

From: [Brian Fowler](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] In Support of Slow Streets
Date: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 6:30:26 PM

Alameda City Council members,
Thank you for engaging with the public to study the value that we Alamedans place on our Slow Streets.

As a father who volunteers with our local public elementary school and a youth soccer coach, I can attest to the value that my son and his friends place on the slow streets when we cycle around the island or walk to the park. Slow streets are safe streets. Mostly. I think some improved signage / occasional reinforcement would be in order in some places.

Please do extend the slow streets for at least the year and continue to work towards permanent safe street solutions, especially those that go North/South.

Thank you once again,
Brian Fowler
2922 Johnson Ave
Alameda, CA 94501

415.948.8393 | [LinkedIn](#)

From: [Troy Staten](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] slow streets
Date: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 10:19:45 AM

To the city council. I am not in support of the slow street program, in particular the one on Versailles. The slow street on Versailles gets very little use and people drive around the barricades as well as causing traffic to be diverted to neighboring streets with those cars driving even faster.

thank you

Troy Staten
Compass
510 508 0762
DRE # 01310594

From: [Ron Valentine](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow Streets
Date: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 10:10:34 AM

Why is there never a serious discussion of the effect "slow streets has on adjacent "Not Slow" streets. Is not putting traffic on other routes diminishing the quality of life and safety of us not gifted with safer streets? Ron Valentine 3131 Marina Dr Alameda.

From: [Karen Miller](#)
To: [Malia Vella](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [John Knox White](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#)
Cc: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow Streets
Date: Monday, December 20, 2021 2:16:59 PM

I strongly oppose the slow streets. Since the time of their introduction, I have seen very little use of them. What I do see is more traffic on the parallel streets which is patently unfair to those who live on those streets. We are going to be living with this pandemic for awhile and we need to get back to "normal".

Regards,

Karen Miller



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.

www.avast.com

From: [Année Tousseau](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Support -- Maintain Our Slow Streets
Date: Monday, December 20, 2021 1:48:06 PM

Hello,

I have been an Alameda resident since 2018. **Please maintain the Slow Streets for as long as possible.**

Slow Streets make Alameda's streets safer. Bicyclists and pedestrians need streets where they can feel safe riding. Cars dominate all the other streets; it shouldn't be a huge deal to close a few miles off to through-traffic. Residents of slow streets can still travel to and from their homes and receive deliveries, and emergency vehicles still have access.

We have WAY too much traffic violence in Alameda, especially this year. People are literally dying because we rely too much on cars. This is one small thing that the Council can do to address this.

And more broadly speaking, we have a beautiful small community that's almost completely flat -- it is excellent for biking and walking. I want to see the Council doing more to encourage and protect other modes of transportation besides cars.

Thank you,
Annee Tousseau

--

Année Tousseau
annee.tousseau@gmail.com

From: [Gina Ledesma](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow Streets
Date: Monday, December 20, 2021 12:41:09 PM

Thank you Mayor Ashcraft and City Council members,

I urge you to use a different type of barrier to slow people down on slow streets instead of barricades. When students are present crossing Third and Santa Clara and people are zooming down Third, two cars trading positions to cross the barricades is adding a level of danger that should not be and does not have to be present. This is especially dangerous during school drop off and pick up for neighborhood schools where folks do live on the barricaded streets and need to drive on the slow streets to pick up and drop off their kids. The Slow Streets on Santa Clara and Third are very dangerous and a different type of barrier should be installed immediately.

A friend of mine came to my house to drop off an item and when I saw her a week later she told me that she had anxiety about getting to my house and continues to avoid my part of town. Why did she have anxiety getting to my house you might ask? I am surrounded by slow streets and she did not know how to get to my house. She does not have slow streets by her house. I am surrounded by them on Santa Clara and Lincoln. The only main street getting to my house that is not a slow street is Central.

I have to tell anyone who is not familiar with the Slow Streets to ignore the barricades and drive through to my house. People will call me and tell me they can't get to my house because the streets are closed. The current barriers look like the construction or closed street due to work barriers. The City of Alameda needs to change this.

Slow streets are not a problem but the barricades are. In the almost 2 years we have had the slow streets, I have seen them used only 4 times for what they are intended for.

If the council recommends keeping the slow streets for another year, please, please, please, remove the barricades and use something else to designate the streets "Slow Streets" if even only for the dangerous intersections to keep kids safe.

Thank you for your time and reading my email. Merry Christmas and Happy New Year.

Gina Ledesma

--

Cheers,

Gina Ledesma



"Worry looks around. Sorry looks back. Faith looks up."

"Always new. Always exciting. Always full of promise. The mornings of our lives, each a personal daily miracle."

Gloria Gaither

From: [L.Konami Chisholm](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow Streets
Date: Monday, December 20, 2021 11:49:07 AM

Greetings,

I'm not positive I can attend the Zoom call however I do have a comment I would like the City Council to consider. While I am a frequent walker in town and have enjoyed the slow streets, I am requesting the city consider switching up the slow streets. I believe there would be benefit in alternating the slow streets wherein drivers have become very familiar with these streets and speed through other streets to avoid the slow streets. As with any routine, things become very familiar and research shows changing up routines is good exercise for the brain!

warm regards,
Konami C

**“Hope is being able to see that there is light despite all of the darkness.” –
Desmond Tutu**

From: [Transportation](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Slow streets
Date: Monday, December 20, 2021 11:28:20 AM

For 12/21 Council, Item 6A.

Thanks,
Rochelle

Rochelle Wheeler, Senior Transportation Coordinator
Planning, Building and Transportation Department, City of Alameda
510-747-7442 | RWheeler@alamedaCA.gov

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

From: Bradley King [<mailto:bradley@thekings.org>]
Sent: Monday, December 20, 2021 10:54 AM
To: Transportation <transportation@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow streets

-Barriers make people drive on the wrong side of the road. They don't slow traffic past themselves. We may as well just leave pianos in the street.

-Speed pillows slow cars 100% reliably.

Please use the effective option instead of (not in addition to) the one that amounts to a driving hazard.

Thanks,
Brad King
2064 San Jose ave

From: [Morgan Bellinger](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow Streets
Date: Monday, December 20, 2021 11:00:50 AM

I'm writing in support of Slow Streets in Alameda.

First, I'd like to thank Councilmember Herrera Spencer for her dedication to taking up council meeting time with questions that could have been emails; this has allowed the community a chance to really dive in to Slow Streets correspondence as the agenda item has been rescheduled.

I read with amusement an allegation that certain individual community members who object to Slow Streets do not have a large organization to represent their points of view (I assume they're referencing Bike Walk Alameda). I'd love to ask those folks directly if they're AAA members, or if they're aware of how much money their representatives at all levels of government above this body have accepted in campaign finance contributions from the automobile or oil industries (\$139 million in 2020 from the latter, per [opensecrets](#)), but instead I'll just hope instead that they'll read the updated correspondence and have time to respond in kind.

Slow streets are imperfect, but work well as part of a **holistic** approach to improving road safety and equity. There are far better ways to slow drivers down by design than by making them hazard their way around an end-of-block sign - and I hope Alameda can presume that professional traffic engineers are in their right mind (that's for you, Mr. Garrard) and embrace the implementation of chokers, mini-roundabouts, and similar measures as part of a better roll-out of the program.

Morgan Bellinger

From: [Justin Gastrich](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Full Support of Slow Streets
Date: Monday, December 20, 2021 10:42:38 AM

Hello,

I already filled out your questionnaire. Just wanted to voice that I am in full support of making the current ones permanent at a minimum and expanding them would be fine too.

Thank you for making Alameda more livable every day.

Best,
Justin Gastrich
Resident of 8 years and West End home owner of 1 year.

From: [Jerry Harrison](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow Streets
Date: Monday, December 20, 2021 10:20:36 AM

Please inform the City Council that Michele and Jerry Harrison support extending the Slow Streets program. Thank you.
Jerome and Michele Harrison
1211 Mound Street
Alameda

From: [Sarah Deming](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment on Slow Streets
Date: Monday, December 20, 2021 10:09:58 AM

Dear City Council,

While the slow streets seem like a great idea in theory, I don't think they are working in practice and I think we should get rid of them. My daughter's daycare is on a slow street (San Jose), when I walk to her daycare sure the slow street provides a bit less car traffic but not enough to actually walk on the street so it doesn't really change our behavior (just using the sidewalk). However, when I drive to pick up my daughter it is much more dangerous on the slow street. The cars that are driving aren't paying as much attention and are driving faster than they would if there was normal traffic--but worst of all when we are turning onto the street we have to turn into ongoing traffic because of the barriers.

I would be for slow streets on city streets / common pedestrian areas like around Park St. but I don't think they make sense on random residential streets.

Best,
Sarah Deming
Resident of Alameda

From: [Nicole Loeffler](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Keeping slow streets
Date: Wednesday, December 15, 2021 10:50:42 AM

We are family of daily commute cyclists living in Alameda with young children. We actually live on a street with more traffic because of the slow street one street over and even still, we STRONGLY support keeping the current slow streets and expanding the safe biking infrastructure per Bike Walk Alameda's recommendations.

Thank you,
The Loeffler-Siu family

From: [VIRGINIA DARROW](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow Streets
Date: Monday, December 13, 2021 11:31:06 AM

I live at 1621 San Jose Ave. between Grand and Paru. The Slow Street in that block has been wonderful because it has increased pedestrian and bicycle use. It has increased safe travel to and from Franklin Park and Franklin School by reducing automobile speed. I hope that this is a permanent measure. If made permanent, the barricades need to be improved, as they are often moved or removed.

Regards,

Virginia Darrow
1621 San Jose Avenue
Alameda

From: [Deborah Goldberg](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] slow streets
Date: Monday, December 13, 2021 9:38:10 AM

Hello,

I am writing in support of approving a One-Year Extension of the Slow Streets Program. My family (2 adults, 1 elementary schooler, and 1 preschooler) benefits greatly from being able to commute on slow streets via bike.

As a non-driver, it has been especially helpful. Slow streets feel safer to ride on vs regular without bike lanes. I also personally observe many children biking on slow streets. With so many children in Alameda, this is a no brainer. I think we need more bike lanes in Alameda overall, but the slow streets are a nice supplement to this. The benefits for the whole community (especially children, non drivers, and those with disabilities) outweigh any minor inconvenience to drivers.

Thank you,

Deborah Goldberg
1611 San Antonio Avenue

From: [Lindsay Whalin](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow Streets Item 6A
Date: Friday, December 10, 2021 9:56:26 AM

I am a resident who lives near, and often uses the Versailles Slow Street. I request the City Council approve the recommendation to maintain and improve it street as a Slow Street.

I am aware some residents of the street are unhappy (indeed I was threatened by one who nearly rammed me with her Explorer and shouted at me to get out of the road as I was walking down it). Frustrated, sad people aside, I imagine there are both advantages and disadvantages to living on a Slow Street and appreciate it requests sacrifices by some residents for the benefit of the larger community.

But this highlights an important point; evidence thus far points to it being a benefit to the community. It's allowed us to safely use the space in new ways that align with the community-oriented culture our wonderful city ascribes to. I have seen families walking and biking, kids playing ball in the street, runners sprinting it... using the space in ways they could take without the barriers. This is what most people live in Alameda for, safe places for the community to enjoy outdoors and each other's company right outside our doorstep. It's our culture and one we should nurture for ourselves and our future. Slow Streets are helping us do that.

Thank you for taking my opinion into consideration.

Lindsay Whalin
Madison St., Alameda

p.s. Thank you also for the well-researched, clear and concise public notice. Very helpful.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Rebecca Peterson](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No to Slow Streets Extension
Date: Friday, December 10, 2021 9:06:37 AM

The city needs to remove all the Slow Streets blockades. It is a hazard to all - especially bikes and pedestrians. I haven't noticed that cars ignore the signs and drive all around them. This leaves the pedestrians and bicyclists more vulnerable as they think it's a safe street. For those cars that pay attention and stay off them, they are forced into other neighborhoods causing a host of other problems i.e. U-turns, turning in and out of driveways, whipping around corners, etc.

Rebecca Peterson

From: [Shannon Whitley](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow Streets Program
Date: Friday, December 10, 2021 7:38:00 AM

Mayor and Councilmembers,

I have been reading the correspondence regarding the Slow Street Program, and I strongly support the points and data provided by Jill Staten. I also agree with other community members such as my wife (Cybelle Kelley-Whitley), Troy Staten, Sharon LaCroix, and the countless other individual community members (who do not have a large organization to represent their points of view). It is time to retire the Slow Streets Program.

Anecdotally, my family has increased its walking time exponentially since the pandemic started. We often take walks in both directions on San Jose at various times of the day. We rarely see cyclists, and the pedestrians are always on the sidewalk. Due to the many housing units on San Jose (and the schools), there is still far too much traffic to safely walk in the street. The slow street provides no benefit to us, and it removes a path for us when we need to travel by car.

As others have noted, I am not confident that we have gathered enough data. For the data we have, out of 1,813 pedestrians, only 239 walked in the street (13%). That's tiny compared to the disruption to traffic by the slow streets. For the pedestrian traffic in the street, I would like to know if people were counted if they quickly walked into the street to provide space for other pedestrians and then moved back to the sidewalk. My family does this on every street, and the slow street makes no difference in this practice. I would also be interested in the increase in vehicle traffic on streets beyond the parallel streets. My alternative routes cannot be adjacent to San Jose since those streets have circuitous paths. The alternative I often take is to go to Central, where I am forced to take a much more dangerous left turn. I have had a number of near misses on my alternate route, where I did not experience these on my route down San Jose before slow streets.

The survey that has been used in support of slow streets should carry little weight. The survey is open on the internet and anyone could have provided a response. Like many city surveys, this survey's results are skewed by organizations that can promote the survey to its large membership.

The slow street program is ineffective, dangerous, and a waste of the city's resources. Please discontinue the program.

Thank you,

Shannon Whitley
Park Avenue

From: [Melissa Clark](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Cc: [Melissa Clark](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Reconsider Versailles Street Selection
Date: Thursday, December 9, 2021 8:39:22 PM

Please reconsider the selection of Versailles as a Slow Street and consider Pearl Street as a better selection. Pearl Street ends at a dangerous intersection on Tilden Way that currently is blocked from vehicles turning right onto Pearl. Pearl Street is also the major entrance to our beloved Edison School where many/most parents walk, bike or deliver kids to the school on Buena Vista Ave, the front of the school, or on Pearl Street where the entrance for disabled kids is located. Making Pearl the Slow Street will benefit the school kids as well as drivers in the area.

From: [Daphne Harmola](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] slow streets in Alameda
Date: Thursday, December 9, 2021 8:00:17 PM

City Clerk

Living a half a block from Versailles has been the pits trying to drive home and leave home.

I walk 2x a week leaving my house at 6:30 am and returning at 7:30 am no walkers no bikers. I'm a retired employee of the City of Alameda. So I'm home all day long and again I don't see the bikers/walkers using Versailles. So what's the purpose???

Do you realize the traffic on Clinton Ave. is like a freeway due to the closure of San Jose Ave.

Yes, I walk from Van Buren St. to Union St.

Versailles is a street to get to a very important business on Encinal Ave. Having to take a detour to get to Encinal Hardware is a pain in the ass for many Alamedans

City Clerk,

Am writing this letter in fears that the City of Alameda is going to keep the closures of city streets for a longer period of time.

Living just a half a block from Versailles Ave. we have noticed very little usage of walkers/bikers using Versailles Ave. If anything it's a pain to get around the barriers to get home. And, why use the extra gas to go the extra block.

I'm a retired City of Alameda employee and have been enjoying my time with early morning walks. Twice a week I leave my house on Van Buren St. at 6:30 am and make it home by 7:30 am and hardly see anyone walking or biking at those times. And, the same during the day!!

Versailles Ave. is a main street for families to get to either Otis or Edison Schools and for a very well used business on Encinal Ave.

In regards to my walks, I make it a point to walk to Union St. Do you realize how Clinton Ave. has become a freeway since the closure of San Jose Ave.??

Why close all these streets, when you should be thinking about how to deal with the traffic with all the buildings of homes, townhouses, apartments and low income housing. How are all these new residents going to come and go from our city???

Don't you think this is the problem the City of Alameda should be tackling?

Daphne Harmola and Jim Evans
2815 Van Buren Street

From: [Peg Magarian](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow streets
Date: Thursday, December 9, 2021 5:55:58 PM

Please discontinue the slow street on Versailles. It's dangerous. Versailles is the main thoroughfare from Otis to Fernside. MANY NEAR MISSES OCCURRING DAILY.
Consider another street to replace this one.
Peg Magarian

From: [Troy Staten](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow streets
Date: Thursday, December 9, 2021 4:36:46 PM

I am not in favor of the slow streets. I live on Moreland Drive and all the slow street on Versailles does is force the traffic over to Moreland and Pearl streets and those drivers are annoyed and end up driving faster. I seriously doubt any of the supporters of the slow streets use the Versailles one, I often walk on the sidewalk of Versailles and there is rarely anybody walking or riding bikes down Versailles. I would love to see the money being spent on this used for fixing all the potholes and damaged sidewalks instead.

Troy Staten
510 508 0762

From: [Becca Wernis](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Council Meeting 12/7, Items 7-A and 7-C (support)
Date: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 6:13:30 PM

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and City Council,

I'm writing to you in support of staff's recommendations for Agenda Item 7-A, adopting the Vision Zero Action Plan and Resolution to Make Significant Safety Improvements, and Agenda Item 7-C, approving a one-year extension of the Slow Streets Program.

Regarding Item 7-A: My primary mode of transport around the island is bicycling. I ride my bicycle to the grocery store, to the bus stop to get to work, and to restaurants as well as recreationally. While I appreciate the separated bicycle and multi-use paths in certain areas (and the slow streets!), when I do need to ride with motor vehicles it can be a pretty stressful experience, as many drivers don't like being "stuck" behind me, even for just a block or two, and I have been honked at and passed closely when trying to ride safely by taking the lane. An integral part of shifting the current culture of car convenience and speed above all else, which leads to the types of unpleasant experiences I've had and much, much worse, is redesigning our streets to prioritize safety. I hope you will support these resolutions so we can get to work as a city making our streets safer for all users.

Regarding Item 7-C: I love the Pacific Ave Slow Street. In the absence of a continuous Cross Alameda Trail (though I know progress is being made), Pacific Ave is my main way to get between West End, where I live, and the commercial area along Park Street. It is far less stressful than being in motor vehicle traffic or right next to it (as I would be on Santa Clara). If possible, I would like to see city council direct staff to ensure there are barricades at every slow street intersection and improve signage on the barricades to more clearly state the intent and purpose of slow streets. I had a motorist honk at me and tell me I should be on the side of the road (out of "his way") on Pacific where it meets Grand. He proceeded to continue on Pacific for several blocks, driving around barricades. Never mind that I'm well within my rights to take the lane on a normal street - clearly this man did not understand the Slow Street designation despite the existing barricades. With this minor addition, I hope you will approve this agenda item.

Rebecca Wernis
463 Buena Vista Ave

From: [Lara Weisiger](#)
To: [Ashley Zieba](#)
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Slow Street Council Meeting
Date: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 5:38:59 PM

From: Lynn Silva <l.silva01@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 5:38 PM
To: City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow Street Council Meeting

Hello,

I can't attend tonight's City Council meeting about Alameda Slow Streets but I understand if I write to you my opinion could be heard. I feel the city survey should not have allowed people from outside of Alameda to participate (they were the top percentage in favor of slow streets) and what residents want should have greater weight. I'd also like to know why it was decided to keep the slow street program another year when only 17% support it? That's less than the percentage of people who don't like slow streets.

Thank you,
Lynn Silva

From: [Lara Weisiger](#)
To: [Ashley Zieba](#)
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Item 7-C Slow Streets
Date: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 5:29:44 PM

From: Lorin Laiacona Salem <lolasa29@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 5:15 PM
To: Lara Weisiger <lweisiger@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Item 7-C Slow Streets

Hi, Lara,

Sorry to bug you but it looks like the ALPR correspondence got mixed up with the slow streets correspondence. Like, it seems that my ALPR letter appears twice in the latest agenda packet (once under slow streets and once under ALPR) and my slow streets letter. Can you make sure the council has the slow streets letter in their packet?

Thank you!
Lorin Salem

On Mon, Dec 6, 2021 at 6:43 PM Lara Weisiger <lweisiger@alamedaca.gov> wrote:

And this one, too.
Respectfully,
Lara

From: Lorin Laiacona Salem [mailto:lolasa29@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, December 6, 2021 6:01 PM
To: City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>;
Manager Manager <MANAGER@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 7-C Slow Streets

Hi, Mme. Mayor and Council,

My family loves the Slow Streets program and hope you will vote tonight to continue it. We are particularly big fans of the San Jose Ave slow street, as that has allowed us to bike from Franklin Park to Park St safely. We have also used the Pacific Ave slow street several times and enjoy how much safer it is to bike across Alameda with these streets in place.

Please continue this program and use it to permanently expand the network of protected bike streets and lanes in Alameda.

Thank you,
Lorin Salem

| resident

From: [Lara Weisiger](#)
To: [Ashley Zieba](#)
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Slow Streets (Agenda Item 7c)
Date: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 5:29:36 PM

From: Pat Potter <pttr_pt@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 4:58 PM
To: City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow Streets (Agenda Item 7c)

Slow Streets in Alameda are not perfect. Riding a bike down one does not mean you won't have to deal with cars, but psychologically for the bicyclist we are hoping to target--the one who is timid and afraid of the traffic, it is a great step. And getting more people on bikes and out of cars has been a goal of the city's for years. Let's not backtrack and throw that hard work away by taking away slow streets. People aren't going to become everyday riders over night, but with a safe and enjoyable way to get around town on the slow streets, they will slowly gain the confidence needed to become regular bicyclists.

Thank you,
Pat Potter
1430 Paru St.
Alameda, CA 94501

From: [Joyce Mercado](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Tonight's agenda items comments
Date: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 2:32:59 PM

Hi, I'm writing in support of the following:

Vision zero staff recommendations

Slow streets continuing

Automated license plate readers

Joyce Mercado

2901 Lincoln Ave

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Julie Robbins](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Supporting safe biking and walking in Alameda
Date: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 2:30:29 PM

Dear Mayor Ashcroft and Council Members,

I live, work, and send my child to school in Alameda. I urge you all to support the efforts of Bike/Walk Alameda and other like-minded community members in the Vision Zero campaign, continuing and expanding the Slow Streets in Alameda, and everything else you can do to slow drivers and increase safe, healthy (for us, our kids, and our Earth) transportation.

Thank you,
Julie Robbins Kim (she/her)

From: [Cameron Holland](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Extend Slow Streets; Keep Versailles
Date: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 2:14:59 PM

I am writing in support of staff's recommendation to extend the Slow Streets program. I also support keeping Versailles a Slow Street.

My family lives on the East End of Alameda in the Marina-Windsor neighborhood. We walk and bike throughout Alameda. Since the beginning of the pandemic, we have used the Slow Streets regularly. Our main entry point is on Versailles at Fernside. From there, we bicycle via San Jose to Franklin Park. Our kids ride or walk on Versailles to Edison school. I ride on Versailles to go to the hardware store or to reach Otis and access South Shore.

Every time we enter a Slow Street on our bikes, our collective family stress goes down. We are not less alert, but we at least know that motorists are put on notice that vulnerable humans are sharing the road.

Some have voiced opposition to Versailles as a Slow Street, arguing it should be removed or moved to Pearl. One argument made is that Versailles is the only north-south connector from Otis to Fernside in that neighborhood, and so it is inconvenient for cars that Versailles is reserved for cyclists and pedestrians. Cars have to use High Street and Broadway to drive conveniently.

However, the fact that Versailles is a north-south connector is the very reason it should be a Slow Street. Alameda has too few cyclist friendly north-south connectors as is. On the East End, cars *have* High and Broadway. I am not comfortable riding on those streets with my family (or alone for that matter). Both have had recent pedestrian or cyclist collisions. It doesn't make sense that motorists should have three convenient north-south options and cyclists none.

With respect to speeding on side streets, staff notes that speeding has increased throughout the island during the pandemic. However, removing Versailles as a Slow Street would shift speeding cars back to Versailles, a street used by many cyclists and pedestrians already for the reasons mentioned above.

Thank you,
Cameron Holland

From: [Bradley King](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow streets for the council meeting
Date: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 10:32:18 AM

Please read this out to the council meeting.

Here are my observations as a resident of a slow street:

- The half-blocked traffic intersections are now chaotic and less safe for pedestrians, bikers and vehicles. This point should be obvious.
- Traffic volume on the streets has not been significantly reduced.
- The roads are still unsafe for child or adult recreation by any reasonable standard (see above).
- Bike safety has not been improved.

If the program is going to continue, here are ways to make it actually effective for at least some of its goals:

- Remove the barriers from intersections. Leave a sign if you like.
- Install speed pillows. This will absolutely accomplish the goal of slowing traffic.
- Create a real bike lane demarcated by painted lines -as has been done elsewhere in Alameda to good effect.
- Rotate the impacted streets so as to minimize the burden to their residents -or else to spread the joy to more residents of Alameda rather than letting us selfishly monopolize any benefits, if you support them. There's no logical reason to keep them where they currently are.

Finally, I'd like to point out that the poll that marginally supported the program was entirely methodologically unscientific. The respondents were self selected and there was no provision to prevent multiple responses from one person. Its results should be ignored in favor of a more representative door to door poll if we really want to know about the level community support.

Thank you,
-Bradley King
San Jose Ave

From: [Transportation](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Cc: [Andrew Thomas](#)
Subject: [For Item 7C] Slow streets support
Date: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 9:35:38 AM

Hello Lara,
I believe this person was intending for this email to go to Council for tonight's Slow Streets item (7C).

Thank you,
Rochelle

Rochelle Wheeler, Senior Transportation Coordinator
Planning, Building and Transportation Department, City of Alameda
510-747-7442 | RWheeler@alamedaCA.gov

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

From: Jennifer Mosier [<mailto:jennifer@gargany.com>]
Sent: Monday, December 6, 2021 10:46 PM
To: Transportation <transportation@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow streets support

Dear Transportation,

I live on Versailles just below Encinal. I am physically disabled and our slow streets have been a boon to me during the pandemic. I am able to walk for exercise and it's great to have enough space to walk on the slow streets. I mention my disability because when I am on a crowded sidewalk trying to dodge other people and maintain six feet of distance is difficult and occasionally painful. I am not a senior citizen but I suspect you would not need to work hard to find senior citizens who have noticed the same thing and also benefit from slow streets. I urge you to extend the slow streets designation until the pandemic has receded more.

Thank you for your attention to my letter.

sincerely,
Jennifer Mosier
1238 Versailles Ave.
310 850 5340

From: [Paul Medved](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow Streets
Date: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 7:22:18 AM

YAY! for Slow Streets!

Thank you!
Paul & Cecily Medved



Virus-free. www.avast.com

September 18, 2021

Alameda City Council Members
City Hall
2263 Santa Clara Ave
Alameda, CA 94501

Dear Alameda City Council Members,

I am writing to you to voice my opposition to continuing the Slow Streets closures beyond your initial stated date of October 31, 2021. The program does not provide the benefit originally intended, but instead creates unsafe and inequitable conditions.

Although the initial closures were a novel idea to give people more space while parks and schools were closed, the streets are no longer being used by the public as initially intended. I have closely monitored both Versailles and San Jose Avenues and I rarely see anyone using the streets for bicycling and never see anyone walking or rolling in the streets. The only people benefitting from the Slow Streets are the residents who now enjoy no car traffic while the adjacent streets pick up the load.

I'd like to specifically address the unsafe situation around Franklin School, Park, and Pool. The road closure beginning at Morton Street and San Antonio Avenue pushes all of the traffic on the 9th and Grand Street corridor onto San Antonio Ave. Prior to the closure, drivers could make safe choices during heavy impact times (like school drop-off and pick-up) to use either San Jose or San Antonio to get to/from Grand Street. The unintended consequence of the closure is that all the traffic is now flowing past the main entrances to Franklin School and Franklin Park, creating crowded and unsafe conditions for students and pedestrians. Furthermore, Franklin Park draws many people to the neighborhood. The street closure reduces the car parking on the Franklin Park block by 50%, pushing cars out into the surrounding streets with inequitable impact for the neighborhood.

Slow Streets is not functioning as a public good for all as originally intended. Instead, it has turned public streets into private streets and created an inequitable and arbitrary policy that benefits few and burdens many.

Please keep your word and bring the Slow Streets program to an end on October 31, 2021.

Respectfully,

Sharon LaCroix
510-522-7696

From: [Andrew Thomas](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: Fwd: [EXTERNAL] Thank you!
Date: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 6:32:26 AM

Letter for slow streets council item.

Andrew Thomas,
510-774-5361 (c)

Begin forwarded message:

From: Andrew Thomas <athomas@alamedaca.gov>
Date: December 7, 2021 at 6:30:29 AM PST
To: Charlie Hale <charles.hale@gmail.com>
Cc: Rochelle Wheeler <rwheeler@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Thank you!

Thank you Charlie! Rochelle is awesome, right? (She has done all the work and gets all the credit.)

Andrew Thomas,
510-774-5361 (c)

On Dec 6, 2021, at 7:40 PM, Charlie Hale
<charles.hale@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Rochelle and Andrew,

I just wanted to thank you for all the hard work you, and I'm sure many others, put into the Slow Streets program. I happen to live near one of the Slow Streets (Versailles & Lincoln) and have two young children, and the Slow Street program made a massive difference to my family (and anecdotally), for all of the neighbors I've spoken to about it. I happen to agree with the recommendation you made to the Transportation Committee and broader Council, but even if I hadn't, I just wanted to say how much I appreciate the thorough, considered process that you followed. From your recommendation, the community survey and many forums you held, it was readily apparent how much work went into this. I know I'm just one resident, but I imagine I speak on behalf of many people in Alameda when I say how much I appreciate your time and energy.

Take care,

-Charlie

From: oogielaflick
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow Streets
Date: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 4:55:27 AM

Hi there,

I wish to complain about these slow streets. I live on a block that was designated as a "slow street". Nobody ever asked any of us on the block if we even WANTED to be designated as a slow street. And yet, here we are, still having to drive around barricades whenever we go out anywhere, people are just walking down the middle of the street, as though it is CLOSED, when it is NOT, but is open to local traffic, which these people don't seem to understand. Why do you keep these barricades up when nobody on the block even wants them there?

Also, while we are at it, who in their right mind, [clearly they WEREN'T in their right mind!] decided that in a city with an increasing amount of cars, and with streets that have been 4 lanes, two each way, for decades, now figures that making these streets into two lanes, is a good idea! I mean, Park Street and Webster St, now routinely have traffic backups for even the slightest delays, such as when garbage trucks stop to pick up trash cans, or because of the crazy way parking spaces are now in what used to be, a traffic lane, when people park there and open their doors, this causes traffic to back up until they close their doors. And regarding park street, well, whenever there is a bridge raising on the park street bridge, because of the shrinkage of 4 lanes down to two, traffic backs up all the way from park street, across the park street bridge, and now, all the way down 20th avenue, and down the northbound exit ramp off of 880. It takes almost an hour to get from that exit ramp and over to Alameda. Why? Because some fool decided to shrink 4 lanes down to 2. And of course, Webster street, during the weekly farmers market day, well, traffic backs up quickly, just during the few seconds it takes for a pedestrian to cross at Haight Street where the farmers market is located. And don't even think about the people who are driving on Webster street and park streets, who are in the right lanes when the street shrinks down, and then get mad at drivers who are in the "through lane" when they don't let them merge, when they should have been in the through lane to begin with.

It is time to get rid of the parklets where restaurants are able to set up shop in parking spaces on the street, and return our 4 lane streets back to us.

--Keith Garrard

From: [Ken Freeman](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Regarding December 7, 2021 City Council Meeting
Date: Monday, December 6, 2021 10:12:46 PM

Dear Major Ashcraft and City Council Members,

I am a long time resident of Alameda, close to 40 years.

I support all the positions of Bike Walk Alameda outlined below.

I ask you to please support these positions as well and vote accordingly.

Thanks for all you do,

Kenneth R Freeman DDS

Here are Bike Walk Alameda's positions, at a high level, for quick reference if you find them helpful (with the full letters we wrote to Council below):

Vision Zero Action Plan (Agenda Item 7-A):

We fully support staff recommendations, underscoring the need for more funding and staffing to ensure success.

IEAP (Agenda Item 7-B):

Our Intersection Access Policy (aka Beg Button Policy) should provide pedestrians and cyclists the same consistent, predictable signal operations the drivers enjoy. The policy proposed by our Public Works department is a good start, but doesn't go nearly far enough. We hope that Council will direct staff to beef up to this policy proposal by 1) expanding the number of signals, and hours of coverage, that signals that will be on full recall and 2) ensuring that our toolbox of pedestrian safety enhancements (LPis, countdown timers, etc..) are applied consistently wherever total recall is not implemented. Consistency should be the goal, not driver throughput.

Slow Streets (Agenda Item 7-C):

We support staff recommendations to extend the program and improve Slow Streets, but would also like to see barricades on each side of every intersection, and new slow street segments added to Eighth, Pacific, Ninth, and San Antonio for a north-south connection between Jean Sweeney Park and the Santa Jose Slow Street.

From: [Troy Staten](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] regarding slow streets
Date: Monday, December 6, 2021 7:21:48 PM

I am not in favor of them, the one on Versailles gets very little use and just forces traffic onto neighboring streets and the cars drive even faster.

Troy Staten
Compass
510 508 0762
DRE # 01310594

From: [Lorin Laiacona Salem](#)
To: [City Clerk](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Manager Manager](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 7-C Slow Streets
Date: Monday, December 6, 2021 6:01:05 PM

Hi, Mme. Mayor and Council,

My family loves the Slow Streets program and hope you will vote tonight to continue it. We are particularly big fans of the San Jose Ave slow street, as that has allowed us to bike from Franklin Park to Park St safely. We have also used the Pacific Ave slow street several times and enjoy how much safer it is to bike across Alameda with these streets in place.

Please continue this program and use it to permanently expand the network of protected bike streets and lanes in Alameda.

Thank you,
Lorin Salem
resident

From: [Andrea Dunlap](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow street support
Date: Monday, December 6, 2021 5:47:48 PM

Hello! I'd love to register my support for the slow streets. I live on Santa Clara between 3rd and 4th and I love seeing the street flooded with kids biking and walking to school every weekday, now!

What I don't love is the parents who drive around the barricades to use our street as a pass-through (not sure why they ignore the no-through-traffic signage). We also still have a fair amount of through traffic at high speeds at all times of day. Personally I'd love a speed bump or a crossing guard to further encourage drivers to take other roads and make the 'slow' street actually slow.

Thanks for everything you do to make it safer for pedestrian and wheeled transit!
Andrea Dunlap

From: [Jerry Harrison](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow Streets
Date: Monday, December 6, 2021 5:40:09 PM

I support extending the Slow Streets program. I often ride my bike on Versailles to and from BART or to and from the Nob Hill to take advantage of the minimal traffic on that street. I see the schoolchildren walking safely on that street. Let's maintain Alameda's family-friendly atmosphere by extending the program.

Jerry Harrison
1211 Mound Street
JerryFromAlameda@gmail.com

From: grampam6@comcast.net
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow streets
Date: Monday, December 6, 2021 5:31:22 PM

Yes, keep them. Even add more.

Sent from my iPad

Alameda City Council

Re: Slow Streets Program

Mayor and Councilmembers:

I have long questioned the value of the Slow Streets Program, and there is now data to back up my observations that only a small percentage of Alamedans use them AND they haven't actually made things safer.

Safety

The traffic study is interesting. It looks like the Slow Streets aren't actually slowing traffic as a whole. While there was some speed reduction on the Slow Streets, the chart on page 10 shows that with the possible exception of Pacific, **the reductions on the Slow Streets are more than offset by increases in speed on adjacent, parallel streets.** With the increased traffic speed on other streets, the program as a whole is **not** a net safety improvement for Alameda - it just pushes fast traffic to other streets.

Encouraging people, especially children, to walk in the middle of the street is a terrible idea, since there is still local traffic to contend with, and it's a dangerous habit for children to get into.

A Slow Streets designation doesn't do much to improve cycling safety. Because local traffic is allowed, cyclists still have to be careful of cars and delivery vehicles, and cross traffic at intersections, where most accidents occur, is not reduced at all.

Looking at the comments on the city's statistically questionable survey (I requested access to the comments), quite a few people indicated dangers and near-misses with cars driving around the barricades. This means the Slow Street designation actually **creates a danger that does not exist with regular streets.**

Utilization

Even without excluding baseline utilization (the people who would have cycled or walked in that particular street even if it wasn't a Slow Street), and even if you

believe the data, only 795 cyclists and 239 in-street pedestrians used any of the Slow Streets on the day surveyed - roughly 1,000, most of them probably kids going to school or runners or cyclists who would have used the streets the same way even if they were not designated as Slow Streets. This is a small fraction of the people who have to deal with the frustration and longer drives (particularly relating to Versailles) due to the street closures.

Community Feel

Several of the survey comments refer to Slow Streets contributing a feeling of community. I live on an adjacent street and the only sense of community I have experienced is my neighbors all talking about how much we hate living next to a Slow Street because the traffic has been diverted from the Slow Street to our street. I assume the people who made the positive comments are enjoying the benefit of being able to essentially have free block parties on their streets anytime, without having to pay the almost \$500 my block of 18 houses had to pay for a permit to close our block for the Fourth of July. If your goal with the Slow Streets is to create a sense of community, you could do that much more fairly by decreasing or eliminating the fee for block parties for EVERYONE in Alameda, not just those fortunate enough to live on a Slow Street.

Versailles is a poor choice for a Slow Street

Unlike some of the other Slow Streets, Versailles is the only street that's most efficient for driving in the area, particularly on the north end. From the Fruitvale Bridge, Broadway is the long way around. You can't turn south on Pearl because there is an existing barricade. The only street between Broadway and High where you can drive straight from Fernside to Otis is Versailles because all the other streets from Otis dead-end at Lincoln. Versailles was the preferred way to drive to the homes and businesses in this area.

For example, the Broadway alternative to Encinal Hardware involves five extra lights. Every time I take that route I get stopped at at least 3 lights. Every time a car or truck stops at a light it spews exhaust, with **negative environmental impact**.

Rather than Broadway, though, most cars take Moreland or Cambridge. If they take Moreland, they have to turn right on Lincoln when Moreland dead-ends after three blocks and go past Versailles again and turn left on Pearl, then left again on Encinal. Or turn left on Lincoln at the end of Moreland, then right on Gibbons, left on Santa Clara, right on Grove, then right on Encinal. The Cambridge route is similar.

Any of these routes involve more turns than the straight shot down Versailles (and are therefore more dangerous for everyone), and they result in more distance driven - again with negative environmental impact and more chance for accidents.

Having Versailles as a Slow Street is a source of frustration to drivers, and frustrated drivers are less safe drivers. The question is, is the benefit worth it? I think the data show that it isn't.

On the survey, the street with the highest level of those living nearby wanting to **remove** the street was Versailles, with 50% of neighbors wanting to remove and 10% wanting changes - some of them meaning a switch to Pearl.

On the north end of Versailles, only 19 pedestrians used the Slow Street to walk or run in the street all day long. That's probably the same number that walk or run in my non-Slow Street on a given day.

Counts show about 5 people per hour biked down Versailles, which is probably about the same as before it was a Slow Street.

The traffic study showed speeds on the streets parallel to Versailles between Santa Clara and Fernside **increased** by a higher percentage than the speeds on Versailles were reduced.

- Versailles speeds showed **NO decrease during the week** and down 19% on weekends.
- Pearl speeds were **up 10% during the week** and **up a whopping 65%** on weekends.
- Moreland speeds were **up 17% during the week** and **up 32%** on weekends.

So having Versailles as a "slow street" is barely slowing down traffic on Versailles, but it is speeding it up significantly with frustrated drivers on the two adjacent parallel streets. This seems to me like a net LOSS in terms of safety for the neighborhood around Versailles.

Initially I advocated for switching the Slow Street from Versailles to Pearl since Pearl is already closed to through traffic from Fernside, which I still think makes more sense than Versailles if the program is retained. But after seeing the numbers that show how few people are using the north end of Versailles as a Slow Street, an alternative if the program is continued would be to take out the blocks between Fernside and Lincoln or Santa Clara so cars can get past the

barrier of the block at Lincoln. The block in front of Edison is already a gap in the Slow Street, so I'm only talking about a few blocks, but that would make a big difference to local residents.

Conclusion

The original premise of the Slow Streets program was to allow people to socially distance while walking and biking during the pandemic. That's no longer necessary, and I hope the Council will vote to sunset this program at the end of this year for the following reasons:

- It teaches children and others that it's safe to walk in a street and stop paying attention to traffic when biking, which is a very dangerous thing to learn.
- The barricades, besides being major eyesores, create dangers when cars and delivery vehicles drive around them to access the street.
- The number of people using them is far eclipsed by the people who have to drive further out of their way to get where they need to go.
- The diverted traffic results in increased stops and re-acceleration - with negative environmental impacts as every stop results in more gas used to accelerate back to speed.
- Versailles was a very poor choice for the area. Even if you keep the other streets, please remove at least the northernmost blocks of Versailles from the program.

At this point the Slow Streets program is a dangerous eyesore of a solution looking for a problem. I hope we don't have to wait for someone to be killed by a delivery truck driving around a barricade before the city realizes that this program creates more problems than it solves.

Jill Staten
1628 Moreland Drive

From: [Ella Rosenbloom](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Love Slow Streets
Date: Monday, December 6, 2021 4:46:24 PM

Our family loves the slow streets program and hopes it will become permanent (and even expanded!). We'd like to see more permanent infrastructure added to ensure safety and beautify bikers and pedestrian experience.

Thank you,
Ella Rosenbloom

From: [Jennifer Ayres](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow streets
Date: Monday, December 6, 2021 3:51:56 PM

Use different less used streets. Versailles and Santa Clara and San Jose should never be slow streets. Also send the survey out to all residents. --

[Jennifer Ayres](#)

jhaayres@gmail.com

From: [\(null\) \(null\)](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow Streets -Feedback
Date: Monday, December 6, 2021 3:43:54 PM

Hello,

I would like to object to extending the slow streets. I live one street over from Versailles Street. We now get a lot of bad actor drivers, assuming they are upset they cannot drive down Versailles Street.

There is much more traffic and many speeding cars. There are lots of children living on this street(Moreland Drive) and I worry for their safety.

I walk my neighborhood frequently all days/hours and hardly ever see anyone actually taking advantage of the closed streets. I am sure the residents that live on these slow street love it but what about the adjacent streets? It does not seem just or fair.

My view of the slow streets have changed mainly because there is no point as there is no advantage to anyone . They are not used as intended. It is creating havoc on adjacent streets and there are very few people walking them.

Thank you,
Caroline

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Leonard Harris](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Extensio of Slow Streets in Alameda
Date: Monday, December 6, 2021 2:56:39 PM

I'm a senior citizen (76) and have appreciated the implementatiion of the Slow Streets program. I use them frequently for bicycle riding. Hopefully, this policy will continue. My main concern is the lack of enforcement for citing vehicles violating the barriers and continuing for several blocks, sometimes at excessive speeds. These violations are often noticed on Santa Clara Ave west of 6TH ST.

Hopefully, APD motorcycle traffic patrols will return and beef up enforcement of not only violating Slow Steets rules but increasing patrols over the entire city to reduce the uncaccpetable number of pedestrian and bicyclist accidents-- in some cases fatalities.

Leonard Harris
1432 4TH ST
Alameda 94501

From: klp249@aol.com
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow Streets
Date: Monday, December 6, 2021 2:53:50 PM

As a longtime handicapped and older resident of Alameda, I am very unhappy about almost all of the traffic changes in Alameda. As a person who works off the island, I cannot take public transportation to my job and I need to be able to get to the freeway easily. I am concerned that more and more, Alameda City government is pretending that we are not an island, that we can build housing on top of housing and make no provisions for parking and traffic and getting on and off the island. They also pretend that we all can walk or bike wherever we need to go. All of the lanes that have been added by the beach and on other streets have not made Alameda safer for pedestrians because they just confuse drivers and no one can tell where they're supposed to drive. Pedestrians and bikers don't always take responsibility for their own safety by obeying traffic laws that apply to them. Bikers regularly run stop signs and endanger pedestrians. Blocking off streets, cutting out traffic lanes to benefit a few bicyclists are not in the interest of the majority of Alamedans. Stop ruining Alameda by trying to take away regular streets. Make Alameda better by not selling the island out to developers!

Karen Soots Pare
Encinal '66, Mills '91

From: [Amy Lundblad](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow streets
Date: Monday, December 6, 2021 2:36:28 PM

Hello City Clerk,

I am in favor of the slow streets proposal. It has made our street (Morton) very much safer and more enjoyable for people, youngsters and pets.

Thanks for reading this,

Amy Lundblad

From: [coopmc](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow Streets
Date: Monday, December 6, 2021 2:32:16 PM

I live on Pacific Ave. and have witnessed the slow streets experiment as it unfolded on my block. My opinion is that the experiment has been mostly successful. I have seen many more pedestrians, families, dogs and bicyclists using Pacific Ave. The problems I witness appear to be primarily inconsiderate drivers who use Pacific as a through street. Visitors to the neighborhood are sometimes unclear on how to proceed onto Pacific Ave. Delivery vehicles often drive poorly but that seems to be universal. I believe the Slow Streets experiment should continue on my street. I can't speak for other streets.

Sent from my T-Mobile 5G Device

From: [William Simpson](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Cc: [Jacy Gaige](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow Streets Extension
Date: Monday, December 6, 2021 2:16:28 PM

Please let the Council know that our family strongly supports the extension of the Slow Street Program.

Sincerely,
Billy Simpson and Jacy Gaige
1848 8th Street

From: stevesummit1@aol.com
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow streets
Date: Monday, December 6, 2021 2:13:33 PM

I love the slow streets as I live on one of them keep it going

Sent from AOL Mobile Mail

From: [Leslie Graham](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow Streets!
Date: Monday, December 6, 2021 2:11:10 PM

Please keep them! They make the city nicer and are well worth any inconvenience to drivers.

Thank you,

Leslie Graham
1345 Bay Street

From: [Jenean](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow streets - I don't prefer them
Date: Monday, December 6, 2021 2:09:19 PM

Dear clerk,

I live on a slow street and it's never used for the purpose intended. But it's a nuisance to drive around.

I live on Pacific between Schiller and Lafayette.

Thank you
Jenean Livesey

From: [Jillian Northrup](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Slow streets are great!
Date: Monday, December 6, 2021 2:06:45 PM

We use the slow streets regularly while walking or biking with or without kids.
I hope they can stay forever!

Jillian Northrup
Founder & Director

Because We Can

Architecture & Design

2526 San Jose Ave., Alameda, CA 94501
(p)510-545-9275

Check out our sister company: **Model No. Furniture**, The first completely customizable, eco-friendly 3D printed furniture, made to order in Oakland, CA.



From: [Drew Dara-Abrams](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [John Knox White](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#)
Cc: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] transportation safety on 12/7 council meeting agenda: 7-A, 7-B, 7-C, 7-D, 7-E
Date: Monday, December 6, 2021 10:56:17 AM
Attachments: [image.png](#)

Dear Mayor, Vice Mayor, and Councilmembers,

I am writing to strongly support adoption of the Vision Zero Action Plan and associated plans and budget for 2022 and beyond. I would also like to comment on how related items on tonight's agenda can concurrently improve the safety and quality of Alameda's transportation network:

7-A Vision Zero Action Plan and 2022 Budget

It's appropriate to see the VZ Action Plan paired together with a concrete set of projects and budget proposed for 2022. I hope you all will vote to pass both resolutions tonight.

Getting to the true safety of "zero" deaths and serious injuries on Alameda's roads may take years and effort — as represented by the target date of 2035 — but rapidly reducing risks for everyone by redesigning infrastructure and making related policy and programmatic changes is within reach in the next handful of years.

Bad news about traffic safety in Alameda is there are so many physical design features, city policies, and behaviors by all of us that lead to potentially dangerous driving. This is also the good news: there are many "levers" the city and residents can all choose to use to lower the chances of deaths and serious injuries on our streets.

Thanks to diligent work by city staff and consultants, this Vision Zero Action Plan has the breadth and the depth needed to effectively address many causes, direct and indirect, of traffic deaths and injuries. This plan learns from what has worked and what has failed in other American cities that have adopted their own Vision Zero plans (many of which, like San Francisco's, were adopted 7+/- years ago and are unfortunately not on track to meet their targets of eliminating traffic deaths within 10 years).

Alameda's original draft did over-correct by setting a target date of 2040. (Sure was depressing to stand around at one of the outreach events and chat with other concerned residents about how many Alamedans might be hit on streets in the period of 19 years!) Thanks to staff for listening to this feedback — but more importantly, thanks to staff for also submitting to City Council an appropriately aggressive plan for 2022. Both ends of the Vision Zero timeline matter: setting a target date that is inspiring but achievable *and* beginning with sufficient commitment and budget across all the city departments to make substantive progress on the most dangerous infrastructure, policies, and behaviors.

One suggestion: Federal dollars are coming for transportation improvements, particularly to support the "safe systems" approach, "complete streets," and projects that promote equity through transportation. **How can the City of Alameda be ready to apply for as many of these funds as possible? What are the bottlenecks to having "shovel ready" projects? If the bottleneck is staff time, please hire more or bring on more consultants. If the bottleneck is cross-departmental communication, please direct the City Manager to prioritize this.** Given the large infusion of funds by the "Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill" and discretion Secretary of Transportation Buttigieg and his staff have been given, this is a unique opportunity for the City of Alameda to improve the safety

and quality of its transportation network. Please go get that funding and use it, on behalf of Alameda's residents of today and tomorrow.

7-B Signalized Intersection Access

What an unfortunate contrast with the Vision Zero Action Plan. With all due respect to the city's traffic engineers and Transportation Commission members, they have presented you with a Catch-22: They think it's unwise to provide pedestrians the same experience at intersections as drivers, because if there's an unneeded WALK cycle with no nearby pedestrians, the motorists will sit, emit more CO₂, and maybe get so mad they just run the red light.

But why do the WALK lights have to be on so long? Because post-war American intersections are very wide to provide multiple thru-lanes and turning lanes for motorists. The WALK cycle must stay on longer than a typical green car signal, to allow a pedestrian to get all the way across all that pavement.

It's even worse near senior living centers, where WALK cycles are often made longer as a token effort to enable slower walkers to cross. Therefore, all the more reason — per the traffic engineer's logic — that these long WALK cycles must only happen when a pedestrian has pressed a “beg button” in advance of the light changing. Pressing the button during a green car cycle isn't sufficient — it has to be pressed in advance.

Note that the “beg buttons” are often attached directly to the posts used to support traffic lights, which may already be offset from the sidewalk. Meaning further walking for the potentially elderly pedestrian.

Take this example. It's between the Marina Village Shopping Center (to the east) and Independence Plaza, a senior living complex. I believe it's also where Augusta Collins, aged 69, was killed while crossing on foot in 2015. The WALK cycle is now extra long, but pedestrians and cyclists are most always waiting, since they didn't arrive at the right time to press the “beg button.” (For cyclists, they have to get off their bike and walk down a slope to reach the posts where the buttons are attached.) The extended WALK cycle time just put lipstick on the pig of an intersection that is no more accessible or safer than before.



The full solutions for intersections like these are to reduce the distance pedestrians must cross, or to redo the entire intersection as modern roundabouts (which have much shorter legs for pedestrians to cross). While those types of changes are out of scope for this specific policy, a good traffic signal policy should still somehow reflect this broader context of what actually makes intersections accessible for all users.

Please take the staff recommendation for “1. Construction of new traffic signals should have crosswalks marked on all legs” and send the rest of this policy back to the drawing board.

7-C Slow Streets

My family has used and enjoyed almost all of the Slow Streets. First as places to walk (novel places to go during the doldrums of last year!) and now mainly as pleasant routes to ride our bikes across town.

The temporary barricades aren't the ideal method to slow traffic everywhere. Many intersections where Slow Streets cross larger arterials could also use re-thinks. But that's what makes this a good experiment: the city is now well positioned to decide what features to retain and what to change.

Please continue the program so that the city can transition these routes to more permanent status as part of the Active Transport Plan. These are exactly the type of projects the city should be primed and ready to submit as “shovel ready” to transportation funding agencies, at moment's notice.

7-D Roundabouts

Alameda may not need quite as many roundabouts as the Indiana town featured in The New York Times article that the Mayor emailed around, but modern roundabouts are a good “tool” to add to Alameda’s “traffic toolkit.”

To use this tool properly does require expertise. For example, the City Council’s most recent discussion of the Central Ave Safety Project turned into an exercise in literal hand-waving about the

proposed modern roundabout at Sherman/Central/Encinal. The fact that electeds asked staff and consultants to dig into the appendix to pull out design alternatives is perhaps representative of the homework everyone needs to do to successfully deploy the tool of modern roundabouts in Alameda. Good to see staff presenting City Council with a productive way forward on this topic.

7-E Automated License Plate Readers

I was surprised to read in the staff report that APD already has vehicles equipped with ALPRs, but they aren't currently in operation. For all the repeated calls for ALPRs, I didn't realize the city already had this technology at hand.

This suggests one potential solution: Just install big fake cameras at Alameda's bridges and tubes. I'm only half kidding. ALPRs seem to have an almost totemic significance to some in Alameda. However, that focus on the solution of cameras at city limits does not make for good decision-making.

To my knowledge, more people in Alameda have been killed in recent years by drivers speeding than by other forms of crime with the culprit then fleeing town by get-away car. **Please broaden the focus of this topic from using ALPRs to "catch bad guys" at city limits to encompass automated camera enforcement, including speeding, in appropriate locations around the city.**

Just as there is much homework to do to effectively deploy modern roundabouts, the City of Alameda must do even more preparation before deploying fixed automated camera enforcement. (To wit: BuzzFeed's reporting in 2019 on APD's unauthorized use of facial recognition software.) By broadening the focus of ALPRs to also encompass roadway safety, I hope the city can have more productive discussions about the role of automated camera enforcement in public safety.

Thank you for helping to make Alameda streets safer for me, my family, and everyone else who lives and works in Alameda.

Sincerely,
Drew Dara-Abrams
Calhoun St.

From: [Cybelle Kelley-Whitley](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Cc: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [John Knox White](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Discontinue the Slow Street Program for San Jose
Date: Saturday, December 4, 2021 2:02:14 PM

Happy Holidays, Mayor Ashcraft and Council Members,

I am writing today concerning the Slow Streets recommendations from the transportation department. I have written to the department in the past; I have also completed surveys and spoken at one of the Zoom outreach meetings. I would like the council to consider ending the slow street on San Jose from Oak to Grand St.

From the beginning of the pandemic until today, having San Jose closed to through traffic has made it a burden to cross the island in the center part of town. Especially with the changes to Shoreline (and now Otis), San Jose is a better route to get from Broadway to Grand from our area of the city. We also have a situation where elementary and high schools are located right in the middle of San Jose, which makes it difficult for student drop-off and pick-up with the street closed. I am not familiar with the other slow streets aside from Versailles and San Jose, but I have not seen the benefit during the pandemic and would like for the the slow street on San Jose especially, to end and not be renewed for another year.

Thank you,

Cybelle Kelley-Whitley



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

**Board of
Directors**

December 1, 2021

Denyse Trepanier
President

RE: Item 7C: Slow Streets

Brian Fowler
Treasurer

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and Council Members,

Cameron Holland
Secretary

We are writing in support of staff's recommendations for Item 7C to extend and enhance the Slow Streets program. While we may be beyond the worst of the pandemic, and no longer using Slow Streets as much for social distancing, we treasure what they offer in terms of proven safety, community, and livability. We believe that, like commercial streets, Slow Streets will continue to be popular and valuable post-COVID, and think that an extension of the program while the Active Transportation Plan is completed is a sound strategy.

Cyndy Johnsen
Board Member

Tim Beloney
Board Member

Regarding the proposed immediate improvements to the Slow Streets program, we support all of staff's recommendations, with a few additional suggestions we hope you will consider:

Lucy Gigli
Founder, non-voting

- Of the choices offered in the city's Slow Streets survey regarding what the community wants done with Slow Streets, the most popular response by far was to **add more streets, and create a network**. Staff recommendations fall short here. We propose better addressing the community's desire by adding just a few select streets, namely segments of Eighth, Pacific (a high injury corridor), Ninth, and San Antonio, to connect the Cross Alameda Trail in Jean Sweeney Park to the San Jose Slow Street. Adding these segments will connect low stress facilities, improve much-needed north-south connectivity, and serve a nearby school. These streets are also compelling candidates because they're already candidate low stress streets: they were on earlier maps of proposed Slow Streets, and they are planned as future bike boulevards. Networking safe facilities is incredibly important, and we believe these small, low-cost additions will be well worth the investment. Here's a map showing proposed Slow Streets (pink is "future phases under consideration"):



Here's a map from the Draft Active Transportation Plan for reference (orange dashed lines are proposed future bike boulevards):



- Incomplete (and disappearing) barricading has detracted from the program. For example, for the five blocks along Pacific between Sherman and 9th, there is only one barricade right now — it doesn't read like a Slow Street at all. It likely discourages people from enjoying it fully, as they don't trust that motorists 'get' that this is a Slow Street. Staff's proposal is to selectively add barriers only where speeding persists, but **we propose replacing the many missing original barricades and adding more** so that all Slow Streets read very clearly as Slow Streets, for all users, whether speeding persists or not. We propose one barricade on each side of every intersection. We think this will improve safety further, and improve perception of safety, which is very important, too, for very little cost and effort.

More broadly, we think it's important to acknowledge that making even these very small improvements (and successfully maintaining them, which has been an issue to date) will entail more commitment than has been allotted so far. While it's still clearly a very low-budget program, it will require a little more time and money to minimize frustration and maximize success. Let's plan for **regular, monthly maintenance by Public Works**, and leverage community volunteers (BWA is willing to help!).

As to the fate of Slow Streets in the long-term, we look forward to the conversations we'll be having as part of the Active Transportation Plan. There's lots to consider. Although it wasn't the intent, this program has served as a pilot for low-stress streets, and the initial data indicates that, even as a quick-build program of simple barricades and sandbags, it's been successful in improving safety, and in encouraging active transportation. With real, more effective traffic calming infrastructure, and a more complete network, we'll see even better results, that will dramatically help our city reach its climate and safety goals.

But this incidental pilot did more than that. It also brought to light the many other benefits of Slow Streets. We believe we'd be shortchanging ourselves if we didn't acknowledge those findings and act on them. We've been able to experience how streets can feel as shared, active, social spaces. We've found that streets where car traffic is deprioritized can offer us so much more. They are rich, productive recreational spaces that can enhance health and livability for everyone, notably the most vulnerable among us — children, the elderly, and people with disabilities. We recognize that to many, this is a different way of experiencing our streets, although some of us are old enough to remember when playing in neighborhood streets was the norm.

In our minds, this recreational and social aspect distinguishes Slow Streets from the bike boulevards which are their closest cousin. With Slow Streets, there is an expectation for people to recreate in the streets. It's an important distinction with implications that we look forward to discussing during the ATP process, as proposed by staff.

Finally, we'd like to take this opportunity to thank the city for their work on this program, for their willingness and courage to try new things (change is hard!), for their thorough community outreach, and their data-driven approach to evaluation.

We hope you will support them.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bike Walk Alameda Board