 2008 Marin County Unincorporated Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, and in particular states "based on criteria specific to Marin County, the feasibility of any of the tunnels is based on several factors, including:

1. The willingness of local jurisdiction(s) to become project sponsor(s) and take on the cost and responsibility of building and operating the facility

2. The political acceptability to local neighborhoods of these renewed corridors provided by reopened tunnels

3. The lack of reasonable, less costly alternatives

4. The expectation that they will significantly increase bicycling and walking

5. Geological, drainage, or other physical factors posed by the reopening of tunnels

6. Ability of project sponsoring agencies to resolve legal issues with affected property owners
7. Cost of reconstruction and available funding
8. The ability to address safety and security issues

It's clear to us that the Alto Tunnel fails utterly on nearly all of these, except for #4, where it clearly succeeds, #1, where we believe it will fail due to costs, and #8, where the jury is still out, so to speak.

The City of Mill Valley's Resolution oo-36 (copy attached), which our Association has supported in numerous public meetings, lists eleven specific issues which the City Council wanted addressed, with the understanding that its support for or opposition to reconstructing the Tunnel would depend on whether or not these issues could be satisfactorily resolved. The Study did not address all the issues in Resolution oo-36, but we believe that the Tunnel fails on most of the criteria which were addressed, particularly the most important ones (#1-cost/benefit analysis, #2-neighborhood impacts, #5-impact on other planned bicycle/pedestrian improvements, and #9-evaluation of alternatives). We note that the study did not address one of the areas of requested information (#6-effects on Bayfront Park), and note the incomplete nature of other issues it did touch upon (#3-seismic analysis, #11-access, easement and other property issues).

The Study's own Evaluation Matrix on pages 3-6 through 3-9 bears out our position, as discussed -earlier in this-letter-namelythat-the cheaper-alternatives-to-theTunnel-are also far less intrusive to the surrounding communities, and that improving those alternative routes could be accomplished more quickly, given the complications associated with the Tunnel option, and without the complicated access issues which will inevitably, perhaps indefinitely, delay the development of that route.

Thank you.

RESOLUTION NO. 00-36

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MILL VALLEY
ENDORSING A FEASIBILITY STUDY TO DETERMINE WHETHER
REESTABLISHING THE ALTO TUNNEL FOR PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE USE
REPRESENTS A PRUDENT PROJECT IN FURTHERANCE OF THE MARIN
COUNTY BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN MASTER PLAN

WHEREAS, it is the intention of the County of Marin to establish a "North-South Bikeway" for the use of bicycles and pedestrians, one possible aspect of which is to re-establish use of the Alto Tunnel ("the Tunnel"); and

WHEREAS, a portion of the Tunnel and the multi-use path leading to/from the Tunnel are located in the City of Mill Valley ("the City") and would substantially impact the City and its residents; and

WHEREAS, recognizing the many benefits to Marin County and its various communities and residents, including Mill Valley, which might result from the use of the Tunnel for bicycle and pedestrian travel, the City considers that a feasibility study should be undertaken to analyze the various factors involved in re-establishing the Tunnel,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City endorses the proposal of the County of Marin to conduct a feasibility study to analyze the various effects that re-establishing the
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Tunnel would have on Marin County in general and the City in particular. In endorsing the feasibility study, the City is not assuming any financial responsibility for the cost thereof and does not commit to conform to any conclusions reached by the study. The City recommends that the study carefully consider specific issues, including but not limited to:

1. The manner in which the Tunnel construction, operations and maintenance costs will be financed, along with identification of possible funding, and a cost/benefit analysis be prepared utilizing these cost figures;

2. The extent to which the Tunnel and the approaches thereto can be constructed and maintained so as to be non-invasive to the privacy and safety of the neighboring residents during both construction and operation;

3. Analysis of the Tunnel Structure including seismic safety of the Tunnel and adjoining properties;

4. Analysis of the likely ongoing costs of maintenance, lighting and security and the impact of these costs on the City;

5. The extent to which construction of the Tunnel is likely to delay or diminish completion of the specific local and regional projects benefiting the City and surrounding areas, as listed in the Marin County Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan;

6. Evaluation of the adequacy of the current multi-use path in Bayfront Park for the expected increased volume of bike riders, and users of the Park;

7. Evaluation of the effect of the Tunnel on the existing and anticipated traffic congestion problems in Marin County in general and the City in particular;

8. Whether reestablishment of the Alto Tunnel might result in its use in connection with train service in Southern Marin County (which would be counter-productive to bicycle and pedestrian use); and

Evaluation of whether alternatives to the Tunnel, including the improvement of the existing route on Camino Alto, the path adjacent to U.S. Highway 101, and other possible north/south routes, may contribute sufficient improvement to bicycle/pedestrian travel and traffic flow without the addition of the Tunnel.

9. Proposed schedule for design, funding, construction and opening.

10. Identification of the environmental impacts of the proposed tunnel on the surrounding areas, including the need for any possible easement or property acquisition.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at the regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Mill Valley on the 4th day of December, 2000, by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Raker, .5oiet gwenson, Naldeck, -yor. Fis:co.

NOES; Norte. ABSENT: None.

My wife Eve and I want to make it very clear that our Association is strongly against the Alto Tunnel. We fully agree with our neighbors .... the Scott Valley Home Owners Association .... and fully support and conquer with all the points made in their attached letter.

OTHER THOUGHTS:
Based on criteria specifically outlined per the Marin County Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (Page 82), the feasibility of reusing any of the tunnels is dependent on eight factors: 1) local jurisdictions willing to take on the cost and responsibility of building and operating the facility; 2) local neighborhoods being willing to accept these revitalized corridors; 3) the lack of reasonable, less costly alternatives; 4) the expectation that they will significantly increase bicycling and walking; 5) there are no geological, drainage, or other physical problems with reconstruction; 6) the property owners can come to an agreement with local agencies; 7) the cost of re-construction is within reason; and 8) safety and security issues can be effectively addressed”.

By my count:

#1: Questionable
#2: Negative. Neighborhoods (both Scott Valley and Mill Valley Meadows Homeowners associations) are Negative •
#3: Negative. Other reasonable and less costly alternatives are available
#4: Probable
#5: Questionable
#6: Doubtful / Negative
#7: Doubtful / Negative
#8: Doubtful / Negative

Now that the draft of the Mill Valley to Corte Madera Bicycle and Pedestrian Corridor Study is completed, with cost estimates to re-construct the Alto Tunnel and to improve access to both of its portals ranging from a low of $48,253,660 to a high of $59,503,893*, I believe that this option is prohibitively expensive, and cannot be justified by any measure of value. I also note that that these estimates do not include the cost of acquiring the necessary 7 parcels of privately held land required to complete the project, each of which is the setting for an occupied home, or, alternatively, of acquiring the rights to cross them, which would be problematic at best -- per research and documentation provided by John Palmer.

We further believe that the much more reasonable estimated cost of $4,369,778 to $5,514,939* to improve the existing Horse Hill route (a figure which omits two gold-plated upgrades suggested in the study, namely the construction of a bicycle/pedestrian bridge over Blithedale for $3.4 — $4,000,000*** and the flattening out of a small section of the route for $6,980,000***) would be a wise investment. Unlike the Alto Tunnel, the Horse Hill route already connects Mill Valley residents with destinations to which they currently drive, such as Town Center, businesses along Tamalpais Drive, and The Village Shopping Mall, so making that route more desirable has the potential to significantly reduce the number of vehicular trips between the two cities.

Many of us use Camino Alto every day to access our neighborhoods, and we agree with the Marin County Bicycle Coalition that the Camino Alto/Corte Madera Avenue route is unsafe for cyclists. We also agree with the Study that there will always be bicycle enthusiasts who will prefer the challenges of this route to the other options; therefore, we believe that any funds available after the improvement of the Horse Hill route should be used to widen and improve the Camino Alto route wherever possible to create more separation between bicycle and vehicular traffic, estimated in the Study to cost between $4,644,473 and $5,465,647*. Marin County must plan to upgrade and make the Camino Alto route safer for both bikers and drivers alike.

In fact, the County could complete both the Horse Hill and the Camino Alto projects for about 1/6th of the cost to reconstruct the Alto Tunnel; the combined result as estimated in the Study would reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled, a prime goal of these projects, by 75% of the figure projected for the reconstructed tunnel**** making this option a far more efficient use of precious resources.

We therefore urge you to discard the tunnel option once and for all and to concentrate on improving the Horse Hill route and making Camino Alto safer for all users. Thank you.

First I want to thank everyone involved for their efforts in pursuing and driving this important initiative. A first class bike corridor through all of Marin would truly enhance our lives and could set a precedent
for bicycle commuting throughout the entire country.

I bike commute from Mill Valley to San Francisco regularly and have a perspective that needs some mentioning in the study. Within the bicycling community, there is different levels of riders and abilities. In the last year I've seen a growing number of experienced bicycle commuters. There is clearly a growing population of riders who are looking for higher speed bike corridors, those that average 15 to 25 miles an hour on open roads and paths. Although we all love to ride, we are really trying to get to work as quickly as possible. One of the real benefits of the Mill Valley to San Francisco run is that with the wide straight paths and bike lanes it allows for both high and low speed biking. In the report under the "evaluation criteria" section, there should be two added categories, one for viability of higher speed riding and another for attributes to get people out of their cars and on their bikes. If bike commuters were surveyed, I think you will find straight higher speed capabilities are what entice people to bike commute, not windy narrow cutup bike ways.

On another note I understand this study was only focused on the 3 alternatives studied. I think it should be stated even in the executive summary how these particular routes for study were arrived at. Seems there are other routes to consider such as:

1. Add bike lanes to East Blithedale from the bike path to Tower Dr that may be a more useful than the Lomita Dr route, out of the neighborhoods and provide a connection to both Horse Hill and Tiburon, maybe more bang for your buck.
2. The grade is quite wide on the Camino Alto-Mill Valley side, not so on the Corte Madera Ave. side. A nice slower paced climbing alternative is to use Chapman Dr and go through the neighborhoods from Corte Madera to the peak.
3. A more significant alternative that I wonder if it was even thought about is to do an underpass tunnel under the highway at Horse Hill and ultimately connect by surface roads to the existing graded train levy of the NWR RR right of way east of the Nordstrom shopping center. This puts those bike commuters out in their own area much like the Bothin Marsh Preserve in Mill Valley, and is a direct connection to the proposed bridge over the creek to the new Cal Tunnel. With the expense of the Alto Tunnel this could be a very viable alternative for that commuter corridor.

I'm sure there are others. I do think these and any others should at least be mentioned even if not studied. It's important that our town decision makers understand there are other options. Again I would appreciate some dialog in the report about how these 3 routes were chosen for study.

As to the Alto Tunnel cost estimate. The costs don't surprise me, but it is open to a lot of criticism because it's so high and it includes a lot of contingencies. This being a preferred solution deserves some more study and accurate cost analysis. I strongly suggest you get an independent estimate from a separate source, as a second opinion. I'm in the commercial construction business and there are independent estimating consultants out there who have the resources to draw from a broad range of projects. There cost opinions are typically much more site specific and analytical. These services are not very expensive, especially at this preliminary level.

At the Mill Valley library I came across a study "Alto Tunnel Scoping Study 8/31/01 by Jacobs Associates" as part of a study by Quincy Engineers dated 8/31/01 and a report by Brady and Associates, Inc Planners and Landscape Architects dated November 1994 Subject Marin County North-South Bikeway Feasibility. The engineering reports of the Alto Tunnel recommend exploratory work of the existing tunnel for further feasibility study. I see no mention of that exploratory work, time line or cost estimate in this report to do that exploratory work. Seems it would be a necessary step to determine Alto Tunnels real viability and necessary for engineering design. Also, there is comparisons as to the cost of a new bore, that should be updated and mentioned in this new report.
The current corridor study discusses plans the towns have in place to improve Camino Alto and the Corte Madera Ave. In the "2008 Update - City of Mill Valley Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan" it discusses waiting for the completion of this corridor study before seeking funding for improvements to Camino Alto. That's disappointing, this route should be improved regardless of the outcome of the other alternatives, they are heavily used, currently dangerous, most practical to improve quickly and will always be used whether the other alternatives are done or not.

In short in the draft corridor study I'd like to see; 1. some more criteria based around that more experienced commuter, 2. discussion on other potential routes, 3. a check cost estimate done on the Alto Tunnel alternative, and 4. clearer discussion.

As a cyclist who tries to commute from Mill Valley to San Rafael for work, I read the entire Mill Valley to Corte Madera Bicycle study with dismay. Here's why. There is NO relief from the following dangerous parts of my commute:

- **Safety**: Cars passing me on Camino Alto where there are blind curves and no shoulder. There are also very poor asphalt conditions on the road, which create their own set of hazards. Wet roads: weather from morning dew or rain poses their own hazards on hilly descents.
- **The Dark**: There aren't enough lights on Camino Alto or Horse Hill making winter riding and evening riding risky.
- **Security**: Horse Hill isn't what I would call "female-friendly", as in, there are often men sleeping along the path and I have met them riding 'by. That is very unsettling. I find it interesting that so much of the comments in the report focused on safety in the tunnel, but very little about personal safety on either of the two existing routes. There are never any police monitoring the path and if something happened to a rider, another rider would probably discover them, first.

A significant issue, briefly mentioned in the report is Time. Riding east to Horse Hill or west over Camino Alto to go directly north to San Rafael adds 20 minutes each way. If I face these issues as an adult, imagine what the same walk or ride is like for young people, the elderly, people trying to get to their job when they don't have a car. The report fails to mention the steep cost of mass transit between Mill Valley and Corte Madera or San Rafael. It also doesn't factor in how long it takes to ride the bus between communities. Both are not the best use of limited resources. The report states that Horse Hill provides direct access to the Corte Madera Shopping center, but fails to mention that there isn't a safe, direct route to The Village Mall- also a place that people want to travel to and where plenty of people have to walk to get to work.

Reopening the Alto Tunnel makes the most sense of any the three routes.

Other glaring problems with the report include: imposing a "tunnel curfew" (why would you close a tunnel at dusk unless you thought pushing people back onto the original dangerous paths was the best way to go?), Underestimating the number of users: see above for why people don't utilize the existing routes, and over-inflated cost projections. I'm hopeful that our elected officials have already considered the points that I have raised in this message, and I look forward to seeing this proposal go back to the drawing board for more accurate cost projections and some serious attention to immediate safety fixes.