

2021 Survey - Mecartney Road / Island Drive Improvement Project

How do you typically use the Mecartney/Island intersection? (multiple options)

- ☐ Private vehicle
- ☐ Walk
- ☐ Bicycle
- ☐ Ride a bus
- ☐ Other

How satisfied are you with the safety of the Mecartney/Island intersection?

- ☐ 1: Very Dissatisfied
- ☐ 2: Dissatisfied
- ☐ 3: Neutral
- ☐ 4: Satisfied
- ☐ 5: Very Satisfied

How satisfied are you with how the Mecartney/Island intersection operates?

- ☐ 1: Very Dissatisfied
- ☐ 2: Dissatisfied
- ☐ 3: Neutral
- ☐ 4: Satisfied
- ☐ 5: Very Satisfied

If the City were to improve the Mecartney/Island intersection, what is your preference? (please state in priority order with "1" as the highest priority)

☐

Roundabout

☐

Reduced footprint all-way stop

☐

Do nothing

☐

Traffic signal

Do you have any comments that you would like to share with us?

If you are interested in updates about the Mecartney/Island Improvement Project, please provide your email or send an email to gpayne@alamedaca.gov

Survey Summary for Mecartney/Island Intersection Project (January 2022)

How do you typically **use** the Mecartney/Island intersection?

Use	Total	Use %
Private vehicle	128	36%
Private vehicle,Walk,Bicycle	79	22%
Private vehicle,Walk	78	22%
Private vehicle,Bicycle	27	8%
Private vehicle,Walk,Bicycle,Ride a bus	19	5%
Bicycle	11	3%
Private vehicle,Walk,Ride a bus	7	2%
Private vehicle,Ride a bus	4	1%
Walk	3	1%
Private vehicle,Bicycle,Ride a bus	2	1%
Private vehicle,Other: Running	1	0%
Private vehicle,Walk,Other: Electric Scooter	1	0%
Total	360	100%

Use Summary	Total	Use %
Private Vehicle	346	96%
Walk	187	52%
Bicycle	138	38%
Ride a bus	32	9%
Other	2	1%
Total	360	100%

How satisfied are you with **safety**?

Safety	Total	%
1: Very Dissatisfied	78	22%
2: Dissatisfied	114	32%
3: Neutral	84	23%
4: Satisfied	55	15%
5: Very Satisfied	28	8%
Total	359	100%

How satisfied with how **operates**?

Operations	Total	%
1: Very Dissatisfied	87	24%
2: Dissatisfied	111	31%
3: Neutral	80	22%
4: Satisfied	57	16%
5: Very Satisfied	26	7%
Total	361	100%

If the City were to **improve** the Mecartney/Island intersection, what is your preference?

Use	Total	%
Roundabout: 3Reduced footprint all-way stop: 2Do nothing: 4Traffic signal: 1	37	10%
Roundabout: 1Reduced footprint all-way stop: 2Do nothing: 4Traffic signal: 3	37	10%
Roundabout: 2Reduced footprint all-way stop: 3Do nothing: 4Traffic signal: 1	36	10%
Roundabout: 1Reduced footprint all-way stop: 3Do nothing: 4Traffic signal: 2	36	10%
Roundabout: 1Reduced footprint all-way stop: 2Do nothing: 3Traffic signal: 4	31	9%
Roundabout: 4Reduced footprint all-way stop: 2Do nothing: 3Traffic signal: 1	24	7%
Roundabout: 4Reduced footprint all-way stop: 3Do nothing: 2Traffic signal: 1	23	6%
Roundabout: 4Reduced footprint all-way stop: 3Do nothing: 1Traffic signal: 2	20	6%
Roundabout: 4Reduced footprint all-way stop: 2Do nothing: 1Traffic signal: 3	15	4%
Roundabout: 1Reduced footprint all-way stop: 3Do nothing: 2Traffic signal: 4	13	4%
Roundabout: Reduced footprint all-way stop: Do nothing: Traffic signal:	13	4%
Roundabout: 3Reduced footprint all-way stop: 2Do nothing: 1Traffic signal: 4	12	3%
Roundabout: 1Reduced footprint all-way stop: 4Do nothing: 3Traffic signal: 2	9	2%
Roundabout: 2Reduced footprint all-way stop: 1Do nothing: 3Traffic signal: 4	7	2%
Roundabout: 4Reduced footprint all-way stop: 1Do nothing: 2Traffic signal: 3	6	2%
Roundabout: 1Reduced footprint all-way stop: 4Do nothing: 2Traffic signal: 3	6	2%
Roundabout: 2Reduced footprint all-way stop: 3Do nothing: 1Traffic signal: 4	6	2%
Roundabout: 3Reduced footprint all-way stop: 4Do nothing: 2Traffic signal: 1	5	1%
Roundabout: 2Reduced footprint all-way stop: 4Do nothing: 3Traffic signal: 1	5	1%
Roundabout: 4Reduced footprint all-way stop: 1Do nothing: 3Traffic signal: 2	4	1%
Roundabout: 3Reduced footprint all-way stop: 1Do nothing: 4Traffic signal: 2	4	1%
Roundabout: 2Reduced footprint all-way stop: 4Do nothing: 1Traffic signal: 3	4	1%
Roundabout: 2Reduced footprint all-way stop: 1Do nothing: 4Traffic signal: 3	3	1%
Roundabout: 3Reduced footprint all-way stop: 1Do nothing: 2Traffic signal: 4	3	1%
Roundabout: 3Reduced footprint all-way stop: 4Do nothing: 1Traffic signal: 2	2	1%
Total	361	100%

Highest Priority (=1)	Total	%
Roundabout	132	38%
Traffic signal	130	37%
Do nothing	59	17%
Reduced all-way stop	27	8%
Total	348	100%

Least Preferred (=4)	Total	%
Do nothing	153	44%
Roundabout	92	26%
Traffic signal	72	21%
Reduced all-way stop	31	9%
Total	348	100%

Demographic Responses on the Optional Questions (January 2022)

Do you live on **Bay Farm Island**?

Bay Farm Resident	Total	%
Yes	302	86%
No	48	14%
Total	350	100%

Do you have children attending **schools in Alameda**?

Schools in Alameda	Total	%
No	180	52%
Yes	167	48%
Total	347	100%

Are you **65 years old or older**?

65 Years or Older	Total	%
No	276	80%
Yes	71	20%
Total	347	100%

Do you **own or rent** your home?

Own or Rent Home?	Total	%
Own	298	87%
Rent	45	13%
Total	343	100%

What is your **gender** identity?

Gender Identity?	Total	%
Female	168	47%
Male	127	35%
Prefer not to answer	36	10%
	28	8%
Non-binary/gender-fluid/non-conforming	2	1%
Total	361	100%

What **race or ethnicity** do you identify with?

Use	Total	%
White, Caucasian	170	47%
Prefer not to answer	65	18%
Asian, Asian American	57	16%
	19	5%
Hispanic, Latino/a/x	13	4%
Asian, Asian American,White, Caucasian	11	3%
Multi-ethnic/multi-racial	9	2%
Black, African American	5	1%
Hispanic, Latino/a/x,White, Caucasian	4	1%
American Indian, First Nation, Alaska Native, Indigenous,White, Caucasian	2	1%
Hispanic, Latino/a/x,Multi-ethnic/multi-racial,White, Caucasian	1	0%
Black, African American,White, Caucasian	1	0%
American Indian, First Nation, Alaska Native, Indigenous,Hispanic, Latino/a/x,Multi-ethnic/multi-racial,Whi	1	0%
Multi-ethnic/multi-racial,White, Caucasian	1	0%
Asian, Asian American,Multi-ethnic/multi-racial,White, Caucasian	1	0%
Pacific Islander, Native Hawaiian,White, Caucasian	1	0%
Total	361	100%

Race or Ethnicity Summary	Total	Use %
White/Caucasian	193	50%
Asian, Asian American	69	18%
Hispanic, Latino/a/x	19	5%
Multi-ethnic/multi-racial	13	3%
Black, African American	6	2%
American Indian, First Nation, Alaska Native, Indigenous	3	1%
Pacific Islander, Native Hawaiian	1	0%
Prefer not to answer	84	22%
Total	388	

Survey Response Summary	Survey	Census
Parents of children attending schools in Alameda	48%	36%
65 years old or older	20%	15%
Rent home	13%	17%
Identify as Asian	18%	43%
Live on Bay Farm Island	86%	100%
Women	47%	52%

Survey Summary for Mecartney/Island Intersection Project: Open-ended Question Responses (January 2022)

Question: Do you have any comments that you would like to share with us?

Safety

Make it safer for pedestrians. I see people not stop there and blow the stop sign. I like the idea of a roundabout but people are just not very smart and don't understand how to use the roundabout.

I almost got hit here multiple times because of conflicting right of way and cars not yielding to pedestrians

Mecartney Road has also become a highway for speeding cars. There are lots of kids and seniors who walk/bike these streets and we need to keep our neighborhood safe. The traffic generated by the new Starbucks also is causing unsafe driving by patrons entering/exiting the wrong way and then making illegal u-turns.

I am curious about an additional option not listed, speed bumps. I am not sure if it is a feasible option ... just curious what issues they may introduce if any

In recent years I've seen more and more cars that completely ignore the architecture of the intersection. It is so big, and there is so much space, that cars are inventing their own lanes and patterns to get through. The left turners coming from the ferry will drive two or three cars at a time through the intersection without stopping at all, the cars traveling from island north towards Safeway will invent their own thru lane and turn lane causing constant confusion, the cars coming from the McCartney and turning right in front on Starbucks never stop at the intersection at all. It's the wild wild west out there, and has gotten more confusing and uncomfortable with the Starbucks. So, anything you can do to bring some order before a kid really does get hurt is much appreciated.

Even when there's a crossing guard during school hours, cars still fail to stop. Speeding on Mecartney is a big safety hazard too. Our neighborhood is filled with kids walking/biking and elderly folks who cross the streets. Please keep our neighborhood safe.

The entire length of Mecartney needs severe traffic calming and improved pedestrian crossings. The dedicated separated bike facility along the road is in very poor repair, forcing bike users to use the unprotected marked lanes on the road surface.

Make it safer for people (esp. kids and elderly) walking and biking.

Problem is drivers do not stop at intersection. they do rolling stop or simply blast through the intersection especially right turns onto mecartney. pedestrians are very at risk at all crossings. cars seldom yield even at signal crossing. average speeds on mecartney run between 35 to 60 mph. narrowing and elimination of 1 right turn lane might help to slow everyone down. roundabout only increases traffic speeds and puts people in danger when attempting to cross.

Walking across takes too long and is dangerous

Many many children use this crossing to go to school. Many seniors also. A roundabout will be dangerous.

Only that I agree that something needs to be done to make this intersection safer for drivers and pedestrians too

Very unsafe intersection like so many out here. With the increased traffic over the years of those employees, deliveries, etc. going to the Business Park - the volume of traffic has increased making it very unsafe. Plus, more stop signs, posted speed signs, flashing pedestrian crosswalks for children, elderly, etc. We have little, if not "nil", traffic enforcement out here on Bay Farm/Harbor Bay Isle. Mecartney, Robert Davey Jr., Dr., Aughinbaugh, Sheffield, Kofman Pkwy., Seaview Pkwy. need better enforcement, plastic barricades to slow traffic at intersection arteries, etc. It's the wild, wild West out here - people rarely go the speed limit & obviously are under the erroneous assumption the speed limit is 35-45mph on these arteries. HELP US PLEASE! MORE POLICE PRESENCE, BETTER MARKED INTERSECTIONS, TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES, DAYLIGHTING MORE CORNER CURBS, FLASHING PEDESTRIAN LIGHTS, ETC.

This intersection is a nightmare and seriously needs to be safer for pedestrians. It is also confusing for drivers. Suggest more signage

The intersection has always been dangerous especially for children walking/biking. Since Starbucks opened drivers coming down Island make a u-turn to enter Starbucks. I have seen a huge number who barely slow seeming to think the 4-way stop doesn't apply if it's just a u-turn. Accident waiting to happen.

This is a very busy intersection and its current configuration is unsafe for pedestrians and aggravating for drivers of automobiles. I use this intersection at least once a day and I'm very pleased that you're going to improve its functioning.

Close the Starbucks. Customers making dangerous and illegal maneuvers constantly.

Please offer a safe way for bicycles and pedestrian to cross, not just cars.

Now with the Starbucks, amongst other factors at this intersection is that more cars traveling South on Island are making a U-turn to enter Starbucks. Just a complication and more to think about rather than taking it for granted that a car will make a left onto Mecartney.

Have lived on Mecartney since 1995 using this intersection daily by car, bike, and walking. I do not understand the driving force behind any changes to this intersection since I have rarely seen accidents or safety issues. There seems to be much higher priority infrastructure repairs needed, for example repaving mecartney south of island. The biggest safety issue near the mecartney/island intersection is the recent opening of the Starbucks and its insane drive through access point.....I cannot believe that this was approved since it really has created a safety issue and will compound design issues if the intersection changes being considered are put forward, especially a roundabout; this new Starbucks drive through entrance has really complicated the whole situation and compromises your proposed designs.

Island and Mecartney are incredibly unsafe and now that Starbucks is here, it is doubly impacted.

I am terrified to bike or walk that intersection.

It's a total hazard in the morning and pm rush hour. Cars take chances they shouldn't do.

Safety should be paramount in making this decision - I see cars clearly not following simple stop sign rules at this intersection every time I use it!

A safety improvement is long overdue for this intersection.

Having a crossing guard regardless is extremely important for pedestrian safety. The problem is not the lack of speed reduction. The problem is the lack of care - I have seen people try to ram the crossing guard or disregard the crossing guard and almost hit kids biking across.

Put speed cameras and fine the people who do not stop here at the stop sign. lots of new Starbucks walking traffic and people almost get hit here every time. thank you for working on an improvement

It needs to be safer since a lot of high school, and younger, kids go to Starbucks go hang out and study after school. People drive like a bat out of hell through there, typical or rich people thinking they can do anything.

The issue is that vehicles are blasting through stop signs on rolling stop especially on right turns. Add to that a very long stretch of crosswalk and drivers are tempted to gun through before pedestrian reaches their side of the road.

It's VERY hard to see which cars arrived there before/after you when there are SO many lanes (especially during rush hours)!!!

Crossing guard during school hours.

more police funding for traffic control.

It's really hard to tell the order of whose turn it is under the current design

Traffic assistance during school hours

I would strongly suggest adding lights if you plan to do anything at this intersection.

Do not make the traffic any faster as we would like pedestrians / kids to be safe

Also, my biggest concern is kids getting to school safely.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Analysis must be updated to include new traffic patterns associated with the Starbucks that has now opened. There is a significant increase in traffic and pedestrian crossing right at that intersection. Also, my top priority is the safety of neighborhood kids on bikes or walking.

Pedestrian safety is top priority

It's an enormous intersection. Has the Starbucks changed the traffic patterns?

Your proposals minus the traffic signal are an accident waiting to happen. Since the Starbucks went in drivers barely stop to race to get to the drive through. The only deterrent we have seen in the past is police presence. Drivers drive down McCartney like it is the freeway.

Please do what's proven to be safest. We've already said that's our priority for road design decisions.

Big intersection that leaves plenty of time for folks to alternate direction.

Bikes that need to cross over to bike path at this intersection could use some help, many kids ride this intersection to get to school. Double right lane on Island may not be needed. It makes the left turn out of CVS to get to the middle lane on Island drive in order to continue across McCartney difficult at times. Also adds to the number of cars bikes need to keep track of getting to the bike path.

I went before the city council 5 years ago to address this intersection. I was directed by the mayor to one Eric Fonstein and he told me it was to be addressed in about 18 months. 18 months came and went and here we are now 2021. Just what seems to be the delay. I have lived here for 52 years and I really think the city can do a better job fixing this intersection. My biggest concern is pedestrian, especially school children's safety. What is this nonsense about a four way stop. I already is a four way stop and has been ever since Island Drive was improved shortly after I moved here in 1970. I'm a retired professional driver and until you curb impatient drivers in an intersection whether it be a roundabout or signal controlled intersection pedestrian safety is going to be a concern.

There should be a pedestrian bridge to allow people to walk across safely and not impact drivers.

Need to account for new Starbucks - may require additional traffic study to determine need for queuing lane or additional right turn lane and merging exit lane from Starbucks complex.

Please make sure any decision is bike friendly for children

I've used this intersection for over 20 years -- slow from McCartney to island during morning rush hour; many accidents at this intersection over the years.

First, I would like to thank you sending out this survey to the residents and giving me an opportunity to provide input. My thoughts are the following. While I understand the preliminary findings is that a roundabout is being considered I think that it may not necessarily help. I feel we are treating a symptom rather than the root cause and it is primarily driving habits particular to Alameda. Driving habits are different among cities and it can be observed even when one compares Alameda vs. say Albany for example or even a city in the Peninsula. A few observations I have noticed about driving in particular to this intersection. - No one really truly stops at the stop sign or the stop line (especially those who are taking right hand turns which throws off the first in first out rule for all-way stops) - A lot of folks like to brake last minute (<100 feet) and as a pedestrian crossing, I feel like I am about to get hit. I have to stare drivers down to ensure they stop or else they will stop less than 10 feet away which is quite frightening considering most cars are 3300 lbs. give or take a couple hundred. - Island Drive coming off of Doolittle Drive is initially 35 mph and then turns into 25 mph in the last ~1000 yards and people still don't slow down to 25 mph - Drivers do not treat the all-way stop as a proper first come first serve. It's a race to the stop sign and then - I have seen cars pulling into the middle of the intersection while children are crossing the crosswalk (not even half-way through) as if the driver doesn't want to lose their turn in the all-way stop. - Drivers in the straight lane will turn left from McCartney Road to Island Drive, effectively making it into a 2-lane left turn. - Drivers from Island Drive going into the intersection and heading straight will form 2 lanes since it is wide enough to fit 3 cars on one side of the road - Multiple drivers have entered into the intersection at the same time, all thinking that they were next to go into the intersection - Also just a general note, not enough drivers signal so others

cannot tell where drivers are going so that would be important in a roundabout for pedestrian safety -

A-pillars are thicker in cars so drivers need to start actively move their heads to get a better perspective of the situation coming into the intersection. If the above sounds a little extreme, I would invite those who are decision makers to come and observe the intersection during the times of rush hour in conjunction with school getting in/out as well as around lunch time. With the observations above, will drivers really be that attentive to pedestrians now that their paths have become a yield rather than a full stop? Alameda drivers seem to always be gunning to be "first" going into an intersection. Personally, I am in favor of a traffic signal with dedicated left turn lanes with permanent traffic cones. Reasons are this: - With the introduction of Starbucks there has been an increase in pedestrians - If implemented, would suggest banning a U-turn on Island Drive to go into Starbucks to prevent car build up as cars enter into Starbucks drive through - Prevent rogue drivers from creating their own rules and making double left turns, etc. - I think a reduced footprint may not help too much considering drivers are already making their own rules and lanes even in the current configuration of the intersection. If this is an option that is being considered I think flashing crosswalk signals for the intersection would be imperative. On a separate note, I do wish that there was more APD supervision to keep the drivers in check at this intersection given the amount of pedestrian accidents. Thank you for taking the time to read this.

My experience is that some drivers do not know how to navigate the rules of courtesy when at this intersection; it disrupts the natural flow of traffic, causing frustration to other drivers. This leads to unsafe driving choices such as running the stop, going out of turn, and pulling into crosswalks when pedestrians are present. As a pedestrian, I am terrified to step out into the crosswalks, and the huge expanse of road one must cross leaves me exposed and vulnerable to frustrated drivers making unsafe choices. I am very happy to see the roundabout alternative which significantly reduces the amount of road a pedestrian has to cross, particularly if they are trying to cross twice. It is a horrible and very unsafe intersection.

Regarding the Mecartney Road/Island Drive intersection. Basically, there are too many lanes of traffic on all 4 sides of intersection, this leads to too many decisions that need to be made and more uncertainty for motorist and pedestrians. If eight cars approach the intersection at the same time, who moves first? For sure Mecartney Road does not need 2 lanes when going eastbound. Most drivers treat the road as a single lane already and have worn off the painted lane dashes dividing the road on the east side of the intersection. There are not that many cars traveling eastbound on Mecartney, by my observation, not by public works mechanical counts. Going southbound on Island Drive, having 2 right turn lanes put pedestrians in danger, they may not see the second car turning to cross their path when walking southbound. Also 2 cars stopped at the right turn lanes blocks the view of pedestrians trying to cross eastbound. By simulation, remove some lanes on both sides of the intersection on Mecartney and remove the second right turn lane on Island, then compare traffic flow rates with the reduce lanes vs. a roundabout. Then choose between the two proposals. thanks for reviewing my comments and helping to make the intersection a safer area.

I have lived for the last 34 years 2 blocks from the intersection. My experience has shown me that this is a VERY safe intersection for people driving, as well as walking. I also worked in the Alameda Fire Department for 30 years and both as a company officer and Chief Officer, this intersection has rarely experienced traffic accidents or pedestrian/vehicle accidents.

Concerned about the proximity to all the business and residential driveways. Also, would like for City to consider narrowing the Island Drive road towards the South (water side) and give the homes the extra space for parking since there was a lot lost due to recent removals.

(1) Please DON'T do anything that will impede traffic or make the intersection less safe. I.e., no roundabout, no reduction in lanes. (2) Increased police presence would be helpful.

Roundabouts

Being originally from Europe, I am familiar with roundabouts and their efficiency. However, as drivers are unfamiliar with them here, I fear they would increase the risk of accidents. It would be interesting to see what is meant by "reduced footprint" in this case. Traffic lights would be safest but would likely cause back-ups. The lack of clarity on how to access Starbucks is a real problem. Finally, what was the trigger for this initiative in the first place?

Roundabout would increase backup traffic on Mecartney and Island and drives and be more hazardous for walkers crossing streets.

If and that's a BIG if, will emergency vehicles be able to get around a roundabout? I don't believe that the (Fire) hook and ladder trucks can.

A roundabout I feel is the least safe option for this intersection.

I think it would be cool to mix it up and put a roundabout

Most US drivers do not understand roundabout right of way rules. Please don't choose that option.

Roundabout is a no brainer.

I had thought a roundabout would work best, but that is good for an intersection with little to no pedestrian traffic. I think a light is imperative here, and reducing the footprint/lanes available. People don't follow the laws regarding right-a-way and it's the Wild West at times.

Roundabout is the best option; however, it should be a protected bicycle roundabout.

The roundabout would cause more safety and traffic issues!

As a driver, I would love a roundabout. but as a parent who has kids who walk and bike on this intersection, I don't see cars slowing down on a roundabout that intakes the amount of traffic that comes in between 8 lanes. I'd prefer traffic lights and speed warnings, as well as considerations for speed humps or bumps.

The trick seems to be confusing right of way. Round about probably best as straight and turns don't need to negotiate. If a traffic signal; protected left(s) a must.

There is absolutely no reason to add a roundabout in this location. I consider it to be safe enough to let my tween/teen children cross on bikes independently. In fact, I specifically instruct them to cross Island Drive at the Mecartney/Island intersection and not from the Safeway turn-in. I'm sure the city funds can be better spent on another improvement project where improvement is truly needed. Thank you.

I have experience with roundabouts when I visit my brother in San Diego. Drivers tend to run through regardless of who is first in the roundabout. It is actually a lot more dangerous for both drivers and pedestrians than just having a regular intersection with lights.

I believe a roundabout at this site would be impractical for pedestrian safety.

Roundabouts are a bad idea. They are confusing and something Alameda residents are not used to. It will be difficult for both pedestrians and drivers.

I understand there is community hesitation with roundabouts, but they are safe and efficient. They will save lives, and people will adapt.

I am concerned about the placement of the crosswalks with the roundabout. I am worried cars will be accelerating out of the turns and into pedestrians.

I have lived all over the US and rotaries work very well in New England for decades. Having moved here in 2019 I was shocked at how big this intersection was and lack of clarity. It's too big to be self-managed. Rotary is the way to go

A roundabout is by far my first choice. Very effective and not very expensive

Roundabouts are the best solution!!! Should replace all lighted signals in Alameda where feasible.

Part of the problem is that people on the eastern side of Mecartney and southern side of island simply ignore the stop signs. I feel like a roundabout would slow down traffic but I worry for pedestrians as they might not be seen as easily.

A roundabout is not necessary at this intersection.

No stop signs with roundabouts!

Roundabouts are European and, in the US, this is difficult for people to understand. I live very close to this intersection. It's used heavily and it would have to be one large roundabout that is further complicated by the dumb as in the city that allowed the current entry of cars into the Starbucks at that intersection. A roundabout will cause issues as you don't use it or live there to see the patterns. A roundabout will cause accidents with pedestrians since cars will enter at higher speeds than not stopping. I don't understand how the city would even consider a huge roundabout there. Have been to Paris and seen the large ones there, where drivers know how to engage them? The simplest and easiest is to install traffic lights to control the traffic and to make it safer for pedestrians. In the morning hundreds of kids cross there. Imagine accidents with children because of the roundabout

Many vehicle drivers do not wait while turning in a roundabout. This is especially dangerous for children walking and biking on understanding when the vehicle should stop or not.

Because of the surge of traffic at various times, an all stop or stop light will leave cars that will idle, and create impatient drivers that may turn right watching for other cars and hit a pedestrian or bike. Stoplights tend to be red too long for those in wait, and will create impatience. A traffic circle at least keeps the traffic "moving" and "slower" and I see a few of these in Galt, CA near Elk Grove and they are working pretty well. Took some time to get used to but effective. They also don't require programming, maintenance, or commissions for the stop light salesman!

The roundabout is the best solution. They work very well.

Everything I've read and know about roundabouts; I am 1000 percent pro roundabout for that intersection!

I like roundabouts in some places but this is too busy with 2 lanes and will be too confusing for so many

We do not need a roundabout. We have lived on Bay Farm for 20 years and regularly go through this intersection. We just need blinking lights for pedestrians.

I live on bay farm. I'm a strong advocate of roundabouts. I'd like to see more of them...great for safety and overall traffic.

This is an ideal location for a roundabout. It's a large intersection that will make design and installation easy, and it maximizes safety while maintaining traffic flow. This intersection is busy and chaotic during commute hours. The roundabout would keep traffic flowing, provide shorter and safer ways across for pedestrians, and eliminate the problem of people jumping their turn into the intersection and creating dangerous situations. The reduced footprint all-way stop would simplify the intersection for cars, but would have fewer advantages for pedestrian safety. This may not be the highest priority intersection for Vision Zero, but every chance to maximize safety should be seized.

When implementing a roundabout, please be sure cross walks and bike lanes are visible to cars. This can often be overlooked in roundabouts where cars decide that yield means only yield to cars

Roundabout or do nothing.

This is a perfect intersection for a roundabout that will improve safety and congestion. See Farmington Hills, Michigan for great case studies on roundabouts

I think a roundabout would be better for emissions / the environment

A roundabout is the safest, most efficient and carbon-neutral way to improve this intersection.

There will be traffic if island drive to mecartney was reduced to one lane in the roundabout picture. Right now, there are four lanes. I understand that the roundtable would reduce stopping but maybe make that part have two lanes into the roundabout, one that turns immediately right and one that goes through the circle.

I grew up in an area with a lot of roundabouts. I think for many Americans, roundabouts can appear confusing, but in the long term they slow cars down and creates a simpler intersection for pedestrians and bikers.

Anything but a roundabout. Americans don't know how to navigate them. It would be a mess.

I feel a roundabout at that intersection would make it more dangerous for the seniors and youth that walk or ride bikes to and from the shopping center, schools, library and park nearby. Traffic in a roundabout is usually moving at or above the speed limit making it a bad situation. Also, the entrance to the Starbucks is just at the corner and people trying to enter the drive through and parking lot would cause problems.

If a roundabout - will there still be a protected cross-walk?

In my experience, roundabouts are safe and very efficient at moving traffic.

People need to be taught how to drive better. If they can't use a 4 way stop properly, then they definitely won't understand a traffic circle

I would love a roundabout as right now people are often confused at this intersection, and it doesn't have enough traffic to really warrant a traffic light. Please add signals and blinking lights for pedestrian safety no matter what you do.

Roundabout is a horrible idea. I've been driving that intersection for 40 years, and have never had a problem.

No roundabout.

A roundabout would be a hot mess! I have lived out here my entire life and have never once had a problem with driving or walking across at this intersection.

Strongly support roundabout. People no longer follow traffic laws so we need a forcing function.

Roundabout is a good idea but difficult with so many pedestrians.

Don't let the roundabout haters overcome the legitimate safety benefits.

There is enough space to do a roundabout. Cars run red lights, so it would still be a safety issue. Roundabouts slow cars down.

I think a roundabout is a terrible idea, especially for pedestrians.

After reviewing the presentation, I do not believe that the roundabout increases pedestrian safety for those trying to cross the affected streets. Also, technical studies to date do not take into account the effect of the new Starbucks at this location, nor the proposed multi-family housing at Harbor Bay Landing.

Please do not put in a roundabout!! Put in a 4-way signal light!! Keep pedestrians and students safe when they cross. The roundabout is the silliest idea ever in such a high traffic area

Californians are clueless about roundabouts.

This is an ideal location for a roundabout. It's best for safety for cars and pedestrians. That intersection is terrifying as it is.

Roundabouts are confusing; public would need much education on how to navigate.

I feel a roundabout would be by far the best option for this intersection.

With the addition of Starbucks entry driveway so close to the intersection, I can only envision a roundabout creating a significant hazard.

Please make this intersection into a roundabout. The current configuration of the intersection is hard to navigate because traffic is coming from so many different directions. When looking one way, then the other, traffic conditions would have changed because the intersection is so big. Vehicles gain a lot of speed going through the intersection making it uncomfortable and unsafe when crossing as a

pedestrian. We need more roundabouts in Alameda to reduce delays and increase safety, a win-win for all modes of transportation.

A roundabout would be a terrible idea. Very unsafe.

Unless someone can show me hard data that speaks otherwise, this is a solution in search of a problem. I've been through this intersection multiple times every day for 20 years. There is zero congestion there, so why do we need a roundabout to confuse matters or a signal? As far as safety, I've never seen or heard of anyone being killed, much less struck there. I do understand that kids cross for school, but we have crossing guards during school hours. At most, I'd recommend installing the blinking light for when a walker wants to cross; it is a very lengthy crossing. But again, it hasn't been a problem. Spend the money instead on repaving the bike paths along Island and Mecartney.

Many people are unfamiliar with right of way regarding roundabouts. Please don't choose this

We will still need a crossing guard if we have a roundabout!

Roundabout only if SINGLE LANE. Multi-lane roundabouts are too hard to navigate on bike or as a pedestrian.

I'm concerned about a roundabout and pedestrian safety. There are several blind residents using this corner. School children etc. Also, if traffic does not have breaks it can be very difficult to enter McCartney from side streets such as Ironwood. The crosswalk at Ironwood is dangerous. An increase in speed by traffic on Mecartney will be a serious complication.

It's not clear to me how a roundabout improves pedestrian safety. There are so many kids crossing Mecartney to get to school, I'm concerned about that. The graphic doesn't show how bicycles get across. Do they mix with the vehicles or?

I think a roundabout would be the most cost-efficient approach and will solve the safety issue

I have been very hesitant to take the bus to Harbor Bay due to safety concerns over this intersection. I am a huge proponent of roundabouts. Having one at this intersection would be very helpful.

A roundabout has been proven to be very effective Globally. It doesn't require traffic signals and is makes drivers MORE cautious of pedestrians and cyclists. Much of the "bad traffic" and driving comes from those who commute by ferry and drive exceedingly recklessly towards the ferry station. The roundabout should definitely be reinforced with Alameda police support with citations for speeding.

A traffic signal is a terrible idea here. They don't solve the problem of pedestrian safety and they cause unnecessary delays at times when the intersection isn't busy - which is most of the day except rush hour. Roundabouts are great, and this seems like a smart place for one.

The New York Times (11/20/21) has an informative article on the increased safety and reduction in emissions with the use of roundabouts. I will forward a copy to gpayne. I strongly encourage the installation of a roundabout at Mecartney & Island Dr.

A round about is just to help Starbucks. There is no consideration for the school aged kids walking and riding to school or for the large numbers of walkers out in the island. Lawsuits waiting to happen. If we have so much money use it to employee more officers and firefighters.

Roundabout would work very well at this intersection. The people/drivers just need to get adjusted to it. We lived in Reno for 14 years and those roundabouts moved traffic very smoothly.

Be clear what a roundabout would look like. ALSO, A reduced footprint all way stop.

Roundabout is a poor idea as it increases speed around adjacent streets.

Traffic Signal

Worried about the large amount of students who use this corner to cross or bike to school. a traffic light is only viable solution it will slow the speeders down and provide best opportunity for children and seniors to cross the street.

A traffic signal would make it much safer for pedestrians and cars trying to turn from mecartney onto island.

Needs a smart traffic signal system

I commute through this intersection by bicycle every day, and every day I feel like I'm putting my life in the hands of the drivers at this intersection. While I generally favor roundabouts, I don't know if a roundabout at this intersection would make me feel any safer on a bicycle. The safest option for me is a traffic signal, ideally with bicycle-priority timing and pavement markings.

Given Starbucks just went I'm on the corner, a light is needed.

People are the problem. Roundabouts are not the solution. Please just put a stoplight, like the rest of the city. A roundabout would only cause more traffic and lack of patients. It would be great for drifting also, which we don't want.

A traffic signal would be the worst of all option

Drivers today do not know the rules, i.e., the driver on the right has the right-of-way, and many zoom through the intersection. A traffic light would prevent this from happening. With a roundabout, what will happen to the pedestrians? There are school children who use this intersection daily.

I have watched numerous people run the stop signs and drive at excessive speed on both Mecartney and Island Drives. Crossing the intersection on foot is also dicey. Although I'm happy that we now have Starbucks in the neighborhood, the entrance is poorly designed and this situation is likely to get worse. People do tend to heed the crossing signal on Mecartney. We've wanted a traffic signal at that intersection for a very long time and seems like the most reasonable solution. I don't see a roundabout being very effective and worry about the safety of pedestrians as traffic doesn't stop.

This intersection is currently an injury/accident waiting to happen. The problem is inattentive drivers, so I think it's imperative that a Traffic Signal be implemented.

Traffic signal with car sensor. Don't want to sit for a whole light cycle during hours with no kids.

Please implement a traffic light, it's the safest option for pedestrians.

Traffic signals are definitely needed as both vehicular pedestrian traffic have significantly increased with the opening of the new Starbucks. Drivers do not currently follow the right of way rules with the current stop signs.

This intersection needs rigorous control. Only a traffic signal is going to provide that kind of control.

Not sure how around about would improve the pedestrian's ability to cross intersection safely. Light would be better - a lot of kids and bicycles and you have the add traffic trying to get into Starbucks at that intersection

I strongly agree with whatever staff and consultants decided traffic signals mean lower anticipated safety performance and increased delays!!! The opposite, it would improve safety and not cause much of an interruption. You will cause these problems with a stupid roundabout that people don't know how to use or cutting down lanes. It doesn't seem to be a problem at Island Drive and Robert Davey.

I would be adamantly against a traffic signal. There are not enough vehicles to warrant this and would create more traffic. I'm a huge proponent for roundabouts and would strongly encourage this option - it keeps traffic flowing, is safe for pedestrians/bicyclists, and if maintained well can be much more aesthetically pleasing than any other form of intersection.

Traffic signal would reduce confusion, stress, and uncertainty at the intersection. Roundabout might not be safe for pedestrian and bike crossings. Currently the intersection is stressful and roundabout would still be stressful.

Having a traffic signal would improve safety for pedestrians and traffic flow for drivers. A roundabout would be confusing for drivers, more dangerous for pedestrians, and impede traffic even more than the drive-through Starbucks on the corner of Island and Mecartney.

A traffic signal would be the best way to improve safety and traffic flow.

Because people cannot even use a 4-way stop correctly in the morning commute, a roundabout is a TERRIBLE idea for this location. The ONLY way to keep kids going to school on bikes safe is with a light, especially because there is often no crossing guard. The Starbucks now has people parking on Island drive, next to no stopping signs. We need a light!!!!!!!!

Adding Starbucks to that corner made everything worse. A light is the safest thing.

People are scared to go through the stop signs, that makes the most issues. A roundabout will scare them even more. My children walk to their grandparents at 924 Island drive most days. They need a stoplight with an "x" cross to be the safest to and from there and school. Don't experiment with your City Planning where we live. We are not your chance to show off for other communities what progressive design actions you are undertaking.

Two lanes should be able to turn left onto Island from Mecartney. Traffic light is a MUST!

Traffic signal is the only safe way for all

Please do not put a traffic signal there.

Just put a signal light.

Traffic signal would be the best way to ensure the safety of all. Roundabouts work when people are more conscientious of pedestrians and bicyclists. A traffic signal will force people to stop and give way to pedestrians.

Put in a signal with walking signal like in Chinatown on Oakland has

For safety sakes, traffic signals are safer than any other type of changes. A roundabout would be more dangerous. Buses, cars & foot traffic are less likely to be confusing for any type of error

Please put in a light. It is LONG overdue. It is not safe for pedestrians or bikers. And many drivers do not know what to do at the 4-way stop. It's even worse now that the Starbucks is on the corner. PLEASE fix this & put in a stoplight. Thank you for listening.

In the morning, with kids on their way to school, this intersection can become hazardous. Drivers need to be alerted to watch for pedestrians. But I think a traffic light is the only real way to effectively make this busy intersection safe.

Reduced Footprint All-way Stop

If the intersection remains the same, there needs to be crossing guards for students going to and from school. Also, the intersection needs to be narrowed for pedestrians to cross safely.

I prefer a four way stop. This is already there. I am not in favor of a roundabout. I think it would cause more confusion and does not require cars to stop. Many people cross the intersection by foot, and a roundabout would be more confusing for them.

Reduced footprint may contribute to more traffic and impatient drivers during rush hour and overall making it less safe.

I need more information on what a reduced footprint all-way stop is, I can't tell from the pictures. How does it differ from what is there currently?

The "reduced footprint" option seems like a very bad idea for the main ingress/egress to the ferry station.

2 left turn lanes from Mecartney onto Island.

The intersection can take a long-time during commute hours. I don't know what it's meant by reduced footprint all way stop, so I gave it lowest priority. Perhaps explain it?

What is a reduced footprint all way stop?

What is a "reduced footprint all-way stop"?

Alameda has historically been a place with very little traffic calming. With all the new housing, it's only right to put this in. Stop-signs are a well know good and cheap to maintain. No brainer.

Do Nothing

It's like any other intersection. Most people wait their turn others don't. As a pedestrian you just have to make sure they see you just like any other intersection. Not sure why this one is even being targeted for improvement as there are hardly any problems. A reduced footprint and reduction of lanes is going to cause a traffic backup and many times of the day and does not do much to improve pedestrian safety. Seems like that would be a big waste of money and time and make things worse for drivers

Don't make things WORSE for motorists. DON'T reduce the number of lanes. DON'T create a Roundabout.

Might be worth reconsidering after we see how much the new Starbucks increases traffic

Seems to work just fine as is. The city could better spend this money elsewhere.

I have used it since the beginning and I am very satisfied with the way it is!!!!!!

What is the problem that needs to be solved? Aren't there higher priority areas in Alameda?

Stop easing taxpayer money

I have been an Owner/ Resident since 1969. This intersection works fine. Please Do not change it.

Works fine like it is

Leave it alone

A roundabout or lights are both stupid ideas, in fact anything reducing the number of lanes is really stupid. Traffic would back up for hundreds of yards at peak times, leading to aggressive driving, frustrations and WAY MORE ACCIDENTS. There have been two accidents in 11.5 years? Considering the volume of foot and vehicle traffic at this intersection that is excellent. Leave things as they are.

Pedestrian Lights

Please if you have to do something, just add flashing lights for pedestrians. Please don't change it to a roundabout. Roundabout is NOT necessary!

Add pedestrian crossing activated light like on Maitland

It won't let me enter DO NOTHING. I did have a rear ended there as kids were racing in their cars to get to basketball courts and I was stopped for a pedestrian. Maybe a flashing pedestrian sign is all That is needed and police ticket those who don't stop

Just add blinking crosswalk signs

Adding blinking yellow lights at the intersection

It's not safe for kids. You need lights on the ground flashing lights for pedestrians

Flashing pedestrian crossing signs seem to be very effective. If there is a roundabout these should be installed.

Just add light activated pedestrian light. Do nothing and keep current all stop.

Drivers drive too fast along Mecartney, especially. There should be stop signs and crosswalks with flashing lights installed.

Pedestrian lights were not added to the above list which is what most people are advocating for this intersection. This survey can then be misleading.

At the very least, installing button-controlled crosswalk lights for pedestrians that flash to show when people are crossing will improve the safety of the crosswalk (similar to the ones that are already on Island Dr before this intersection).

I live at 924 Island Drive. The ONLY house on that block and I have to make a U-turn every time I go to my house and deal with traffic speeding up out of the intersection when I leave my house. The Starbucks had only exacerbated my issues. A roundabout puts me in increased danger both when I go home and when I leave. My grandchildren often walk to my house. A pedestrian traffic light will keep them the safest.

I have been rear-ended by a young man racing to get to basketball court. I think keeping the interchange the same but putting up blinking light would help. I was waiting for a pedestrian

Flashing lights on the ground for the crosswalk regardless if it is a stoplight, all way stop or turnabout. Pedestrian safety is paramount in this intersection. The foot traffic has increased significantly with the Starbucks and the occasional crossing guard on weekdays is not consistent. When the crossing guard is there, they only help with one corner. They either need to have 2 guards OR they need to help all the kids on each corner.

Can we consider adding a flashing crosswalk instead? The roundabout proposal did not look like it will solve problems. Many people don't know how to drive a roundabout and it might cause more harm than good, especially when there are people crossing the street as well.

Leave as is, but install blinking lights in the crosswalk.

Pedestrian activated lights

Landscaping

Landscape and mole issues

If this is a roundabout, please make sure that the green planting is attractive and don't look neglected. Also, large boulders would help with the visual as well.

Other Intersections or Issues

Garden Road and Island Drive intersection is more dangerous to cross because unexpected u-turn from Island Dr and left turn from Safeway

Please take bay farms needs seriously. Mecartney is in need of sidewalks and improvements like a roundabout 5-way intersection where Maitland meets it.

I'm also very concerned about the crosswalk across Island Drive from Garden Road to Safeway, where I've seen several people get hit.

Unrelated to the current proposal but would love to see funding allocated to improve bike ability and walk ability on the east side of Mecartney

How about a walkover bridge at Mecartney and also at Robert Davey. IMO, that's worse.

Changes to this intersection are overdue. But they need to be accompanied by changes to Mecartney to reduce width and slow traffic coming into the Island intersection. It should be reduced to two travel lanes instead of four with roundabouts at Belmont

I'm sure there are other intersections in Alameda that need to be upgraded. Please use the city's funds there first. I have never had a problem at the Mecartney/Island intersection and I use it all the time. Motorists are very considerate. Fernside and Central is another example of very heavy 4-way traffic that manages just fine with just stop signs.

This is a waste of tax payers' money. We need to put our money towards hiring more police officers.

I have never seen problems at this intersection. Is this a high-accident location? I think the lack of pedestrian connection between the two parts of the lagoon trail over Robert Davies is a much higher safety priority.

What would be even better is some speed enforcement on McCartney and raised, lit cross walks! I have seen multiple people nearly be murdered trying to cross McCartney when one lane stops and the other lane has cars doing 45+.

This project should extend to the other traffic stop where many people run stop signs on the 5-way intersection on Mecartney / Melrose / Maitland just SE of this project. I hope you will consider this since, well, there are more traffic offenders, and bad behaviors noticed at this artery. Also, both of these high traffic points should have better lighting at night. Same with Otis / High St, and Otis/Broadway. There are lights at the very end of Maitland at the airport that would be ideal. Thanks for making a left turn light on Otis and Broadway, another should be added to high street and Otis. Kudos to your team for that!!

I'm even more concerned about the Mecartney/Melrose/Maitland intersection.