Exhibit 9:

Public comments made

on

Public Review Draft Active Transportation Plan (October)

Includes:

1. Summary of comments from October Workshops/Commission Meetings/Presentations
2. Comments emailed to staff
3. Written comments sent to Transportation Commission's October meeting
4. Public Agency Staff comments
5. Online Survey Responses

Draft Active Transportation Plan:

Comments from Workshops/Commission Meetings/Presentations in October

Virtual Open House, 10/05/22

Questions/Comments from Meeting (and the chat)

- Alameda has a number of sidewalk gaps (Tilden Way, Main Street, Grand Street, for example). The plan mentions these in a general sense but, as far as I can tell, does not map them, enumerate them or outline a plan to fill them. Could it do so?
- Many Alameda intersections have four or more legal crosswalks, but many of them (or all of them) are unmarked. Could the plan make marking all legal crosswalks a design standard, or at least encourage it?
- How does a "neighborhood greenway" differ from a "bike route" other than a green paint on the street? What is class iii vs class ii?
- Will vehicular through-traffic be allowed on Neighborhood Greenways?
- Participant feels peds/cyclists wearing dark clothing and should be educated. Feels this Plan vision is forced on others because not many people are in attendance compared to the population of Alameda. Lives on street recommended to be Neighborhood Greenway and doesn't understand why because there "aren't many accidents."
- Lives on neighborhood connector street and traffic on street is fast. Street is not proposed as Neighborhood Greenway; will other traffic calming treatments be considered?
- Participant recommends targeted education to show people how to get to low-stress routes.
- How to make High St safer?
- Class II and Class III differences?
- Will vehicular through-traffic be allowed on Neighborhood Greenways?
- Most speeds are at 25mph but in reality people drive up to 40mph. How will Neighborhood Greenways address this?
- Narrowing Central Ave to single lane of traffic each way: is that still planned?
- 9th Street and other streets cross major streets and crossing them at night is scary. This will require a lot of attention to mitigate traffic.
- Did you do any surveys questions on if people were willing to have less parking for pedestrian improvements? Or bike improvements? That seems to be quite the sticking point with some.
- Dissuade single-occupancy cars and remove slow streets – what is the benefit to walkers/bikers and what message we are sending? Participant lives on slow street and sees it as a major amenity.
- Is this Plan a state requirement like GP Housing Element?
- If you don't implement Housing Element, there are legal ramifications. Council rejection of Grand St (which is in Plan) begs the question- will in the future there be legal ramifications for not implementing ATPs?

- Plan for delivery vehicles? Number seems to be increasing on some streets. Plan for double-parking?
- Right now, most streets in Alameda are at 25 MPH but in reality, the actual traffic speeds are ranging closer to 35-40MPH. How will a difference of 5MPH be meaningfully enforced if we are trying to create a comfortable non-car scenario on neighborhood greenways?
- What exactly changes to turn a slow street into a greenway? serious traffic calming?
- When we say we are trying to dissuade single occupancy cars, and then remove slow streets…what is the benefit to walkers and bikers and most importantly, what message does this send? I live on a slow street and view this as a major amenity.
- Does the city have any plans to enforce no parking cars in the buffered bike lanes? People park in them daily near schools such as on Auginbaugh causing bikers to have to go into the traffic lanes
- I am confused. Gibbons Drive is LOVED by many visitors from other cities and other states. Making Gibbons Drive a "we discourage through traffic" will make outsiders HATE Alameda Government for taking away from their lovely visit to Alameda.
- On the Lincoln bicycle street, the plans show a connection to Pacific via Park. Are there plans to make it a low stress/easy connection? Right now it's quite difficult to cross Park on Lincoln and get to Pacific.
- Every plan promoting carbon friendly methods of transit will come with a compromise at the cost of drivers. Does Alameda have a sense for the compromises residents are willing to make?
- Any plans for custom signage for neighborhood green ways to better designate those streets?

Planning Board, 10/10/22

- Public Comment
    - Cyndy Johnson:
        - Would like more concrete, specific performance measures.
            - Mode shift goals – Transportation Choices Plan is 5 years old and didn't call out active transportation. Also, shouldn't just be commute focused.
            - Minneapolis – 33% bike mode share by 2030!
            - Show current and future targets
            - Make things measureable, if can't be measured currently.

Commission on Persons with Disabilities, 10/12/22

- Public Comment
    - Karen Miller:
        - Grand St – neighbor of the area. Accessible parking areas limited in proposed plan. Blocks are long. Parking is being taken away. Urge you to look at plan. ADA spaces are around corner on side streets.
        - This plan will do this elsewhere, including top part of Grand St.
        - Unconscionable when looking at from perspective of disabilities.
        - Active Transportation Plan is not for people with disabilities.
        - Not a viable plan.
        - Grand is great for pedestrians
        - Bike lanes are wide as they are.

        - Plan Survey – 31% said traffic was biggest concern. Only 7% said bike safety was a concern. Renters not accurately represented.
    - Carol Gottstein
        - This Plan destroys visit-ablility of homes on Grand St, and others.
        - Supports Karen Miller.
        - Hit by car 25 years ago – spine surgery. Needs shortest distance from front door to car. Can't bike.
        - Grand St – important to work on what neighbors need.
        - Wants to hear directly from ADA consultant for Grand St.
        - Bikes aren't best solution for everyone.
        - Surveys are online – not everyone can do this.
        - Low Stress is only for those in the bike lane – high stress for peds, people pushing walkers.
        - Confusion as to where each mode belongs, and how interface with people using mobility scooters.
        - Exhibit B of May City Council talks about public outreach for ADA Transition Plan. Has this been done? Hasn't seen it.
- Commissioners
    - Amanda Bugge:
        - How was the network developed? How were streets choosen?
    - Katy Beehler
        - Rolling: Wheelchair users. How do they use streets? Pedestrian area (sidewalk) or bike lanes? And what about when crossing the pathways.
        - Crossings at Grand, others – not many stop signs. Can be a hazard. Was that considered?
    - Chair Allison Mullings
        - Nearby parking for Grand. And Accessible parking.
        - What are city requirements for parking?
    - Jane Schmitz
        - Concern around wheelchairs and mobility scooters on sidewalks. They can't use the sidewalks. Can they operate more safely in the street? Get around damaged, aging sidewalk skirts, need to plan for this.
        - Wheelchairs and bikes don't belong in same space.
    - Katy Beehler
        - Echo what Schmitz said
    - Lisa Hall
        - Has three-wheeled bike – add photos of them!
        - Shoreline is a nightmare, so is Grand and Otis. Bike riders feel entitled – bad behavior. What did to Shoreline is so sad. Grand/Otis – people don't know what to do. Has made things worse.
        - Know we want to reduce our emissions. Sounds good in theory,
        - Shoreline – people can't get out of their house, park anywhere.
        - Bicyclists are over zealous, too much "green", gets colluded.

Active Transportation Plan Community Advisory Group, 10/13/22

- Staff presentation + Comments:
  - Vision:
    - Add semi-colon to second sentence.
  - Goals:
    - Equity – What are these areas? How decided? Need a map to show where they are.
  - Pedestrian Strategy:
    - Could be good to normalize Pedestrian Street Types with [General Plan] Streets Classifications.
  - Bikeway Network:
    - Trails – create a lot of connectivity. And Marina Village. Lots of stress issues – trails need maintenance!
      - City can't maintain trails in HOA's
      - Need clarity on who owns what trail and how to maintain. If not maintained, need a separate bike facility.
    - Seems like Bay Farm Island is pretty low stress overall, because have lower traffic volumes and trails.
  - Water crossings:
    - West End bridge is critical.
      - In emergency – Coast Guard needs to get through.
    - Shoreline to Sea view bridge:
      - What are miles saved with new bridge?
      - Very appealing!
      - Cuts out heading into the wind.
      - Current bridge connection is less safe, with young children.
      - May have boater push back – New Year's Day event during high tide to circle the island.
  - Projects & Programs
    - To encourage more biking add a program for maintenance of bikes.
    - Park St/Oak St bikeway proposal: This doesn't include parklets, and build outs we've become accustomed to. So, bikes on Park St may not be the best place. But getting people to Park St is a priority. Use places like Alameda Ave to get there, and park. Want to get folks to district, but not necessarily on Park St.
    - Looks great! Kids will be able to safely bike/walk. Has changed so much in a generation!
    - Looks great! Excited to see the data too – "interested but concerned" is exciting – lots of potential.
    - Agrees. Has significant visual impairment. Network looks like it will work well.

Recreation and Parks Commission, 10/13/22

- Commissioner Comment
  - Alice Nguyen:
    - Great!

        - How was SeeClickFix community input incorporated into this?
        - Slow Streets: how to get them? How decided which ones to remove?
    - Philly Jones:
        - How do you deal with North/South streets? Narrower.
    - Adrienne Alexander, Vice Chair:
        - Educate people on how to stay in bike lanes (like on Shoreline). Is education a component?
    - Tara Navarro, Chair:
        - Family is "Interested by Concerned" category.
        - Happy to see what's going on.
        - Current daylighting and separated bike lanes projects – what plans/policies do these come from?
        - If Plan not adopted as is, could it be modified and adopted?
- Public Comment
    - Participant:
        - If association thinks they need stop signs, etc. but told NO by City, how can they get them? Eastshore needs them, near Lincoln school. Don't want speed humps, but people race down the street.

In Person Open House, 10/16/22

- *See following spreadsheet*

Public Comments from Draft Active Transportation Plan
In-Person Open House (10/16/22) + Farmers Market (10/18/22)

Where	Comment	Street (if any)
In person workshop - Map	Promote and expand free shuttle to Webster & Park and Bike racks	
In person workshop	I love all this! I would advocate more for separate streets prioritized for bikes/walking vs cars than having everyone on the same street. Thank you for your work. Also speed bumps! Just a few on Fernside would be great. People drive really fast at night.	Fernside
In person workshop	The Shoreline Bike path for bicyles is very dangerous. 1) clean up sand that otherwise creates slippage & loss of control when turning 2) prevent cars from driving on it and opening doors.	Shoreline
In person workshop	Taylor Ave is a good interim bike street until Central is complete.	Taylor
In person workshop	"Sharrrows" never seem to do anything but allow a city to say they've done something. I suspect they send a message to drivers that other streets should not allow bijes and encourage unsafe driving.	
In person workshop	I'm really excited about the future of biking in Alameda. I appreciate moving away form Sharrows & signage, which don't really work. I think to separate facilites for bikes. Please keep adding bike racks at shopping areas as well.	
In person workshop - Map	Are there stop signs fore traffic to stop on cross streets so cyclist keep rolling? (Atlantic Ave)	Atlantic Ave
In person workshop - Map	Currrently an awkward bike intersection - have to stop and press button and wait for crossing (Jean sweeney)	Atlantic/Constitution(1
In person workshop - Map	Otis and Broadway can be dangerous intersection for bike/ped	Broadway/Otis
In person workshop - Map	Central between regent & park st is chaotic - righe of way is unclear, pedestrians in cross walk are at risk, cars turning often, Kaiser lot exit obstructed view.	Central
In person workshop - Map	Central and High - merge bike lane sign or safer merge for bikes.	Central
In person workshop	constructions workers using bike lanes	Clement
In person workshop	need to block cars from bike lane. Saw a truck with a boat	Clement
In person workshop	put temporary guidance for bikers at last stop sign before it drops off.	Clement
In person workshop - Map	Why stop signs for bikeway? Stop for drivers! (Clement Ave)	Clement Ave
In person workshop - Map	Traffic calming needed on new stretch of Clement behind Del Monte. Its currently a drag strip and dangerous.	Del Monte
In person workshop - Map	Fernside between High & Tilden is a Freeway! Turn late just 60, it’s a hazard	Fernside
In person workshop - Map	People on bikes have to make a dangerous crossing on Fernside to stay in bike lanes south of lincoln middle and north of otis	Fernside
In person workshop - Map	Traffic calming on Fernside and Central at 4 way stop, many drivers either don't stop or breifly stop but not let ped cross	Fernside/Central
In person workshop	dangerous intersection now. Traffic light or RRFB, people blow the stop sign	Fernside/Garfieild
In person workshop	Eliminate turn lane (Fernside)	Fernside/Garfieild
In person workshop	Fernside needs to be slowed way down!	Fernside/Garfieild

In person workshop	Larger bike lanes (Fernside)	Fernside/Garfieild
In person workshop	Maybe traffic circles (Fernside)	Fernside/Garfieild
In person workshop - Map	Garfield and Fernside intersection is very dangerous, many near missies and actual pedestrian vs vehicle accidents, Needs rumble strips flashing lights, etc	Fernside/Garfieild
In person workshop - Map	Its time for a light or lighted crossing at Fernside and Garfield	Fernside/Garfieild
In person workshop - Map	Crossing Arterals (?) Central, Encinal, Lincoln is crucial for neighborhood greenways routes. Need bike/ped first priority, No BEG BUTTONS!	Greenways
In person workshop - Map	Keep sharrows on neighborhood Greenways to keep cyclist out of door zones.	Greenways
In person workshop - Map	Harbor Bay Parkway & Doolittle intersections is ped unfriendly, feels dangerous.	Harbor Bay PKWY
In person workshop - Map	Need to broaden little ramp to cross from Mariana Vill Park to shopping center @ marina vill.	Marina Village PKWY
In person workshop - Map	Drivers tend to speed (>30mph!) on Otis west of bridge	Otis
In person workshop - Map	All four way stop signs to all intersections on Pacific	Pacific
In person workshop - Map	How will pedestrians & bikes cross Grand at Pacific? Please reduce car traffic on San Antonio - kids on bikes to Franklin park/school	Pacific San Antionio
In person workshop - Map	Visibility to turn onto Shoreline from side streets is very poor. Extended corner red zones would help improve safety.	Shoreline
In person workshop - Map	Add stops signs (Staton)	Stanton St (at Clement?)
In person workshop	Yes to raised crossings, we need drainage for storms thought.	Stanton Lincoln Pacific Buena Vista
Farmers Mkt	Webster has been squeezed down TOO MUCH! Traffic between Santa Clara ave and Atlantic gridlocks and this leads to crazed drivers taking very dangerous chances, ie driving the wrong way risking a head on collision, pedestrians put even more at risk as cars run red lights, etc. Bikes are great for many reasons but decisions like this are ridiculous, out of touch with reality and not thought out well. I live on Central off Webster. Please don't apply this "planning" to Central. Get a clue....	Webster
In person workshop	Consider timed lights on main thoroughfares to give cars a reason to use them instead of the bike/walk focused streets? (Think Franklin St in SF)	
In person workshop	Why keep "blue" traditional bike lanes? What treatment can eliminate parking/stopping in them? Ie Broadway/Singleton/Central	
In person workshop - Map	When do bilke loop detectors work at trail at Constitution and Webster?	
In person workshop - Map	Wind River parking lot needs a tiny bike way to connect with Jean Sweeney	
In person workshop	Need education and enforcement for kids & adults about bike safety - speifically not endangering pedestrians in the sidewalk and not endangering themselves by speeding from the sidewalk into intersections (and risk getting hit by turning cars)	
In person workshop - Map	Repave dangerous bumpy bike path	Bay Farm
In person workshop - Map	Shared use path needs regrading (tree roots) & repaving on Harbor Bay PW all the way around N Loop Rd	Bay Farm

In person workshop - Map	Shared use path needs regrading (tree roots) & repaving on Island Drive	Bay Farm
In person workshop - Map	Re-pave path! Dangerous!	bike path at Seaview Pw Bay Farm
In person workshop - Map	This path is in need of repaving, roots make it unsafe (Harbor Bay PKWY)	Harbor Bay PKWY
In person workshop - Map	Ninth St needs correction	9th Street
In person workshop - Map	There will definitely need to be bike lanes to get to these new parks/refuge	Wildlife Refuge
In person workshop - Map	Wonderful idea! (Alameda Wildlife National refudge)	
In person workshop - Map	Protected lane on 8th between Jean Sweeney and Washington Park. Connents CAT, May Lin Ele, and South Shore path! Need safe route to school.	8th St
In person workshop - Map	Any chance of a bridge crossing between Crown Beach and Ballena BLVD?	Ballena Blvd
In person workshop - Map	Marina is a great low-stress walking route opening barrier to tilden would be great.	Marina Village PKWY
In person workshop - Map	Stairs/access btw Marina & Tilden would open walking access	Miller-Sweeney Bridge
In person workshop - Map	Would love Sherman to get an upgraded bike lane option. Several stretches are pretty dicey & a lot of people like to use as a cut through. Diciest strectches between Central & Buena Vista.	Sherman
In person workshop	What about a Greenway/Bay Trail extension on Marina (extended from eastshore)?	Marina
In person workshop	Currently many drivers ignore the "slow streets" signage and barricades along Pacific. Looking forward to more effective traffic calming techniques.	
In person workshop	Versailles slow street works well, mostly, but the crossing at Central (with Gibbons also) is currently dangerous - drivers do not know/care to stop.	
In person workshop	What kind of "traffic calming" techniques will be used? More details would help, no beg buttons please! Give bikes and ped priority!	
In person workshop	These maps should incorporate "safe routes to school map". It is lovely that we are optimizing recreational bike routes, but if we arenot keeping our kids safe, we are missing an essential funciton of this city government. We should not promote our kids walking and biking to school if we are not prioritizing their safety. Bike lanes, speed bumps, flashing lights or stop lights at intersections, more crossing guards need to be considered on these routes. I do not see exisiting school routes notes on this proposals.	
In person workshop - Map	Ferry light won't turn green for bike riders. Fix!	Main Street Ferry
In person workshop	Drivers on all current slow streets do not seem to understand what they are intended for. They simply drive around the barricades and proceed at full speed. We need clarity and enforcement.	
In person workshop	Pacific works great as a slow street. Traffic calming needs to be explicit like it is there	
In person workshop	What kinds of "traffic calming" on neighborhood Greenways. Be specific and list all the tools, so we can evaluate the transition from bike blvds and slow steets to NGs.	
In person workshop - Map	Love path around the point!	Alameda Point
In person workshop - Map	Great to improve on and off Bay Farm Bike Br. Great to improve seperation of Bikes & Pedestrians at Otis and Bay View.	Bay Farm Bike Bridge
In person workshop - Map	Bike/Ped bridge option would also be great! (to Oakland)	Estuary Bridge

In person workshop	Honestly, Central Alameda to Oakland bike/ped offering is my #1 priority. Especially with all the additional housing going on. People want to bike but can't safely	
In person workshop	I think a water shuttle is a good idea. Would it run all day or just commuter hours? Love to see it in action on farmer market days!	
In person workshop	Love the idea of a water shuttle!	
In person workshop	Massive support for any additional ways for non-vehicle traffic to get from Posey-Tube area to Oakland side.Vehicle traffic is only getting worse, esp at rush hour. I have tried multiple options to get from Webster to Oakland and gave up because none felt safe and or took far too long to go all the way around to East End. Strong push for running shuttle frequently at least from 7:00/7:30am. - 7:00pm	
In person workshop - Map	Yes Please! Long and overdue (Estuary Water Shuttle)	
In person workshop - Map	Every east/west major street has some bike/ped accomodations except Buena Vista. Why was this ignored?	Buena Vista
In person workshop - Map	Slow Streets - proposed Greenway on Pacific and road diet on Clement is pushing all traffic on to Buena Vista. No consideration is given to the residents there.	Buena Vista
In person workshop - Map	Encinal, Central, Lincoln, Pacific etc need to be safe and accessible to all cyclist and be ped safe	Encinal Central Lincoln Pacific
In person workshop - Map	North bound Island Dr bike lane would be great	Island Drive
In person workshop - Map	Connecting these would be awesome for extending coast path	near Lincoln middle school
In person workshop - Map	This would be lovely but first would address dangerous school routes. Priority should be given to school routes	proposed new Shoreline to Seaview bridge (?)
In person workshop - Map	There are no existing bike lanes here (near Washington Park and Central)	Washington Park
In person workshop - Map	Please close this gap and remove the bike path dead end. (West tower Ave near Bladium)	West Tower Ave
In person workshop - Map	Yes please! Willow St btw Otis and Encinal is pretty unsafe	Willow St

Virtual Office Hours, 10/17/22

- Participant 1:
  - Grand St & Trip Potential map:
    - Not on the map! Low trip potential!
  - Miller Sweeney Bridge
    - Evacuation concerns with travel lane reduction. Bottleneck. Unsafe.
  - People diverting off of Otis – more traffic on Clinton now and others.
  - Grand – concerns about accessible parking spaces.
  - Doesn't use Grand now – uses Chestnut – has stops at every corner.
- Participant 2:
  - Likes west end bridge and water shuttle idea. Uses Park St Bridge now – too out of the way.
  - Water shuttle – will it be on demand?
  - San Jose from Pearl to Park:
    - Happy about Neighborhood Greenway. This stretch needs calming
    - Regent & San Jose crossings are wide open. Only one stop sign. Confusing for people. Lots of honking. Added a SeeClickFix. Need stop sign or traffic circle. Incongruent with the Chochenyo Park.
    - Not working for motorists or for bicyclists – choose one or other.
    - Lots of conflict – people pushing both directions.
  - Appreciate this – uses a lot of bike/ped friendly options.
  - Supports draft Plan – other areas to support.
- Participant 3:
  - West end bridge: Concerned about boats being able to pass under.
  - Why not use bridge money for water shuttle?
  - Concerns about re-routing of traffic from Neighborhood Greenways.
  - Need streets designed for cars, so rest of streets can be good.
  - Gibbons and Versailles are through-streets for cars – not local streets
    - Gibbons used by cars and so is Versailles.
  - Most of plan is directed to biking. Nothing for pedestrians – what is there for pedestrians East of Park St?
  - Need to prohibit bike riding on sidewalks.
  - Many new shared paths – these are not low-stress for pedestrians. Too many people together at different speeds.
  - E-bikes and e-scooters. Allowing them at RRFB's is too dangerous. Go really fast.
  - No e-bikes/e-scooters on sidewalks or pedestrian-only paths.
  - RRFBs – love them! Want more.
  - Signals – concern that signal cycle is so long, especially with new signal policy.
  - Sherman/Clement – make lump bigger/more visible.
  - Gibbons – traffic circles would be good here.
  - Like roundabouts!

Farmers' market, 10/18/22

Bicycle networks feedback

- Chestnut neighborhood greenway: worries this will cause problems for drivers, because this is an important road for the driving network, too.
- The paths through Crab Cove will need better lighting to function as part of the low-stress network. Very dark at night.
- Support neighborhood greenway on San Jose and think it should be a priority, especially for safety interventions at San Jose and Pearl. In the meantime, need "cross traffic does not stop" signs with reflectors.
- Prioritize routes to ferries.
- Low-stress backbone doesn't get me to South Shore. Otis is a problem.
- Oak should be the bikeway, not Park.
- Should get rid of parking on Park St.

Programs

- Bicycle education: need to educate parents (not just kids) that, when riding on the sidewalk, you should stop and/or dismount before riding into a crosswalk.
- Need more bicycle parking at Encinal High.
- Want bike route signage.

Other comments

- Central Ave: Need to make sure there's a drop-off plan for Paden.
- Live near Otis and love the changes.
- Happy to see new marked crosswalks on Buena Vista. Love to walk in Jean Sweeny Park and elsewhere in Alameda.

Virtual Office Hours, 10/18/22

- Participant 1:
    - Like focus on how we can be carbon neutral as fast as possible.
    - Lives on Grand – not a big fan of proposal.
    - Grand – not a good example of how we can engage with the community. People care about their streets. More open forums to just talk. Not presentations. Like did for the Climate Action and Resiliency Plan. Small groups – really good to listen and talk to each other.
    - Likes to see a range of choices – not binary options. People need to see trade-offs – what was or can be considered.
    - Don't "tell" – but involve people.
    - Roundabouts – a big fan. But bungled Otis/Grand and Clement/Sherman/Atlantic. Should have done them at these 2 locations.
    - Communicate about the challenges the City faces, like the above. Publish in the Sun. Talk about our challenges – be honest.
    - Workshops are great. Dialogue is great.

Transportation Commission, 10/16/22

- Commissioners

- Geoffrey Johnson
  - Pedestrian High Injury Corridor map – hard to tell difference in the colors. Change so more visible.
- Tina Yuen, Vice Chair
  - Thanks for tremendous effort for amazingly robust plan. Represents all hard work to date. Taken to heart the multitude of comments over many years.
  - Maps:
    - Appreciate them!
    - Appendix A: Colors feel backwards. Red should be highest priority and green should be lowest.
    - Many maps – not clearly understanding the intention of the maps. Add in the caption/legend more explanation.
  - Table 5 [Pedestrian Design Matrix]:
    - How will staff use this?
    - Describe this more robustly in the plan.
    - Describe the spectrum of when used/not used. Describe the key.
  - North/South access: Grand St project. How to comment, given it's still in review?
  - Feasibility of projects/programs in 8 years: Stay the course and be aggressive to achieve the goals (CARP, Vision Zero, etc). More housing coming.
    - Chapter 8 says "no additional staff needed". Rethink this. If needed – then put it in.
  - Evaluation metrics: Is there a way to add the amount of greenhouse gas (GGH) reductions when these project in? X bike lanes = X reduction in GGH?
  - Stargell is not a Class III now. Dangerous! Revisit calling it Class III.
  - Class III bike routes – confused about what Neighborhood Greenway is. How different from Bike route? Still have sharrows? A low stress facility would be separated or even buffered. Add more info in the plan about this.
- Rebecca Kohlstrand
  - Overall – great plan! Lots of work, over much time.
  - Goes towards more balanced use of our public right of way. That's what we're after; and addressing climate change.
  - 90-95% of the way there.
  - Biggest concern is integrating the two plans (need to work with staff on this in working committee). [other plan is Street classifications.]
  - Gateways: more consideration to what can be accommodated at these gateways and how to improve transit mode share.
  - So many capital projects are bike and ped!
  - Key areas to look at and resolve:
    - Redundancy of east/west routes. If we had unlimited money, would be okay.
    - Lincoln is the one last street that's 4 lanes. Consider for transit.
    - Main Streets and Gateways: Whether/how to accommodate all modes.
      - Especially High St.

- Gibbons – why not a Neigh Connector? Need to discuss this. Could impact whether we have a Neighborhood Greenway on Gibbons.
- Anxious about Webster and Park accommodating all modes. Particularly Park St. Happy that Oak is considered. Challenging to get all modes on Park.
- Bay Farm:
  - Will bike paths be built by developers? Who maintains?
  - Conditions are bad! On bike is awful.
- Second crossing to Bay Farm
  - Not a bad idea for long term. Low priority
- Bay Trail
  - Move to Marina and Eastshore, rather than Fernside. Closer and to connectors.
- Maps
  - Coast Guard – not in our jurisdiction to make changes on the island.
- Unpaved path – will it remain unpaved? Why? Likes it as is.

- Samantha Soules, Chair
  - Prioritization:
    - Bay Farm trails are overdue for maintenance. Seniors are walking on street. Prioritize this and make more clear.
    - Flagged but low priority (in prioritization).
    - Need connections to transit.
  - BIG list of projects!! Feasible? Be more realistic – fewer projects done well, than lots done poorly. Right size it.
  - Yes for trail improvements on Bay Farm!
  - Speeding along streets is big issue.
  - Struggled with Performance Measures – Need same level of rigor here. Liked data-driven focus of rest of this plan. See less on back end – were projects impactful with mode shift? Intra island vs off island. Don't look at all trips. Commuter vs recreational. Not specific enough. Pull all measures together.
  - Great work done!
- Alysha Nachtigall
  - Great! Many years, and lots of great work.
  - Excited by low-stress network.
  - Like Slow Streets transitioning to Neighborhood Greenways
  - Need enough north/south low stress connections – to/from Cross Alameda Trail and all greenways and schools. They have to be safe for pedestrians, wheelchairs, bikes. Get across these busy streets. Arterial streets are high stress for people walking/biking.
    - Room for more for safe crossings
    - Make sure all folks on Northern Waterfront can get across the island. And get to South shore safely.
  - Wants more north/south routes all over the place – not just Grand.
  - Neighborhood Greenway Question: 1500 car trips per day as threshold. Existing segments meet this?

- Saravana Suthanthira
  - Amazing and progressive plan!
  - Deep thoughts to make it come together for both modes. Not a small feat.
  - Just needs refinement to make it better and meet City objectives.
  - Like the Goal under community – "promote and foster community…"
    - All about internal circulation.
    - For getting off island – it's auto only really (except transit, access to ferry). Need to acknowledge this.
  - LOTS of info! But what came across was not much for Bay Farm.
    - Disappointed that low priority.
    - Trail maintenance is majorly needed.
    - Island Drive and Maitland Drive – high stress for bike and Maitland Drive.
    - Many seniors on Bay Farm. And low income here. Two schools. Need safe facilities for all.
    - Need better access to Park and Ride, Ferry and both Schools.
    - There is right of way for trails.
    - Only some people allow kids to bike.
    - Think about adding more…Trails? Separated bike lanes? Protected bike lanes?
    - Getting to Lincoln Middle School – bus or drop off. Kid wouldn't bike to Lincoln. Trail is SOO bad.
      - Project #11 – what is considered here? Describe more.
    - Look at access points to schools.
    - Very important for seniors/schools.
    - Access to ferry – not just Class II bike lanes on Mecartney.
    - Excited by second bridge connection.

- Public comments
  - Denyse Trepanier
    - Very excited! Thanks to all work from staff and consultants. Really good plan.
    - Neighborhood Greenways – need minimum design standards. Not just a toolbox. Like daylighting at corners. Expedite implementation. Burden of proof on those opposing not supporting the project. Create a default set of treatments.
    - McKay – need safe facility, to connect to park.
    - Gateway and Commercial Street Districts – need the safest treatments there.
    - 4 of existing East/West facilities are not low-stress bikeways.
  - Travis Morgan
    - Excellent plan!
    - Lives on Gibbons. Wants it to be a Neighborhood Greenway. Make them awesome.
  - Jim Strehlow
    - Electric bikes belong in protected bikeways.
    - Education is needed

- Versailles – highest complaints at 49% in Slow Streets survey. Ignores resident desires. Traffic diversion caused by Slow Streets.
- Fernside – Never asked for two-way protected bike lane. Only change indicated for this street. They feel overlooked – only bike needs.
- Gibbons – Neighborhood Greenway. Will be a right turn only at High Street. Shown as a Neighborhood Connector which contradicts the Neighborhood Greenway. Out of town visitors enjoy driving on Gibbons. Who on staff have authority? At whose request was this done?

West Alameda Business Association Board Meeting, 10/26/22

- Seniors and sidewalk maintenance – how addressed?
- West end Bridge and water shuttle – good for economic development
- Traffic signal improvements are needed along Webster, and at Central, for traffic.

Alameda Collaborative for Children, Youth, and their Families, 10/27/22

- Is the bike/ped bridge included? The Mayor talked about an interview she did with Encinal High School students who strongly supported the bridge idea, talking about how it would give teenagers more mobility.

Social Services and Human Relations Board, 10/27/22

- Commissioners:
  - Bernard Wolf
    - Heard about west end bridge. Are you planning it for public health or reducing emissions? Which one?
    - More housing coming! Considered?
    - Access to transit? Increase of transit with this plan?
  - Scott Means
    - 21% not biking – must be older people. Seemed high at first.
    - Bridge: would bike to work if could. Won't go through tunnel. Access equity from West end – no way except underground. Appreciate health and transportation focus.
  - Dianne Yamashiro-Omi
    - Thanks for report!
    - Love that Alameda is bikeable and walkable
    - Were there any comments on *barriers* to biking or getting a bike?
  - Gerald Bryant
    - Central Ave – Class IV: Evacuation concerns. So maybe greenways would be better – since don't take traffic lanes around. Real concern.
    - Lives at XXX/Central – major utilities right there – would be a problem.
    - Can Central Ave become Neighborhood Greenway instead?
    - Major traffic congestion, if need to move around the island, after something happens.
  - Michelle Buchholz
    - Huge undertaking! Thank you. Can't please everyone.
    - Any interaction with Oakland? Like at Fruitvale bridge?

- Safe routes to schools? Planned around schools?

City of Alameda

Public Review Draft Active Transporation Plan (October)

Emailed comments

#	Comment
1	I read through the plan and was very happy to see Gibbons Drive on the Bicycle Vision map (figure 6) as a Neighborhood Greenway. But to my dismay it is not included on the Vision 2030 plan (figure 9). Although Gibbons Drive is currently shown as a Neighborhood Street it is being used as a Neighborhood Connector by cars coming from and going to High Street Bridge. It needs immediate attention to stop it being used this way. Immediately changing the speed limit to 20 mph would be easy (I think). But really we need to at least not allow cars coming off of High Street Bridge to go down Gibbons or speedbumps to discourage them to use Gibbons as a Neighborhood Connector which they are using the street as currently.
2	Thank you for the email and announcement. Can you please comment on which groups were involved in drafting the plan as far as external consultants? I didn't see any direct notations in the plan thus far citing those groups.
3	Here again are my reasons why I am against the Slow Streets initiative for Alameda. [Attached]
4	I just reviewed the transportation plan, and I absolutely love that I live in a city that prioritizes safe, eco-friendly, inclusive transportation and recognizes actual behavior and common routes and seeks to make them even more accessible for all. I live on San Jose Avenue and see the large number of middle schoolers that bike down our street and on the multi-use bridge from Bay Farm, and I love the efforts to make those routes even safer for all. I'm also an avid cyclist myself and try to substitute commute / errand driving with bike rides where I can, and you captured both the existing level of safety and the areas of improvement that would be most impactful.
5	Thanks for the Zoom presentation tonight. In response to the City's move to get us out of our cars, I've been researching ebikes as I am disabled and no longer able to pedal my old bike. I'm concerned about ebike theft and have scoped out the availability of permanently installed bike racks around town. Much to my surprise they don't appear plentiful all around town and they are also somewhat randomly placed. I hope the transporation plan will include installation of additional bike racks, and bike storage boxes like those installed at ferry terminals. If the City is planning to eliminate parking stalls and get us into alternative modes of transportation, then please ensure we have safe parking for our bikes, ebikes, wheelchairs, etc. to protect from theft and also avoid having our bikes/wheelchairs from blocking sidewalk traffic. Additionally, not all residences provide parking for residents cars, bikes or wheelchairs. I expect you anticipate the number of alternate vehicles, like ebikes, will increase as a result of the Active Alameda plan and that will need appropriate parking. If the City is pushing residents out of cars, then it has an obligation to help ensure places for us to park other modes of transportation, city-wide.
6	These road blocks impede travel through the island. These new proposals disempower Alamedans by removing their ability to move and travel. This plans feels more like a foundational plan toward setting up check points and roadblocks in the future. It feels disingenuous and nefarious as it's proposed to Alamedans under the guise of environmentalism. However, electric cars and bikes are being hailed as an alternative when those lithium batteries are just as damaging and unsustainable as our current petroleum based economy. Where are these plans coming from, who is incentivizing city council to implement them and for what end goal? Slow streets disempower citizens.

7	My suggestions are the following: 1. Willie Stargell ave and 5th st (Alameda Landing) - intersection is very slow (lights) for pedestrians and bicyclists (dangerous since willie stargell ave is a narrow with no separate lane for bicycles). 2. Webster ave - extremely dangerous for bicyclists (requires separate lanes for bicycles) - no easy way to bike to farmer's market from alameda landing without going through the dangerous traffic of webster st) 3. All over Alameda - very difficult to turn the light green at any intersection when riding a bicycle. Have to get off and press the button and then come back to your left turn lane is not very dangerous and inconvenient.
8	Thank you for the opportunity to give my feedback concerning the Active Transportation Plan. PLEASE reopen the slow streets to cars. I personally am a walker and I can tell you without hesitation that pedestrians, bicyclists, playing children, etc are not using those streets as they did when we were all quarantined. People are using the sidewalks, not the middle of the streets. With the exception of cars that either ignore the barricades or live on those streets, their centers are empty. On the other hand, streets that are adjacent to the slow streets are busier than ever with automobile traffic and these streets are sometimes too narrow to allow cars to pass each other from opposite directions. College Avenue, for instance, has traffic passing through constantly now. It's become dangerous. Crime has also increased on College Avenue since wide, comfortable, easy to maneuver Versailles has been closed to traffic. I appreciate you wanting to make walking and cycling safer for people like me who enjoy leaving my car at home, but closing major streets is not the answer. Our surrounding cities have all reopened their slow streets. Schools are open. People are working and traveling again. The slow streets are not being used to gather, play, pedal or walk in the center anymore. PLEASE allow cars to drive down them legally again! Thank you.
9	I'm confused as to how this is supposed to "save" Alameda. People live their lives as conveniently as possible for them. By being forced to go out of their way, not use the most direct or common sense means of getting from point A to point B, does nothing to improve their situations. I definitely don't understand how you think causing gridlock on many streets is saving the environment. Since parklets and slow streets have come about, cars are blocked up, in single lanes, idling, whereas, before, they would move on to their destination. As an example, while sitting at The Local, on Park St., we watched as the UPS truck blocked traffic from Central to Encinal. Traffic completely stopped! Through three signals! A cement truck driver kept leaning on his horn, didn't help, but made him feel better. Pre-parklets, traffic would have kept moving. Cars would get to their destinations more quickly, without the idling time added in. Slow streets, which seldom have bicyclists or walkers on them, cause detours and longer drives. More unnecessary pollution! What might looks good on paper, and in designs, is not always the best, in reality. Alameda was a quiet little community, where people figured out their own routes, and you're changing it into a noisy, place with blocked off streets, cheap, dirty plastic barriers, dirty sand bags at slow street barriers, bumper to bumper traffic, and bicyclists who fly through red lights and stop signs, putting walkers at risk, and causing near auto/bike accidents. Perhaps, you should do a survey as to how many City Hall employees and safety personnel, and general city employees ride their bikes to work. It's one thing to support this bike style, in a parade, but how many support in day to day life? Maybe, check the designated employee parking spaces to see how many have cars and how many have bikes.

10 There are a LOT of materials to review and if you're using your computer or tablet to Zoom, you can't refer to them. It would be great to have two screens!

Thank you for listening this afternoon. It feels like everything is bike-focused, so people like me and my neighbors who don't use a bike for errands because we don't have the strength and/or equipment to carry stuff on a bike, or are too lazy, or are afraid our bikes will be stolen without a $100+ lock (or who don't have a bike because they can't afford it or it was already stolen) feel left out. Unless the city wants to buy everyone all the cycling equipment needed and better enforce bike theft and completely change our innate laziness, most adults just aren't going to ride here to complete errands so there isn't much point to creating good biking downtown. That's reality. I do think there's more opportunity to design for bikes in the newer parts of town (which also tend to be occupied more by younger, stronger people) so focusing on that does make sense.

People like to talk about how people bike everywhere in Europe, but I haven't actually seen that in the European cities I've visited. I did see thousands of bikes in Amsterdam, but they were locked up in double-decker bike storage near the train station rather than actually being ridden in the city. Most of the people actually riding bikes in downtown Amsterdam were tourists — the city is absolutely not designed for riding a bike , and they don't have bike lanes. The Dutch use bikes to ride from their homes in the suburbs to the train, then walk or take local transit to their jobs in Amsterdam.

I went to school in Davis and of course rode my bike everywhere. Loved the bike circles! But Davis also did have some major roads which cars used because they were more efficient than the neighborhood streets. That left little car traffic on the neighborhood streets (which also mostly had large trees for shade), so they were fine to ride through — like much of Alameda, actually. But it's the campus itself that was really bike-friendly, because the whole thing was designed to work that way and there were no existing houses to deal with.

The most pleasant place to walk is Bay Farm. They have separate shady paths in many places along the green belts, and on the shoreline there is only a multi/use path but you can walk off-path along the shore so that works. I wish I didn't have to drive to get there to walk my dog - at least my car is electric. New development offers great opportunities to do it right like Bay Farm!

[Continued from above]
Unfortunately Alameda seems determined to make even the wide streets that ARE suitable for cars into car-unfriendly routes, which moves cars into narrow residential streets to avoid the signals and other obstacles because realistically 99% of people who go off-Island would never consider riding a bike to do so. Would you want to ride a bike into Oakland over the Park Street Bridge? I sure wouldn't. The only reason to use the High Street Bridge is to get onto 880, so there are no measures you could put in place to reduce that car traffic. And those cars have to go somewhere once they get to Alameda. Gibbons is the best way into the middle of town. I'd be fine with more stop signs to slow traffic down, but driving traffic from Gibbons to neighborhood streets is not the answer.
Unless the plan is to put speed bumps on every single street in Alameda, traffic calming on one street will just drive cars to other streets, which are generally narrower and even less suitable for the traffic, and even more unsafe.
I do try to walk for errands as much as practical, but the routes to places like the main library (from points east) are just not pleasant. The main ways to improve walkability for me are provide shade trees, sidewalks wide enough for two people to pass to pass (unlike the sidewalk on Park next to the Southshore parking lot) and make sure street crossings at intersections are safe. I do feel safe at most intersections except Lincoln and Park (traffic in too many directions, plus the narrowing of Park from one lane to two right there) and Fernside/Blanding at Tilden (also too much going on; closing off Pearl altogether in conjunction with the roundabout would probably help a lot).
You asked about the path arrangement at Ralph Appazato and I actually did try that once, but the lack of shade and landscaping made it unappealing to me. Separate paths are great though!
I'm not sure why no one is factoring in the weakening of traffic enforcement as an explanation for increasing speeding. That's probably the single change that would have the most impact on making Alameda safer - and isn't that the most important goal?
[And, in follow-up email:]
Oops, I meant ride over the High street bridge rather than Park (although basically the Oakland side of any of our bridges is not very bike-friendly).

11 First of all, I want to thank you for being at the outreach event today. I appreciate the outreach to the public but I hope that the number of people who participate are tallied in order to understand who is participating. I get the push for transportation that is carbon neutral but it seems to me that, that agenda is being pushed regardless of the data. We will all be driving electric cars in the future which will mitigate all those arguments. You mentioned Davis today as an example of a city that is now bike friendly due to the redesign of the streets. Are you aware that the median age of a Davis resident is 26.2 years old as of 2021. The census data for Alameda is 40.2 years old. That should be a sobering statistic.

I do reiterate my concern about removing parking in front of residences due to its impact on the disabled-either temporary or permanent. As I mentioned today, my husband has Parkinson's and will not be able to drive in the near future. Fortunately, I do no live on Grand, but if I did I would be outraged if this plan goes through. The blocks on Grand are the length of a football field. If we lived on a block that did not have parking nearby, he would not be able to navigate that distance to get to a ride. The bike lane would prohibit a transit van or ride share to stop in front of our house. At your suggestions, I have contacted Mr. Vance to investigate this further and he has gotten back to me. We are awaiting a meeting.

My skepticism starts with the survey that was done showing the sample 60% owners and 35% renters which is not representative of the Alameda population and continues with comparisons of Alameda to Davis given the median age differences. This is an ill conceived transportation plan. I fear that in the case of Grand, staff was given the task of placing protected bike lanes and came up with the only way you can make it work regardless of its practicality. I feel like this is a done deal and I am sure the unintended consequences will be great.

12	I have read your plan for Slow Streets and have concerns that don't seem to be addressed in this draft. The draft states that Versailles is a long standing bicycle route yet it is not painted for bikes. Is Versailles going to be painted for bike use? Central has a painted bicycle path so why does the Slow Street go to San Jose and stop? There isn't a painted bicycle path on Encinal or San Jose so it seems to just leave bicyclist on an unprotected road. The draft mentions a network of bicycle travel yet none of these routes connect. When will that happen? I walk Versailles where the slow street closure currently is in place. I have attached photos of a summer camp program that used Edison School for the summer. The drop off was and continues to be for Edison School on the Versailles entrance. The cones were put in the street so drivers could drive through to drop off there children on a slow street. People parked across the street and the children crossed over through the car drop off. The signage of slow street leaves pedestrians and bicyclist with a false sense of security when cars are encourage to use the same roadway. Why are city operated buildings exempt from operating within the slow street program and continue to encourage automobile use? The school district should require drop offs on the 3 adjoining streets not on a slow street. Will that happen? On San Jose I routinely share the sidewalk with bicyclist who are riding to school on the sidewalk. There is no painted bicycle route here and despite the street blocked with the slow street signs the bicyclists continue to use the sidewalk. Many middle school and high school students are now riding Ebikes and travel at a higher speed. The plan does not address this increasingly used transportation. Will they continue to have access to our sidewalks and bike paths? Look forward to understanding the Slow Street program since it appears it will continue.
13	Hello: I submitted a survey for slow streets but also want to add an item. I live on Versailles Ave. near the intersection of Versailles and Fernside and many drivers continue to make the illegal turn onto Versailles from Fernside. I recommend removing the left turn lane on Fernside.
14	We had the opportunity to review the Active Transportation Plan at Pride in the Park about two weeks ago, and looked it over more closely in recent evenings. We're delighted that our street, Garfield Ave, has been selected as a Neighborhood Greenway, and are crossing our fingers that we'll be early in that process. As bikers, runners, and dog-walkers, we've loved the Slow Streets program and are in favor of those or their safe and green counterparts like the Neighborhood Greenway for as many of Alameda's primarily residential streets as possible. It's especially great that Garfield was selected, because it feels as if we're among the least safe streets on the East End for pedestrians. It's one of the widest streets connecting two main thoroughfares (High and Fernside), which invites motorists to speed for a quarter-mile. This is most troubling at the intersection of Fernside-Garfield, where not a week goes by without someone having an extremely close call or being hit by a car. A boy on his bike was hit on a recent Friday morning, and we've had close calls while walking our dog at multiple times of day. From the High St. bridge, ours is the first stop sign on the "Fernside Freeway," and it's often ignored as drivers have built up speed throughout the curve; on the other side, drivers have often been accelerating since Central Ave, two-plus blocks away. We're now parents to a future Lincoln Lion who'll be walking or biking that way to school in the years to come and loves watching kids bike as we stroller along in the mornings; we shudder to think about how unsafe it might be in the next ten years given what it's like now - even during the pandemic with less commute traffic. Again, it's very appreciated that Garfield will become a Neighborhood Greenway - but something has to be done for crossing safety at Fernside-Garfield intersection much sooner. Residents have taken it upon themselves to place orange handheld flags there to increase visibility but they have not proven to be a significant deterrent to drivers who fail to stop at that intersection. Can highly visible crossing lights be added at the crosswalk in the near-term? Thanks in advance for your consideration.
15	I use a wheelchair. What area would I be using in your new roadway: bicycle pathways, sidewalks, roadways?

16 I am afraid I have come a little late to this issue and have not offered any input thus far. However, today I took the Survey and I would also like to submit some thoughts about this draft Transportation Plan.
First let me say, we have lived on the North side on Buena Vista Ave. for over 40 years. During that time we have seen many changes (mostly good) come to Alameda and our neighborhood. During that time we have also had to fight for quality of life issues for our neighborhood. It took us 20 years to finally get the Truck Route designation removed from this street and we enjoyed a truck-less existence for 18 years. However, the trucks have started using Buena Vista again, we believe as an alternative to the "improvements" that have been made on Clement. We love the bicycle route on Clement however, the new STOP signs that have been put there (for the developers) are causing trucks to choose to take what they must consider a faster and easier route onto Buena Vista. We have spoken to the Police Department about this problem, and they are doing what they can with limited resources to enforce the No Trucks on Buena Vista policy. But we would like to see some sort of traffic calming on this street to discourage the truck traffic in the first place. We would love to have more STOP signs installed (like on Willow and Buena Vista). However, we have been told, in the past, that we don't have enough accidents to warrant that. Yet, Clement gets STOP signs at intersections that don't even have cross traffic. How is that justified?
In the entire draft Transportation Plan there is not one amenity given to Buena Vista. Heck, we don't even rate street resurfacing. Your Plan boasts goals of Equity, Environmental Justice and High Quality of Life. None of that is apparent for our neighborhood.
We are a working class neighborhood with a majority of multifamily residences. Just in the area of Willow to Park St. there are more than 175 residences, most of which are in two or three family houses with a smattering of apartment complexes. The neighbors here are many renters who don't or can't take part in City affairs like this transportation plan. But just because of their lack of participation does that mean they should be shut out of your goal of Equity? This is a very ethnically diverse neighborhood, too, so does that mean because of their cultural differences they should be denied Environmental Justice? And, the people who live here are by no means high income. Does that mean they should be without a High Quality of Life?
I ask that you consider this neighborhood in your plans. Give us a "road diet" or "traffic calming" and let us experience the same Quality of Life, Environmental Justice and Equity as you are giving to other parts of Alameda.

17 Like numerous other city projects here in Alameda the city staff preparation begins months, if not longer, before the public is even aware of a very large, expensive or controversial project is underway.

This particular project again is consistent with the city's process of making decisions on a project before asking for citizen input. How can staff truly know in which direction to proceed if they do not have public input? Like the Central Avenue project and the homeless medical facility issue this current project is tantamount to a fully loaded freight train barreling down the track and can not be stopped. To me, the "survey" you are asking for is worthless and pro forma in that decisions have already been made. It is simply a meaningless effort to justify and support what has already been decided.

I understand that the city has received a $200 million dollar grant to be utilized in the walk/bike project. I am sure that a majority of citizens if allowed to a pre-survey or input prior to committing this huge amount of money would be able provider other projects which serve the entire community rather than a minority of bicycle enthusiasts who lobby quite efficiently.

After attending for years literally dozens of meetings, "work shops" and discussions about pending projects in Alameda I have finally learned that for the most part decisions have already been made prior to those supposed information input gatherings making them just a meaningless process.

This is why I will not be completing the requested survey for this project as it certainly appears that history is repeating itself and the bureaucracy will continue down the tract like the aforementioned locomotive.

18	I have submitted the survey and here are my questions: Who are the bicycle groups: Community Action for a Sustainable Alameda, Bike Walk Alameda, Bike EastBay? How many people are in these groups? Do they live in Alameda? Because I live on Versailles Ave., I'm most concerned with that street. Since the barriers went up 2 years ago it is much more unsafe, causing more crimes and because people are forced onto Pearl St. there are more accidents and near misses at the intersection of San Jose Ave. Also, very few bicyclists use Versailles Ave. but those that do sail right through the stop signs, even with children. I can't tell from the vague description of Separated Bike Lane if parking will be prohibited on one side of the street. This would be a disaster for all the residents on this street many of whom have no off-street parking. I'm old and disabled and need to park near my back gate. I understand that some of the on-line neighborhood groups have asked their participants if they are in favor of what the city is doing to the streets and the majority are not. Has anyone counted how many people are using the street for walking and biking? Have any live surveys been done where bikes and walkers have been counted? Do you have statistics? I am not asking for opinions or poll results with this question. I am asking for hard numbers. How many of the survey participants are not Alameda residents? Why are they included? These changes affects businesses and residences and is being presented as a benign change but it is not. Please listen to all of Alameda.
19	Just a note to let you know: I spent 2.5 hours typing my thoughts into your survey on my phone, only to have the results completely disappear when I tried to send it to you. Won't be doing this again. [And, follow-up email: Whoops! Used the wrong acronym. My bad. I meant the ATP survey. The one with 30 projects in 8 years. Really would like to know why a class 4 one way costs $2.4 million per mile more than a class 4 two way. And many other comments. 20 days in the middle of tax and election season was just too short to review such a large document and comment on it.]

	[These two comments received after the October 23 comment deadline.]
20	Hello, hopefully I'm not too late, but I'd love add my feedback in a couple points: • I'm thrilled St. Charles St. is becoming a Neighborhood Greenway • We will need physical traffic slowing measures - such as speedbumps - to make that safe. Right now around 25-30% of cars treat the road as a speedway and are traveling at speeds dangerous to pedestrians, including hooking hard turns onto Fair Oaks and sending children scattering. • All my neighbors and local residents are concerned given the growing number of young families on St. Charles and really appreciate these measures.
21	As a homeowner I truly appreciate our slow street on Versailles and wish it would become permanent. Reason: It stops drivers from speeding 40 - 50 miles down the street. With little to no respect for the residents of the area...who pay high taxes to support the community. This is a school street (Edison) and before the slow streets it was like an expressway and quite dangerous. Cars constantly speeding (yes constanttly speeding) down from Fernside to Otis. When asked to slow down speeders were beligerant, screamed, and threatened the residents here. It happened so frequently that we can say it was a common occurrence. People who do not live in this area complain 'it inconveniences them not being able to race down this direct street.' These drivers feel entitlement and exhibit little to no respect nor consideration for safety of the people living on this street. Beyond that people within the community truly enjoy biking and walking in the safe slow street zone. And utilize it quite frequently. My 15 adjacent neighbors all feel the same way. We've all talked about it. I implore you to please consider making Versailles a permanent slow street. For the residents, community, and especially the kids. Thank you.

I wish to weigh-in against institutionalizing Slow Streets in Alameda. My stance against institutionalizing Slow Streets is:

(1) Safer for Slow Streets is not a safer plan for the entire city

(2) With increased building in Alameda, safe egress in the event of an emergency is more crucial than ever

(3) The stated need to create open space for pedestrians and bicyclists due to Covid stay-at-home mandates is no longer true

(4) Inequality- Why do some streets and their inhabitants merit extra care and others do not?

(5) Small businesses along Slow Streets are negatively impacted from lack of egress and parking.

(6) My tax payer dollars were to support the infrastructure of streets for cars. I vote in extending bike paths separately. This is now bait and switch

I sent a letter (copied below) to the Alameda City Council and the Alameda sun expressing my concerns over an unsafe situation ***caused*** by funneling two lanes down to one when two cars approached an intersection at the same time as a woman bicycling with two children. My correspondence with Erin Smith and John Knox was misinterpreted even upon reiterating the scenario. Neither car was driving too fast or inattentively. They were navigating around the Slow Street barrier, and I dread what would have happened if the woman wasn't accompanying the two children on bikes and the children proceeded into this confusing merge.

I asked for clarification and figures supporting that Slow Streets actually decrease serious accidents. I was provided links (Slow Streets program ; Active Transportation Plan) that had "upcoming" city council dates apparently from 2020. Another unanswered question pertinent to decide if the Slow Street initiative actually reduces accidents and morbidity is Alameda's rates for 2020 vs 2022. If it follows other Slow Street cities and the national figures, accidents involving cars have actually increased since Slow Streets were implemented- connoting that while those protected streets may be less hazardous, it actually shifts the danger to neighboring streets. Trish Spenser of the council provided a document from the Alameda County Department of Transportation:

https://www.alamedaca.gov/Departments/Planning-Building

	Average per year, 2009–2018	2019	2020	2021
All modes				
Killed	2	1	4	4
Severely injured	10	6	5	9
All injuries	221	273	167	158

While the numbers are blessedly too low to show a statistical significance either showing that Slow Streets decrease accidents or increase them, there is a trend of increased serious accidents associated with when the Slow Streets initiative was enacted.

The Slow Streets need to come down to restore safe passage for all Alamedians.

Sincerely, Jennifer Kidd

Letter to the Alameda City Council and Alameda Sun 7/26/22

It's Time to Take down our Barriers

Streets are for cars; bike lanes are for bikes and sidewalks are for pedestrians. Stating the obvious is not obvious when looking at our Alameda streets. It's time to take down the Slow Street barriers because not only have they outlived their purpose, but they are actually causing safety hazards.

At the onset of the pandemic when children were kept at home, we read that the Slow Streets provided a safer environment for children and their families to exercise. That is no longer true and what we are left with is worsening traffic congestion in Alameda. I have witnessed one neighbor turning into a Slow Street while another neighbor was approaching the same single-lane intersection at the very time that a woman and two children on bicycles had to come to a standstill.

By all means, let's continue to set aside access trails for bikes and pedestrians as Alameda grows. But let's take down the Slow Street barriers so cars can pass safely.

Sincerely, Jennifer Kidd, a 50+ year Alameda resident

(510) 516-0497
P.O. BOX 2732
ALAMEDA, CA 94501
www.bikewalkalameda.org

Board of Directors

Denyse Trepanier
President

Brian Fowler
Treasurer

Tim Beloney
Secretary

Cyndy Johnsen
Board Member

Lucy Gigli
Founder, non-voting

October 19, 2022

RE: Item 6A (Draft Active Transportation Plan)

Dear Transportation Commissioners and Staff,

We're very excited about the Active Transportation Plan and are writing in support and appreciation of this important initiative. It's critical to improving safe mobility for everyone, and achieving our climate and Vision Zero goals, all while enhancing livability in Alameda.

There are a few broad areas that we think can be improved, described below, which we hope you will consider. We also have compiled more detailed, specific suggestions in this spreadsheet from select members that we hope will be helpful.

Neighborhood Greenways
Since our 2030 Low Stress Backbone Network relies heavily on Neighborhood Greenways, they must truly function as low stress facilities: car speeds and volumes must be effectively reduced to target volumes, and be safe and comfortable when they are at their worst. Some suggestions to ensure this happens, courtesy of Bike East Bay's Advocacy Director Robert Prinz:

- Include metrics and goals for ***peak*** hour car traffic and ***maximum*** measured car speeds, not just average daily traffic and average car speeds. For example, on page 39, expand the metrics from 1500 daily vehicles or less to include peak traffic volumes of less than 50 motor vehicles per hour in the peak direction at peak hour per NACTO).
- Create a dedicated project (or expand on P.3: *Develop a toolkit to achieve and maintain Neighborhood Greenway volume and speed targets using volume management and traffic calming tools*) to collect data and existing conditions analysis proactively on as many Neighborhood Greenway corridor segments as possible. Bike Walk Alameda would be happy to help with manual counts, but exploring long-term options for data collection is preferred. Having this information will allow staff to monitor, iterate, and make swift design decisions when opportunities arise via paving, utility coordination, development projects,

etc. Here are some example docs from OakDOT, which outsourced much of this analysis work to consultants:
    - scope of work for upgrades analysis project here
    - upgrades screening spreadsheet here
    - draft web map of analysis locations here
- Develop minimum design standards (like this guide from Oakland DOT) that can be implemented routinely, by default, with all paving projects and other capital improvement projects, with streamlined outreach standards for other upgrades that go beyond the minimum when added funding is available.These minimums should include midblock and intersection traffic calming, as well as intersection controls and crossing improvements.
  To minimize through-street driving, we'd like to see partial diverters (or modal filters) used as generously as feasible.
- The reason Santa Clara and Orion aren't recommended as neighborhood greenways is because they, or streets parallel to them, are planned to have low stress treatments. However, it will be a while before that work is done. At least until those improvements are in place, we propose these streets remain traffic calmed. We also support the rationale behind keeping Versailles as a Neighborhood Greenway.

Trails

Many trails that are part of the low stress network are in poor shape and are not maintained by the City of Alameda. We recommend a dedicated project (or expand on Project 26 on page 61: *Maintain and upgrade shared use trails, based on prioritization criteria*) to identify trail ownership on a map, and create a process that ensures minimum standard maintenance of these trails. If they cannot be adequately maintained, alternative facilities should be considered where options exist. Areas of specific concern are Bay Farm and Marina Village.

2030 Low Stress Backbone Map Suggestions

Overall, this map looks great, especially in addressing safe north-south connectivity, a key issue in Alameda. The corridors of Webster and Park Street are not only needed for connectivity and general access, but are high injury corridors that should be fixed, so we're glad to see protected facilities for them on this priority map. There are a few areas that could be better connected, though, including:

- The Marina Village area, which will serve many of Alameda's new residents. Enabling people to walk and bike safely to shopping and jobs here is important. Protected bike lanes along Marina Village Parkway and Challenger will help, and will connect to the Cross Alameda Trail to stitch this area into the larger network better. If the bike and pedestrian

bridge lands here, a low stress facility will be essential to low stress cross-estuary travel.
- McKay and Westline should be on this map, too, to connect Central to the Bay Trail/Shoreline.
- The West End could use more connectivity, in particular, Main Street (to the ferry) and Orion.

Goals/Ongoing Evaluation/Performance Metrics

One of the recommendations in our Bicycle Friendly City report card from League of American Bicyclists, was to "Adopt a target level of bicycle use (percent of trips) to be achieved within a specific timeframe, and ensure data collection necessary to monitor progress."

This is an area where this plan falls very short. We understand that right now, our city may not have the ability to capture the data needed to do this, but we urge the city to find ways to do so, because it's hard to improve without measurement. Please consider adding a program that addresses this issue: hire consultants to study how other cities have done it, coordinate volunteers to do counts, buy/rent equipment to automate data collection, etc.

Ideally**,** each of our performance metrics would include actual numbers and target dates where they make sense (ie, x% of y by date z), and we'd have the data and tools to monitor progress and effectiveness of investments.

Bicycle Facility Types (Table 7)

This table helpfully divides low stress from high stress facilities, but might go further in expressly deprecating standard paint-only bike lanes. While protected bike lanes have been shown to improve safety for all users, paint-only lanes and sharrows do not, and further, are not inviting to the very important 46% of Alamedans who are 'interested but concerned' in biking. Often, paint-only bike lanes are built to fill in the space when road diets are implemented. So while they serve a purpose, our city should install these only as a last resort, after safer facilities have been determined technically infeasible. If a street has — or is anticipated to have — motor vehicle volumes and speeds that call for bike lanes, they should be protected bike lanes, and that should be conveyed clearly in this table and in related discussions.

In general, we see our small city as a place where everyone can get around safely, no matter how they do it. We believe that almost anywhere cars go in Alameda, bikes and pedestrians should be able to safely go, too, and our approach to facility type should reflect that thinking. We should start with the safest and most welcoming facility, and degrade only when necessary.

This is in line with Caltrans' approach to 'complete streets' — the exceptions where streets cannot be safe for all users should be rare and fully justified. Our General Plan also takes this approach:

- *Safety First: When designing streets, the safest treatments should be considered the default starting point and be degraded only if necessary after documenting rationale for the approach. (Policy ME-6, Action B.)*
- *Space Priorities: When allocating public right-of-way space, the first consideration shall be for people walking, bicycling, and using transit. Space for on-street parking shall be the lower priority. (Policy ME-6, Action G.)*
- *Low-Stress Bikeways: Provide separated bicycle lanes instead of unprotected, standard bicycle lanes, unless not feasible. (Policy ME-14, Action H.)*

We hope to see this thinking normalized and reflected across various city documents where these issues are relevant, like this Bicycle Facility Type table, and street classification documents.

Staffing

Page 57 references the limits of staff resources, and suggests that some projects won't get done if there's not sufficient bandwidth. Bandwidth is a known issue as is, so we'd prefer that we plan to hire staff or consultants if projects are at risk, or goals are not being met, rather than abandoning or delaying important safety initiatives. This is in line with Goal 2.1 of the Vision Zero Action Plan, which states, "Through the City Council budget process, propose ongoing, dedicated funding and staffing for Vision Zero implementation and coordination (ongoing)," with the City Manager's Office as the lead.

Thank you again for the great work on the Active Transportation Plan to date, and for considering our thoughts.

Sincerely,

Bike Walk Alameda

Bike Walk Alameda:

Online spreadsheet of specific comments, referenced in 10/19/22 Letter to Transportation Commission on Public Draft ATP

Section	Comment
Chapter 2: Vision and Goals	Goals should be more robust, data-driven. Table 11 at the very end has evaluation criteria, but is still light. For more detail and suggestions, see: see: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1sWc590BzbkO0bXMmZqLfAaD2n2qK7yXkymOCLAXWKSg/edit?usp=sharing
Chapter 3: Existing Conditions	Suggest adding an image of one of our low stress facilities on p. 13. Like Cross Alameda Trail along Clement. Also, somewhere in here, it would be nice to feature a parent with a cargo bike.
Chapter 3: Existing Conditions	The survey is great! It's useful grounding for this entire planning process.
Chapter 3: Existing Conditions	p. 14 mode share infographic: This adds up to only 91%
Chapter 3: Existing Conditions	Table 2: What is the order here? Suggest starting with least stress (top) to most stress (bottom).
Chapter 3: Existing Conditions	Figure 2: There are a few segments on here that are spec'd as separated, but are not
Chapter 3: Existing Conditions	Slow Streets: The proposal to remove Santa Clara is driven by the fact that Central (with planned improvements) is parallel; Orion because it will get protected bike lanes. But since those projects won't be complete for a while, might it make sense to keep traffic calming in place? What is the downside?
Chapter 3: Existing Conditions	A good decision to focus the next stage of planning on the "Interested but Concerned" group of people. It's the largest group. Using this as the reference group isn't ignoring others — it's using them as the most representative of a wide range of needs, ages, backgrounds, etc.
Chapter 3: Existing Conditions	"The PLTS for Alameda focused on intersections and mid-block crossings": Interesting. This makes sense as a decision to focus on intersections, where there are competing priorities -- as made clear by the kind of subpar Intersection Access Policy!
Chapter 3: Existing Conditions	Figure 3: I have a hard time believing that there are no high injury areas in Bay Farm for either cyclists or pedestrians.
Chapter 4: Pedestrian Design Strategy	Figure 5: I want to highlight that there is no crosswalk or curb to connect the trail to N. Loop Road which has a school, two daycares and businesses. This results in people having difficulty crossing Harbor Bay Parkway here which disincentivises cycling to these schools/businesses. This has been an ask for years, but it got off the radar. This is really important because otherwise there is an entire area that is walled off.
Chapter 4: Pedestrian Design Strategy	Table 4: This should be normalized with the City of Alameda Street Classifications doc, which has the same types, but a different way of showing info, and includes curb use priority.
Chapter 4: Pedestrian Design Strategy	Table 4 - Business Commercial Street: This seems like a good street type for protected bike lanes. On the Street Classifications doc, parking is prioritized over safe biking for this type of street, which would seem to violate General Plan which calls for prioritizing safety for bicyclists and pedestrians above parking on all streets.
Chapter 4: Pedestrian Design Strategy	Table 4 - Business Commercial Street: I'd also recommend they call out the need for improved access by cyclists and pedestrians getting into the business complexes. For example, South Shore Center is very hard to access by bike currently. The pedestrian crossings are also few and small given the number of people accessing that super block on foot. I think they could call out the need for access into the superblocks, not just travel past the superblocks on this type of street.
Chapter 4: Pedestrian Design Strategy	Table 4 - Gateway Street: It's great to see in the Street Classifications doc that 25 MPH is the proposed target speed for these streets. But to accomplish that will require physical changes. For example, the intersection of Constitution and Marina Village Pkwy (site of a pedestrian fatality) needs changes to actually constrain motorists to 25MPH.
Chapter 4: Pedestrian Design Strategy	Table 5 - Corridor Treatments: Can we have full traffic diverters, aka modal filters, to deter traffic along neighborhood greenways?
Chapter 4: Pedestrian Design Strategy	Table 5 - Streetscape Improvements: Why are trees high cost? Planting a tree is cheap.
Chapter 4: Pedestrian Design Strategy	Table 5 - Streetscape Improvements: this should have an asterisk because a bench is cheap.
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Add as Comfort and Connectivity performance measure: increase percentage of low-stress bikeways from 51% to 72% by 20??
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	"Climate Action and Resiliency Plan (CARP) goal to add 10.4 new miles of previously unplanned bikeways": Another Comfort and Connectivity performance measure to add to Goals and Evaluation section at end. Although miles of bikeways alone aren't sufficient -- we should have actual mode shift goals.
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Figure 6: I am really torn about leaving broadway as regular bike lanes. The Park / Oak corridor will not be low stress for many years. This leave broadway as the only north/south bikeway for east/central. Its pretty bad right now, with delivery and construction vehicles blocking the bike lanes regularly. Its definitely high stress.
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Figure 6: It may be beyond Alameda city limits, but I think they should provide some information on the corridors as far as reaching Fruitvale BART and reaching the street grid beyond 880. Cyclists don't magically appear on the bridges, or disappear once they go over the bridges. The East Oakland street grid and the BART station are the actual origins/destinations that need to be served safely and comfortably.
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Figure 6: Propose Marina Village Pkwy and Challenger have protected bike lanes -- is there a reason that would be infeasible? Northern Waterfront will see a lot of new housing and these residents should be able to bike safely to shop and work in this area. Might also be where the bridge lands.

Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Figure 6: Open access to Cross Alameda Trail for residents of apartments just south of it between Webster and Poggi.
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Figure 6: Propose protected bike lanes on McKay to enhance low stress connectivity, and because there is a key destination and parking lot at the end, and bus traffic is expected.
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Figure 6: The Bay Trail is mentioned in this document, but there's no information on how it would connect on this leg. At a minimum, this plan should indicate that Alameda will coordinate with Caltrans project on SR-61 along San Leandro Bay and ERPD work for MLK Regional Shoreline trail.
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Introducing Neighborhood Greenways: Slow Streets welcomed pedestrians in the street, and it's been great. It made it easier for people recovering from injuries to walk (sidewalks can be a challenge), it gave people with disabilities greater access, it enabled groups to walk more comfortably, for runners to run more comfortably, etc. We should not lose that dimension in this transition to neighborhood greenways. This definition should make it more clear that these streets are prioritized for people walking and biking in the street.
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Introducing Neighborhood Greenways: My hope for the Neighborhood Greenways is that they will be designed so that, for example, elementary school aged kids can cycle without being passed closely by an SUV. I think all drivers will need to be driving at a slow enough speed so that they can brake quickly and fully. That's definitely lower than 25 MPH. Not sure if it's 15 or 20 MPH.
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Introducing Neighborhood Greenways: I want stronger language. Swap "may" to "will" include the following design elements proven to reduce travel speeds such as. We should make several treatments the default, unless technically infeasible, similar to what we've done with PBLs and daylighting. We need to put the burden on those fighting AGAINST these treatments, not on those fighting FOR these treatments.
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Introducing Neighborhood Greenways: Why not full diverters (modal filters), particularly on neighborhood greenways that are a part of the low stress backbone?
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Table 7: This table is really useful. I think they should add another table on intersection treatments. Neighborhood Greenways will not be successful if cyclists aren't able to comfortably and safely cross larger streets. Seeing a pic of a Berkeley bike boulevard in this plan isn't encouraging — Berkeley's bike boulevards have lousy crossings of major streets! I haven't read the appendixes yet. They probably have more detail there. But I'd suggest they make sure to address intersection/crossing treatments more right here, so that it's seen as integral to the Neighborhood Greenways. Relevant NACTO guide for them to cite is https://nacto.org/publication/dont-give-up-at-the-intersection/
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Table 7 - Separated Bike Lane: add bollards
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Table 7 - Separated Bike Lane: Whenever there is a case where a crossing of the street has to occur, there should be an obvious (painted) way to cross the street to connect the two bike lanes. Using Pedestrian cross walks for this purpose is very difficult with heavy cargo bikes with kids.
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Table 7 - Buffered Bike Lanes: I do not agree with this statement. 30 mph is fast. Plus the example is with no parking. When there is parking like on Fernside, it is more stressful
Chapter 5: Bicycle Network	Table 7 - Buffered Bike Lanes: I would like to see Buffered and Traditional bike lanes painted a bright color to highlight that they are not parking. I think the lack of highlighting may confuse people who don't see them as very different from street-parking. If they are saving money by not making them protected, this seems like a reasonable thing to try.

Chapter 6: Trail Network and Water Crossings	Maintenance and Upgrades: I want more detail on this. There are so many terribly maintained paths with confusion about who is responsible for maintenance. IMO, if the trail/path is part of the transportation network, it is the city's responsibility to maintain. I don't think the city can take responsibility over other jurisdictions (HOAs, park districts, etc), but I agree that there should be more thinking on this issue, and a process defined to handle trail failures, if those trails are going to be included in our low stress backbone network. Maybe we pose this as a question to staff to see what they think should be done? One thing I'd like to see is an overlay of the trails map that shows who manages what. Bay Farm and Marina Village both rely on trails a lot, and it's hard to parse where the responsibility is. Maybe if they are not under the City's control, they can't be included on the city's low stress network? That is definitely a good points Cyndy. I would recommend a couple of things here: 1) Whenever a development builds infrustructure, it should cede over maintenance of that infrastructure to the city after a certain period of time (5 years maybe?) This seems like it should be negotiable 2) I would also like them to make it a point to determine who is responsible for what. In the event the path is not well-maintained, it should be reported to the agency/responsible authority to determine a maintenance plan. If that authority is an HOA that is refusing to fix the infrastructure in a reasonable amount of time, can they consider fines or ceding of the responsibility to the city? 3) If there is no way to improve path quality for a "low-stress" network, then I don't think it should be included. As a side note, on the north-side of the Bay Trail in Harbor bay, someone (city of Alameda or East Bay Parks) goes and picks up the garbage and pays for path trimming etc, so that indicates to me that someone is responsible for maintenance of that area. We need more pressure on this segment because it is heavily used and has gotten very little work done on it in the almost 10 years I've lived here. It's only getting worse.
Chapter 6: Trail Network and Water Crossings	Webster Tube Path: How long is construction anticipated, and what is the plan for circulation during construction for cars, buses, and bikes?
Chapter 6: Trail Network and Water Crossings	Wooden Bridge: This absolutely needs to be prioritized. Every person who uses this bridge hates the condition. It's long past time it the wood surface gets fixed up.
Chapter 6: Trail Network and Water Crossings	Figure 8: How does Bay Trail connect going south? Should reference relevant ERPD and Caltrans projects.
Chapter 7: Programs	Program 2: Local rebate currently available through AMP. Propose: "Support, promote, and/or expand..." Also might grow to include conversion kits, not just new e-bikes.
Chapter 7: Programs	Program 3: - Include metrics/goals for peak hour car traffic and maximum measured car speeds, not just average daily traffic and average car speeds as is usually included - We need these facilities to still be safe and comfortable even when they're at their worst, not only on average - Develop minimum design standards (like this guide from Oakland DOT: https://cao-94612.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/OaDOT_NBR_Guidance.pdf) that can be implemented routinely with all paving projects and other capital improvement projects, with streamlined outreach standards for other upgrades that go beyond the minimum when added funding is available. These minimums should include midblock and intersection traffic calming, as well as intersection controls and crossing improvements. - Recommend a dedicated project to collect data and existing conditions analysis proactively on every existing and recommended neighborhood greenway corridor segment, to allow staff to make swift design decisions later when opportunities arise via paving, utility coordination, development projects, etc. Here are some example docs from OakDOT who outsourced much of this analysis work to consultants: scope of work for upgrades analysis project here: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1aIIEouvuBCN1ApBF3TmAUBqA7Ccd4pOv/ upgrades screening spreadsheet here: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1ka98iucvocxNAai3cK91ioSHQyrzWQwl/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=116441291070816754665&rtpof=true&sd=true draft web map of analysis locations here: https://arcg.is/0jefKe
Chapter 7: Programs	Program 4: add maintenance of bike repair stations (most are in disrepair now)
Chapter 7: Programs	Program 6: AB 1909 passed recently, allowing cyclists to use pedestrian walk signals -- remove this as done? But it might be good to make this more broad and say "Support legislation that improves safe streets and active transportation." There's a lot of it!
Chapter 7: Programs	Program 10: All city-owned parking lots/structures, and shopping centers should remove a certain number of spaces to set up quality, safe bike parking. All park and ride areas should have similar as well. Places near businesses that cater to kids (Clement and Park), etc. should also have more parking for bikes of various sizes.
Chapter 7: Programs	Program 11: adaptive bikes, too (https://www.sfmta.com/blog/permanent-adaptive-cycling-program-unveiled-golden-gate-park#:~:text=To%20reserve%20a%20bike%2C%20contact,disabilities%20in%20Golden%20Gate%20Park.) Also consider a cargo bike loaner program through the library, so people who only need to need one occasionally (or don't have room in their homes to fit one) can have access. Related: https://oaklandside.org/2022/08/08/electric-bike-library-planned-for-oakland/
Chapter 7: Programs	Program 12: Very similar to P.2 -- maybe combine them?
Chapter 7: Programs	Program 13: I think Robert Prinz or someone at Bike East Bay mentioned having a list of proposed clean-up to the Alameda Municipal Code. Hopefully this can be done quickly and easily, not take too much energy away from other goals.

Chapter 7: Programs	Program 17: Seems this should be near term, so we ensure all the stuff being planned is well done? Or alternatively, make a short term Goal of having review by consultants well-versed in best practices. Yes, sounds good to encourage them to do this sooner rather than later. City of Alameda should become a NACTO member (only $7,500 a year for this size city, it looks like) and should send some staff to the NACTO conference.
Chapter 7: Programs	Program 18: include shade trees
Chapter 7: Programs	Program 21: Does BWA want to continue this or not?
Chapter 7: Programs	Program 24: Most stands are in bad shape. Establish a maintenance schedule to keep these in good repair.
Chapter 7: Programs	Program 25: Bike to Wherever Day (not Bike to Work Day anymore)
Chapter 7: Programs	Program 29: Explicitly tie into Mode Shift goal, if we find it's difficult to make a numeric goal right now. I wonder if City of Alameda could expand upon the ACTC count program (https://www.alamedactc.org/programs-projects/bicycle-and-pedestrian/bicycle-pedestrian-count-program/) to evaluate projects. For example, when we were wondering about Bay Farm Bike Bridge usage, it turns out it's not included in the ACTC counts. The city could add that and other key locations to the count program to get better baselines and comparisons over time.
Chapter 7: Programs	proposed program: Ensure new developments are providing adequate parking/storage facilities for residents for all types of bikes and trailers, especially as we're seeing larger cargo bikes. I'm seeing new developments putting in vertical racks, which aren't great. Ensure there is charging ability, too, for ebikes.
Chapter 7: Programs	proposed program: Look into feasibility of bounty program for bike lane blockers: https://momentummag.com/austin-bike-lane-blockers/
Chapter 7: Programs	proposed program: Coordinate with AUSD/SR2S/PTAs to create bikebuses throughout Alameda to help encourage more biking to school and reduce the amount of driving to school.
Chapter 8: 2030 Infrastructure Plan	Let's push for more resources (whether staff or consultants) to ensure the plan gets completed, rather than planning to remove projects. Perhaps the trigger would be if incremental goals are not being met? This is in line with Goal 2.1 of the Vision Zero Action Plan, which states, “Through the City Council budget process, propose ongoing, dedicated funding and staffing for Vision Zero implementation and coordination (ongoing),” with the City Manager’s Office as the lead. Perhaps this plan isn't the right place to explicitly request more FTE. But all the delays with this plan certainly demonstrate the need for more transportation planners and transportation engineers! Hear you on this document not being the place to explicitly request FTE, but I don't think it should explicitly rule out requesting FTE, either...
Chapter 8: 2030 Infrastructure Plan	It's surprising that the cost of the projects are not included in the main document (only in appendix). I recognize that the cost was not a factor in their data driven prioritization of projects, but what's the feasibility of funding/delivering these projects in 8 years if the cost is not listed, and potential funding identified?
Chapter 8: 2030 Infrastructure Plan	Table 10 - Park Street and/or Oak Street Corridor: Deferring a full build until after 2030? Downtown Alameda deserves better than that. I think some of the objections to the quality of the current "quick build" materials on Park Street right now are valid. Park Street is also overdue for new sidewalks, new street furniture, and new lighting. Not sure if the City or DBA would take the lead on this. Also not sure if the funding would come from the City or from a DBA tax assessment. But it would be in the interests of residents and business owners to fully spiff up downtown streets in the next few years. Comparable examples: Castro Street in Mountain View got a rebuild in the '90s, Burlingame Ave in Burlingame got a rebuild in the '00s.
Chapter 8: 2030 Infrastructure Plan	Table 10 - Oakland-Alameda Bicycle-Pedestrian Bridge: Let's put an X in the 2030 column!
Chapter 8: 2030 Infrastructure Plan	Figure 9: Open up access to Cross Alameda Trail from apartment complex just south of it, between Poggi and Webster.
Chapter 8: 2030 Infrastructure Plan	Figure 9: Add Main Street as protected bike lane and Orion as either neighborhood greenway or protected bike lane -- we're short of low stress facilities here.
Chapter 8: 2030 Infrastructure Plan	Figure 9: McKay should be low stress.
Chapter 8: 2030 Infrastructure Plan	Figure 9: There is no good connection between the Bay Farm pedestrian bridge and the bike route on Bayview Drive. This should be addressed and planned for to make getting to south shore and lower park street easier.
Chapter 8: 2030 Infrastructure Plan	Figure 9: Would be good to Westline as protected bike lanes on this map to complete north-south connectivity here.
Chapter 8: 2030 Infrastructure Plan	Table 11 - Safety: Also important to have bike/ped counts to use for comparisons, to be able to compute "exposure" rates at different places — not just the absolute number of injuries/deaths. This is another reason for the city to be more involved in the ACTC bike/count program, and to place bike counters in more locations.

Table 11 - Connectivity and Comfort: City should consider maintaining a list of key destinations in Alameda (and nearby in Oakland, such as Fruitvale BART) and grading each on ease of access by bike and foot.

Lisa Foster

From: Drew Dara-Abrams
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2022 11:06 AM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] ATP feedback for staff and Transportation Commission

I'd like to share some feedback on the draft ATP with Planning staff and with the Transportation Commission.

Thank you,
Drew

--

- **Research**:
  - This is an appropriately comprehensive and thoroughly prepared plan. I particularly appreciated the survey conducted by a market research firm in Appendix B. It's useful to see the wide range of people who walk and bike around Alameda.
- **Business districts**:
  - Great to see Park/Oak and Webster included in the low-stress safe cycling network. It's important for cyclists of all ages and skills to be able to access the business districts and to also connect north/south to the rest of the low-stress cycling network. The Commercial Streets program has already demonstrated how both corridors can operate effectively with some lanes re-allocated from thru-auto-traffic to active transport modes.
  - Why is a full build using permanent materials for downtown Alameda not scheduled until after 2030? That's a long time to maintain "quick build" materials. Both Park and Oak have tripping hazards on their sidewalks currently. Can a full streetscape rebuild happen sooner rather than later? Are there means to fund some of these improvements in collaboration between the city and the DABA business association?
- **Pedestrian network and design treatments:**
  - *Table 5. Pedestrian Design Matrix* is comprehensive, but I'm not sure it's useful to the general public. Please consider identifying a smaller subset of treatments that the city is equipped to prioritize and roll out at scale. Pictures would be useful for the most important of the design treatment options.
  - It would be great to see a sampling of these design treatments built as demonstration projects, similar to how the Slow Streets barricades were rolled out very quickly. For example, neighborhood traffic circles would be great to build with "quick build" materials as a demonstration in a number of neighborhoods.
  - At present, too many of the Gateway Streets would be better identified as "car sewers." It's great to see that the target design speed is proposed as 25 MPH for all of the Gateway Street segments. This will take hard work — and will likely require more literal concrete in certain places. But it's definitely worth the effort. For example, the intersection of Constitution and Marina Village Parkway has been the site of at least one pedestrian killed by a driver. Those crosswalks are used often by seniors in the neighboring AHA complex, and the intersection is proposed to be part of the low-stress bicycle network. To reach a 25 MPH design speed for the roads entering and exiting that intersection is a worthy goal.
  - For both the pedestrian and cycling networks to succeed, there will need to be focus on key intersections and crossings. Some hard decisions will have to be made at intersections, due to space constraints. The logic of "levels of service" will need to be set aside in favor of safety. The

Vision Zero Action Plan identified high injury intersections. For the purposes of the ATP, please consider adding maps that specifically mark the high-injury intersections and also identify intersections that will need to be improved in order to support the low-stress bike network.

- **Cycling design treatments:**
  - *Table 7. Existing and Proposed Bicycle Facility Types in Alameda* is good, but it doesn't address the importance of intersections. Please consider adding another table into the ATP document about intersection treatments.
  - Consider referencing and using this NACTO publication: https://nacto.org/publication/dont-give-up-at-the-intersection/
- **Neighborhood Greenways**:
  - A great next step for the Slow Streets. My family walks on Versailles and cycles on San Jose regularly -- would love to see those built out with more permanent treatments as soon as possible.
  - To succeed, the bike boulevards need treatments where they cross larger intersections. I would strongly suggest that the ATP include the requirement that a Neighborhood Greenway have crossing/intersection treatments before any sections are allowed to be branded with signage as a Neighborhood Greenway. It is confusing to children and lower skill cyclists to have welcoming branding on signs and maps… and to then leave them almost stranded when they have to cross, say, 4 lanes of uncontrolled auto traffic.
- **Staffing**:
  - City of Alameda "punches above its weight" thanks to hard and creative work by its planners, engineers, and consultants. However, to deliver effectively on the ATP goals (as well as the goals of the Vision Zero Action Plan and the Climate Action and Resiliency Plan), the city very likely needs more staff to manage parallel projects, consultants, etc.
  - Under the Biden administration, a once-in-a-generation amount of funding has been authorized for transportation and infrastructure projects around the country. To fully take advantage of these funding opportunities, the city needs more transportation planners and transportation engineers on staff.
  - In addition to adding more staff, the Planning/Building/Transportation and Public Works departments would do well to explore how to most effectively and efficiently coordinate multi-faceted projects.
  - Perhaps the ATP is not the most appropriate document to propose and plan for organizational improvements. But I would at a minimum recommend removing the paragraph that says no additional FTE is required to accomplish the 2030 infrastructure plan. With all due respect, I wonder if that is overly optimistic.
- **Evaluation**:
  - Can the city collaborate with ACTC to add additional bike/ped count locations? For example, when I went looking for usage counts for the Bay Farm Bike/Ped Bridge, I found that that is not one of the locations in the ACTC counting program. Perhaps some more coordination could help to make the ACTC counts more useful to evaluate specific corridors and projects in City of Alameda.

  - What is the cost to add some additional in-pavement bike counters, beyond the city's existing one of the CAT? Just a couple more of those would help to provide coverage throughout the year, which can be used to adjust point-counts at other projects that don't have automated counters.

Lisa Foster

From: Carol Gottstein
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2022 2:44 PM
To: Lisa Foster; Lara Weisiger
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 10.20.2022 Public Comment Transportation Commission Special Meeting Agenda 6-A

Dear Transportation Commissioners:

Re: Draft Alameda ATP Public Review October 20, 2022

It seems to me this very large document is being pushed through public review in an extraordinarily short time frame: Oct 3-23, 2022. When I mentioned this to Staff, they referenced all the community outreach which had been done since late 2019. However, COVID-19 began in Winter 2019. In mid-March 2020, the Alameda public computer facilities, such as the libraries and the senior center computer lab, abruptly closed to the public for Shelter-In-Place. The Mastick facility remained closed until approximately September 2021.
This excluded many seniors, disabled, and low-income Alamedans; who do not have home or office Internet, from participating in online city meetings or surveys. I know many such people would have wanted to participate: I am one of them.

It appears the survey data was obtained by invitation to select Alamedans only. We are going to have to accept on faith that the survey analysis does not exhibit a bias toward the opinions of elite, computer-savvy Alamedans who are well-off and sophisticated enough to have access to a computer in their home or office.

I hope that some acknowledgement of the unusual lockdown circumstances that occurred contemporaneously with the development of this Plan, and may have limited public comment, will be acknowledged in the public record.

Thank you,
Carol Gottstein
1114 Grand Street
Alameda, CA 94501
510.930.4471

Rochelle Wheeler

From: Crystal Wang <cwang@actransit.org>
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 2:45 PM
To: Rochelle Wheeler
Cc: Nathan Landau; Robert Del Rosario; Michael Eshleman; Chantal Reynolds
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Reminder: Alameda's Draft Active Transportation Plan - Comment by Sunday, Oct 23

Hi Rochelle,

Thanks for providing us with the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Active Transportation Plan! Nathan and I reviewed the document, here are our comments/suggestions for your consideration:

- Page 12 – Under "Connectivity and Comfort", consider adding a sentence(s) along the lines of "Walking and biking also serve as key first/last mile connections to transit, so improvements to the active transportation network should also focus on enhancing connections to the transit network"
- Page 12 – Under "Mode Shift", consider adding "…to increase walking and biking *and promote better access/connections to transit*, while reducing driving"
- Page 18 – It would be good if this page acknowledged that many streets have to work for both bicycles and transit
- Page 31 – In the table, you list the Neighborhood Connector Streets as "often have transit". Consider adding "including major transit routes," because many of our routes run on those streets
- Page 31 – Under "Business Commercial Streets", should "bus shelters and benches" be called out too? (as listed under "Neighborhood Connector")
- Page 32 – Would be helpful to include the map of the Transit Overlay somewhere in this document
- Page 32 – Under the description of the Transit Overlay, in addition to noting the need for access to transit, should also mention "efficient transit operations"
- Page 33 – Regarding roundabouts, should include a footnote that "roundabouts on transit routes should be large enough to allow buses to operate through them"
- Page 34 – Thank you for including the transit overlay into design treatments. For road diets, consider including a footnote like "Road diets can be problematic for bus operations, and may not be appropriate on some transit streets" or other similar wording
- Page 38 – The map legend says "low stress bikeway on Park or Oak. We'd prefer it on Oak, since Park is important to our operations.
- Page 40 – The Separated Bike Lane concept should refer to the AC Transit Multimodal Design Guidelines, since we have some concept designs. Also, "streets with separated bikeways shall provide access for paratransit vehicles that meets paratransit guidelines"
- Page 63 – Ongoing evaluation should also review bike/transit interaction
- Page 64 – Mode shift performance measures should include "Increase in people walking or biking to transit"

Thanks!

Crystal Wang

Rochelle Wheeler

From: Gerard, Pierre <PGerard@oaklandca.gov>
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2022 3:51 PM
To: Rochelle Wheeler
Cc: Patton, Jason; Ferrara, Nicole; Patton, Jason; Reed, Christine; Manasse, Edward; Ehlers, Emily; Olsen, Kerby; Ream, Charlie
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Reminder: Alameda's Draft Active Transportation Plan - Comment by Sunday, Oct 23

Hi Rochelle,

I have comments on behalf of the City of Oakland—please note that we did not receive comments from other staff (though they may have been sent to you directly), so these comments are mine and are actually mostly questions:

- *Page 31:* Will any "Business Main Streets" be considered for Posted Speed Limit reduction as per A.B. 43?
- *Page 38:* The proposed estuary water shuttle should not be considered a proposed Class I Bicycle Facility as shown on the map.
- *Page 39:* How does a design speed of 20mph differ from one of 15mph? The City of Oakland is targeting a design speed of 15mph for its Proposed Neighborhood Bike Route Network.
- *Pages 40 and 53:* Will there be opportunity for City-sponsored neighborhood-level place-making signage to complement proposed bicycle wayfinding signage on Neighborhood Greenways? I see that street art and placemaking (e.g., "painted bulb-outs, in-street bike corrals and intersections") is proposed.
    - Relatedly, are residential in-street bike corrals being considered for placemaking on Neighborhood Greenways?
- *Page 51:* On what kind of quality metrics will bikeway striping maintenance be based?
- *Page 53*: How are corral locations determined and what kind of maintenance do these bicycle parking corrals receive? The City of Oakland's business-initiated corral application and maintenance agreement has not resulted in consistent maintenance: https://cao-94612.s3.us-west-2.amazonaws.com/documents/Oakland-application-agreement.pdf
- *Page 53:* Which agency/agencies will be responsible for maintaining the proposed expansion of free-standing bike repair stations and where will/should the funding be sourced? Bike shops and non-profits may be best suited for contracted labor to maintain them.
- *Page 53:* Will low-dollar amount payment incentives and City-sponsored childcare for public meetings be considered to increase engagement of underrepresented groups? The City of Oakland is exploring this incentive model through prepaid debit cards, though no examples yet exist.
- *Page 63:* MTC-defined equity priority communities in the City of Alameda equate to two census tracts, covering roughly the western geographic half of the City. Might there be a better set of metrics for equity priority?
    - Relatedly, what percent of ATP projects should be in these communities?

If any of my colleagues CC'd here have comments/questions about the City of Alameda draft ATP, please reply to Rochelle directly or as a reply to this email thread.

Thanks! This Plan was exciting to read.

Pierre Gerard
Pronouns: he/him/his
Transportation Planner
Bicycle & Pedestrian Program
Safe Streets Division

Rochelle Wheeler

From: Joel Shaffer <jshaffer@bayareametro.gov>
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2022 4:14 PM
To: Rochelle Wheeler
Cc: Nicola Szibbo
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Reminder: Alameda's Draft Active Transportation Plan - Comment by Sunday, Oct 23

Hi Rochelle,

Nice work on the Draft Alameda AT Plan! MTC staff have reviewed and our consolidated comments are below:

- It may be beneficial to mention Equity Priority Communities (or the relevant equity metric) in the Existing Conditions chapter and show on an existing conditions map as well – it seems like these data are in Appendix D but not in the draft plan. Making this edit could be helpful given that Equity is a key goal of the plan.
- "Who are we planning for?" (p. 36) does not mention any equity populations.
- P. 52: Equity priority areas should be updated to Equity Priority Communities.
- Equity Priority Communities (p. 52, 53, 63) are mentioned but not defined. Is the plan using the MTC definition? If so, it should be defined as such and capitalized to indicate.
- Equity is not included in the 2030 infrastructure plan considerations (p.56) though it was used in the prioritization process (Appendix A). Suggest adding note about role of equity in the prioritization process.
- Would be helpful for performance measures (p. 63) to include 2022 baseline in Table 11.
- Draft plan document does not include any discussion of community engagement; there is only an appendix. Recommend including at a minimum a summary of engagement conducted with EPC residents and noting in plan how recommendations were made as a result of this engagement. This will set future projects up for success in grant applications.
- Appendices should be relabeled in order they are referenced in the plan.
- Figure 8 Proposed Bay Trail Route – There appears to be a gap just east of Encinal terminal. This part of the map needs to be filled in to show connectivity for the Bay Trail.
- Figure 8 Proposed Bay Trail Route – Eliminate duplicate parallel alignments of the Bay Trail shown along Fernside and the Eastern shoreline of Alameda island as well as the duplicative parallel alignment shown on Central Avenue and the adjacent shoreline.
- Chapter 6 – Add language to clarify that the proposed Estuary Crossing Bike/Ped bridge is being proposed as a part of the Bay Trail system when the final alignment is determined.
- Mckay Ave is currently Class III with no upgrades proposed, although Class II or IV may be more appropriate given vehicle speeds and volumes. It is a narrow road with lots of parking in the adjacent parking lot, so perhaps this is an opportunity to remove on-street parking.
- 3rd street which also connects Class IV on Central Ave to the Bay Trail is also currently Class III with no proposed improvements. Consider removing parking on one side and adding Class II.
- Why is class III being proposed on Oriskany Ave, which directly connects to both the Bay Trail and the Sea Plane Ferry Terminal?
- The proposed Class III on High Street between the High Street Bridge and Lincoln Ave will likely not make the street any more comfortable than current conditions with no facility. Class II is probably not feasible but could a Class III Neighborhood Greenway with more robust traffic calming treatments be considered? Treatments at the intersections on this segment would greatly improve safety/comfort.
- As a reminder, any proposed edits to the Bay Trail network, as shown in the draft plan, would need to go through Bay Trail Steering Committee approval before becoming official. The process is as follows: local agency/ROW owner would bring proposed changes to Bay Trail staff's attention and request an update to the

formal Bay Trail alignment and online data. Staff would prepare a summary statement and request a letter of support/reso/plan amendment from the requesting agency, and then take this to the Steering Committee for their consideration.

Please let us know if you have any questions!

Best,

Joel

Joel Shaffer, P.E.
Associate Engineer/Planner – Active Transportation
Licensed in CA | (he/him)

From: Rochelle Wheeler <rwheeler@alamedaca.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2022 7:26 PM
To: Rochelle Wheeler <rwheeler@alamedaca.gov>
Cc: Marquises, Sheila <smarquises@sanleandro.org>; Christopher Marks <CMarks@alamedactc.org>; Denise Turner <dturner@alamedactc.org>; Jennifer Holmes-Ledet <jledet@alamedacountysr2s.org>; Lee Huo <lhuo@bayareametro.gov>; Joel Shaffer <jshaffer@bayareametro.gov>; Nicola Szibbo <nszibbo@bayareametro.gov>; Nicole Ferrara <nferrara@oaklandnet.com>; jpatton@oaklandnet.com; Aleida Andrino-Chavez <aandrino-chavez@alamedactc.org>; Chad Mason <mason@watertransit.org>; Reed, Christine <CReed2@oaklandca.gov>; Courtney Wood <courtneywood@altaplanning.com>; Crystal Wang <cwang@actransit.org>; Dani Solis <dani@bikeeastbay.org>; dave@BikeEastBay.org; Manasse, Edward <EManasse@oaklandca.gov>; Ehlers, Emily <EEhlers@oaklandca.gov>; hmaddox@bart.gov; Jasmine Law <jlaw@alamedacountysr2s.org>; Olsen, Kerby <KOlsen@oaklandnet.com>; Lucy Gigli <lucy@alamedatma.org>; Robert Prinz <robert@BikeEastBay.org>; Sean Dougan <sdougan@ebparks.org>; swilson@ebparks.org; Tommy Bensko <tommy@localmotionca.com>; Ruiz, Sergio@DOT <sergio.ruiz@dot.ca.gov>; Currey, Gregory@DOT <Gregory.Currey@dot.ca.gov>
Subject: Reminder: Alameda's Draft Active Transportation Plan - Comment by Sunday, Oct 23

External Email

Hello colleagues,
Just a friendly reminder that our **comment deadline** for Alameda's Draft Active Transportation Plan **is this Sunday, Oct. 23rd.** Please send any comments (or questions) to me.

And, the Plan can be found here:
https://www.activealameda.org/Draft-Plan-2022

Thanks so much!
Rochelle

Rochelle Wheeler, Senior Transportation Coordinator, City of Alameda *(she/her)*
510-747-7442 | RWheeler@alamedaCA.gov

From: Rochelle Wheeler
Sent: Monday, October 10, 2022 2:53 PM
Subject: Alameda's Draft Active Transportation Plan - Comment by Oct 23

Hello Public Agency Staff and Other Partners,
At long last, I'm pleased to present our draft Active Transportation Plan! Hopefully, you've already received the below announcement. We'd love for you to review our draft Plan and let us know if you have any comments or edits to

Question 1.

Do you think the Pedestrian Street Types Map (Figure 5) reflects how streets are used in Alameda?		
Yes	200	61%
No	73	22%
Unsure	47	14%
Blank	*7*	*2%*
Total	327	100%

Question 3.

Overall, what do you think of the Bicycle Vision Network shown in Figure 6? This long-range planning map includes all types of bicycle facilities, from low- to high-stress.		
Looks great	96	29%
Looks good with small changes	109	33%
Neutral	37	11%
Needs a lot of changes	29	9%
Don't like it	44	13%
Blank	*12*	*4%*
Total	327	100%

Question 5.

What do you think of the Trails and Water Crossings Vision Network shown on Figure 7, the long-range planning map?		
Looks great	140	43%
Looks good with small changes	75	23%
Neutral	51	16%
Needs a lot of changes	16	5%
Don't like it	30	9%
Blank	*15*	*5%*
Total	327	100%

Question 9.

What do you think of the 2030 Infrastructure Plan projects list (Table 10)?		
Looks great	140	43%
Looks good with small changes	68	21%
Neutral	41	13%
Needs a lot of changes	24	7%
Don't like it	34	10%
Blank	*20*	*6%*
Total	327	100%

Question 11.

What do you think of the 2030 Low-Stress Backbone Bicycle Network (Figure 9)?		
Looks great	133	41%
Looks good with small changes	65	20%
Neutral	48	15%
Needs a lot of changes	21	6%
Don't like it	32	10%
Blank	*28*	*9%*
Total	327	100%

Demographic Questions

What is your annual household income?		
Under $40,000	8	2%
$40,000-$74,999	29	9%
$100,000-$149,999	56	17%
$150,000-$299,999	113	35%
Over $300,000	69	21%
Blank	*52*	*16%*
Total	327	100%

What is your gender identity?		
Female	141	43%
Male	151	46%
Non-binary/gender-fluid/non-conforming	6	2%
Not Listed	6	2%
Blank	*23*	*7%*
Total	327	100%

What neighborhood do you live in?		
Alameda Point	7	2%
Bay Farm	33	10%
Central Alameda	100	31%
East End	106	32%
South Shore	12	4%
West End	56	17%
I don't live in Alameda	4	1%
Blank	*9*	*3%*
Total	327	100%

Do you identify as a person with a disability as defined under the Americans with Disabilities Act, or are you a person with accessibility needs?		
Yes	31	9%
No	284	87%
Blank	*12*	*4%*
Total	327	100%

What is your age?		
Under 18	3	1%
19-29	8	2%
30-39	69	21%
40-49	91	28%
50-59	70	21%
60-69	45	14%
70+	26	8%
Blank	*15*	*5%*
Total	327	100%

What bicyclist description fits you best?		
Cannot ride a bicycle due to disability or other limitation	19	6%
Not interested in riding a bicycle	32	10%
Interested in riding a bicycle, but have safety concerns that keep me from doing it very much	53	16%
Somewhat confident rider	76	23%
Highly confident bicycle rider	137	42%
Blank	*10*	*3%*
Total	327	97%

Demographic Questions (cont'd)

What race or ethnicity do you identify with? Please check all that apply:		
African American, Black	4	1%
African American, Black ,Hispanic, Latino/a/x	1	0%
African American, Black ,White	1	0%
American Indian, First Nation, Alaska Native, Indigenous	1	0%
American Indian, First Nation, Alaska Native, Indigenous ,White	1	0%
Asian, Asian American	20	6%
Asian, Asian American ,Multi-ethnic/multi-racial	1	0%
Asian, Asian American ,White	7	2%
Hispanic, Latino/a/x	16	5%
Hispanic, Latino/a/x ,White	2	1%
Middle Eastern	3	1%
Multi-ethnic/multi-racial	9	3%
Multi-ethnic/multi-racial ,Pacific Islander, Native Hawaiian ,White	1	0%
Multi-ethnic/multi-racial ,White ,Not listed	1	0%
Not Listed	14	4%
Pacific Islander, Native Hawaiian	3	1%
Pacific Islander, Native Hawaiian ,White	1	0%
White	198	61%
Blank	*43*	*13%*
Total	327	87%

2. Are there any missing pedestrian improvements (aka design treatments), that are needed to increase safety and comfort of walking? Refer to the Pedestrian Design Matrix (Table 1).
"Neighborhood Connector" streets are not sufficiently differentiated by street width; for examples see Sherman from Central/Encinal to Atlantic, Willow from Otis to Clement. There should be enhanced daylighting (or total parking prohibitions) on these streets for pedestrian safety, especially near schools/facilities serving small children.
(1) Increase safety by prohibiting cyclists from riding in the street(s). (2) Don't covert any more traffic lanes to bicycle lanes, and restore the current ones to vehicle-only use. (3) Require APD to actively monitor cyclists and issue citations as necessary.
* Raised crossings should be used on other street types beyond just Neighborhood Streets. I think they are even more important to have on other higher-stress roads in order to slow down the traffic more. And they should be constructed of "bumpy" materials like cobblestones that encourage drivers to slow down to an appropriate target speed. I have seen YouTube videos on how these are used for great success in the Netherlands - check out the Not Just Bikes channel for lots of inspiration and deep analysis!! * It is good that daylighting is being considered near intersections. But we should also consider it near high-traffic driveways, too. For example, the parking lot for my apartment complex accommodates dozens of vehicles and yet has a single exit that has no daylighting and makes it unsafe. * Please discuss the timing aspects of pedestrian signals for each street type: will we have to push beg buttons? Could there potentially be pedestrian sensors to reduce the need for a beg button, similar to how vehicles trip magnetic sensors in the road? Does the signal change automatically without the need for any beg buttons or sensors? How quickly does the light respond to a button push? There is nothing more aggravating as a pedestrian than coming up to an intersection with a green light for cars in my direction of travel, but a red light for pedestrians, and then finding that pushing the button causes me to wait a full light cycle. It really tempts me to read the traffic lights for motor vehicles and cross anyway, but I have to trust that I read the car traffic lights correctly & that I can finish crossing in the 3 second yellow time a car gets. If a ped pushes the crossing button, that needs to be prioritized, even if it lengthens the current light cycle. That would squash all these safety concerns from impatient pedestrians who feel they are second-class citizens to cars.
+1 to speed humps/cushions and neighborhood traffic circle! FYI - San Jose Ave between Park Street and Pearl feels closer to a "neighborhood connector" - many cars zip (above speed limit) from the East end neighborhood over to / past Park street around commute time (typically to get to the HS in time). It's especially busy between Park and Broadway as folks are trying to beat the light at Park (coming from Broadway).

2. Are there any missing pedestrian improvements (aka design treatments), that are needed to increase safety and comfort of walking? Refer to the Pedestrian Design Matrix (Table 1).
1) Remove bikes from the sidewalks in all parts of town (with an exception only for small children who ride slowly) 2) Eliminate shared use paths. As I'm walking my dog on these paths I am constantly looking over my shoulder to see if a bike is going to whiz by and kill my dog. It's stressful. With electric bikes, scooters, etc., there are even more fast-moving vehicles on these paths. When I had my last dog, she once darted in front of a cyclist on one of these paths (she was on a standard 6' leash), which the cyclist didn't appreciate. Clearly these paths are not good for either pedestrians or cyclists. If you MUST have them, make them at least 12' wide. 3) Adding trees along paths definitely increases the comfort of walking. I'm sorry that there are so few trees along the new paths. The reason I answered No in question 1 is that Gibbons and Versailles are not marked as neighborhood connectors.
2009 City Council deemed all streets in Alameda to be predestrian friendly.
4 way stop signs on Broadway
a combination of narrowing lanes and removing parking to make an area feel more like a people space and less like a car space -e.g. parklets, space for businesses vendors targeted at foot traffic.
A flashing cross-walk located near Lincoln Avenue and Central Avenue is needed.
Accessibility standards: accessible way finding, accessible sidewalks in business district with sidewalk seating/dining, making inaccessible sidewalks a priority for repairs, timing crossing lights so that seniors and people with disabilities have enough time to cross- can't make it across many current intersections currently because timing doesn't allow for mobility issues
Additional Pedestrian Rapid Flashing signs.
An important part of pedestrian safety is getting bikes off the sidewalk, which requires creating safe bike plans. Maintenance is another important part of pedestrian safety.
Anything that calms traffic will help pedestrian safety. Flashing lights are great - but drivers who can't see pedestrians EVEN WHEN THEY ARE IN FRONT OF THEIR CAR aren't going to be stopped by anything except physical barriers AND enforcement.
As traffic calming measures are implemented on Encinal and Grand, parallel streets will almost certainly experience an increase in additional traffic. I'm thinking mainly of San Jose and Saint Charles, but alameda ave also comes to mind.
At intersections where multi paths cross a major road, provide clear separation between walkers and cyclists, and signs asking dog owners to reel in their pets' leashes.
Begged buttons at the lights are an issue since it forces people to wait an entire cycle in all sorts of weather and sends msg to drivers that they're more important. https://sf.streetsblog.org/2021/01/11/advocate-urges-removal-of-s-f-s-beg-buttons/
Better crosswalks at Tilden and Buena Vista
Bicyclists traveling on Island Drive (Bay Farm) navigate significant traffic with little protection. There is no way for bicyclists to transition from Island Drive, across Doolittle Drive, and enter the bike/walking path.
Broadway at Lincoln should have a traffic light. Tilden at Buena Vista needs a true cross walk.

2. Are there any missing pedestrian improvements (aka design treatments), that are needed to increase safety and comfort of walking? Refer to the Pedestrian Design Matrix (Table 1).
Buena vista needs attention, as does constitution. Kids in central alameda are basically locked in because it's so difficult to cross the streets. Buena vista needs more stop signs and protected crosswalks, and constitution needs a pedestrian signal at Buena vista.
Central Avenue between Webster and Main Street is a complete example of neglected control of traffic, drag racing, and proper use of tax payer funds for street safety improvement and care.
City of Alameda needs to seriously reconsider installing speed cameras, especially on neighborhood connector streets. This is the most cost-effective way to enforce 25mph limits and enhance pedestrian safety.
clearly marked and totally available shore trail (goes everywhere)
Close streets to through traffic, only allowing non-motorized traffic. Berkeley style! But seriously, are you asking members of the public to analyze a table with 100+ unfamiliar elements?! I have to assume the professionals have done their jobs.
Commercial driveway mirrors or signage or painting for pedestrian safety (i.e. sidewalk in front of auto shops on Buena Vista NW of Webster).
Connecting lagoon trails on Bay Farm - especially the crossing of Robert Davey Jr Dr would improve safety
Consistency: At cross streets that intersect neighborhood connectors, if only one side of the street has a marked crosswalk, the other side should also be marked.
Constitution Way is listed as a "Business Commercial Street". This is baffling. There are many more residential houses/apartments along this street than businesses. Currently the pededistrian facilities on this street are terrible. The sidewalks are too narrow, and there is very little buffer between the sidewalks and constantly speeding cars driving on it.
Crossing High Street (b/n Otis Drive and Fernside) at any given point as a pedestrian, cyclist, or driver is very scary. Not enough visibility. Cars driving at a high rate of speed.
Crossing Lincoln avenue between Stanton and Grand needs improvements- access to Littlejohn and Jean Sweeney parks as well as to area around Delmonty new development has greatly increased the need for safe crossing especially at Benton. Access to Franklin park and shoreline from Littlejohn area is also needed.
Crosswalks at odd-angle intersections in Fernside neighborhood (Gibbons/Southwood; Giboons/Northwood, etc.)
Crosswalks or other traffic calming measures are needed on Third between Central and Pacific, where cars drive recklessly fast all the time. I was nearly struck by a speeding car this week. Also, the 100-200 blocks of Lincoln have become a cut-through for access to the Encinal Boat Ramp as well as for pickups and dropoffs for Encinal High. The neighborhood is much busier than it was pre-pandemic, and the Slow Street signage is widely ignored.
Do not build walkway into Bay 37 community.
Does not reflect slow streets.
During Covid, Park Street went from a four lane street to two. I don't know how much study was performed about how the change would impact parallel side streets. The quick change caused traffic to divert off Park onto Oak and Walnut increasing traffic measurably on both. That may have turned Oak into a Business Main Street and Walnut into a neighborhood connecter with the associated safety concerns. Speed control by APD isn't happening. In the City's new plan, I see proposals for speed humps for safe/slow streets. I would propose speed humps on unsafe/fast streets like Walnut and Lincoln before installing them on already slow streets.
Eighth Street - continued to e.g. Grocery Outlet and Walgreens

2. Are there any missing pedestrian improvements (aka design treatments), that are needed to increase safety and comfort of walking? Refer to the Pedestrian Design Matrix (Table 1).
Electric bikes silently traveling at high speed on shared pedestrian-bike paths create unsafe conditions for walkers.
Encinal av. bet. Morton st. & Sherman st. is marked as Business but should be Connector. Encinal av. bet. Morton st. & ~Benton st. is marked Connector but should be Business. The crosswalk across Morton st. is dangerous on the S side of Encinal av.
Enforce the speed limit along Otis Drive, especially between Park Street and High Street. Issue speeding tickets. Bring back the 5 motorcycle police officers. Increase the Alameda Police Force. Reduce the lanes of traffic on Otis Drive to one lane in each direction. Enforce the speed limit along Otis Drive, especially between Park Street and High Street. Issue speeding tickets. Bring back the 5 motorcycle police officers. Increase the Alameda Police Force. Reduce the lanes of traffic on Otis Drive to one lane in each direction. In all honesty, putting in crosswalks with blinking lights on Otis between Broadway and High st is asinine until you address the fact that cars are speeding above 40 mph on a daily basis. Someone is going to get hit in those walkways. Reduce the lanes to reduce the speed of drivers.
Enforcement of current laws and pedestrian safety measures.
Flags? Some residents have taken to including those on streets like Central and Grand. There are also some streets listed as "neighborhood streets" which are, unfortunately, heavily trafficked by speeding vehicles (for example, San Antonio, Clinton, Dayton, and Morton/San Jose). If there isn't traffic calming for some of those streets (which I expect there will be for the bike boulevard + closing off Sherman) then some of pedestrian improvements like bulb outs would also be welcome at certain corners (e.g., near the park or along Sherman at Dayton and Clinton). Bulb outs improve visibility, shorten the crossing distance, and also slow cars down.
Gibbons at Cambridge and Cambridge at Northwood are very large unprotected intersections that are very difficult to walk across safely and are commonly used by families walking to Edison School. Cambridge is commonly used by neighbors to get to Fernside and cross the Fruitvale Bridge. Crosswalks and traffic circles are needed at these intersections.
How about banning bicycles from the sidewalks that say "No Bikes"? Especially on busy streets like Park and Webster.
I believe a flashing lights crosswalk is sorely needed at Grand Ave and San Jose.
I believe that the plan to put people on bikes and out of cars is a plan for only the young and crazy progressive movement.
I believe there is a missing overlay of ‘priority pedestrian neighborhood streets’. This network ideally avoids major vehicular thoroughfares where walking is generally more enjoyable. Traffic calming measures, like increased stop sighs and or speed humps to minimize cross island vehicular travel. For example, San Antonio and Pacific are both class III bike routes, but an inconsistent distribution of stop signs at alternating intersections make these otherwise lovely avenues needlessly challenging for pedestrians to cross intersections safely.

2. Are there any missing pedestrian improvements (aka design treatments), that are needed to increase safety and comfort of walking? Refer to the Pedestrian Design Matrix (Table 1).
I cannot tell if this is in the matrix, but installing more sidewalks in Alameda Point would be great - particularly by the APC Farm2Market, on Barbers Point Road, Pearl Harbor Road, etc. It seems like several streets have sidewalks on one side of the street but not the other. Apologies if I have this wrong!
I could not see the plans for the intersections of Pearl and Versailles at Fernside Blvd. Pearl at Fernside is especially problematic due to cars from Pearl attempting to cross over Fernside to Tilden and the Fruitvale Bridge. Another trouble spot is Marina at High Street, right at the High Street bridge. I believe there should be only right turn traffic allowed there.
I live on Lincoln Ave and it is a raceway. Please slow down these cars. Some of the changes include, but are not limited to, curb extensions, median refuge islands, and daylighting.
I see "daylighting" is "permitted" in residential streets but if so, why is it so rarely used? It seems like most neighborhood streets need daylighting and don't have it.
I think the matrix is generally pretty good, but different streets will have different requirements. I want to highlight that there is no curb/crosswalk between the greenway and N. Loop Road (in the Harbor Bay Business Park) which makes that crossing dangerous for people who want an easy ride or walk to the businesses/schools, etc. there. There should also be a formal path for bicycles and pedestrians to more easily access the business park from the residential neighborhood (instead of the sandy foot path by the lagoon on Ratto Rd that isn't rideable). There should be a focus on connecting these types of areas to foot traffic and bicycles.
I think there are some business/commercial areas that should be classified as business/main streets, specifically around shopping areas where most of the new housing is going in. (Triumph, Challenger will both be major non-car connectors to the CAT) and why is the southern part of the Alameda Pt. all business/comm? New roads shouldn't be so car-focused.
I think we should prioritize raised crossings and other physical impediments to vehicle speed over designs that focus on visibility and do nothing to reduce vehicle speed.
I would like to see more Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons in high-volume Neighborhood Connector stretches, particularly along Central Ave (between Sherman and 8th) where there is often low visibility for cross streets, no slow-down measures such as stop signs or stoplights, and high crash rates.
I would love to see more around Tilden Ave bridge to slow it down and make that intersection feel even more pedestrian friendly. Same wirh the rest of Tilden way. It’s not clear if there will be improved signage there. Also in fernside, the very large intersections with no roundabouts, protected medians, or other signage leave kids with massive areas of road to cross where cars don’t consistently slow.
I'd like to see the "Slow Streets" made permanent. And to block off one end of each block, as they do with the Bicycle Boulevards, in order to slow traffic on those routes. I live on Pacific Avenue, and people still occasionally blow by my house at 50 mph.
I'd love to see more small-form roundabouts on neighborhood streets. Similar to those on bike boulevards in Berkeley.

2. Are there any missing pedestrian improvements (aka design treatments), that are needed to increase safety and comfort of walking? Refer to the Pedestrian Design Matrix (Table 1).
If I may get specific. I appreciate that Willow is noted as a neighborhood connector. For the most part, Willow is very walkable, but the intersection at Willow and Buena Vista is somewhat problematic, with only one pedestrian crossing zone across Buena Vista which is not a crosswalk. It's very common that cars do not stop, or slow only and do not keep the intersection free. It's quite difficult to cross and I've seen some scary incidents there in the morning especially when kids are on their way to Love Elementary.
I'm encouraged by the proposed design treatments outlined in the draft plan and expect they would help make Alameda safer, and more friendly to pedestrians and cyclists. I'd love to hear more about the specifics around Neighborhood Greenways, since it sounded like the actual treatments could vary. I think the draft plan would be promising but ultimately fall short if the city doesn't implement robust treatments beyond bike lane markings, and consider actual speed cushions, partial diverters or turn restrictions, raised crosswalks, especially on neighborhood streets with higher pedestrian traffic (e.g. near schools).
I'm not sure about that ! Cuz I ve not been there and wants to see this send me an example pictures of there as my please
Improved pedestrian safety at Fernside and Garfield / Eastshore Dr.
Increasing crossing lights and extending cross walk "timers" where there are traffic lights would be helpful.
Install more street bumps to slow traffic. Install bicycle stop signs and speed limits.
Intersection of Grand and Clement needs something. Sidewalk on Lincoln btwn Park and Grand is outdated, too narrow, needs maintenance. Design treatments that are listed seem good. I like when there is separation with trees or other physical items that would block a pedestrian from getting hit if a car went out of control.
Island Dr. and Mecartney have become especially dangerous due to speeding cars and lack of stop signs or lighted pedestrian crosswalks.
It's really unclear from this matrix. It's incredibly hard to read.
Largely no, there are too many changes already. Reducing the number of lanes on many of the roads is crazy with the levels of traffic already present on the island and no plan to deal with increased levels of traffic from new housing being built (forcing people to pay for transit passes will still result in a higher number of cars present on the island, not everyone is going to use transit to get everywhere). Additionally, Otis St. and Encinal should be gateways or business commercial streets at least. Neighborhood connectors simply does not reflect reality in how these streets are used. One pedestrian improvement that should be added is prohibiting most parents from dropping off / picking up their children at any high schools, and likely also middle schools. Traffic in these areas is unbelievable during pickup hours and most students should be able to take the bus or bike/walk to school.
Lincoln needs a major road diet
Lincoln street is used as a freeway for fast drivers. The installation of multiple light activated crossings, such as the one at 1629 Park street would be welcome. A light activated crossing would be particularly welcome at Paru and Lincoln as the Frank Bette gallery has eveni g events.
List looks comprehensive enough
Maintain sidewalks.

2. Are there any missing pedestrian improvements (aka design treatments), that are needed to increase safety and comfort of walking? Refer to the Pedestrian Design Matrix (Table 1).
McKay avenue is a major pedestrian path to the beach and needs to be impproved. There needs to be signs for bikes to yield to crossing pedestrians and for pedestrians to check for bikes before crossing the bike path on shoreline. Additionally some parking spots should probably be removed to daylight the cross walks from the bike path. If there is a large van or truck parked near the crosswalk you can't see any pedestrians and the bikers can't see you. 5th street needs design treatments to make it easier to cross north of Stargell. People race down that street to target. Also the 5th and Stargell intersection needs a lot of work. It's not safe for pedestrians and I wouldn't let my kids cross that by themselves to get to school.
Missing bike & pedestrian areas include San Jose Ave between Park & Broadway & Bay Farm Island to Alameda access - both are heavily used by bike and pedestrians and current infrastructure is lacking & highly car centric.
More available trash and recycle bins on commercial corners.
More flashing crosswalks in neighborhood. Baywood village on Ironwood should have speed bumps.
More flashing signals at crossings.
More frequent maintenance of existing sidewalk and pedestrian areas that include trash clean up and emptying of trash cans.
More mid-block marked/protected crosswalks on neighborhood connectors, the crossing there is quite dangerous because of drivers.
More traffic enforcement by the police department is needed. Encouraging pedestrians to walk in the street is unsafe.
Most of these roads lack safe crossings and people speed terribly.
N/A
Narrowing the width of painted vehicle traffic lanes to reduce vehicle speeds
Near school crossings are a death trap. A kid will die. Please traffic calm before this happens.
Need more crosswalks with flashing lights (beacons). These are 1000% easier to see and respond to than crosswalks without flashing lights!!
Need more crosswalks with warning lights.
need more lightened paths
Need speed bumps on San Antonio between Grand and Morton.
Need to upgrade the sidewalks on Bayview drive so they are not sloping into the street, it is a safety concern for wheelchairs, elderly, pedestrians in general walking twisting an ankle and tripping.
Need to work the stop lights with the traffic.
Neighborhood connectors seem to be experiencing increased traffic. Unsure if it's from delivery vehicles or folks taking shortcuts as directed by google maps. It does not appear that Raised crossings are permitted/recommended, but IMO should be. This would do a lot for encouraging folks to slow down or stop at the crossings instead of blowing through (unless the idea that every intersection on neighborhood connector would have a roundabout). With regard to "daylighting", red curbs are only going to go so far to "discourage" folks from actually parking in them. Seems like having bollards to prevent violations would be a better solution.
neighborhood streets should have crosswalk visibility enhancements

2. Are there any missing pedestrian improvements (aka design treatments), that are needed to increase safety and comfort of walking? Refer to the Pedestrian Design Matrix (Table 1).
No
no
No
No
No
No
no
no
no
No
No
No
No
no
No
No
no
No.
No. Walking in Alameda is great the way it is.
None missing, but you people are completely missing the FACTS, that instead of focusing on pedestrians, you need to open back up the dang streets that you shrunk down from 4 lanes to two. I mean, it is a complete lack of common sense, when we are in a city that had 4 lanes on park, Webster, and Otis, for years, and now that the city is expanding with ever increasing housing on Buena Vista at the former Del Monte, as well as the HUGE INFLUX of new vehicles off of Willie Stargell Avenue, not to mention what will happen on the Base, you guys need to open back up the streets, instead of designating bicycle lanes on Webster. I mean, c'mon now. Have you guys ever tried driving on Webster street now? It is a snake like maze and not safe at all.
None needed
None that I can think of
None that I see
Nope!
North-South neighborhood streets are routinely treated as connector streets due to app-based driving directions causing unsafe pedestrian conditions (e.g. loading and unloading vehicles) on these narrow streets. Speed bumps should be an option for blocks that want them,
not sure
Not sure
Not that I can see.
Not that I can tell from the Matrix. Who designed the Matrix and what is th e love affair with Modern Roundabouits that so few understand how to access and use correctly
Nothing missing, in particular. We need lots of implementation, especially to slow traffic.
Otis is not safe for pedestrians

2. Are there any missing pedestrian improvements (aka design treatments), that are needed to increase safety and comfort of walking? Refer to the Pedestrian Design Matrix (Table 1).
Our neighborhood streets are blindly lumped together into one classification. That's obviously wrong. Walnut (where I live) is nothing like other so called "neighborhood streets" where people are supposed to be socializing and where traffic is less than the connectors. I cannot comfortably socialize outside on the sidewalk and there is no safe place for my child to walk around our neighborhood. We get dozens of cars a minute down our stretch of tiny road, many speeding easily in excess of 30mph, and many blowing through the stop sign at the corner. The road is so narrow that cars passing each other in opposite directions will pull so far over as to drive up on the curb, with their side mirrors knocking over the trash bins. None of the design treatments proposed for the neighborhood streets could solve speeding, volume of traffic, or stop sign violators. Drivers intentionally roll through without stopping with young children still present in the crosswalk, all day long, every single day. This is all up and down walnut, from Clement to clinton, but especially near Buena Vista/Pacific/Lincoln. Again lumping walnut, or willow for that matter, in with other neighborhood streets is a complete mistake. High traffic roads that are meant to be neighborhood roads should be closed to thru traffic, lanes reduced so they are on way, or speed limit drastically reduced form 25 to 15 mph, with traffic shaping measures to ensure compliance with crosswalks, especially near schools routes, bus stops, and parks.
Overnight parking for visitor close by neighborhood streets, or with shuttle options.
Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons would be good to consider on select neighborhood connectors as well. Portland, OR deploys them at select intersections with wide crossings or poor pedestrian visibility. Not everyone stops for the flashing beacons. The intersection of Pacific and Constitution is one spot that could benefit from a hybrid beacon. It's one of the worst intersections in the city.
Pedestrian mall sections of Park and Webster. Beg buttons are really annoying! Take them all out! If it is safe to cross, make it green.
Permanent pedestrianization of main streets is not mentioned. I know it would be a huge undertaking but I believe sections of Park and Webster would benefit more from being pedestrian-only than being main thoroughfares.
Please replace beg buttons at stoplights. Gibbins is also becoming more of a "neighborhood connector"
Raised crosswalks are needed in beach, park, and school access areas to slow traffic down.
Raised ped crossings / continuous sidewalks
Red light cameras
repair sidewalks so people do not fear tripping, falling, or injury
road diet, high visibility crosswalks, and modern roundabouts, vertical traffic calming, and bus bulb outs
RRFB are needed when missing from neighborhood connector streets. Example of what is missing on diagram for connector streets: intersection of San Jose and Broadway is already designated with CalTrans bulb out and RRFB - this is already a heavily pedestrian and cycling area, a slow street as well, that is not called out in this plan.
Section from Clement & Grand to Clement & Hibbard St is not accurate on the map. You must either go North on Grand to the Grand Street Marina or South on Grand to Ellen Craig Ave or Eagle Street, then Right on Hibbard to continue on Clement. Currently a safe pedestrian crossing does not exist at Clement/Grand.

2. Are there any missing pedestrian improvements (aka design treatments), that are needed to increase safety and comfort of walking? Refer to the Pedestrian Design Matrix (Table 1).
Seems pretty comprehensive. Would encourage maximum use of roundabouts at intersections, as these are the holy grail since they benefit pedestrians, cyclists and motorists. Also, I would avoid where possible shared use paths--pedestrian and cycling combined on the same path. As a cyclist and pedestrian on these paths, I believe these are actually high stress for both. As a cyclist, even ringing a bell and saying "on your left" pedestrian's are often startled; and as a pedestrian, you are often caught off guard. Not comfortable for either. Obviously, if there is not room for both, this is better than nothing, and I'm a big fan of practical compromises. Shared path is better than putting cyclists on a bike route--as a pedestrian, I would consider that a reasonable compromise.
seems pretty thorough and thoughtful
Separate walking paths and sidewalks from the street whenever possible
Slow or divert cars off of buena vista. It is the most difficult street to cross when walking or riding across the island
slow streets need to go
Some neighborhood streets are used by drivers as shortcuts to avoid traffic on the busier main streets (Park, Webster) and drive too fast. Specifically the north/south streets adjacent to Park which are too narrow for fast 2-way traffic and parked cars.
Speed humps on local neighborhood streets are a good idea.
Stop allowing bicyclists to ride on sidewalks. Parents are teaching children that it's okay to ride on sidewalks, then to ride across the street. That is so dangerous. Instead, they should be walking their bike across the street, or better yet, use the bike path, or road.
Table 1 did not address the underground pedestrian. The proposed pedestrian underground section link Michell Ave to Marina Village Parkway is not addressed in Table 1. This section will highly likely used by homeless as a refuge or drug users or dealers. It will be costly to build and create unsafe conditions for the pedestrian and general public.
-The bike/pedestrian trail at Alameda Pt converts to road going past the Hornet. There is another bike/pedistrian way that starts just past the Hornet near the ferry depot. This stretch should be looked at being a pedestrian friendly rout, especially with the problems we've had with car events causing extremely unsafe environment. -Atlantic, west of main street should be looked at as a neighborhood street or potentially slow street. This has been a problematic throughway with unsanctioned car events and ferry commuters. With homes now built in this area improvements need to be made to prevent pervasive unsafe driving.
The Business Commercial street type should include protected bike lanes. Streets like Marina Village Parkway, which many residents (existing and future) will use to go shopping or to their jobs here, should be safe and welcoming for bicyclists.
The flashing crosswalks definitely needed to cross Grand. Especially at Pacific and Clement
the NEW curb/burms at Atlantic and Constitution provide a false safety, cars drive into curbs
The section of Tilden from Broadway to Park Street is a raceway to and from Fruitvale bridge. Raised crosswalk for ENTIRE intersection with a pedestrian scramble.
There are not enough crosswalks on Otis drive to allow for pedestrians to cross safely. Cars are not yielding as people stand at unmarked crosswalks to cross Otis dr.
There are too many cars parked on streets that used to be safer and easier for pedestrians. Without parking requirements for new construction pedestrians will always be at risk.
There aren’t any missing improvements that I can tell, but I want a communication channel where citizens concerned about a street in their neighborhood can request these design treatments to be installed or at least start an engagement process with the city to request for the design treatments.

2. Are there any missing pedestrian improvements (aka design treatments), that are needed to increase safety and comfort of walking? Refer to the Pedestrian Design Matrix (Table 1).
There is no immediate/short term plan to address the lack of pedestrian improvements at Alameda Point, asides from the newly developed blocks.
There should be crosswalks on both sides of Buena Vista crossing at Tilden.
Third Street isn't included as a connector - and IT IS! Cars zoom down this street between Central and Appezatto - even though there's bike stencils between Pacific and Appezatto. There should be a designated cross walk at either Santa Clara or Pacific and Third St.
This looks like a very complete list of options. Could be helpful to have pictures for each. My bigger concern is that it doesn't seem like the city has been successful at putting enough budget toward these types of improvements. For example, Park Street would really benefit from entirely new sidewalks. There are so many tripping hazards currently. Adding bike lanes along Park and/or making the parklets permanent would go along well with a full rebuild of the sidewalks and replacement of the street furniture. I'm just mentioning this particular example because it's worth doing well, with many of the design treatments on this list, but it will require money and effort to accomplish. I hope both the money and effort can happen.
This looks quite comprehensive.
This map is missing the any pedestrian walkways related to the Bay37 neighborhood. It might be helpful to have a crosswalk in the community near the proposed ferry.
This poorly reflects major traffic arteries, overstates many understates others.
Too many main streets are blocked off for pedestrians; not many pedestrians using these, and cars are going around the barriers. Main thoroughfares are very bad choices to block off.
Too much to comment on except that it appears like the consultants are using a generic template. For instance, " Raised crossing: comment 4: Applicable on streets with posted speeds 30mph or less, ADT 9,000 or less, and less than four lanes". Could they have learned that virtually all streets in Alameda are at 25mph?
Traffic speed is a major safety problem for everyone involved, particularly along the neighborhood connector streets where there is often room to speed, but also many pedestrians crossing. Even with flashing beacons at crossings on Fernside, for example, cars will frequently not stop, and the speed signs do little to slow down speeders who don't seem to care. Additional stop signs or other more impactful traffic calming design elements should be considered where speeds are high. Some of these streets, e.g. High Street, are crossed by hundreds of school kids every day, but there are no stops or other traffic calming measures at the vast majority of places kids cross (e.g. San Jose). There should be an increased effort to provide safe routes to and from the schools for kids across the connector streets.
Unknown. Design matrix complicated
Unsure
Versailles and Gibbons are both arteries needed and used to get people to the bridges. As the Park Street Bridge becomes more congested with an additional 6000+ units, the other bridges will become more necessary. I do not want to see speed bumps, lower speed limits or fewer lanes on residential streets. The more you constrict, the more crazy you make people in a hurry (think moms trying to get to school to pick up kids in their SUVs). I live on one of the few streets that go through in my neighborhood and, with the rare exception of a crazy person, we are not experiencing difficulties in this area.

2. Are there any missing pedestrian improvements (aka design treatments), that are needed to increase safety and comfort of walking? Refer to the Pedestrian Design Matrix (Table 1).
Vertical traffic calling to make sure speed limit is followed even on neighborhood connectors (e.g., speed cushion). Example: after Park St on Otis towards Bay farm, a large portion of vehicles do not follow speed limitations and drive around 30-35mph. This is a huge safety problem with Franklin elementary and Krusi park along that route. Kids and families walk along this axis all the time. Speed cushions and horizontal traffic calming need to be implemented and cannot be overseen from this plan.
Water features, sensory gardens
We don't need more pedestrian improvements, we need to undo all of the ridiculous changes that have been made at South Shore and other parts of Alameda that limit parking spaces and close traffic lanes and snarl traffic. This isn't Amsterdam! This is an island and we need cars to get around and to get off the island. And as long as we are building outrageous amounts of high density housing, we need MORE parking and MORE multiple lane streets to serve all of the added people.
We have a few "Drag Strip" street sections in town, such as Central Ave between Webster and Ballena Isle. Low teck, low costs speed bumps would go a long way to discouraging making drag strip runs in such stretches of our roadways.
What do you mean design treatments ? And would you know why people walk in the STREET !!!
What is Dublin Lane? And where is Willie Stargell Avenue?
What's missing is forcing pedestrians to take responsibility for themselves. Doesn't matter what right of way they have, they will lose to a vehicle. They need to act like it and stop walking out into the street staring at a phone or not looking both ways or just expecting cars to stop for them.
Why would planting trees be "high" cost?
Would generally recommend against pedestrian scrambles and removal from the table. They increase safety by providing separate ped and vehicle phases, ASSUMING 100% driver and pedestrian compliance. This may not be an accurate assumption, especially given that all-ped phases increase signal cycle lengths and increase delay to all users, which may encourage pedestrians to cross concurrently with parallel vehicular movements and/or vehicles to turn right on red during the all-ped phase. Leading pedestrian intervals (LPIs) are a better solution that enable pedestrians to establish priority in the intersection prior to vehicular movements, while minimizing intersection delay for all roadway users.
Would like to see more Rapid Flashing Beacons on Broadway, Island Drive, High Street, Fernside, Grand, Santa Clara, Lincoln
Would of been helpful instead of a table to show what these updates look like with visual examples.
Yes - please install permanent traffic barriers on slow streets like they have in Berkeley - now people just sped around them
Yes! Buena Vista Ave which is a major neighborhood connecting street has been virtually ignored on every one of the proposed improvements suggested. The only improvements made or even suggested to this street are those that have been implemented for the developers in the area of the ?Del Monte project.
Yes, on Otis Drive between Broadway and High streets.
Yes, there is no safe crossing amendments on Willow and Buena Vista for the school children who live north of Buena Vista and go to Love elementary and the children who live or go to school south of Buena Vista and use this crosswalk to go to McKinley Park. Buena Vista is notoriuos for fast traffic and there is a definite danger at this intersection.

2. Are there any missing pedestrian improvements (aka design treatments), that are needed to increase safety and comfort of walking? Refer to the Pedestrian Design Matrix (Table 1).
Yes, while high-visibility (ladder-style) crosswalks are included there is no mention of "regular" crosswalks. It's as though the plan assumes these are already in place at all intersections. But that is not the case—many intersections I encounter daily/weekly lack any crosswalk at all, such as Grand and Alameda. Others have a crosswalk on only one side, such as at Central and Paru. (And let me just say I've never met a pedestrian who is going to cross to the other side of the street they're walking down just to cross in a crosswalk!)
Yes. Enforce the speed limit along Otis Drive, especially between Park Street and High Street. Stop the speeders! Increase the Alameda Police Force. Bring back the 5 motorcycle officers/motorcycles. Issue speeding tickets!
Yes. There needs to be improvements along Otis between High St and Broadway. Between Broadway and Park St, the lanes are reduced down to one lane in each direction. Work with Caltrans to reduce the two lanes down to one lane in each direction between High St. and Broadway.
You are missing highly ped traffic for schools, eg Walnut St to Alameda High School. eg Streets to Saint Joseph Notre Dame, Edison etc, Young ped need to be protected. #1 would be to paint crosswalks.
Your assumptions about Alameda Point are very wrong relative to how businesses and people use the area.
Your matrix is WAY too confusing for the average person to interpret. I think pedestrian safety should be considered first, especially kids on the way to school. The bike lobby is interested lobbying for what they want, to the detriment of pedestrian safety.

4. If you said the Bicycle Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
* Broadway should have a separated bike path in both direction between Otis & Shoreline. * The north/south corridor on Park and/or Oak is a key element that needs a lot more detail. * Would love to see collaboration with Oakland to create a bike freeway between the Miler-sweeney bridge & the Fruitvale BART station.
* The Class II bike lanes on Broadway need to be upgraded. This is the most logical north/south corridor in that area, as it connects the end of the cycle track on Shoreline Drive with Tilden Way for off-island travel. Yet, the lanes are often very narrow and high stress: often bicyclists must either ride in the door zone, or slightly enter the traffic (e.g. riding the white line). The whole street needs a re-do and I would love to see this upgraded to at least buffered bike lanes at minimum, if not separated bike lanes. Since this is such a major north/south corridor, we should prioritize safe transportation over parking when redesigning this street. Alternatively, Versailles could potentially fill that role - but then it would need much better connections to the Shoreline cycletrack than currently proposed. * The best west/east facilities that can be found between Clement and Otis are only Class II. It would be nice if one of the corridors somewhere in the middle can be upgraded to class IV (or at minimum, buffered bike lanes). * The new style of protected intersection at Otis & Grand is great. It's basically like a "bicycle roundabout". We need more of these, and these types of designs which keep bicycles out of the "vehicle left turn lane" should be the preferred alternative. Where space permits, we should also use vehicle roundabouts as well instead of car traffic lights, with the "bicycle roundabout" further surrounding it and with high quality raised & signalized crossings for bikes & peds as vehicles approach the vehicle roundabout. Good examples can be found in the Netherlands. When space does not permit full roundabouts, I think protected intersections as proposed is the next best option. But care is needed to have good signaling to avoid frustration for the bikes... * HOWEVER: we can do far better when it comes to signaling. The worst examples are on the Cross Alameda Trail (CAT) where bicycles must ride off the class IV bike lane onto the sidewalk in order to push a pedestrian beg button. Things we should try (1) have bicycle sensors so that beg buttons don't normally need to be used in the first place, (2) always give the bikes a green light in the first place in addition to the cars - especially on the most important and advanced bike routes like the CAT, (3)

4. If you said the Bicycle Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
[cont'd] have a "green wave" timed for cyclists across multiple intersections, similar to what San Francisco has been experimenting with (4) if there must be a beg button, have it conveniently placed for bicycles, (5) the one advantage of using the car left turn lane when on a bike is that it is only one signal, not two - find a way to make the two signals for a left turn in a protected intersection for a bicyclist less painful. Good example on YouTube of signaling in the Netherlands (1 minute short): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CpCRYKPJUHY * For serving such a major and popular public park containing off-street bike trails, we can do FAR BETTER than class III bike routes on McKay Ave south of Central. I think the road is easily wide enough to accommodate buffered bike lanes at minimum, if not class IV. Painting sharrows and calling it a day would be a major disservice. * A positive comment: the prevalence of proposed class IV bike lanes around the old Navy base is exactly the kind of mindset we should be having when we have the room to start fresh and existing street widths are not a major constraint. * And in general, I am excited to see the ambition in this map! I think it's a vast improvement over the status quo.
1. building a bridge is ridicoulsy expensive. You need USCG approval (not likely) and you already have a bridge next to the one to bay farm. You don't need two. 2. The elephant in the room is that terribly shxtty bike path around bay farm. Don't care who owns it. It is unrideable. Fix it. Been 20 years of poor maintenance. 3. Bike paths that you have along Shoreline and Grand are in terrible shape. You never clean them, the shoreline one is full of sand and weeds. The Grand by Otis and Grand is unrideable. Tree bark, rocks, and poor pavement so I ride in the street anyway because of that. You can't create new infrastructure unless you have built in the maintenance of existing. Most biking is that way. 4. The green paint on Main by Alameda Point is almost all gone. one and done? Needs to be maintained and it has not. In general, put the pie in the sky plans on the back burner and get back to basics and put in good, useable and inexpensive routes. Much of the bike paths are in great shape but not the heavily used ones. The bridge idea is the dumbest over priced plan I have ever seen. You already have one, and people ride across park street. The tunnel.. tube.. well there is no answer for that because it was built when bikes were not needed. We don't need a mega expensive bridge.
1. We really need a north-south real bike lane between Grand and Broadway. There's not really an efficient/safe north-south route. And if you want non-hardcore people to ride around town, don't add bike routes, add bike lanes, preferably buffered. I'm thinking of Sherman as well as Santa Clara east of Park. Would also prefer separated bike lanes where possible over buffered.
A fully dedicated bike path or separated bike lane (dotted green or dotted red) through the middle of Alameda like (vs just Memorial/Clement or Shoreline). This will give more safe options for kids biking to schools and commuters biking to ferry terminals, bus stops, etc.
A holistic approach to transportation needs is warranted. Improving bike paths at the expense of other transportation and parking needs is myopic.
A new bridge between Shoreline Ave. and Bay Farm seems over-the-top and completely unnecessary.

4. If you said the Bicycle Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
A plan to connect up to Bart stations. I know that is technically outside of Alameda, but it is a critical transportation link.
A road diet needs to be implemented between High St. and Broadway along Otis Dr. Work with Caltrans to reduce the two lanes to one lane in each direction, and allow for bike lanes in both directions.
A way to safely bike across from Webster street to Oakland / Jack London would be really good for the island
All bikes should be on street not sidewalks and more separated bike paths.
All Class II bikelanes should be upgraded to Class IIB or higher. This is especially true on Lincoln where drivers typically exceed 35 - 40 mph speeds, despite posted speed limits
All of the intersections need to be have the daylight process done first anticipating all of these changes. It's incredibly dangerous right now for my kids. Please finish the extension of Clement at Grand as soon as possible. Traffic has increased ten fold in the area due to the rest of street being open.
Another bridge to Bay Farm? That's unrealistic and unneeded. A bike lane on Island drive wouldn't be much better than the current path. I'd prefer either a protected bike lane, or just leave it as it is with the two paths (maybe designate more clearly one for walkers, one for bikers?). Also, separated walking and biking paths in Crab Cove would be awesome! It is stressful to bike through when there are scores of people hanging out and walking. In general, I'm excited about more bikeways! Great work planning! Thank you!
Any paint only bike lane, just like any "sharrows", does not enhance safety, because double-parkers routinely block those lanes. Saturday morning garage-sales - very dangerous, block bike lanes.
Apply the changes already made on Otis Drive between Westline Drive and Willow Street, to Otis Drive between Park and High Streets. Residential neighborhoods should not see traffic in excess of 35 mph. Otis Drive between Broadway and Island Drive regularly sees cars driving 35 to 50 mph.
As a cyclist, the difference between a bike route and a bike lane is significant, however the differences between a bike lane, a buffered bike lane, and a separated bike lane are negligible. Simpler is better. I recommend converging on a single solution: bike lanes. Doing so will save money and, more importantly, be less confusing for both cyclists and drivers which will yield a safer system.
As I just mentioned about shared use paths, sometimes the practicalities of street design mean that a median or hybrid approach might be best. As a pedestrian (or a cyclist), I don't particularly like shared use paths--but I'm also in favor of them if other alternatives are less desirable. A shared use path is better than forcing cyclists on to a bike route. Similarly, there are places on the island where we've love to see a true separated bike land, but where there isn't enough space or this would greatly upset the neighborhood. In these cases I urge us to consider hybrid approaches, where we design an enhanced buffered bike lane, using raised lane separators or small armadillos and periodic vertical lane separators. This is less stress than a buffer only for both cyclists and motorists and will likely generate more support from the neighborhood. The perfect is the enemy of good applies in crafting workable, practical solutions.
At intersections provide raised curbs or knobs as footrests. Also add signs asking dog owners to reel in their pets' leashes.
Better bike entry/exit from South Shore. Entire length of Willow St should be a bike way.
Better paving up on the old base. There are nice bike paths up to the base and then on the base by the water. In between though is horrible. I broke my collar bone and a couple of ribs when I hit a pot hole up there. So don't put a nice bike path beyond what amounts to a gritty dirt road full of pot holes.
Bike lanes taking too much of the spaces and too complicated.

4. If you said the Bicycle Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
Bike path with buffer at least between Park St and Kruci park where Franklin school is. A significant amount of families try to bike at their own risk around this area. This should be address with this holistic redesign.
Bike riders with no lights are too frequently underway during our long fall-winter evenings and mornings.
Broadway between Otis and Shoreline could use some improvement to avoid merging into traffic.
Buffered bike lanes on Central and Grand would be the changes I propose.
buffered bike lane on Bayview Dr, if it along the path by the water, bikes often electric, have near misses with pedestrians and should avoid that path. Also, there is a blind corner from the access to the path that is a bit dangerous. Bikes should use the designated bike route only.
Buffered bike lane on major streets: Encinal, Central, Lincoln.
Buffered bike lanes will reduce traffic lanes for vehicles and create more traffic and air pollution while cars are sitting idle in traffic. Otis approaching South Shore is already a bottle-neck; what will it be like when more housing is created at South Shore? Did the committee take into account the areas that will be impacted by new housing?
Buy in from the residents in neighborhoods where bike lanes are to be built/ expanded is crucial.
Cars tend to speed on Lincoln Avenue, and on Broadway near Tilden, is it possible to make these cycling paths separate? Or perhaps adding more visual stimulation (trees like on Central as an example) or some traffic calming/raised crossings at intersections like Broadway at Lincoln, which is near Edison Elementary?
Central Ave should have the bike lane inside of the parked cars. This is the main thoroughfare from the East End to Park Street and it is very uncomfortable for young children to bike safely on this route with cars very close by and going fast. Without taking up additional space, the bike lane should be able to go between the parked cars and sidewalk. Biking on the sidewalk should be allowed on Santa Clara between Broadway and Park/Oak where there is no safe route for children to get from the East End to the bike lane starting at Park/Oak. Lincoln needs a protected crossing at Broadway in order for this to be a safe alternative route Central, as well as a way to get across Park St going northbound where it becomes one way going southbound right before Park St. In general there are not enough low stress routes to get from East End neighborhoods to Park St.
Central avenue is listed as a separated bike lane which it is not. There should be separated bike lanes connecting the Alameda Pt Shoreline to the bike trail next to Crown Drive.
Change Central Ave, between Sherman and Webster to single lane each way. Cars drive way too fast, passing cars going speed limit, run red light at Sherman. This will make street safer for bikes. Also, publicize and enforce laws against double parking in bike lanes.
Change more of the bike lanes and greenways over to separated bike lanes. Cars are speeding on the neighborhood streets, making it dangerous for bikers/peds. We need more space for bikers.
Clement corridor at Broadway needs to be addressed as well. Is that included on this map? Separate pedestrian and bicycle lanes will help as proposed!
Continuous protected bike routes from the ferry terminals to the rest of the island and from bridges (Tilden / Fruitvale bridge for access to BART and Park St. for access to Embarcadero / Jack London).

4. If you said the Bicycle Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
Crossing on the CAT(between Constitution and Main) are terrible!!! I would feel safer riding in the road on the other side of the street. Having to press EVERY 'beg button' defeats the entire purpose of having a trail. If you just miss the timing you have to wait many Minutes for the next oppoturnity to cross. People constanly make left turns into the CAT and both Poggi and Third St, The best solution would be a 'no turn on red'. The situation going North on Broadway coming off Shore Line bike paths. They have improved the intersections for pedestrians but on a bicycle if there are no cars coming N or no pedestrians you will NEVER get a green signal due to the sensors. The only option is to ride up on the sidewalk and pust the button. There is just some really horrible and potentially deadly gaps in our bike network.
Currently cars speed down Versailles. Currently a slow street but it doesn't stop speeders. Need more stop signs at Versailles and Central. Very dangerous intersection to cross.
Definitely want to keep the dedicated bike lanes for kids' routes to school (eg Grand, Santa Clara). Love the new proposed ones. Some intersections need more help for bikes turning left (eg turning left from Grand onto Santa Clara) I wish something could be done for bikes on 8th st but I get it's so narrow. So, I appreciate what you are trying to do with 9th and Webster, And I also wish we could have some no car streets to encourage more bikes, walking, etc. but I know that is so hard
Developing bike lanes are good. But developing in every main street are causing the burdensome for the drivers. I prefer no more than 3 streets dedicated to bike routes. Especially, the changes to lakeshore ave car parking were not a good idea. The parking should be lined with ramps, not in the middle of the bike lane and road. The people who are getting on and off of cars also should be considered when planning the safety of travelers.
Do not build walkway into Bay 37 community.
Enforce the law on sidewalks that say "No Bikes."
Every East - West "Connector Street" has some sort of bicycle lane except Buena Vista. If this is truly a "Connector Street" then why doesn't it serve those of us who would like to use it with a bike? It doesn't need a Greenway designation (although that would be nice) but even a Class III bike lane would be equitable compared to all the other "Connector Streets" in town.
Expectation of bike use is not realistic.
Fernside residents for years have requested enforcement and maybe some calming; but NOT discussed by them was a 2-way protected bikeway. Keep the bike lanes on Fernside as is.

4. If you said the Bicycle Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
First, bravo. I put "small changes" only because the level of detail in the plan is lacking somewhat and I think it is important that the city not shy away from using tools like forced turns, turn restrictions, smaller roundabouts, dead ends, etc to curtail cut through traffic on bicycle boulevards. Cars should generally not be able to travel "through" more than 2-3 blocks, should no the able to connect major arteries to major arteries using bike boulevards, and there should be great thought given to making sure drivers can't circumvent these restrictions too easily. Also, speed humps are never great for bike boulevards and residents don't usually like the additional noise they create (plus some people don't even slow down for them). Strong vote in favor of making Oak Street a bike/ped only zone.
Frankly, I liked driving my car on Santa Clara Avenue. I went the speed limit. I stopped at all the stop signs. It was a nice safe way for me to get across town.
Generally looks good, but the bike/pedestrian bridge simply should not be built unless the cost can be drastically reduced. The near $200 million dollar price tag is ridiculous, a water shuttle could be operated for free for decades without reaching this number and would most likely not substantially exceed expected operating costs for the bridge including staffing, maintenance/upkeep, and utility costs.
getting onto the cross alameda trail/protected bike path from sherman is prohibitively scary
Glad to see the Slow Streets turned into real "Greenway" streets, especially at the major intersections.

4. If you said the Bicycle Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
Great goal to have safe cycling options across all of Alameda. As I have found while riding with my kids, a bike network is only as good as its weakest link. Please consider also adding detail on the corridors reaching to Fruitvale BART and to the main Oakland street grid (the far side of 880). I know that's out of your jurisdiction, but being able to make those connections is very important. Very important to see protected bike lanes proposed on Webster -- that is the only good north/south connection nearby, and access to the business district is important. People will want to cycle north to the Target shopping center, so a connection from RAMP up to there will also be important. For downtown, it's fine to be flexible at this point on whether Park or Oak is designed for cycling. Both have their advantages. But it's very important that at least one of them be redesigned to safely let cyclists access downtown and move north/south. No comment on Grand Street -- as we're all waiting to see what happens at the next City Council meetings... I like the Neighorhood Greenway plan as long as each one gets a full treatment. Not just signage. My main concern with the Neighborhood Greenways is where they will cross larger roads. Many of Berkeley's bike boulevards are bogus -- they may have diverters and signage along the way, but then they offer little or no protection when cyclists need to cross larger roads. Palo Alto's bike boulevard is a better example, because it actually has fully controlled intersections when it crosses major roads. With a full treatment along its entire length, San Jose Ave could be a great first bike boulevard in Alameda.
Harbor bay parkway has space for a protected lane. Vehicle speeds regularly exceed posted limit, due to multi lane traffic pattern and high posted speed limit. There is regular bike traffic from model airfield to protected Ron Cowan lanes. The existing shared use path is not in good repair and during high ped traffic, bikes moving at 10mph and higher cannot safely share this path, and must use the street. A bike collision at over 45mph is more likely to result in serious injury to the cyclist. Please protect cyclists on this speedway.
Have a plan to incorporate some streets for Cyclist but not every street. Seems more and more streets have some sort of bike accommodation, is this necessary and can we plan to make some more bike friendly and other not so.
Honestly I just hope we sustain the political will to change and ensure that these changes are ultimately effected. This would be a substantial improvement to my neighborhood for both transportation and the safety of my children.
I am not a bicyclist, but in my experience as a pedestrian and driver, Central Ave between Pacific and 9th is NOT an existing separated bike lane. It is, by the plan's definition, a bike route. There are no markers on the road or separations to protect bikes. And because cars are zooming through this portion of the road, bikes don't feel safe staying on the road and will understandably take the sidewalk instead. This road section should be updated to PROPOSED because it should be a separated bike lane and, currently, it is not.
I am tired of this city trying to make everyone ride bikes. I can't ride my bike to work for my profession. I don't see the Mayor or any Council members riding their bikes to work.

4. If you said the Bicycle Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
I do not think that Grand Street should be changed to separated bike lanes, with the plan to zig zag parking all over. This is a major cross town driving street and it will significantly impact the driving, pushing drivers onto side streets or onto Otis over to Shoreline and Washington Park, which is already impacted during commute hours. Additionally this will provide significant challenges for individuals with physical disabilities to park on Grand street. I am for visibility improvements to the bike lanes on Grand street, and the buffered bike lanes, if there is room. As I drive across Alameda every week I regularly see bicyclists who are not following the rules of the road of signalling, etc. and have been a witness to a bicycle vs. car accident because the bicyclist did not stop for a red light. I am for increasing bicyclists safety, and this solutions on Grand Street feels like motorists are being punished with harder driving and parking because bicyclists are breaking the law.
I don't understand the high stress, I prefer to ride on slow streets, pacific, Taylor form st Charles to EHS and the base, I ride daily and almost never use Clement or Shoreline.
I enjoy biking and walking frequently for leisure and exercise, but we simply do not need this many bike lanes in Alameda. It is a pie-in-the-sky vision to believe that 1) more bike lanes will produce more people biking and 2) people will make bike trips for anything other than occasional leisure.
I fear by trying to make a separated bike lane on Webster, it will decrease from transit and pedestrian safety and convenience on Webster. Webster should not have a separated bike lane south of pacific given how crowded the right of way already is (with wide sidewalk seating, parklets, bus stops, parking). If in order to add bike lanes south of pacific, we need to narrow sidewalks or remove amenities such as seating areas, parklets, or bus stop bulb outs, it would come at great cost to the businesses and surrounding neighborhood. Please consider modifying your recommendations for a protected bike lane on Webster south of Pacific, given the sacrifice it would require in currently optimally used right of way. Instead please keep the recommendation for a bike lane north of pacific, with bike boxes and shared roadway with traffic calming measures south of pacific. Thank you.
I feel like the Alameda Ave. greenway kind of ends abruptly. Also, the Alameda/Central/Benton intersection could probably benefit from some special treatment. All-way stop? Traffic circle? But overall, I think this looks fantastic!
I generally support the effort and thought underpinning this plan. As an avid commuter cyclist and weekend-dad-rider, I am anxious to see (2) critical improvements to the plan. 1) more emphasis on N/S routes. Sherman and Broadway are extremely challenging bike routes for inexperienced riders due to the constricted lanes and heavy vehicle traffic. I would hope more emphasis could be placed one protecting 3rd Ave, 9th Ave, St Charles Ave, Chestnut Ave, etc… Each of these routes requires deliberate traffic calming measures to discourage non-local vehicle traffic. 2) A more focused effort to add stop signs at all Class 3 intersections. I am appaled at the number of intersections along Pacific, San Jose, Taylor, and San Antonio, where many simple neighborhood intersections only have stop signs for 2 directions. The lack of adequate stop protection allows vehicles to move with far more speed and freedom than should be appropriate for local neighborhood streets.
I hope the neighborhood greenways receive enough treatments to slow traffic and reduce the number of vehicles on those routes!

4. If you said the Bicycle Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
I hope the project will consider separated bike lanes ClassIV for Pacific/Lincoln where possible. As someone who lives on this corridor, I can attest that the vehicle speeds have gone up dramatically. I would especially appreciate mechanical traffic calming measures such as speed bumps or rumble strips near our schools.
I like it. I just want it to move faster and have even more bicycle lanes and permanent slow streets.
I like the neighborhood greenways. The trails mark as bikeways are bumpy and in disrepair. They are not great for cyclists. These need to be repaired and maintained. They should also have separate spaces for bicyclists and pedestrians.
I live in Alameda and I am a long-time bicyclist (for errands, commuting to work, etc.). I just turned 50 years old, and want to continue bicycling for as long as possible. This plan is really wonderful and inspiring, thank you! My main suggestion would be to consider what is used as separators when building Separated Bike Lanes. I am generally not a fan of bicycling next to parked cards, but Shore Line Drive feels pretty safe to me / there is good separation between the bike lanes and the parking. Also, I 100% support the Neighborhood Greenways. I lived in South Berkeley from 2004-2012 without a car, and was able to get around easily and speedily because of their network of "Bicycle Boulevards" which are Neighborhood Greenways.
I live on San Jose and we get lots of morning traffic to SJND High School (even now with the slow street signage). Ensuring that cars don't turn from Broadway onto San Jose would help alleviate this issue.
I ride a bike in town every other day for exercise: Santa Clara to Seaplane, around the base, up Central to Crab Cove, up Shoreline and down Broadway. I have never thought of riding a bike on Lincoln because it is unsafe. There are plenty of bike safe streets that can be used to ride east/west in town (Central, Santa Clara,Pacific, and now Clement). The Lincoln corridor changes can't happen fast enough, and include a bike lane, but I don't know that I'll use Lincoln even with a designated bike lane because of traffic.
I think Central or Santa Clara should have a separated bike lane, probably Central since that road goes all the way through Alameda end to end. Also, the plan didn't specify which intersections would be made more comfortable for bicycles, but I really like what was done at Grand & Otis for bikes and hope that approach is used in some other places too.
I think gibbons in particular needs a more aggressive approach to increase safety. Possibly exchanging stop signs for signals etc. The rush hour times are particularly perilous and that coincides with kids going to school and folks out walking dogs, exercising, etc. gibbons and lincoln is quite scary at times
I think good doesn't match my excitement, as a parent I am so thrilled at the prospect of my kids being able to get to high school from bay farm safely on a bike, that's a concern I have every time they want to get to shoreline on bike is how they'll get there using Otis. The only real change I would say to look at is to look at establishing an "end to end" type of rout from Bay Farm to Alameda Landing ala "Bay Trail" style. Thats a very common reason for us to have to resort to driving, but honestly if we knew how to safely and easily get from one side of the island to the other, I am IN! So excited to see this. http://procrasti-nation.eu/wp-content/uploads/Shut-up-and-take-my-money.jpg
I think the plan is overly optimistic on bike usage and makes driving more of a hazard with narrow lanes and obstacles
I think the plan looks good, but would question the accuracy of the depiction of the existing facilities in certain streets. For example, the figure indicates that there currently exists a pike lane on Encinal Ave west of Park Street. This is not correct. Another example is the depiction of a current separated bike lane on Central Ave west of 8th Street. This is also not correct.

4. If you said the Bicycle Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
I want to be able to bike around the island, literally a huge loop, in protected bike Lanes.
I would hope to see more specificity about what type of traffic calming WILL be implemented instead of will be CONSIDERED. I would like these treatments to be similar to what we've done with daylighting, in that it's the DEFAULT treatment, unless it's shown to be infeasible. Can we (for once) put the burden on those fighting against safety improvement to show they're NOT needed instead of vice versa? Also these changes should not be appealable or subject to tons of process and approvals. Just do it!
I would like for Encinal and Central to be buffered or separated bike lanes. People speed down these road and there always students from elementary to high schoolers biking these roads.
I would like the intersection of Park/Lincoln/Tilden to change so that eastbound crossing Park is not allowed on Lincoln for cars. This is the design that should have happened when the shopping center was built. Additionally, a class II bike lane on the south side of Lincoln west of park seems infeasible due to the diagonal parking. But I hope you will change the parking because it doesn't work very well for cars backing out into traffic there either.
I would like to see more bike only paths
I would like to see more separated bike lanes and physical protections. We've already seen at the revamped intersection of Sherman and Clement that cars don't respect paint.
I would like to see more separated or buffered bike lanes on major east-west routes across the island, eg Lincoln Av, Central Av, or Encinal Av.
I'd like people who ride bikes to stop at stop signs and follow the rules of the road
I'd like to see a protected or buffered bike lane on either encinal, central, Santa Clara, or Lincoln. These are some of the most trafficked bike routes on the island, and it seems like at least one of these arteries could be made safer.
I'd like to see the Shoreline bike trail truly separated from the parking areas. Too many times cars jump the line, or park in at an angle to squeeze into a spot, parking across the bike lane. If there were more permanent posts that could not be easily flattened by a parking/parked car, this would be a safer route.
If you want Third Street to be a "Neighborhood Greenway" for bicycles, then I think there should probably be something like a mini traffic circle at 3rd and Santa Clara to calm car speeds down, because a lot of cars come accelerating up Third Street when they turn off of Central. Maybe that will change after Central Ave gets redeveloped, but as of this moment, there is too much car speeding on Third Street for it to feel safe as a recommended route for bicycles in a shared space with cars. I am more likely at this point to take a non-direct bicycle route via 2nd/Main to the Cross-Alameda Trail or to Singleton Ave than to use Third Street to get to those destinations. A mini traffic circle would also serve to calm car traffic on Santa Clara, which hasn't been a problem since it became a Safe Street, but I fear will be worse than before when Central gets a road diet and the Safe Street designation goes away. I don't want Santa Clara to become the preferred street for cars that want to speed when they're late for the ferry.

4. If you said the Bicycle Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
I'm a big fan of the improved bicycle facilities. Our family almost exclusively uses bikes and walking on island. For the Neighborhood Greenways, it's my primary hope that more attention is paid to making intersections that cross Greenways crossable safely for both bikes and pedestrians. There are a number (most I think) of intersections on Pacific where cross traffic does not stop. That makes it difficult to utilize Pacific to travel the island. I'm glad to be phasing out the slow streets as is, but very glad they'll be replaced with a more valuable and relevant solution (greenways). One more small place I think there needs to be some improvement in is in the placement of Bike signal buttons along the cross Alameda trail. Ralph Appezzato & Webster is a good example, where bikes need to ride up onto the sidewalk to press the crossing signal. The other is the locations of the new crossing signals near the playground at Jean Sweaney park. Especially on a bike carrying kids, it can be hard to maneuver around to get to the right signal. Maybe consider weight pads if possible, or even foot activated signals (which I believe I've seen before). Lastly, I want to say I had no idea we were proposing a mixed use trail around the airfield at the base. I think that's absolutely awesome. It would be such a fantastic resource, it's a really cool space. I'm sure its a ways off, but I'm already looking forward to those weekend rides with the kids! Overall, I believe this represents a huge improvement in safety, accessibility, and in creating a really robust, bike friendly transportation network. Thank you!
I'm not sure a "low stress" parkway is possible on Park Street or Oak without a dedicated bike lane. The current "share" pathway on Oak is "high Stress". The map showing Clement as an existing separated bike lane from Willow to Broadway is not accurate. The dedicated bike lane ends at Willow and Clement. It is currently dangerous (and impossible during afternoon commuting hours) having to cross from this bike lane to the opposite side of the road to continue to Oak street. This need immediate attention.
I'm sorry - why do we all have to accommodate bicyclists so THEY feel comfortable? I'm all for safety, but the majority of people use cars to get around and therefore cars should be accommodated much more than bicycles. Especially since the city is refusing to stand up to the State and continuing to build unsafe levels of high density housing in Alameda. When a disaster hits, we'll all be trying to walk or ride our bikes on the water as try to get off the island. What are you thinking?
I'm sorry but I'm red-green colorblind and I find this map way too hard to read. It's also too much information for one map. It would be better if it was in layers using Google maps so you could add and subtract information as needed. Nevertheless, I put "looks great" because I'm sure someone put a lot of work into it and I would defer to them. In general, I support less space for cars and more protected bike lanes.
Is there anything that can be done to address the condition of the shared path around Bay Farm, which currently creates many hazards due to tree roots? Also, is there any plan to link the four-lane road that links Doolittle and HB Parkway, along the south side of Corica Park? That stretch of road is quite wide and does not see a lot of traffic, so cars absolutely, excessively speed down it.
Island Drive is a main artery and so congested, adding a bike lane seems like it would be unsafe, squeezing both bikers and drivers into too-narrow spaces

4. If you said the Bicycle Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
It is a good thing to share the roads with bikes. But every single street does not need to be a bike boulevard with expensive and confusing treatments. This is going to cause more accidents, not fewer. You have made Versailles and San Jose private streets, but just as many people are biking down Clinton, San Antonio and Pearl...when you have given them their own private streets to ride down. For some reason or other, they do not choose to use your blocked off streets. And you cannot make every street private. There are many, many people - think the elderly, handicapped, moms with small children, workers who garden, clean houses, make repairs and otherwise allow people to have time to ride bikes - need access to streets with automobiles. Delivery drivers (Amazon to Uber Eats) park in the bike lanes and so if you have cut Lincoln from 4 to 2 lanes, there will be no place for cars to safely pass.
It needs more low stress bike lanes (separated from car traffic) for our children who are not comfortable going to school by bike, especially because there are no school buses in Alameda. I know that many parents are afraid to let their children use the bicycle because of the lack of separate bike lanes
It needs to be expanded. More rose diets. More streets closed to cara
It seems good, but the graphic is very busy and hard to follow. For example, what is the second link from Bay Farm to the main island? Is that another proposed ferry or a bike bridge?
It would be smart to have a buffered, more protected bike lane for all students to be able to bike to middle schools within the school zone. It seems like some streets on the edges of those boundaries do not have a direct, most safe way to get there.
It'd be nice to have bike lanes on park st. or Oak. St so cyclists could navigate north and south between business on Park st.
It's hard to see in the maps how stop signs and stop lights will be set up. Currently there are certain bicycling corridors that have a lot of 2-way stop signs that stop the flow of bicycle traffic but do nothing to slow or stop opposing vehicular traffic. As always, where possible it would be great to create physical infrastructural changes as opposed to things like sharrows and visibility improvements.
It's just too much. Maybe half of these ideas are practical and none of it is necessary. We are NOT BERKELEY. We are NOT EMERYVILLE. Stop trying to change this town to make it like all the others that have been ruined by these projects. I am saying this as a mother who rides my kids to school every day on our bikes. We stick to slow streets and quiet neighborhoods. This is not necessary and aggravating for those of us who like it the way it is.
less people that drive crazy you can put all the gizmos you want waste money and if you dont enforce driving habits nothing will change. nobody comes to a full stop anymore. spend the money on police enforcement
Less shared use paths more greenways etc
Like to see bike parking locations and perhaps charging stations fir the e-bikes.
Lincoln/Pacific where it merges on the West End should have dedicated wide bike lanes. It's a major west-east corridor and a dedicated bike lane would provide more safety. I'd also like to see more dedicated bike lanes at Alameda Point. I ride through there all the time and it's very unsafe near cars on the roads.
Looks great would like to see at least one more cross island separated bike path closer to Encinal.
make a street for bikes only
Make the slow streets impossible to drive as a through street with permanent barriers
Many of the new proposed routes are crossing places with unhoused population are increasing. This bike vision can be compromised if not implemented jointly with unhouse population solutions.

4. If you said the Bicycle Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
Maps are unclear. Enforce the speed limit along Otis Drive, especially between Park Street and High Street. Stop the speeders! Increase the Alameda Police Force. Bring back the 5 motorcycle officers/motorcycles. Issue speeding tickets!
Marina Village and Challenger should have protected bike lanes. McKay should be low stress (cycletrack, neighborhood greenway, or protected bike lanes. The neighborhood greenways need to be engineered so car volumes and speeds are really reduced, even from how they are performing as slow streets. Many trails are in disrepair, and if the low stress network is relying on them, they should be better divided between walkers and bikers, and maintained much better.
More allocation of fully protected bike lanes with adjacent accessible sidewalks. Too many people walking in bike lanes and cycling on sidewalks due to poor sidewalk conditions coupled with unsafe unprotected bike lanes.
More Class IV bike lanes
More dedicated bike lanes. Repurposing some of our extra car streets as dedicated bike / local traffic only. Substantial safety improvements to walnut and willow as bike approaches to love elementary, as far as making them one way and devoting half the area to bike/ped.
More greenways. There aren't very many considering this is a long term plan
More safe bicycle parking so bikes do not get stolen.
More separate bike lanes. Class 2.
More separated pedestrian facilities
My main driving routes are along 2 of your green routes. Please keep the needs of drivers in mind. Do not aim to make life difficult for those who are not able to ride bikes. Cooperative answers are possible.
Need more North-South streets with buffered or separated bike lanes
Need to integrate traffic speed calming with bicycle calming on neighborhood connector streets. Also along bicycle paths would like to see traffic calming and enhancements such as more street tread and occasional planter boxes& strips.
Needs a lot more Buffered Bike Lanes not just plain bike lanes (some of which are ridiculously narrow and dangerous such as Broadway)
needs additional concern connecting Paden to the greenbelt towards crab cove.
No more protected bike lanes. They have poor sight lines, create additional driveway and intersection hazards, collect debris, and make it difficult for cyclists to safely pass each other.
No more slow streets
North south around Park Street is really concerning. Its too high stress and looks like it will remain that way for a while. I ride Broadway 5 times a week from south shore to Bridgeside Shopping center. It is very stressful with delivery and construction vehicles blocking the bike lanes regularly and straight-thru vehicles cutting into the bike lanes to pass left turning vehicles. Versailles is two blocks further and has limited assess to Bridgeside.
Not all of the elderly can bike and the idea that we should then get on a bus/public transit mode is not realistic and too focused on the the wishes of city planner with tunnel vision

4. If you said the Bicycle Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
Not enough safe ways to go north and south along the island. Broadway is a joke, and everything else requires crossing major cross streets .. which you can't really do with kids. If you're relying on neighborhood bikeways (eg Versailles), you need to have red lights to stop cross traffic at major streets like central and encinal.
Not sure how Sherman can be a connector street AND a bike route.
Not sure if this is the place to bring up concern for safe parking of bikes along the newly built paths.
Nothing has been proposed for Buena Vista which is a major neighborhood connecting street. Some of the proposed changes (for example Grand Street) are overkill. Grand street is wide enough to ensure safety with painted bike lanes.
Otis Drive is very dangerous for bikes and should get separate bike lanes
Overall I am very excited by the vision for the bike network. Speaking as a daily biker, neighborhood greenways (I know them as bike boulevards from growing up in Berkeley) are absolutely the best option for getting around. The combination of low+slow car traffic with the charm and trees/shade of residential streets beats out separated/buffered bike lanes on larger streets hands down! One specific project I'm less keen on is the idea of changing Grand from bike lanes to separated bike lanes with parked cars as the separator. Speaking as a biker, I feel less safe when biking within that street design. I also experience the new intersection design at Grand and Otis, which is intended to feel safer, as being less safe. Those little "curb islands" feel hazardous to me as a biker. I preferred the former layout.
Overall my fear is that greenways won't be slowed down enough. I hope the streets are creatively narrowed to make driving fast scarier and use tactics like rumble strips to make passing bikes feel very uncomfortable for drive. Very excited there will basically be a complete island loop that is fully protected.
Park St and Webster St, the city's main commercial streets, MUST have protected bike lanes. Leaving them out of the plan is a major error
Park st. extends into proposed class 1 shared path across water to Bay Farm island--what's this about? Park st. bikeway design is deferred. This is dangerous for bikes and has gotten worse the past three years due to street seating causing bikes to frequently merge in and out of traffic. Santa Clara av. bet. 3rd st. and Webster av. is a class III bike path but Slow Street restrictions routinely ignored as of a year ago, resulting in fast-moving commuter cars (i.e. not local traffic) passing young cyclists occupying the whole lane. Good intentions thwarted by poor execution, perhaps resulting in more danger.
Please consider adjecent streets to Amelia Earhart School. Afterschool, some kids ride down island drive and many don't due to the poor road condition for the bike path. Kids will cross into Victoria Bay and cross over at Oyster Shoals as alternate means. However, many drivers don't stop at this intersection and roll a right turn near missing students on bicycles cutting into the intersection. So scary. 0ne day soon, some kid will get hit. Until the bike path is fixed, simple solution as bike path crossing signs or children crossing signs at this intersection will help drivers to be more careful.
Please do not settle for unprotected bike lanes. Sharrows and paint will endanger citizens -- build infrastructure that works for all riders, including young children and elderly.
Please don't block or impede major thoroughfares with bike lanes that are solid barriers
please Not everyone is able to ride a bike...

4. If you said the Bicycle Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
Reconsider the bicycle greenways
Reduce number of bike lanes to 2 primary east west and 4 north south. Move those lanes to low car traffic arteries. The proposed plan will generate a lot of traffic congestion and result in minimal bike use per modified road, in short make a few roads the "bike roads" and don't change the major auto traffic arteries,
Refer to comments re: begged lights and link https://sf.streetsblog.org/2021/01/11/advocate-urges-removal-of-s-f-s-beg-buttons/
Require bicyclists to follow safe riding etiquette. Horns, bells and speed limits
Resurfacing https://seeclickfix.com/issues/13009433 surrounding Regent & San Jose intersection. Overall, diverting traffic to other higher vehicle traffic corridors such as Encinal and Otis would help preserve the calmness of the green space at Chochenyo park, and more aggressive traffic calming treatments speed humps, traffic circles, etc. along the strip between Park and Broadway would support the strong amount of peds and bicyclists traversing San Jose Ave between Park and Broadway.
Scrap it, and restore all existing bicycle lanes to vehicular traffic lanes.
See response to question 3. All other connectors streets on the East end of Alameda are in progress and or have bicycle improvements. Shame on Alameda for not equally improving streets fairly. There is a noticeable bias of city improvements.
Separated bike lane in Broadway as commuter late to Fruitvale Bart Station
Shared-use paths in my experience have always been problematic. Particularly w/ the rising popularity of e-scooters / e-bikes, this seem rife w/ potential for injuries & conflicts. As road diets affect traffic on higher traffic streets, I'm also concerned that the neighborhood greenways may not have enough traffic calming measures to discourage drivers seeking shortcuts / alternative routes and speeding/driving recklessly on them.
Stop adding more bike lanes and taking away lanes and parking. People don't drive their cars because they feel unsafe to bike. People drive their cars because it's more practical for them. People have to be in multiple places within a short span or they have to carry several things or people or they are disabled and can't bike. Also, these reduced lanes make it much harder for emergency vehicles to navigate the city.

4. If you said the Bicycle Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
Thanks for this plan, and I'm really excited by a lot of it. The things that excite me most: more separated bike lanes, and the neighborhood greenways. One thing to consider on the neighborhood greenways is the cross streets. Pacific is a good example. This is the perfect route across town for cyclists — in fact, if done right, more people will use this route than any of the bike lanes on busy streets — but there are many crossings where Pacific has a stop but the crossing street does not. This can change. Harder spots like where Pacific crosses Grand will need some attention. While this improves the network considerably, there is still a notable lack of north-south streets with separated bike lanes. Between Grand and Fernside, there's no option, and that covers a lot of Alameda's population. Walnut would be a good option, but it would probably have to be made one-way for cars. However it works, please consider more north-south options for the future. One other challenge in the network is safe crossings of Park and Broadway. In the map, only Clement and Shoreline have separated lanes bridging the gap, and they're on extreme edges of the island. The San Jose greenway may be helpful, but it's not ideal. The stretch along the shore between Broadway and High (or where High would come out if it did) shouldn't be a high priority for adding bike use. It's a sensitive habitat with erosion and inundation issues already, and bicycle traffic is already well handled along Bayview Drive. I'd recommend keeping that area undeveloped and just for pedestrians - it's a special spot, one of the few places like it left in Alameda. In terms of prioritization, I'd suggest focusing on projects that get people riding sooner first. Adding bike lanes to busy streets is necessary, but riders generally don't like them because the experience is unpleasant. Focusing on the greenways - cross-town routes that are both practical and enjoyable - will get more people riding sooner. Big thumbs up to the new path behind Encinal High. That's a key gap in the Bay Trail.
The bicycle and pedestrian bridge to Oakland needs to be removed. With only 2% of trips being bicycle and 3% being pedestrian there is no demand for that. The bridge is too expensive- you could purchase a bicycle for every alamedan for less money and bicycle usage would still be low. The result of a pedestrian connection at that location will be increased property crime. If the intent is to relieve traffic on the west end to Oakland, the appropriate action is to build another tunnel for cars.
The bicycle vision is taking away people who wants to drive and the parking areas for the vechiles.
The map incorrectly shows the separated bike lane on Clement Aveneue from Grand to Broadway as "existing." In reality the lane currently ends abruptly at Willow Street. Please clarify the minimum level of treatment for Park or Oak that would qualify as a "low-stress" bikeway. A door-zone bike lane or sharrows are not low-stress, for example.
The more protected bike lanes the better.

4. If you said the Bicycle Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
The network needs more protected bike lanes. This map does not go far enough. On my street, Lincoln Ave, there are four traffic lanes and parking on both sides. This is not needed on a street with a 25mph speed limit. Get rid of of lanes, remove parking, whatever it takes and run protected lanes the whole way. There also need to be more north/south safe connections. It's criminal that we don't have something safer either on Webster or 8th/constitution. I put my 7 year old son's life in danger every time we ride these sections. And we will sue the shit out of the city if something ever happens to us on these unsafe streets. The Cross Alameda Trail is good, but is being built too slowly. Lastly, there needs to be a better way to access BART (fruitvale) by bike. Oakland has a plan for their section, please do your part.
The only truly protected bike lanes are at Shoreline drive, and down Memorial Parkway. Need more. Both Park and Oak are way too dangerous to bike right now. Broadway is the safest, but it needs to be wider.
the plan mostly designs for paths, east-west (long side of the island). the most dangerous areas are north-south but the plan does not include those.
The Separated Bike Lane should continue along Harbor Bay Parkway instead of stopping. The road is wide enough to add a lane, and the shared use path that exists is overgrown with shrubbery and isn't great for those who are using the paths for cycling/exercise. The Shared use path on the North west side of Bay Farm should also be widened and re-paved to accommodate better separation between cyclists and pedestrians. The path is in dire need of maintenance all along this segment as well. One of the changes I'd like to see is better marked Class II bike lanes. Cars are constantly parking in the bike lanes and I don't think they (always) realize it is a bike lane. Painting lanes bright green would highlight that these are active lanes and differentiate them from parking. When cars are parked in the lanes, it increases the danger to everyone using them because cyclists need to join car traffic. Also, whenever there is a case where going from one bike lane to another requires crossing the street, there should be a marked route that cars and bikes are expected to follow that doesn't require stopping at a cross-walk. (Consider Fernside between Encinal and the protected path in front of Lincoln Middle School). My cargo bike is too heavy when I'm carrying kids to dismount and press the button to cross, but it's often tricky to make that turn from the bike lane to the separated bike path. Ensuring there is a rideable crossing is imperative.
The separated bike lanes on 5th street are too narrow, people use the sidewalks as bike paths because they feel unsafe given all the commercial driving traffic there. A fully protected bike lane from the base to Webster Street to Park Street should be a priority so that someone can feasibly get from one end of the island to the other island fully protected.

4. If you said the Bicycle Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
The Shoreline bike path needs better separation from the cars. People parking will often rapidly pull into the bike lane and then reverse into the parking spot. This is extremely dangerous. Also many cars park in the bike lane because there are no bumpers or curbs to prevent them. Also some landscaping work needs to be done to reduce the amount of sand that gets in the bike path that makes it difficult for bikes to stop rapidly for pedestrians who don't think to look for a bike before crossing. Also the rubber bumps need to made into a proper curb like the Clement bike path. Right now they don't offer much comfort when people are driving 30-50 mph down shoreline or when using the bike lane as space for a U-turn. 5th street needs a separated bike lane from the cross alameda trail to the future water taxi. This will encourage people to to ride bikes to alameda landing shopping. Stargell bike ped path is a major priority. Cars don't share the road between 5th and Main Street. I avoid it because I get run off the road the few times I've tried it. Also it's not safe for pedestrians because cars are constantly smashing into the light poles and such around there. The Island drive bike path and the sea view bike path need to be repaved. If you want people to use bike infrastructure it needs to be maintained as well as the streets. You couldn't even drive small suvs on parts of the island drive path because it is so rooted. If the bike infrastructure was better maintained it would be easier for people to bike between the islands. Also the pedestrian signal needs to be always on for island drive and Robert Davey otherwise you get stuck on your bike several minutes waiting for it to cycle or you just unsafely cross. Lots of trees should be planted all along the cross alameda trail and Main Street park to shield the wind and sun and generally beautify the relatively treeless west end. Also if some bollards could be added so you don't have to hope the drivers safely make the left turn from 5th to Ralph instead of smashing into you while waiting for the bike light on 5th that would be nice.
The street crossings need work. Crossing Constitution on Pacific Ave. is very difficult. Constitution street does not have a bike path. there needs to be a bike path that goes to the tunnel that does not involve crossing numerous streets that have fast traffic. The street lights need to be ahede of the bike crossings so that the cars stop before the bike path.
There are issues with some of the existing separated lanes, i.e., at Walgreen's on Atlantic, if a motor vehicle is making a right turn into the parking lot, there is very limited visibility into that bike lane, and there is no indication that bicyclists should stop for turning motor vehicles. I have seen far too many near misses, both between cars and cyclists, and between two cars when the turning vehicle has to stop fast to avoid hitting cyclists and the car behind has to stop fast to avoid hitting the turning car. There has to be a solution that keeps cyclists safe while not impeding motor vehicle traffic. I love the bike lanes, but there are a few that are just setting people up for injury. Another trouble spot is Fifth at Stargell with cars having to merge left before turning right. Great idea, horrible execution.

4. If you said the Bicycle Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
There are too many changes to accommodate bikes. They are not highly used and it is forcing unsafe driving conditions, which will result in more accidents. The majority of bike use is for recreation, we have done so many improvements to our city and any biker can find a safe path to get across the island. It is time for the planning commission to improve the cross walks, create parking spaces for all the new housing projects coming to the island. A great majority of the residents are not able to ride a bike to get around the island. It is unrealistic to expect people only ride a bike or walk everywhere. It is very discriminatory to have those expectations.
There is a limited amount of space on every roadway. The roads don't get any wider - we all have to share the same space. If bicycle traffic gets its own lane, that means that other forms of transportation get less, it's that simple. This means that cars get less, and pedestrians get less. Placing curbs to allow for bike lanes will impede emergency vehicles and cause more accidents than they prevent. It is wrong to give the bicycle lobby every thing they ask for, without considering impact it has on others. I ride a bike too, and I get it that people think it's something they need to support because it's a green form of transportation (and so is my electric car), but I don't want or need a dedicated bike lane on so many streets. Perhaps you should consider bike lanes on less busy thoroughfares, where emergency vehicles don't travel. Ask the bike lobby how it'd feel about having a dedicated electric car lane on many streets?
There is no reason to disrupt the residents of the streets that will be changed from the way they want it and expected it to be when they bought the property.
There needs to be more dedicated bike pathways. Not integrated on streets with painted lanes. Separate bikes from cars.
There's a lot of buffered bike lanes or bike lanes that, for the sake of safety, should consider moving to real separate bike lanes. Drivers will kill cyclists and pedestrians without strong enough protections, whereas the worst that happens to drivers is they lose a lane and maybe some parking. On the one-hand, literally death, on the other, inconvenience at worst. But if we want to meet climate goals, and if we want to have a city that still feels like a small town, getting people on bikes, on foot, and out of cars is essential.
They are overly complicated and underutilized and cater to a small group of people.

4. If you said the Bicycle Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
This is a great start! But as I look at the details, there are some pretty big gaps that I see. Major issues: -My priors: I want good protection as a cyclist to do errands that take me around the island. -First thing I look for is a good east-west artery on the Island that runs more or less down the center. I see lots of proposed bike lanes (no protection or even buffers!), which we *already have* on Encinal, Santa Clara, and Central. At least one of those should be upgraded to a separated bike lane at minimum. Now, I most frequently use Pacific for this purpose but its safety getting worse and drivers increasingly abuse it for through traffic. So if "neighborhood greenways" are intended to provide this kind of protection, they need to do a better job of preventing through traffic (speed cushions?) than their current configuration does. It's hard to emphasize enough how important it is for these neighborhood greenways to be annoyances for vehicle drivers in order to be effective. -Second, I want a safe route to go north and south while accessing amenities along Park and Webster. There should be some kind of (at minimum) separated bike lane protection running north-south within a block of Park and Webster Streets. Minor quibbles: -This is a major issue, but perhaps only tangential to the bicycle network: there needs to be a *lot* more bicycle parking infrastructure for us to realize goals that involve people purchasing expensive e-bikes (I'm all for it!). -Central Ave between 4th and 8th is shown has having an existing separated bike lane, but that does not exist. I always ride on the side walk there because the four lane street is dangerous to bike in. -Likewise, Harbor Bay Pkwy along the east side of the golf course is listed as a shared use path. This may be the case, but it is not clearly marked as such and I sometimes feel guilty for biking on it given how skinny it can be. To sum up, my biggest asks: strong safety measures for cyclists on a central-island east-west artery (at minimum, give the neighborhood greenways real teeth), and the same for north-south routes near to Park and Webster.
This is a great step and I'm really optimistic that the network will provide for a safer bicycle experience in Alameda. I hope the city errs on the side of more robust design treatments that better protect cyclists, such as separated lanes with dividers. When combined with infrastructure that more forcefully slows traffic, such as speed cushions, I think the result would be something that would make families more comfortable commuting every day to work or school by bike.
This is not Amsterdam. People will always need and use cars. Bicycles are for recreation, not for transportation to work, shopping or family outings. Alameda is feeling more crowded with all the new units without required parking. What is wrong with the planning department?
This plan caters too much to a loud (but small) bike lobby in Alameda.
Too many bike lanes and not enough car lanes for traffic. Seniors and disabled cannot use bike. Too much traffic congestion, cars have to sit at street lights for long periods of time which increases polution, stress, etc. What is Alameda doing to our island? Most people cannot bike to work, costco, etc. The city keeps adding more housing, more people, and decreasing the ability for people to get around in town and out of town. Negatively impacts quality of life.

4. If you said the Bicycle Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
Too many major 4 lane streets that are parallel and in close proximity to each other where a bike lane would mean a reduction in car lanes. I suggest pick one.
Too many seperated bike lanes on older, already established, and much more narrow neighbourhood streets, eliminating parking. As a disabled woman with a disabled child, with no access to assigned street parking, not being able to park on the block I am attempting to access is unacceptable and feels discriminatory towards disabled persons. Will there be disignated handicapped only parking on every block?
Two way protected lanes (such as shoreline or Clement) are not the best design. Would prefer to see bike lanes follow traffic pattern such as bike lane in each direction of traffic. I also don't like "protected" lanes because should I need to make a left turn, I have no way to easily exit the lane. Buffered lanes are my preference. Please avoid lanes that are sandwiched between parking and sidewalks because visibility isn't the best. Road conditions, especially on slow street Pacific Ave, are really poor. I feel unsafe trying to dodge cracks, bumps, and potholes. Repaying streets would make it safer for me and my little ones to ride in the streets.
uncertain how the Park St to Bayfarm connection works, as its currently labeled.
Unless priority is given to making some pleasant, shaded routes, no one (except hard-core cyclists and kids who can't drive) is going to bike in Alameda, and I think making changes that are ugly and confusing isn't going to help anyone. For example, biking on Clement is not pleasant even if it is safer. You don't need a lot of these nice bike routes - I would vote for fewer, nicer bicycle routes for recreational cycling. Central is a good choice because of the trees. People don't use bikes for errands because they are expensive, thefts are rampant, it's hard to carry purchases, and bike helmet mess up women's hair (just being realistic here). When we completed the survey years ago I'm sure I'm not the only person who made it seem like we would bike on errands if changes area made, but now I'm being realistic.
Until the plan addresses sidewalk usage by bikes, the plan misses at least 40% of biking use.
Very much appreciate the thought put into the Bicycle Vision Network and the Neighborhood Greenways, especially along Gibbons Dr. This will really help encourage more people to ride, especially children and seniors. Thanks for helping make Alameda a bike friendly city for all!
way to much focus on bicycle paths. your vision is extremely disruptive. need better balance with vehicular traffic for people to travel outside of alameda. Public transportation sucks and is unrealistic in most cases.
We need more secure bike parking (like at ferries and commercial areas). Also there are no safe north-south bike routes planned between oak and chestnut?Yet how am I supposed to let my kid bike to school? The sidewalks are too narrow in this neighborhood, so that's out of the question. How are we supposed to even get anywhere? Pacific is a joke of a slow street, no one goes slow, and it's basically begging to be run over every time you cross willow/walnut/oak/chestnut on Pacific. There is nothing low stress about biking here either currently or planned.
We need REAL protected bike lanes. Paint doesn't stop cars (also neither does sidewalks if you read the news.) I want my biking transit to be prioritized over car convenience.
We need separated bike lanes to all three ferry terminals. In particular, along main street to the main street terminal. And along Central to the seaplane lagoon.

4. If you said the Bicycle Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
We need to have some sort of local shuttle that makes sense for getting around town and to BART. AC Transit does a good job of the overall East Bay, but Alameda needs to address the future influx of people from all the new housing. Biking and walking are both great and need support, but we can't assume everyone can or will use them.
We should strive to remove regular bike lanes where they sit in-between curb parking and the road. It is very high stress and creates door and pull over risks. Instead, parking should be eliminated to prioritize buffered bike lanes or bike lanes which between an active lane and the sidewalk. Also, more residental streets with curb parking on both sides should have parking on one side eliminated to create bike-ways (possibly with both directions of bicycle traffic on one side?) to prioritize safety and enjoyment of residents and not subsidizing parking lots. THANK YOU
Where's the bike/ped bridge on the west end. Only see a proposed water shuttle. Really need a bridge
while dining on Park st, which is difficult to navigate with cars, bikes, parklets, and pedestricans, the first thing I noticed is the fire department can not navigate traffic in and around Park st, which is a major safety concern.
While it is claimed bicycle safety is the reason for so many street restrictions, my feeling is the real reason for the random bumps, (example, Otis & Grand.) is to restrict auto use by increasing auto accidents.
Who came up with this plan. I live in one of hte proposed "Neighborhood Greenways" and this is the first I am hearing of this. Why weren't residents surveyed at the beginning. of the process rather than the end of it????
Why are there no class 4 separated bike lanes going East-West in the center of the island? One has to go to Clement or Shoreline just to get from Park to Webster. All of Central should have class 4 bike lanes. Otherwise if you live on San Jose x 9th, and you want to go to Washington Park, you have to do goofy things like bike on the sidewalk for a block or two on Central. I don't trust neighborhood greenways: does that just mean we put up a sign saying bikes might be there, or does that mean that roads are actually narrowed? Do they get paved with that brick that sounds loud if you go fast? Can we add more oak trees? The Gold Coast Slow Street is very well positioned to avoid traffic on Central. If Central doesn't get class 4 bike lanes all the way to Park, then we need to make sure that Slow Street turns into something next generation that actually slows cars. I wouldn't underestimate the importance of East-West transit: most of my on-island trips are going to either Park St or Webster St! Or somewhere inbetween. I'd like to be able to do that safely while hauling kids on my bike.
Why is Clement Class IV shown as complete. Is it fully funded? East-west connections to Bay Farm island bridge need upgrade. North-south network has gaps that could be filled
With the demise of the Grand Street protected bike lane plans, the map now lacks a low-stress north-south connector in central Alameda which is a pretty major gap in overall network access
Would love to see safer bike lanes on Broadway
Yes but sounds good need more improvements to keeping on and more focusing more than that ☺
You're dreaming if you really think that there will be this much bicycle utilization. You're devoting too much street area to non-existent current and future traffic.

6. If you said the Trails and Water Crossings Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
- Shoreline to Seaview Bridge: I do not support this, as it would likely be extensive / large scale project that mainly adds convenience for a small set of the Alameda population vs. a host of other projects that could improve safety and increase bike usage for a larger set of the population. - Bike / Pedestrian Bridge to Jack London: I support this, as it is currently very difficult to access Oakland from this part of the island due to biking in the Webster Tube is a very uncomfortable experience. A bridge would allow access to Oakland for commuters and would increase visitors to Alameda Point.
It wasn't clear from this doc if the planed Water Crossway from Shoreline to to Seaview is a bike walk roll bridge or also a car bridge. If Car bridge, then it seams like this goes against the main idea of trying to get more people to use active transportation.
$millions are being spent to address the needs of a very small percentage of Alamedans.
* "parallel but separate walking and bicycling paths" should be the preferred option, and existing paths should be upgraded to this standard wherever possible. A good example of where this is needed is the shoreline on Bay Farm Island: pedestrian and bicycle conflicts are far too common on this very popular path when the only option for both users is a single paved pathway. While the consequences of a collision clearly aren't as great as with a car, this type of setting should not be stressful for any users. To contrast, Shoreline Drive has minimal conflicts between bicycles and pedestrians, despite high levels of traffic for both. The best designs will include clear signs and paint that indicate which spaces are for bikes, and which are for pedestrians. * To continue picking on Bay Farm Island: the pavement is in really poor quality in many places here. I don't know who is responsible for this - the homeowner's association or the city - but it needs to be fixed, and if it's the HOA they need to be held accountable for this because these public shoreline routes are useful to everyone for both shoreline recreation on a public seashore, as well as access to transportation (ferry). * The trail passing through Harbor Bay Landing shopping center along the lagoon shore does not seem to actually exist in my experience. This is most awkward when trying to go for a recreational ride through this area. Clear signage and markings / a route should be developed to connect both ends of the trail along the lagoon shore through this shopping area. * The situation for exiting the west end of the island is dire. While long term solutions (bike/ped bridge) and medium term solutions (water taxi) are proposed and are great ideas, it's totally unclear for novices to navigate to the existing Posey Tube sidewalk while on a bike TODAY. _THERE NEEDS TO BE CLEAR SIGNS AND PAINT_ to indicate how to access the Posey Tube sidewalk & Oakland from nearby streets that have bicycle traffic. This should not take much time or money to fix: get it done in 2022, or 2023 at the latest. Know this: slapping a small "no bicycles" sign beyond the point of no return is NOT ENOUGH for this corridor that has a lot of pent-up demand from bikes & peds. I personally know a friend

6. If you said the Trails and Water Crossings Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
[cont'd] from San Francisco who had the misfortune of accidentally riding in the car lanes in the Posey Tube when exiting the island because they weren't able to figure out where to go in time. Seeing other reports on Alameda-focused Facebook groups of bicycles riding with traffic in the tunnel leads me to believe this may not be an uncommon occurrence. It is a real safety hazard and someone is going to die if left unaddressed! * Miller-Sweeney Bridge should be prioritized over the other neighboring bridges: it has the shortest connection to Fruitvale BART /w Class II bike lanes in Oakland (and more improvements in Oakland forthcoming). And the concrete pavement (i.e. not metal grating) will be a good surface for bicycles. We just need to find the guts to paint some bike lanes on it for at least an interim solution. Doing nothing for many years while waiting for something expensive like "bridge replacement" is unacceptable. We need something better than the existing class III "bike route" ASAP. * Bay Farm Island bridge needs better connections to neighboring streets. If I'm coming from the cycletrack on Shoreline Drive, how do I get to it? The signs and markings are almost non-existent. Assuming I'm coming east on Bayview Drive, there's just no clear & signed option and some of the ways I've found I suspect infringe on private property to varying degrees... With proposed class II bike lanes on Otis, there needs to be _really clear_ connections from Otis to this bridge. And ideally this should be better than a class II connection on Otis between Bayview Drive and the bridge. * Similarly, the south end of the Bay Farm Island bridge needs top quality signed & signaled connections to Doolittle Drive and Island Drive. Signs are relatively cheap and we need more of them!
[cont'd] * I have mixed feelings on the Shoreline to Seaview bridge proposal: it will save a lot of time commuting to the ferry & avoiding the complexity of the existing bridge to Bay Farm island.... but it will also have an effect on the scenery. I will be curious to learn more of this proposal. I do think we need to prioritize the other improvements in my comments here before funding this proposed bridge, which definitely falls under the "nice-to-have" category rather than "we desperately need this now" category.

6. If you said the Trails and Water Crossings Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
1) I am very excited about the possibility of adding another bridge from Harbor Bay to Park Street. The current bridge is too busy at rush hour and there isn't a great way to get to Park Street from it. I'm guessing it will be politically difficult to accomplish considering the Oakland bridge feedback, however. 2) I am very excited for improvements to the wooden bridge. This is so desperately needed. It's incredibly unpleasant to ride on and is getting worse by the year. 3) There needs to be a better plan for maintenance of existing and new infrastructure. For one, it seems like there is confusion about who is responsible for maintaining things like the Bay Farm Shared Use Paths, which all need a ton of work. Tree roots and general wear and tear make it frustrating to ride on. If these are supposed to be maintained by the HOAs, I doubt that will occur, so there needs to be some requirement/maintenance schedule for these paths. If they aren't high quality enough, then I'm afraid they shouldn't be included in the low-stress network. 4) Maintenance responsibility must be determined before the infrastructure is built. One suggestion should be that whenever infrastructure is built as part of a new development, the development should cede over maintenance of that infrastructure to the city after a certain period of time (5-8 years?) This seems like it should be negotiable at planning stage. For existing infrastructure, I would also like the City to make it a point to determine who is responsible for maintenance. In the event the path is not well-maintained, it should be reported to the agency/responsible authority to determine a maintenance plan. If that authority is an HOA that is refusing to fix the infrastructure in a reasonable amount of time, can fines or ceding of the responsibility to the city be an option?
A shoreline to seaview bridge is crazy, don't build it. Access to the bay farm bridge from shoreline drive could be improved but there is easy bike/ped access in this corridor a new bridge is impractical and unnecessary. The estuary bike/ped bridge is also unnecessary, a small water ferry across the estuary could be operated for decades for free without incurring costs anywhere close to the bridge construction without even considering ongoing costs for operating/maintaining the bridge. Additional improvements should be made to access the embarcadero on the Oakland side from the Park/Fruitvale/High St. bridges.
Again not enough for people who wants to drive and park at any of the trail and water areas.
Again, all bike trails must keep cars and bikes clearly apart from each other. The water crossing is way too costly and will add too much construction for too few people using it to and from Oakland. Why bring more congestion to Alameda or to Oakland?
Again, I commend much of the thought and effort on many of the past and current trails around the island. Both the Cross-Alameda Trail and Shoreline Trail are exceptional foundations from which to build a transformational network to build a sustainable community. I personally use the bus to travel with my bike through the tunnel during commute hours, and frequently ride with my family to Harbor Bay across the bridge. I cannot say more emphatically how much more we need improved connections to Oakland and JLS. I will use a future water shuttle if the ramping and schedule is convenient for commute times. I do not believe I will see a day when a bridge will be funded and approved, but we must have dreams. Lets make this happen. As far as the Shoreline to Seaview bridge is concerned, I do not understand how the dramatically improves our existing infrastructure. Given the regulatory hurdles for such a crossing, this seems a waste of resources with the Bay Farm bike bridge allowing efficient access.

6. If you said the Trails and Water Crossings Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
Again, one more cross alameda path near the center of the island would make this plan perfect.
Agreed crossings to Oakland are needed. Link Tildenway with Jean Sweeney to compleat network and fill in gaps all the way to ferry stations.
Also so excited to see the future parks in Alameda Landing. I'm curious what this pathway between Seaview and Shoreline Plaza, as an avid paddler and wing surfer in that area I'd be concerned about clearance.
Another drawbridge? Seriously no.
As a pedestrian who usually walks with my dog, I hate shard use paths with a passion. I am always looking over my shoulder to see if there is a cyclist about to run us over because few ring a bell or call out to alert pedestrians they are coming (bless those who do). And now with electric bikes and scooters it's even more dangerous to mix the two. Thank you for the Shoreline scheme with separate ped and bike paths, and for the separate paths along Lincoln School. And please, please make riding a bike on a sidewalk illegal everywhere in Alameda except for very young kids who are riding slowly. That would be so cheap and easy to change, and would improve safety a LOT. Another drawbridge, this one in the part of the estuary with much more boat traffic, seems unreasonable. It will be up all the time due to sailboats, and we know from the other drawbridges that this means bikes will have to wait at least five minutes, which they will not want to do so they won't actually use this bridge. And honestly, with Downtown Oakland going to pot and businesses moving away from the Oakland City Center in droves (my company did), there is a lot less need than there once was. People would much rather commute to SF by ferry than BART, so access to the Lake Merrit station isn't really a priority anymore now that there is better ferry coverage.
better signage so bike riders, do not get into traffic in the tubes
Can a car-bridge be added to the West End as well? In an emergency situation, with Alameda's increased population, there are not enough routes off the island (and in an evacuation, enclosed vehicles might be important).
Complete the loop with something along Fernside
Concerned about water crossing to Bay Farm from Park St.
Concerns with the bicycle and pedestrian crossing at the tube. clear wayfinding and breathable air need mayor help
Definitely need estuary crossing for bikes and pedestrians in the area of Webster and Posey Tube. I'm not sure of the need for a crossing from Shoreline to Seaview.
Do not build walkway into Bay 37 community.
Do your best to provide a path all around the island and there should be another one on the west end.
Don't understand what the Shoreline to Seaview Bridge is for. If that is a new crossing - is it necessary?
Estuary Bike-Ped bridge should be the priority. Other crossings, e.g. Bay Farm, are a distraction. Unless Oakland prioritizes improvements on its side of Park, Miller-Sweeney and High Street Bridges, any treatments to those crossings will be a waste. The Oakland sides of these crossings are currently dangerous car sewers (I ride over the Park St Bridge every day).
Estuary crossings further west than the current plan to serve the Alameda Point industrial/commercial area are needed. Or a vision to connect Alameda Point to the Alameda Landing dock.
Expedite the west end bike/ped bridge!

6. If you said the Trails and Water Crossings Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
Four-foot Webster Tube path seems inadequate width-wise particularly if shared between pedestrians & bicycles.
Frankly your maps are very hard to read. In my experience, using walking trails that are set off from streets is dangerous because bicycle riders obey no traffic laws and have almost run me down several times. I am sick of bicyclists who ride too fast, run through stop signs and signals, and generally bully everyone else on the road, Keep them off pedestrian walkways and out of the way of cars,.
I am especially excited about the Alameda to Oakland ped/bike bridge and the trali around the perimeter of Alameda Point. Intrigued by idea of Shoreline to Seaview bridge - hadn't heard about that one!
I am not sure how the waterfront trail will be constructed along East Shore Drive between Liberty and Encinal. Seems like a lot of displacement and right of way issues along the back yards. However, if it can be done on budget, would be great.
I am not sure why another shoreline to Seaview bridge is needed to/from bay farm. I know it makes it easier to access the shoreline center, but it will be another barrier for boats to circle the island. Perhaps look at making the current bridge more accessible to bay farm residents and improving the access on the roads on both sides.
I biked to work from Alameda to downtown Oakland from 2007 to 2015 and used the Park Street Bridge and the Embarcadero to get there. I would often not see a single other bicyclist on my route, so the low estimate of 35,000 bicyclists per week using the proposed bike-only bridge seems wildly optimistic. I rode through the tube once on a bike and never will again because of the fumes. Building additional walkways in either tube doesn't sound useful for the same reason. Given the amount of building going on in town, it would seem more prudent to design a bridge from Alameda to Oakland for cars and bikes. I do not see a benefit to building another bridge from Park to Seaview. There is already a way to get to/from Bayfarm on a bike from the main island, and the cost of building the new structure can't be justified. I would rather the City spend money on making existing streets slower and safer.
I do not like the pedestrian bridge that connects Alameda to Oakland. None of the residents of Bay37 have been consulted on having thousands of people on foot and bike streaming through their neighborhood. The only people who want the bridge are a few hundred bike riders who mostly live on the east side of the island.
I don't see the necessity for the Shoreline to Seaview bridge as there is another one near by. The number 1 priority should be the bridge near Posey Tube since using the Tube on a bike is gross and dangerous. That Tube is the only reason I and other people I know don't commute by bike ever.
I don't think encouraging more pedestrian and cycling traffic into the tunnels is a realistic plan for encouraging non-driving modes of estuary crossings. It's hard to imagine changes that could be made to the physical infrastructure of the tunnels that would make it appealing. Even at twice its current width - which would surely impact car lanes - the Posey tube would continue to be unpleasant at best. Please consider aggressive pursuit of the bridge backstopped with more waterborne estuary crossings.
I don't think Fifth street is wide enough to accommodate the traffic a water crossing would bring. Unlike other water crossings, this will be right next to residential areas which would make living there less peaceful for the residents
I don't like the Proposed Bike-Ped Bridge.
I don't see any need for a Shoreline to Seaview bridge.
I don't think the cost is worth the amount of trips, dedicated bus through the tube to transport bikes for those not inclined to ride, I also ride over the Park st bridge almost daily and have never encountered an issue with sharing the lane with pedestrians.

6. If you said the Trails and Water Crossings Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
I had no idea we were proposing a new bridge between shoreline and harbor bay island. So cool!! Oakland/Alameda bridge to jack london area would obviously be fantastic.
I like the proposal of a pedestrian/bike bridge connecting Alameda and Oakland. I don't see the need of a new pedestrian/bike bridge connecting Alameda and Bay Farm. It doesn't seem worth the likely substantial cost.
I love both the shuttle and bridge ideas for getting across the estuary to / near Jack London Square!
I LOVE the additions and hope that this plan is implemented
I really don't see the County shelling out $200M for a w West End Crossing. Certainly not in my lifetime. It sounds good on paper and gets Politicians votes.
I think the perimeter trails look great but would like more detail on near-term solutions to west side water crossings.
I think the Shoreline pedestrian walkway would be better described as a separate walking/biking path. It confuses the definition of a pedestrian walkway which appears to be a neighborhood cut-through. Shoreline to Seaview Bridge, while cool, doesn't seem to solve a huge transportation need (jobs/school/shopping/etc), like the Oakland-Alameda Pedestrian Bike Bridge, so I hope it doesn't gain priority.
I think the side path on the bridges is sufficient for bikes and pedestrians and would oppose creating a separate lane on bridges for bikes.
I used to commute by bike via Posey tube...it's dangerous and unpleasant. The improved guardrail is much better but dangers remain. For example, when cyclists pass each other, it can involve lifting a bike above the roadway! The proposals sound not very helpful (water taxi, Webster tube path) or speculative (new bridge). Ferry between Main St and Jack London is a short hop but incredibly slow. Before investing resources in this, validate that a water taxi could achieve usably fast turnaround time with economic staffing...I suspect not. Webster tube path will help a bit but suffers from Posey path's lack of passing ability, which is the core issue. Suggest an additional approach consisting of a bike-centric bus or van that continually cycles through Webster and Posey tubes. This could ultimately be made autonomous. The proposed Park st. to Seaview bridge isn't terribly important to cyclists given the proximity of Bay Farm Island bridge. Suggest defer this.
I would just be happy to see an alternative to going through the tubes. That's just scary and gross. I like the Shoreline to Seaview bridge as well.
I would like a combined auto-bike tunnel or bridge to serve the Alameda Point community
I would like to see a trail that encircles the main island, eg connecting around Fernside.
I would like to see as many separate walking and biking paths as possible, like the ones near the Seaplane Lagoon ferry stop. I am a bicyclist and I believe they benefit both pedestrians and cyclists. In my experience a majority of pedestrians walk with earbuds in, and cannot hear when a bicyclist calls out from behind them on a shared bike/walk path. This results in the pedestrian being startled or worse, causing a collision. And for cyclists, shared bike/walk paths mean that on weekends when crowds of people are walking on the paths, bicyclists are simply unable to use them and end up on city streets, sharing the roadway with cars.
I would love to see a trail that completes the wrap around the island. Our water beauty should be open and shared to all (like seaview parkway on Bayfarm) - the area on Alameda east end by Fernside should have a coastal wrap around trail constructed for walking and biking.
I'd discourage through transit of the bird sanctuary. The second bridge to BayFarm looks great!

6. If you said the Trails and Water Crossings Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
I'd like to see the bike lane paved the whole way along Shoreline to the Bay Farm bridge. It's too hard on bicycle tires to go over the unpaved, dirt sections.
I'd like to see this project completed at some point before I retire, this has been in the planning stages for too long.
I'd rather see investment in improving the existing Bay Farm trail network and approach to the bicycle bridge than in building a Shoreline to Seaview bridge. Could a water taxi be used here instead? The single best thing the city could do is to build the bicycle and pedestrian bridge to Oakland.
If only we could get a safe bike route from here to Treasure Island. Wow!
If Willie Stargell is the connector to the bike bridge, that bike lane needs to be wider - in fact going west, it's a bike lane to nowhere. Too many folks will want to use that road to get to the bike bridge - so there should be a dedicated bike path. Same scenario for Constitution - Make a dedicated path for bikes! Also the 5th St. bike path is a joke - too narrow - I've almost been hit by cars going 50 mph down that street north of Appezatto.
I'll echo my feedback on the previous bicycle question: the central parts of the island alon with Park and Webster are woefully undersupplied here. Ideally? I'd love to see one of Park or Webster blocked off for pedestrians only, and while it's tempting to call that a pipe dream, note that the City of Ventura has done with with five main street blocks, and their city council recently voted unanimously to extend it through 2024. Keep in mind that pedestrian traffic is crucial for improving outcomes for most small businesses. If Alameda were to develop a shared bike-pedestrian path going east-west that connects Park and Webster while going through some of the business corridors, you can easily imagine it developing more business capacity and becoming a regional destination for visitors.
Incorporate landscaping/shade cover for trails.
Increase knowledge of Water Taxis. Increase education of the bike/ped trail at Tidewater in Oakland that provides beautiful views of Alameda.
Increasing bike/ped crossing is essential. Whether it is through the water shuttle or bridge, additional options between West Alameda and Oakland are needed! The trail around the Navy base is also very promising. Would be fairly low cost for how much value it would add to Alameda.
It looks incomplete. Fill in the gaps.
It needs a dedicated trail also in park street
It would be more useful if prioritized the crossing by car path. People will travel more likely by car rather than walking or biking. Especially when it is not that bike-friendly or safe to walk on the other side, Oakland. The expected completion of Webster Tube Path in 2027 still sounds so far. It would be better to prioritize completing this project than the bicycle-pedestrian bridge.
It'd be nice to connect Main st. With Crown dr.

6. If you said the Trails and Water Crossings Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
It's be great when the Cross Alameda Trail all connects and the used shared paths are completed along Clement. I implore the city not to build the oneway road through the former railroad land between Tilden and Clement. Even for a few steps along that stretch of the trail it'll be pleasant to have fewer vehicles. I'm also super excited about a pedestrian bridge between Jack London Square in Oakland and Webster on the island. Imagine all the extra foot and bike traffic encouraged and facilitated between those two neighbourhoods once they're better interconnected. Definitely needs a great Welcome To Alameda sign on this side!
It's just really hard to picture what those water crossings will be like! The path inside the tube is something I currently avoid using so adding another does not seem like a good plan.
Less shared use paths! Too many conflicts with unleashed dogs while riding and pedestrians taking up entire path creating cycling conflicts. The water taxi HAS to be on demand as a scheduled service will be out of the norm for other examples plus create major conflict with connecting transit options with conflicting schedules.
Like it overall. Would like to see more analysis done in terms of cost benefit of each element, along with possible alternatives. But am generally supportive of more trails and water crossings.
Like that there is a portion of unpaved dirt trail along Bayshore and the proposed shoreline bike crossing to make access to the Bay Farm ferry much faster for East End/Central Alameda residents. The other ferries are a little too far to easily bike to. Bike improvements to Miller Sweeney bridge welcome to allow safer access to Fruitvale Bart.
Looks good but ensure that paths connect without uncomfortable or sketchy crossings between lanes. Truly make it a network that all riders (including children and elderly) can feel safe using.
Looks good great idea!! 🤘
Looks good in general. The Shoreline to Seaview Bridge seems like an unnecessary and duplicative infrastructure investment that would increase VMT. Funding for its planning, design, and construction would be better spent on bike/ped upgrades to the existing bridge crossings and the new estuary crossing.
Looks pretty good. The real challenge for me is the Oakland side of Park Street. I'm forced to ride the on the wrong side of the bridge on the pedestrian path, which dumps riders into a no-man's land, with difficult-to-access bike lanes, which are often cluttered with parked or abandoned cars. Getting from the bridge to the Embarcadero is dangerous.
Loving the idea of a bridge from Bay farm to south shore!
Many of the upgrades proposed will be impacted by the growing unhouse population, some of the places being consideren currently have growing unhouse population issues
More pedestrian and bike paths
More trails through center of island. The circular is great for recreation but for practical everyday use it lacks direct routes
Need to expedite building Oakland-Alameda bike/ped bridge. Must find a way to fast-track this and complete ASAP. Not a fan of the proposed Shoreline-Seaview bridge but it makes sense. Bridge design (visual aesthetic) will be a big factor.
New bridges for bikes across the estuary would be extremely expensive, and probably can't be justified by use. I would like to see a new seismic resistant bridge across the estuary, but that could also carry buses and be available for emergency vehicle access, not just for bikes.

6. If you said the Trails and Water Crossings Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
No bridges near the tubes nor connecting Shoreline with Seaview. And pave the remaining part of the Bayview trail.
NO BRIDGES!! To EXPENSIVE AND NOT NEEDED.
no more access
No need for a new bridge between Shoreline and Bay Farm. A safer way to cross the estuary on the West End would be very welcome.
no pedestrian bridge!!! between the ferry and the awaited water taxi service - will meet needs of both people with and without bikes. its an unnecessary expense that doesn't make any sense.
Not enough in the east end of Alameda.
Not enough information to endorse the bicycle/pedestrian bridge because it's unclear whether is practical or likely to be used by many, especially as a pedestrian bridge. Need more information on where it is proposed to be built, how long it will be in terms of distance and where exactly it would exit in Oakland. With inflation, I am also concerned about potential for ballooning costs. Also would want more detail regarding the other proposals.
Not sure of the need for the shoreline to seaview bridge, not sure how many people would be biking if not for that connection. On the other hand, the bike-ped bridge to Jack London is make-or-break for the success of this plan wrt mode share.
One crossing at tube one at high. No reason for this many crossings. I disagree with the premise that building water crossings off island will significantly decrease auto ridership off island,
People's behaviors are not taken into account. Many people do not follow rules of the road yet there is little enforcement around this issues. In addition many walkers do not adhere to the paths they are supposed to adhere to. Maybe some education around this topic could help, but again people behaving badly.
Please build!
Please keep homeless people from living in parks and trails. I don't feel safe when I walk in Jean Sweany parkway and there's folks with crazy eyes watching me and my dog, and I see abandoned shopping carts all over.
Priority for water shuttles, preferrably autonomous and numerous. Bridge is spectacularly expensive to build and operate and not as great as many think as it will need to open frequently for marine traffic.
Rather than waste money creating a new water crossing from bay farm to mainland, create a real traffic bridge to lessen congestion you are creating for people living on bay farm. You are cramming additional housing on bay farm while eliminating basic services like drug store, grocery store, restaurants, etc than make it convenient to live on bay farm. instead you off islanders just keep wanting to make situations here worse.
Reiterating a previous point: please don't open the shoreline stretch from Broadway to High to bikes. It's too sensitive of a habitat and bikes are already well served by Bayview Dr. Including this in the Bay Trail plan could encourage further habitat degradation without careful planning. Very excited by the prospect of the two new crossings! With the Shoreline to Seaview possibility, please ensure that it doesn't conflict with wetland restoration and sea level rise mitigation efforts.
Riding by the water is lovely, but you can already do that. Again, this is not necessary.
See note for question 4 on trails. The bike ped bridge needs to be prioritized
Separate the bikes from the pedestrians at Crab Cove park. Small kids and dogs often do not overlap well with the bikes.

6. If you said the Trails and Water Crossings Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
shared use path on Bayview path by water is too narrow to support bike traffic. Often bikes ride on the Ravenscove grass to avoid peds, or they narrowly miss them keeping on the path
So so excited to have a water crossing. Suggest starting with the water shuttle and consider expanding to a water taxi that runs along the entire estuary. If the cost to operate the shuttle is $2m a year and the bridge costs $200m (i.e. 100 years until breaking even), consider leveraging the flexibility of running the water shuttle running more often and along the estuary vs building the bridge that will need 70' of elevation and cause boat traffic. Also - so so stoked to see a trail system on the west end along with a wildlife refuge!
STRONGLY support the Bike-Ped Bridge across the estuary. There should be at least one north-south separated bike path in each of west, central and east Alameda. Grand Street seems like the most obvious place for such a separated bike path, and, being central, should be the top priority. More effort needs to be make to make the bike paths along Island Drive and Harbor Bay Parkway safe, they are riddled with tree roots that make the bike paths uncomfortable bumpy. Not sure about the Shoreline to Seaview Bridge idea; I'd first like to see the wooden bridge that goes under the Miller-Sweeney bridge be improved; it's also too bumpy for bikes, and is, along with the tree-root-riddled bike paths, a disincentive to crossing the Bay Farm bridge by bike.
Terrible for boaters to cross
Thank you for including the crossing from Bay Farm Island to South Shore!
The addition of a cycling and pedestrian bridge connecting the West End and Oakland would be a monumental quality of life improvement.
The bicycle and pedestrian bridge to Oakland needs to be removed. With only 2% of trips being bicycle and 3% being pedestrian there is no demand for that. The bridge is too expensive- you could purchase a bicycle for every alamedan for less money and bicycle usage would still be low. The result of a pedestrian connection at that location will be increased property crime. If the intent is to relieve traffic on the west end to Oakland, the appropriate action is to build another tunnel for cars.
The biggest problem with the estuary approach on bike/foot is angry speeders on clement. More traffic calming the entire length of clement.
The ped/bike bridge is really critical. The water taxies are a cute idea but they aren't going to be very practical and they will probably be more expensive than we plan. Let's make sure we are focused on making some of these trails best in class. You visit countries in Europe, like Switzerland, and they have these gorgeous trails along their lakes with planting beds, and trees, and mini pocket parks with maybe a swing set here, or a slide there, and they are just wonderful. We should really strive for that, particularly along more scenic stretches like shoreline.
The Shoreline to Seaview bridge seems a bit unnecessary, or much further down the seniority list from other bodies that lack crossings such as the western estuary and improvements to bike crossings at other bridges.
The trails can be cleared of tree roots to have even safe pavement. I do bot think adding a pedestrian/bike bridge to shoreview is necessary. Instead add a kayak and paddleboat rental on seaview. The bridge is not necessary on seaview which has heavy pedestrian and bike use. Improve seaview pavement with more bight lights instead!

6. If you said the Trails and Water Crossings Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
The water crossings are very important to me as a biker + walker (don't care as much about the trail network). I'm so glad the plan recognizes the importance of bike/walk access to Oakland and how unpleasant/unfeasible the current conditions are. I am strongly in favor of the propsed bike/ped bridge near the tubes! That said, its success will be highly dependent on location, on both sides. It's got to have low-stress access from common bike routes on the Alameda side, and it's got to connect smoothly and efficiently with bike-friendly paths to Lake Merritt BART, 12,th St BART, and Jack London Square on the Oakland side.
The Webster tube does not have a bike path and it will probably will not have one in the future. I will be dead before the bike bridge gets built.
The wooden underpass awful and needs to be fixed. Half the time I walk my bike on it because I don't want my children to get shaken baby syndrome. I can't imagine what this would be like in a normal stroller. I hope the water taxi has a high enough frequency and length of service to be useable. I also hope Oakland has better bike infrastructure to BART from Jack London Square. As previously mentioned the water taxi needs a protected path all the way to the cross alameda trail. Sharing the road on 5th street doesn't work well between car doors and speeding cars.
There are plenty spaces around the former Navy base. It will improve safety and more enjoyable for the bikers and walker using it as a trail to have the path separated instead of shared.
There really needs to be a mid island traffic bridge to Oakland. If more housing keeps getting added (which I support btw) then the ingress and egress we have right now is going to get overwhelmed.
This looks fine, but why is this a priority when the walking/biking routes to school are not safe. Cars are consistently turning into crosswalks, nearly hitting children with way too much frequency. Safer routes to school should be a higher priority.
This map would be much better if it also included streets that have or will have Class IV and sidewalks. Trails are great but that would help show connectivity.
This section doesn't describe any details at all about what upgrades and improvements are planned for the existing and new trails in the city. I would have liked to see evaluation of existing trails that are "in need of maintenance" as described in the first paragraph, followed by suggested design improvements and visions for each of these trail types. Specifically, I would like to see that consideration is given for existing trails where the only landscape planting is maladapted grass, which are dying and yellowing every summer due to California's new reality of yearly droughts. I also want the plan to include a vision of replacing such grass with more suitably adapted drought-tolerant plants, which will not only survive in our climate but also thrive to provide better visual interest/natural environments for those using the trails.
Trails are great, but Estuary Bridge is a poor investment for the money. Again, we need a local transit/shuttle system for getting around the Island.
Trails plan looks great. I like the idea of a bike/pedestrian crossing to increase access to BART & Jack London Square, but I also have some concern about the inevitable migration of tent villages as access eases. The City of Alameda needs to be comprehensive in its planning so that likely impacts — even if indirect — are factored into its decision-making and resource-allocation.
Trails through the Webster and Posey tubes serve little purpose. That route is too loud/dirty/narrow to reasonably use as a cyclist or pedestrian.

6. If you said the Trails and Water Crossings Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
Unclear. Enforce the speed limit along Otis Drive, especially between Park Street and High Street. Stop the speeders! Increase the Alameda Police Force. Bring back the 5 motorcycle officers/motorcycles. Issue speeding tickets!
Unsure what the proposed Shoreline to Seaview Bridge includes. Is this just walking/biking or is this an auto bridge a well?
Waste of time and money
Water crossing ideas look great & I hope they are built, but the funding challenges are so huge that it's very unlikely they ever happen.
Water crossing over the Estuary will never happen; the Feds will not allow restrictions to ship traffic.
We don't have enough maintenance on these trails. Harbor Bay trails and the wooden bridge connecting the Bay Farm bike/ped bridge to the Harbor Bay club path is in very bad repair. Please don't build anymore of these without a maintenance plan for the ones we have now. Also, for connectors, please make these as straight as possible. Curvy paths are fun for recreation, but people walking or biking shouldn't need to go further.
We don't need another walking bridge
We need a pedestrian or mixed use trail along Doolittle Drive between the Bay Farm Island, Bridge and Harbor Bay Parkway. It is very dangerous to walk along too little at that place. I oppose the shoreline to sea view bridge. A threat to birds, a visual blight and an unnecessary expense .
We need another bridge fir cars nit just bikes and people walking .
We're an island so please make sure that the public has water access at every possible point. It looks pretty good but there's always room for improvement.
What is the shoreline to seaview bridge? Is that a new pedestrian crossing?
Where does the Bay Trail go south of Alameda? It's nice to see the ERPD construction along Doolittle. Can a similar project be done for a safe walking/cycling trail between the model airplane field and the MLK Regional Shoreline visitor center? I know that's outside of Alameda city limits, but those type of longer-distance connections are almost the entire point of hiking/biking/walking trails.
Why are yo adding another bridge from Bay Farm??? And adding bicycles to the Webster Tube is asinine!!
Why waste money making a 4' wide path in the tube?
Would be great to see another way off the island!
would like to see it together with overlay on street changes to ensure that there are connections between trails and streets that have protected bike and pedestrian pathways
Would like to see shared trails extend down Pan Am way. This is becoming a more busy area with development
Would love to see bike bridge to Oakland prioritize over bay farm to south shore
Would love to see the estuary crossing built as soon as possible and the existing waterfront park opened up so that the existing bay trail can connect and be used.
yet again...not everyone is able to ride a bike
You can't give priority to one thing by "disappearing" another. Alameda needs to expand the tunnel or ad a new bridge connecting it to Oakland or San Francisco. Don't spend money on things we don't need right now

6. If you said the Trails and Water Crossings Vision Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
You're not really looking at how people use what's here now. The Bay Farm bicycle/pedestrian bridge is a great example of trails that don't get used.

7. What do you think are the most important programs in Table 9? Please list up to four, including the identifying numbers.	8. Should any programs be removed or changed? For changes, please include the program number.
	6., 11., 12., 13. Bikes should follow either motor or pedestrian rules, not both. Electric bikes should be registered and licensed. They are motor vehicles.
	All of them. And put ANY changes on the voters instead of committee with agenda's that does not represent the WHOLE city.
	Electric bikes are heavily represented in your proposed programs but I'm unsure they should be prioritized since Alameda is flat. E-bikes may be a necessity for partially disabled folks but seem a luxury for able-bodied folks. Is the cost of e-bikes low enough to make them widely available?
	too many, hard to understand impacts, etc.
- P.13. Revise the Bicycle Chapter in Alameda's municipal code to reflect current laws and practices, support safe bicycling in Alameda, eliminate bicycle registration requirement and discourage motorists from parking or idling in bike lanes. - P.1. Regularly provide free or discounted bicycle repairs and maintenance via a local non- profit, such as the BikeMobile, and/or through partnerships with local bike shops. - P.2. Support and promote local, regional and state electric bike rebate programs for low- income individuals. - P.11. Evaluate current bikeshare (standard and electric), scooter share and other micro- mobility options, and establish programs and policies for their operations in Alameda. Include discounts for low-income residents. "Easy wins" is the name of the game here.	
#8	
#8, #5, #9, #3	#6 should be removed.
#8,#7,#3	There needs to be a focus on actually making the "safe routes to school"safe.

7. What do you think are the most important programs in Table 9? Please list up to four, including the identifying numbers.	8. Should any programs be removed or changed? For changes, please include the program number.
* P.10: Bike parking, but needs to be more ambitious (see answer to question 8) * P.11: Bike share and scooter share provide the EASIEST way for "bike curious" people to mode shift and try out an active lifestyle. This should include more "exotic" and uncommon bike options such as cargo bikes! Despite the imperfections, I was disappointed that Lime bikes left Alameda a few years ago.	* P.10: The bike parking goals are not ambitious enough. We need more SECURE bike parking provided by BikeLink, which are an amazing product! Putting a few lockers in the basement of the Civic Center garage and at the ferry terminals isn't enough. We should establish some general rules like: no business in Alameda should be more than a quarter mile from a BikeLink locker. Please build secure bike parking right into the zoning codes: let's have "minimum [secure] parking requirements" for bikes instead of cars! Where are the BikeLink lockers at Shoreline shopping center? Elsewhere on Park St? Crab Cove? etc. etc. People don't want to get their bike stolen & vandalized, and bike locks can only do so much, especially if they want to ride a nice/expensive bike that is a hot target for thieves. These lockers should be ubiquitous. We spend $$$$ on "free" parking for cars, but barely throw a bone for bicycles. That needs to change if we want to take the full advantage of the bike network we are building. * P.15: Why are property owners responsible for sidewalks in the first place? They are part of the city street, not the private property. This should be completely managed by the city such that the property owner does not need to concern themselves with the sidewalk any more than they do the car lanes. We shouldn't need "incentives" to get property owners to maintain their sidewalks. Just have the city do it for them automatically, and raise property taxes a small amount if necessary....
1) P.3. Develop a toolkit to achieve Neighborhood Greenway volume and speed targets using volume management and traffic calming tools.	
1. Yes, free or discounted bike repair is a good idea 8. Yes, we need to focus on school guards. All kids should have a safe path to and from school.	10. We do not need to add bike parking. Everywhere I go on the island they are all all empty. I see a few used at the ferry lot, but at the shopping centers and parks they are all empty. Plus bike theft is so high, it is not safe to lock your bike. 13. I disagree, all bike riders should be registered and pay an annual fee. The cost would offset path maintenance. We have 4 in our household that use our bikes for recreation, we should contribute to the maintenance. 20. We have so many areas that have sufficient dining options. Businesses suffer if their clientele can't easily park to visit their shop.
18 - infrastructure 8 - school crossing 23 - signage	There are too many to list that need to be removed. Everything can’t be a priority!! Narrow to about 25% of what is listed. Ruthless prioritization is needed.
18,22,29	Please add more auto speed reduction programs. Perhaps traffic speed enforcement and eyes on streets programs to support pedestrians
2, 4, 10, 27	
2, 8, 10, 16	12 might not be as high priority

7. What do you think are the most important programs in Table 9? Please list up to four, including the identifying numbers.	8. Should any programs be removed or changed? For changes, please include the program number.
26 - listen to the community, 1 - not just repairs but access to reused bicycles, e.g., Cycles of Change, 10 - there is NOT ENOUGH bike parking and the new bike parking is flimsy and not safe for bikes, 14 - get more folks bikes ... and I know this isn't on the list, but please educate e-bike riders on etiquette!	This isn't on your list, but I encourge city staff and elected's to educate the public about the rights or pedesterians and cyclists. I have people in cars yell at me, drive way too close and even try to drive me off the road because they claim I don't have a right to ride my bike on certain streets.
27, 15, 13, 10	
28. Otis - Doolittle Drive 17. Greenway For San Jose St 22. Broadway to Otis Greenway 23. Otis to Central	
3 4 7 17	
3 8 10 13	
3) many of our streets are so veeeeeeery wide; random bulb-outs in the middle would help. crossing guards made it incredibly easy to bike across busy street crossings when going to school parking. Enclosed bike boxes? I'm scared of trying to park my trailer somewhere! BikeLink parking is great, especially if it can handle larger bikes used to transport kids. We should have a ton of it!	Consider having Weekend valet bike parking on Webster/Park.
3, 17, 18	
3, 20, 19 #3 is by far the most important. Alameda point is burdened with car enthusiasts causing an unsafe environment for people and children living in the area	
3, 4, 10, 14	16 is a great idea (see Vancouver BC for excellent examples of trackers) but can be done more cost effectively to start and then gauge success.
3, 4, 5, 20	
3, 4, 8, 27	We don't have enough data to evaluate ROI on most programs.
3, 8, 18, 20	19
3,4,5,10.	

7. What do you think are the most important programs in Table 9? Please list up to four, including the identifying numbers.	8. Should any programs be removed or changed? For changes, please include the program number.
4 - If that means making bikes illegal on sidewalks. Bikes are legally vehicles and should get the privileges and responsibilities of vehicles. [If that's not what it means, I vote for 31] 18 - Why are so few programs focused on anything other than promoting bicycling? This is the only item out of 31 about encouraging use of public transit. 20 - If that means neighborhoods can have block parties without paying a fortune for permit and insurance. [If that's not what it means, I vote for 28 if that means making the traffic light sensors work for bikes.] 29 - It is critical to measure impacts so we can do more of what works and stop what doesn't.	Remove 2, 12 - Electric bikes and scooters are not active transportation - they are more like motorcycles. Because they go so fast, they should not be allowed on mixed-use paths or sidewalks -- much less be subsidized. 6. If a cyclist wants the privileges of a pedestrian (by definition, someone walking), they can and should dismount. Riding in crosswalks should never be allowed - it's dangerous to pedestrians. 15. Absolutely not! If the city wants sidewalks repaired, it needs to pay for them. Forcing homeowners to pay for repairs the city wants is just wrong. 16. I have no idea what this is.
4 10	
4, 10, 15, 18	
4, 10, 18, 26	
4,7,8	
5,11,15,15	
6 8 10 13	Cars Blocking bike lanes, double parking, should be cited. “Discourage” is not enough.
6, 10, 13	
7 is very important for the children's safety than I do except from that the points is!	No everything looks good as practical ways and change for the better either ways ! Okay
8, 26, 29, 13	
8,4,3, 5	
All are good, but please consider including language to equitably distribute these programs. I highly recommend placing priority on areas that have high population density and have been historically underserved, such as census tract 4276	
All you guys do is make it harder for cars to move around the island. By slowing cars down you're increasing harmful emissions. Stop cutting down on lanes available to cars.	
Anything that improves safety and decreases auto speeds on existing streets with bike paths	
Anything that is financially sustainable, ie with a funding source.	
Bicycle paths connecting all the island. Bridge from foot of park street to Seaview on BFI.	I think we are on the right track as long as we can tweek it as we go.
Bikeway maintenance and school access	
Creating structures at bus stops-but must be accessible Sidewalk repairs- desperately needed seems strange it’s left to patchwork of home owners Wayfaring- must be accessible	If you can require review projects for Maintenance considerations you should certainly be able to review for accessibility considerations Really wish there were more projects aimed at accessibility for pedestrians with disabilities
Decline.	Decline.
Definitely in support of more bike racks across the city.	

7. What do you think are the most important programs in Table 9? Please list up to four, including the identifying numbers.	8. Should any programs be removed or changed? For changes, please include the program number.
Do not build walkway into Bay 37 community.	Do not build walkway into Bay 37 community.
Document the impacts of pedestrian and bicycle capital projects and programs on safety and mode shift. Conduct before-and-after studies of projects using a consistent methodology.	Evaluate current bikeshare (standard and electric), scooter share and other micromobility options, and establish programs and policies for their operations in Alameda. Include discounts for low-income residents
Enforce the speed limit along Otis Drive, especially between Park Street and High Street. Stop the speeders! Increase the Alameda Police Force. Bring back the 5 motorcycle officers/motorcycles. Issue speeding tickets!	Enforce the speed limit along Otis Drive, especially between Park Street and High Street. Stop the speeders! Increase the Alameda Police Force. Bring back the 5 motorcycle officers/motorcycles. Issue speeding tickets!
Enforce the traffic regulations for bikes. It is dangerous to drive and walk in Alameda because the majority of bicyclists run red lights and do not follow the traffic rules. Often bicyclist are driving on sidewalks which is dangerous for elderly and handicap The police need to cite these offenders.	Remove all of them. MOST alamedeans use cars not bikes out of necessity. If not using cars, they walk. WHY are we wasting all of this money on bicycles?
Get rid of slow streets The bike bridge Signage Lights	Get rid of slow streets
GREENWAYS 3, Maintenance 4, rebate programs 2	
Hire more city workers to address the issues of street maintenance	
I can't use a bicycle- what about me and those like me?	I don't care about bicycles - I care about infrastructure for vehicles in and out of Alameda!
I do not support any of these recommended programs.	Remove items P1 - P31
I don't see programs addressing increasing security issues in the island, the risk of crime in the island is increasing. That will discourage bike usage.	I don't see programs addressing increasing security issues in the island, the risk of crime in the island is increasing. That will discourage bike usage.
I really think the following 7 are very important: 1, 4, 8, 10, 18, 20, 21 But if I have to pick 4 only, they are as follows: P.8 P.10 P.18 P.21	
I think this looks great. To me the most important piece is traffic calming and speed accountability in neighborhood greenways.	
I'm all in on teaching bike safety to all ages.	
In the near term P4 and P5 are the most important. Midterm, P18 should be at the top of the list of it all. It is by far the most important thing on the list. I will say P15 is complete nonsense. The city should be 100% responsible for all street and sidewalk repairs!	

7. What do you think are the most important programs in Table 9? Please list up to four, including the identifying numbers.	8. Should any programs be removed or changed? For changes, please include the program number.
In theory biking is ideal. I reality aggressive bikers run over pedestrians, challenge auto drivers, and disregard DMZ bike laws. Further, what about those that don't ride bikes and are too far away from buss routes; the auto is their only form of transport. How do seniors carry their groceries on bicycles?	Bikcycling should be a secondary form of transport, not primary - get real.
Increase bike parking.	
Increasing safety in items p.3 and p.7 - so that residents see slower speeds that make biking safe - will drive up cycling figures. Making bikes and ebikes discounted for low income folks, and increasing available cycle parking in p.2 and p.10, will signal the expected behavior and make it accessible.	I don't think any programs should be removed or changed. One national level change we could advocate for, is increasing cycling and transit benefits instead of car benefits for employers. It is common for example to have a public transit benefit (discount on transit pass) and parking benefit (discount on parking fees). It is less common (and less funded) to have a biking transit pass (storage) or biking benefit, and when available, funds are not comperable to car and transit passes.
Infrastructure maintenance Way finding/ routes like used in Alameda (e.g. "Wiggle") More bike racks like what was lost near the farmers market.	Many of these rebate programs seem best fit within a non-profit or grant-based as it may be difficult (and expensive) to promote to those most in need.
Involve the citizens living on the neighborhood green streets in the development so all all views are heard.	It looked okay.
Listed by order or priority: P.13. Revise the Bicycle Chapter in Alameda's municipal code to reflect current laws and practices, support safe bicycling in Alameda, eliminate bicycle registration requirement and discourage motorists from parking or idling in bike lanes. P.10. Install additional bike parking throughout Alameda, including in-street bike corrals and parking that accommodates longer wheelbase cargo bicycles P.20. Investigate opportunities to create pedestrian-only spaces for outdoor dining and community gathering for special events or longer term. P.4. Develop and implement a maintenance schedule for bikeway infrastructure, including striping and separated bike lane barriers.	
Maybe I missed it. Teach parents and children the rules of the road and how to navigate them safely? More bike racks that are safe to lock your bikes to. Better signages for how to navigate Alameda.	Remove electric bike rebates. If they can afford to buy an electric bike, they should be able to pay for it.
More Bike Parking	Bicycle Maintenance
More bike parking around town, especially downtown corridors. Bicycle education for young children to bike safely on city streets.	
Most important, by far: "P.3 Develop a toolkit to achieve Neighborhood Greenway volume and speed targets using volume management and traffic calming tools." (The Neighborhood Greenways will only succeed with appropriate support.)	

7. What do you think are the most important programs in Table 9? Please list up to four, including the identifying numbers.	8. Should any programs be removed or changed? For changes, please include the program number.
My Top 4: P4: Ongoing maintenance. P3: Traffic calming and speed maintenance. P20: More car-free spaces. The closed section of Alameda Ave between Park and Oak is great. I'd love see the block of Oak between Santa Clara and Lincoln be closed and become the primary Alameda city square. P29: Measure the effectiveness of these ideas.	
Near term P3 and P4; P15, P18	
No link to table 9. Can not comment	
No opinion.	No opinion.
none	remove all
None of the programs. This only focuses on youth	All not acceptable
None of them are important.	All should be eliminated. We don't need any more government bureaucracy.
None, this is a waste of taxpayer resources	Implement none
None. They are wasteful.	All should be removed.
not in favor	
One I want to point out is how poorly the bus waiting spaces are, many are in direct sunlight, are often hard for bus drivers to see, and have no seating for elders, those who need it. I also like the maintenance of spaces for people to sit outside, eat, and gather.	
P 8 School crossing. It seems to me like you have already decided on bike traffic, safety, and security is the most important thing. What about everything else on the island? Pedestrians? School safety? Parking? Providing buses to schools!!!!! Not having school buses has a big impact on safety and traffic	Yes. P1 we don't need to subsidize bike repair. P2 we don't need electric bike subsidies. P4 Striping bike lanes barriers seem to go unnoticed. Instead of P8, why can't Alameda get school buses? I know that there are public buses that go on a school route, but they often get kids late to school and are extremely crowded. P10 we do not need to spend more money on bike parking.
P. 10, P. 18, P. 20, P. 4,	
P. 14; p. 26	P. 15- Isn't sidewalk repair already a condition of a property sale? It should be
p. 2 - electric bike rebates p. 20 - pedestrian-only spaces - Park St. for pedestrians! p. 13 - no more cars in bike lanes!! p. 31 - safe routes to schools	p. 6 - we cyclists should act like vehicles and follow stop lights, stop signs. p. 24 - does anyone use bike repair stations?! p. 16 - not sure why we need bike detection video systems
P. 3 - traffic calming. Everywhere. All streets - especially the side alleys full of kids angry drivers race down like eagle, walnut, willow. P 8 - sort of. Please start a volunteer crossing guard program ASAP to increase coverage and reduce costs. Drivers are scary AF near every elementary I commute past. A kids gonna die, this is #1 priority. P13 - with the additon of enforcement for construction crews that permanently close bike lanes without a permit. The work site on clement near near grand has closed the bike lane without a permit on at least 40 days in the last three months. P16 - crossing Webster is a death trap. Someone will die with current signs.	P6. Alamedas use of pedestrian signals for bikes is dangerous and confuses drivers and bikes. Please stop no one else does this.

7. What do you think are the most important programs in Table 9? Please list up to four, including the identifying numbers.	8. Should any programs be removed or changed? For changes, please include the program number.
P. 3 neighborhood freeway P. 10. Bike parking P. 4. Bikeway maintenance schedule P. 1. Free bike repair	
P. 3 P. 18 P. 19 P. 27	I believe P.6 is covered now that the state passed legislation.
P. 4, p.2, p.3, p.13	P.11 CAN NOT HAPPEN. Rideshare bikes and scoots are bad for the community. Will create conflicts on sidewalks and with cyclists, pedestrians and motorists including unsafe operation + abandoned and discarded gear.
p. 8, p. 10, p. 7, p.2.	No but p.2 is super important for climate change prevention as it provides alternative transportation options for low-income people.
P.1 Free / discounted bicycle repairs, P. 18 Infrastructure installation - benches, shelters, safe pedestrian crossings, etc. P. 10 - more bike parking, P. 4 - maintenance schedule for bikeway infrastructure	
P.1, P.2, P.4, P.18, P.22	Remove P.8. School crossing guards are a band-aid for improperly designed streets that fail to provide a safe walking/bicycling environment for children. Instead of bandaging broken streets with crossing guards, they should be redesigned (e.g., narrow lanes, curb extensions, ped refuge islands, raised crossings) that maximize child safety and force proper driver behavior. The money spent on crossing guards could instead be spent on geometric changes to roadways or more useful programming efforts.
P.1. P. 7. P.8. P.9.	P.2. Electric bikes are now becoming the "new " motorcycles! They are traveling at the speed of cars, but, are not obeying motor vehicle rules. I would not consider increasing the use of them.
P.10 - more bike parking P.13 - revise and update municipal code P.8 - data-driven school guard program P.4 - maintenance schedule	P.16 - not sure what this means nor what its intent is
P.10, P.20, P.3, P.4	
P.10. Install additional bike parking throughout Alameda, including in-street bike corrals and parking that accommodates longer wheelbase cargo bicycles. P.12. Develop and distribute materials that educate the community on the benefits of electric and cargo bikes and promote programs that provide rebates for electric bikes. P.18. Where needed, install infrastructure such as benches, shelters, safe pedestrian crossings and lighting along bus transit lines, prioritizing high-frequency bus corridors, equity priority areas and stops near senior centers and schools. P.21. Continue partnering with Bike Walk Alameda on development of the printed walking and biking map of Alameda, and create an online bicycling map.	

7. What do you think are the most important programs in Table 9? Please list up to four, including the identifying numbers.	8. Should any programs be removed or changed? For changes, please include the program number.
P.10. Install additional bike parking throughout Alameda, including in-street bike corrals and parking that accommodates longer wheelbase cargo bicycles. P.20. Investigate opportunities to create pedestrian-only spaces for outdoor dining and community gathering for special events or longer term.	no
P.10. Install additional bike parking throughout Alameda, including in-street bike corrals and parking that accommodates longer wheelbase cargo bicycles. P.13. Revise the Bicycle Chapter in Alameda's municipal code to reflect current laws and practices, support safe bicycling in Alameda, eliminate bicycle registration requirement and discourage motorists from parking or idling in bike lanes. P.20. Investigate opportunities to create pedestrian-only spaces for outdoor dining and community gathering for special events or longer term. P.4. Develop and implement a maintenance schedule for bikeway infrastructure, including striping and separated bike lane barriers.	
P.10-install additional bike parking P.13-discourage motorists from parking or idling in bike lanes (note: this should be a separate line item) P.2-ebike rebate programs for low income individuals	P.13 - program to discourage motorists from parking or idling in bike lanes should be a separate line item AND be a top priority
P.11 (micromobility) is the most important to ease car traffic, then P.8. for children who bike to school, and then P.1 (discounted repairs)	
p.11 Bike Share implementation, p.4 maintenance p.19 p.23 signage	
P.11, P.13, P.20, P.3	
p.13, p.3, p.18, p.23	
P.15. Develop strategies to assist and incentivize property owns to repair their sidewalks across the City P.16. Identify priority intersections for bicycle video detection and implement. P.13. Revise the Bicycle Chapter in Alameda's municipal code to reflect current laws and practices, support safe bicycling in Alameda, eliminate bicycle registration requirement and discourage motorists from parking or idling in bike lanes. P.10. Install additional bike parking throughout Alameda, including in-street bike corrals and parking that accommodates longer wheelbase cargo bicycles.	I'm strongly against the following two proposals. I'd rather see the money going to programs that make transportation easier for those with mobility issues. We are a flat island, manual bikes are cheaper and more healthy. P.2. Support and promote local, regional and state electric bike rebate programs for lowincome individuals P.12. Develop and distribute materials that educate the community on the benefits of electric and cargo bikes and promote programs that provide rebates for electric bikes

7. What do you think are the most important programs in Table 9? Please list up to four, including the identifying numbers.	8. Should any programs be removed or changed? For changes, please include the program number.
P.16. Identify priority intersections for bicycle video detection and implement P.17. Increase training opportunities for Public Works and Transportation Planning staff directly involved in the planning and design of bicycle and pedestrian facilities on best practices for infrastructure design, implementation and maintenance. P 11 Currently it is the Wild Wild West in Alameda Bike lanes. I am 73 and still pedal my bike but I am passed by folks going over 20mph in the bikelanes on electric bikes. Someone will get injured at some point. I have neve seen any Rules as per use of electric vehicles in Alameda.	
P.17. Increase training opportunities for Public Works and Transportation Planning staff directly involved in the planning and design of bicycle and pedestrian facilities on best practices for infrastructure design, implementation and maintenance. P.13. Revise the Bicycle Chapter in Alameda's municipal code to reflect current laws and practices, support safe bicycling in Alameda, eliminate bicycle registration requirement and discourage motorists from parking or idling in bike lanes. P.1. Regularly provide free or discounted bicycle repairs and maintenance via a local non- profit, such as the BikeMobile, and/or through partnerships with local bike shops. P.4. Develop and implement a maintenance schedule for bikeway infrastructure, including striping and separated bike lane barriers.	
P.20 is a great idea, especially after living through the pandemic and enjoying the additional outside space for eating that sprang up outside many businesses. Alameda Pride in Chochenyo Park is a recent example of a social event community gathering that worked really well. P.23 could make Alameda hella cool! I love the idea of the city becoming known for its trail and cycle system, which will need a well-designed, simple and cute map. The island really could do with proudly branding all its public facing literature and signage with its nautical heritage and progressive ideals.	Can't see any mention of free local buses but it's such a pity the shuttle stopped running. They admittedly needed their routes improving, and better drivers, but it would be great to have a service that went around the island again. Maybe even beside the beach like before!
P.20. Investigate opportunities to create pedestrian-only spaces for outdoor dining and community gathering for special events or longer term. P.27. Implement a regular sweeping schedule for bicycle/pedestrian facilities P.5. Develop guidance on integrating maintenance considerations P.10. Install additional bike parking throughout Alameda	

7. What do you think are the most important programs in Table 9? Please list up to four, including the identifying numbers.	8. Should any programs be removed or changed? For changes, please include the program number.
P.20. Investigate opportunities to create pedestrian-only spaces for outdoor dining and community gathering for special events or longer term. P.7. Update existing City design guidelines for bicycling and walking facilities to reflect best practices and the range of new types of infrastructure. P.10. Install additional bike parking throughout Alameda, including in-street bike corrals and parking that accommodates longer wheelbase cargo bicycles. P.4. Develop and implement a maintenance schedule for bikeway infrastructure, including striping and separated bike lane barriers.	
P.23. Develop and implement a citywide wayfinding signage program, including trail systems.	P.3. Develop a toolkit to achieve Neighborhood Greenway volume and speed targets using volume management and traffic calming tools. P.16. Identify priority intersections for bicycle video detection and implement. P.17. Increase training opportunities for Public Works and Transportation Planning staff directly involved in the planning and design of bicycle and pedestrian facilities on best practices for infrastructure design, implementation and maintenance. P.19. Encourage and support partner organizations to develop temporary street closure programs, such as Sunday Streets, to provide safe and fun places for people to walk, bike, roll, and gather, such as on Shore Line Drive, Harbor Bay Parkway, or Ferry Point. P.22. Develop program guidelines for street art and placemaking, such as painted bulb-outs, in-street bike corrals and intersections. P.28. Continue implementing the Signalized Intersection Access Equity policy and communicate about implementation status. WHAT IS THIS?
P.23. Develop and implement a citywide wayfinding signage program, including trail systems. P.20. Investigate opportunities to create pedestrian-only spaces for outdoor dining and community gathering for special events or longer term.	
P.27, P.18, P.15, P.8	I just think matters of safety should take priority over mode shift. While I understand a lot of these go hand-in-hand, safety should always be at the top of the list.
P.29, P.21, P.28, P.7	P.19, P.15, P.2,
P.3 P.15 P.19 but where will ppl. park to get there? P.23	Honestly, is this much thought, time, money and input by others required for anything else? WHY BIKES?
P.3 P.7 P.19 P.20	

7. What do you think are the most important programs in Table 9? Please list up to four, including the identifying numbers.	8. Should any programs be removed or changed? For changes, please include the program number.
P.3, P.13, P.18, P.20	
P.3, P.26.	For P.26, I would also like to see efforts to reach out to residents in general, as many often have opinions and comments about the state of traffic and transportation on the island. Additionally, this was not included on the list, but I would like to see a program developed that would allow citizens particularly concerned about an urgent or recurring problem with street/traffic safety (which can be corrected with a design treatment) to initiate and voice their concerns with the city's transportation department. The residents who live and work everyday know best what problems/issues arise in some particular streets that a public official might never know of, so having that channel for communication and quick action is very critical.
P.3, P.6, P.8, P.10, P.19, P.20, P.24, P.26	
P.3, P.7.	
P.3. ,P.10. P.13.	I do not see the city's current partnership with Cycleofchange.org program which offers free bike classes to all public school 5th graders listed. Please keep this program going.
P.3. Develop a toolkit to achieve Neighborhood Greenway volume and speed targets using volume management and traffic calming tools. P.4. Develop and implement a maintenance schedule for bikeway infrastructure, including striping and separated bike lane barriers. P.10. Install additional bike parking throughout Alameda, including in-street bike corrals and parking that accommodates longer wheelbase cargo bicycles.	
P.3. Develop a toolkit to achieve Neighborhood Greenway volume and speed targets using volume management and traffic calming tools. P.10. Install additional bike parking throughout Alameda, including in-street bike corrals and parking that accommodates longer wheelbase cargo bicycles. P.29. Document the impacts of pedestrian and bicycle capital projects and programs on safety and mode shift. Conduct before-and-after studies of projects using a consistent methodology.	

7. What do you think are the most important programs in Table 9? Please list up to four, including the identifying numbers.	8. Should any programs be removed or changed? For changes, please include the program number.
P.3. Develop a toolkit to achieve Neighborhood Greenway volume and speed targets using volume management and traffic calming tools. P.20. Investigate opportunities to create pedestrian-only spaces for outdoor dining and community gathering for special events or longer term. P.7. Update existing City design guidelines for bicycling and walking facilities to reflect best practices and the range of new types of infrastructure. P.8. Develop a data-driven school crossing guard policy that provides guidance on where to locate crossing guards and, in partnership with other public agencies, adequately fund the program	P.15 The city should maintain the sidewalks. P.16. This hardly seems like a priority and an expensive endeavor. Adding push buttons to key intersection for cyclist (such as on Cross Alameda Trail's Webster intersection) seems sufficient.
P.3. Greenway P.7. Design guidelines P.6. LPI P.10. bike parking	
P.3. P.10. P.23. P.19.	
P.3., P.4., P.6., P.7. P.6. is very important, but doesn't go far enough.	P.10. is not needed. There are already sufficient lock-ups for bikes on the island. Spend the money on improving visibility of bike lanes and on educating drivers so cyclists don't have to risk their safety when sharing the roads. P.9. is also not a good use of money.
P.3: Getting the neighborhood greenways right is essential P.4: Maintenance of facilities P.7: Design guidelines so stuff is built right P.17: Staff training on best-practices	P.17 Might be moved to near-term. Consider adding: Make sure we're getting all the data needed to plan well. Consider bounty program for bike lane violators. Support legislative efforts that make streets safer.
P.31 - assist with safe routes to schools (require all able bodied children to bike/walk/bus to school) no more parental dropoffs. P.15 - assist with sidewalk improvements P.6 - support bikes using pedestrian signals P.24 - expand bike repair stations	P.19 - eliminate any street closures programs. Existing slow streets are not used.
P.31. P.8. P.18. P.26	Anything that is going to interfere with regular car commuting on the Island should be eliminated. No roundabout, no in-street bike parking, no raised crosswalks. It increases stress of drivers and makes being a pedestrian even more dangerous.
P.4 develop and maintain bike lanes. P 10 bike parking facilities downtown. P 20 pedestrian only spaces.	Remove the shoreline to Seaview water crossing as stated above.
P.4 P.8 P.15 P.27	

7. What do you think are the most important programs in Table 9? Please list up to four, including the identifying numbers.	8. Should any programs be removed or changed? For changes, please include the program number.
P.4. Develop a maintenance schedule for infrastrcture P.10 Bike Parking (make it substantial enough for cargo bikes, after all, we continue to make parking stalls big enough for SUVs...) P.5 Develop guidance on maintenance considerations during development P.12. Support rebate programs for electric/cargo bikes	
P.4. Develop a maintenance schedule for infrastructure P.10 Bike Parking (especially secure parking for all types of bikes including Long-tail cargo bikes) P.5 Develop guidance on maintenance considerations during development P.12. Support rebate programs for electric/cargo bikes	I don't see any changes to make, these are a lot of great programs. I think doing a lot to make it easier to bike now will encourage more people to start cycling around Alameda instead. Today, I saw 7 cargo bikes at Bay Farm School, so they are definitely gaining popularity, and now it's time to ensure the infrastructure is improving to support those folks while we work on the larger programs. It's important that the infrastructure be ready for the people who are going to make the shift to cycling.
P.4. Develop and implement a maintenance schedule for bikeway infrastructure, including striping and separated bike lane barriers P.3. Develop a toolkit to achieve Neighborhood Greenway volume and speed targets using volume management and traffic calming tools. P.13. Revise the Bicycle Chapter in Alameda's municipal code to reflect current laws and practices, support safe bicycling in Alameda, eliminate bicycle registration requirement and discourage motorists from parking or idling in bike lanes. P.20. Investigate opportunities to create pedestrian-only spaces for outdoor dining and community gathering for special events or longer term.	
P.4. Develop and implement a maintenance schedule for bikeway infrastructure, including striping and separated bike lane barriers. P.8. Develop a data-driven school crossing guard policy that provides guidance on where to locate crossing guards and, in partnership with other public agencies, adequately fund the program. P.10. Install additional bike parking throughout Alameda, including in-street bike corrals and parking that accommodates longer wheelbase cargo bicycles P.22. Develop program guidelines for street art and placemaking, such as painted bulb-outs, in-street bike corrals and intersections.	
P.4., P.19., P.20., P.21.	
P.5, p.18, p.23, p.26	
P.7 - Update City design guidelines P.8. Develop a data-driven school crossing guard policy P.13 - Revise the Bicycle Chapter in Alameda's municipal code P.20 - Outdoor pedestrian spaces, especially dining and gathering. Alameda Ave is a huge success!	P.8. School crossing guard policy: Consider hiring high school seniors for these roles. My hometown did this and it was very successful.

7. What do you think are the most important programs in Table 9? Please list up to four, including the identifying numbers.	8. Should any programs be removed or changed? For changes, please include the program number.
P.7. Update existing City design guidelines for bicycling and walking facilities to reflect best practices and the range of new types of infrastructure. P.20. Investigate opportunities to create pedestrian-only spaces for outdoor dining and community gathering for special events or longer term. P.25. Continue to support the community-wide celebration of the annual Bike to Work Day and encourage a wider focus on more than just work trips and develop an annual event to promote walking. P.29. Document the impacts of pedestrian and bicycle capital projects and programs on safety and mode shift. Conduct before-and-after studies of projects using a consistent methodology.	
P.7. Update existing City design guidelines for bicycling and walking facilities to reflect best practices and the range of new types of infrastructure. P.17. Increase training opportunities for Public Works and Transportation Planning staff directly involved in the planning and design of bicycle and pedestrian facilities on best practices for infrastructure design, implementation and maintenance P.18. Where needed, install infrastructure such as benches, shelters, safe pedestrian crossings and lighting along bus transit lines, prioritizing high-frequency bus corridors, equity priority areas and stops near senior centers and schools. P.29. Document the impacts of pedestrian and bicycle capital projects and programs on safety and mode shift. Conduct before-and-after studies of projects using a consistent methodology	
P.8	P.1, P2, P3, P34, P5, P6, P7, P9, and P10 Not necessarily in that order
P.8, more crossing guards P.10 more SECURE bike parking (cages please, thieves easily cut through bike locks) P.15 repair sidewalks (my kid has tripped on jagged pavement so many times on her scooter I've lost count) P.20 more ped only spaces, that's where we spend most of our money when we go out	P.3 just ticket speeders... P.13 ticket and tow vehicles parked in bike lanes, especially buffered or divided lanes because those are extremely dangerous P.17 please don't involved your staff in directly planning bicycle or pedestrian infrastructure unless any public works staff actually bike or walk work? They tend to do such a great job running stop signs in their trucks as it is 🙃 Maybe leave planning to professionals or those already self-interested. P.31 the safe routes to school program recommends routes where pedestrians and bicyclists have literally died or been injured in just the past few years. Could we do something about that?

7. What do you think are the most important programs in Table 9? Please list up to four, including the identifying numbers.	8. Should any programs be removed or changed? For changes, please include the program number.
P.8, P.7, P.4, P.2	Isn't P.6. (allow bicyclists to use LPI) unneeded now with the recent signing of AB 1909, the "Omni-bike bill?"
P.9	P.26
P1- accessible bike repairs P8-crossing guards better placed (why no crossing guard at Santa Clara near Maya Lin many days a week??) P21- printed bike map	
P1, 4, 11, 18,	
P1, P10, P11, P13	
P1, P10, P11, P20	
P1, P2, P5, P10	
P1, P3, P8-P10	
P1, P4, P18, P31	I am not sure what P3 means in terms of actions. Is it a toolkit meaning education or is it actually changing infrastructure to address the problem?
P1, P5, PP9, P10	
P1, P6, P11, P13	Not so sure about homeowner sidewalk repair
P1, P6, P17, P22	
P10 - Bike parking P7 - Bicycling and walking best practices P31 - SR2S P19 - Temporary street closure, aka Sunday Street	
P10 (additional bike parking), P11 (bike share + equity), P18 (safe infrastructure), P23 (wayfinding).	Depending on use, perhaps a long-term goal would be installing more sophisticated signals at busy car/bicycle/pedestrian intersections? "Why the Dutch Wait Less at Traffic Lights": https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=knbVWXzL4-4
P10 I believe we need a lot more bike parking. It's very common that the only place for me to lock up a bike is on a street sign, which isn't great for anyone. P18 Supporting public transit corridors makes them more attractive alternatives to driving. P22 Public art and engagement are so enriching for everyone, and have huge value in the community.	P24 unfortunately suffers a bit from the tragedy of the commons. The freestanding repair tools at the library for example are, last I checked, not useable due to them being broken or otherwise vandalized.
P10 P5 P6 P4	
P10 P19 P20 P23	
P10 P3 P4 P5 I think are most important	
P10, P14, P18, P25	P2 and 11 seem similar
P10, P4, P2, P7	There needs to be a public education plan on crosswalks: marked or unmarked carry the same requirements for pedestrians and drivers

7. What do you think are the most important programs in Table 9? Please list up to four, including the identifying numbers.	8. Should any programs be removed or changed? For changes, please include the program number.
P10. p13. P3. p7.	
P11 - bringing back lime or other alternatives to commute easily to ferry and Bart. Implementing electric bikes in this program would help me, never to use my car again	
P11 - city should never have stopped allowing bike/scooter rentals, bring them back! P13 - APD parking enforcement should be actively helping cyclists by ticketing automobiles interfering with bike traffic P23 - signage will encourage people who are currently driving/walking to consider biking next time P26 - community and equity is important; make sure programs are for all genders, ages, cultures, ethnicities	
P11 P18 P29 - let's actually find out what the impacts of what you have done so far have been on people, on accidents, on safety. Pedestrians are now walking down the middle of a lot of streets that are not blocked off. We made sidewalks to keep me safe when I walk. Why is it good for me to be able to walk down the middle of a street? Also, how many people are using slow streets vs other streets? P26 P15 P5 P8 P10 - great, but no "in-street parking corrals" That's distracting for drivers and dangerous.	P3 P19 - Only on nonresidential streets. Someone always needs to use residential streets. What are handicapped people supposed to do? P20 - overreach. P22 - dangerous
P11, P13, P19	
P13 P3 P6 P21	
P13, p18, p29, p3	Would rather see support for all cyclists and pedestrians instead of focus on "marginalized" communities.
P-15 is a bad idea, property owners don't own the sidewalks and should not be responsible for repairing them unless they are the cause of damage.	P-15 is a bad idea, property owners don't own the sidewalks and should not be responsible for repairing them unless they are the cause of damage.
P15, P31, P8, P18	P8 Crossing guards are in t he best position to ID dark clothing pedestrians, which I consider to be at tremendous risk during hours of darkness for crossing Alameda corridors and feeder routes.

7. What do you think are the most important programs in Table 9? Please list up to four, including the identifying numbers.	8. Should any programs be removed or changed? For changes, please include the program number.
P17 - Can we please add a process for transportation and planning to sign off on every project that hasn't been reviewed in 12 months prior to construction, especially if they're developer led? (see Clement/Sherman/Atlantic) P3 - can we please design the NGs for peak traffic and speeds, not average traffic and speeds?	P6 is done!
p17, P13	
p19 and p21	More programs that encourage bike use across the island without alienating old timers that are stuck in their cars
P19, P20	No
P2 - make it more accessible P3 -Stuff that makes greenways safe	P11 - mostly worried about scooters, they're usually shorter trips that can be replaced by walking and have an enviro impact. So would rather focus on bikes and walking.
P2 Electric bike rebate P8 Crossing guards	
P2 P3 P4	
P2, P3, P23, P31	They are all relavant.
P2, p4, p10, p11, p16, p19, p20, p25, p31	
P2, P4, P3, P14	No
P2. Electric bike rebate P11. Bike/scooter share P15. Sidewalk repair P5. Integrate maintenance during planning	No
P20 P3 P1 P19	
P20, P17, P18, P24	no
P21, P5, P7, P14 and P17	
P27. IF you don't have a sweeping schedule already in place, shame on the city. If it is in place, fire the people doing it because they miss most of it.	Active Transportation - this is not a free handout for everyone. Delete P1, P2, P18 which has nothing to do with this plan. P22 - Street Art? that has ZERO to do with this plan and you need to back off your spending spree.
P3 Toolkit/greenways; P13 update/revise code; P14 bike gear for low income folks; P17 Train city planning staff	
P3 P10 P11 P.23	
P3 P10 P11 P27	
P3 P11 P7 P27	

7. What do you think are the most important programs in Table 9? Please list up to four, including the identifying numbers.	8. Should any programs be removed or changed? For changes, please include the program number.
P3 P18	
P3 P4 P10	
P3 P4 P10 P20	P11 - bikeshare should be deprioritized
P3 P5 P6 P4	I am not sure if P9 should be part of this program or a consideration in a broader community policing/safety plan
P3 P7 P10 P13	N/A
P3, 4, 9and 13	
P3, P10, P11, P16	
P3, P4, P10, P11	Is P24 useful?
P3, P4, P10, P20	
P3, P5, P8	P1, P9 seem unnecessary given budget constraints
P3, P6, P10, P1	
P3, P6, P8, P10	
P3, P7, P10, P2	
P3, P8,	I don't see any program related to education for drivers about how to navigate bike and pedestrian related street improvements. It seems like some drivers an unaware of how to share the road with bike paths, bike lanes, etc.
P30, 31, 1, 9	
P4 - 6, 8, 10. But I would add educational programs like in Amsterdam and other cities for motorists about how to make road safe for cyclists. This is especially important where the infrastructure doesn't allow for "perfect" solutions. For example, if there is not room enough for a 3ft. door opening lane, put up signage reminding motorists to check their mirrors before opening the door (in Amsterdam they've trained drivers to use their right hand to open the door, forcing them to twist and look behind them!).	
P4 - bike lane maintenance; P10 - bike parking P15 sidewalk repairP 18 infrastructure at bus stops	
P4 - maintain bike infrastructure P 10 - install more bike parking P 11 - we need a bike and scooter share program P18 - improve infrastructure	
P4 & P27 (Maintenace) P10 P13 P18	remove electric bikes program. These are expensive. If people need an electric bike to be encouraged, they have the wrong motivation. Model our bike program after the bike friendly city like Amsterdam

7. What do you think are the most important programs in Table 9? Please list up to four, including the identifying numbers.	8. Should any programs be removed or changed? For changes, please include the program number.
P4- maintenance for bikeway (safe smooth streets with clear markings) P9- reduce bike theft P10- increased safe bike parking, especially for cargo bikes	
P4, P10, P3, P2	
P4, P10	
P4, P15, P18, P27. Four choices are too few! Many of the other ones are also important, especially P2, P5, P18, P26. This whole list is very bike-centric, please balance it out a bit.	
P4, P2, P1	
P4, P5, P13, and P27	
P4, P5, P7	No opinion
P4, P5. P17, P21	
P4, P7, P10	no
P4, P7, P5, and P3	
P4. Bike infra needs to be as well maintained as the roads. P10. Cargo bike parking at the grocery stores would be a benefit. Also better bike parking at Robert Crown.	Need to establish a bike bus program to take kids to school and back.
P4; P3, P18, P17	
P4; P5; P7; P10	
P5, P6, P7	All others not included in question 7.
P5; P10; P18; P31	For P24 please consider adding e-bike charge stations and vending machines with bicycle tubes. For any educational program, please include in the material information on the hazards provided by use of high-intensity, white - led lights, particularly when blinking rapidly.
P7 and P4	
P7 P8 P20 P18	
P7 P10 P20	
P7 P16 P4 P10	I would like to see programming aimed at educating drivers about driving safely, sharing the road, and opening doors safely.
P7, P10, P22, P23.	P11, not sure Alameda's size warrants bike share unless done in conjunction with a bigger city like Oakland. Would rather seen money spent on infrastructure (protected lanes, wayfinding signs, bike parking) than on a consultant for a project that might not be very successful.
P7, P20, P5, P25	P16, P11, P2
P7, P8, P14, P18	P15 - The City should be taking more of an active role in upgrading sidewalks instead of putting this burden on homeowners. Low and moderate income homeowners are doing their utmost to maintain their property and shouldn't be tasked with maintaining City property.
P7, P8, P3, P1	

7. What do you think are the most important programs in Table 9? Please list up to four, including the identifying numbers.	8. Should any programs be removed or changed? For changes, please include the program number.
P8 crossing guard policy P5 maintenance P18 install infrastructure near bus lines and schools P19 utilizing weekend low use streets for temp closures P23 wayfinding	P13 bike registration should be kept and expanded to help pay for this plan P20 not if this includes parts of main thoroughfare streets such as Park, Otis, Webster, Central etc
P8 school crossing guards based on data.	Almost all of these are a waste of time and money driven by bureaucracy and should be removed.
P8 P18 P29 P31	Remove anything that seems beholden to the bike lobby; I don't understand how or why the city is in so deep with the bike lobby.
P8, P18,	The focus on bikes is commendable but unrealistic. Cyclists need training and must abide by street / car laws, not follow pedestrian rules when convenient. Without consistency from cyclists, drivers don't know their intent.
p8,p7,p25,p29	P13 needs to be revised, bikes should be registered which would help with theft.
P8. Crossing guards. I don't see much concerning safety against cars. More bikes on the road will require to slow down. Speed bumps would be nice.	
P8: more school crossing guards rather than stop signs etc. P12 develop policy regarding 20 mph ebikes: where allowed/not allowed. DANGEROUS! P13 bike laws currently prohibit bikes towing children in wheeled buggies P15 City is responsible for most sidewalks. Few developments might have responsibility.	P16 sounds scary, invasion of privacy etc. P19 I am against street closures P28 signalized intersection policy is a failure
Program 8: I feel safety is the most important consideration! Infrastructure needs to exist, but enforcing safety at key intersections will remove barriers bicycle use. Program 7: It is wonderful to see the implementation of dutch-style Protected Intersections (eg. Grand and Otis). There are many intersections that would benefit from these, and increased use would add to both bicycle/pedestrian safety and increased vehicle driver awareness of bikes that are likely to be encountered during daily driving. Program 10: If it is more difficult to find parking for a bike vs. a car, it discourages the use of bikes. Program 6: Bicycle safety could be greatly improved at some high-traffic areas (High St. & Fernside, Fernside & Tilden, Park St. Bridge)	
Programs supporting safe biking for all ages: #10, 11, 1, 4.	

7. What do you think are the most important programs in Table 9? Please list up to four, including the identifying numbers.	8. Should any programs be removed or changed? For changes, please include the program number.
Protected bike lanes is #1 priority	Roundabouts should be scrapped. They are a very expensive solution in search of a problem and their effectiveness is dubious, despite what ginned up "studies" by "experts" say. They are designed to keep traffic moving which is completely antithetical to pedestrian safety, and drivers' unfamiliarity with them will cause many accidents.
Safe riding practices should be for everyone, including parents, so they can teach their children. The city and or schools should provide " how to ride a bike safely in traffic" classes.	
Sweeping of the street to ensure safe riding. School wide programs to teach how to ride safely. Adult programs on etiquette and safe riding practices.	
The entire bicycle focus of the plans in table 9 are ridiculous.	All of it.
The most important thing to do is to be realistic - most people drive cars and will continue to do so. We live on an island. Most people work off of the island. People who do ride bikes need to learn traffic laws and obey them. All your ridiculous "traffic calming" efforts just cause accidents and make people frustrated and then they drive more aggressively. Where do you come from? This is not what Alameda wants.	All programs should be removed. You should be working to limit the amount of housing being built on an island which already has significant traffic issues which you are making worse. You completely fail to understand the nature of the island of Alameda and what works here. Money should be used to house the homeless and provide everyone health care, not fix people's bikes,.
The only one I agree with is Point 8, Crossing Guards.	Points 1 through 7 and 9 through 31 should be removed: P. 11, Highly against this. We have had Bike Share vehicles left in front of our house, blocking the sidewalk and preventing access to the disabled. The companies involved refused to retrieve them. P. 13, This is counter-intuative. Due to the notoriously high rate of bike thefts. Registration mitigates this. P. 14 Let the other agencies fund this. P. 15, The sidewalk belongs to the city. It is infrastructure and therefore the property owner is not responsible.
There are too many to read through.	There are too many to read through.
There isn't a link to table 9. You could put all the bike corals you want, but I'd never park my bike there. Theft is rampant. How about focusing on reducing crime and speeding and bad driving then biking will be safer.	

7. What do you think are the most important programs in Table 9? Please list up to four, including the identifying numbers.	8. Should any programs be removed or changed? For changes, please include the program number.
They all seem very comprehensive. What I would like to see added is a training program for ALL cyclists sharing the road. I was knocked to the ground when a cyclist hit me from behind because they did not call-out as they were approaching me. And I've noticed lots of inconsistencies with all cyclists on this important safety etiquette. Training should also include how to handle STOP signs while in traffic (among other things). One evening (it was dark) while leaving South Shore via Park Street exit, we were stopped at the STOP sign, looked both ways and slowly proceeded to turn right. From out of nowhere, a cyclist came flying through the STOP sign and turned left onto Park Street, crossing our path. That cyclist was close to being killed.	P13. Why is bicycle registration being eliminated? Also, include in municipal code that any cycling event (promoted via social media or otherwise) taking over city streets should require appropriate permits and advance notice to the community. P15. The city should shoulder the responsibility for sidewalk repairs as in years past. That way they can ensure volume pricing on repairs and consistency in quality of work. P19. Eliminate Street Closure Programs. We have so many beautiful parks in our city that can be put to full use instead of closing any streets or major thoroughfares. P26. Include bringing the community together by listening sessions for ALL parties sharing our city streets (yes, drivers too). Underrepresented groups and equity priority does not sound inclusive for this venture.
they all suck. exclusively focused on bicycles needs.	build a 2nd auto bridge off bay farm.
This is a hard question! All of them? P3 - Neighborhood Greenway plan. This is important to kickoff as soon as possible. P20 - This is my long-term dream. Alameda has some great options for pedestrian only (or ped+bus) roadways. P8 - Crossing guards (but see suggestion for improvement below) P29 - Documentation. This is important and it's also important to show people who are car-only how it benefits the city as a whole, including them.	P8 - Crossing guards. Maybe broaden this concept. The goal is safety of students getting to and from school. It's not clear that crossing guards are the best or only solution to this. Stop signs, speed bumps, flashing beacons, etc. are all possible options that should be on the table, and the study should inform these choices. For example, the intersection of High and San Jose should probably be a 4-way stop with flashing beacons today, even before the greenway project gets underway. It may be beneficial to also have crossing guards there on school mornings, but that intersection is sufficiently dangerous at other times of day as well. P2 - Related: Please consider developing incentive programs to encourage installation of chargers in Alameda homes including rental properties. P15 has a typo - should be "property owners"
Toolkit for speed targets Sidewalk improvements	

7. What do you think are the most important programs in Table 9? Please list up to four, including the identifying numbers.	8. Should any programs be removed or changed? For changes, please include the program number.
Top priority: P.15., P.27., P.18., P.26. Near term: P.4. Develop and implement a maintenance schedule for bikeway infrastructure, including striping and separated bike lane barriers P.8. Develop a data-driven school crossing guard policy that provides guidance on where to locate crossing guards and, in partnership with other public agencies, adequately fund the program. Medium term: P.15. Develop strategies to assist and incentivize property owns to repair their sidewalks across the City, such as: » Develop voluntary “opt-in” neighborhood-scale sidewalk repair efforts, allowing Public Works to help property owners address sidewalk maintenance; batching sidewalk repairs across a neighborhood creates an economy of scale and potential cost savings. » Evaluate requiring sidewalk repair when properties are sold as a condition of sale. » Evaluate establishing a revolving “micro-loan” fund, with options for deferred payment when properties change hands P.18. Where needed, install infrastructure such as benches, shelters, safe pedestrian crossings and lighting along bus transit lines, prioritizing high-frequency bus corridors, equity priority areas and stops near senior centers and schools.	
You need to fix all the streets in Alameda before anything else should be done and paid for.	Streets and traffic are first in my priority.

10. If you said the 2030 Infrastructure Plan projects list needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see. Should any projects be added or removed?
#2, and all the slow streets, need much clearer signage, clearer markings, and blocked intersections, similar to the Bicycle Boulevards in Berkeley, which only let EMS through. #7, Park street needs dedicated Bicycle lanes. Also, I'd love to close the core of Park Street to cars entirely.
#4 is unnecessary. The base is fine and fun to ride a bike around. Please don't touch it.
* The short segment of Mckay Ave south of Central should be included with buffered bike lines or better, since it's such a key connector with the trails and the class IV lanes on Central. There's enough room here it should be easy to do. * It might be a bit gnarly of a project, and I don't know if it's feasible to do it without bumping another important project, but I _REALLY_ would like to see improvements made to Broadway: the existing class II bike lanes are too narrow and in the door zone for this important north/south corridor that I use to ultimately connect with Fruitvale BART. Maybe this can be put off IF AND ONLY IF the north/south low stress Park St corridor actually happens. * Consider having projects focused on upgrading existing intersections to protected intersections, as well as projects focused on improving bicycle signaling. (As noted in my other comments.) * Maybe it's not the highest priority project if the city has to do all the work... but maybe the homeowner's association can help out with repairs and improvements to the shoreline path on Bay Farm island - both in repaving it where it's bad, and also adding separated paths for pedestrians, and adding clear signs & markers? This path is so popular it's worth another look.
1. Not sure what the park street low stress solution is, but this is needed quickly. 2. very exited for San Jose to be the neighborhood greenway. Build this quickly.

10. If you said the 2030 Infrastructure Plan projects list needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see. Should any projects be added or removed?
21 - Versailles should revert to being the neighborhood connector for cars that it used to be - there is no alternative in the area. Pearl is already a lower-traffic street and would require fewer traffic-calming interventions, making it more cost-effective for the city to make that into a greenway. Just shutting Pearl off entirely from Fernside would make it even slower. Most other streets in this neighborhood are bicycle-friendly already due to low traffic. Putting in ugly traffic-calming measures on Versailles seems like a solution looking for a problem. Add a project for either widening existing shared-use paths or (even better) adding separate sidewalks next to shared-use paths. Relatively narrow shared use paths aren't low-stress for pedestrians - quite the opposite. Separate sidewalks are lower-stress for walkers. Shared use paths aren't low-stress for bicyclists either because dogs and their leashes can make for sudden obstacles, and when more than one person is walking side-by-side it's tough to get by - particularly if there are users going the opposite direction. If you MUST do shared-use paths, make them a lot wider than the ones that currently exist. I don't ride my bike for errands because I've had two bikes stolen and the police won't do anything about it because the thieves take them to Oakland to chop. I am not alone in this feeling. The focus should be on getting people to WALK more for errands, building on Alameda's walkability, and the bicycle projects should focus on recreational cycling. Walking requires no equipment so all able-bodied people can afford to do it. There is nothing you can do to make cycling on Park or Webster safer short of razing the existing downtown and rebuilding from the ground up. All the changes on Park and Webster have done is make things uglier and more confusing - and confused drivers are dangerous drivers.
[cont'd] You have made it look like most of these projects benefit pedestrians, but they don't. if there is already a sidewalk in an area, getting bikes off the sidewalk by making it illegal is all you need to do. Clearly the focus of this plan is on bicyclists, even though bicycling is only an option to those with money for bikes and helmets and locks (and replacement of these when they get stolen), and your own data show many more people walk than cycle for errands. Also, no one seems to be concerned about the fact that many of these projects are just plain ugly. I'm not saying aesthetics should trump safety, but the city has not demonstrated that the ugliness has made things any safer.
4-way stop at Buena Vista and Willow. This intersection is extremely dangerous for both pedestrians and vehicles.
9 - Remove the Alameda-Oakland Bike/Pedestrian bridge. Replace with a water taxi/small ferry (under 150pax USCG subchapter T). A small ferry program could implemented for startup costs including vessel construction of perhaps $10 million and operated for $1-2 million per year. Ongoing maintenance / staffing costs of the bridge would likely equal that amount without the insane $200 million dollars initial cost and could be operational far more quickly. 11 - Prioritize changes to the wooden bridge access for the alameda-bay farm bike bridge. 29 - Eliminate road diet on Encinal St and anywhere else it is being considered. More housing is being added to the island, which will result in a larger population and more traffic.
Add connectivity of Bay Farm trails - particularly Robert Davey Jr crossing

10. If you said the 2030 Infrastructure Plan projects list needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see. Should any projects be added or removed?
Add the connection to make Clement a throughway (link between Paru and Grand).
Again, does this include proposed walk/bikeway at Clement/Broadway extension? This should be a priority
Again, please prioritize improvements in areas with high population density and that have been historically underserved. I again point to census tract 4267 (Atlantic/RAMP to pacific from Webster to main). This tract has a population density of 21k per sqmi, the highest in the city and almost 3x higher than the city average. It have been overlooked for generations on this island due to largely unsavory historic inequity. Please consider prioritizing improvements in this and other similar areas that have high existing population density and have been historically underserved.
Again, the North end of Buena Vista is left off of any improvements or changes. This area of town is again treated with inequity. A road diet is proposed for Encinal Avenue which is a 4 lane street and already has several traffic lights. Yet Buena Vista, which is two lanes and has far fewer traffic calming features left with nothing. At minimum a road diet should be implemented here.
Anything that removes parking places, auto access installing greenways or any other unnecessary infrastructure.
As I mentioned earlier, I am not in support of the propsed changes to Grand. I write this as a daily biker who often uses Grand. Traffic on Grand is typically light, especially between Central and Shore Line. As a biker I feel less safe in separated bike lanes where parked cars form the separator.
AS long as they are executed :)
As mentioned earlier, I think some of our bus/comm roads should be reclassified to bus/main since they have a higher percentage of retail than commercial and we need to accommodate non-car modes in those corridors.
Atlantic Ave between Jean Sweeney Open Space through to crossing Webster St is very dangerous for bikers. A safety improvement project in that area is needed. The lane are protected but drivers are constantly about to hit bikers at crosswalks and breaks in the bike lane.
Broadway street improvement, and Tilden/broadway intersection improvement are both missing
Can you make this streets that cars drive on straight lines, for example the Webster Street Business District and the Park Street Business District have become a curvy, confusing, clusterfucks.
cancel
Car congestion on the island has progressively gotten worse in the last 10 years. While I think increasing bike lanes is something that can improve this issue, this entire plan leaves out infrastructure suited for cars which no matter what the city does will still be around. You can't expect everyone to just ride bikes, as that's just unrealistic for those commuting to work or even for the elderly population who can't bike 2 miles every day.
City of Alameda needs to seriously reconsider installing speed cameras, especially on neighborhood connector streets. This is the most cost-effective way to enforce 25mph limits and enhance safety for pedestrians and cyclists.
commit to more fully protected lanes, less shared lanes
Community input - in particular, input from residents of proposed bike lanes & other projects - need to he prioritized. The experience so far on the Grand Street project is an example of how NOT to engage the community.
Convert the bike lanes on shoreline and central back to care lanes.
Could we make the crossing at Buena Vista Ave at Tilden Way safer? There is only a crosswalk on one side of the road, and the intersection has blind corners for a street that has a 30+ mph speed limit.

10. If you said the 2030 Infrastructure Plan projects list needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see. Should any projects be added or removed?
Do not build walkway into Bay 37 community.
Don't underestimate how many people will use the Bay Trail if it hugs closer to the estuary and bays. Sections of the Bay Trail elsewhere are better when you can walk beside the water rather than have to keep heading along streets, as we have to on the island currently.
Enforce the speed limit along Otis Drive, especially between Park Street and High Street. Stop the speeders! Increase the Alameda Police Force. Bring back the 5 motorcycle officers/motorcycles. Issue speeding tickets! Reduce all of Otis Drive to one lane in each direction for vehicle travel.
Especially support Cross Alameda trail gap closure and Miller Sweeney Bridge improvements
Everything needs emphasis on safety.
Focus on infrastructure! Alameda needs a new bridge or expand the tunnel. We have irresponsible planners in Alameda. Adding thousand of people without access or egress. What's wrong with you?
For #2, I think that should be the entire length of Central, not just Sherman to Pacific.
Get rid of slow streets. Or rotate. I'd like my street to be a slow street. The streets were designed for cars. I think more bike lanes are great but get rid of the slow streets.
Grand Street needs a protected bike lane all the way through, why did the mayor vote this down? The Ralph Appezzato bike lane and pedestrian trail need lighting. It is dangerous to traverse at dark hours.
Grand Street should not be zig zagging. There will be accidents all the time. There has to be a different way.
Grand Street should not have a separated bike lane.
Greenways are great. Alameda has felt like a small town while I've lived here, and I think that keeping streets slow, or making them slower, are a fantastic way to keep this feel in Alameda.
I don't expect the standard bike lanes on the Miller-Sweeney Bridge to bring any safety or access improvements. I will simply continue to use the sidewalk if on bike or foot.
I don't understand what the projects entail from the table, and why so many completed projects still appear on the plan for approval?
I love project #9 - the Oakland/alameda bike/ped bridge.
I only wish the timeline was sooner.
I see no attempt to implement any type of road diet between High St. and Broadway along Otis Dr. This is an ongoing issue that this stretch of Alameda is ignored, even though it is considered a neighborhood corridor. There is no attempt to reduce the amount of traffic, where this instead is a main thoroughfare for individuals and commercial vehicles to ignore the speed limit. The stretch of highway, needs to be worked out between the City and Caltrans, so that it meets the needs of the neighborhood. A road diet needs to be implemented.
I seriously doubt even half of these items can be completed by 2030. I would like more focus and prioritization.
I think 2030 to get started on a pedestrian bridge over the estuary is overly generous. This should happen MUCH sooner. Eight years to think about a pedestrian bridge? It could have been built more than once during that time.

10. If you said the 2030 Infrastructure Plan projects list needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see. Should any projects be added or removed?
I think Alameda is pretty accesible to walking and biking but se need to upgrade and maintain current sidewalks and trails. Bay Farm Harbor Bay and Sea View trails are heavily used and poorly maintained. More safe crossing guard and speed bumps near schools may be best.
I think that generally these proposals all look great but it is critical to get these backbone greenways in place now. It can be done with little effort but should be done with urgency. So I take issue with the fact that we may stretch this out over 8 years.
I would add Eastshore Drive and the connector behind Lincoln middle School as a greenway to maximize access to the water.
I would like to know how much taxpayer money the City wasted on this plan. This is not a plan that works for Alameda and no one seems to have any understanding of what Alameda needs. **We do not need "low stress bicycle facilities." We need less stressful traffic for drivers** and we need to limit the influx of people who are congesting our streets. I'm sick of driving down narrowed, confusingly-designed streets while empty bike lanes take up all of the previous driving lanes. No one is using the bike lanes while we sit in traffic!!! Most of all, your plans are anti-seniors - you ignore the needs of the disabled too. Only healthy young people who can ride a bike matter
I would make all of Central have separated class 4 bike lanes. Getting to Park/Webster is useful!
I'm unclear on the neighborhood greenways and how they impact movement around the island. This plan really has lots of information to try and digest. Trying to see how all these ideas work together and what outcomes the will dictate is a challenge.
I'd encourage the city to consider merging the plans for #19 Lincoln Avenue/Garfield Avenue and #5, Lincoln/Marshall/Pacific Corridor, or opt for the more robust design treatments. Speed cushions, buffered bike lanes and other infrastructure to slow traffic and enable safer pedestrian/cyclist commuting, would be ideal.
I'd like to see all E/W transit streets be reduced down to one lane, each direction: the full length of Lincoln, Encinal, Harbor Bay Parkway
I'm uncertain about the Park Street and/or Oak Street Corridor plan, partly because it's not yet clear what it looks like, but also because in a future where the core part of Park St. from Lincoln to Encinal becomes pedestrian/bus-only, there would need to be a plan to divert car traffic to Broadway and/or Oak to allow access to parking options and points beyond (e.g. South Shore). That may be a distant dream, but I wouldn't want to prevent the possibility of that in the future by our actions now.
In general it seems weird that there's nothing on high street. It comes off a bridge, is near Christmas tree lane, Lincoln park, Lincoln middle, and Otis elementary, but seems like it's kind of ignored as a place to slow things down and make them more people friendly.
Include tree planting and maintenance and where possible planting areas that protect bicycle and ped areas.
It doesn't include any improvements, changes or plans for the area of Buena Vista Ave. To ignore this entire section of town while addressing all the other major neighborhood connecting streets smacks of discrimination. This area houses more multi-family households and people of many ethnic origins than several of the areas that are included in the infrastructure plan. Why is it being ignored?
It should also includes ensuring that Otis Dr (between Park St and High St) is safer for bikers and pedestrians which is not the case at the moment
It's a good start!
Its a start. We have to start somewhere
Just reiterating my plea to have a widened bike lane on 5th St., separate, dedicated bike lane on Constitution to the bike bridge.

10. If you said the 2030 Infrastructure Plan projects list needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see. Should any projects be added or removed?
Leave Grand St alone. Just paint crosswalks and bike paths and enforce the law.
Less concentration on physical changes (protected bike lanes, bulb-outs, fancy paint jobs that become slippery) and more attention to a long-term local shuttle.
Let's include Gibbons on the list of roads needing a road diet.
Link Shoreline to point via Crown beach, complete Appazato, Jean Sweeney, Clement fernside.. Create a single lane through tube (not 2 lanes) and a single lane over High Street.
Love all the bike and Ped improvements esp on school routes and near schools. I would also ask for any green belt dev on West side. I love the medians on Lincoln and Santa Clara Also what about incentives to property owners for creating bio swales, bee/ butterfly gardens, and/or food gardens in their yards?
Major water taxi a major priority with ondemand operation.
Many great projects on this list. I can't wait to walk, bike (and even drive) on many of them. Why can't downtown Alameda get a permanent redesign before 2030? I imagine it will cost a lot of money. So maybe it needs to involve a tax assessment with the Downtown Alameda Business Association, or some more means of funding. Other Bay Area cities have very nicely rebuild their downtown streetscapes. Alameda should look into doing so as well. Boy, we're going to have to wait a while for the Oakland-Alameda bike/ped bridge. But it'll be worth it!
Many of these projects are exciting and I am optimistic the net positives will make Alameda much safer. Regarding specific bike improvements to Webster and Park. I recognize the desire to make these routes work for cars, buses, bike and peds, but the resulting compromises sacrifice more than is satisfying. If bikes are to compliment these thoroughfares, we should be investing in truly separated/raised lanes. The current chicanes and gutter pathways are dangerous for all users and give cyclist a bad reputation. My hope is that emphasis lays on building the secondary networks and protecting neighborhood greenways before getting lost in compromised solutions for roadways that are overly constrained and over programed.
More emphasis on pedestrians, and less on bicycles. More consideration for seniors and less abled people who do not want to use a bicycle - alternative transportation options.
Most of these would cost more than the benefit they provide. Please be more careful when spending other peoples money for what you have decided will benefit them.
N/A
Need it now not later. Your adding more housing and neglecting infrastructure.
Need to add bike lane from pacific to shoreline in the Eighth street. This is the way to get over to the crab cone from central alameda and it is very dangerous on a bike.
No current automobile lanes should be taken away. Parking spot removal, especially for the disabled should be minimized. The bike paths throughout Bay Farm need to be completely repaved.
No slow streets

10. If you said the 2030 Infrastructure Plan projects list needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see. Should any projects be added or removed?
Not enough details about the impact of adding new bike lanes, standard or buffered, on major 4 lane streets and how it will be mitigated, many of which are parallel and not far from one another. As with much of the plan, heavy on bicycling rather than walking and not addressing those who may have difficulties using one or the other or both. If climate is an issue here, where is the section on electric vehicle charging stations.
Oak Alameda bike bridge is good.
Overall it's good, but it seems that Bay Farm is sometimes forgotten compared to the main island
Park & Webster need protected bike lanes. Scrap the roundabouts.
Park & Webster street could really benefit from having some car free sections.
people will still drive cars..we need better signal crosswalks for children
Permanent barriers for slow streets
Planning and construction of the bike/ped bridge should be a bigger priority. As described here, nothing more than planning will happen in the next 8 YEARS. 8 YEARS!!!!!! Need to move faster.
Please identify the sidewalk gaps that should be filled, in the same way bicycle improvements have been mapped. Tilden Way or Main Street, for example, shouldn't receive any grant money for repaving unless they also get sidewalks, for example.
Prioritizing the cross alameda trail and estuary crossing on the west end (either bridge or water shuttle) should be more highly prioritized.
Project 11 (updating the existing, heavily-used trails on Bay Farm makes total sense; we know people bike there, including a lot of kids. Any projects that keep modifying our busiest thoroughfares (Webster? Really?) are excessive. We have plenty of routes across the island.
Project added: Reduce the lanes of traffic on Otis Drive to one lane in each direction for the ENTIRE of Otis Dr. Including Broadway to High st.
re: Number 3 Grand Street - I am not sure how well I like redone intersection at Otis and Grand. It feels confusing to me as both a bicyclist and a car driver, but maybe I just need to ride it more and get used to it. I would be curious if you have received other feedback on this intersection update.
Remove #3, adding bike lanes to Grand Street. There may be others, but it requires a degree in civil engineering to interpret what you already have planned and expect to accomplish. "Low Stress Backbone" requires an orthopedic surgeon or chiropractic degree. Your terminology is not understandable.
Remove 3 and 9
Remove all existing bicycle lanes and prohibit cyclists from riding in the street(s).
Remove bike lanes on Webster and Park Street. You are creating gridlock. Remove San Jose from Neighborhood Greenway. San Jose has never had that much traffic...well until everybody started having everything delivered...and it does not need some giant conversion. Versailles is an ARTERY, the only street that actually gets people from the neighborhoods near Otis Dr. to the Miller-Sweeney Bridge without rambling through the circular streets in the Fernside neighborhood. That bridge is going to be increasingly important. People could (and do) bike down Pearl Street. It is not fair to expect the people living on Broadway to carry all of the traffic in the entire area of the island east of Park Street. The proposed roundabout at Tilden and Blanding is going to be an expensive traffic disaster that is going to be hard to undo.

10. If you said the 2030 Infrastructure Plan projects list needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see. Should any projects be added or removed?
Remove proposed Gibbons Drive. Gibbons Drive residents did not request it. It is outlandish that "others" have proposed Gibbons Drive to be a Neighborhood Greenway with only a few weeks notice since the Draft ATP was released to the public for comment. UNFAIR. Not how the CIty should conduct business without the direct input of residents.
Remove the Slow Streets. They've done what they're supposed to do. We don't need to have people walking down the middle of the street.
Replacement need everywhere.
rom a pedestrian standpoint Grand st is terrible, I would add the intersection of grand and Otis is a danger with left turning vehicles and pedestrians crossing at the same time, Add a dedicated left turn arrow would eliminate this issue, I don't think the cost for adding bikes lanes to the park st bridge is needed.
Seaview Parkway on Bayfarm has a fantastic opportunity for shared use path, however it is very poorly maintained and it is not clear what area is for peds and for bikes - this is an easy opportunity for maintenance and marking to make a huge improvement to an already great asset.
See following comment
Separated bike lanes on Grand are unnecessary.
Some of the projects and areas are suffering from increasing crime, security issues and unhoused population increases. The project impact can be at risk unless addressed
Some of these, such as Grand Street, really don't need a huge overhaul. Remember that many on the island do still use and need cars. I would like to see traffic calming measures without aggravating motorists. I love using the slow streets like Pacific to avoid Buena Vista and Lincoln traffic, but it needs repaving and better barriers. I have noticed more cars driving down it for long distances lately.
speed the backbone implementation
Streets and traffic first.
That's looks 👆 to me neatly ❗!
The bike lanes that cross between Webster and Constitution are an accident waiting to happen, particularly with the automobile right turn lane crossing the bike lanes at the corner of Constitution. We've seen many near misses between the right turn into the shopping center and the right turn at Constitution.
The Lincoln Marshall project can't start fast enough. This project has been in planning for at least five years and Lincoln is a Tier 1 street for accidents. I don't understand postponing work for more study.
The Oakland-Alameda bridge must not be built. A colossal waste of money to bring Oakland's crime problems into Alameda.
The pedestrian bridge across the estuary is a bid waste of limited resources. Who will use it? Blocks a lot of precious views of the estuary on both sides. Don't do this.
The plan leaves few pedestrian access routes to Sweeney park - a huge city asset that is only growing. Please continue to help kids and bikes get to Sweeney from many different parts of the island. The north/south connections contain tons of tough crossings and streets with narrow sidewalks where cars often speed (like Sherman and constitution)
The slow street concept is a failure and just pushes traffic onto neighboring streets. All of the slow streets have sidewalks and the streets usage by bicycles is not higher than neighboring streets.
There should be a complete network of physically separated bike lanes in all residential areas. Nobody should need to travel more than 2 or 3 blocks to join this network.

10. If you said the 2030 Infrastructure Plan projects list needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see. Should any projects be added or removed?
These things all sound and look great on paper. Alameda had a small town feel. It's nice that there have been some improvements made and bikers have more places that they consider to be safe to ride but biker still don't watch for cars or stop at lights or stop signs. Also, I don't live on the East End so normally I wouldn't care literally at all but if you can implement these changes without changing the look and feel of that neighborhood that would be great. Same thing for the older homes section of The Base. It is a charming neighborhood with character. Fix the old sidewalks and leave it alone.
This is a huge list. I'll call out three specifics, and one general piece of feedback. I would prioritize areas where there is no real bicycle infrastructure: 1. Between Crab Cove and Alameda Point on the southwest side, 2. between Clement and Alameda point on the northeast side. And here, conventional bike lanes are better than nothing, so let's do something, even if it's not perfect! 3. Grand Street--again, perfect is the enemy of good here. Implementing a solution with enhanced buffered bike lanes (or semi-separated/protected), using raised lane separators or armadillos and periodic vertical lane markers/separators, would greatly enhance the bike lane while still preserving usability for residents--striking a practical balance until we have the money to actually create a true cycle track at some point. And then overall---the overall plan is good. And each element needs to be fully vetted out and discussed with key stakeholders, including the neighborhoods involved in each section. We want neighborhood support; sometimes this may mean a modification or hybridization of the doctrinaire or "perfect" design. As we used to say in my line of work, we'd rather have a strategy that is 75% perfect, but that 100% support, than an approach that is 100% perfect but that only 50% support.
Versailles is a cross street for the neighborhood. PEARL would make a much better slow street. Lincoln Ave is a wide street that now will now be narrowed. Again wide streets allow for better vision.
Versailles should not be a slow street.
Walnut willow and eagle are being ignored by traffic calming, as a result they are getting a huge increase in angry speeders avoiding adjacent streets. Reviewing previous traffic studies, it looks like these streets have been ignored. They are in dire need of radical traffic shaping as they are all full of small children pedestrians and angry drivers now. This combos is not good.
We need to have the Park Street/Oak Street Corridor completed before 2030. This area is a huge gap in the current infrastructure. I am a huge fan of changing some streets to neighborhood greenways! While some may find it frustrating, I'm guessing it may make those streets more desirable to live on in the long term as well as safer in general.
We need to return the streets to drivers.
What happened to projects on Harbor Bay? We need infrastructure upgrades to sewers, streets , paths and landscape maintence to reflect the taxes we pay.
Wooden bridge should be fixed much sooner. I bet some plastic decking could be put over it with minimum effort and it would greatly improve it. The shoreline bike path may need to be widened if more people use it. Also roundabouts should be included because they make biking and walking safer. If the bridge over the estuary doesn't get built a gondola might be a good cheaper alternative.
Would prefer to keep Santa Clara as a neighborhood greenway. And add traffic calming (speed cushions) to Orion, which can be there even when safer bike facilities are built.

10. If you said the 2030 Infrastructure Plan projects list needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see. Should any projects be added or removed?
Yeah, all the bike projects. Maybe you should make good roads for cars and separate streets for bikes. You guys are always just making it harder and harder to get around Alameda. And that was the number one issue....getting off the island.
You are building a lot in Alameda. You are narrowing roads and creating driving hazards. Otis and Grand is a disaster! You are not adressing improving transport to and from the island and the many cars your new buildings are going to mean as the population continues to increase. This used to be a calm place to live. Transport wise, this is becoming a nightmare!!
You have already restricted Webster with a farmers market, reduced lanes for restaurants (not a bad idea) and there is no parking either. Where are you going to put the bike lanes? Need to put it on a alternate street. There is no more room to screw with Webster just like you wouldn't do that to Park street. Also, we cannot afford a Oakland - Alameda bike bridge.

12. If you said the 2030 Low-Stress Backbone Bicycle Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
Overall is fine, but highlights the point that the overall plan in general is too bike centric, please do not lose sight of pedestrian and transit users, who your own data show use our streets much more often.
1. Should add the Island Drive to harbor bay connector. 2. Add Westline Dr between Shoreline Dr and Central Ave. Without this connection those of us on the south end can't get to Webster street or Alameda Point safely. The alternative is meandering through Crown Beach and Crab Cove, which are not good for transportation. 3. There should be one or two low stress facilities at Alameda Point like West Tower or main St to get to Spirits Alley and the Skate Park. 4. Willow street to Otis. Again for those of us on this end, we have few north-south connectors and those should be low stress soon.
A lot of the proposed things don't seem high priority or necessary. Really need to focus on maintenance, providing kids safe routes to school and more bike storage at schools. More crossing guards and flashing intersections.
A place that could use a protected bike lane would be to the Main Street Ferry, specifically between Pacific Avenue and the Main Street Ferry.
A shorter connection from the proposed Webster Bike lane to Shoreline would be amazing!
Add in bike lanes on Otis Dr for the entire road. It's a main thoroughfare, why aren't you encouraging people to use bikes and scooters on Otis? Otherwise it looks like you know cars are speeding and bicyclists and scooters are in danger.
Again focused on youth
Again, I'd encourage the city to opt for more robust design treatments where possible. Speed cushions, buffered bike lanes and other infrastructure to slow traffic and enable safer pedestrian/cyclist commuting, would be ideal.
Another waste of space and creates unnecessary and unwanted traffic problems .As always, differently abled people and seniors are completely ignored.
Anything that can help folks from Bay Farm connect to the major areas of interest (High Schools, etc) should reduce alot of traffic.
Anything to make Park easier to cross or go down on a bicycle will be welcome!!
As mentioned above, there should be separated, bike lanes to all ferry terminals, especially along main street to the main street, terminal and from Central to Sea Plane Lagoon along W. Pacific or thereabouts
Bring more bikes and less cars (& car parking) to Park St - it's for pedestrians and people - don't make the bikes ride on Oak "in the back alley and out of view".
buffered/separated bike lanes on central Webster to Grand.
cancel
Central Ave. improvements and Park St. need to be a bigger priority.
Commendable but unrealistic.
Definitely need clarity on the Park/Oak st segment. This is one of the more challenging segment to address, but also likely the most impactful.
Do not build walkway into Bay 37 community.

12. If you said the 2030 Low-Stress Backbone Bicycle Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
Enforce the speed limit along Otis Drive, especially between Park Street and High Street. Stop the speeders! Increase the Alameda Police Force. Bring back the 5 motorcycle officers/motorcycles. Issue speeding tickets! Reduce all of Otis Drive to one lane in each direction for vehicle travel.
for the TBD lanes on Park or Oak, I'd like to see Park be shut down to car between Encinal and Lincoln. Many larger cities have done this with great success, and businesses still thrive- but the reduction in double parking, bad driving behaviors on what should be a shared pediestrian/bike space is eliminated.
Getting all the schools and sports areas on the backbone is critical for traffic safety and reduction.
Good start
Grand is a wide street and doesn't need a separated bike lane. Webster cannot support parklets and a separated bike lane unless you have full time enforcement of double parking
Grand Street (#3) is a key part of the backbone but that plan was gutted by city council. I'd love to see an implementation exactly as mapped, but it's hard to take the plan seriously if council members will simply ignore staff recommendations in favor of the status quo. Painted bike lanes are insufficient and can never contribute to a low-stress network.
harbor bay parkway from Doolittle to Maitland shows a shared separate bike/pedestrian pathway. This pathway is poorly maintained. As a consequence of the condition of the path, bicyclist ride on the road way as an alternative. There is no bicycle lane line and many drivers exceed the speed limit, especially during morning commute hour. The map leads the reader to believe there is a low stress bike path, but the reality is quite different.
Have bicyclists be safe and use Grand to cross the Island.
Honestly looks amazing. One more cross island path would be great. Along with traffic calming through out the island
I can't use a bicycle- I need to drive and I'm stuck in traffic in Alameda! There used to be no traffic and now it's horrible. Who is responsible for this nightmare?
I do not think bikes should be routed onto Park, given pedestrian density.
I don't think bicycles should have the power over autos
I prefer biking on dedicated bike lanes than a side-street with random cars backing up.
I see a lot of proposed class 3 neighborhood greenways but even after reading the description, I don't know if these substantively change anything--is it just painting sharrows on the roadway?
I think it is a bit too reliant on neighborhood greenways. I would prefer to see more dedicated cycling/pedestrian infrastructure
I wish we could add some kind of trail or connection between Towata park and Bayview dr on Otis. Right now tons of cyclists just ride on the sidewalk for that small section of Otis. It's such a small distance, it seems like a simple win given how popular it is.
I wish you respected the needs of drivers as well as bikers. Leave one wide street for cars, please....Lincoln.

12. If you said the 2030 Low-Stress Backbone Bicycle Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
I would like to see better cycling paths/routes from the Bay Farm Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge to the proposed neighborhood greenway on Bayview Drive. This is an awkward section to ride and I do it almost every day. Also we need a better plan for connecting Oak Street to South Shore Center for bicycles. I would like to see additional infrastructure in Bay Farm as part of the low-stress backbone network. Including a connection from Island Drive to the Business Park and a connection from Maitland Drive to the Ferry Terminal. That street may be useful to consider as a semi-gateway street since a lot of people use it for commuting off the island.
I would like to see Lincoln Ave as the east-west neighborhood greenway rather than switch from Lincoln to Pacific at Park St. It seems more dangerous for cyclists to have to make those turns, and Lincoln has more businesses that could benefit from the extra bike traffic.
I would love to see the Central Ave bike lane continue west of Sherman, closing the existing gap. Central Ave is a great arterial because it is mid-island (thus providing a central east-west option between the proposed Pacific and San Jose greenways) and is shaded for most of its length (unlike Santa Clara!!).
I would make Central go all across the island. I would put something class 4 on 9th St between Central and Shoreline. There's a very wide sidewalk in some sections, maybe continue it on down? Additional N/S connecters should be: * around St. Charles * around (southern) 5th St. More is needed on the Point.
I'd love to see something more like the existing full loop that has a protected bike lane down the middle of the island as well rather than only at the edges. Generally just want to make sure the orange greenways really are legitimate keeping people safe and not just making people "feel" safe while putting them in danger from drivers. Make them hard to drive down in a straight line, have rumble strips if they try to pass someone, etc.
I'd like those calm streets to have permanent barriers to discourage cars
I'd like to see a fully dedicated bike lane connecting directly to Edison Elementary School from other dedicated bike paths/lanes (e.g. on Lincoln & Versailles) vs Neighborhood Greenways.
I'm not sure about separated bike lane on Pacific. I am at 400 block of Pacific and we have no parking as is, I don't know if there is room for a bike lane. But do need something to handle traffic between Island High and the Academy on school days.
In the great cities of the world, they reduce congestion and traffic by moving people together in groups using public transit. Regardless of what you think, our public transit in Alameda is poor. It would make more sense to improve public transit than the tear up roads and pretend that people do not have to get places in less than several hours. I would love to see a streetcar to Fruitvale Bart. I would use that. I am in my 60s with an autoimmune disorder. You should not expect me to bike down any of these new corridors soon.

12. If you said the 2030 Low-Stress Backbone Bicycle Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
Include Mckay and Westline in the backbone. We need to see Webster and Park with protected bike lanes. These are critical north south corridors.
It does not go far enough. This is not low enough stress. If it's not safe enough for elementary students to ride to school and back, then it needs to go further. There should be a complete network of physically separated bike lanes in all residential areas. Nobody should need to travel more than 2 or 3 blocks to join this network.
It should also includes ensuring that Otis Dr (between Park St and High St) is safer for bikers (including students to Otis School) which is not the case at the moment
Just expand the bike trails. Separate bikes from cars as much as possible. They don't mix. No pedestrian bridge anywhere.
Keep expanding separated lanes and deincentivize car trips. Congestion (making trips longer and more bothersome for drivers) is a good thing for overall safety! If a city like Paris can go all in on converting trips from cars to bikes in the span of the pandemic, surely Alameda can too. People won't bike as intended if they don't feel safe, please don't go go one foot in, one foot out on this plan.
Less shared paths and more protected bike lanes
Like it overall, but same reaction as for question 11: I would prioritize areas where there is no real bicycle infrastructure: 1. Between Crab Cove and Alameda Point on the southwest side, 2. between Clement and Alameda point on the northeast side. And here, conventional bike lanes are better than nothing, so let's do something, even if it's not perfect! 3. Grand Street--again, perfect is the enemy of good here. Implementing a solution with enhanced buffered bike lanes (or semi-separated/protected), using raised lane separators or armadillos and periodic vertical lane markers/separators, would greatly enhance the bike lane while still preserving usability for residents--striking a practical balance until we have the money to actually create a true cycle track at some point. And then overall---the overall plan is good. And each element needs to be fully vetted out and discussed with key stakeholders, including the neighborhoods involved in each section. We want neighborhood support; sometimes this may mean a modification or hybridization of the doctrinaire or "perfect" design. As we used to say in my line of work, we'd rather have a strategy that is 75% perfect, but that 100% support, than an approach that is 100% perfect but that only 50% support.
looks like the plan includes a new bridge from Park St. to Harbor Bay. This map doesn't indicate a cycle route on it. It's probably an accidental ommission?
Marina Village Parkway and Challenger should have protected bike lanes. McKay should be low stress. Consider protected bike lanes for Harbor Bay Parkway, too, as part of a road diet.
More 4 way stop signs on Broadway
More more more ☺
Most of these would cost more than the benefit they provide. Please be more careful when spending other peoples money for what you have decided will benefit them.
Mostly good. Webster is a done deal. There is no more room unless you REMOVE all of the in street dining and get rid of all the weird concrete abutments you put out into the street. It is not wide enough. Needs a MAJOR rework. You also need parking availability on Webster... just like the parking garage you put off Park by the theatre.
N/A
Need a low stress connecting Littlejohn and Franklin parks - use Benton. Low stress does not need straight lines people can walk and bike using some cone timing streets.
Need better north south routes, with safe, fast, predictable crossings across central, encinal, etc

12. If you said the 2030 Low-Stress Backbone Bicycle Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
Need more room for drivers. Hardly see many bikes or pedestrians. Do actual study on this please.
Need more separated bike lanes. And by separated, I mean like we have on Fernside b/n BFI Bridge and LMS, *not* what we have on Shoreline. At least 1/3 of my rides on Shoreline include at least one scary encounter where some idiot drives into the bike lane while making a u-turn, parking, or just plain driving on the bike lane.
Need to add bike lane from pacific to shoreline in the Eighth street. This is the way to get over to the crab cone from central alameda and it is very dangerous on a bike.
Needs improved paths and better connectivity on Bay Farm
None of it should be implemented. It will contribute to more congestion and the city does not seem to be interested in people who cannot ride a bike or walk very far.
Not agreeing that Oak St. Is a place for any bike path. It's very narrow and congested
not in favor
Not needed.
Not requested by Fernside residents. Why are "others" able to force changes to Fernside who do not live on Fernside?
Not sure- did not seem complete
Noted in the answer to question 10.
Otis Drive should be part of the network. Seems like there is a North/South gap between Nineth and Grand.
Park street needs a separate bike lane, as well as the entire Mecartney road where cars go very fast in the morning and the road is bumpy (especially east end)
Park street will be even more of a disaster if bike lanes are added. Have you ever driven down Park street? Especially after they took 2 lanes away and added outdoor seating? This is simply not practical and seems like whoever came up with this idea has never seen the street.
Please please make this happen
please restrict or discourage car traffic in problematic areas (e.g. Morton Street etc. around Franklin Park) and other similar locations.
Please see my other comments
Please take San Jose off of the Slow Streets/Low Stress Network. It has two schools on that street, neither of which are considered neighborhood schools, which makes it difficult for parents to get their kids to school. It is a major street to get from one end of the island to Grand St. It also has a lot of single family, multi-family, and apartments on that street, so not the best street to try to stop congestion on because of the many cars and delivery vans that need to access that street.
Same comment as above, would add Eastshore to the plan.
See above
See above. We need more enforcement of current laws and a local shuttle.
See comments on 10.
Separated bike lanes are much safer than paint only bike lanes.
Several north-south connections missing. Westline, Sherman to connect to Jean Sweeney Park, more in central Alameda such as Willow toward Park.
Shared-use paths are not low-stress. If you made them 12 or 15 feet wide it would help to enable bicycles, rollerbladers, dog walkers and other pedestrians to more comfortably use them, but separating actual pedestrians from faster-moving vehicles would be even better.
Slow streets are no longer effective.
So good!

12. If you said the 2030 Low-Stress Backbone Bicycle Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
Some of the projects and areas are suffering from increasing crime, security issues and unhoused population increases. The project impact can be at risk unless addressed
Streets and traffic first.
That's all you need.
That's looks 👌 and more thinking positively and more moves on with it as well as more focuses on this more importantly is more improvement on that! But looks good ways on that! Accepts it!
The "shared path" on Bay Farm should be extended the entire length of the lagoon past the shopping center and over to Robert Davey Drive. Also, please minimize the distraction on city streets of over-kill on striping, multiple colors, signs painted on the ground, signs on poles.
The network looks fabulous, but please, let's get this in place by 2024...not 2030!
The three major ways on and off the island Webster, Park, and the road leading to Miller Sweeney bridge are very narrow road as they are. By adding separate bike lanes the traffic will be further backed up. Building separate bike over pass is the real solution with more and more development being built on the island.
There should be signage for education purposes. Wherever new infrastructure is out in (ex: which button to push for bike crossing to jean sweeny- someone had to tell me)
There's a missing east-west route between the two commercial strips. Encinal or central should have protected or buffered lanes
There's no changes proposed for Bay Farm !!
This looks fantastic, and I hope the approach is more solid than the current slow streets signs. Not included here, but I'd like to see additional four-way stops along the routes like Pacific in situations where the slow street bicyclists have a stop and cross traffic does not. Crossing that fast-moving traffic with limited visibility is not low stress for anyone, especially children or inexperienced cyclists.
This looks great overall. Please separate bikes and pedestrians whenever possible. Shared paths don't work well for either, particularly when so many people are using headphones. Only combine paths when absolutely necessary due to space constraints.

12. If you said the 2030 Low-Stress Backbone Bicycle Network needs changes, please describe the changes you'd like to see.
This looks like a really good grid. Could help me and my kids much more safely and comfortably reach the places we currently go on bike. Would also give me much more confidence to let them ride their own bikes to school and elsewhere someday. Given that this relies on the neighorhood greenways so much, it's going to be very important to make major changes where those cross larger roads. This entire plan would be a bit of a waste if you're directing less skilled cyclists to use their minor roads but then leave them waiting for all the cars when they need to cross Lincoln or High (or any of the other arterials). Please consider marking on this map the intersections that will get cyclist crossing treatments -- or consider making an additional map that focuses just on the intersections that need to be redesigned. I do think there's a "desire line" right there between Webster/RAMP and the Target shopping center that should be met. Same from Webster/Central down McKay. A question: What does "Webster phased approach to ultimate separated bike lane" mean? A rhetorical question: Why is Caltrans putting a bike lane on Encinal Ave later this year (or next year?) that doesn't fit the criteria of this safe cycling network? Maybe the City of Alameda can't change that -- but please do regularly remind your counterparts at Caltrans that their bike/ped designs could be so much better. What a waste of money to build bike/ped things that are 10 or 15 years behind best practices...
Too many new lanes. I think looking and studying traffic patterns might be also very helpful
Way to much modification and significant impact on vehicular traffic and neighborhood transit
We need a slow street connecting san jose and pacific
We need to go back to being a normal city.
What does this mean?
Where neighborhood greenways cross larger roads, they should get signalized intersections that automatically detect people on bicycles. Too many existing slow streets have dangerous, unsignalized crossings without even any marked crosswalks (Pacific and Grand, for example).
Why are you putting Bike Lanes on the Streets that are most heavily trafficked by automobiles? It doesn't make any sense if a you claim safety is an issue.
Why doesn't Pacific Ave bike lanes continue all the way to the Seaplane ferry?
Why isn't Otis on the Low-Stress network?
Why isn't the bike lane from Sea Plan lagoon onto Pacific not contiguous? I have an issue with bike lanes to nowhere. We need dedicated bike lanes even more on Alameda Point.
Would prefer more buffered lanes over "protected" lanes as I find the protected ones more restrictive. Buffered lanes make it easier to merge into traffic to make left turns and such while still providing enough space to feel safe.
You're dreaming.

13. Do you think this is the right approach for Slow Streets? If not, what adjustments should be made?
* The treatments here look great and should be widely implemented beyond just the existing slow streets. Stuff like raised crosswalks? Do it everywhere, please! * That said, I do wonder if the proposed treatments will be adequate to dissuade car traffic vs the temporary barricades.
Absolutely won't work. We have plenty of signage and sharrows that don't work now. Only way to realistically create a proper slow street is to prohibit vehicles unless local.
Absolutely, we should prioritize the NGs, but I'm curious what proactive measures will be taken to ensure cars choose other roads to drive down. I appreciate the removal of the temporary barriers, but what will replace them to discourage drivers? And if drivers do choose or need to drive down a NG, how will we ensure they will do so slowly and with caution, giving priority to pedestrians and cyclists?
Add roundabouts to two areas on Bay Farm to enhance traffic movement. #1:Mecartney and Island drive and #2: the 3way stop at Melrose, Maitland, and Mecartney.
Add transverse streets to plan, such as walnut and willow. Slow streets make angry drivers adjacent. Add stop lights, crosswalks, traffic shaping (planters), slow signs, and pedestrian priority signs on small "angry shortcut" alleys intersecting slow streets such as walnut. Make walnut willow not high traffic angry "shortcut"through streets using selective road closure (e. g. Not connecting to Beuna Vista or Lincoln)
Again - get real. Alameda is not Disneyland; we are a bedroom community. The auto is here to stay; stop discriminating.
agree with the approach
Agreed that the Slow Streets were a great rapid response during the pandemic. They're overdue for changes, although I totally understand that it takes time. My family uses San Jose Ave to bike across the island. Would love to see that become a full bike boulevard with intersection/crossing treatments. I'd be fine with either Versailles or Pearl becoming the north/south bike boulevard. Can see the advantages of how Versailles already has four-way stop at Encinal and some other crossings. Please look into doing neighborhood traffic circles -- not just along the Slow Streets but also along the nearby streets that may see slightly increased thru-traffic as a result
All looks good to me! Impressive!
All slow streets should be eliminated. When I drive around town, I am probably the only person that does not drive down the streets. I turn right or left all the other cars go straight. I have seen so many near misses when cars turn right and they have to go around the barrier and there is a car going through. It is very unfair to the other streets that are take in the extra traffic so some have the luxury of a "slow street." There was a need when the pandemic hit, but it is no longer needed. To pick and choose a few streets is so unfair. We have parks and open areas that people can use now. It is time to close that chapter.
All streets are the same to me align the traffic lights with the flow of cars.
All streets should be slow streets. Loud cars and motorcycles should be banned.

13. Do you think this is the right approach for Slow Streets? If not, what adjustments should be made?
Anything that is better is good. But we need more slow streets and even roads with no cars!
Anything that keeps drivers under 30 and off of side streets I'm all for.
Anything that resembles shoreline drive needs to be re-examined and redesigned. Seems much less safe and usable since the recent changes.
As a frequent user of slow street via bicycle, I can say that it won't make too much of a difference if they return to bicycle boulevards or class II or III bike routes. The slow streets benefits the residents with kids who play on that street the most, it is less of a transportation matter in my opinion.
As a West End Santa Clara Ave resident, I will miss the Slow Streets status, and am worried about the car traffic turning bad once the Slow Streets barriers are removed, especially since Central will be getting a road diet. I fear many cars may turn to Santa Clara Ave as their preferred route. I would like the traffic consequences observed closely after this transition, and traffic calming measures considered if it results in increased traffic and/or speeding.
As I have already said, Versailles is a community cross street for cars. Please look at Pearl instead. Please consider involving people who live on these streets make choices about their streets.
As I've stated, the city is focusing way too much on bike-cycle accessibility. How are these bike lanes going to help me get off the island quicker, especially given the fact that Alameda is increasing housing? Shutting these medians of traffic off from car use or even limiting them is troubling. Traffic is just going to get worse which means more emissions and therefore worse for the environment
AS long as there is proper calming method. The barricades right now are not doing enough. Cars, in high traffic period, are still using these streets to cross the city faster. Adding speed cushion, elevated cross walks, diverters, signs and monitoring.
As per the plan, I strongly feel that the "Neighborhood Greenway" of San Jose should extend farther than the current slow street that ends at Park St.
As someone who lives on a slow street AND uses other slow streets to bike around with two small children, I am beyond excited about this plan. Please consider paving these new neighborhood greenways, Versailles, San Jose and pacific has some major sections of road with huge potholes which makes it hard to ride around. (Our most used section of Versailles between San Jose and Calhoun is terrible and the only part of Versailles that has not been replaced in the recent future)
As with the permit process, I think you should do personal outreach and canvass the people who own and live on these Streets, not depend on this survey. In addition, still need to analyze the impact and mitigation needs, both specific to the proposed slow streets or green ways but also as a whole with the many other proposed changes.
Before you change neighborhoods why not fix the sidewalks on Gibbons. My wife and I no longer walk ther because the sidewalks are unsafe. Maybe fixing existing problems before creating new ones would be helpful
Best to listen to residents on those streets.
bike only streets
Bring back slow streets but for commercial areas and create walking districts. These are the best types of places to visit for shopping and dining.
By its nature, Slow Streets presumes there are Fast Streets. I'd prefer the City spend its money and resources on reducing speeds and making fast streets like Lincoln safer, rather than making already slow streets slower. I'm sure its nice for the Slow Street neighborhoods, but at its heart, it smells like favoritism
Cameras might help slow streets for drivers who still remain unsafe on slow streets.
Do not build walkway into Bay 37 community.

13. Do you think this is the right approach for Slow Streets? If not, what adjustments should be made?
Do not have traffic circles. Remove all slow streets, they are not needed now and only cause disruption to getting to where you need to go.
Don't know
Eliminate them.
Eliminate them.
End the Slow Streets program.
Enforce the speed limit along Otis Drive, especially between Park Street and High Street. Stop the speeders! Increase the Alameda Police Force. Bring back the 5 motorcycle officers/motorcycles. Issue speeding tickets! Reduce all of Otis Drive to one lane in each direction for vehicle travel.
Enthusiastic yes
Every slow street I encounter is not being used. why create something that will never be used.
Focus on improvements where Slow Streets cross arteries and corridors.
Get rid of slow streets. this is not 2020 anymore, move on.
Get rid of the barriers. Asap. Don't wait for something new to be installed. It's been years, you've had long enough.
Get rid of the unsightly barricades which force traffic to drive on the wrong side of the street to get around. Replace with numerous speed humps.
Get rid of them!!!
Getting rid of the hideous barricades would be an improvement, and allowing local traffic back if they drive slowly seems like a much better idea. But I still think Pearl makes much more sense than Versailles for this designation. Block off Pearl for cars from Fernside and use that instead. If the issue is that flashing crossing of Fernside at Versailles, just put good signage having bikes turn from Versailles at Buena Vista and then onto Pearl. And honestly, not that many bikes turn from Fernside onto Versailles anyway.
Good idea
Great approach! I would love to see speed bumps, each with a slot to accommodate bicylces.
How many bicycles are we talking about to justify the costs?
I 100% agree with this. Current system does not have much rhyme or reason, and helps adjacent residents only. Most are in SFH districts in any case, again perpetuating inequalities in access to pedestrian amenities.
I agree all barricades should come down as the intention of slow streets is not being currently effective. Not sure why Versailles would need to have calming measures but understand around Edison school. San Jose is a complete mess now with barricades and not sure what proposals will be made but this is a major through fare across the island. Pacifc Is very quiet and should also be taken off as a slow street.

13. Do you think this is the right approach for Slow Streets? If not, what adjustments should be made?
I agree that Greenways are important. As infrastructure, however, they must be efficient to provide value. The proposal to make Lincoln and Pacific Greenways would form a broken line (at Park Street, no less). This will heavily discourage use. Low use means low efficacy, i.e. low return on investment. I would like to see a more radical approach to Greenway planning, such as Central Avenue. It would provide a backbone for trans-island bicycle commuting with minimal impact to commercial access. It's wide enough to continue to support parallel automobile traffic (albeit with a lane reduction). De-emphasis as an automobile route would require promoting the favorability of an alternative, such as Lincoln Avenue (this could be achieved by developing the avenue into a parkway, as an example). Regardless of how it is achieved, the key takeaway is that Greenways should be considered major infrastructure. Retrofitting side streets (especially disjointed, indirect routes) will not precipitate a substantial shift in the mode of inter-island transport.
I agree with this approach.
I am fine with transitioning Pacific, San Jose and Versailles to Neighborhood Grrenways. I would like the Santa Clara Slow Street designation removed sooner rather than later. I live on this street and am afraid to walk on the Slow Street because so many cars and trucks ignore the barricades altogether. Additionally, it has driven traffic over to 100-200 Lincoln, where drivers routinely run the stop signs as they think Santa Clara is blocked off. It’s a mess.
I am so glad the barriers are going away. I prefer no speed bumps… I get sharp back pain (herniated disk) on the ones going into the Lincoln park parking lot. The rest of the plan seems fine.
I appreciate the Slow Street barricades being removed since people don't obey them anyway, but I'm not sure the greenways are going to feel comfortable to bike on with small children even with the propsoed treatments. It is scary when there is oncoming traffic and they are biking in the middle of the street. Every effort should be made to reduce traffic and speeds on these roads.
I cannot speak to the two slow streets being removed but I think it would be good to know more why they were selected to be discontinued. I love the greenway project and fully support the streets that will be retained (I am also a resident of one). The greenway project is urgently needed in our flat, small-town, family-focused city.
I can't tell where on Pacific, San Jose and Versailles the neighborhood greenways are. I liked the concept of slow streets and would like to see something like them in the future
I do, but I would like to see Santa Clara included. It took a little getting used to, but I think it works well as a slow street.

13. Do you think this is the right approach for Slow Streets? If not, what adjustments should be made?
I hate the Slow Streets program with a passion. Every single time I have to go somewhere, I curse this plan. You have privileged some residents over others, giving them their own private streets. Other residents, those on Broadway, Clinton, Pearl etc then have to take the bulk of the extra traffic. You have also declared those of us for whom biking is not an option to be the enemy. That is not how you go about effecting lasting change in a community. I will leave it to the people around Pacific to speak for themselves, but Versailles is an artery needed by people in the neighborhoods around it to get on and off the island and San Jose is the only street that goes directly from Fernside to Franklin Park without dealing with the congested nightmare of Encinal Avenue...which I am guessing you plan to reduce to two lanes. Neither street should be turned into a greenway. Just exactly how much support - outside of the very vocal members of Bike Walk Alameda - do you actually have for this plan. When last asked, a majority of respondents wanted the Slow Streets to go away immediately or after another year. A majority did not ask you to turn three of those streets into permanent slow streets.
I like having it be more explicit that the roads are not to be used as thru streets; that drivers should really avoid those streets. I'm not sure if the bike boulevard approach is that explicit.
I like it better than slow streets baricades
I like the idea of Pacific and San Jose as bike boulevards.
I like the implementation of slow streets.
I like these in Berkeley, but I fear it will force more vehicles onto adjacent streets or for those that ignore the slow street language, dirty looks and a false sense of security from non-car users will lead to confrontations--all difficult to enforce.
I like this approach of transitioning Slow Streets to Neighborhood Greenways for the 3 proposed streets.
I likke Pacicifc ave as a slow street, needs to add stop signs on cross streets such as Chestnut, don't think San Jose is a good street for a slow street as well as Versailles.
I love the slow streets approach and future greenways. As Alameda becomes more built up we have a greater need for greenways and green places
I love the slow streets. We should be keeping the barricades. And we should keep Santa Clara as a protected street.
I love the slow streets. I advocate for a slow street mid main island running perpendicular to San Jose and pacific.
I see many thru traffic cars on Versailles slow street near Edison. Roadblocks ignored.
I support the bike lanes and traffic calming/ road diet engineering. I'm not really a fan of closing the streets completely because it creates a division within the city. Why are some streets chosen for street closure as opposed to others? Also, I think it creates confusion for some vehicles who may have to ride down the street for delivery or for the distribution of other goods and services.
I support transitioning to the use of different traffic calming methods. While I wholeheartedly support infrastructure that encourages safe and easy bicycle and pedestrian access, barricades on these streets are not very equitable, eg. why can't my street have barricades? Dedicated Neighborhood Greenways (eg. Shafter Ave in Oakland with roundabouts) strike a good balance between bike and vehicle access.
I support turning them into greenways but we shouldnt remove any slow streets. There should be more slow streets. There are great. People need to stop driving and slow down when they do drive.
I think either Versailles or Broadway should be a slow street to safely commute to fruitvale Bart station
I think greenways are the way to go. I would even go further and place barriers at intersections that prevent automobiles from traveling straight while allowing bicyclists and pedestrians to travel straight.

13. Do you think this is the right approach for Slow Streets? If not, what adjustments should be made?
I think it is time for slow streets to retire. I don't feel a need for transitioning them to greenways. Repainting exiting bike route signs and crosswalks should happen.
I think it really all comes down to the traffic diversion strategies put into place. In Portland, shared streets and neighborhood greenways are nearly indistinguishable from one another. I do think removing the slow-streets designation from Orion and Santa Clara is a mistake, though. Even some kind of "soft" barricade, like the large concrete planters that Portland has been installing, would make those streets more hospitable to pedestrians and cyclists, and reduce cut-through traffic: https://bikeportland.org/2021/07/29/pbot-will-install-80-concrete-barricades-to-make-safe-streets-more-permanent-335767 I've traveled down Santa Clara on my bike plenty over the years and have seen my fair share of bad behavior from drivers.
I think it's fine to keep these streets slow, but you must plan for the additional car traffic on adjoining streets like Buena Vista and Lincoln.
I think it's a great idea, but unless we have by default, modal filters (traffic diverters) tabletops, and traffic circles as part of the default implementation plan, I don't see them reducing traffic enough to make them safe NGs. Let's not fight over each specific treatment for every block. Let's change the process to meet our challenges!
I think keeping safeties and calming elements to those streets would be great, especially ones that make it much harder to speed in those sections (which people do already)
I think permanent barricades would be more effective, but otherwise yes.
I think slow streets don't make sense unless they connect in a way to make a riding path through Alameda. It doesn't make sense to have them as isolated slow streets otherwise.
I think that's ok, but even with the barricades, cars occasionally zoom down the block, so will the "traffic calming" really be effective? Please don't make it like Berkeley where some roads just stop and you can't drive through. Maybe speed bumps and something similar to the current barricades that you can go past in a car if you need to.
I think the barricades have been a failure since they allow people to cross blocks on a slow street. Taking out Santa Clara seems really odd: it's useful for an E/W connector, and I often saw it in use by bikes/peds during commute hours. I suspect you'll have to raise some of the street pavement or narrow the streets to Willow St width to slow people down. Repave with the bumpy bricks. Add lots of trees. A lot of work is going to be needed to make cars continually go slow. It might be easier to add more barricades at the street crossings! Of the methods given, turn restrictions are probably the most effective for keeping traffic from racing through. If that is something like through street restrictions. Most of those streets are so wide, that you're going to have some serious work to signal to cars that they should go slower. More barriers in the middle of the block would help. Dig up the center of the street and turn it into a 6' opening and put in oak trees.
I think the barriers should be maintained and made permanent and bigger. Like some I see in Berkeley. Unless you actually close the street to traffic you will still get idiots racing down streets like Versailles at way over 25 mph. It happens now even with the barriers as they do not look serious enough.

13. Do you think this is the right approach for Slow Streets? If not, what adjustments should be made?
I think the current signage and enforcement amount to lip service. Through traffic goes along San Jose all the time and rarely at the reduced speed required. Hoping to see San Jose and Saint Charles added to the greenway list as well.
I think the greenways should go even further: in addition to traffic calming and other design improvements, the most dangerous intersections should prohibit car traffic entirely. For instance, there is no need for drivers to have the option to use Versailles as a north-south route -- cars should be blocked from turning onto Versailles from Encinal. We should be more actively dissuading drivers from using these streets by taking away any cause for them to do so outside of local destinations.
I think the real problem is addressing drivers speeding constantly through neighborhood streets. I've biked through one of these slow streets and noticed most drivers dont care if its classified as a "slow street" they continue driving at speeds above 25 mph+. Would be nice if the city can remedy this by issuing more speeding tickets and more speeding deterrence measures.
I think the Slow streets if made permanent will have the effect of pushing traffic onto neighboring streets to their detriment. I think Slow streets should be a moveable feast in that each neighborhood should be the recipient of this advantageous element. Schedule each area for 6 months or a year and make this plan truly equitable.
I think the street selection seemed thoughtful and data-driven. I'm very happy that Alameda is the type of city that embraced this innovative approach to meet resident need during a difficult period, and then decided to integrate it for the longterm. Being a resident near one of these slow streets, I'd encourage the city to consider really robust infrastructure to reinforce the status of the street. When walking or cycling with young children on the street, I've noticed motorists who clearly aren't residents on the block itself accelerating dangerously down the street. With temporary barriers, I believe some neighbors who prefer driving on the street moving them when possible. I hope the city can commit to these valuable new assets to the community and implement them in a way that actually improves safety and improves the quality of life in our community.
I think this is a good solution, but Santa Clara should be included.
I think this is great and should go further. Neighborhood Greenways should provide dedicated space for bicycles in favor of traffic and parking lanes. Consider providing "1.5" lanes of car travel space so that local traffic must go slow and take turns if/when passing (which should not occur often on a low volume street) giving favor to dedicated and protected bicycle/scooter space. Once the "Street Closed" signs are removed, Google Maps and other apps will start routing lots of drivers through these connectors again, and they don't care to read signs or be polite - a barrier is the true way to reduce this stress for cyclists and children.
I think this is the right approach. The Slow Streets program has been such a huge benefit to the affected neighborhoods.
I think this is the wrong approach. Stupid and unnecessary are the words that come to mind. You are sacrificing and inconveniencing drivers for something that isn’t necessary. There are never people out on the streets you are making slow neighborhoods. What is the point?
I think this sounds good.
I walk the slow streets but never on the street itself, on the sidewalks. I don't see a need for them. There are already traffic calming, called stop signs on them.
I worry removing the barricades completely will just mean increased traffic - especially for streets that feed to stop sign crossings that are easier for cars such as Versailles and Encinal. Curious if there’s a way to keep a small remnant of the sign but permanently (eg 1-2 concrete poles similar to what’s done in Berkeley but smaller scale… so cars can still easily drive around but it slightly slows them)

13. Do you think this is the right approach for Slow Streets? If not, what adjustments should be made?
I would encourage a very liberal use of speed humps. The ones that currently exist on Bayview Dr. make a huge difference in terms of safety and keeping cars from speeding.
I would have preferred to keep Slow Streets
I would like Santa Clara returned as a car friendly street.
I would like to see more impediments to automotive traffic using these streets - if not the barricade, then other structures that really inconvenience drivers from using these streets.
I would prefer cars not be allowed on slow streets (unless they are people who live on that street).
I would prefer to keep the slow streets as they are, with barricades.
I would rather see streets that prohibit cars entirely, but I don't see the community liking that so I think this is a good compromise.
Ideally I would choose streets with more park-like settings (think Encinal between Fernside and High, Chochenyo park area, Gibbons) and streets that border existing parks like Krusi. I realize though, that the streets that were chosen are more ideal for transportation and connection, vs walking/biking for pleasure and exercise.
If you remove Santa Clara west of Webster as slow streets, it won't be as safe for cyclists. That road is used by kids going to Encinal High and other west end schools. There won't be any slow streets on the West End. What's the rationale for removing this slow street?
I'm concerned that removing the barriers will increase the flow of traffic. A lot of the Greenway changes are about making it more bicycle friendly and less about discouraging cars, other than the speed humps. I don't know the solution but I think some kind of additional discouragement similar to the barriers would be good.
I'm concerned that Slow Streets creates a false sense of safety for bicyclists. We currently use San Jose as a slow street, but quite often cars will swerve around the barricades, speeding down the street, completely ignoring that it is a designated slow street. Hoping that greenway improvements will help with this.
In general, I'm a big fan of this concept. If these are done well, they can balance practicality with an appealing place to ride, making it more likely that people use bikes and walking to get around Alameda. This isn't guaranteed, however. From experiences in other cities, e.g. the bicycle boulevards in Berkeley, these efforts can be next-to useless if not done thoughtfully, but can be quite effective when the city engineers them carefully to actively divert traffic elsewhere. Careful planning needs to be done at cross streets, and the design of the streets itself should discourage speeders. Under the current "slow streets" people regularly ignore barricades, speed, and even brag about it on a certain local social media platform like it's a badge of honor. Traffic calming designs can deal with this. Overall, I love this approach, and think it should be a high priority, but it needs to be engineered somewhat aggressively — some signs and a coat of paint will not achieve the goal of safety for all. One problem point that will need careful attention is the complex intersection of Versailles, Central and Gibbons. I don't have a brilliant solution, but that's a frequent place of near-misses, high speeds (on Central) and challenging visibility.
In my experience, the slow street on Santa Clara has become considerably less safe in 2022, with drivers moving around the barriers in unexpected ways and backing out of driveways as though the street is always empty. transition to bicycle boulevards for the other streets is reasonable approach
It depends on how this will look when complete. Will this be too colorful or change the look of neighborhoods. We can modernize Alameda without such imposition.

13. Do you think this is the right approach for Slow Streets? If not, what adjustments should be made?
It is, but it doesn't go far enough. *All* streets parallel to the current slow streets that aren't major thoroughfares should have the same traffic calming put in place. I live on San Jose and welcome the proposed traffic calming but drivers are just going to tear down Clinton instead.
It's ok. I wish there were more dead ends to prevent cars zooming through.
it's ok but I would consider more aggressive methods to get cars off these roads like Berkeley dead end street
It's OK. I'd like to see the analysis of Pearl St. vs. Versailles Ave before stating a firm opinion.
Jury is still out. I am seeing more people ignore that and drive block to block on the safe streets. It is a good idea. Santa Clara is one of the best cross town paths but now with the one along the estuary opening up and the one along the shoreline (if you swept it more often) then Santa Clara can be a secondary.
Keep Santa Clara and Orion as slow streets. Block intersections on slow streets, similar to Berkeley's Bicycle Boulevards.
Looks good.
Looks great! Definitely should discourage cars on Slow Streets. Would like to see more Slow Streets on the West End of Alameda as well
Loooks good. the sooner the better for closing Pacific to traffic.
Love the Slow Streets Program. Should probably post a maximum speed so there is a way to enforce SLOW Streets.
Love this plan. If any adjustments could be made, it would be to add steel bollards or cement planters to prevent car crossings in some high risk intersections, or to adjust the flow of traffic to 1-way along some of the greenway street segments.
Love this, wish we could more (esp for Santa Clara as it's a school route))
Mini roundabouts should be added to intersections.
Missing access to schools
More more more slow streets. More permanent bicycle/pedestrian safety measures.
More STOP SIGNS. Painted crosswalks and flashers are helpful, but stop signs need to be seriously considered at all intersections with neighborhood greenways. Cyclists and pedestrians should not feel like they are in a game of chicken while crossing an unprotected intersection.
No
NO - it is not right. Slow Streets and Greenways and traffic calming methods are an imposition and major burden on the owners and residents of the affected streets. My private property is adversely affected when the City has invited and encouraged people not from my street to bring their dogs to do their business, leave their litter, make noise, pick my flowers, and impose themselves on me. Why can't people walk along the shore or go to a park or walk on their own street?
No i do not. Traffic calming should be spread out on many of the other streets in Alameda. These streets are very low as frequently traveled streets and don't need the traffic calming as much as several other streets in town.
No- it feels inequitable and prioritizes the needs of only certain residents.
No opinion. It's fine as is or would be fine removing entirely.
No slow streets.
No slow streets.

13. Do you think this is the right approach for Slow Streets? If not, what adjustments should be made?
No We need to be able to drive on the streets that were created for cars. Instead the city is making them off limit or converting them to bike lanes. At the same time the city is adding more and more residents.
No, I do not. I believe the correct course of action is the aforementioned temp closures of commute thoroughfares on weekends.
No, I don’t think anyone will actually use them as slow streets and traffic will continue as usual
No, I prefer to keep the barricades, but also add bike Blvd lettering.
No, the slow street concept is misguided at best. All it does is push traffic onto other streets. City staff should actually go out and look at the amount of use they get. The one on Versailles has very little bicycle and pedestrian traffic. We have sidewalks for pedestrians.
No, this should not be implemented anywhere especially on a narrow street like Versailles that passes through a business district and is not an actual thoroughfare. In addition, proposing expensive infrastructure devices such as traffic circles that will require time consuming maintenance does not make sense since you are proposing that property owners be responsible for city owned property such as sidewalks.
No. Get rid of them. Seemed like a nice idea when we were all stuck inside at the beginning of the pandemic, but now they're pointless. Drivers basically ignore the barriers now. You still have to drive the length of the island, so doesn't that mean the traffic moves to Clinton or San Antonio if San Jose isn't available? In two years, I have not seen any uptick in walking or biking on those streets. Folks will walk on the sidewalk (which is why we have them!) or the occasional biker will stay to the side.
NO. I am thankful that Santa Clara Avenue will be returned to a regular street. Those of us who live on it, DIDN'T ASK FOR IT, we never wanted it, and it has been a real pain in the butt.
No. I think Santa Clara is currently the best east/west corridor on the island and keeping parts of it a slow street/greenway would utilize existing bike lanes and infrastructure more efficiently.
No. I think you are privileging younger, more physically able people over seniors and those with disabilities. People who need cars are not evil
No. I would like to keep the barricades but make them less restrictive for pedestrians and cyclists by using spaced out bollards (I believe Jean Sweeney Park has them). If the roads are easier for motorists to ride, they can and will ride them more often and abuse the speed limits. While opening them up as greenways with speed bumps seems like a good compromise, it makes the road harder for bikes to travel easily on them too and creates dangerous conditions (easy to fall from bike if you hit a speed bump the wrong way)
No. Orion and Santa Clara should not be removed as Slow Streets, and barring that, SHOULD be converted to Neighborhood Greenways.
No. Please remove the slow street designation for Versailles. It is a major thoroughfare. Put the bikes on the less used adjacent streets. There are near misses everyday on Versailles. Very very dangerous.
No. Slow Streets is a bad move. Another approach needs to be found instead of disabling already existing streets to vehicular traffic.
No. Slow streets should be removed. Of course folks on these streets want to keep them, since traffic is greatly reduced. However, this puts huge stress on the adjacent streets.
not at all
Not necessary
Not sure
Not sure, but open to try
ok

13. Do you think this is the right approach for Slow Streets? If not, what adjustments should be made?
Once the signs come down, cars will start to use those streets again (not that they aren't doing so now, but more people will take advantage of another driving street being open). Whatever the plan is to calm traffic, I hope it works better than the signs are now, especially if you're encouraging more bikers to use them.
Oppose ALL streets from being converted to "Neighborhood Greenways." Streets are supposed to be just that: streets.
Paint and signage don't go far enough. Infrastructure needs to be added in order to see a safer street.
Partially. I think adding dedicated bike lanes/paths to the Greenways is better though.
Permanent bike lanes should replace slow streets
Please add speed humps!!
Please don’t get rid of grid system by blocking streets and forcing traffic on to parallel streets causing new issues.
Please emphasize actual infrastructure changes to reduce speeds as opposed to things like paint and signs. Drivers need to feel uncomfortable to drive slower and paint won't accomplish this. The speed that you are allowed to travel through the toll gates on the Bay Bridge is 25 mph and that is a very uncomfortable experience; to make 20 mph a reality it needs to be a similar feeling of discomfort (aka tighter feeling streets). I support wider sidewalks, medians in the road, and any other measures that would make drivers feel less comfortable while traveling in these pedestrian/biker focused spaces. Drivers drive more safely when they are uncomfortable or unsure!
Please keep Santa Clara - it's super important for commuting via bike to the ferry
Please make it impossible to drive from one end of San Jose to the other - put in permanent barriers like in Berkeley
Please take San Jose off of the Slow Streets/Low Stress Network. It has two schools on that street, neither of which are considered neighborhood schools, which makes it difficult for parents to get their kids to school. It is a major street to get from one end of the island to Grand St. It also has a lot of single family, multi-family, and apartments on that street, so not the best street to try to stop congestion on because of the many cars and delivery vans that need to access that street.
Prefer current slow street setup
Reduce traffic jams by adding a new bridge or expanding the tube. I don’t care for slow streets, I care about the traffic all this new development is creating.
Remove all slow streets
Remove slow streets, alameda doesn't have enough throughput for traffic as it is. Entitled bicycle riders who think they own slow streets and do not yield to traffic, veer into the middle of the street when cars approach fosters an unsafe environment which could possibly lead to more bicycle rider injuries.
Remove them altogether. It is certainly desirable for those who live on those streets, but it simply pushes traffic onto surrounding streets. Where are they to go, otherwise? It doesn't remove traffic anywhere - it just shifts it and makes other streets more dangerous & crowded.
Right approach
Right approach. Central Ave is the back bone.
Santa Clara seems like a vital street for kids biking to Encinal. Why not turn SC into a Greenway? At least on the West End.
Seems reasonable, though I hope that you can ensure that traffic calming actually occurs. I'd love for my kids to be able to use the greenways independently. Regular use of bike-friendly speed cushions would be really nice. Cars should be truly considered lower priority than pedestrians and walkers.
Seems very bike-centric. How will pedestrian safety be ensured?

13. Do you think this is the right approach for Slow Streets? If not, what adjustments should be made?
sharrows do not appear to work w/ motorists frequently speeding past or worst swerve and use their cars to physically threaten to run bicycles off the road. Ideally one side of the sidewalks can be widened with a separated & painted outer lane for bicycles.
Slow street barricades were and are really effective- the Pacific slow street has really improved my life as an Alameda resident and cyclist for the past few years. I hope whatever transition is planned still preserves the qualities of these streets
Slow streets are great for the folk that live on them but terrible for the folk on the next street over
Slow streets are important to encourage people who are averse or afraid to riding their bikes. Education on bike safety starting in schools will ensure a generation who will adopt bike riding as a life style.
Slow Streets are under-utilized currently and should be removed. This was originally started during the pandemic and I don't believe it has caught on. This seems like a very low priority to me. I do understand the concept of the Neighborhood Greenways but don't think it is necessary.
Slow streets aren’t effective. The traffic calming is also bad for emergency vehicles
Slow streets may not be necessarily being used as "slow". Versailles is not a slow street it's a speed street.
Slow streets need to be eliminated. The initial reasoning behind the creation of slow streets is sound and I supported their initial creation. However, now they simply remain a reminder of an awful period of isolation. Plus, cars don't obey the closures anyway. Turning some of the existing slow streets into bicycle boulevards is a good option. Otherwise, we should simply return the slow streets to their pre-covid status and focus on the creation of safe and protected bike lanes throughout the island. These streets all have sidewalks, so there really is no need for "slow streets".
Slow streets were great in 2019 and 2020 but should be opened now
Slow streets work great when the calming measures are respected. However, I regularly rode with my 6th children to school and witnessed many commuter cars zooming along Santa Clara av. bet. 3rd st. & Webster st. I informed the police but there were no changes. Suggest that slow streets be monitored and transgressions trigger an automatic, pre-planned escalation in calming measures.
So you're allowing some people to have their house values increase by making their streets into slow streets. Not very equitable.
Some of the projects and areas are suffering from increasing crime, security issues and unhoused population increases. The project impact can be at risk unless addressed
Sounds great
Sounds great.
sounds like a good plan
The more slow streets the better but this plan makes sense.
The only way to ensure this method will work will be to install the needed infrastructure - barriers, bollards, and roundabouts will be beneficial. Drivers do not adhere to speed limits or stop signs and APD has abandoned traffic enforcement so building the infrastructure is the only way.
The Slow Street program is great, but it should be deployed in more areas of Alameda, not just the Gold Coast.
The Slow Streets program should be dumped. The barricades make it look like a construction zone, and it is not fair to all the other streets in the city whose residents don't get this protection. Make every street slow by enforcing the speed limit, which is now so widely ignored as to be no-existent.
There are enough bike paths without Slow Streets. They should be eliminated.

13. Do you think this is the right approach for Slow Streets? If not, what adjustments should be made?
There is little to no representation for the West End in this Slow Streets future. I understand that the current West End slow street will be converted to Greenways, but why have this transition if slow streets are seen to be safer? Would rather see the Slow Streets on the West End be made permanent.
There's no way to remain safe from Alameda drivers without separating cars. Who knows if this will help make things safer or just encourage people to speed more down my street so they can take a "shortcut" down one of the greenways. Traffic shaping will need to be aggressive, with smaller traffic circles for smaller streets like oak, walnut, willow, eagle.
These should be made slower, not faster. Seems great that we will have more streets, but am very worried that people will not understand what these new words mean, esp if from out of town, and will treat them just like any other road and people will get hurt or die because of it. The giant orange signs are ugly. But there are prettier ways to do it that can achieve the same purpose. In general just seems like need to look at what Dutch cities do more.
these things don't work
This is a good idea, but are limited in distance of the actual streets being designated.
This is an acceptable start.
This is the worst aspect of a very poor plan. The city needs to focus on making a few transit arteries work well for vehicles and a few for bikes/pedestrians. This approach of changing everything will slow traffic leading to vastly higher green house gas emissions and stressed drivers which will increase auto accidents,
This seems like a reasonable approach.
To be a proper greenway on Pacific we need to have stop signs for every street that crosses.
Too focused on bikes when bike licensing policies should be in place
Versailles is the continuation of main traffic way from High Street bridge down Gibbons. Move the slow street to Pearl or Mound. Also: Why is San Jose not labeled on any of the maps?
Versailles should not be a Neighborhood Greenway ... as per earlier Alameda Transportation Commission vote. Your goal to reduce greenhouse gasses increases when you force vehicles going to/from Encinal businesses must use street diversions into other neighborhoods.
We can't leave the base out of slow street programs
We need a slow street connecting san jose and pacific
We need more slow streets, not less. I'd vote to make Lincoln a slow street from Main St. to High St. Alameda PD are not doing their job to enforce traffic laws, so we need to build infrastructure that slows cars down to the speeds the city claims it wants.
We need slow streets in Alameda Point. Trident Avenue and parts of west Atlantic would be great.
We use Pacific as a biking street all the time, and it's great because it's a slow street, but it was fine before also. I don't think these changes are needed.
What do you mean by Slow Streets? The streets with bike rides are prioritized? Yes, it looks good.
Why pay taxes to closedown streets? Open them up.
would like to see even more slow streets
Yes
Yes
Yes

13. Do you think this is the right approach for Slow Streets? If not, what adjustments should be made?
Yes
Yes
Yes
yes
yes
yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
yes - I don't like "Slow Streets"
Yes - love it! I vote for as many mini-circles and speed humps as possible. Cars still speed on slow streets even though they are marked, so these would help.
Yes for slow streets but concerning how many cars still speed through them.
Yes it is the right approach
Yes prioritize these streets for pedestrians and bicycles. Add additional road blocks or raised speed bumps to discourage car traffic.
Yes with special importance on the major intersection streets.
Yes!
Yes! Can't wait for San Jose between Oak St to Fernside.
YES! Please keep Pacific a slow street.
Yes, although I would like to see more of these speed bumps and slowing tools on streets that are not greenways, such as this slow street segment of Santa Clara.
Yes, and excited for signage, lights, and raised crossings to better increase visibility and awareness from cyclists, pedestrians, AND motorists all around. I even wonder if some of the calmed intersections and streets can make the stop signs redundant to help traffic move smoothly.
Yes, as long as Santa Clara remains a slow street until the Central project is completed. It is currently the only "safe" way to bike to Encinal High Scool and Encinal boat ramp.
Yes, but the transition of Santa Clara to a class III bikeway only makes sense after the protected bike lanes are available on Central.
Yes, cars need to be slowed down so that pedestrian and bicyclists will fee safe.
Yes, current slow streets suffer from one key problem. a certian percentage of drivers just ignore the "slow down" signs and just drive as normal. Please improve the clarity of expectations and please ticket them.
Yes, greenways are ideal for slow streets! I would love more greenways. We love walking and biking the current slow streets and improving the traffic calming and clearly identifying them will do a lot to keep them slow and safe.

13. Do you think this is the right approach for Slow Streets? If not, what adjustments should be made?
Yes, I strongly support making all of San Jose a Neighborhood Greenway / Bike Boulevard. Also, slow streets still have cars go through them, but making more systematic changes will enforce these streets to become slower due to infrastructure changes.
Yes, I think the need for the existing slow streets has passed. This slow street idea seems to work but I would defer to residents who live on those streets. Has there been a count of traffic (vehicle, pedestrian, bike, other) changes on existing slow streets over the past 6 months as all COVID restrictions were removed?
Yes, I think this evolution to neighborhood greenways / bike boulevards is a fantastic idea! And the streets chosen for it are great choices. My one concern is that Pacific in particular would absutely need to be repaved—its surface is terrible.
Yes, looks great
Yes, please move forward with this plan
Yes, right approach
Yes, slow streets has become ineffective at providing a safe avenue for biking/walking. Cars routinely exceed the speed limit and transverse multiple blocks. I do not feel safe on Pacific.
Yes, slow streets work and there should be as many as possible.
Yes, sounds good!
Yes, sounds good.
Yes, this is the right approach.
Yes, this is the right approach.
Yes, this is the right approach. Thank you for keeping them until neighborhood greenways are in place. Please make sure they are designed well, so that young kids can use these streets safely and independently -- these will be key to our safe network. There should be minimum design requirements (like speed cushions midblock) that are implemented routinely, by default, and regular data collection and monitoring to ensure design goals are met. Goals and metrics should be around *peak* hour traffic and maximum speeds so people feel comfortable in their worst state, not only the average. Also, would like to make it clear that on these streets, cars are a lower priority cyclists and pedestrians. Slow streets have been great for group walks, people recovering from injuries, dog walkers, etc. It should be made clear that neighborhood greenways welcome those activities, too. I support keeping Santa Clara and Orion as neighborhood greenways at least until lower stress facilities are in place on those streets or nearby, and I support Versailles and Gibbons as well.
Yes, this is the right approach. Those shitty barricades have outlived their usefulness. Particularly on Versailles where everybody ignores them. Also please fix the Gibbons intersection to prevent drivers who routinely go 75 mph onto Gibbons from Central.
Yes, this seems great. Directing people with calming measures (like forced right turns) will be better than current slow streets where people still use the streets as cut throughs and force small children on bikes off the road.
Yes.
Yes.
yes. dedicated corridors for safe travel to bridge the gaps between larger arteries is essential. especially through dense neighborhoods.

13. Do you think this is the right approach for Slow Streets? If not, what adjustments should be made?
Yes. Makes lots of sense...and ensure we engage the neighborhoods involved with workshops, discussion, alternatives, etc.
Yes. Red to prioritize low speeds and low vehicle volumes.
Yes. Remove the barriers, and speed humps will preserve the same effect.
Yes. Currently, I see cars using the barricaded streets as their personal express lane. Today I saw a city of Alameda pickup truck speed all the way down San Jose Ave, driving around the barricades at each intersection. People have learned that police do not enforce these streets.
Yes. Please use modal filters to block cars from key intersections and prevent through car traffic.
Yes. Thank you for keeping them until neighborhood greenways are in place. Please make sure they are designed well, so that young kids can use these streets safely and independently -- these will be key to our safe network. There should be minimum design requirements (like speed cushions mid-block) that are implemented routinely, by default, and regular data collection and monitoring to ensure design goals are met. Goals and metrics should be around *peak* hour traffic and maximum speeds so people feel comfortable in their worst state, not only the average. Also, would like to make it clear that on these streets, cars are a lower priority than not just bikers, but walkers. Slow streets have been great for group walks, people recovering from injuries, dog walkers, etc. It should be made clear that neighborhood greenways welcome those activities, too. I support Versailles as a neighborhood greenway – your rationale makes sense.
Yes. The slow streets are great but the car barriers are confusing and unsightly. By now local drivers have become habituated to taking other routes, so the transition to bike routes should be smoother.
Yes. This is a great approach. As I noted earlier, slow streets are a great idea, with a challenged implementation.
Yup!

14. Please share any feedback you have about the overall plan or about chapters 1-3 (Introduction, Vision & Goals, Existing Conditions).
A lot of it looks good. Please take the drivers in town into consideration. We live here, too. We want live at peace, live in fear of hitting someone on a bike not paying attention, and care about our city too. Narrow streets cause accidents.....
Add more specific goal that are measurable.
After many discussions with the City, there still has not been any progress to implement a road diet along Otis Dr between High St and Broadway. The City needs to mandate that Caltrans implement the changes to reduce traffic in the neighborhood corridor.
Again, I would like to see the plan address a way/method where concerned citizens can communicate more quickly and effectively with those who have the authority to implement street design improvements. Also in chapter 3 about the existing conditions, I see no mention of rampant speeding and drag racing in the Alameda Point area, where the old navy tarmacs are often used by race car enthusiasts and create extremely unsafe situations for residents living there. I would like to see the plan acknowledge that wide, open plain areas of asphalt road there has created an invitation for these folks to come into the island and race off in residential neighborhoods, and that there definitive road design treatments that can be implemented to deter them.
Again, it's hard to take any of this seriously without the support of city council. After the recent scrapping of the plans for a low-stress Grand Street backbone, I have little confidence that a low stress network is possible in this environment of political cowardice.
Again, please prioritize improvements in areas with high population density and that have been historically underserved. I again point to census tract 4267 (Atlantic/RAMP to pacific from Webster to main). This tract has a population density of 21k per sqmi, the highest in the city and almost 3x higher than the city average. It have been overlooked for generations on this island due to largely unsavory historic inequity. Please consider prioritizing improvements in this and other similar areas that have high existing population density and have been historically underserved.
Alameda has a unique opportunity to set a standard for a city that is motorist-, cyclist-, AND pedestrian-friendly. With how many new homes are being built, I'm excited to see how the city will empower its residents' choices of mode of travel away from the car.
Alameda is just getting worse and worse. And you guys are one of the reasons it's going down the drain.
Alameda Point needs major infrastructure upgrades to make it safe to both walk and ride a bicycle. The planning for those upgrades are far into the future. There should be some short-term solutions - bus shelters & benches, crosswalks painted, lighting installed, road markings, painted bike lanes.
Alameda point needs serious safety measures put in place dealing with side shows. This should be the number 1 priority in all of Alameda.
All fantastic, really impressed.
All looks great! Fantastic to see and looking forward to all of this. FROM OPEN HOUSE
Already gave my feedback in other text fields. Excited to see this happen!
Although this is a noble idea, please pay close attention to the increased population due to the increased housing being built. Please do not grind the traffic to a halt. Try to create a good flow for BOTH cars and bikes. Please realize NOT EVERYONE CAN RIDE A BIKE. Think about adding better public transportation! Streetcar system would be so charming
Am strongly opposed to Slow Street, greenway, traffic calming. Let the Slow Streets expire.

14. Please share any feedback you have about the overall plan or about chapters 1-3 (Introduction, Vision & Goals, Existing Conditions).
As both a pedestrian and a driver I love the flashing crosswalks like the one near Lincoln School. They enable peds and bikes to cross safely but don't require cars to stop any longer than necessary. Shared use paths are not low-stress. They are always too narrow. It's fine when there is only one bike and one pedestrian at a given point, but trying to pass a ped (especially someone walking a dog or two people walking together) while cycling when there is someone riding or walking in the opposite direction isn't safe. Please don't add any more shared use paths, and widen the existing ones. That would make things both safer and more stress-free. Regarding the Street Types Map, you don't show any neighborhood connector streets in the area between Broadway and High , Santa Clara and Fernside. In fact both Gibbons and Versailles (before it was turned into a Slow Street) serve this purpose and I'm not sure why you are hiding that fact. I am disappointed that there aren't more projects related to getting people to use public transit or walk. The vast majority of this plan seems to be about trying to get people to bicycle on errands, which isn't going to happen with the expense, bike thefts, difficulty in carrying purchases without still more expensive equipment, and the impossibility of making pleasant routes in the existing business districts. It's great to create bike paths in areas of new development, where there is space to make them pleasant. I wish the city would just focus on that. I tried the new path on Clement, and found it very unpleasant. I think it's because all that additional asphalt absorbs heat, and there are no trees for shade. Landscaping that doesn't involve trees isn't providing much benefit. Keeping smelly piles of trash and dumpsters away from sidewalks would make walking in the downtown area much more pleasant. You probably can't use the grant money for things like making walking and cycling routes more pleasant, but that is one thing that would increase my own likelihood of walking or biking instead of driving.
Awesome!
Biased pmanning.
Building plans don’t adress the transport problems. Your Grand and Otis and antiquated tunnel is an example of that. Stop building !
Do not build walkway into Bay 37 community.
Effective communication of basic elements.
Eliminate noisy leaf blowers.
Eliminate the slow streets.
Enforce the speed limit along Otis Drive, especially between Park Street and High Street. Stop the speeders! Increase the Alameda Police Force. Bring back the 5 motorcycle officers/motorcycles. Issue speeding tickets! Reduce all of Otis Drive to one lane in each direction for vehicle travel.
excited to see it coming to fruition!
Fantastic. Thank you!
Finish clement st bikeway and we need a better way to cross the bridge to bay farm island as the area is a mess coming from the water.

14. Please share any feedback you have about the overall plan or about chapters 1-3 (Introduction, Vision & Goals, Existing Conditions).
For active transportation, the plan is fabulous. For walking/biking for pleasure and exercise, a few elements could be added to make it more attractive/interesting.
FROM OPEN HOUSE
FROM OPEN HOUSE
Getting people out of their cars on trips of less than 2 miles will help with congestion, environment and health. It is an investment in the future
Goals and performance metrics should be fleshed out more. Each performance metric should include target numbers and dates. Mode shift goal in particular should be clearly defined. Like the data focus in general, and should be reflected here. Also, there was a paragraph about staffing constraints and how projects might suffer. I think instead we should plan to invest to make sure projects get done. Thank you for this great work!!
Great to see expansion and prioritization of pedestrians and cyclists over cars! We should leverage the beauty and size of the island for people and not create more car highways and parkings lots. It creats so much more value to think about homeowners looking onto a green street filled with people and bicycles instead of looking at a two rows of rusting and empty cars.
Great work!
Grrrrrr.
I am quite confident that the city of alameda has no clue nor common sense, regarding what they have done to the streets. While the cross city trail seems to be a good idea, no doubt in my mind it will get screwed up sooner or later. Look at what has happened to our streets. It is extremely difficult to get around anymore, in Alameda, with all of the main thoroughfares having been SQUEEZED from four lanes down to two. Completely idiotic. We have more vehicles and yet, the stupid city reduces the streets down to two lanes. I mean, how stupid is that?
I am appreciative that so many people are working to make it safer to bike and walk around Alameda.
I am completely against the pedestrian bridge. We need more isolated bike paths.
I am excited about the improvements for active transit. My family of 5 walks and bikes, and this looks like a safer and more enjoyable Alameda that will help reduce car emissions in favor of active transit. Thanks for helping the climate and safety.
I am excited for the future of Alameda! I wanted to share that the figure on p. 14 "How do Alameda residents get around?" doesn't add up to 100%, so this should probably be looked at. I would also like to see even more crossing lights for pedestrians and encouragement for pedestrians to use them every time they cross. :) I'm a recent convert into cycling around Alameda and I hope this plan encourages more people who are curious to take that leap as well.
I am excited to be part of a City with a vibrant action plan like that! Can't wait for my Son to grow in this safe environment.

14. Please share any feedback you have about the overall plan or about chapters 1-3 (Introduction, Vision & Goals, Existing Conditions).
I am proud to live in a city that is prioritizing walkability and biking over car-based transportation. I would love to see more safe ways to get off the island on a bike or by foot. Whether it's the water shuttle or a pedestrian/bike bridge, building a connection to Jack London Square will be transformational for Alameda and I would love to see it happen.
I am so excited that Alameda has such vision! It makes me want to fast forward 5 years.
I am so grateful to the City of Alameda for all of the work on the transportation plan. As a bicyclist and pedestrian I love being able to travel around the island without using a car, but I don't always feel safe (especially biking) because of speeding or careless drivers. This plan will provide more safety in multiple ways. Thank you!!
I am very happy with the philosophy and approach you are using in developing and implementing this vision, and with your priorities. Great job!!
I appreciate the charm Alameda has to offer in not only appearance, but in how it feels. You have been building ALL OVER THE PLACE on the West End creating a lot more traffic (car) and we are constantly narrowing streets for bikes. Give them a street or to bike on with cars in the 2 directions and call it a day. Like I stated earlier, bikers don’t follow the rules of the road anyway.
I appreciate the effort to make it safe for cyclists but am concerned that it is at the expense of the older and disabled
I believe we are on track. Need to budget for large ticket items.
I commend these goals. As a 24 year resident of mainland Alameda and 44 year resident of Bay Farm island, I believe the 2 main actions that can make bikers and walker safer, are reduced speed limits with constant enforcement and additional pedestrian rapid flashing signs.
I don’t like the bridge from seaview to shoreline. Focus on maintaining existing infrastructure and building up on it before starting something new.
I don't agree with this plan and I don't believe that the city is taking into consideration the overall island population especially property owners who are heavily financially invested. There is too much consideration to outside influences.
I frankly think that bicycling has been overprioritized and would rather focus on pedestrian safety and enforcement of current speed limits and stop Signs.
I keep hearing about all these wonderful things but then everything is Vision 2030. There are projects, like the Clement extension at Grand that desperately need to be completely. It’s a serious hazard for my kids to get to school.
I like the direction approach Alameda is going. Nice job staff!
I live on Broadway near Clement (this why I'm asking so much about this proposal) and I truly think that this proposed extension will support biking and walking in Alameda. I would love to see more accessible walking/biking paths in this area of the island!!
I love it
I love it. We need to drive cars less and this plan is a great step to making biking and walking less stressful and dangerous in Alameda. While not everyone can walk and ride the more of us who do benefits everyone with less pollution, less traffic and congestion, less of a need for parking, and overall a better city experience
I love that you are planning a bike path to Oakland near the tunnel, I love that alameda goes green and encourages feet and bikes!!!
I LOVE the emphasis on bike safety. This should be a top priority for city administrators.

14. Please share any feedback you have about the overall plan or about chapters 1-3 (Introduction, Vision & Goals, Existing Conditions).
I really appreciate all of the work and thought that went into this plan, and overall am very pleased with the direction this is taking. One piece of feedback: not everyone will be as positive about this as I am. People will, of course, object to certain projects on a street-by-street basis — that's unavoidable. But there are also people who are not bought into the overall goals of the work, notably people that only use cars and are already unhappy with the state of traffic on the island. From a messaging standpoint, I think it's important to underscore how these projects will benefit everyone by increasing safety for everyone who uses our streets while not meaningfully impacting travel times. In some cases, as with roundabouts, it may even decrease travel times and rush hour backups. The point is to dispel the myth that these improvements just benefit a small number of dedicated cyclists, which is a common narrative. You will also likely hear "Why are we doing these new projects when sidewalk X has needed repairing for over 5 years?" And, frankly, this isn't a bad point. If we get a new protected bike lane on Clement, but the bike path on Island Drive remains hazardously bad, this sends a message, intentional or not. It would be helpful for people to be able to see a rough schedule of upcoming work so that they know they haven't been completely forgotten in favor of new, shiny projects. Thank you all for your work on this plan. It's much appreciated, and I have greatly enjoyed seeing the progress in Alameda over the recent years.
I see a big push towards the almost criminalization of using an automobile. As I mentioned, as a disabled woman with a disabled child, using a bike or walking to commute, go grocery shopping or even traverse the island is not possible. I should not be penalized or shamed for this. I see nothing within this plan addressing the needs of the disabled. Where are the extra parking spaces for handicapped parking? What happens when you remove parking spaces and there is even more competition for the remaining parking spaces? In fact, portions of this mission statement and plan could be viewed as discriminatory against the disabled.
I see that the plan does not address public transportation. Given that the extremely limited shuttle has been discontinued, there really aren't any decent "island-centric" options. I would probably drive half as much if we had a decent and regular island shuttle. Something like West Virginia U's PRT would be amazing.
I think it all looks good. I would say the design of each of those maps was so complicated, so many lines, dotted and otherwise on one map is confusing and hard to parse out what looks good. I had to magnify, then memorize what was on the tables.
I think it is great that Alameda is proactive about sustainable modes of transit and want to encourage more drastic approaches (physically reducing vehicular speed). We have a great opportunity to be a leading bay area city when it comes to safe transit and i hope that this work is not undone by NIMBYs and people living on bay farm island. It is also good that we recognize the urgent need for a west alameda-oakland connection.
I think it stinks. Where was the Community input. I do not recall notice of any public process. We aren’t talking about putting a couple of stop signs. You are talking about completely changing the make up of our city and I think it is shameful.

14. Please share any feedback you have about the overall plan or about chapters 1-3 (Introduction, Vision & Goals, Existing Conditions).
I think it's a good start, but there's many pieces that need to be strengthened - including access to bikes for more folks, repair stations, parking - it's very inadequate - and educating e-bike riders who are now using bike paths and bike lanes.
I think people are taking advantage of the slow streets, they have become front yards. Put speed bumps and get rid of the barriers please.
I think that, having passed Vision Zero, it would be a good idea to take a look at how, where and why accidents are happening. We have had 2+ years of Slow Streets, so you should be able to see some results from that. Traffic deaths are increasing across the region. If someone hits a cyclist because they are texting, drunk, stressed beyond endurance, then a separated bike lane is not going to solve the problem. Making decisions without knowing why people are being injured doesn't reduce injuries. Building bike lanes without taking into account who can and cannot use them creates an unfair double standard. Turning every road into a bike boulevard is overkill and is really angering more people than just me. And most of the people I have spoken with will not fill out your survey. But that does not mean they are not upset and don't feel that this is unfair.
I think the emphasis upon safe school commutes for bikers and pedestrians is fantastic. I also support connecting the length of the island via bike paths.
I think the plan looks good and I'm excited for the future. I do want to make sure that safety from drivers is considered at all times, since the good infrastructure built is often negated by poor driving.
I think the plan really gets at what we want to make Alameda feel like a very livable community. People should feel safe being out and about, walking and cycling. Driving cars is just the wrong way of being out and about. Our community should feel like a community, not a series of residences alongside automobile transportation corridors. There appears to be a lot of thought about trying to make that happen with this transportation plan.
I wholely embrace the goal for a more bike-friendly and connected Alameda. This proposed active transportation plan needs to be mapped with the housing development plan so that increased traffic forecasts are accounted for. This plan needs to also cross-over/drive a larger vehicle traffic plan; especially at school drop-off time and end-of-work-day times.
I would like to see more blocks converted into permanent pedestrian thoroughfares. Connection across the estuary would be fantastic. More traffic calming/bike routes would be great.
I would like to see more focus on accessibility for people with disabilities. There are so many sidewalks that are in accessible for people who use wheelchairs because of tree roots and disrepair. There are other spots in the city where sidewalks don't even exist. Putting more seating and dining on sidewalks in business districts makes it very difficult for people with disabilities to safely access that corridor. All way finding efforts need to include accessible versions. Accessibility needs to be a consideration in all projects. Consider working with BORP to get some accessible bikes available on the island.

14. Please share any feedback you have about the overall plan or about chapters 1-3 (Introduction, Vision & Goals, Existing Conditions).
If we have to keep street parking on Park St, it should be twice the cost of the parking lot or of parking elsewhere. It should be expensive and quick. We should pedestrian mall at least two blocks of both Park and Webster, and probably more. Make the street crossings be disabled parking. Right now Park St is very confusing for cars (why are there two lanes of parking in front of Toy Safari?) and forboding for bikes. This street could be so much nicer! Webster is just confusing to drive down: the chicanes are annoying. Constitution is next door, it can take all the car traffic.
If you want to encourage people, esp. families to use their bikes, one major issue is to get cars to slow down and adhere to the speed limit. This plan with bike lanes is wonderful, but speeding cars are still a hazard and people will not feel safe, even in a bike lane. The city should have more speed traps !!
I'm a homeowner on Central Ave in the West End. I didn't see details among the plans on the traffic circles. I think it's a good idea for this patch of the Central/Main because of the accidents I've seen. This corner of the city attracts cyclists on weekends for the recreation and commuters on weekdays. The attention to bike paths creation would alleviate the dangers here for all kinds of cyclists.
I'm excited about and appreciative of these plans!
I'm excited about it! So much work has gone into this!! Thank you, all who worked on it!!
I'm excited about this overall, but I think there are small changes that can be made today that would improve connectivity in the near term. I'll say it one more time - safely connect the lagoon paths on Bay Farm across Robert Davey Jr Dr.
I'm really excited overall, and bummed I couldn't make it to the in person events. I truly believe the best way to get cars off the road is to make people feel safe riding their bikes. Also as people are introduced to electric assist bikes, I think it will really change minds (especially for people less comfortable in their ability to ride long distances). I know that some projects will move faster than others, but there are many that I'm very excited about. Can't wait for Clement to finish up between Willow and Broadway!!
Impressively thorough and well-thought out. I'm exceedingly grateful to the city staff and residents who carefully thought through so many options. Would love for our city to have increased biking options, more greenways and fewer cars.
Improve the Grand/Otis intersection by either implementing the planned roundabout, or at least install left-only traffic signals.
In regards to the next page: Why is there no $75,000-$99,999 household income listed?! And I'm Caucasian, not White.
It all seems like a waste of time if the proposed plans are rejected or made into a half-measures.
It does not address the need for bicycle training for adults. Children receive some fifth grade safety classes but no requirements for safety classes for adults which are the majority bike riders who fail to use bells or horns on shared paths with pedestrians and who speed through intersections.
It is a start. The opposition to these improvements confuse me. People need to rethink short trips and get out of their cars. Its healthier physically and mentally
It looks good but should also includes ensuring that Otis Dr (between Park St and High St) is safer for bikers and pedestrians which is not the case at the moment
It looks good! Continue to prioritize low stress biking options so that we can safely bike around town with children!

14. Please share any feedback you have about the overall plan or about chapters 1-3 (Introduction, Vision & Goals, Existing Conditions).
It’s an irresponsible plan because it doesn’t address the 20k new people and the traffic at the access and egress points. First build a new car bridge or expand the tunnel and then add more units. As a planner the access and egress expansion is your problem to solve. Stop ignoring it and stop giving excuses.
It’s wasteful.
It's an okay start but there seems to be a lack of political will to move the plan forward quickly.
It's overwhelming and it would be better to break it up into smaller pieces. I appreciate all the work you have done on this but it's really tough to digest it all.
It's really cool that the city has a plan like this. When I moved to Alameda, this was a huge reason for moving here. The bike infrastructure has really improved, but the driver's have gotten worse. I used to fear the police when I drove and now I don't worry about speeding. The city needs to step up to slow cars, keep bikes and peds safe, to create the best version of our city.
Just don't. Please. This will forever change the island and not in a good way. We moved here because it was a nice, quiet little town. This will surely make it on par with Berkeley and Emeryville. Think of the residents and please listen to their voices. Thank you.
Let's implement it
Looking good! Proud to live somewhere that includes the voices of its actual residents. Let's see it put into action.
Looks good
looks good
Looks good and more positively and more practical on everything and that's it will do in any good!
looks good.
Looks good. Lincoln needs some work to make pedestrians and cyclists feel safe. The crosswalk at Ninth and Lincoln is currently a death trap. Also, if you are turning on to Lincoln from a side street, cars are often parked in the red curb on Lincoln and you cannot see. Even if cars are parked legally, it's still impossible to see. You need to sneak out in to the right turn lane and if a car is speeding, they will hit you. This is a legitimate fear of mine on a daily basis.
Looks great! Please do it all and do anything it takes to get people out of cars!
Looks great. Please add walnut and willow and other streets that angry drivers are using as shortcuts to next year plan. Traffic shaping desperately needed in this young kid ped neighborhood streets.
Lots of effort put forth in this and I greatly appreciate it. A bit disappointed in the Public Engagement Activities in that it seemed limited in participation for a city of 70,000+. Would also be helpful to have more demographic info on the 2019 Community Perceptions where 1,000 people were surveyed. Again, seems like a narrow sampling for a city of our size. Hopefully not intended to sway the outcome of the results of the study.
Lots to read and to figure out. Look forward to the actual numbers of people involved in bicycles. No percentages, please - they are easy to fudge the truth.
Love it. I’d encourage public messaging that says, if you don’t like traffic, you should welcome all of these ways to get people out of cars.
Love that you're putting more effort into making Alameda a more ped and bike friendly place! Greener spaces all around!
Love the slow streets Hate the proposed shoreline to seaview bridge

14. Please share any feedback you have about the overall plan or about chapters 1-3 (Introduction, Vision & Goals, Existing Conditions).
Love the thought that went into creating a comprehensive network across the island!
Many people (who are not part of the Bike Walk Alameda lobby) are strongly opposed to the Oakland-Alameda bridge. It should not be a goal or part of the vision.
more bike and walking paths, greenways, open space are all great - no pedestrian bridge to jack London square. its a huge costly inconvenience to all the neighborhoods surrounding it. also jack London square is not really a destination and the converse is even more true.
More emphasis needed now on helping motor vehicle traffic flow thru Alameda during commute times. Better efforts needed to confront pedestrians disregard for being more visible when crossing streets in dark hours.
More ferry times and more frequent bus schedules to encourage people to use public transportation and unload Alameda streets from more vehicles.
Must admit I have mixed feelings reading this. Many of the projects look great -- I hope to be able to cycle and walk along them someday! At the same time, it looks like there are a lot of hard decisions that will need to be made. How to prioritize the projects, how to fund them, how to staff them... The fact that everyone who cares about safe cycling in this city is still advocating on behalf of less than a single mile of Grand Street is frustrating. Then again, it's great to see how many people really do care about and need these improvements. The appendix with the market research survey is a useful call to action.
My biggest asks: strong safety measures for cyclists on a central-island east-west artery (at minimum, give the neighborhood greenways real teeth), and the same for north-south routes near to Park and Webster.
My biggest complaints as a cyclist are the number of cars parked on side streets blocking sight lines and the terrible conditions of our roads. I live off Buena Vista in Central Alameda and there is no traffic calming between Sherman and Grand on Buena Vista. Since Clement/Atlantic opened behind the Del Monte project, motorists have been speeding through my neighborhood with zero regard for children and pedestrians. I've nearly been run over 2x in the past week from cars trying to get around the construction traffic by speeding down side streets. Get APD out there ticketing people hard! Enforcement of speed limits is such an easy start. My neighbors and I have also asked for traffic calming at Stanton and Buena Vista for years and have been met with deaf ears to our concerns. We live here, we see the problems every day. Listen to residents who are asking for solutions to make their neighborhoods safer! I feel like our area of the island has been ignored.
MY personal feeling is that Alameda has regressed in substantially as far as mobility impaired people are concerned. If this were any other Bay Area City there would be hell to pay. I ride a bike every day BUT I also have mobility issues. There is very few Handicapped Parking spaces in Business Districts, You took away Parking spaces that could be used and gave them to gig workes and you eliminated the Alameda Shuttle. It is disgusting!!!!
N/a
N/A
Need more attention to long-term thinking and less to bandaid fixes.
Need more patrolling especially on Otis drive between Broadway and high streets to reduce speeding, yielding to pedestrians and reduce property damage to park cars.
Need Otis Drive, between Broadway and High Streets addressed. Too many large vehicles, too many vehicles speeding, unsafe for pedestrians to cross, etc.

14. Please share any feedback you have about the overall plan or about chapters 1-3 (Introduction, Vision & Goals, Existing Conditions).
Need start implementing this faster. We are in a slow death by process paralysis. It should be approved once and be done with it. Having to vote and fight over every single item will keep this plan from being implemented until 2050.
No opinion.
No slow streets.
Not enough educational content and definitions as part of the actual survey (before the questions) or enough detail in general, especially on potential negative consequences, intended or otherwise, and what will be done to anticipate and mitigate them. Also not enough information on cost/benefit. Seems like most of the focus is on biking, not enough on walking or potentially unrealistic proposal for much pedestrian use, like the bike/walk bridge to Jack London. In addition, must address directly impacts on those due to age or disabilities that are precluded from either biking or walking. Also autos will not disappear, despite the "calming and road diets", so why not include surveys/plans for other climate action like making it easy and cheap to have electric vehicle charging?
Our family is excited to see this vision come to fruition in the coming years. We have loved in Alameda for over 15 years and look forward to many more!
Overall I'm very excited by this plan to enhance pedestrian and bicycle safety across Alameda. However, the City of Alameda needs to seriously reconsider installing speed cameras, especially on neighborhood connector streets. This is the most cost-effective way to enforce 25mph limits and enhance safety for pedestrians and cyclists.
Overall it looks good.
Overall plan is great.
Overall the draft plan is well developed with thoughtful consideration for the community safety and comfort. I appreciate the team providing community many opportunities to provide input and look forward to seeing many of the inputs being put into revised plan.
Overall very good work. Thank you to the preparers and contributors.
Overall, I am excited by the plan and the vision for the low stress backbone and greenways. I ride from end to end of the island on a regular basis to commute to the ferry and for recreation. I'd love to feel like it is safe enough to bring my young kids on their bikes, too. It would also be fantastic to have a bike/ped bridge into Oakland near the tube. I live, bike, and walk on Santa Clara Ave, east of Broadway. This is identified as a high injury corridor and cars speed east of Gibbons toward Lincoln Park often. I want traffic calming/slowing somewhere if possible, but it didn't seem like that was planned. The Santa Clara/High Street intersection is also super scary when my kids are with me on bikes. We have almost been hit multiple times crossing the street with the signal because turning drivers aren't paying attention. Improving safety at that intersection would be helpful. This is such a busy, kid-filled area with the schools and park nearby. Thank you!
Overall, I think the design and approach is thoughtful and well done. As a West End citizen, I encourage you to consider that in the past couple years vehicles have become more reckless and treat the West End as a racetrack. I see speed bumps have been deployed in more well-represented ($$$) areas of the city. We sorely need these in our school zones (AoA, NEA, Love). Thank you for your work to make biking and walking safer for all!

14. Please share any feedback you have about the overall plan or about chapters 1-3 (Introduction, Vision & Goals, Existing Conditions).
Overall, I'm super excited by what the City has in mind! In addition to Alameda, I've spent a lot of time cycling around Portland, and the density of cycling infrastructure outlined in the Active Transportation Plan could very well elevate Alameda's cycling infrastructure beyond that of Portland. I like the fact that you're thinking big, and I hope this plan comes to fruition. As a pedestrian, I think Alameda is already a great city for walking, so I am encouraged by further investments in this area.
Overall, it looks good. I was originally thinking that you are developing separate bike lanes on all streets by reducing 2 car lanes into one. But it look like allocated fairly into the streets. Nice work.
Overall, this is a very solid plan that will make Alameda a safer, more liveable city.
Park street is a mess both with parking and biking. I feel that park street has become unsafe with people parking wherever there is room. This also affects riding bikes to downtown businesses,I refuse to ride my bike downtown due to extremely poor decisions regarding traffic. Why put in a bike lane if it’s going to become parklets and vehicle parking. It is a free for all and bicycles lose.
Part of what wasn't covered was driver behavior, and enforcement when bad behavior is taking place- this is something the City must address as part of the plan to make our island safer to walk and bike on.
People who drive because of disabilities are not being consideted.planning staff that tell Alameda residence who are elderly to take a bus if they cannot ride a bike shiuld be terminated.
Planning for Link21 transbay tube, and the possible station(s) in Alameda seems relevant to start considering early! Where will that station be located and how will the construction and development around that station(s) fit into the active transportation plan? This will bring big changes to Alameda and we should be prepared for those changes. Nice work on this report, it is very appreciated!
Please do something about the traffic and people speeding through Alameda. It seems like nothing is being done to address the rampant reckless driving on the island.
Please rename this plan to reflect what it is, a alternative transportation ie biking, walking plan. It does not address public transportation or private vehicle transportation. The word "active" is missleading.
Poor
Prioritization for truly safe routes to schools is lacking. Drivers are becoming more reckless and kids lives are in danger. There have been so many near misses and things have to be implemented quickly before something way more tragic happens.
Reduce the lanes of traffic on Otis Drive to one lane in each direction. Enforce the speed limit along Otis Drive, especially between Park Street and High Street. Issue speeding tickets. Bring back the 5 motorcycle police officers. Increase the Alameda Police Force.
See previous comments
Seems bike centric to me, Ebikes need to have further thought. An Ebike exceeding 20 miles an hour is more of a vehicle to me. We live in a flat city and should promote standard bikes instead of adding to battery pollution.
Seems like you have made up your minds already, and are asking for sign off. There are too many cooks in the kitchen, resulting in a confusing mess of a plan. You should have a civil engineer, WITH NO STAKE IN THE OUTCOME, review this. It's way too confusing and will result in increased traffic problems.

14. Please share any feedback you have about the overall plan or about chapters 1-3 (Introduction, Vision & Goals, Existing Conditions).
Seems pretty comprehensive. Currently Buena Vista is over-used by bikes so thanks for improving that.
Seems to overall neglect the importance of using bollards to demarcate and protect pedestrians/bicyclists. Otherwise, can't happen fast enough...
Seniors and disabled people are not just ignored - they are made to feel irrelevant, ignorant and civically irresponsible. And everyone else is just inconvenienced. This is Alameda, an island, not a city in Europe with lots of reliable, accessible, convenient public transportation. We are surrounded by water and yet you make no accommodations for getting more people off the island in a disaster or emergency. This is fantasy land stuff, the dreams of people who live in a world where everyone is young and healthy and works down the block.or better yet moved here on their tech millions. Start working for the majority of Alamedans. And fix the potholes.
So excited to see protected bike paths! The need for enforcement of vehicle speeding violations will be even more important, though.
solid vision. not overreaching. attainable goals for 2030. need to execute.
Some of the projects and areas are suffering from increasing crime, security issues and unhoused population increases. The project impact can be at risk unless addressed
Strongly oppose the new proposed, expensive, pedestrian and bike tunnel. See previous comments
Supportive of this overall. Specific applications are where the most work needs to be done! The key is to fully vet out and discuss the plan with key stakeholders in each area, especially the neighborhoods involved in each section, including alternatives. We want neighborhood support; sometimes this may mean a modification or hybridization of the doctrinaire or "perfect" design. As we used to say in my line of work, we'd rather have a strategy that is 75% perfect, but that 100% support, than an approach that is 100% perfect but that only 50% support. Can't emphasize this enough!!!!
THANK YOU
Thank you for all your work and for providing so many opportunities for public comments. You're all wonderful!
Thank you for doing all of this work. I very much appreciate it.
Thank you for the comprehensive suggestions
Thank you for working to keep Alameda a safe place for people to walk and ride their bikes.
Thank you for your proactive approach on making bike riding and walking safe and appealing for all!
Thank you very much for working so hard on the Active Transportation Plan for our community. As the bike lanes and other changes develop, I will do my best to encourage friends and relatives to walk and bicycle more often. Re: the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Greenway (currently slow street) - the pavement on Pacific is quite rough in some places. I hope that it gets repaved soon . . . or maybe it has already? I have avoided it for a while now, since it is so bumpy!
Thank you. Please continue partnering with Bike Walk Alameda. I was a part of the community meetings organized by Gail Payne and others for Shoreline bike path, which has been a big success. FROM OPEN HOUSE
Thanks for letting me express my thoughts. Rock on!
The emphasis on bicycles is overblown and caters to a small group of people. The slow street concept is a bust, ugly and a waste of money.
The entire plan is wonderful, especially the proposed Neighborhood Greenways, 2030 Low Stress Backbone Network, and Bay Trail.

14. Please share any feedback you have about the overall plan or about chapters 1-3 (Introduction, Vision & Goals, Existing Conditions).
The existing conditions was a little confusing on the map because some aren't existing yet. Overall plan looks good. Water shuttle sounds interesting. Glad something is going to be done about the bridges - can you work with Oakland so that on the other side of the bridge a bicycle isn't dumped into a place unsafe to ride? Please pay special attention to intersections near schools. Please also create routes for cars that will have fewer pedestrians/bicycles so it is efficient for them too as well as safer for walking/biking. Thanks for doing this!
The goals and visions as stated are wonderful. However, i do not believe that they are being met by what has been proposed. To be truly equitable all areas of the City need to be included and it is obvious to me that they are not. However, since I am only one voice with objections, I don't see anyone listening to me and so I am very disillusioned by this whole process.
The Goals in Chapter 2 are well stated! Personally I feel that the environmental benefits of the Mode Shift goal could be stated more strongly-- Alameda has the potential to be greatly impacted by climate change due to sea level rise as compared to neighboring cities, and having more strongly worded goals with supporting infrastructure plans can help raise awareness within the community of our connection to climate change and how we can be an example. AMP's 100% clean power is a great example of this-- many Alameda residents that I know are proud of how all of our power comes from clean sources and are leading the way on this transition, and emphasizing the environmental benefit of biking plus having area-leading infrastructure would make Alameda a great example city.
The major comments are: 1) Eliminate the Oakland-Alameda Bike Ped Bridge and fund more immediate implementation of a free small ferry/water taxi operating between Alameda and Oakland. Quicker implementation than a bridge, no issues with USCG operations, massively lower startup costs, likely similar operations/ongoing costs. 2) Eliminate road diets anywhere on Alameda, new housing is being put in with no plan to improve traffic that is already bad. It is unreasonable to think every new person moving into the new housing is not going to have a car and rely on public transportation. 3) Require (able-bodied) middle / high school students to either bus, bike, or walk to school and implement bus route improvements/expansions as required. The traffic caused by school pickups and dropoffs is ridiculous and unnecessary, no students on Alameda are so far from school that they need to be driven to school by their parents.
The premise is flawed. Lots of fancy data, but it seems contrived by and for a tiny minority of extreme bike enthusiasts. Particularly there is no way to tell from the data if folks would start biking for which kind of trip. Yes, if it's made safer, maybe more able-bodied people bike for leisure, but let's be honest - carting kids to functions or shopping or any other myriad tasks aren't going to be done by bike. And the arguments about climate change - I 100% agree we need to act, but to make real progress, we need to adapt with some infrastructure. Bike enhancements won't make a dent. And the kicker - California is mandating no gas cars by 2035. That's a much more useful step. So maybe we should look at finding space for charging stations and pause on the bike infrastructure. We're fine as we are in that regard.
The quicker this plan can be approved the better. You are the professionals in this situation and citizen input should not be held in higher regard than your own. You serve the City, not the individual, so I encourage you to do what you feel is best for the City as a whole and not bow to the noisy few.

14. Please share any feedback you have about the overall plan or about chapters 1-3 (Introduction, Vision & Goals, Existing Conditions).
The town is family oriented and families are not going to shop, dine, travel to out of town locations on bikes. It's unrealistic. Cyclists are a vocal, dedicated group and have the attention of the City but the majority of residents may not agree.
The urban planning focus on bicycles is a waste of resources.
This is a very detailed, thorough, and well thought out plan.
This is very exciting, thank you for all you do!
This plan will be amazing -- IF it's implemented in its current form.
This survey assumes basic understanding of the Plan which I don't have.
This survey is ridiculous. People need to have the whole city plan in front of them like a textbook to take it. References to specific figures? It's not a good survey.
Two other things I didn't see covered are protection from the elements and crime safety. For the first point, people may not want to bike or walk a route because it is too sunny or windy. In a car, you can protect yourself from the elements you cannot when walking. The plan covers safety from motorists, but not safety from crime (for lack of a better word). A reason parents don't allow their kids to walk to school is they are afraid their kid will be kidnapped. Two solutions for this I have seen are blue lights on college campuses and the Japaness walking bus for school children.
UNFAIR to publish a draft plan with only three weeks for public input. Why was there little done in 2021. Public awareness of this plan is lacking. Low attendance of the recent ATP meetings on Zoom and at the library show the poor marketing job by the City. Expect lawsuits.
Very disappointed
Very exciting!
Very Thorough and Bike centric Would like to see something about enforcement What to do with people behaving badly??????
Vision Zero is bullshit
waste of money focus on enforcing driving have police walk the streets
waste of tax payer money
We have a neighbor in a wheel chair. It is hard for him to get around on our sidewalks. The small mitigation of shaving down the root lift on the sidewalk has not done anything for smooth and even sidewalks. I would assume most of our sidewalks are not ADA compliant

14. Please share any feedback you have about the overall plan or about chapters 1-3 (Introduction, Vision & Goals, Existing Conditions).
We have done some great improvements on the island. But we don't have to keep adding these huge projects. Projects that only benefit a small group on the island. We should focus on the majority of the people in Alameda. The majority are families with multiple kids. Kids that go to school, play sports, dance, theatre, after school classes, martial arts, etc. Most families carpool when they can, bus and bike does not work for all these programs. The fixes are minor, make the crosswalks safer by adding blinking lights. APD should enforce our 25 MPH on the roads. Stop spending millions of dollars on projects that don't benefit the majority of the residents. It is disappointing when our city staff, mayor and council members only focus on satisfying the loudest and smallest organizations in the name of climate control. We are all going to be driving electric cars in a little over 10 years. Please stop wasting so much money on things that are not needed. So much of that money should be spent on the families who need help with the basics. Adding unneeded bike lanes and bike/pedestrians bridges are not needed, they are wants. Stop creating solutions to non existing problems. Please think of Alameda and not your own personal agendas.
We need more policing of speed - when we moved here we were warned that Alameda PD really enforces the 25 mph speed limit and that's simply not true anymore. It's unsafe on most roads.

14. Please share any feedback you have about the overall plan or about chapters 1-3 (Introduction, Vision & Goals, Existing Conditions).

We need to significantly reimagine how our main business districts look (Park/Webster). It will be controversial, but I honestly think we need to TOTALLY ELIMINATE PRIVATE VEHICLES from these streets and REBUILD THESE STREETS FROM SCRATCH. These streets should be reserved for bikes, pedestrians, outdoor dining, public transportation, and very attracting landscaping/hardscaping ONLY. It will cost money. It will be controversial. It will be WORTH IT. This would have a multitude of benefits:

* Far more space for outdoor dining and shopping in a city blessed with great outdoor weather. The parklets look like an afterthought. We should make the street look like it was designed for these purposes from day 1.
* Visually attractive landscaping/hardscaping with far more space allocated to this than a few scrawny trees that impinge on the already-narrow sidewalks today.
* These streets are NOISY due to the car traffic, and honestly makes the outdoor spaces, such as outdoor dining, less attractive. Not Just Bikes has an excellent segment discussing this problem and how cars are the primary contributor to noise: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CTV-wwszGw8
* Safety concerns related to traffic & parklets are almost completely eliminated.
* Smelly, toxic exhaust gasses from vehicles are eliminated - improving both the health and the comfort of those using this outdoor space.
* Few cities seem to be willing to make such a controversial step, yet walkable spaces are attractive to the public. I believe this would make Alameda more of a regional destination that people would go out of their way to visit - ultimately helping our businesses and also gain more tax revenue.

As a driver, I actively go out of my way to avoid Park St entirely when exiting the island. It makes no sense to have our main business district be a gateway road to the island. There are better options.

A good street configuration for Park St might be:

14. Please share any feedback you have about the overall plan or about chapters 1-3 (Introduction, Vision & Goals, Existing Conditions).
[cont'd] * Two lanes for vehicular traffic, but limited only to busses and delivery vehicles. With some creative signaling and/or restrictions on delivery vehicles, maybe it can even be reduced to a single bidirectional lane with periodic pull-offs for passing (similar to how trains do single-tracking). * Limited to no space for pulling over: since traffic is so limited, it is reasonable for a bus to stop in the lane of traffic. I think even OK for a delivery vehicle to stop in the lane of traffic, and allow other vehicles to pass them by entering oncoming traffic. But if necessary, a FEW, VERY LIMITED pullover spots could exist only on ONE side of the road at a time. * Attractive bike paths that are COMPLETELY SEPARATED from the vehicle traffic lanes by very wide hardscaping. They should be raised to be more sidewalk level than street level. * The sidewalks should be CONSIDERABLY enlarged so that businesses have room to sprawl outdoors without impinging on disabled pedestrians in wheelchairs. * Clear barricades that discourage all entry to the street to thru-traffic. The guiding principle is to ELIMINATE AS MANY VEHICLE LANES AS POSSIBLE, because that leaves more space for the sidewalks, which we want to be as wide as possible. People will undoubtedly bitterly complain about this plan, but I don't get it. The few times I have driven to Park St (both pre-COVID and post-COVID), there is no street parking available because it is all taken, so I either park in the garage or on a side street. Therefore, I didn't really need to drive on Park St either. I would rather walk there. I'd probably walk there A195more often (read: pay restaurants more money) if it was a nicer place outdoors without the cramped sidewalks and noisy vehicle traffic.
We're building a lot of housing in Alameda Point that will exacerbate traffic through Webster and Posey tubes. Suggest incentivizing the building of car-free housing, with deeds or rental agreements legally restricting car usage in Alameda. Then set up an enforcement system to make sure they don't just park away from their home. Then set up a mixture of public transport, bikeways, and fractional car rentals to make it livable
What about bicycles having to obaying the law !!!!!!!!!!
Whoever does any of these planning needs to go around and observe traffic and see the congested areas and fixed those areas.
Why are we wasting money on this???
Wonderful overall. Please don't shy away from trying lower cost techniques to implement programs quickly (e.g., signs and restrictions vs. speedbumps and concrete). The sooner the better.
yet again..not everyone can or is able to ride a bike. Bikes are great cars are great..Don't make it an ugly conversation or deal breaker..moderate
You are ignoring older adults that do not feel safe on bicycles. Children are not learning the rules of the road and parents will have a false sense of safety because instead of teaching their children. Please remove the Slow Streets.
You have many pie in the sky artist/underserved/homeless stuff in this plan. That is not what the plan is for.