

From: [David Moran](#)
To: [Transportation Commission](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fernside Design Appreciation
Date: Friday, November 15, 2024 10:40:48 AM

I am unable to attend the Transportation Commission meeting on November 20th, but I wanted to send my appreciation to the commission for the short-term and long-term designs that allow pedestrians and bikers to more safely navigate our streets.

David Moran
Parent and Biker

From: [Andy Wang](#)
To: [Transportation Commission](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Gibbons intersection: in support of 2026 NEAR-TERM improvement
Date: Monday, November 18, 2024 2:46:38 PM

Hello Transportation Commission:

My name is Andy Wang. I'm a resident of Gibbons Drive. I live four houses away from the 5-way intersection at Gibbons, High, and Fernside. I'm writing in support of a [safety improvement proposed by staff](#) to this intersection earlier this month. Staff had initially proposed these improvements not as part of the long-term Fernside project but rather as part of the near-term, 2026 Fernside restriping and resurfacing project.

Staff has since pulled back on the 2026 timing and is recommending the project be contemplated instead as part of the long-term improvements. This would push a terrifically effective, yet simple measure off to a much further implementation. A number of Gibbons Drive households with young children are disappointed by this decision.

To put it simply: timing matters.

As professionals in this field, you all know that the very first delay usually becomes the parent of another, and then the grandparent of yet another generation of delays. **Delays beget delays.**

Our kids walk, run, and bike on Gibbons today. We live daily with the dismay at cars that barrel down Gibbons far above the speed limit in both directions, not to mention the traffic collisions at the Gibbons/High intersection that some of us can hear from our windows.

This should be low-hanging fruit: an easy win for Alameda's hardworking staff, for the Transportation Commission, and for the safety of kids, families, and bicyclists and drivers on Gibbons and High. The 2026 improvements are already funded. The intervention would be implemented practically right away. It would be straightforward to put in place, and it would largely eliminate vehicle collisions between Gibbons and High drivers. **Rarely in policy and the public sector do you see a win-win-win like this.**

And that's why I'm dialing in to the question of why sooner, rather than later: Safety matters. Quality of life matters. **And timely delivery of those things matters too.**

A large number of comments raised came from residents on neighboring streets concerned about this proposal causing traffic to instead speed onto their streets. This

is a good-faith concern. **But unlike Gibbons, those streets have natural advantages that help them avoid speeding through-traffic.**

1. **They don't connect anywhere to anywhere.** Unlike Gibbons, they don't offer major cross-island traffic from Central, Santa Clara, and Lincoln a direct, unsignaled, and practically unimpeded route to the one traffic light that controls access to the High Street Bridge. The immediate reward awaiting any driver taking advantage of Bayo Vista as a supposed shortcut in lieu of Gibbons would be an unsignaled left turn onto High Street.
2. **They're way narrower.** Unlike Gibbons Drive, which is approximately 36 feet curb to curb, those adjacent streets are approximately 30 feet curb to curb. Factoring in two parking lanes of 8 feet each, that leaves only 7 feet for each travel lane on neighboring streets like Bayo Vista and Cornell, compared to 10 feet on Gibbons. Research such as from the [Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health](#) and the National Association of City Transportation Officials has repeatedly demonstrated that the narrower the street, the more ["dramatic" the effect on speed reduction](#). The experience of driving on a street like Bayo Vista and Cornell bears this out: a driver going at even the speed limit routinely needs to slow down and pull over slightly to allow for any opposing traffic to pass.

But, putting this analytical diversion aside, these are matters for staff to address with the community.

The question I want to put forth is one of timing. If, as a community, we're committed to timely progress, and we want to avoid being beset by delay, inertia, or doubt, then our questions should be:

- **What questions and comments raised by the community have technical merit and policy merit?** Vision Zero and the City's Active Transportation Plan set our north star; let's not waver at the task.
- **Can we pursue implementation on a 2026 timeline while simultaneously putting a good faith effort into answering those questions?** Truly, does this task merit another six or more years?
- **Can we otherwise design a set of measures to address concerns of merit,**

perhaps phasing in those measures thoughtfully on an as-needed basis?

And finally, I'd boldly ask: **would there be any harm in asking staff to try?**

Thank you for your consideration,

Andy Wang, father of a 4-year-old and a 5-year-old who love to race each other on Gibbons

From: [Megan Murphy](#)
To: [Transportation](#); [Lisa Foster](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Missed Opportunity for Near-Term Vision Zero Win
Date: Thursday, November 14, 2024 1:49:21 AM

To Lisa Foster and Transportation Staff:

I live on the 3100 block of Gibbons Drive. I just received the email that the near-term safety improvements proposed for Fernside/High/Gibbons street intersection are no longer being pursued. Instead they're deferred to a long-term plan that's not funded.

What just happened? The survey is still open.

What am I missing? From my perspective:

1. The Transportation team identified the current 5-way intersection as the site of collisions and proposed turning it into a 4-way intersection.
2. Residents participated in the pop-up where I was informed that this would be funded along with the Fernside Corridor Improvement plan (funded between Tilden and High streets) for delivery in 2026.
3. Residents filled out the survey. I sent it to several neighbors organizing to send emails to the transportation board and make public comment at the 11/20 meeting in support of the Transportation committee's proposal.
4. Four days later, I heard the safety improvements to the intersection were called off with no consideration for exploring adjustments to the plan in the near term. In fact, the long term Fernside improvement plan is unfunded.

Why is the Transportation team no longer addressing the safety concerns that the Transportation committee raised for a near-term solution?

Why not explore solutions to address the concerns that were raised by residents on Bayo Vista before eliminating the opportunity to improve safety at this intersection?

My family uses this intersection in the following ways:

1. Driving: I avoid this intersection and instead take the Fernside bridge to leave Alameda.
2. Lyft: My lyft drivers often verbalize that they don't know when they're supposed to drive through the intersection from Gibbons.
3. Bike: My partner bikes daily with my two young children. My children will start bike to Lincoln Middle in 2.5 years. I no longer bike because I broke my leg slipping on the wet pedestrian bridge to Bay Farm in December 2023.
4. Pedestrian: I take the O and W Transbay buses to San Francisco. I am mobility impaired (due to broken leg from December 2023) and fear for my safety when crossing Fernside to Gibbons on the return home.

This was a great opportunity to make strides towards Vision Zero in the near-term and I'm

disappointed I didn't get a chance to rally behind the Transportation team's proposal to improve safety for our community before it was shut down.

Still hanging onto hope for more support for safety in the near-term,

Megan Murphy

Gibbons Drive resident

From: [Meg Bailey](#)
To: [City of Alameda](#); [Transportation](#); [Lisa Foster](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Fernside Blvd Draft Final Design Concepts Released - Join Us at TC 11/20!
Date: Friday, November 15, 2024 6:46:13 AM

All,

I'm dismayed at the decision-making process for the intersection at High and Gibbons.

As you all know and addressed at your pop up and in the pamphlet you circulated, the intersection is truly confusing and dangerous and leads to many accidents (which we, the residents of Gibbons, hear and observe regularly). The high-speed traffic on Gibbons is a further concern for all of us who walk, bike, and drive on Gibbons (not to mention the many young children who live on this street and are at risk every day). I was so excited at the possibility that something was being considered to address these very real dangers, and so I attended the pop-up and filled out the survey (as did my husband). I had planned to attend the meeting on 11/20 to express my support. I was absolutely floored that less than a week after the pop-up and the survey, the proposal has been removed from consideration for 2026. If there was no real chance that this would be addressed in the near-term, it should not have been addressed as such. I'm further concerned that it was removed from consideration after neighbors on the surrounding streets mobilized to oppose the efforts - just on basic math, there will always be more of them than there are people that live on Gibbons, and it's alarming that the City will leave in place something truly dangerous to placate the NIMBY voices of people who do not live on Gibbons and are not affected on a daily basis by this dangerous intersection.

I would like to encourage you to reconsider this proposal, sooner rather than later, for the safety of all Alameda residents.

On Thu, Nov 14, 2024 at 6:08 PM City of Alameda <alameda@public.govdelivery.com> wrote:

Having trouble viewing this email? [View it as a Web page.](#)



Transportation Commission Considers Fernside Design Concepts on 11/20

Mark your calendars! The Transportation Commission will consider endorsing [draft final design concepts](#) for the [Fernside Blvd Traffic Calming & Bikeways Project](#) at its [November 20 meeting](#).

This bulletin includes:



Board of Directors

Denyse Trepanier
President

Brian Fowler
Treasurer

Tim Beloney
Secretary

Cyndy Johnsen
Board Member

Maria Piper
Board Member

Lucy Gigli
Founder, non-voting

November 17, 2024

RE: Item 6-A: [Fernside Project](#)

Dear Transportation Commissioners and Staff,

We wanted to share our thoughts for this project.

We support Staff's long-term recommendation of a Two-way Protected Bikeway. Our preference is for the curb-protected option (LT2a) over the raised option because it offers the same safety and usability benefits for \$6M less, and has a better chance of getting built more quickly.

For the short-term, we favor One-way Separated Bikeways (NT2). This design offers the following advantages over the Buffered Bike Lanes design (NT1) recommended by Staff:

- More traffic calming and increased safety for all users
- Prevents dangerous passing maneuvers and illegal parking in bike lanes that have proven difficult to enforce for paint-only lanes
- It would be a *low-stress* facility for people biking, and will contribute significantly to the 2030 Backbone Low Stress Network called for in our Active Transportation Plan. The long-term design, if built by 2030, will also achieve this, but that's a big "if." The grant funding needed for that will be difficult to win, especially in the years ahead with the new federal administration
- It offers improved transit access for bus riders

We favor NT2 over NT3 (two-way separated bikeway) because the unimproved intersections will be safer and more natural for people biking to navigate. Eastbound bicyclists crossing High Street would just have to cross one leg of the intersection to continue east, which is much more convenient and safer than having to cross two legs in the two-way scenario.

One of the downsides of NT2 is that it removes more parking than the other options. However, parking is abundant here — even at peak times, over half of the parking spots are available, and most lots have driveways. The resulting parking reduction should not cause undue hardship. Importantly, our General Plan prioritizes safety over car parking:

- **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.)*
- **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.)*

Cost is another consideration. NT1 (painted buffered bike lanes) is cheaper than NT2 (separated lanes), but it's also the least effective in terms of safety. If this facility is in use for 4 or more years and prevents serious injuries and deaths during that time, the \$1M cost difference may not seem significant. That said, we also understand this project is one of many, and there are competing safe streets objectives and priorities.

Regarding the Fernside/High/Gibbons intersection improvements, we encourage studying them further and if possible, implementing them as part of the near-term project. The benefits are compelling, and of those surveyed, more wanted them than didn't (53% vs 42%). A better understanding of potential diversion in the context of [desired circulation patterns](#) would help inform this discussion, and warrants analysis.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bike Walk Alameda Board

From: [Elina Rubuliak](#)
To: [Transportation Commission](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] SUPPORT for the Fernside Blvd Traffic Calming & Bikeways Project AND the Gibbons Dr/Fernside Blvd/High Street intersection proposal
Date: Tuesday, November 19, 2024 2:25:58 PM

Hello,

I am writing to voice my support of the [draft final design concepts](#), both the near-term and long-term proposals, for the [Fernside Blvd Traffic Calming & Bikeways Project](#). The goal of this project is to reduce driver speeds and increase safety and mobility for all road users, and I believe these goals will be achieved by the plans as proposed and that the data bears that out. I live a block off Fernside Blvd. and walk, bike, or drive it several times a week. I see drivers speeding nearly every time I am on Fernside.

I have been following the progress of these proposals and attended the Fernside Blvd Public Workshop on Wednesday, June 5, 2024. During that workshop several concerns were raised. One particular concern mentioned was that these changes will lower property values of the homes located on Fernside Blvd. because the amount of street parking will be reduced. Any real estate agent will tell you, the opposite is true. A slower, safer, quieter Fernside Blvd. will increase the value of the properties located along that street—especially with the addition of new plantings and trees on the boulevards.

I also would like to voice my support for the [proposed changes to the Gibbons Dr/Fernside Blvd/High Street intersection](#). I attended the Pop-Up Open House on Saturday, November 9, 2024 and thought the proposal shown there would make what is currently a dangerous intersection much safer and slower. Honestly, I was surprised at how unpopular the proposal was to a loud minority of individuals who attended the pop-up event and felt compelled to loudly try to sway their neighbors at the event.

Lastly, I would like to take this opportunity to appreciate and thank the city staff and the vendors from Parametrix who ran the workshops and have reached out to the community to educate them on the proposals and collect their feedback throughout the process. They have been nothing short of professional, accommodating, and truly working for the betterment of Alameda residents. For them I am grateful. However, it must be said that I have witnessed other residents treat city staff and vendors with a shocking level of aggression, discourtesy, immaturity, and outright contempt. In the face of this completely inappropriate abuse, city staff have maintained an impressive level of decorum and courtesy, and openness to feedback. I am embarrassed on behalf of my neighbors who failed to behave civilly.

Thank you to the members of the Transportation Commission for considering my feedback.

Regards,
Elina

Elina Rubuliak
415-503-7491

From: [Rochelle Wheeler](#) on behalf of [Transportation](#)
To: [Lisa Foster](#)
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Gibbons Traffic questoin
Date: Tuesday, November 19, 2024 5:02:00 PM

For you.

[Rochelle Wheeler, City of Alameda](#)
[510-747-7442](tel:510-747-7442) | RWheeler@alamedaCA.gov

From: Ingrid C. Llewellyn (Mackay)
Sent: Tuesday, November 19, 2024 1:02 PM
To: Transportation <transportation@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Gibbons Traffic questoin

Hi there,

I'm wondering do any Council members or other city officials live on Gibbons? I don't need addresses or names but a yes or no will suffice. And, can you tell me how this new traffic plan/proposal to cut freeway access from Gibbons began? Who initiated the conversation? Who is championing the change? Gibbons is one of our main thoroughfares and if one purchased a home there they were well aware of this prior to purchase. You can't build tons of homes, increase the population and traffic in Alameda and then take away a thoroughfare and push traffic on to other people's streets because you don't want traffic on your street. And, if you say it is a safety issue with the intersection, it may be, but you can fix the intersection in many ways without stopping freeway access from Gibbons. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Ingrid