

**From:** [Alameda Citizens Task Force](#)  
**To:** [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tracy Jensen](#)  
**Cc:** [Manager Manager](#); [City Clerk](#); [Yibin Shen](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Correspondence, 11/21/23 City Council Agenda, Item 7-B  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 15, 2023 9:35:39 AM  
**Attachments:** [ACT Letter 11 15 2023 Item 7B Estuary Bridge.pdf](#)

---

Dear Mayor and City Council members,

Please see attached correspondence for the 11/21/23 City Council Meeting, Item 7-B.

Thank you.

ACT

# *ACT*

## **Alameda Citizens Task Force**

Vigilance, Truth, Civility

---

November 15, 2023

Dear Mayor and City Council members,

Re: 11/21/23, Agenda Item 7-B

We write to you to express the following concerns regarding Item 7-B, and ask that you not approve the update until further clarification and study is provided to the public:

1. The Staff presentation fails to adequately inform the public on a more accurate realization of the proposed bridge project. Photographs from [estuarybridge.org](http://estuarybridge.org) should be included in the Staff report. These demonstrate a more accurate **scale** rather than the artistic sketch drawings. The clearing distance required for sailboats is 40 feet from the water--approximately a 4 story building. The Staff presentation drawings should reflect this necessary requirement for full visual transparency.

2. There was a detailed report done in Jan, 2021 considering all alternative estuary crossings (110 pages) that is missing from the Staff report.

[https://www.alamedaca.gov/files/content/public/v/269/departments/planning-building-and-transportation/transportation/estuary-crossing-report\\_20210125.pdf](https://www.alamedaca.gov/files/content/public/v/269/departments/planning-building-and-transportation/transportation/estuary-crossing-report_20210125.pdf)

There is also an FAQ document at: <https://estuarybridge.org/documents>

[https://ehq-production-us-california.s3.us-west-1.amazonaws.com/53671a21fd9ff2bde9bcf864af12ca6f242935c2/original/1675200902/0d3b9c4f9bc20eeb23a8da8579771073\\_Oakland\\_Alameda\\_Estuary\\_Bridge\\_FAQ.pdf?X-Amz-Algorithm=AWS4-HMAC-SHA256&X-Amz-Credential=AKIA4KKNQAKICO37GBEP%2F20231113%2Fus-west-1%2Fs3%2Faws4\\_request&X-Amz-Date=20231113T023901Z&X-Amz-Expires=300&X-Amz-SignedHeaders=host&X-Amz-Signature=abdff6405be1696ef361212858c7f45fa589b83bb52de86075e61c13c21ced6d](https://ehq-production-us-california.s3.us-west-1.amazonaws.com/53671a21fd9ff2bde9bcf864af12ca6f242935c2/original/1675200902/0d3b9c4f9bc20eeb23a8da8579771073_Oakland_Alameda_Estuary_Bridge_FAQ.pdf?X-Amz-Algorithm=AWS4-HMAC-SHA256&X-Amz-Credential=AKIA4KKNQAKICO37GBEP%2F20231113%2Fus-west-1%2Fs3%2Faws4_request&X-Amz-Date=20231113T023901Z&X-Amz-Expires=300&X-Amz-SignedHeaders=host&X-Amz-Signature=abdff6405be1696ef361212858c7f45fa589b83bb52de86075e61c13c21ced6d)

This information, including links, should also have been included in the Staff report for the public to review.

3. FAQ #8 states that a lift bridge like at Fruitvale would need to be about 200 feet tall to allow a 175-foot-tall Coast Guard cutter to pass. However, a drawbridge like Park Street would not require as much height. FAQ #9 tells us, "If the bridge deck is approximately 60 feet above the water, the length of the bridge would be approximately 3,150 feet in length. If the bridge is designed to be 40 feet above the water, the bridge length would

be approximately 2,240 feet, but the lower bridge will need to open more often to allow tall sail boats with masts over 40 feet to pass.

The above information leads us to conclude that a drawbridge would be preferable in order to avoid two 200' towers. We also think that, since this is not a vehicular bridge, more frequent raising of the lower bridge would be a minor inconvenience when compared with the better aesthetics and the easier compliance with ADA requirements for disabled users.

4. The 2021 Report at page 15 and following includes a Traffic Demand Module done by a private consultant. This analysis contains no polling of the public as to whether they use the bridge and how often. While it contains a lot of data, the data provides no more than somewhat informed speculation on its usage projections.

The community survey included in the <https://estuarybridge.org/> website also fails to solicit more substantive information as to whether or not the public would indeed utilize the pedestrian/bike bridge crossing. The current questions simply ask a basic level of accessibility, but a stronger and more detailed poll is needed to understand if the end-to-end proposed pathways reflect accurate destination points that would indeed increase pedestrian and bicycle mobility. A further analysis of likely frequency and time of day use would also be helpful information to gather at this time in the planning phases.

We further support a more thorough review of the Broadway crossing. These connection points would better serve the need to access Amtrak, Jack London Square restaurants and retail, and the BART connection at Broadway/12th St.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Alameda Citizens Task Force

**From:** [Transportation](#)  
**To:** [Transportation Commission](#); [City Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** Correspondence: Bicycle Bridge  
**Date:** Tuesday, November 14, 2023 2:15:26 PM

---

Correspondence on Estuary Bridge item on the TC and CC agendas, 11/15 and 11/21 meetings, respectively.

Thanks,  
Rochelle

Rochelle Wheeler, Senior Transportation Coordinator, City of Alameda (she/her)  
510-747-7442 | [RWheeler@alamedaCA.gov](mailto:RWheeler@alamedaCA.gov)

-----Original Message-----

From: John Jacobs <[jacobs1507@gmail.com](mailto:jacobs1507@gmail.com)>  
Sent: Thursday, November 9, 2023 11:48 AM  
To: Transportation <[transportation@alamedaca.gov](mailto:transportation@alamedaca.gov)>  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Bicycle Bridge

Please don't waste any time or money working to develop a bicycle bridge in West Alameda. I see it as being much like the situation of the Richmond Bridge, which closed lanes to traffic to accommodate a few bicycle riders and is now facing pushback from the communities it serves. I wouldn't want to see the City of Alameda make the same mistake spending huge amounts of money to satisfy a very limited number of people when there are other much more urgent situation's that require attention and money.

John Jacobs  
Fourth generation Alameda resident

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Rochelle Wheeler](#)  
**To:** [Transportation Commission](#); [City Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL] Oakland-Alameda Estuary Pedestrian-bike bridge presentation  
**Date:** Tuesday, November 14, 2023 1:58:41 PM

---

John Galloway indicated that he'd like us to forward these questions to the TC and CC for their 11/15 and 11/21 meetings, respectively, RE: the Estuary Bridge item.

Thanks,  
Rochelle

Rochelle Wheeler, Senior Transportation Coordinator, City of Alameda (she/her)  
510-747-7442 | [RWheeler@alamedaCA.gov](mailto:RWheeler@alamedaCA.gov)

-----Original Message-----

From: John Galloway <[jrg@toasterfish.com](mailto:jrg@toasterfish.com)>  
Sent: Thursday, November 9, 2023 5:32 PM  
To: Rochelle Wheeler <[rwheeler@alamedaca.gov](mailto:rwheeler@alamedaca.gov)>  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Oakland-Alameda Estuary Pedestrian-bike bridge presentation

What I do NOT find in your estuary bridge presentation is:

- \* You claim that key uses would be commuting, accessing services and recreation but I find no survey data showing how many people even claim that they would switch from other transport to a bike for commuting or service access were this bridge available.
- \* While the Posey & Webster tubes are very bad for bikes, they are also bad for cars and likely will have to be replaced/rebuilt/expanded at some point but I find no data estimating when this might occur yet this seems key to determining if such a bridge is worth the cost since new/expanded tubes could greatly improve bike access.
- \* I do not see any info on similar projects elsewhere in the world yet there must be at least a few somewhere. How did they turn out and how much did they cost?
- \* What of the alternative of a very small bike and pedestrian only (possibly fully automated free) ferry that only crosses the estuary. While not nearly as sexy as a sweeping bridge such likely is orders of magnitude less expensive. I do not see alternatives such as this investigated in your presentation.

-john galloway