

From: [Francesca at A.R.M. Team](#)
To: [John Knox White](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tony Daysog](#)
Cc: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] OPPOSITION TO ROUNDABOUT at Island Dr. and McCartney
Date: Tuesday, July 5, 2022 1:32:54 PM
Importance: High

REASONS I, Francesca Battani Strucksberg resident of Harbor Bay Island, owner of 137 Parfait Lane and 127 Asby Bay- OPPOSE THE ROUNDABOUT:

1) It is not needed: With the 4 way stop there are extremely low traffic accidents or pedestrian injuries.

a) Nothing within the past 10 years per the Police Dept.

b) It is one of the safest pedestrian/car intersections in Alameda.

2. Yellow crossing lights embedded in street would be a sufficient addition.

3) Due to the many school children and disabled people crossing the intersection, a roundabout will be more dangerous for all.

3) Current car delays times are short. Delays are as long as the City proclaims: "30 second wait" . Not true. It's more like 5 to 15 seconds depending upon the time of day. Creating traffic bottle neck at peak hours

4) Roundabout construction will take a year. Extremely inconvenient for entire Bay Farm/HBIA. UNACCEPTABLE because there is no need for this disruption and outlay of funds

5. "IF IT ISN'T BROKE DON'T FIX IT!": Spend the enormous amount of money(at least \$300,000) it will cost elsewhere in the City for more needed projects

Sincerely,

Francesca Battani Strucksberg

From: [Gail Payne](#)
To: [Gary Krauss](#)
Cc: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Mecartney/Island Roundabout
Date: Tuesday, July 5, 2022 12:35:31 PM

Gary,

Thank you for your correspondence, and I am copying the City Clerk's office so they can add it to the emails received. Please know that this Mecartney/Island agenda item has been withdrawn for this evening.

Kind regards,

Gail Payne, Senior Transportation Coordinator, City of Alameda (she/her/hers)
510-747-6892 - gpayne@alamedaca.gov

From: Gary Krauss <2contactg@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 5, 2022 12:12 PM
To: Gail Payne <GPayne@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Mecartney/Island Roundabout

Hi Gail

I strongly oppose using a roundabout at this location. It is not warranted to control traffic and exposes pedestrians significant risks.

It is a waste of money. Just because governmental matching funds maybe available, there are a lot of other projects to spend money on improving. Try downtown Park to open up the mess you have completed.

I also suspect you and the city of backroom deals to force this through while ignoring public input against it. I definitely any willing to support legal challenges to block creating a roundabout. The traffic mess you will create trying to build it will last forever.

Consider keeping a reserve fund to unbuild it once accidents and pedestrian injuries start occurring.

Gary Krauss
206 Lagunaria Lane

From: [Rena Palloff](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [John Knox White](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Oppose Bay Farm roundabout
Date: Tuesday, July 5, 2022 12:11:12 PM

I am writing to express my opposition to spending approximately \$6 million to construct a Bay Farm roundabout. I sent an email in advance of the last meeting expressing concern about this. This is a solution in search of a problem -- installing flashing walk lights would promote safe crossing of this intersection. I understand that the Alameda PD reports NO accidents in that intersection in the last 10 years. If that is the case, why is the city seeking to invest a huge amount of money to solve a problem that doesn't exist? Given that Starbucks is on that corner, already creating some traffic overflow, a roundabout would only create a problem where none currently exists. I live in Baywood Village and drive through that intersection almost every day. I have never experienced a problem, even at peak traffic times.

I strongly oppose this project and suggest that the city use that money to repave some of the roads in Bay Farm that are seriously in need of repair.

Sincerely,

Rena Palloff

--

Rena M. Palloff, Ph.D.

Faculty, Capella University, Fielding Graduate University

Consultant, Crossroads West

Whatever you can do, or dream you can, begin it.
Boldness has genius, power, and magic in it. ~ Goethe

From: [Lisa Tang](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Item 5-F - McCartney Roundabout - July 5 2022 City Council Meeting
Date: Tuesday, July 5, 2022 11:27:28 AM

I agree with Ed Sing that the proposed roundabout is not appropriate for the intersection at Island Drive and Mecartney.

Lisa Tang, Bay Farm resident

----- Forwarded Message -----

TO: Alameda City Council

Thank you for the opportunity to provide my comments on the subject project. I previously provided detailed comments to the Alameda Transportation Commission for their March 23, 2022 meeting on this project (see attached detailed comments). Following is a summary of those comments in addition to further comments on the proposed project. Please refer to the attached diagrams for the locations of "A", "B" and "C" at this intersection.

SUMMARY:

a. **What is the safety issue at this intersection that warrants a \$2 million + investment?** The staff report for this meeting notes that intersections on high injury corridors are prioritized for improvement. Yet, neither the Staff Report nor the Consultant's Report identified this intersection as being in a high injury corridor. In fact, few vehicular accidents have occurred at this intersection. Unfortunately, the impression that many residents are left with is that the roundabout is a solution in search of a problem – especially since residents equally favor a traffic light (37%) vs roundabout (38%) at this intersection.

b. **Pedestrian safety will continue to be a factor at locations “A” and “B” even with the roundabout.** I consider the roundabout a “Passive” traffic system with respect to pedestrian and bicycle safety. Yes, it may slow vehicular traffic but it will not stop it for pedestrians, as it does with the current four-way stop, or would with pedestrian signals or traffic lights – which I consider “active” systems. In fact, the pedestrian crossing (“A”) on the west side of Island Drive from the north to the south side of McCartney Rd will be further setback with the roundabout from the intersection, reducing the motorist’s line of sight of pedestrians as motorists proceed from southbound Island Drive onto westbound McCartney than currently available with the four way stop sign. Hence, the safety of pedestrians crossing here will actually be exacerbated - as the roundabout results in a continuous traffic flow vs a full stop with the current four way stop sign or with a traffic light/pedestrian signals.

c. **Traffic within the roundabout will be affected by cars queuing to enter the Starbucks parking lot, exiting the shopping center parking lot onto Island Drive (opposite Starbucks) and entering the shopping center at the gas station with its single lane concept – at any time of day but especially during high traffic time.** Traffic at Starbucks (location “C”) can back up onto Island Drive (see attached photo) at any time of day – not just during morning commute hours. This backup will impede traffic flow within the roundabout as well as traffic trying to enter the roundabout on westbound McCartney in front of Starbucks. A similar situation would exist at the gas station entrance to the shopping center. Finally, traffic from the shopping center (opposite Starbucks) will find it difficult to enter Island drive under the one lane concept (where 3 lanes now exist). Note that the volume of traffic entering and exiting the shopping center will increase significantly if residential units are built there in the future.

d. **Pedestrian signals at locations “A” and “B” were not but should be included as an alternative for consideration.** It is acknowledged that pedestrian and bicycle safety at this intersection is a concern (as evidenced by the use of crossing guards here): crossing “A” facilitates the passage of not only regular pedestrians but also bicycles and school age children; and, crossing “B” has experienced

increased pedestrian use due to the opening of Starbucks. It is recommended that an active safety system such as pedestrian crossing signals be used at "A" and "B" in lieu of a roundabout. This would give pedestrians and bicyclists active control of traffic to cross the intersection instead of solely relying on motorists to slow down or stop for them.

e. Roundabout with Pedestrian Signals should be included as an alternative. This would pair both a passive and active traffic safety system, to address the concerns outlined in paragraphs b and d, above.

f. Roundabouts are no guarantee that motorists will slow down. My personal and other motorist's experiences with roundabouts in California's highly urbanized areas is that they present an even more terrifying experience than a four way stop sign. I frequently use a roundabout in Oakland and have been repeatedly almost hit by cars entering at high speed and failing to yield to those cars already in the roundabout.

g. No decision on traffic safety measures for this intersection should be made without determining and comparing the first and annual maintenance costs for alternatives being considered. No first and annual maintenance cost comparison has been provided for these alternatives. I would suspect that the \$2.3 million first cost for the core elements of the roundabout would exceed the cost of either pedestrian or traffic signals. In this time of limited government funds, no decision on the selection of the roundabout or other alternatives should be made until a cost analysis is performed.

Thank you for your consideration of the above!

Ed Sing

Bay Farm Resident

<EB Mecartney at Island Dr 2022 03 20 AM.jpg><MeCartney Roundabout -
Ed Sing Cmts for Mr 22 2022 Mtg.docx><Roundabout Concept - Eds
Cmts.pdf>

July 5, 2022

Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council of Alameda California

Re: July 5, 2022, Agenda Item 5A, HBI Roundabout

Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is my considered opinion that the Roundabout that has been proposed by Andrew Thomas and his staff for the intersection of Island Drive and Mecartney Road amounts to a boondoggle of the first order, one that, if accepted by the Council, will cost the residents of Alameda **upwards of \$6 million**.

While I am not opposed to roundabouts per se, this particular one cannot be justified by any stretch of the imagination. **Comments from the staff's survey overwhelmingly oppose the proposed roundabout, and instead suggest a preferred solution of installing flashing pedestrian lights.**

As I understand these traffic diverters, their primary purposes are to facilitate the flow of traffic and to reduce the probability of harm. Construction of a roundabout at this location would eventuate in neither a measurable enhancement of the flow of traffic nor a reduction in the number of crashes or injuries. Currently, the four-way intersection with stop signs, is not generating idling beyond what is normal for any brief stop, nor has any data been presented to support a logical concern that excessive amounts of greenhouse gasses are being produced at the intersection of Island Drive and Mecartney Road.

Congestion at this intersection has been, and continues to be, brief and fairly minor, occurring primarily during very brief and limited periods when crossing guards are supervising the school children as they proceed to and/or from Earhart School. A roundabout will not eliminate or reduce this activity. In addition, automobile traffic is significantly heavier during the few minutes of the morning commute when parents are driving through the intersection on their way to drop off their children at Earhart and Lincoln Schools. The crossing by the children will continue to directly require interruption in the follow of traffic twice daily, and their parents' autos will continue to add to the congestion for a few minutes each morning of the school year. So, enhancement of traffic flow by insertion of a roundabout will not be significant, if it occurs at all, when factored over the entire day's traffic cycles even during the few months of the school year.

During the fifty or so years that the intersection has experienced residential traffic flow there have been only rare collisions. And these, to the best of my knowledge, were fairly trivial and did not cause significant injuries, if any. **No data was presented to suggest that the intersection is unsafe as currently configured.** So, enhancement of safety cannot logically be expected to be an outcome of the construction of the contemplated roundabout at this location? We should note that an experienced cyclist was struck and killed while traveling through a traffic circle in Berkeley last April, and another was struck and killed in Lafayette just seven months ago in December.

Mr. Thomas and his staff are arguing that pedestrian crossings will be shorter. Excuse me? Are they actually suggesting that construction of the roundabout will have the effect of narrowing Island Drive and Mecartney Road? That the roundabout will cause the two sides of each street to move closer together, thus shortening the distance pedestrians will travel when

crossing them? There are already pedestrian islands at the midpoints of three of the four streets comprising the intersection.

As alluded to above, another absurdity being put forward by Mr. Thomas and his staff to justify the construction of the roundabout is their projected decrease in greenhouse gases. However, given the insignificant number of briefly idling vehicles during the morning commute period which constitutes about one out of twenty-four hours daily five days a week and only during the months that schools are in session, not to mention the growing prevalence of electric vehicles, it is hard to believe that any reduction in greenhouse gasses would even be measurable, let alone significant, especially when compared with the much greater amount of fumes resulting from the City's ongoing effort to "calm" traffic which is resulting in more congestion and fumes all day long every day of the year related to the currently large number of vehicles idling for extended periods at such intersections as Park and 1) Otis, 2) Alameda Avenue, 3) Central, 4) Santa Clara, 5) Lincoln, 6) Buena Vista, 7) Clement, and 8) Blanding. And that's just at the East end.

If the City is serious about reducing greenhouse gasses by employing roundabouts, we might consider constructing a roundabout at Park and Otis and another at Atlantic and Webster. Also consider eliminating the parklets that might conceivably be benefiting a handful of restaurant owners but that are certainly not serving a practical purpose for the majority of Alamedans, and which continue to contribute to the congestion and fumes from the idling vehicles, especially on Park Street. The congestion caused by the presence of the parklets also significantly degrades the opportunity for optimal emergency responses by police, ambulance, and fire vehicles on Park Street and Webster Street, soon to be two of our city's only remaining crosstown thoroughfares now that Grand Street, at the Mayor's behest, is to be converted into a quiet idyllic lane for her and her wealthy neighbors on Grand Street.

But here is possibly the most inane proposal for the roundabout at Island Drive and Mecartney Road. Mr. Thomas and his staff are proposing that **the center of their roundabout would be a great location for works of art**. And to this end, and perhaps for educational purposes, they might favor a replica of Michael Angelo's *David*, or a life-sized replica of Bronti's *Venus-of-Pietrasanta*. Really? Artwork in the center of a traffic circle. Who could possibly object to the view-blocking placement of eye-grabbing and educational statues in such an innocuous location? I mention these two specific pieces of fine art only to emphasize the absurdity of the proposal.

After considering the several rather silly arguments that Mr. Thomas and his staff have put forward as justifications for constructing a roundabout at Island Drive and Mecartney Road, I believe that we can't escape from classifying the proposed project as a stellar example of a classic boondoggle.

The proposed \$6 million for this project would amount to an enormous waste of public funds that would be better suited to serve the community elsewhere.

Thank you.

Jay Garfinkle

From: [Roxanne Clement](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Roundabout at Island and McCartney
Date: Tuesday, July 5, 2022 10:37:54 AM

I am seriously concerned about your movement toward approving the roundabout at Island and McCartney. Please do not move forward with this idea.

The project costs way too much money (6 million dollars) to remedy a minor problem that can be relieved with the continued use of traffic guards during school hours. That money could be used for other more important projects like lighted pedestrian crosswalks with traffic guards during school hours.

Your study shows that traffic/ accidents/ speeding/ are not issues at this crosswalk. Installing a roundabout will create a visual problem and as an educator who lives and teaches in the area I know that students will not go to an area to cross that is less direct than their current path, especially when running late or after hours when no guard is available. The raised roundabout will create a visual hazard for anyone using the pedestrian crossings.

I am against the establishment of a roundabout installed at McCartney/Island as a potentially dangerous structure that addresses a non-issue.

Roxanne Clement
124 Cork Rd
Alameda, Ca. 94502

From: [Angelina Miley](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] A "do nothing" approach is not the answer for Mecartney/Island
Date: Tuesday, July 5, 2022 8:57:09 AM

Greetings,

A few years ago at the intersection of Mecarteney Rd and Island Dr the lanes were repainted in preparation for a traffic signal. I remember thinking 'well this is a relief I've seen so many near accidents and pedestrians almost hit.' Then, nothing happened. No traffic lights were installed but peak hours were still volatile and ferry riders were using Mecartney like a highway.

Some people still remember the two left turning lanes that were painted from Mecartney to Island and illegally turn left from the middle lane. Some people still don't recognize the Crossing Guard's prescence and aggressively make their way through this intersection.

A "do nothing" approach must be off the table, an action must be taken for all the residents of Bay Farm, but especially for the children and elderly attempting to navigate this too-large intersection. To note that there have been no major casualties at this intersection while willfully ignoring the two that happened just west on Mecartney Rd is dangerous. Please don't assume this hazard will just right itself. **Anything is better than nothing.** A roundabout, a traffic light, something to meter the aggressive and timid alike. As a mother I implore you to help my family and my community. Thank you.

Angelina Miley
1090 Melrose Ave
510-610-9944



From: [Chris Miley](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment on Item 5-F July 5, 2022 Agenda
Date: Tuesday, July 5, 2022 8:25:55 AM

Hello Madam City Clerk,

Please share this comment with the Mayor and Councilmembers on the above referenced item on today's agenda. Thank you!

Mayor Ashcraft and Councilmembers:

I've lived on Bay Farm for the past 12 years and have experienced the challenges of navigating the Mecartney/Island intersection as a motorist, pedestrian, and cyclist. The intersection is far too large and the 4-way stop simply does not function safely/well, particularly during peak hours. I have witnessed numerous occasions, at all times of day, motorists simply do not see or ignore pedestrians crossing this very large intersection.

This intersection serves as part of many kids route to school, especially those biking to school. The crossing guard helps immensely in the mornings, but there are still conflicts and he cannot be out there all day.

I hope your Council can prioritize not just approving in concept a solution to this intersection, but funding and delivering a project for the residents who use this intersection daily. This intersection is poorly designed for today's use and traffic patterns and is an accident waiting to happen.

Sincerely,
Chris Miley

From: [Trish Spencer](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: Fwd: [EXTERNAL] Proposed roundabout on Bayfarm
Date: Monday, July 4, 2022 11:18:00 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: mscynthiabishop <mscynthiabishop@yahoo.com>
Date: Jul 4, 2022 12:40 AM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed roundabout on Bayfarm
To: Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>
Cc:

906 Lilac St
Alameda, CA 94502

Hi Trish,

I am writing you to express my disapproval of the proposed roundabout on Bayfarm. It is an unnecessary and costly expense that could be put to better use elsewhere in our city. Please be my voice in the upcoming council meeting.

Thank you in advance.

Sincerely,
Cynthia Bishop
Alameda resident of 36 years

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: [Trish Spencer](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: Fwd: [EXTERNAL] Please do not put a roundabout in Harbor Bay
Date: Monday, July 4, 2022 11:16:58 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Kathy Jones <kathyjones158@outlook.com>

Date: Jul 4, 2022 9:12 AM

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please do not put a roundabout in Harbor Bay

To: Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>, Malia Vella <MVella@alamedaca.gov>, Frank Matarrese <FMatarrese@alamedaca.gov>, Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>

Cc:

Dear Alameda City Council,

The City Council agenda for Tuesday, July 5th includes authorization for a roundabout in Bay Farm at McCartney and Island Drive. I reviewed the results of the community survey and there is not consensus that this is what the residents want. I drive through that intersection very often and while it is a bit "awkward," it does not need to be converted into a roundabout. That would be a huge waste of \$6 million dollars. I understand this money would come from assessments on the businesses in business park, but this points to the absurdity of how easy it is for the City to raise \$6 million for something the City doesn't need when you could raise approximately double that amount for something the residents actually want.

Frequently, I use a roundabout in Walnut Creek. It is scary to drive on it because the cars get backed because people do not use the roundabout correctly.

I have lived in Harbor Bay for 30 years.

For me, putting in a roundabout is a total waste of funds.

That intersection does not need a roundabout period.

Best Regards, Kathy R. Jones

158 Oak Park Drive, Alameda, Ca. 94502

From: [Susan Natt](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [John Knox White](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Roundabout at Mecartney and Island
Date: Monday, July 4, 2022 10:04:47 PM

My position on this has not changed from the last time this was up for discussion.

It is a complete waste of money.

It's not needed. It will NOT improve anything and it will make more issues now with the Starbucks on that corner. Sometimes cars are lined up for the drive thru and backed up on the road. The roundabout will just make this worse. The money would be better spent fixing Mecartney! The road is in terrible condition with giant pot holes and tree roots.

The park by the harbor bay ferry terminal needs work. The rock wall is eroding and the rocks need to be brought up and replaced. It's slipping down to the bay. With rising sea levels that has to be put back as it was initially intended But no maintenance has been done all these years.

The park itself is overrun with ground Squirrels who have made a million holes making it very dangerous to walk without falling into a hole.

Just waiting to hear about that law suit!!

Anyway those are three more urgent and significant issues that need attention now and a better use of the money.

PLEASE SAY NO TO THE ROUNDABOUT

Thank you,
Susan Natt
Bay Colony Homeowner since 2006

From: [Donna Fletcher](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Malia Vella](#); [John Knox White](#); [Tony Daysog](#)
Cc: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] July 5 City Council Meeting Agenda Item 5-F Mecartney Roundabout
Date: Monday, July 4, 2022 8:50:34 PM

Dear Madam Mayor and Members of the Council,

I am adding my voice to the community members who oppose the installation of a roundabout at the intersection of Island Drive and Mecartney.

I have read Mr. Edward Sing's detailed analysis of the issue (which was sent to you on July 3) and agree that other safety solutions are more effective at this location and should be costed out before proceeding with the vote. These include a traffic light and pedestrian crossing lights.

I also understand that the entire project could ultimately cost approximately \$6 million. If this is accurate, I believe the investment of time and money necessary to complete this project will far outweigh the anticipated benefits.

Please "do not approve the roundabout concept and direct staff to proceed with another approach." My suggestion for "another approach" is to implement the traffic light and pedestrian crossing lights as a first phase solution. Then determine if these actions have sufficiently improved safety conditions at this intersection.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,
Donna Fletcher
112 Centre Court
Alameda, 94502

From: [Sandra Berger](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Roundabout at Island and McCartney
Date: Monday, July 4, 2022 5:20:43 PM

>

> We strongly appose the construction of a roundabout at Island and McCartney. Currently there is a very short wait at that intersection. A roundabout would be dangerous for pedestrians crossing. Many of the people crossing there are children. Roundabouts are for commercial areas. This is a residential area. Construction there is unnecessary. In addition It would be extremely inconvenient for Bay Farm and Harbor Bay residents during reconstruction at that site.

>

> Paul and Sandra Berger

> 265 Creedon Circle

>

> Sent from my iPad

From: [Mike Lindstedt](#)
To: [John Knox White](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Mecartney/Island Roundabout
Date: Monday, July 4, 2022 4:33:22 PM

We understand that you are having a meeting on July 5 to discuss a proposed roundabout at the corner of Mecartney and Island. It is our understanding that the City of Alameda's staff/consultant team estimates that the Mecartney/Island roundabout concept would cost approximately \$5.9 million. This proposal is outrageous.

1) We do not need this roundabout. We live in Harbor Bay very close to this intersection and drive through this intersection almost every day - mornings, mid-day, evenings, week day and weekends. There has rarely ever been a significant queuing of cars while using this intersection. Roundabouts serve a useful purpose where there is a heavy traffic density, e.g. 880 Freeway entrance just recently constructed. This roundabout is in no way required at the Mecartney/Island intersection.

2) This cost is totally extravagant and is totally wasteful wherever the funding comes from, municipal or private. Paying for this from the collection of building permits in the Business Park or in the residential areas of Harbor Bay is a total misuse of funds for citizens of Harbor Bay or Business Park owners. This \$5.9 million could be far better spent by addressing the affordable housing needs of Alameda residents.

Mike and Janice Lindstedt
Harbor Bay residents

From: [kittylin22](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Roundabout at Mecartney and Island
Date: Monday, July 4, 2022 9:19:17 AM

Sent from my Galaxy

Hello,

I have been a resident on Bay Farm for over 35 years. I believe constructing a roundabout at this intersection is a big mistake and an enormous waste of taxpayers money. This will do nothing to improve traffic. It does not even need improving. Please vote no to this proposal. Instead repave Harbor Bay Parkway and Veterans Court. Those two streets are a disaster.

Linda Stone
105 Payot Ct
Alameda, CA 94502

Sent from my Galaxy

From: [Marie Kane](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [John Knox White](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Bay Farm Roundabout
Date: Monday, July 4, 2022 8:09:12 AM

Dear Mayor and City Council,

Please do not vote to put a roundabout at Maitland and Island Drive. It would not be a wise decision for this residential neighborhood crossing. It would decrease the safety of our pedestrians especially our children and seniors.

Please come out here to observe this residential intersection and its traffic and pedestrian flow before voting. A normal traffic light with times for pedestrian crossings would be much more appropriate and safe. Many, many children cross this intersection to go to school.

Thank you.
Marie Kane

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Edward Sing](#)
To: [John Knox White](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Lara Weisiger](#)
Cc: [Bill Pai](#); [Dawn Jaeger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 5-F - McCartney Roundabout - July 5 2022 City Council Meeting
Date: Sunday, July 3, 2022 4:41:59 PM
Attachments: [We sent you safe versions of your files.msg](#)
[McCartney Roundabout - Ed Sing Cmts for Mr 22 2022 Mtg.pdf](#)
[Roundabout Concept - Eds Cmts.pdf](#)

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

TO: Alameda City Council

Thank you for the opportunity to provide my comments on the subject project. I previously provided detailed comments to the Alameda Transportation Commission for their March 23, 2022 meeting on this project (see attached detailed comments). Following is a summary of those comments in addition to further comments on the proposed project. Please refer to the attached diagrams for the locations of "A", "B" and "C" at this intersection.

SUMMARY:

a. **What is the safety issue at this intersection that warrants a \$2 million + investment?** The staff report for this meeting notes that intersections on high injury corridors are prioritized for improvement. Yet, neither the Staff Report nor the Consultant's Report identified this intersection as being in a high injury corridor. In fact, few vehicular accidents have occurred at this intersection. Unfortunately, the impression that many residents are left with is that the roundabout is a solution in search of a problem – especially since residents equally favor a traffic light (37%) vs roundabout (38%) at this intersection.

b. **Pedestrian safety will continue to be a factor at locations "A" and "B" even with the roundabout.** I consider the roundabout a "Passive" traffic system with respect to pedestrian and bicycle safety. Yes, it may slow vehicular traffic but it will not stop it for pedestrians, as it does with the current four-way stop, or would with pedestrian signals or traffic lights – which I consider "active" systems. In fact, the pedestrian crossing ("A") on the west side of Island Drive from the north to the south side of McCartney Rd will be further setback with the roundabout from the intersection, reducing the motorist's line of sight of pedestrians as motorists proceed from southbound Island Drive onto westbound McCartney than currently available with the four way stop sign. Hence, the safety of pedestrians crossing here will actually be exacerbated - as the roundabout results in a continuous traffic flow vs a full stop with the current four way stop sign or with a traffic light/pedestrian signals.

c. **Traffic within the roundabout will be affected by cars queuing to enter the Starbucks parking lot, exiting the shopping center parking lot onto Island Drive**

(opposite Starbucks) and entering the shopping center at the gas station with its single lane concept – at any time of day but especially during high traffic time. Traffic at Starbucks (location “C”) can back up onto Island Drive (see attached photo) at any time of day – not just during morning commute hours. This backup will impede traffic flow within the roundabout as well as traffic trying to enter the roundabout on westbound Mecartney in front of Starbucks. A similar situation would exist at the gas station entrance to the shopping center. Finally, traffic from the shopping center (opposite Starbucks) will find it difficult to enter Island drive under the one lane concept (where 3 lanes now exist). Note that the volume of traffic entering and exiting the shopping center will increase significantly if residential units are built there in the future.

d. **Pedestrian signals at locations “A” and “B” were not but should be included as an alternative for consideration.** It is acknowledged that pedestrian and bicycle safety at this intersection is a concern (as evidenced by the use of crossing guards here): crossing “A” facilitates the passage of not only regular pedestrians but also bicycles and school age children; and, crossing “B” has experienced increased pedestrian use due to the opening of Starbucks. It is recommended that an active safety system such as pedestrian crossing signals be used at “A” and “B” in lieu of a roundabout. This would give pedestrians and bicyclists active control of traffic to cross the intersection instead of solely relying on motorists to slow down or stop for them.

e. **Roundabout with Pedestrian Signals should be included as an alternative.** This would pair both a passive and active traffic safety system, to address the concerns outlined in paragraphs b and d, above.

f. **Roundabouts are no guarantee that motorists will slow down.** My personal and other motorist’s experiences with roundabouts in California’s highly urbanized areas is that they present an even more terrifying experience than a four way stop sign. I frequently use a roundabout in Oakland and have been repeatedly almost hit by cars entering at high speed and failing to yield to those cars already in the roundabout.

g. **No decision on traffic safety measures for this intersection should be made without determining and comparing the first and annual maintenance costs for alternatives being considered.** No first and annual maintenance cost comparison has been provided for these alternatives. I would suspect that the \$2.3 million first cost for the core elements of the roundabout would exceed the cost of either pedestrian or traffic signals. In this time of limited government funds, no decision on the selection of the roundabout or other alternatives should be made until a cost analysis is performed.

Thank you for your consideration of the above!

Ed Sing

Bay Farm Resident



Comments previously provided Ed Sing, Bay Farm Resident, for the March 23, 2022 Meeting of the Alameda Transportation Commission:

Gail - please forward these comments to the members of the Transportation Commission.
Thank you!

To: Transportation Commission

Thank you for initiating a study to determine the best alternatives for improving safety at this often busy intersection on Bay Farm Island. I offer, below, my comments, observations and questions on this study and the selected alternative of a roundabout.

1. What is the safety issue at this intersection? Based on information provided on accidents at this intersection, there have been few vehicle accidents and no pedestrian /bicycle accidents here. As one commenter noted, promoting the roundabout is a “solution looking for a problem”. The existing four way stop intersection is intended to induce a positive action by drivers to stop and yield to other vehicle, pedestrians and bicycles. Granted, the streets at this intersection are broad. Hence, It is presumed the original intent of the four-way stop here is to ensure safe passage of vehicles – which it has apparently succeeded in doing for years. But the width of the intersecting streets does present some difficulty for pedestrians in their passage crossing the streets.

2. Transportation survey data used in this study:

a. The transportation survey data used in this study is 7 years old (2015) and can hardly be considered to represent prepandemic conditions (that would be 2019). Since 2015, many offices have been constructed in Harbor Bay Business Park – and more are yet to be filled bringing more vehicles into this intersection. Island Drive and Mecartney Road are major thoroughfares for workers commuting to and from the Business Park.

b. The presentation for the March 23rd Transportation Commission meeting notes that 2022 traffic survey data has been included in the transportation analysis. However, neither the data nor the analysis results are presented to the public.

c. The survey data used in this study represents only one day of observations (1/13/2015) The report does not discuss in any detail how this day could be considered representative of “typical” volume of vehicle/pedestrian/bicycle traffic.

d. The survey data also appears to cover only “commute” hours (7-9 AM and 4-6 PM). The study fails to recognize that there are other busy time periods at this intersection including lunch time (business park workers cutting thru Bay Farm to Starbucks and to the Main Island) and after school hours (2:30 – 4 PM). The latter time period being especially critical for the safe passage of school children returning home but not counted in the survey data.

e. The survey data and roundabout design does not reflect the traffic patterns after the construction of Starbucks on the NE corner of the intersection. This includes U-turns made on SB (Southbound) Island Drive; slowing of traffic entering the Island Drive entrance into the store parking lot; the backup of traffic in the left turn lane from EB Mecartney to NB Island Drive queuing for Starbucks (see 3/20/22 photo of queue); and, the backup of vehicle queues from the store entrance into Island Ave traffic lanes (and hence into the proposed roundabout (see location “C” on diagram).

f. The survey data also does not report on the number of “California stop” (slow down but not fully stop, or not even slow down!) vehicles making right turns from SB Island Drive onto WB Mecartney Road as well as WB Mecartney onto NB Island Drive. These drivers pose great safety hazard to pedestrians crossing at those sides of the intersections – and hence the need for school crossing guards both before and after school. Without these crossing guards, traversing these streets would be very hazardous for our children.

3. Online Survey does not give Roundabout Concept a clear Margin of Public Approval: Given that results of the online survey were 38% in favor of the roundabout, 37% for installation of a traffic signal system, 27% for stop signs with reduced traffic lane widths and 17% for the “do nothing” alternative, there is no clear consensus (statistically speaking) of residents favoring the roundabout vs a traffic signal system, with a stop sign with reduced traffic lane widths a relatively close alternative also.

4. Limitations of Traffic Analysis performed by Transportation Consultant: The traffic analysis appears to favor the roundabout alternative – but we need to recognize its limitations based on items and concerns outlined in paragraphs 2 and 3, above.

5. Other drawbacks of the roundabout alternative:

a. Traffic through the roundabout depends upon vehicles in entering streets yielding to traffic already in the roundabout. Given the majority of traffic in the morning is from EB Mecartney to NB Island Drive moving through the roundabout on their way to school or work, how difficult will it be for WB Mecartney Rd and NB Island Drive traffic to enter the roundabout? With the existing 4 way stop sign or traffic signal, traffic does not/would not have this problem.

b. The pedestrian crossing of the west side of this intersection (shown as “A” in the attached diagram) is where the majority of pedestrians cross Mecartney Rd. Although traffic should theoretically slow before coming upon this cross walk with the roundabout alternative, pedestrians will not have the positive safety factor of a stop sign or traffic signal to cause cars to slow or stop for them. In addition, vehicles turning from SB Island Drive to WB Mecartney will not be able to readily see pedestrians crossing as the crossing will be setback to the West from its current location. For this reason, if the roundabout concept is adopted, I urge the Transportation Commission to include a Pedestrian Cross Signal at this location (“A” on the attached diagram) as well as across Island Drive (“B” on the diagram) due to the increased foot traffic at this location due to Starbucks. In addition, the pedestrian Crossing Signal at “A” must be visible from SB Island Drive so that drivers can slow down and stop in time before the crossing.

c. If the principal concern with this intersection is pedestrian safety, there is another alternative: install pedestrian crossing signals (similar to the one which already exists on Mecartney Rd at Leydecker Park) at locations “A” and “B” on the attached diagram.

d. However, if the pedestrian signals are implemented, then you might as well implement a traffic signal system at this intersection.

6. Economic Analysis: It is recognized that there are intangibles related to safety issues which cannot be economically quantified. But given that the roundabout concept will cost in excess of \$2 million for a vehicular safety issue which is not substantiated by accident data and purportedly solves a pedestrian crossing issue which will continue to be a safety issue even with the roundabout (as noted above), the Commission should review the first and annual maintenance costs of all four alternatives before making a decision to move this proposal forward to City Council.

7. Summary:

- a. What is the safety issue at this intersection that warrants a \$2million + investment?
- b. Pedestrian safety will continue to be a factor at locations "A" and "B" even with the roundabout.
- c. The roundabout will exacerbate traffic issues due to its effect on vehicles entering the Starbucks parking lot.
- d. Pedestrian signals at locations "A" and "B" should be included as an alternative for consideration.
- e. No decision on traffic safety measures for this intersection should be made without determining the first and annual maintenance costs for alternatives being considered.

Thank you for your consideration of the above.

Ed Sing

Bay Farm Resident

Mecartney Rd and Island Dr Intersection Improvements

Preliminary Design Subject to Change
Date: February, 2022

LEGEND

- Pavement
- Landscape/Rain Garden
- Existing Landscape
- Pedestrian Facility
- Bike Facility
- Roundabout Apron
- Driveway



From: [Kathleen Valerio](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [John Knox White](#); [Andrew Thomas](#); [Amy Woodriddle](#); [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Cancel Roundabout - buy Harbor Bay Club
Date: Sunday, July 3, 2022 1:03:48 PM

I did not author the message below - but I fully agree with its sentiment. I've rented Heather Farms for my kids' birthday years ago. It's sad that Alameda doesn't have a comparable facility. I see this as a great opportunity to improve Alameda.

Sincerely,
Kathleen Valerio
206 Baywood Rd.

Dear Alameda City Council,

The City Council agenda for Tuesday, July 5th includes authorization for a roundabout in Bay Farm at McCartney and Island Drive. I reviewed the results of the community survey and there is not consensus that this is what the residents want. I drive through that intersection very often and while it is a bit "awkward," it does not need to be converted into a roundabout. That would be a huge waste of \$6 million dollars. I understand this money would come from assessments on the businesses in business park, but this points to the absurdity of how easy it is for the City to raise \$6 million for something the City doesn't need when you could raise approximately double that amount for something the residents actually want.

If you want to allocate money toward a project that would actually benefit the residents of Bay Farm and all of Alameda, you should consider spending money to buy the Harbor Bay Club and turning it into a community recreation center. The club is currently for sale and my understanding is that the asking price is in the range of \$13 million dollars. Alameda does not have a signature recreation center. The club being for sale is an opportunity to remedy this situation and create a community asset of outdoor recreation for all Alamedans!

Heather Farms in Walnut Creek is a great model for what the Harbor Bay Club could become. It is a city owned recreation center that has tennis courts and a swimming pool and is managed by Lifetime Activities. I have spoken with the CEO of Lifetime Activities, Dana Gill, and he said the Harbor Bay Club is a great fit for his company to manage for the City of Alameda. If the City of Alameda will buy the property and commit the funds for a "face lift" of the facility, Lifetime Activities can coordinate the renovation and then manage the facility going forward.

If there is enthusiasm on your part for the City buying the Club, please let me know and I will have Mr. Gill make a presentation on how his company can renovate and manage the facility. Please don't miss out on this amazing opportunity to create an outdoor recreation center for all Alamedans!

From: [Susan Dunn](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [John Knox White](#); [Andrew Thomas](#); [Amy Wooldridge](#); [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Vote NO to the proposed Roundabout in Bay Farm at McCartney and Island Drive. Better ways to spend our money!
Date: Sunday, July 3, 2022 12:34:27 PM

To The Alameda City Council,
I am a resident of Bay Farm Island at 36 Sunny Cove Isle in the Brittany Landing HOA.
I agree with the letter below and intend to confirm my opposition to the roundabout at the Tuesday 7/5 meeting.

Thank You,
Susan and Jeff Dunn

Dear Alameda City Council,

The City Council agenda for Tuesday, July 5th includes authorization for a roundabout in Bay Farm at McCartney and Island Drive. I reviewed the results of the community survey and there is not consensus that this is what the residents want. I drive through that intersection very often and while it is a bit "awkward," it does not need to be converted into a roundabout. That would be a huge waste of \$6 million dollars. I understand this money would come from assessments on the businesses in business park, but this points to the absurdity of how easy it is for the City to raise \$6 million for something the City doesn't need when you could raise approximately double that amount for something the residents actually want.

If you want to allocate money toward a project that would actually benefit the residents of Bay Farm and all of Alameda, you should consider spending money to buy the Harbor Bay Club and turning it into a community recreation center. The club is currently for sale and my understanding is that the asking price is in the range of \$13 million dollars. Alameda does not have a signature recreation center. The club being for sale is an opportunity to remedy this situation and create a community asset of outdoor recreation for all Alamedans!

Heather Farms in Walnut Creek is a great model for what the Harbor Bay Club could become. It is a city owned recreation center that has tennis courts and a swimming pool and is managed by Lifetime Activities. I have spoken with the CEO of Lifetime Activities, Dana Gill, and he said the Harbor Bay Club is a great fit for his company to manage for the City of Alameda. If the City of Alameda will buy the property and commit the funds for a "face lift" of the facility, Lifetime Activities can coordinate the renovation and then manage the

facility going forward.

If there is enthusiasm on your part for the City buying the Club, please let me know and I will have Mr. Gill make a presentation on how his company can renovate and manage the facility. Please don't miss out on this amazing opportunity to create an outdoor recreation center for all Alamedans!

Susan Dunn
36 Sunny Cove Circle
Alameda, CA 94502
510-337-1354 (home)
510-759-9771 (cell)

From: [Linda Woodworth](#)
To: JKWHITE@alamedaca.gov; [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Tony Daysog](#)
Cc: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] VOTE No on Roundabout on Bay Farm
Date: Sunday, July 3, 2022 12:24:08 PM

Dear council members

I don't often reach out about public issues; however, I am now reaching out to ask you to vote No on the proposed round-about on Bay Farm Island.

The cost involved with this work is excessive and unnecessary. The traffic at this intersection is light except in the morning during the school year. While the flow might be improved slightly with the change, to go through the cost for a once day issue is a waste of resources.

Thank you
Linda Woodworth

From: deligato@gmail.com
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Vote No on Roundabout in Bay Farm
Date: Sunday, July 3, 2022 10:51:32 AM

Please vote no on this pointless use of our tax dollars. The intersection is fine the way it is.

Use the money for more police presence and keeping the streets repaired and clean.

Sincerely,
Ben Deligato
135 Justin Circle
Alameda, CA 95402

From: [Trish Spencer](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: Fwd: [EXTERNAL] Mecartney/Island roundabout
Date: Sunday, July 3, 2022 9:02:24 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Skip Hutchison <skipperhutchison@gmail.com>
Date: Jun 30, 2022 9:52 AM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Mecartney/Island roundabout
To: Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>
Cc:

I live on Bay Farm. I am opposed to the roundabout because I think it will make traffic worse. I think it's a waste of city money.

It would be much better to spend the money repaving and filling in the pot holes on McCartney which have become quite a hazard.

James Hutchison
30 Millington Ct, Alameda, CA 94502

From: [Trish Spencer](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: Fwd: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Roundabout at Island Drive and McCartney
Date: Sunday, July 3, 2022 9:00:14 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Jerry Harrison <jerryfromalameda@gmail.com>
Date: Jun 30, 2022 5:05 PM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Roundabout at Island Drive and McCartney
To: Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>
Cc:

I fully support the proposed roundabout at Island Drive and McCartney. My experience with roundabouts in Europe and elsewhere in the US is that they are much smoother and much more convenient to use than a conventional intersection. I understand that there is data showing that they are also safer and more energy-efficient than conventional intersections. Please vote to approve the roundabout. Thank you.

Jerry Harrison
1211 Mound Street
Alameda
510-521-2358

From: [Trish Spencer](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: Fwd: [EXTERNAL] Round about
Date: Sunday, July 3, 2022 8:59:55 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Kristine E Watson <kewatson2019@gmail.com>
Date: Jun 30, 2022 5:52 PM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Round about
To: Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>
Cc:

Hi Trish

I would like you to note that we are firmly against round-abouts at Island Dr and McCartney
I will try to attend Tues mtg. 7/5 also.

We lived one bock to round ' about in Sf. Foresthill neighborhood. It actually caused more
accidents, over the years than the number of events prior to install.
By far much less traffic situation.

See you at Parade

Kristine E. Watson
Robert Lattimore
1510-701-4200

From: [Trish Spencer](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: Fwd: [EXTERNAL] Bay Farms round about
Date: Sunday, July 3, 2022 8:59:39 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Thomas Cipriano <tcip@att.net>
Date: Jun 30, 2022 7:23 PM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Bay Farms round about
To: Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>
Cc:

Please do not proceed with this roundabout. There is no need and this intersection is already on of the safest intersections in Alameda.

There are other intersections that need work, let us proceed with those.

[Sent from AT&T Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

From: [Trish Spencer](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: Fwd: [EXTERNAL] Proposed roundabout at intersection of Mecartney and Island Drive
Date: Sunday, July 3, 2022 8:59:24 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: "Samuel H. Glassner MD" <shgmdinc@comcast.net>
Date: Jun 30, 2022 9:29 PM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed roundabout at intersection of Mecartney and Island Drive
To: MVELL@ALAMEDACA.GOV, Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>, Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>, Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>, JKWHITE@ALAMEDACA.GOV
Cc:

I am a resident of Bay Farm Island and I am opposed to this.

Samuel H. Glassner, MD
152 Tynebourne Place
Alameda 94502

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows



Virus-free. www.avast.com

From: [Trish Spencer](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: Fwd: [EXTERNAL] Roundabout on Bay Farm Island
Date: Sunday, July 3, 2022 8:56:36 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: rodsroost1@comcast.net
Date: Jul 2, 2022 9:48 AM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Roundabout on Bay Farm Island
To: Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>
Cc: mexxyashcraft@alamedaca.gov, jkwhite@alamedaca.gov, mvell@alamedaca.gov, Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>

Trish,

Please talk some sense into these people that want a roundabout at McCartney and Island Drive.

There is no need!!!

Traffic lights would be a better solution. But leaving it like it is would be the best solution,

John Roderick

RodsRoost1@comcast.net



Virus-free. www.avg.com

From: [Trish Spencer](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: Fwd: [EXTERNAL] \$6 million for a Roundabout in Bay Farm???, How about a Community Recreation Center Instead!
Date: Sunday, July 3, 2022 8:56:11 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Jeff Petersen <jeff@allmaneconomics.com>
Date: Jul 2, 2022 12:18 PM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] \$6 million for a Roundabout in Bay Farm???, How about a Community Recreation Center Instead!
To: Malia Vella <MVella@alamedaca.gov>, John Knox White <JknoxWhite@alamedaca.gov>, Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>, Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>, Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>
Cc: Andrew Thomas <athomas@alamedaca.gov>, Amy Wooldridge <AWooldridge@alamedaca.gov>

Dear Alameda City Council,

The City Council agenda for Tuesday, July 5th includes authorization for a roundabout in Bay Farm at McCartney and Island Drive. I reviewed the results of the community survey and there is not consensus that this is what the residents want. I drive through that intersection very often and while is it a bit "awkward," it does not need to be converted into a roundabout. That would be a huge waste of \$6 million dollars (my understanding of how much it would cost).

If you want to allocate money toward a project that would actually benefit the residents of Bay Farm and all of Alameda, you should consider spending money to buy the Harbor Bay Club and turning it into a community recreation center. The club is currently for sale and my understanding is that the asking price is in the range of \$13 million dollars. Alameda does not have a signature recreation center. The club being for sale is an opportunity to remedy this situation and create a community asset of outdoor recreation for all Alamedans!

Heather Farms in Walnut Creek is a great model for what the Harbor Bay Club could become. It is a city owned recreation center that has tennis courts and a swimming pool and is managed by Lifetime Activities. I have spoken with the CEO of Lifetime Activities, Dana Gill, and he said the Harbor Bay Club is a great fit for his company to manage for the City of Alameda. If the City of Alameda will buy the property and commit the funds for a "face lift" of the facility, Lifetime Activities can coordinate the renovation and then manage the facility going forward.

If there is enthusiasm on your part for the City buying the Club, please let me know and I will have Mr. Gill make a presentation on how his company can renovate and manage the facility. Please don't miss out on this amazing opportunity to create an outdoor recreation center for all Alamedans!

Sincerely,
Jeff Petersen
Alameda Resident

From: [Trish Spencer](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: Fwd: [EXTERNAL] I oppose roundabouts in bay farm
Date: Sunday, July 3, 2022 8:54:13 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: grace chang <waimuichang@yahoo.com>
Date: Jul 3, 2022 5:29 AM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] I oppose roundabouts in bay farm
To: John Knox White <JknoxWhite@alamedaca.gov>, Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>, Malia Vella <MVella@alamedaca.gov>, Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>, Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>
Cc:

Hello, I would like to voice my opposition to the proposed roundabouts on Bay Farm Island. I do not believe they will bring value to the community and the funds for a project like this should be used for other purposes on bay farm.

**Thank you
Grace Gossage
10 Bordwell Ct, Alameda**

From: [Paul Beusterien](#)
To: [John Knox White](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] July 5 Council Meeting - Item 5-F Correspondence (Roundabout)
Date: Saturday, July 2, 2022 3:31:47 PM

Honorable Mayor and City Councilmembers:

I'd like to understand how the proposed roundabout is the best use of our available funds, especially in light of the recent substantial increase in projected cost. I believe that a roundabout will make the Island/Mecartney intersection incrementally safer. However, when the proposal was on the council agenda in March, I wasn't sure that incremental safety was the best we could do with the projected \$2 million cost. Now that the projected total cost has risen to \$5.9 million, I'm even less certain.

From the staff report:

Regarding costs, the staff/consultant team estimates that the Mecartney/Island roundabout concept would cost approximately \$5.9 million. City staff/consultant team recommends a phased approach to construction so as to expedite the core elements of the roundabout, which are expected to total about \$2.3 million for this first phase. A subsequent construction phase, which would include the addition of adjacent path improvements and bioretention areas for flood reduction at the lane transitions, is expected to total \$3.6 million.

Is flood risk at that intersection really a priority worth \$3.6 million? For example, what about using those funds to address the low sea wall gate near Harbor Bay Club that is causing several hundred homes to have high flood risk and high flood insurance costs?

Thanks,
Paul Beusterien

From: [Daria Mehra](#)
To: [John Knox White](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Objection to Bay Farm roundabout proposal
Date: Saturday, July 2, 2022 2:37:31 PM

Dear City Council, I respectfully write to express my objection and concerns on the proposal to build a roundabout at Mecartney / Island intersection in Bay Farm.

I am a long term home owner in Bay Farm, and over 10 years of residence never noticed any need for a roundabout in that location. It is not subject to high traffic and to the best of my knowledge, presents a low level of danger to motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians. In fact, when my kids started riding their bikes on the streets of Bay Farm, I specifically instructed them to cross Island Drive at that intersection (and not, for example, at the Safeway turn-in) because I assessed it as being a safe crossing place. I have frequently driven across that intersection, including in commute hours (going to/from the ferry) and consistently found it a perfectly easy intersection to maneuver.

There is no reason to spend the city funds on constructing a roundabout in this location to address any existing problem because there isn't one.

I acknowledge that traffic patterns on Bay Farm will change over time, and am wondering if the proposal aims to address a future concern. If so, it should be reviewed as part of a package which includes plans for new construction (in which specific location? Perhaps street improvements will be needed elsewhere) as well as other considerations such as expanding school capacity. I strongly disagree with having this proposal as standalone, it makes no sense on its own.

Please accept my input into your decision, which in my opinion should be to reject the roundabout proposal, and commit funds instead to other more necessary improvements — for example, toward protecting Bay Farm from rising sea levels.

Regards,
Daria Mehra.

From: [Nina Cooper](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [NVELL@Alamedaca.gov](#); [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Roundabout on Bay Farm
Date: Friday, July 1, 2022 10:54:56 AM

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Nina Cooper <ninae.cooper@icloud.com>
Date: July 1, 2022 at 10:48:55 AM PDT
To: JKWHITE@alamedaca.gov
Subject: Roundabout on Bay Farm

Bad idea and waste of money, not supported by local residents and voters.
The people are not being listened to. Spend the money on pedestrian crossing lights or traffic lights if you feel justified.
Most problems at this intersection currently caused by cars backing up into intersection while trying to get into Starbucks.
I feel you are pushing this because of your plans to increase the population at the intersection with the units in the shopping center thus increasing traffic greatly and stripping locals of needed services that we will now need to go to the main island for.

Sent from my iPad

From: [Hope](#)
To: JKWHITE@alamedaca.gov; [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tony Daysog](#); MVELL@alamedaca.gov
Cc: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] AGAINST roundabout at Island/McCarthy intersection
Date: Friday, July 1, 2022 8:45:38 AM

As a Harbor Bay resident of 40 years who often drives through this intersection, and never had a problem, I agree with the following NextDoor post, supported by most resident responders, & also neighbors I've spoken with.

Nancy Schlegel
214 Centre Court, Alameda

LATE 2021, BAY FARM RESIDENTS SPOKE STRONGLY AGAINST THE CITY PROPOSAL FOR A ROUNDABOUT AT THE INTERSECTION OF ISLAND/MECARTNEY. REGARDLESS, CITY STAFF STILL SEEKS APPROVAL. THE MINIMAL COST WOULD BE \$300,000. THE SOURCE OF FUNDS IS STATE TAX MONEY, WHICH IS ULTIMATELY OUR MONEY. THERE ARE MANY GOOD REASONS TO OPPOSE THE ROUNDABOUT BUT VIRTUALLY NO REASONS TO SUPPORT IT: IN SUMMARY, A. ROUNDABOUT IN THAT LOCATION IS NOT NEEDED: 1) THIS IS PRESENTLY ONE OF THE SAFEST INTERSECTIONS IN ALAMEDA WITH ITS 4 WAY STOP SIGNS . PER THE POLICE DEPT, EXTREMELY LOW MINOR TRAFFIC INCIDENTS AND NO PEDESTRIAN INJURIES IN THE LAST 10 YEARS. 2) DUE TO THE FREQUENT MANY SCHOOL CHILDREN AND DISABLED PEOPLE CROSSING THOSE STREETS, A ROUNDABOUT WILL ONLY INCREASE PEDESTRIAN DANGER. 3) CURRENT CAR DELAYS ARE VERY SHORT FROM 5 TO 15 SECONDS. THE CITY SAYS THE AVERAGE DELAY AT 30 SECONDS. THIS IS NOT CORRECT. CARS MOVE QUICKLY BUT COURTEOUSLY AS WE ARE ALL NEIGHBORS. 4. CONSTRUCTION OF A ROUNDABOUT WOULD TAKE AT LEAST ONE YEAR. EXTREMELY INCONVENIENT FOR BAY FARMERS.

From: [PAM JOYCE](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO Roundabout for Harbor Bay Isle
Date: Friday, July 1, 2022 6:08:33 AM

Hello

We have lived in Harbor Bay Isle since 1981.

We strongly oppose the proposed Roundabout.

The City Staff's controversial proposal for a **traffic roundabout for the corner** of Island Dr. and McCartney is DANGEROUS and UNNEEDED.

Do NOT approve this proposal which the City Staff will submit for approval from the City Council on Tuesday, July 5th at 7:00 pm via zoom meeting.

Reasons to Oppose the Roundabout:

1) It is not needed: With the 4 way stop there are extremely low traffic accidents or pedestrian injuries.

Nothing within the past 10 years per the Police Dept.

It is one of the safest pedestrian/car intersections in Alameda.

2. Yellow crossing lights inbedded in street would be a sufficient addition.

3) Due to the many school children and disabled people crossing the intersection, a roundabout will be more **dangerous** for all.

3) Current car delays times are short. Delays are as long as the City proclaims: "30 second wait" . Not true. Its more like 5 to 15 seconds depending upon the time of day.

4) Roundabout construction **will take a year.** Extremely inconvenient for entire Bay Farm/HBIA.

Alameda doesn't need to spend the enormous amount of money (at least \$300,000) it will cost to build this UNWANTED Roundabout!

Pam Joyce

150 Basinside Way, Alameda CA 94502 (since 1981)

From: [Jerry Harrison](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Roundabout at Island Drive and McCartney
Date: Thursday, June 30, 2022 5:07:21 PM

I fully support the proposed roundabout at Island Drive and McCartney. My experience with roundabouts in Europe and elsewhere in the US is that they are much smoother and much more convenient to use than a conventional intersection. I understand that there is data showing that they are also safer and more energy-efficient than conventional intersections. Please be sure to let the members of the City Council know that I and many others are eager for this improvement. Thank you.

Jerry Harrison
1211 Mound Street
Alameda
510-521-2358

From: [Michelle](#)
To: [John Knox White](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); mmgossage@gmail.com; [Malia Vella](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] I oppose roundabouts on bay farm island.
Date: Thursday, June 30, 2022 12:32:04 PM

Hello council members, I wanted to voice my opposition to the proposed roundabout on bay farm island.

There isn't anything wrong with the current road conditions or driving conditions on Bay farm and there is absolutely no need to replace current streets with roundabouts. They are extremely difficult to navigate and does not add any value to our neighborhood. I believe It hinders traffic and will cause more accidents. Created terrible conditions for people walking as well.

Sent to:

jknoxwhite@alamedaca.gov, mezzyashcraft@alamedaca.gov, mvella@alamedaca.gov, tspencer@alamedaca.gov, tdaysog@alamedaca.gov, lweisiger@alamedaca.gov

--

Michelle Gossage
Mobile (650) 455-8916

From: [Brandon Svec](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Mecartney/Island Roundabout Concept Approval Request
Date: Thursday, June 30, 2022 11:45:59 AM

Hello. I just want to record my support for the planned roundabout at Mecartney and Island. I think it is the best option to improve pedestrian and cyclist safety and also allow automobile traffic flow.

Thank you,
Brandon Svec

From: [Long, Annabel](#)
To: [John Knox White](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please Do Not Add a Traffic Roundabout
Date: Thursday, June 30, 2022 11:00:55 AM

Dear Alameda City Staff,

I hope you are doing well. I wanted to express my concern for the proposed traffic roundabout on the corner of Island Dr. and McCartney. Because the street corner is close to Amelia Earhart Elementary, many children walk through this intersection. Adding a traffic roundabout to the intersection may be dangerous for them, especially since car drivers cannot see them as easily as adult pedestrians who are taller. If it is possible to keep the current four-way stop sign instead of adding a traffic roundabout, I believe it will be safer for the children who regularly walk along the Island Dr. and McCartney intersection. Thank you so much for your time, and I hope you have a good day.

Sincerely,
Annabel Long

From: [Stephanie Long](#)
To: [John Knox White](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Oppose Traffic Roundabout for the corner of Island Dr. and McCartney
Date: Thursday, June 30, 2022 10:20:36 AM

Dear Alameda City Staff,

I **oppose** the proposed Traffic Roundabout for the corner of Island Dr. and McCartney, and I urge you to leave the existing 4 way stop sign in place. I believe that the number of school children, elderly residents, and other foot traffic are best served by the existing 4 way stop at Island and McCartney. I also do not support unneeded construction especially if it compromises the safety of the intersection. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Stephanie Long

From: [Roxanne LeBlanc](#)
To: [John Knox White](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed roundabout on BFI
Date: Thursday, June 30, 2022 10:17:34 AM

Please DO NOT proceed with a roundabout at Mecartney and Island Drive under any circumstances!!!

I once lived on Bay Farm Island two blocks away from 1972 to 2004 and never heard of an accident or injury at that intersection. The Starbucks that opened created a traffic issue due to cars having to make u-turns to enter the driveway. A roundabout will create even more issues and all needlessly, since there is NOT A PROBLEM at that corner. I am now living on Chatham Pt. off of Packet Landing, so the issue for me now is trying to get off the island via Robert Davey to Island Drive. Mecartney and Island Drive do not present a problem at all.

Those of us who live here on Bay Farm and travel via Mecartney and Island Drive at times are careful, take turns letting others proceed at the four-way stop, and are very much aware of safety when school is in session. The blinking lights at crossings are a huge help when it comes to pedestrian crossings, and that would cost very little in comparison to the roundabout debacle.

I was a teacher at Earhart from the time it opened in 1979 and am more concerned about the traffic issues at that location. At the time many of us were concerned about the fact a school was being built on Packet Landing, a dead-end street! Those living in Brittany Landing and Centre Court have lived with that nightmare ever since. Traffic has always been an issue there and continues to be an issue to this day. Drivers block the intersection of Robert Davey and Island Drive time and time again, even though they can see traffic isn't moving down Island Drive toward the bridge. Perhaps your time and our city's finances would be better spent on fixing that problem instead of fixing an intersection that is NOT A PROBLEM. When I was still teaching at Earhart we saw great changes in driver behaviors when police officers would show up from time to time to ticket those blocking the intersections.

I sincerely hope you will move on to more important areas that do need your time and our tax monies.

Thank you!

Roxanne Le Blanc
21 Chatham Pt.
rrleblanc40@att.net

From: [Skip Hutchison](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Mecartney/Island roundabout
Date: Thursday, June 30, 2022 9:53:21 AM

I live on Bay Farm. I am opposed to the roundabout because I think it will make traffic worse. I think it's a waste of city money.

It would be much better to spend the money repaving and filling in the pot holes on McCartney which have become quite a hazard.

James Hutchison
30 Millington Ct, Alameda, CA 94502

From: [Jennifer Russo](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment for 7/5 City Council Meeting
Date: Wednesday, June 29, 2022 7:30:26 PM

Hello,

My name is Jennifer Russo, I am a lifelong Alameda resident and have been a resident of Bay Farm since 2006. I have two children who attend Amelia Earhart elementary school and cross the Mecartney/Island intersection multiple times a day.

I am strongly opposed to a roundabout being placed at the intersection. I understand that the metrics all point towards a more efficient traffic flow, however, I think that the human aspect needs to be further considered.

I believe the traffic calming goal of this project is misdirected. To align with the city's overall goal of Vision Zero, this project should aim to provide the best pedestrian and bike protection. Traffic is backed up at most for 10-15 minutes during school/commute hours and shortly after the ferry docks. Both times, the traffic congestion is generally in one direction only. I am concerned that it creates 8 (2 in each direction) completely unprotected street crossings. Additionally, that intersection has historically been difficult to staff with a crossing guard. Even if one crossing guard is hired, they would then need to monitor at least 4 of the 8 crossings, with none of them being immediately adjacent to each other, as shown in the renderings.

I truly hope the city council reconsiders the roundabout recommendation. As a resident who drives through this intersection numerous times a day, I am thankful it is being reviewed. At a minimum, a reduction in lanes/crosswalk area is necessary, and perhaps even a signal light, but I strongly urge the council to reconsider the roundabout proposal.

Thank you,
Jennifer Russo

From: [Trish Spencer](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: Fwd: Mecartney/Island Roundabout Concept Approval Request
Date: Monday, June 27, 2022 11:24:15 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Steven Jones <stevegeorgejones@gmail.com>
Date: Jun 27, 2022 11:12 AM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Mecartney/Island Roundabout Concept Approval Request
To: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>, Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>, Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>, Malia Vella <MVella@alamedaca.gov>, Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>
Cc:

Sent from my iPad

Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers

I have spoken at the last 3 transportation meetings about the proposed roundabout for the intersection of Mecartney Rd & Island Drive. I have lived for the past 35 years 2 blocks from the intersection. I can tell you this is one of the safest intersections within the City of Alameda. The traffic and pedestrian flow is remarkably safe considering the amount of traffic and pedestrians who pass through this intersection on a daily basis.

According to the City's own statistics there have been 2 injury accidents in the last 11 years. That's one injury accident every 5.5 years. I also spent 30 years in the Alameda Fire Department and was stationed at the Bay Farm Station for several years and had not one response to this intersection. As Deputy Fire Chief between 1996-2003 I reviewed the daily response reports looking for problematic intersections which were a danger to our citizens. The intersection of Mecartney Rd & Island Drive was considered to be one of the safest high traffic flow intersections within our city.

This intersection in 2000 was being considered for traffic lights and I met with the then Public Works Director Matthew Naclerio for an on site look during the morning commute hours. I requested this meeting with the public works director because I was opposed to the traffic light proposal. After watching the traffic flow over coffee, Mr Naclerio said, we have much better places to spend our money than at this location. Hence the idea was stopped.

I believe this location will become far less safe with a roundabout and our injury accidents will significantly increase if this is completed. After listening during the recent transportation meetings, the City has grant money to spend with a sunset date approaching and is choosing to use it at this intersection, instead of using it where it is far more needed along Fernside Drive or other locations being considered. I did see at the most recent meeting that the intersection of Mecartney Rd & Island Drive was considered to be a green dotted location for traffic and pedestrian issues and other locations were yellow, or red dotted for higher priority locations.

I urge you to look for yourself prior to the next CC meeting and you will see just how safe this intersection is. Please do not approve this for construction, as there are MUCH better places to

spend the City's money and make it safer for our citizens. I am also available to meet any of you in person at the intersection to observe the traffic and pedestrian flow.

Respectfully,

Steve Jones