



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

Re: Item 6B, 9/23/21 Transportation Commission

Dear Transportation Commissioners,

Board of Directors

Denyse Trepanier
President

Brian Fowler
Treasurer

Cameron Holland
Secretary

Pat Potter
Board Member

Cyndy Johnsen
Board Member

Tim Beloney
Board Member

Lucy Gigli
Founder, non-voting

Thank you for considering Bike Walk Alameda's comments regarding the proposed Intersection Access Policy. While we believe this is a significant improvement, and codifies most of what Council was asking for in this policy, we still have a few unanswered questions and concerns.

First, we would strongly suggest that the definition of 'intersection equity' be modified so that the goal is equal distribution of **burden**, not **cycle time**. The burden for pedestrians waiting for a signal change is not the same as a drivers. Simply re-allocating cycle time doesn't mean we've improved access for pedestrians. For example, this policy doesn't address one of the most burdensome times for pedestrians; if they arrive at an intersection when the traffic light is green for cars, press the beg button, then still must wait an entire cycle for their Walk signal, even if there's sufficient time to cross the street. Drivers are never faced with that situation. *That's* the unequal burden we would like to see addressed with this policy.

Our first question is what is Public Work's direction with respect to beg buttons in general? Specifically, is our Public Works Department planning on installing *more* or are we planning on deprecating them over time? This is critical because based on this policy, whether or not pedestrians will get automatic recall is dependent on whether or not there is a beg button present, so understanding our long-term commitment to beg buttons will decide how much additional burden we're placing on pedestrians, and how much this policy will affect pedestrians. We know that one was installed at Central and 8th. Are there plans to add more? Or, as with our plans with the Central Safety Improvement project, is our long-term goal to reduce signalized intersections overall?

There are several places in this policy where it states that we will follow this policy "where feasible" or "where technically feasible". Can we please define cases where it would not be feasible? For example, we've been waiting for signalization improvements on the western portion of the Cross Alameda Trail from Jean Sweeney Park to Main St. for almost 3 years. Would it be possible to implement this policy there?

There are thresholds in this policy for 25 peds/hour or 50 peds/hour. These seem like very high thresholds. Are these thresholds NACTO standards for auto recall? Is the only difference between these two thresholds whether it's a transit priority street or not? If so, why are they being treated differently? Do we know which intersections will meet these thresholds for auto recall?

Can we please specify what peak or school hours are? Can we say 7-9am and 3-5pm to account for after school activities?

The policy states that beg buttons will need to be manually activated where there are protected left turning vehicles. Can you elaborate if this is because we can't mix left-turn arrows and traffic detectors with walk signals? This seems like a technical limitation we should be able to overcome, however, there may be additional safety considerations.

And finally, we wanted to share [this 10 minute video](#) with you from the Netherlands about how they design *for* pedestrians when building their intersection signals. Of course this wouldn't meet our out-dated technical 'standards', but it's something to aspire to!

Thank you again for your consideration of these points. We're looking forward to Wednesday's discussion

Best,

Denyse Trepanier

Board President, Bike Walk Alameda