



(510) 516-0497
P.O. BOX 2732
ALAMEDA, CA 94501
www.bikewalkalameda.org

Board of Directors

Denyse Trepanier
President

Brian Fowler
Treasurer

Tim Beloney
Secretary

Cyndy Johnsen
Board Member

Lucy Gigli
*Founder,
non-voting*

October 19, 2022

RE: Item 6A (Draft Active Transportation Plan)

Dear Transportation Commissioners and Staff,

We're very excited about the Active Transportation Plan and are writing in support and appreciation of this important initiative. It's critical to improving safe mobility for everyone, and achieving our climate and Vision Zero goals, all while enhancing livability in Alameda.

There are a few broad areas that we think can be improved, described below, which we hope you will consider. We also have compiled more [detailed, specific suggestions in this spreadsheet](#) from select members that we hope will be helpful.

Neighborhood Greenways

Since our 2030 Low Stress Backbone Network relies heavily on Neighborhood Greenways, they must truly function as low stress facilities: car speeds and volumes must be effectively reduced to target volumes, and be safe and comfortable when they are at their worst. Some suggestions to ensure this happens, courtesy of Bike East Bay's Advocacy Director Robert Prinz:

- Include metrics and goals for **peak** hour car traffic and **maximum** measured car speeds, not just average daily traffic and average car speeds. For example, on page 39, expand the metrics from 1500 daily vehicles or less to include peak traffic volumes of less than 50 motor vehicles per hour in the peak direction at peak hour [per NACTO](#)).
- Create a dedicated project (or expand on P.3: *Develop a toolkit to achieve and maintain Neighborhood Greenway volume and speed targets using volume management and traffic calming tools*) to collect data and existing conditions analysis proactively on as many Neighborhood Greenway corridor segments as possible. Bike Walk Alameda would be happy to help with manual counts, but exploring long-term options for data collection is preferred. Having this information will allow staff to monitor, iterate, and make swift design decisions when opportunities arise via paving, utility coordination, development projects,

etc. Here are some example docs from OakDOT, which outsourced much of this analysis work to consultants:

- [scope of work for upgrades analysis project here](#)
- [upgrades screening spreadsheet here](#)
- [draft web map of analysis locations here](#)
- Develop minimum design standards ([like this guide from Oakland DOT](#)) that can be implemented routinely, by default, with all paving projects and other capital improvement projects, with streamlined outreach standards for other upgrades that go beyond the minimum when added funding is available. These minimums should include midblock and intersection traffic calming, as well as intersection controls and crossing improvements.
To minimize through-street driving, we'd like to see partial diverters (or modal filters) used as generously as feasible.
- The reason Santa Clara and Orion aren't recommended as neighborhood greenways is because they, or streets parallel to them, are planned to have low stress treatments. However, it will be a while before that work is done. At least until those improvements are in place, we propose these streets remain traffic calmed. We also support the rationale behind keeping Versailles as a Neighborhood Greenway.

Trails

Many trails that are part of the low stress network are in poor shape and are not maintained by the City of Alameda. We recommend a dedicated project (or expand on Project 26 on page 61: *Maintain and upgrade shared use trails, based on prioritization criteria*) to identify trail ownership on a map, and create a process that ensures minimum standard maintenance of these trails. If they cannot be adequately maintained, alternative facilities should be considered where options exist. Areas of specific concern are Bay Farm and Marina Village.

2030 Low Stress Backbone Map Suggestions

Overall, this map looks great, especially in addressing safe north-south connectivity, a key issue in Alameda. The corridors of Webster and Park Street are not only needed for connectivity and general access, but are high injury corridors that should be fixed, so we're glad to see protected facilities for them on this priority map. There are a few areas that could be better connected, though, including:

- The Marina Village area, which will serve many of Alameda's new residents. Enabling people to walk and bike safely to shopping and jobs here is important. Protected bike lanes along Marina Village Parkway and Challenger will help, and will connect to the Cross Alameda Trail to stitch this area into the larger network better. If the bike and pedestrian

bridge lands here, a low stress facility will be essential to low stress cross-estuary travel.

- McKay and Westline should be on this map, too, to connect Central to the Bay Trail/Shoreline.
- The West End could use more connectivity, in particular, Main Street (to the ferry) and Orion.

Goals/Ongoing Evaluation/Performance Metrics

One of the recommendations in our [Bicycle Friendly City report card from League of American Bicyclists](#), was to “Adopt a target level of bicycle use (percent of trips) to be achieved within a specific timeframe, and ensure data collection necessary to monitor progress.”

This is an area where this plan falls very short. We understand that right now, our city may not have the ability to capture the data needed to do this, but we urge the city to find ways to do so, because it’s hard to improve without measurement. Please consider adding a program that addresses this issue: hire consultants to study how [other cities have done it](#), coordinate volunteers to do counts, buy/rent equipment to automate data collection, etc.

Ideally, each of our performance metrics would include actual numbers and target dates where they make sense (ie, x% of y by date z), and we’d have the data and tools to monitor progress and effectiveness of investments.

Bicycle Facility Types (Table 7)

This table helpfully divides low stress from high stress facilities, but might go further in expressly deprecating standard paint-only bike lanes. While [protected bike lanes have been shown to improve safety for all users](#), paint-only lanes and sharrows do not, and further, are not inviting to the very important 46% of Alamedans who are ‘interested but concerned’ in biking. Often, paint-only bike lanes are built to fill in the space when road diets are implemented. So while they serve a purpose, our city should install these only as a last resort, after safer facilities have been determined technically infeasible. If a street has — or is anticipated to have — motor vehicle volumes and speeds that call for bike lanes, they should be protected bike lanes, and that should be conveyed clearly in this table and in related discussions.

In general, we see our small city as a place where everyone can get around safely, no matter how they do it. We believe that almost anywhere cars go in Alameda, bikes and pedestrians should be able to safely go, too, and our approach to facility type should reflect that thinking. We should start with the safest and most welcoming facility, and degrade only when necessary.

This is in line with [Caltrans’ approach to ‘complete streets’](#) — the exceptions where streets cannot be safe for all users should be rare and fully justified. Our General Plan also takes this approach:

- *Safety First: When designing streets, the safest treatments should be considered the default starting point and be degraded only if necessary after documenting rationale for the approach. (Policy ME-6, Action B.)*
- *Space Priorities: When allocating public right-of-way space, the first consideration shall be for people walking, bicycling, and using transit. Space for on-street parking shall be the lower priority. (Policy ME-6, Action G.)*
- *Low-Stress Bikeways: Provide separated bicycle lanes instead of unprotected, standard bicycle lanes, unless not feasible. (Policy ME-14, Action H.)*

We hope to see this thinking normalized and reflected across various city documents where these issues are relevant, like this Bicycle Facility Type table, and street classification documents.

Staffing

Page 57 references the limits of staff resources, and suggests that some projects won't get done if there's not sufficient bandwidth. Bandwidth is a known issue as is, so we'd prefer that we plan to hire staff or consultants if projects are at risk, or goals are not being met, rather than abandoning or delaying important safety initiatives. This is in line with Goal 2.1 of the [Vision Zero Action Plan](#), which states, "Through the City Council budget process, propose ongoing, dedicated funding and staffing for Vision Zero implementation and coordination (ongoing)," with the City Manager's Office as the lead.

Thank you again for the great work on the Active Transportation Plan to date, and for considering our thoughts.

Sincerely,

Bike Walk Alameda

Bike Walk Alameda:

Online spreadsheet of specific comments, referenced in 10/19/22 Letter to Transportation Commission on Public Draft ATP

Section	Comment
Chapter 2: Vision and Goals	Goals should be more robust, data-driven. Table 11 at the very end has evaluation criteria, but is still light. For more detail and suggestions, see: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1sWc590BzbkO0bXMmZqLfAaD2n2qK7yXkymOCLAXWKSq/edit?usp=sharing
Chapter 3: Existing Conditions	Suggest adding an image of one of our low stress facilities on p. 13. Like Cross Alameda Trail along Clement. Also, somewhere in here, it would be nice to feature a parent with a cargo bike.
Chapter 3: Existing Conditions	The survey is great! It's useful grounding for this entire planning process.
Chapter 3: Existing Conditions	p. 14 mode share infographic: This adds up to only 91%
Chapter 3: Existing Conditions	Table 2: What is the order here? Suggest starting with least stress (top) to most stress (bottom).
Chapter 3: Existing Conditions	Figure 2: There are a few segments on here that are spec'd as separated, but are not
Chapter 3: Existing Conditions	Slow Streets: The proposal to remove Santa Clara is driven by the fact that Central (with planned improvements) is parallel; Orion because it will get protected bike lanes. But since those projects won't be complete for a while, might it make sense to keep traffic calming in place? What is the downside?
Chapter 3: Existing Conditions	A good decision to focus the next stage of planning on the "Interested but Concerned" group of people. It's the largest group. Using this as the reference group isn't ignoring others — it's using them as the most representative of a wide range of needs, ages, backgrounds, etc.
Chapter 3: Existing Conditions	"The PLTS for Alameda focused on intersections and mid-block crossings": Interesting. This makes sense as a decision to focus on intersections, where there are competing priorities -- as made clear by the kind of subpar Intersection Access Policy!
Chapter 3: Existing Conditions	Figure 3: I have a hard time believing that there are no high injury areas in Bay Farm for either cyclists or pedestrians.
Chapter 4: Pedestrian Design Strategy	Figure 5: I want to highlight that there is no crosswalk or curb to connect the trail to N. Loop Road which has a school, two daycares and businesses. This results in people having difficulty crossing Harbor Bay Parkway here which disincentivizes cycling to these schools/businesses. This has been an ask for years, but it got off the radar. This is really important because otherwise there is an entire area that is walled off.
Chapter 4: Pedestrian Design Strategy	Table 4: This should be normalized with the City of Alameda Street Classifications doc, which has the same types, but a different way of showing info, and includes curb use priority.
Chapter 4: Pedestrian Design Strategy	Table 4 - Business Commercial Street: This seems like a good street type for protected bike lanes. On the Street Classifications doc, parking is prioritized over safe biking for this type of street, which would seem to violate General Plan which calls for prioritizing safety for bicyclists and pedestrians above parking on all streets.
Chapter 4: Pedestrian Design Strategy	Table 4 - Business Commercial Street: I'd also recommend they call out the need for improved access by cyclists and pedestrians getting into the business complexes. For example, South Shore Center is very hard to access by bike currently. The pedestrian crossings are also few and small given the number of people accessing that super block on foot. I think they could call out the need for access into the superblocks, not just travel past the superblocks on this type of street.
Chapter 4: Pedestrian Design Strategy	Table 4 - Gateway Street: It's great to see in the Street Classifications doc that 25 MPH is the proposed target speed for these streets. But to accomplish that will require physical changes. For example, the intersection of Constitution and Marina Village Pkwy (site of a pedestrian fatality) needs changes to actually constrain motorists to 25MPH.
Chapter 4: Pedestrian Design Strategy	Table 5 - Corridor Treatments: Can we have full traffic diverters, aka modal filters, to deter traffic along neighborhood greenways?
Chapter 4: Pedestrian Design Strategy	Table 5 - Streetscape Improvements: Why are trees high cost? Planting a tree is cheap.
Chapter 4: Pedestrian Design Strategy	Table 5 - Streetscape Improvements: this should have an asterisk because a bench is cheap.
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Add as Comfort and Connectivity performance measure: increase percentage of low-stress bikeways from 51% to 72% by 20??
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	"Climate Action and Resiliency Plan (CARP) goal to add 10.4 new miles of previously unplanned bikeways": Another Comfort and Connectivity performance measure to add to Goals and Evaluation section at end. Although miles of bikeways alone aren't sufficient -- we should have actual mode shift goals.
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Figure 6: I am really torn about leaving Broadway as regular bike lanes. The Park / Oak corridor will not be low stress for many years. This leave Broadway as the only north/south bikeway for east/central. Its pretty bad right now, with delivery and construction vehicles blocking the bike lanes regularly. Its definitely high stress.
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Figure 6: It may be beyond Alameda city limits, but I think they should provide some information on the corridors as far as reaching Fruitvale BART and reaching the street grid beyond 880.
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Cyclists don't magically appear on the bridges, or disappear once they go over the bridges. The East Oakland street grid and the BART station are the actual origins/destinations that need to be served safely and comfortably.
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Figure 6: Propose Marina Village Pkwy and Challenger have protected bike lanes -- is there a reason that would be infeasible? Northern Waterfront will see a lot of new housing and these residents should be able to bike safely to shop and work in this area. Might also be where the bridge lands.

Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Figure 6: Open access to Cross Alameda Trail for residents of apartments just south of it between Webster and Poggi.
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Figure 6: Propose protected bike lanes on McKay to enhance low stress connectivity, and because there is a key destination and parking lot at the end, and bus traffic is expected.
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Figure 6: The Bay Trail is mentioned in this document, but there's no information on how it would connect on this leg. At a minimum, this plan should indicate that Alameda will coordinate with Caltrans project on SR-61 along San Leandro Bay and ERPD work for MLK Regional Shoreline trail.
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Introducing Neighborhood Greenways: Slow Streets welcomed pedestrians in the street, and it's been great. It made it easier for people recovering from injuries to walk (sidewalks can be a challenge), it gave people with disabilities greater access, it enabled groups to walk more comfortably, for runners to run more comfortably, etc. We should not lose that dimension in this transition to neighborhood greenways. This definition should make it more clear that these streets are prioritized for people walking and biking in the street.
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Introducing Neighborhood Greenways: My hope for the Neighborhood Greenways is that they will be designed so that, for example, elementary school aged kids can cycle without being passed closely by an SUV. I think all drivers will need to be driving at a slow enough speed so that they can brake quickly and fully. That's definitely lower than 25 MPH. Not sure if it's 15 or 20 MPH.
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Introducing Neighborhood Greenways: I want stronger language. Swap "may" to "will" include the following design elements proven to reduce travel speeds such as. We should make several treatments the default, unless technically infeasible, similar to what we've done with PBLs and daylighting. We need to put the burden on those fighting AGAINST these treatments, not on those fighting FOR these treatments.
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Introducing Neighborhood Greenways: Why not full diverters (modal filters), particularly on neighborhood greenways that are a part of the low stress backbone?
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Table 7: This table is really useful. I think they should add another table on intersection treatments. Neighborhood Greenways will not be successful if cyclists aren't able to comfortably and safely cross larger streets. Seeing a pic of a Berkeley bike boulevard in this plan isn't encouraging — Berkeley's bike boulevards have lousy crossings of major streets! I haven't read the appendixes yet. They probably have more detail there. But I'd suggest they make sure to address intersection/crossing treatments more right here, so that it's seen as integral to the Neighborhood Greenways. Relevant NACTO guide for them to cite is https://nacto.org/publication/dont-give-up-at-the-intersection/
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Table 7 - Separated Bike Lane: add bollards
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Table 7 - Separated Bike Lane: Whenever there is a case where a crossing of the street has to occur, there should be an obvious (painted) way to cross the street to connect the two bike lanes. Using Pedestrian cross walks for this purpose is very difficult with heavy cargo bikes with kids.
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Table 7 - Buffered Bike Lanes: I do not agree with this statement. 30 mph is fast. Plus the example is with no parking. When there is parking like on Fernside, it is more stressful
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Table 7 - Buffered Bike Lanes: I would like to see Buffered and Traditional bike lanes painted a bright color to highlight that they are not parking. I think the lack of highlighting may confuse people who don't see them as very different from street-parking. If they are saving money by not making them protected, this seems like a reasonable thing to try.

Chapter 6: Trail Network and Water Crossings	<p>Maintenance and Upgrades: I want more detail on this. There are so many terribly maintained paths with confusion about who is responsible for maintenance. IMO, if the trail/path is part of the transportation network, it is the city's responsibility to maintain.</p> <p>I don't think the city can take responsibility over other jurisdictions (HOAs, park districts, etc), but I agree that there should be more thinking on this issue, and a process defined to handle trail failures, if those trails are going to be included in our low stress backbone network. Maybe we pose this as a question to staff to see what they think should be done? One thing I'd like to see is an overlay of the trails map that shows who manages what. Bay Farm and Marina Village both rely on trails a lot, and it's hard to parse where the responsibility is. Maybe if they are not under the City's control, they can't be included on the city's low stress network?</p> <p>That is definitely a good points Cyndy. I would recommend a couple of things here:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Whenever a development builds infrastructure, it should cede over maintenance of that infrastructure to the city after a certain period of time (5 years maybe?) This seems like it should be negotiable 2) I would also like them to make it a point to determine who is responsible for what. In the event the path is not well-maintained, it should be reported to the agency/responsible authority to determine a maintenance plan. If that authority is an HOA that is refusing to fix the infrastructure in a reasonable amount of time, can they consider fines or ceding of the responsibility to the city? 3) If there is no way to improve path quality for a "low-stress" network, then I don't think it should be included. <p>As a side note, on the north-side of the Bay Trail in Harbor bay, someone (city of Alameda or East Bay Parks) goes and picks up the garbage and pays for path trimming etc, so that indicates to me that someone is responsible for maintenance of that area. We need more pressure on this segment because it is heavily used and has gotten very little work done on it in the almost 10 years I've lived here. It's only getting worse.</p>
Chapter 6: Trail Network and Water Crossings	Webster Tube Path: How long is construction anticipated, and what is the plan for circulation during construction for cars, buses, and bikes?
Chapter 6: Trail Network and Water Crossings	Wooden Bridge: This absolutely needs to be prioritized. Every person who uses this bridge hates the condition. It's long past time it the wood surface gets fixed up.
Chapter 6: Trail Network and Water Crossings	Figure 8: How does Bay Trail connect going south? Should reference relevant ERPD and Caltrans projects.
Chapter 7: Programs	Program 2: Local rebate currently available through AMP. Propose: "Support, promote, and/or expand..." Also might grow to include conversion kits, not just new e-bikes.
Chapter 7: Programs	<p><u>Program 3: - Include metrics/goals for peak hour car traffic and maximum measured car speeds, not just average daily traffic and average car speeds as is usually included - We need these facilities to still be safe and comfortable even when they're at their worst, not only on average</u></p> <p><u>- Develop minimum design standards (like this guide from Oakland DOT: https://cao-94612.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/OaDOT_NBR_Guidance.pdf) that can be implemented routinely with all paving projects and other capital improvement projects, with streamlined outreach standards for other upgrades that go beyond the minimum when added funding is available. These minimums should include midblock and intersection traffic calming, as well as intersection controls and crossing improvements.</u></p> <p><u>- Recommend a dedicated project to collect data and existing conditions analysis proactively on every existing and recommended neighborhood greenway corridor segment, to allow staff to make swift design decisions later when opportunities arise via paving, utility coordination, development projects, etc. Here are some example docs from OakDOT who outsourced much of this analysis work to consultants: scope of work for upgrades analysis project</u></p> <p><u>here: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1aIEouvuBCN1ApBF3TmAUBqA7Ccd4pOv/</u></p> <p><u>upgrades screening spreadsheet</u></p> <p><u>here: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1ka98iucvocxNAai3cK91ioSHQyrzWQwl/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=116441291070816754665&rtopof=true&sd=true</u></p> <p><u>draft web map of analysis locations here: https://arcg.is/0jeffKe</u></p>
Chapter 7: Programs	Program 4: add maintenance of bike repair stations (most are in disrepair now)
Chapter 7: Programs	Program 6: AB 1909 passed recently, allowing cyclists to use pedestrian walk signals -- remove this as done? But it might be good to make this more broad and say "Support legislation that improves safe streets and active transportation." There's a lot of it!
Chapter 7: Programs	Program 10: All city-owned parking lots/structures, and shopping centers should remove a certain number of spaces to set up quality, safe bike parking. All park and ride areas should have similar as well. Places near businesses that cater to kids (Clement and Park), etc. should also have more parking for bikes of various sizes.
Chapter 7: Programs	<p><u>Program 11: adaptive bikes, too (https://www.sfmta.com/blog/permanent-adaptive-cycling-program-unveiled-golden-gate-park#:~:text=To%20reserve%20a%20bike%2C%20contact,disabilities%20in%20Golden%20Gate%20Park)</u></p> <p><u>Also consider a cargo bike loaner program through the library, so people who only need to need one occasionally (or don't have room in their homes to fit one) can have access. Related: https://oaklandside.org/2022/08/08/electric-bike-library-planned-for-oakland/</u></p>
Chapter 7: Programs	Program 12: Very similar to P.2 -- maybe combine them?
Chapter 7: Programs	Program 13: I think Robert Prinz or someone at Bike East Bay mentioned having a list of proposed clean-up to the Alameda Municipal Code. Hopefully this can be done quickly and easily, not take too much energy away from other goals.

Chapter 7: Programs	<p>Program 17: Seems this should be near term, so we ensure all the stuff being planned is well done? Or alternatively, make a short term Goal of having review by consultants well-versed in best practices.</p> <p>Yes, sounds good to encourage them to do this sooner rather than later.</p> <p>City of Alameda should become a NACTO member (only \$7,500 a year for this size city, it looks like) and should send some staff to the NACTO conference.</p>
Chapter 7: Programs	Program 18: include shade trees
Chapter 7: Programs	Program 21: Does BWA want to continue this or not?
Chapter 7: Programs	Program 24: Most stands are in bad shape. Establish a maintenance schedule to keep these in good repair.
Chapter 7: Programs	Program 25: Bike to Wherever Day (not Bike to Work Day anymore)
Chapter 7: Programs	Program 29: Explicitly tie into Mode Shift goal, if we find it's difficult to make a numeric goal right now.
	<p>I wonder if City of Alameda could expand upon the ACTC count program (https://www.alamedactc.org/programs-projects/bicycle-and-pedestrian/bicycle-pedestrian-count-program/) to evaluate projects.</p> <p>For example, when we were wondering about Bay Farm Bike Bridge usage, it turns out it's not included in the ACTC counts. The city could add that and other key locations to the count program to get better baselines and comparisons over time.</p>
Chapter 7: Programs	proposed program: Ensure new developments are providing adequate parking/storage facilities for residents for all types of bikes and trailers, especially as we're seeing larger cargo bikes. I'm seeing new developments putting in vertical racks, which aren't great. Ensure there is charging ability, too, for ebikes.
Chapter 7: Programs	proposed program: Look into feasibility of bounty program for bike lane blockers: https://momentummag.com/austin-bike-lane-blockers/
Chapter 7: Programs	proposed program: Coordinate with AUDS/SR2S/PTAs to create bikebuses throughout Alameda to help encourage more biking to school and reduce the amount of driving to school.
Chapter 8: 2030 Infrastructure Plan	<p>Let's push for more resources (whether staff or consultants) to ensure the plan gets completed, rather than planning to remove projects. Perhaps the trigger would be if incremental goals are not being met? This is in line with Goal 2.1 of the Vision Zero Action Plan, which states, "Through the City Council budget process, propose ongoing, dedicated funding and staffing for Vision Zero implementation and coordination (ongoing)," with the City Manager's Office as the lead.</p> <p>Perhaps this plan isn't the right place to explicitly request more FTE. But all the delays with this plan certainly demonstrate the need for more transportation planners and transportation engineers!</p> <p>Hear you on this document not being the place to explicitly request FTE, but I don't think it should explicitly rule out requesting FTE, either...</p>
Chapter 8: 2030 Infrastructure Plan	It's surprising that the cost of the projects are not included in the main document (only in appendix). I recognize that the cost was not a factor in their data driven prioritization of projects, but what's the feasibility of funding/delivering these projects in 8 years if the cost is not listed, and potential funding identified?
Chapter 8: 2030 Infrastructure Plan	Table 10 - Park Street and/or Oak Street Corridor: Deferring a full build until after 2030? Downtown Alameda deserves better than that. I think some of the objections to the quality of the current "quick build" materials on Park Street right now are valid. Park Street is also overdue for new sidewalks, new street furniture, and new lighting. Not sure if the City or DBA would take the lead on this. Also not sure if the funding would come from the City or from a DBA tax assessment. But it would be in the interests of residents and business owners to fully spiff up downtown streets in the next few years.
	Comparable examples: Castro Street in Mountain View got a rebuild in the '90s, Burlingame Ave in Burlingame got a rebuild in the '00s.
Chapter 8: 2030 Infrastructure Plan	Table 10 - Oakland-Alameda Bicycle-Pedestrian Bridge: Let's put an X in the 2030 column!
Chapter 8: 2030 Infrastructure Plan	Figure 9: Open up access to Cross Alameda Trail from apartment complex just south of it, between Poggi and Webster.
Chapter 8: 2030 Infrastructure Plan	Figure 9: Add Main Street as protected bike lane and Orion as either neighborhood greenway or protected bike lane -- we're short of low stress facilities here.
Chapter 8: 2030 Infrastructure Plan	Figure 9: McKay should be low stress.
Chapter 8: 2030 Infrastructure Plan	Figure 9: There is no good connection between the Bay Farm pedestrian bridge and the bike route on Bayview Drive. This should be addressed and planned for to make getting to south shore and lower park street easier.
Chapter 8: 2030 Infrastructure Plan	Figure 9: Would be good to Westline as protected bike lanes on this map to complete north-south connectivity here.
Chapter 8: 2030 Infrastructure Plan	Table 11 - Safety: Also important to have bike/ped counts to use for comparisons, to be able to compute "exposure" rates at different places — not just the absolute number of injuries/deaths. This is another reason for the city to be more involved in the ACTC bike/count program, and to place bike counters in more locations.

Table 11 - Connectivity and Comfort: City should consider maintaining a list of key destinations in Alameda (and nearby in Oakland, such as Fruitvale BART) and grading each on ease of access by bike and foot.

Lisa Foster

From: Drew Dara-Abrams
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2022 11:06 AM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] ATP feedback for staff and Transportation Commission

I'd like to share some feedback on the draft ATP with Planning staff and with the Transportation Commission.

Thank you,
Drew

--

- **Research:**
 - This is an appropriately comprehensive and thoroughly prepared plan. I particularly appreciated the survey conducted by a market research firm in Appendix B. It's useful to see the wide range of people who walk and bike around Alameda.
- **Business districts:**
 - Great to see Park/Oak and Webster included in the low-stress safe cycling network. It's important for cyclists of all ages and skills to be able to access the business districts and to also connect north/south to the rest of the low-stress cycling network. The Commercial Streets program has already demonstrated how both corridors can operate effectively with some lanes re-allocated from thru-auto-traffic to active transport modes.
 - Why is a full build using permanent materials for downtown Alameda not scheduled until after 2030? That's a long time to maintain "quick build" materials. Both Park and Oak have tripping hazards on their sidewalks currently. Can a full streetscape rebuild happen sooner rather than later? Are there means to fund some of these improvements in collaboration between the city and the DABA business association?
- **Pedestrian network and design treatments:**
 - *Table 5. Pedestrian Design Matrix* is comprehensive, but I'm not sure it's useful to the general public. Please consider identifying a smaller subset of treatments that the city is equipped to prioritize and roll out at scale. Pictures would be useful for the most important of the design treatment options.
 - It would be great to see a sampling of these design treatments built as demonstration projects, similar to how the Slow Streets barricades were rolled out very quickly. For example, neighborhood traffic circles would be great to build with "quick build" materials as a demonstration in a number of neighborhoods.
 - At present, too many of the Gateway Streets would be better identified as "car sewers." It's great to see that the target design speed is proposed as 25 MPH for all of the Gateway Street segments. This will take hard work — and will likely require more literal concrete in certain places. But it's definitely worth the effort. For example, the intersection of Constitution and Marina Village Parkway has been the site of at least one pedestrian killed by a driver. Those crosswalks are used often by seniors in the neighboring AHA complex, and the intersection is proposed to be part of the low-stress bicycle network. To reach a 25 MPH design speed for the roads entering and exiting that intersection is a worthy goal.
 - For both the pedestrian and cycling networks to succeed, there will need to be focus on key intersections and crossings. Some hard decisions will have to be made at intersections, due to space constraints. The logic of "levels of service" will need to be set aside in favor of safety. The

Vision Zero Action Plan identified high injury intersections. For the purposes of the ATP, please consider adding maps that specifically mark the high-injury intersections and also identify intersections that will need to be improved in order to support the low-stress bike network.

- **Cycling design treatments:**

- *Table 7. Existing and Proposed Bicycle Facility Types in Alameda* is good, but it doesn't address the importance of intersections. Please consider adding another table into the ATP document about intersection treatments.
- Consider referencing and using this NACTO publication: <https://nacto.org/publication/dont-give-up-at-the-intersection/>

- **Neighborhood Greenways:**

- A great next step for the Slow Streets. My family walks on Versailles and cycles on San Jose regularly -- would love to see those built out with more permanent treatments as soon as possible.
- To succeed, the bike boulevards need treatments where they cross larger intersections. I would strongly suggest that the ATP include the requirement that a Neighborhood Greenway have crossing/intersection treatments before any sections are allowed to be branded with signage as a Neighborhood Greenway. It is confusing to children and lower skill cyclists to have welcoming branding on signs and maps... and to then leave them almost stranded when they have to cross, say, 4 lanes of uncontrolled auto traffic.

- **Staffing:**

- City of Alameda "punches above its weight" thanks to hard and creative work by its planners, engineers, and consultants. However, to deliver effectively on the ATP goals (as well as the goals of the Vision Zero Action Plan and the Climate Action and Resiliency Plan), the city very likely needs more staff to manage parallel projects, consultants, etc.
- Under the Biden administration, a once-in-a-generation amount of funding has been authorized for transportation and infrastructure projects around the country. To fully take advantage of these funding opportunities, the city needs more transportation planners and transportation engineers on staff.
- In addition to adding more staff, the Planning/Building/Transportation and Public Works departments would do well to explore how to most effectively and efficiently coordinate multi-faceted projects.
- Perhaps the ATP is not the most appropriate document to propose and plan for organizational improvements. But I would at a minimum recommend removing the paragraph that says no additional FTE is required to accomplish the 2030 infrastructure plan. With all due respect, I wonder if that is overly optimistic.

- **Evaluation:**

- Can the city collaborate with ACTC to add additional bike/ped count locations? For example, when I went looking for usage counts for the Bay Farm Bike/Ped Bridge, I found that that is not one of the locations in the ACTC counting program. Perhaps some more coordination could help to make the ACTC counts more useful to evaluate specific corridors and projects in City of Alameda.
- What is the cost to add some additional in-pavement bike counters, beyond the city's existing one of the CAT? Just a couple more of those would help to provide coverage throughout the year, which can be used to adjust point-counts at other projects that don't have automated counters.

Lisa Foster

From: Carol Gottstein
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2022 2:44 PM
To: Lisa Foster; Lara Weisiger
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 10.20.2022 Public Comment Transportation Commission Special Meeting Agenda 6-A

Dear Transportation Commissioners:

Re: Draft Alameda ATP Public Review October 20, 2022

It seems to me this very large document is being pushed through public review in an extraordinarily short time frame: Oct 3-23, 2022. When I mentioned this to Staff, they referenced all the community outreach which had been done since late 2019. However, COVID-19 began in Winter 2019. In mid-March 2020, the Alameda public computer facilities, such as the libraries and the senior center computer lab, abruptly closed to the public for Shelter-In-Place. The Mastick facility remained closed until approximately September 2021.

This excluded many seniors, disabled, and low-income Alamedans; who do not have home or office Internet, from participating in online city meetings or surveys. I know many such people would have wanted to participate: I am one of them.

It appears the survey data was obtained by invitation to select Alamedans only. We are going to have to accept on faith that the survey analysis does not exhibit a bias toward the opinions of elite, computer-savvy Alamedans who are well-off and sophisticated enough to have access to a computer in their home or office.

I hope that some acknowledgement of the unusual lockdown circumstances that occurred contemporaneously with the development of this Plan, and may have limited public comment, will be acknowledged in the public record.

Thank you,
Carol Gottstein
1114 Grand Street
Alameda, CA 94501
510.930.4471