

From: [J.W.T. Meakin](#)
To: [City Clerk](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [John Knox White](#); [Tony Daysog](#)
Cc: [Pat Potter](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed multimodal bridge on West end of island.
Date: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 3:01:48 PM

I am writing to support the proposed bike/pedestrian bridge between the West End of Alameda and Oakland.

I trust it will be open to e-bikes, e-trikes, wheelchairs and other personal transport devices for the disabled.

A number of factors, one of which we hope is temporary, point to the usefulness of such a bridge:

Roads are already congested, and pedestrians and cyclists use far less road space than motor vehicles.

The climate is kind, so an outdoor route will be pleasant to use much of the year.

Covid-19 has made mass transit dangerous, and recent findings point to rideshares and taxis as sources of contagion. So the only safe way to get on and off the island right now is isolated in a private car. CV-19 won't last, but there was a major flu epidemic two years ago and there will be more.

A multimodal bridge could assist greatly in evacuation caused by a major seismic event, which we know is going to happen some time.

Of course, the usefulness of the bridge will be determined in large part by travel patterns on the Oakland side. Connections to mass transit will be crucial.

Yours,

JWT Meakin.

From: [Jody Linick](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Council Meeting 11/17, Item 6-A (OAAP)
Date: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 1:37:39 PM

Dear Clerk,

I support our city's position on the Oakland Alameda Access Project. I believe it should be approved with reasonable conditions. As is, the project does not sufficiently improve the experience of bicyclists and pedestrians crossing the estuary. Another substandard Tube walkway is not enough of an improvement, given the focus and scale of this decades-long project, and given the pressing need for better bicycle and pedestrian access here.

BTW, have you gone through the tunnel or tube lately? We left Alameda and went into Oakland yesterday, and I noticed the bike path was covered with garbage and litter. There is no way a bike could ride through without the rider dismounting, let alone a pedestrian walking through without carefully stepping over and around piles of garbage.

I would like to see progress on the bike and pedestrian bridge included as part of this project because:

- It is the only solution that will fix the critical, long-standing gap in the bicycle network between West Alameda and Oakland with a safe, standards-compliant, 24x7x365, convenient, enjoyable, and socially equitable facility;
- It is projected to reduce vehicle trips by 45-50K a week over OAAP's walkway proposal, reducing energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions; since transportation contributes 70% to GHG emissions in Alameda, being able to make climate-friendly transportation choices across the estuary is very important to me and our future;
- Along with (possibly) BART, it will be the only new transportation infrastructure connecting Alameda and Oakland, since there will be no more automobile connections, ever; I am concerned about growth, congestion, and resiliency on our island and recognize that this will be one of the few ways to address those issues;
- Our local economies and cities would benefit greatly from a state of the art, world-class, iconic, architectural focal point like this bridge, and the foot traffic it will generate;
- The bridge design is feasible and is already listed in multiple regional planning documents on both sides of the estuary; it just needs funding for the next studies to move forward -- let's not delay!

Thank you for your consideration,

Jody Linick
1206 Otis Drive

From: [Lena Tam](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [John Knox White](#); [Jim Oddie](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Oakland Alameda Access Project-Perfect should not be the enemy of the Good.
Date: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 10:01:23 AM
Attachments: [image.png](#)

Dear Mayor Ashcraft, Vice Mayor Knox White, and Council Members Oddie, Vella, and Daysog, Pre-pandemic, I commuted daily through the Posey tube for almost three decades to my workplace in Oakland's Chinatown. I am very glad to see that help is in sight for the tube to freeway connectors and that Alameda is in support of the Oakland Alameda Access Project (OAPP). It will mitigate the impacts that I create as a commuter from Oakland to Alameda.

I have personally seen the impact of Alameda's traffic on Chinatown's streets. In fact, I was a witness to the tragic car/pedestrian accident in 2002 that finally led to a community movement to create Alameda County's first scramble <https://sf.streetsblog.org/2009/01/13/eyes-on-the-street-history-of-oakland-chinatowns-barnes-dance/> When I was on the Alameda City Council, the predecessor project, "Broadway-Jackson Interchange," was considered and languished due to lawsuits and lack of funding. As Alameda Point is on its 4th or 5th developer, local cost share funding for the project becomes even more uncertain. We have an opportunity now to help create safer complete streets in Oakland Chinatown with the Measure B and BB funding.

Let's not hold the project hostage with Condition #2 in the letter which conditions Alameda's support of OAAP upon a commitment by the Alameda CTC to fund a report and documents for the Alameda Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge. (see below screen shot)

Condition #2. Bicycle and Pedestrian Access Improvements. This project does not meet the commitment for multimodal improvements between Oakland and Alameda and Alameda Point made to voters who supported Measure BB in 2014. Therefore Alameda's support for the project is conditioned upon a commitment by the Alameda CTC to lead the next steps in the regional effort to build a bicycle and pedestrian bridge between the two cities and to fund a Project Study Report (PSR) (estimated cost \$1.4 million) and Project Approval/Environmental Document phase (estimated cost \$4.4 million) for the Oakland to Alameda Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge.

While I have consistently supported bike lanes (Shoreline) and support studying the proposed Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge, I am against any delays which this condition may cause on the OAAP timeline. Chinatown residents have had to endure the pollution, traffic congestion and overall safety issues caused by Alameda traffic long enough. Please move this project forward for the safety of our neighboring community.

/s/ Lena Tam

Former Alameda Vice-Mayor/Councilmember

From: [Cameron Holland](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [John Knox White](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Jim Oddie](#); [Tony Daysog](#)
Cc: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public Comment on CC 11/17 Agenda Item 6-A
Date: Monday, November 16, 2020 11:48:36 PM

Mayor Ashcraft and City Council members:

This comment is in support of Mayor Ashcraft's letter regarding the Oakland Alameda Access Project at agenda item 6-A.

I live in the East End of Alameda and work in Old Town Oakland. I prefer to bicycle to work; however I am not a "strong and fearless" bicyclist. I am most likely to bike to work on a nice day when I have energy and time and feel up to the stress of navigating my route.

Currently, my bicycle route to Oakland takes me over the Park Street bridge (walking my bike in the pedestrian lane), through a nerve-wracking Jingtletown maze, and along the Embarcadero to Old Town. The route is stressful enough that I am more likely on most days to hop into my car to make the trip rather than go by bike.

The OAAP proposal to widen a walkway in the Webster Tube would not alleviate this stress. Biking in either the Webster or the Posey tube is noisy, dirty and uncomfortable, worse even than my current commute. Minor improvements there would not change my habits.

A bike/ped bridge connecting Alameda to Oakland across the Estuary would not only make my bicycle commute less stressful, but it would be an attraction *encouraging* me to bicycle to and from work. And that would be one less car vying to get on and off the Island during commute hours. I assume my situation is not unique.

In sum, a commitment by the CTC to lead and fund progress on a bike/ped bridge, even at the expense of the Webster walkway enhancements, would be a step in the right direction to reduce congestion on both the West AND the East Ends of Alameda and to meet our climate goals of reduced greenhouse gases. I fully support Mayor Ashcraft's letter.

Thank you for your attention,
Cameron Holland



2020 Board of
Directors

Serena Chen
President

Lena Tam
Vice President

Kenneth Pon
Treasurer

Marilyn Ng
Secretary

At-large members

Rev. Gregory Chan

The Hon. Suzanne
Lee Chan

Dr. Stewart Chen

The Hon. Benny Lee

Harris Mojadedi

Ces Rosales

The Hon. Sheng
Thao

Julie Yim

P.O. Box 223
San Leandro, CA
94577-0022



www.apacaucus.org
www.facebook.com/apacaucus

To: The Honorable Mayor Ashcraft, Vice Mayor John Knox White, and council members Vella, Oddie, and Daysog
Re: ACTC Letter from Mayor on OAAP
Date: November 17, 2020

The City of Alameda's letter to the ACTC should not make the approval of the OAA Project contingent upon the ACTC's commitment to a future Pedestrian/Bike bridge project. While we agree that the changes to the bike/pedestrian walkway are insufficient, we understand that making the tubes, designed in 1927, safe for pedestrians and bicyclists would be cost prohibitive. We respectfully ask that the merits of the OAA Project should be considered separately from Ped/Bike bridge. I am writing as a 23 year long resident of Alameda and as the president of the Asian Pacific American Democratic Caucus of Alameda County.

Oakland Chinatown has been suffering the repercussions of Alameda's traffic for over 60 years since the addition of the Nimitz Freeway 1-880 section which created a circuitous route between the tube and the freeway which cut off everything west of 7th street from the rest of Chinatown – like the Chinese Garden Park and single family homes sandwiched between the pollution of the freeway and the impatient traffic from Alameda on its way to 1-880.

Since Chinese first settled in Oakland in 1850 --170 years ago, they and subsequent Asian immigrants have been subject to overt racism – the first two settlements were burned and residents driven out until they were finally able to settle into the area surrounding 8th and Webster in 1880. Despite all this, the community grew and expanded all the way to the waterfront – which was halted by the decision to build the Nimitz straight through the residential blocks in the 1950s, destroying 2,000 housing units, including my late father-in-law's family home. (see photo below)

No one represented the interests of the Chinese/Asian community in the 1970's when city officials decided on the location of the new BART headquarters which resulted in 50 Chinese families losing their homes. The new Laney College and Oakland Museum further boxed in Chinatown.

It is no accident that Oakland Chinatown is the most polluted neighborhood in Oakland and has the highest rate of pedestrian-automobile accidents. And yet it is home to many elderly seniors and newer immigrant families who value the proximity to multi-lingual health, mental health, and social service providers; churches; the cultural center; and, of course, familiar foods. It is a touchstone for many Asian Americans throughout the East Bay, including Alameda which is home to over 25,000 Asians, many of whom would be very disappointed to know that their city would use approval of a much needed project to provide relief for Chinatown as leverage to convince the Alameda County Transportation Commission to support a separate bike/pedestrian bridge. The bridge's merits deserve to be argued separately.

Most recently the anti-Chinese hysteria fueled by our national leadership caused Chinatown businesses to be attacked and boycotted – this after reeling from a decade of overflow street protests from City Hall over racial injustice.

Those who value Oakland Chinatown, which is among one of longest surviving Chinatowns in the United States, need to recognize that we need to support the OAA Project without contingencies to a completely separate in-the-future project. It is not fair, and it completely ignores the long history of social injustice that Chinatown has had to face and continues to face.

It is our hope that the City Council approves the OAA Project to demonstrate what racial equity looks like in 2020. Chinatown has waited 30+ years for relief from the traffic congestion and pollution burden that Alameda has caused. Please do no more harm and approve the project.

Sincerely,



Serena Chen

President, APA Democratic Caucus of Alameda County



The Lim Sing family. Most of the children in this photo eventually moved to Alameda where many of their children now live -- in the areas not red-lined.

From: [Denyse](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Written comments on item 6A
Date: Monday, November 16, 2020 9:00:28 AM

Good morning, Ms. City Clerk,

Can you please pass the below comments on to our City Council in reference to item 6A on tomorrow's City Council agenda? Thank you

Denyse

+++++

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

Thanks for taking the time to read my thoughts on staff's draft letter from the City of Alameda to ACTC in response to ACTC's draft EIR on the OAAP project. First, I want to thank our staff for writing this GREAT letter. It's thoughtful, well-researched, and holds true to the direction that Council has given. The letter is also consistent with our stated goals in our General Plan and Climate Plan. I wholeheartedly support the letter, and hope you do too.

I know you're going to hear from a lot of people from Oakland saying that this project should move forward with Alameda's unconditional support because of the historical investment inequities in the Chinatown and JLS communities. I wholeheartedly agree that those neighborhoods deserve additional safety treatments, and don't deserve to be treated as Alameda's on and off ramps. And while I support additional investment in these neighborhoods, please don't forget that Alameda's West End also has a traditionally underserved, and underfunded population. Not only is there inequity in economics between our east and west end residents, but there's also traditionally been inequity in safe infrastructure investment, which you have the opportunity here to address. The east end has four ways to walk or bike off the main island in relative safety, while the west end has none. Two of our most recent pedestrian fatalities were in the west end. And, as you'll see in the Active Transportation Update, the Webster street corridor, heading to the tube, is one of the highest injury corridors in the City. That infrastructure inequity, coupled with the fact that the vast majority of new housing is on the west end, and the trend to load up the west end with more housing is likely to continue with the failure of Measure Z makes it crystal clear that we need a safe way on and off the west end that isn't car-dependent. This is a rare chance for you to make sure that Alameda secures the active transportation funding committed to her so that we can invest in our traditionally underserved communities on the west end.

I also wanted to comment on a change that was made to the original version of this letter, per direction from the Transportation Commission. The initial letter stated that the City of Alameda would not be opposed to re-directing the \$7.4M proposed for the Webster path retrofit and redirect that funding to the next two bridge studies, which total approximately \$6M. The Transportation Commission asked that this suggestion be removed because they felt that Alameda should have both, the path AND the money for the bridge studies. While I applaud their optimism, I'm not sure that we can realistically expect that we won't need to give up something when you consider what's happening to our transportation funding for the very near future. I support staff's original offer to forgo the path in favor of the studies. The path is useless, at least from a transportation perspective. If Caltrans wants to build it as a mitigation

during construction, or for emergency egress for drivers, we're not opposed to it, but I think we should also be realistic, and be ok with giving it up.

The critical point of staff's letter is that it conditions our support for OAAP on **identified, committed, FUNDING sources**. We can't settle for supporting this project in exchange for a promise that the bridge studies will be fast-tracked. We can't settle for supporting this project in exchange for commitments from ACTC that they'll support the bridge studies going forward. We need **committed, identified FUNDING**. I've been advocating for this bridge for many years, and I know there are relatively few people who are opposed to the bridge. Getting the bridge added to various plans and getting people to sign petitions saying we need this is easy. But this is one of the very rare chances we have to secure ACTC's commitment to funding what this project was supposed to deliver, a multi-modal estuary crossing.

Thank you for your time and attention, and again, I urge you to support staff's letter as written.

Denyse Trepanier
BWA board member

From: [Catherine .E](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] OAAP
Date: Sunday, November 15, 2020 6:35:50 PM

Dear Clerk,

I am writing to request that at the upcoming City Council meeting, the Council members approve the OAAP with the condition that key bike-pedestrian studies get funded as part of the OAAP. Advancing the Bike-Ped bridge will make this the multimodal corridor the voters were promised.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Catherine Egelhoff

From: [johnsen_cyndy](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [John Knox White](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Jim Oddie](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment for Item 6-A, City Council Meeting on 11/17
Date: Sunday, November 15, 2020 5:05:58 PM

To:
Mayor Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft
Vice Mayor John Knox White
Councilmember Malia Vella
Councilmember Jim Oddie
Councilmember Tony Daysog

Re: Item 6-A, OAAP

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and Councilmembers,

I am a West End resident who travels to and from Oakland frequently, and a Boardmember of Bike Walk Alameda. I support the city's recommendation on OAAP, as described in its letter.

I recognize the benefits of OAAP, but I feel it needs to do more to fulfill its promise to voters of enhancing multimodal connectivity across the estuary. This corridor is famously devoid of standard bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, an issue that has warranted serious attention for many years. OAAP is likely to be the only project of magnitude that focuses on this corridor for a while, and with its charter, it would be a travesty if it fell short for two very important and long-neglected modes: walking and biking.

Between the noise and poor air quality in the tubes, the pathway that pedestrians and bicyclists currently use is basically a health hazard. We wouldn't ask car drivers to submit to an experience like that. Why is it acceptable for people who aren't in vehicles, whether by choice or financial circumstance, to submit themselves to an experience like that?

Proposing a similar path in the Webster Tube as the multimodal 'enhancement', as OAAP does, is woefully inadequate. OAAP should, at a minimum, be advancing a solution that does not jeopardize people's health and safety if they walk or bike.

I support the city's condition that OAAP advance the bike and pedestrian bridge because in so doing, the project will fulfill its multimodal commitment. And of all the bike and pedestrian solutions studied for this corridor, the bridge will be most impactful. Apparently, it would be so popular that it could reduce vehicle trips through this corridor by 45,000-50,000 trips a week!

Mode shift at this scale could be transformational for Alameda. Enabling so many people to make better transportation choices, and live less car-dependent lives will positively impact the environment in a number of ways, while giving us greater flexibility around land use decisions. Traffic congestion and the pressure for parking

space will be reduced as more residents can reconsider car ownership. As our island's population grows, these benefits will compound.

Oakland will not allow another car bridge, but they welcome a bike bridge. It's already in a number of key local and regional planning documents. And we now know a bike bridge is technically feasible. If the Coast Guard is willing to partner on this and revisit its default requirements, bridge costs could be reduced dramatically. So let's get on with it and take the next steps. Let's take OAAP as the opportunity that it was billed as, and move the bike bridge forward. The bike bridge needs funding for studies, an amount which is just a small fraction of OAAP's overall cost. In the event that OAAP funding is limited though, and trade-offs need to be made, reconsidering project elements that are costly and of very marginal value—like the proposed new walkway—might be worthwhile. Most of us won't use that walkway, anyway. We'd rather see expedited progress on the bike bridge, in the hopes of actually riding across it within the next decade.

Thank you to city staff and leadership for their work and vision on this vitally important issue.

Sincerely,

Cyndy Johnsen

To: Mayor Ashcraft, Vice Mayor John Knox White, Council Members Daysog, Oddie, and Vella

From: Patricia Potter, Community Action for a Sustainable Alameda and Bike Walk Alameda

Re: Agenda Item 6a – Support for Mayor’s letter in support of OAAP Project contingent upon agreement by Caltrans and ACTC to condition No. 2, Bicycle and Pedestrian Access Improvements

The Mayor’s conditional support of OAAP is required in order to uphold the City’s commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions from gasoline powered cars. The only way to significantly reduce the number of vehicles going on and off the island is by providing a bicycle and pedestrian bridge. Car traffic will not be reduced by offering a substandard path through the Webster Tube.

The City recognized the urgent need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions when it unanimously passed the Climate Emergency Declaration of March 2019. Every Plan passed that relates to transportation and climate in the past few years has emphasized transportation as the most important factor in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Here are a few direct quotes from these plans:

General Plan Update, November 2020, Conservation + Climate Action Element

“Reduce greenhouse gas emissions from Transportation...and specifically encourage walking and bicycling. (CC-9 p. 06)

“Over 70% of Alameda’s greenhouse gas emissions are from Alameda’s vehicle trips.” (p. 60)

Climate Action and Resiliency Plan, September 2019

“Creating transit alternatives like bike routes and ferries that allow Alamedans to avoid the Webster and Posey Tubes not only reduce GHG emissions from cars, but also make Alamedans less reliant on those flood-prone transportation routes. (p. 4)”

“The first priority is to create transportation options that make it sensible for Alamedans to choose walking, biking, or transit over driving alone.” (p. 16)

For Alameda to reach net zero emissions: “First, the City will have to adopt or accelerate large-scale transportation projects that reduce solo driving, such as...a new estuary crossing for bicyclists and pedestrians.” (p. 42)

Transportation Choices Plan, January 2018

“Goal 1- Estuary Crossings: Decrease drive alone trips at estuary crossings, especially in the peak period.”(p. 4)

“Climate Change: Provide programs and strategies that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.” (p.19)

Please support Agenda Item 6a: Recommendation Authorizing the Mayor to Sign a Letter of Support for the Oakland Alameda Access Project (OAAP)

#####

From: [Pat Potter](#)
To: [City Clerk](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [John Knox White](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Jim Oddie](#); [Tony Daysog](#)
Cc: dave@bikeeastbay.org
Subject: [EXTERNAL] City Council Mtg. 11-17-20, Comment on Agenda Item 6A, Recommendation Authorizing the Mayor to Sign a Letter of Support for OAAP
Date: Thursday, November 12, 2020 3:05:59 PM
Attachments: [We sent you safe versions of your files.msg](#)
[BWA BEB Letter OAAP Oct 2020 \(1\).pdf](#)

Mimecast Attachment Protection has deemed this file to be safe, but always exercise caution when opening files.

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and Councilmembers:

BWA supports the city's letter and would like to share with you the comments we submitted to ACTC in regards to the OAAP DED in October. We also had over 500 people sign our related petition, and invite you to review it and the comments people made here: <https://www.thepetitionsite.com/520/040/300/your-support-for-the-estuary-bike-pedestrian-bridge-needed-now/> . Thank you for your consideration."

Thank you,
Pat Potter
President
Bike Walk Alameda



October 26, 2020

Alameda CTC
1100 Broadway
Suite 800
Oakland CA 94607

Re: Revised Comments on Oakland Alameda Access Project

Dear Alameda CTC:

We thank Alameda CTC staff for providing feedback and meeting with us to discuss our earlier letter of October 19. In response, we provide the following updated response to the draft EIR for the Oakland Alameda Access Project (OAAP) to better reflect our concerns and understanding of the project.

Bike East Bay and Bike Walk Alameda have been closely involved in your development of the OAAP over the past several years and we appreciate the time you have committed to meet with us and discuss our concerns about bicycle and pedestrian access with this project. We also appreciate your prior commitment that allowed us to complete a feasibility study for a bike-ped bridge over the Oakland Estuary, which is our highest priority part of this project. We are encouraged to learn of the complete feasibility of a bike-ped bridge and look forward to hearing your ideas for advancing the final design and ensuring that the OAAP is truly a multimodal project when it comes to connecting Alameda and Oakland. We also appreciate your commitment to include a two-way cycle track on Oak Street with this project and we want to see that bikeway built before any other construction activity happens to ensure safety.

That said, we retain our concerns with the over-emphasis on cars with this project but for the following reasons are staying engaged in hopes that our concerns will be addressed. OAAP as envisioned in the DEIR does little to improve multimodal connectivity and access across the Oakland Estuary, which is what voters were promised when they approved the allocation of Measure BB and B funding almost 30 years ago. This is a critical shortcoming that needs to be fixed. For this reason, we are looking for your commitment to complete a PSR and PAED for the bike-ped bridge. This should be doable given the relative costs of these studies compared to the overall cost of OAAP. It does not matter to us whether funding to complete these studies comes

from OAAP or from another source. In addition, the project needs to improve the freeway underpasses of 880, and make further pedestrian safety improvements in Chinatown, as requested by Chinatown Coalition and Jack London District. Thank you for verbally committing to improving the pedestrian undercrossings of 880 in our most recent phone call. We look forward to seeing more details about these pedestrian improvements and their cost estimates. Should these deficiencies be addressed, then we can support the project enthusiastically and we hope to do just that.

Bike-Ped Bridge over Oakland Estuary

The proposed Webster Tube walkway is not a true bike-ped enhancement, but rather environmental mitigation and clearance for Caltrans. While maybe improving emergency pedestrian egress for drivers, it does not meet NACTO, or even Caltrans' own standards for a bikeway, or a shared-use facility. Because it will suffer the same issues as the Posey Tube walkway (noise, smell, dirtiness) and be only slightly wider, it will not attract new users, and it won't improve the bike and pedestrian network here in any meaningful way. This corridor needs real solutions for bicyclists and pedestrians, not more of a bad thing.

The bike-ped bridge was considered 'out of scope' for this project, but we feel it should have been included, as it squarely addresses multimodal access and connectivity within this corridor. The recent Estuary Crossing Study shows that by 2030, a bike bridge could induce significant mode shift through this corridor, projecting potentially 8-13% of cross-estuary trips by bike or foot, compared to 0-3% for the proposed Webster Tube walkway. The bike-ped bridge would mean significantly fewer vehicle trips through the corridor versus a walkway (between 45,000-50,000 fewer vehicle trips per week, depending on the alignment chosen), benefitting the broader community in many ways, particularly Chinatown.

We therefore think it's wholly appropriate and necessary, and can support the project, if Alameda CTC clearly identifies funds — approximately \$6M for the PSR and PAED (environmental document) — for the bike-ped bridge, and places it in its Capital Improvement Program. In addition, because of the regional, cross-jurisdictional nature of this project, we urge that Alameda CTC manage the bike-ped bridge project going forward, much as it is managing OAAP, the East Bay Greenway, HOV lanes, freeway interchanges, and many more important priority projects.

Oak Street Cycle Track Bikeway and related bike issues

Thank you for including the Oak Street cycle track in this project and extending its good design up to 9th Street to connect to Lake Merritt BART Station. This is a needed bikeway connection from the Embarcadero into Downtown Oakland and through an area with heavy freeway traffic. We want to make it clear, however, that we do not request a bikeway on 6th Street, as designed into this project. Our preference is to have a bikeway on 7th Street, which will become part of a connection from West Oakland BART to Chinatown and Laney College. We understand the CEQA reasons for including 6th Street in this project, in case for some reason a bikeway cannot be constructed on 7th Street, but 7th Street is our preference, not 6th Street.

Thank you for understanding our concerns and revising the projects to improve bicycling and walking safety, as discussed herein. We look forward to our next conversation with updates and more specifics as we stay engaged.

Sincerely,



Dave Campbell
Advocacy Director
Bike East Bay
dave@bikeeastbay.org

Pat Potter
Patricia Potter
President, Bike Walk Alameda
pat@bikewalkalameda.org

From: [Lilli Keinaenen](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [John Knox White](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Jim Oddie](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Bike bridge
Date: Thursday, November 12, 2020 2:30:09 PM

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

As an avid biker in Alameda, and a concerned citizen for climate change, and someone who follows the local "there's too much traffic" complaints, I think an important part in growing Alameda is to provide a way for people to bike to Oakland & further out that doesn't include a bus, or biking on slippery bridges, or, the horror of horrors, taking the tube (I myself attempted this once, only to turn back halfway, it made me feel physically ill).

I am supporting Bike Walk Alameda's goal: we are asking council members to approve *with the condition that key bike-pedestrian bridge studies get funded* as part of OAAP. We feel advancing the bike-ped bridge will make this the multimodal corridor project the voters were promised.

Alameda could become a cycling haven, but the most impact is to allow "normal" people to commute to the East Bay using bikes, in addition to the bravest spandex warriors who do it now.

Cheers,

Lilli Keinaenen

cell: (415) 489 8223

email: lilli.keinanen@gmail.com

From: [Donna Eyestone](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [John Knox White](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Jim Oddie](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Council Meeting 11/17, Item 6-A (OAAP)
Date: Thursday, November 12, 2020 10:12:43 AM

Dear Councilmembers,

As someone who has been actively involved in Bike Walk Alameda for many years, and a person who regularly walks, bikes and scoots as my main transportation means, I'm in support of any project that makes our roads safer. I support our city's position on the Oakland Alameda Access Project. I believe it should be approved with reasonable conditions. As proposed, the project does not sufficiently improve the experience of bicyclists and pedestrians who need to leave the island. Getting across the estuary is tough no matter which way you go, but it is especially dangerous through the Tube. Making a substandard Tube walkway is not enough of an improvement to make me feel safe biking or walking through the Tube. There are toxic fumes that get trapped in the tube making it a health hazard to spend any amount of time breathing that air.

I would like to see progress on the bike and pedestrian bridge included as part of this project because:

- It is the only solution that will fix the critical, long-standing gap in the bicycle network between West Alameda and Oakland with a safe, standards-compliant, 24x7x365, convenient, enjoyable, and socially equitable facility;
- It is projected to reduce vehicle trips by 45-50K a week over OAAP's walkway proposal, reducing energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions; since transportation contributes 70% to GHG emissions in Alameda, being able to make climate-friendly transportation choices across the estuary is very important to me and our future;
- Along with (possibly) BART, it will be the only new transportation infrastructure connecting Alameda and Oakland, since there will be no more automobile connections, ever; I am concerned about growth, congestion, and resiliency on our island and recognize that this will be one of the few ways to address those issues;
- Our local economies and cities would benefit greatly from a state of the art, world-class, iconic, architectural focal point like this bridge, and the foot traffic it will generate;
- The bridge design is feasible and is already listed in multiple regional planning documents on both sides of the estuary; it just needs funding for the next studies to move forward let's not delay!

Thank you for your consideration,
Donna Eyestone

From: [Becca Wernis](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [John Knox White](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Jim Oddie](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Council Meeting 11/17, Item 6-A (OAAP)
Date: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 8:01:56 PM

Dear Councilmembers,

Hi, I'm Rebecca, a new west Alameda resident (as of a couple months ago) who is rapidly falling in love with the island and loves to explore on foot and by bicycle. I also commute to Berkeley a couple days a week, and as much as I love Alameda, I've been pretty disappointed with my options for getting off the island without a car.

I support our city's position on the Oakland Alameda Access Project; I believe it should be approved with reasonable conditions. As is, the project does not sufficiently improve the experience of bicyclists and pedestrians crossing the estuary. Riding through Posey Tube was the most unpleasant experience I have ever had on a bike and I will never do it again. For \$7 million, any "improvement" to Webster Tube is not going to affect my transportation choices or those of thousands of others who would love to walk or bike between West Alameda and Jack London Square but cannot given the available options.

The proposal for Webster Tube is a distraction. We urgently need progress on the bike and pedestrian bridge, and including that as part of this project would go a long way towards making it a truly "multimodal" project.

The bridge is the only solution that will provide a safe, standards-compliant, enjoyable mode of bicycle and pedestrian transport that people will actually use! It is projected to reduce vehicle trips by 45-50K a week over OAAP's walkway proposal, reducing energy consumption, greenhouse gas emissions, and congestion on the island while dramatically benefiting our local economies. The bridge design is feasible and is already listed in multiple regional planning documents on both sides of the estuary; it just needs funding for the next studies to move forward. Let's not delay!

Thank you!
Rebecca Wernis
463 Buena Vista Ave

From: [Davis Straub](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [John Knox White](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Jim Oddie](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Council Meeting 11/17, Item 6-A (OAAP)
Date: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 5:47:18 PM

Dear Council members,

I support the city's position on the Oakland Alameda Access Project.

But let's get real here, the Posey Tube totally sucks for pedestrians and cyclists. The proposed "improvements" will not encourage anyone to spend any time breathing the fowl air in that underground hell hole.

I've ridden my bike many times from the west end over to Oakland and Richmond, and, of course, I always go to the Park Street bridge. There is no way in hell I'm ever going to go through that disgusting tube.

If any one is serious about encouraging people to ride from Alameda to Oakland (say to the Bart station) then they have to make the ride safe and enjoyable. On a bike you are not protected inside a little capsule. You experience the environment in all its glory and its not so glorious self.

We can continue with our self destructive ways or we can act like our species has some intelligence left.

Let's get the bridge on the west end built.

Thanks for your consideration and forbearance.

Davis Straub
<http://ozreport.com>

From: [Jonathan Randell](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] item 6A
Date: Tuesday, November 10, 2020 2:04:58 PM

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

Thanks for reading my thoughts on opening up the Webster tube path for bikers and pedestrians. I've never been involved in any advocacy work before, and have never addressed any boards or councils before now either, but this issue has forced me to speak up. I've lived in Oakland for most of my life, until I was fortunate enough to land here in Alameda. I've also been a bicycle mechanic in the east bay for over 30 years, including a few stints at Alameda Bicycle over the years, before my retirement. All this is to say I have a lot of history both with my own bike commutes from the west end of Alameda through the tubes, and have spoken to most everyone else who's had to do it. So I can tell you with 100% certainty that opening up the Webster tube's path does not make the OAAP project multi-modal. The fact that the path had to get some special Caltrans exemption to even be called a path proves that point.

There's never been enough money for bike and ped projects relative to car projects. But whenever there's been a chance to fund more through increased tolls and taxes, the bay area has usually stepped up and chosen to fund what's needed to get people out of cars and build safe bike lanes and paths so that people can get around safely without cars. I know I voted for both measure B and measure BB, because I was told that my money would be spent on a way for people to walk and bike to Oakland from the west end. Now, all these years later, we're being told that we're using a big chunk of that money and redirecting it to another car project? That's a bait-and-switch and I want you to hold those decision makers accountable for using our money how we said we wanted it used. There's been way too many people in power lately who think they can ignore the vote of the people. You KNOW the Webster path won't get anymore drivers out of cars. ACTC's own studies have shown that. Again, I don't have a problem with the project itself. But stealing bike and ped funds to save a few minutes of drivers time is shameful.

I've heard that a lot of folks in Oakland support this project as an equity issue. And I fully support allocating whatever CAR PROJECT funding is available to address those inequities and make Oakland's surface streets safer, especially for the Chinatown residents. But I don't support the gross inequity in taking money from Alameda's most underserved residents (those who suffer the tube paths now) and redirecting that money to solve Chinatown's equity issues. One of Alameda's most recent victims of traffic violence was an unhoused pedestrian near the entrance to the Posey tube. Not funding a safe crossing is an equity issue right here!! It costs the average Californian \$9,500 a year to own and run a car. And right now, you can't get off the west end to Oakland safely without one!! Where's the equity in saddling all of Alameda's west end with that 10k/year burden because you've allowed bike and ped funds to be redirected to another car project?

Please hold this project accountable as a car project and support staff's EIR comments as drafted.

Thank you,

Jon Randell