

**From:** [Drew Dara-Abrams](#)  
**To:** [Transportation Commission](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] 6A Grand Street  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 20, 2023 10:41:16 AM

---

Dear Transportation Commission members and Planning staff,

To reiterate what has been said many times, Grand Street is an important north/south connector for people traveling by all modes around Alameda.

To just focus on the options being presented at this TC meeting: Alternative 1 is the ideal design to meet the needs of the vulnerable road users from students on bicycles to seniors on foot, while still providing ample on-street curb parking for residents of the blocks with multi-family and public uses. Alternative 1 along all three segments of Grand would serve as a "backbone" for a low-stress bike network across Alameda — the kind of network that parents would feel comfortable sending their kids out to cycle to school, and the kind of network that adults of all ages would see as an enjoyable alternative to using a car to drive to a drugstore or a similar kind of errand. (As you all know, transportation is the largest source of carbon emissions in Alameda, and short trips are the most common of auto-based trips by Alameda residents — it's all those short trips by gas cars where we have the most to gain by encouraging pollution-free modes of transport.)

However, the best plan is of no benefit for any of us if it's just a plan. A key question for Alternative 1 is how implementation would be funded for Segment B. According to the staff report, "If local funds are not identified for Segment B, construction would be delayed until grant funds are secured, possibly in 2026 or 2027." There's a real risk that by switching to Alternative 1 for the entire corridor, the segment of Grand between Otis and Encinal will have the exact same faded paint for unprotected Class II bike lanes and at-grade crosswalks as the end of this decade approaches.

Please consider encouraging City Council to only adopt Alternative 1 in place of the existing Council-approved Concept for Segment B if the difference in cost is covered by local city funds. If City Council is uncomfortable covering the difference in cost for the added benefits, then the Council-approved Concept for Segment B is still a reasonable outcome of incremental improvements. Please don't have the perfect be the enemy of the good in terms of improving the safety and utility of Grand Street.

Thank you for your time,  
Drew Dara-Abrams  
Calhoun Street

**From:** [Nuala Creedon](#)  
**To:** [Transportation Commission](#); [Lara Weisiger](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Transportation Commission Meeting, 6/21/23 - Item #6A  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 20, 2023 1:14:58 PM

---

Dear Transportation Commission Members,

RE: Grand Street Improvement Project, Agenda Item 6A.

Having considered the City's new proposals for Grand Street, we prefer Alternative #2, the one-way raised bike lanes on both sides of Grand. We think this is the safest option. Our reasons include:

- it shares the need to watch for cyclists more evenly.
- it is more intuitive for people entering or exiting driveways, and at intersections.
- it maintains symmetry, and the aesthetic character of the street.

Safety is the biggest concern for everyone who uses Grand Street, with pedestrians being the most at risk. Any changes must prioritize safety. We believe additional measures should be implemented, including:

- Enforcement of speed limits and other road laws.
- Reducing the speed limit to 20 mph on Grand Street.
- Adding speed bumps.
- Adding one or more four-way stops.

We attended the recent Community Meeting at Mastick Center to see the new City plans for Grand Street. We appreciate the City's decision to re-look at the plans for Grand Street, and to consider the full length of Grand Street when coming up with alternatives. We appreciate that all the new alternatives could work for all of Grand Street; the chicane plan clearly does not.

The City's Alternative #1 has some safety issues around the 2-way bike lanes - it's more complicated at intersections and driveways, and changes the balance of the street - but it is still much better than the chicane plan. We oppose implementation of

the chicane plan in Section B (Otis to Encinal). Multiple roadway designs, with differing requirements for pedestrians/ cyclists/ motorists, will not promote safety along Grand Street, so we encourage you not to move forward with that. We believe it's worth waiting to have a safer, more consistent roadway design. As an interim measure, the City could paint the bike lanes in Section B (they're basically non-existent right now); the rest of Grand Street has visible painted bike lanes already. Painted bike lanes are in use all over Alameda (and will be included on upcoming projects like Encinal and Lincoln/ Marshall Way), so they are familiar to all.

One area where further delay is unacceptable is in Section C with the absence of a true sidewalk from Eagle to Clement on the east side and Ellen Craig Avenue to Fortmann Way on the west. This area is tricky for pedestrians to navigate as is and impossible for anyone with mobility issues. Please prioritize sidewalk construction in this area - this should not be held up for 3-7 years (per the City's presentation).

Thank you,  
Nuala Creedon & Matt Anderson  
924 Grand Street.

**From:** [Carol Gottstein](#)  
**To:** [Transportation Commission](#); [City Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Transportation Commission Special Meeting Wed. 6-21-2023. Agenda Item 6A  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 21, 2023 1:01:37 PM  
**Attachments:** [21 June 2023 TC Special Meeting Agenda Item 6A.docx](#)

---

Dear Transportation Commission and Staff Members:

Attached is a 3-page Word document containing my comments for Agenda Item 6A, Grand Street Designs. Please add it to tonight's agenda 6A public comment file.

Thank you,

Carol Gottstein

21 June 2023 TC Special Meeting Agenda Item 6A: Grand Street

I oppose City staff's request to "Endorse" the "preferred Design Concept"... "for a continuous 2-way bikeway from Shoreline Drive to Clement Avenue."

I am a Segment B resident of modest means. I was fortunate to inherit a house my parents bought on Grand in 1949, when there was no Grand Street south of the lagoon. There was no lagoon, because the Bay hadn't been filled in yet. After The Fill, the width of the Grand Street extension (Segment A) was greatly expanded to accommodate future changes. But the original street width north of the fill (Segments B and C) remained.

I oppose the staff recommendation because one continuous design for the whole street only makes sense if the street is of uniform width and consistency from Shoreline to Clement, which it is not. There is a dramatic bottleneck in width at the lagoon bridge where the new street meets the old street. Alternative 1 makes sense for Segment A, the part of Grand Street that began its existence in 1955, but, because Grand Street north of the lagoon bridge retains the narrow width it has had since the 1890's, Alternative 1 literally tries to force a square peg into a round hole by forcing a wide cycle track onto the almost 150-year-old part of the street, at the expense of space for vehicles and parking. Since Federal and State minimums for disabled parking spaces are not accommodated by the Alternative 1 design, portions of the street could be found to be in violation of Federal and/or State law if built as shown in the designs. As of this writing, the Grand Street designs do not show specifications for establishing disabled parking spaces within the new rights-of-way.

I question how seriously the City is committed to disability accommodation. Since there has been 8 ft wide unmarked parking in front of my house for 100+ years (Existing Conditions), I had no need to request a designated DP space until I learned that the City is planning to remove parking or narrow the entire parking lane width below 8 ft minimum in order to provide more space for the new bike lanes.

On Dec 18, 2022, six months ago, I submitted a Residential DP Parking Space application to the City of Alameda for a dedicated space in front of my house. Although I received an acknowledgement that my application was received, I have received no further response at all, positive or negative! My in-person inquiries have been answered with excuses like: ask someone else, it will be fit into the final design, but we haven't decided yet, we are short on staff, etc. I have sent print correspondence to every Commission reviewing this street reconfiguration: Transportation Commission, Commission on Disability Issues, etc., but they have ignored my concerns. The City states in its written staff reports that the project is ADA compliant, but without parking specifics. I live on the east side of Grand, which will bear the entire burden of a one-sided 2-way cycle track (Alternative 1).

I will be lifting my walker into the passenger side of my car while standing in the cycle track. Given the dimensions in the exhibits, it is hard to understand how my request will be "shoehorned in".

FACTS: There are Federal and California State standards for the minimum width of an accessible parking space on a public street. The CA standard is 108 inches or 9 feet [May 20, 2020: Parking Code Regulations, California Building Code (CBC), Title 24 Part 2: Technical Specifications: 11B-502.2 Vehicle Spaces: "Car parking spaces shall be 108 inches (2743 mm) wide minimum, shall be marked to define the width, etc."].

The Federal standard is narrower, only 8 feet. Clearly, a space can be in Federal compliance while still being in violation of the CBC standards, i.e. State Law. You can see from the "Existing Conditions" slide that the current parking lane is considered to be 8 feet wide, whether or not there are any disabled markings. Both Alternatives #1 and #2 narrow the parking lanes down to 7.5'. For a City to deliberately narrow the parking lanes down below both Federal and State standards, removing accessible parking where it existed before, is asking for a future lawsuit.

Burdening the east side of the street with all of the bicycle track will decrease property values on the east side of the street. All of us will have to cross the 2-way bicycle track just to reach the driver's side of our vehicles. Unloading a car on the passenger side is currently done with the door open over the landscape strip. With Alternative 1, unloading of passengers and cargo will be done directly into the 2-way cycle track. Cars will be washed by spraying the hose through the passing bicyclists.

If I have to choose the lesser, and more fair, of two evils, I choose Alternative 2. At least it treats both sides of the street equally and bicycles will ride with the flow of traffic, as they would legally have to do wherever bike lanes are undefined.

However, having lived on Grand since before there were signaled intersections, I do not believe anything less than a new stop sign between Encinal and Otis is going to slow down speeders. The fear of getting a moving violation on your license jacking up your insurance premium is the only proven way to deter speeding. Installing a few 4-way stops on Grand would be a far simpler, cheaper, and quicker way to slow down traffic, provide traffic breaks so residents could safely pull out of and into driveways; and add safety to the street for all. If there is enough traffic to justify traffic calming measures proposed by these "alternatives", surely there is enough traffic to qualify Grand Street for additional 4-way stops! They are PROVEN to increase pedestrian safety. Yet city staff refuses to even consider adding 4-way stops to Grand Street.

It is a shame this project was presented to the public as if anything they chose would be possible. In a perfect world, streets would always be wide enough to accommodate everyone's desires: bicyclists, motorists, and parking spaces. But Alameda is not a perfect world. Some parts of Grand Street cannot be widened and there are already residents living there. The Federal laws established to protect the access of disabled residents have been in place for more than 30 years. Compromise is necessary. Please give more consideration to Alternative 2 and do not endorse Alternative 1.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Carol Gottstein  
1114 Grand Street, 94501  
21 June 2023

---

**From:** Hank Lindemann  
**Sent:** Friday, June 9, 2023 10:43 AM  
**To:** Transportation <transportation@alamedaca.gov>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL]

Dear Council,

Being a Grand Street resident I would like to make known my feelings with respect to any **Grand Street Safety Improvements and Pavement Resurfacing**.

I was unable to make the Mastic School event due to schedule conflicts. My thoughts are as follows on traffic and safety controls in a historic district and in general:

Resurfacing is always good, It reduces street noise, reduces tire grind (petroleum "rubber" going into the waterways and Bay).

Painting green bike paths and unnecessary colored and fancy street markings with plastic cones, barricades, bump stops and signs just contribute to more micro-plastics in the marine environment. I think there is no need for this and creates confusion for drivers.

There is a huge expense to all the fancy bike lanes and plastic hardware, painting and signage. In construction there should be cradle to grave cost estimates for the life of transportation projects like bridges, and structures. Any traffic improvements should be estimated for COST TO MAINTAIN, MAINTENANCE COST ESCALATION , DISRUPTION TO RESIDENCES and REALISTIC MAINTENANCE EXPECTATIONS. PLEASE DON'T KICK THE FICAL MAINTENANCE ON TO THE RESIDENCES, HOMEOWNERS OR THE TAXPAYERS, e.g.: Review what pocket the money is going to come out of. California , Feds, County and the City can't afford to maintain what they have. This is in general state and country wide. Regardless of the source (This project is funded by Measure B/BB Local Streets and Roads, Measure B/BB Paratransit, TDA Article III and One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) federal monies), the same concerns apply: Ask yourself where is the money going to come from? This applies to all the new, fancy bike paths, They are starting to look bad and maintenance is not happening ,and if it is, it at the cost of other street repairs and improvements! Will ABAG fix these street improvements in disrepair?

With respect to Grand Street this is a bad idea, making the whole historic street look like Otis Drive and Grand Street. This was and still is a confusing mess for drivers, bicyclers and pedestrians. For what and for what cost. Look at the tire marks in the bike lanes on the curbs, all the signs and how well it works during school hours and peak traffic. We have more residents more cars and we restricted flow. This costs time, fuel and creates congestion. I don't think we want the entire width of the Island to look like that.

Now, take a look at the older and beautiful historic homes on Grand Street. Do we really want to erect a bunch of plastic barricades, paint up the streets, do expensive and dangerous bump-outs on a street that has historic homes? To make Grand Street look like shoreline, Otis and Grand, Park Street would be awful. Please preserve the character of the Island, historic district and keep a piece of the past alive. The current bike lanes are sufficient and were everywhere else too. Just cause Oakland does it does not mean we have to. ABAG, OBAG may be a double edge sword for Alameda and we need to ask ourselves if aligning ourselves with these agencies is right for our City.

Please take into account these views into the planning of this project and convey the above thoughts as part of the overall plan and fiscal due diligence that should be applied on ALL Measure B/BB Local Streets and Roads, Measure B/BB Paratransit, TDA Article III and One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) federal monies. I would like to suggest that 10% of ANY money taken from Measure, or Public funds be applied to larger capital improvement infrastructure in such a capacity as to "shall allow for improvements under the road surfaces, which necessitate repairs to any and ALL traffic striping, improvements, signage and otherwise deformation of existing and new street improvements.

Thank you for sending out the flyer to Grand Street Residents and trying to do your best to balance growth, safety and sensibility to our Island history culture and residents.

Sincerely,  
Henry Lindemann

**From:** [Steve Gorman](#)  
**To:** [Transportation Commission](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Grand Street Safety Improvements project, feedback  
**Date:** Friday, June 9, 2023 11:22:11 AM

---

Dear Transportation Commission staff,

Thank you for considering feedback on the Grand Street Safety Improvement plan. Below is the text of a letter I wrote to the Alameda City Council offering constructive ideas on the plan.

Thank you for the May 31<sup>st</sup> Grand Street safety improvements presentation at Mastick Center. I found it informative, and at the same time, concerning. As someone who rides a bike and drives a car, I understand and appreciate the needs of both groups.

Extending the previous council-approved design north of Encinal Avenue, with its large loss of street parking (60 – 75%) seems problematic to me. The neighborhoods north of Encinal Ave., extending to Clement Ave., have a much different character than the southern half of Grand St. The north half of Grand Street is characterized by more multi-family homes, apartment buildings, churches and businesses. A large loss of street parking in this sector could have serious negative consequences and create unsafe conditions on Grand St. and the surrounding streets. This potential large loss of street parking in a dense neighborhood is totally inappropriate and unacceptable to me and the neighbors I've spoken to. Especially at a time when we are encouraging more density through ADUs and more multi-family housing. In addition, we have already lost significant street parking due to all the corners being painted red for safety/visibility reasons.

I respectfully ask that the City Council and Transportation Commission give preference to Alternative #1, the raised 2-way bikeway. This option seems like a no-brainer, in that it meets the needs of both bicyclists and residents who need to park on the street. This plan has the benefits of offering the least parking loss, being the second fastest to build, is the second least expensive, separates bicycles from cars, and uses a 2-way separated bikeway that matches the 2-way bikeways on Shoreline Drive and Clement Avenue. In that sense, it is \*more\* intuitive to use a 2-way bikeway that matches the bikeways on its north and south ends, not less.

The loss of 5 – 15% of street parking with Alternative #1 would still be challenging, but it seems fair to ask residents to adapt to that change in order to provide a safe, separated bike route on Grand Street. It may cost a little more and take a little longer to build Alternative #1, but when making a change of this magnitude, it is more important to do it correctly, not just quickly or cheaply. We're going to live with this change for a long time to come, so let's do it right the first time.

Both bicyclists and car owners are citizens of Alameda, deserving of equal respect and consideration. As someone who lives in both of these worlds on a daily basis, I feel Alternative #1 is the fairest and most effective way to improve Grand Street's safety.

Thank you for your consideration,

Steve Gorman

Alameda, CA

Sgorman1b@yahoo.com

**From:** [Amy Cheng](#)  
**To:** [Transportation Commission](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Grand Street bikeways  
**Date:** Sunday, June 18, 2023 9:35:13 AM

---

Dear Alameda Transportation Commission,

I support Alternative #1, raised two-way bikeways, on both segments of Grand Street, for tonight's meeting.

I ride down Grand every day as part of my commute to the Main Street ferry terminal. I have narrowly escaped being doored (hit with an opening car door) multiple times. I occasionally see children and families riding bikes well within the dooring zone of cars parked on the side of the road.

I understand why, though: there isn't a good bike access route in Grand's direction on the island. If cyclists want to get to Jean Sweeney, Alameda Point, or the newly built waterfront parks, Grand is the current best option. Broadway is probably second best, but the lanes are even narrower.

I also ride down the the two-way protected bikeway on Ralph Appezzato every day. That dooring fear is entirely negated, which explains why so many more families seem willing to enjoy it.

With Alameda's new housing well under construction, transportation congestion on the island is guaranteed to grow. We should encourage alternatives to cars. In conjunction with the new bike-friendly water taxi pilot and the ferries, a network of protected bikeways will do just that.

Thank you,  
Amy Cheng



(510) 516-0497  
P.O. BOX 2732  
ALAMEDA, CA 94501  
[www.bikewalkalameda.org](http://www.bikewalkalameda.org)

**Board of  
Directors**

June 19, 2023

Denyse Trepanier  
*President*

RE: Item 6A: Grand Street Safety Improvement Project

Brian Fowler  
*Treasurer*

Dear Transportation Commissioners,

Tim Beloney  
*Secretary*

Grand Street is a vital corridor in Alameda, and we're very eager to see it improved for all users as soon as possible. After reviewing the many proposed designs and evaluating the pros and cons of each, we share staff's preference for Alternative 1 — the raised 2-way bikeway on the east side of the street — for both Segments B and C, with qualifications as described below. The design's bike signals, dedicated bike signal phasing, and raised crossings go a long way in addressing our concerns about intersection safety for bicyclists. And we're reassured to hear about plans for short- and long-term maintenance of this facility (and others like it) going forward, since path maintenance has been a big issue elsewhere in Alameda.

Cyndy Johnsen  
*Board Member*

Maria Piper  
*Board Member*

Our remaining concern is around implementation timing. Our climate and street safety emergencies are not waiting for us, and we feel it's imperative to get infrastructure that allows people to make greener and safer transportation choices built as quickly as possible. One sure way to expedite implementation is to use local funds for Segment B, rather than competing for uncertain grant funding. Staff's presentation notes that the local funding option would save at least a year, probably two or more, which is significant. Staffing, contractor, and process enhancements other cities have adopted could speed implementation further. We hope you will join us in urging our Council and City Manager to explore those strategies. We have a backlog of other delayed transportation projects around Alameda that could benefit from these changes as well.

Lucy Gigli  
*Founder,  
non-voting*

If the timeline for Segment B cannot be expedited, ideally to have construction beginning in 2024, our 'Plan B' preference would be for the Council-approved design for Segment B. This design has a clear advantage over the others in being considerably less expensive, and getting built next year.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Bike Walk Alameda

**From:** [Francisco Sprouse](#)  
**To:** [Transportation Commission](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Grand Street Improvmenets  
**Date:** Monday, June 19, 2023 9:03:58 AM

---

Dear Transportation Commission,

I'm writing to support Bike Walk Alameda's views on the upcoming Grand Street Improvements. We've waited long enough for this important project - the island's first low-stress north-south route and a vital path for our schoolchildren.

Let's get this done fast and efficiently. I'm behind both the council-approved design and Alternative 1, but only if we can speed up Alternative 1's implementation. We've seen too many delays with our low-stress bike improvements.

While I like the raised cycle track in Alternative 1, I don't want to let perfect stand in the way of progress. So, I'll only support it if we can speed things up by using local funds instead of waiting for grants.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Francisco "Paco" Sprouse

**From:** [Grand Street Neighbors](#)  
**To:** [Transportation Commission](#)  
**Cc:** [Lara Weisiger](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comments for 21 JUN Transportation Commission Meeting from Grand Street Neighbors regarding plans for Grand Street  
**Date:** Monday, June 19, 2023 8:24:43 AM

---

Dear Transportation Commission Commissioners,

Our neighborhood group, Grand Street Neighbors, supports the new plans being proposed by the City of Alameda for Grand Street. Specifically:

1. We believe having a consistent approach for the sections of Grand Street between Otis and Clement will create the safest environment for all modes of transportation.
2. We believe either Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 will work.
  - a. Some of us prefer Alternative 1 because it would a. provide a continuation of the 2-way bike lane in front of Wood Middle School and b. leave slightly more room for the bicycle buffer zone and for automobile traffic and parking lanes.
  - b. Some of us prefer Alternative 2 because it is a. more intuitive for drivers and safer for both cyclists and motorists because people backing out of driveways and turning at intersections would encounter bicycle traffic moving in the same direction as auto traffic, and b. from an esthetic standpoint it is more balanced.
3. To enhance pedestrian safety and reduce speeds, we believe either Alternative can be enhanced by flashing markers for pedestrian at cross walks. We further believe that 4 way stop signs at the two busiest intersections between Otis and Encinal, San Jose and Clinton, would further enhance safety by slowing traffic and ensuring pedestrians are seen at these busiest intersections on this section of Grand.
4. We further support the plans for Grand Street from Otis to Shoreline, adjacent to Wood School and Rittler Park. We believe these plans will coordinate well with either Alternative 1 or 2 and will facilitate and encourage students cycling to school.

We want to thank the City for creating these new alternatives that increase safety for all modes of transportation and preserve the usability of Grand Street for residents.

Respectfully,

Grand Street Neighbors

Sent by John Brennan on behalf of Grand Street Neighbors

**From:** [Grand Street Neighbors](#)  
**To:** [Lara Weisiger](#); [Transportation Commission](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Feedback on plans for Grand Street  
**Date:** Monday, June 19, 2023 10:15:06 PM

---

Dear Transportation Commission,

We want to send our family's perspectives on the proposed changes to Grand Street.

We believe either Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 will work and enhance the safety of Grand Street for all modes of transportation. Of the two, we prefer Alternative 2, as we believe bike lanes on both sides of the street that follow the direction of automobile traffic will make it easier and more natural for motorists to look for and see cyclists when turning in and out of driveways and side streets.

We also believe having a consistent approach on Grand Street from Otis through Clement is safest and easiest for cyclists and motorists to follow. We also support the current design for Grand adjacent to Wood Middle School and Rittler Park.

If we were designing from scratch, we find Alternative 3 to be the best. But given the built infrastructure and the expense, this seems unworkable.

We want to thank the City for revisiting the design of Grand Street, and feel these current Alternatives represent a very positive step.

John and Jean Brennan