

Rochelle Wheeler

From: Crystal Wang <cwang@actransit.org>
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 2:45 PM
To: Rochelle Wheeler
Cc: Nathan Landau; Robert Del Rosario; Michael Eshleman; Chantal Reynolds
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Reminder: Alameda's Draft Active Transportation Plan - Comment by Sunday, Oct 23

Hi Rochelle,

Thanks for providing us with the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Active Transportation Plan! Nathan and I reviewed the document, here are our comments/suggestions for your consideration:

- Page 12 – Under “Connectivity and Comfort”, consider adding a sentence(s) along the lines of “Walking and biking also serve as key first/last mile connections to transit, so improvements to the active transportation network should also focus on enhancing connections to the transit network”
- Page 12 – Under “Mode Shift”, consider adding “...to increase walking and biking *and promote better access/connections to transit*, while reducing driving”
- Page 18 – It would be good if this page acknowledged that many streets have to work for both bicycles and transit
- Page 31 – In the table, you list the Neighborhood Connector Streets as “often have transit”. Consider adding “including major transit routes,” because many of our routes run on those streets
- Page 31 – Under “Business Commercial Streets”, should “bus shelters and benches” be called out too? (as listed under “Neighborhood Connector”)
- Page 32 – Would be helpful to include the map of the Transit Overlay somewhere in this document
- Page 32 – Under the description of the Transit Overlay, in addition to noting the need for access to transit, should also mention “efficient transit operations”
- Page 33 – Regarding roundabouts, should include a footnote that “roundabouts on transit routes should be large enough to allow buses to operate through them”
- Page 34 – Thank you for including the transit overlay into design treatments. For road diets, consider including a footnote like “Road diets can be problematic for bus operations, and may not be appropriate on some transit streets” or other similar wording
- Page 38 – The map legend says “low stress bikeway on Park or Oak. We’d prefer it on Oak, since Park is important to our operations.
- Page 40 – The Separated Bike Lane concept should refer to the [AC Transit Multimodal Design Guidelines](#), since we have some concept designs. Also, “streets with separated bikeways shall provide access for paratransit vehicles that meets paratransit guidelines”
- Page 63 – Ongoing evaluation should also review bike/transit interaction
- Page 64 – Mode shift performance measures should include “Increase in people walking or biking to transit”

Thanks!

Crystal Wang

Rochelle Wheeler

From: Gerard, Pierre <PGerard@oaklandca.gov>
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2022 3:51 PM
To: Rochelle Wheeler
Cc: Patton, Jason; Ferrara, Nicole; Patton, Jason; Reed, Christine; Manasse, Edward; Ehlers, Emily; Olsen, Kerby; Ream, Charlie
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Reminder: Alameda's Draft Active Transportation Plan - Comment by Sunday, Oct 23

Hi Rochelle,

I have comments on behalf of the City of Oakland—please note that we did not receive comments from other staff (though they may have been sent to you directly), so these comments are mine and are actually mostly questions:

- *Page 31:* Will any “Business Main Streets” be considered for Posted Speed Limit reduction as per A.B. 43?
- *Page 38:* The proposed estuary water shuttle should not be considered a proposed Class I Bicycle Facility as shown on the map.
- *Page 39:* How does a design speed of 20mph differ from one of 15mph? The City of Oakland is targeting a design speed of 15mph for its Proposed Neighborhood Bike Route Network.
- *Pages 40 and 53:* Will there be opportunity for City-sponsored neighborhood-level place-making signage to complement proposed bicycle wayfinding signage on Neighborhood Greenways? I see that street art and placemaking (e.g., “painted bulb-outs, in-street bike corrals and intersections”) is proposed.
 - Relatedly, are residential in-street bike corrals being considered for placemaking on Neighborhood Greenways?
- *Page 51:* On what kind of quality metrics will bikeway striping maintenance be based?
- *Page 53:* How are corral locations determined and what kind of maintenance do these bicycle parking corrals receive? The City of Oakland's business-initiated corral application and maintenance agreement has not resulted in consistent maintenance: <https://cao-94612.s3.us-west-2.amazonaws.com/documents/Oakland-application-agreement.pdf>
- *Page 53:* Which agency/agencies will be responsible for maintaining the proposed expansion of free-standing bike repair stations and where will/should the funding be sourced? Bike shops and non-profits may be best suited for contracted labor to maintain them.
- *Page 53:* Will low-dollar amount payment incentives and City-sponsored childcare for public meetings be considered to increase engagement of underrepresented groups? The City of Oakland is exploring this incentive model through prepaid debit cards, though no examples yet exist.
- *Page 63:* MTC-defined equity priority communities in the City of Alameda equate to two census tracts, covering roughly the western geographic half of the City. Might there be a better set of metrics for equity priority?
 - Relatedly, what percent of ATP projects should be in these communities?

If any of my colleagues CC'd here have comments/questions about the City of Alameda draft ATP, please reply to Rochelle directly or as a reply to this email thread.

Thanks! This Plan was exciting to read.

Pierre Gerard

Pronouns: he/him/his

Transportation Planner

Bicycle & Pedestrian Program

Safe Streets Division

Rochelle Wheeler

From: Joel Shaffer <jshaffer@bayareametro.gov>
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2022 4:14 PM
To: Rochelle Wheeler
Cc: Nicola Szibbo
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Reminder: Alameda's Draft Active Transportation Plan - Comment by Sunday, Oct 23

Hi Rochelle,

Nice work on the Draft Alameda AT Plan! MTC staff have reviewed and our consolidated comments are below:

- It may be beneficial to mention Equity Priority Communities (or the relevant equity metric) in the Existing Conditions chapter and show on an existing conditions map as well – it seems like these data are in Appendix D but not in the draft plan. Making this edit could be helpful given that Equity is a key goal of the plan.
- “Who are we planning for?” (p. 36) does not mention any equity populations.
- P. 52: Equity priority areas should be updated to Equity Priority Communities.
- Equity Priority Communities (p. 52, 53, 63) are mentioned but not defined. Is the plan using the [MTC definition](#)? If so, it should be defined as such and capitalized to indicate.
- Equity is not included in the 2030 infrastructure plan considerations (p.56) though it was used in the prioritization process (Appendix A). Suggest adding note about role of equity in the prioritization process.
- Would be helpful for performance measures (p. 63) to include 2022 baseline in Table 11.
- Draft plan document does not include any discussion of community engagement; there is only an appendix. Recommend including at a minimum a summary of engagement conducted with EPC residents and noting in plan how recommendations were made as a result of this engagement. This will set future projects up for success in grant applications.
- Appendices should be relabeled in order they are referenced in the plan.
- Figure 8 Proposed Bay Trail Route – There appears to be a gap just east of Encinal terminal. This part of the map needs to be filled in to show connectivity for the Bay Trail.
- Figure 8 Proposed Bay Trail Route – Eliminate duplicate parallel alignments of the Bay Trail shown along Fernside and the Eastern shoreline of Alameda island as well as the duplicative parallel alignment shown on Central Avenue and the adjacent shoreline.
- Chapter 6 – Add language to clarify that the proposed Estuary Crossing Bike/Ped bridge is being proposed as a part of the Bay Trail system when the final alignment is determined.
- Mckay Ave is currently Class III with no upgrades proposed, although Class II or IV may be more appropriate given vehicle speeds and volumes. It is a narrow road with lots of parking in the adjacent parking lot, so perhaps this is an opportunity to remove on-street parking.
- 3rd street which also connects Class IV on Central Ave to the Bay Trail is also currently Class III with no proposed improvements. Consider removing parking on one side and adding Class II.
- Why is class III being proposed on Oriskany Ave, which directly connects to both the Bay Trail and the Sea Plane Ferry Terminal?
- The proposed Class III on High Street between the High Street Bridge and Lincoln Ave will likely not make the street any more comfortable than current conditions with no facility. Class II is probably not feasible but could a Class III Neighborhood Greenway with more robust traffic calming treatments be considered? Treatments at the intersections on this segment would greatly improve safety/comfort.
- As a reminder, any proposed edits to the Bay Trail network, as shown in the draft plan, would need to go through Bay Trail Steering Committee approval before becoming official. The process is as follows: local agency/ROW owner would bring proposed changes to Bay Trail staff’s attention and request an update to the

formal Bay Trail alignment and online data. Staff would prepare a summary statement and request a letter of support/reso/plan amendment from the requesting agency, and then take this to the Steering Committee for their consideration.

Please let us know if you have any questions!

Best,

Joel

Joel Shaffer, P.E.

Associate Engineer/Planner – Active Transportation
Licensed in CA | (he/him)

From: Rochelle Wheeler <rwheeler@alamedaca.gov>

Sent: Monday, October 17, 2022 7:26 PM

To: Rochelle Wheeler <rwheeler@alamedaca.gov>

Cc: Marquises, Sheila <smarquises@sanleandro.org>; Christopher Marks <CMarks@alamedactc.org>; Denise Turner <dturner@alamedactc.org>; Jennifer Holmes-Ledet <jledet@alamedacountysr2s.org>; Lee Huo <lhuo@bayareametro.gov>; Joel Shaffer <jshaffer@bayareametro.gov>; Nicola Szibbo <nszibbo@bayareametro.gov>; Nicole Ferrara <nferrara@oaklandnet.com>; jpatton@oaklandnet.com; Aleida Andrino-Chavez <aandrino-chavez@alamedactc.org>; Chad Mason <mason@watertransit.org>; Reed, Christine <CReed2@oaklandca.gov>; Courtney Wood <courtneywood@altaplanning.com>; Crystal Wang <cwang@actransit.org>; Dani Solis <dani@bikeeastbay.org>; dave@BikeEastBay.org; Manasse, Edward <EManasse@oaklandca.gov>; Ehlers, Emily <EEhlers@oaklandca.gov>; hmaddox@bart.gov; Jasmine Law <jlaw@alamedacountysr2s.org>; Olsen, Kerby <KOlsen@oaklandnet.com>; Lucy Gigli <lucy@alamedatma.org>; Robert Prinz <robert@BikeEastBay.org>; Sean Dougan <sdougan@ebparks.org>; swilson@ebparks.org; Tommy Bensko <tommy@localmotionca.com>; Ruiz, Sergio@DOT <sergio.ruiz@dot.ca.gov>; Currey, Gregory@DOT <Gregory.Currey@dot.ca.gov>

Subject: Reminder: Alameda's Draft Active Transportation Plan - Comment by Sunday, Oct 23

External Email

Hello colleagues,

Just a friendly reminder that our **comment deadline** for Alameda's Draft Active Transportation Plan is **this Sunday, Oct. 23rd**. Please send any comments (or questions) to me.

And, the Plan can be found here:

<https://www.activealameda.org/Draft-Plan-2022>

Thanks so much!

Rochelle

Rochelle Wheeler, Senior Transportation Coordinator, City of Alameda (*she/her*)

510-747-7442 | RWheeler@alamedaCA.gov

From: Rochelle Wheeler

Sent: Monday, October 10, 2022 2:53 PM

Subject: Alameda's Draft Active Transportation Plan - Comment by Oct 23

Hello Public Agency Staff and Other Partners,

At long last, I'm pleased to present our draft Active Transportation Plan! Hopefully, you've already received the below announcement. We'd love for you to review our draft Plan and let us know if you have any comments or edits to