

## **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 August 26, 2024

RE: <u>Item 6-B: Neighborhood Greenways Implementation and Slow Streets Barricade</u>
Removal

Dear Transportation Commissioners and Staff,

The temporary barricades have reduced automobile speeds and volumes, and made these few streets feel a little safer for all users, particularly people walking and rolling. We're very eager for more effective infrastructure to be implemented, and lament every delay, but we discourage potentially jeopardizing the gains that have been made by removing or scaling back on barricades in any way. We strongly prefer Option 1 (keeping the barricades in place) over the other options because:

- It best preserves reduced automobile speeds and volumes, the primary goal of the program.
- It's supported by the majority of respondents in the recent community poll.
- It aligns with the Active Transportation Plan and original Council direction.
- It avoids having to create new signage and communications that might introduce confusion and risk making the transition to Neighborhood Greenways more difficult.

Below are our responses to the "cons" for Option 1 as noted in the staff report:

- Continued Public Works maintenance resources: Any quick-build solution will
  need on-going support from Public Works. That's the reality of quick-builds:
  they're fast and inexpensive in terms of materials and installation, but to be
  effective over time, maintenance is required. Rather than something to cut back
  on, we see this support as a critical investment in a program that's vital to
  meeting our city's goals around street safety, climate action, and livability.
- An additional winter with barricades being blown over. We propose using the \$25-\$30K referenced in the staff report to address this issue to make a few minor tweaks:
  - Purchase more sandbags and removable anchors if feasible to better secure the barricades for winter storms.
  - To improve flow around the barricades, repaint barricade markings to position barricades so there's a 4-foot opening between the barricade and the flexpost, or between the barricade and the curb. This will give people on bikes an alternative to going around the outside of the flexpost.
  - Swap out flexposts at major crossings with wider paddles with a QR code as proposed for Option 3.
- Continued community complaints about the safety, aesthetics and inconvenience
  of the barricades. In our minds, the larger issue here is not really the barricades,
  but communication and managing change. Per the staff report, concerns about
  safety around the barricades have been unfounded, so it should be countered,
  especially given the broader context of safety gains overall. 'Inconvenience' is

largely by design, to discourage fast, inattentive, and unnecessary driving on these streets. It's not something to be fixed, but to be explained. Aesthetics is probably the most compelling of these complaints, and no one will argue that the barricades are attractive. However, safety is our primary concern, and they've helped on that front. In making these spaces more welcoming, the barricades have allowed people to enjoy active transportation and a greater sense of community, and we'd argue there's a beauty to that — barricade aesthetics are something we can live with a bit longer, given those upsides!

Regarding the implementation strategy for conversions and broader roll-out, we hope that keeping things on track will be a priority, given the time already lost and urgency for progress. A few further thoughts and suggestions:

- Leverage insights from neighboring cities like San Francisco and Oakland to accelerate our rollout and improve our program.
- Apply consistent/minimum standards across the program.
- Anticipate and include Public Works/maintenance costs in future budgets for all quick-build projects.
- In collecting data to study diversion, consider also collecting data on a few streets outside of Neighborhood Greenway streets and their parallels, to serve as controls and benchmarking.<sup>1</sup>

We hope you share our interest in keeping the momentum of this important project moving forward by supporting Option 1. Thank you for your consideration.

Bike Walk Alameda Board



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Studies show that in projects like this, some diversion to immediately adjacent streets happens, but it's not significant. Fears of traffic congestion may often be unfounded. Here's one study: <a href="Exploring traffic evaporation: Findings from tactical urbanism interventions in Barcelona">Exploring traffic evaporation: Findings from tactical urbanism interventions in Barcelona</a>.

From: <u>Transportation Commission</u>

To: <u>Jennifer Warner</u>

Subject: Fw: [EXTERNAL] Neighborhood Greenways

Date: Wednesday, August 28, 2024 1:33:36 PM

Public comment on 6-B

From: William Niland

Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2024 1:22 PM

To: Transportation; Scott Wikstrom; Tracy Jensen; Tony Daysog; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Malia Vella;

Trish Spencer; Gail Payne; Erin Smith; Jennifer Ott; Transportation Commission

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Neighborhood Greenways

## In Response to the City's Proposed Greenways

To All: All streets have a job to do, and that's to carry traffic safely. Choosing to spend money on these already "slow streets" to create boutique ones in some neighborhoods while high accident corridors like Lincoln get nothing is wrong. How does this in any way achieve the goals of Vision Zero?

For years the City has declined to put speed bumps and right turn only signs on Walnut at Lincoln where we live because it claims it would hamper emergency and commercial vehicles. Yet now the City proposes installing "speed cushions" and right turn only signs on greenways. Versailles and the other slow streets do not need improvement. They're already safe. Speed cushions on greenways may very well slow traffic speed and improve safety for people walking, bicycling and driving on greenways, but it also seems likely to push even more traffic off greenways and onto other streets.

The City asserts it has to wait for grant money for the Lincoln Marshall Project to begin. Why does Lincoln have to wait for funding when it appears the City has funding to enhance already improved streets like the slow streets and Fernside? Addressing the "easy" problems like making greenways out of already slow streets does little to nothing to improve traffic safety in town and diverts resources from streets like Lincoln that are high accident corridors. The greenway plans should be scrapped and the money saved should be spent on improving safety on streets that desperately need the improvements, even if it's one block at a time. Bill Niland