

Summary of Comments Received at Community Workshop

Summary of Comments Placed on Maps/Cross-Sections on Walls

135 comments written and posted on the maps and cross-sections were collected. Of these,

- 12 comments reflected appreciation for the new alternatives
- 4 reflected disapproval for the process.

Of those comments on specific design alternatives, they were grouped as follows:

Alternative	Total number of comments	Voiced Support	Voiced Disapproval	Comments or questions only
Council-approved	25	11	6	8
Existing (repaving and repainting)	9	3	0	6
Alternative 1	25	10	5	10
Alternative 2	16	15	0	1
Alternative 1 or 2	15	14	0	1
Alternative 3	5	2	2	1

Summary of comments:

- Council Approved Design:
 - Those against cited loss of parking and the dislike of bollards and chicanes
 - 2 believe that the plan was not “legally approved”.
 - One suggestion to “add vivid markings & ceramic raised dividers (road bumps) to separate car lane/bike lane.”
- Existing:
 - A few suggested just repaving and repainting the street, instead of any redesign.
 - Others suggested better traffic/speed enforcement, adding stop signs and/or roundabouts and that Grand Street is “dangerous for pedestrians, not bicyclists”.
- Alternative 1:
 - While many supported this alternative, some expressed concern about 2-way bikeway safety, especially at intersections and driveways.
 - There were 3 comments about parking, one stating that this alternative is “Not fair to East side of street”.
- Alternative 2:

Grand Street Safety Improvements: Shore Line to Clement
Community Workshop, May 31, 2023

- Many were in favor of this alternative.
- A question was asked if physical barriers could be added, and if it was possible to do this alternative without raising the bike lane.
- Alternative 1 or 2:
 - Many were in favor of either Alternative 1 or Alternative 2.
 - Others commented that they want to “Keep parking on both sides” of the street, and that enforcement of speed limit is needed.
- Alternative 3:
 - Very few comments about this alternative, and not much support.
- Other variables:
 - Questions were asked about:
 - how the alternatives impact the possibility of on-street vehicle charging
 - lowering vehicle speeds
 - creating safe pedestrian and bike routes for school travel
 - impacts on delivery trucks of a narrower street
 - data that supports that Grand Street is a high injury corridor
- Bike Lanes/Bike Safety:
 - Comments mentioned the need for more bike lanes/bike safety and safe bike route across the city, other parallel streets could be used as bike corridors instead, the width of the bike lanes, and need for more bike safety programs to the schools.
- Other comments:
 - Suggestions for adding crosswalks, speed bumps, traffic lights, stop signs, etc.
 - Need for crossing guards or clearly marked crosswalks.
 - Population of Alameda is increasing and less parking will have a long-term impact on the island.

Grand Street Safety Improvements: Shore Line to Clement
Community Workshop, May 31, 2023

Summary of “What Do You Think?” Handout Comments

QUESTION #1: Would you prefer that the City stick with the Council-approved design on Segment B (Otis to Encinal)? And, then later extend this same design to Clement? Or use a different design on Segment C (Encinal to Clement)?

Alternative Options	For Segment B	For Segment C
Council-approved	6	4
Alternative 1	10	11
Alternative 2	2	3
Alternative 1 or 2	1	0
No Alternative stated	14	14
Leave Grand as is	2	2
None	1	1

- Total responses: 38
- Want the *fastest option*: 5

QUESTION #2: What do you think of Alternative #1 (raised 2-way bikeway) on Segments B and C (Otis to Clement), that would create a continuous 2-way bikeway on all of Grand Street?

Answers	For Segment B	For Segment C
Supportive	23	24
Supportive but also concerned about 2-way bikeway	3	3
Does not support. (“2-way bike lane are not safe”)	6	6
Concerned about navigating intersections	2	2
Concerned about length of time for project completion	3	3

- Total responses: 37

QUESTION #3: What do you think of Alternative #2 (raised 1-way bikeways)?

Supportive	12
Not as good as Alternative 1	8
Leave Grand “as is”	1
Concerned about cost	2
Concerned about parking	3
Concerned about length of time for project completion	2
Does not support/ unsafe	3

- Total responses: 33

Grand Street Safety Improvements: Shore Line to Clement
Community Workshop, May 31, 2023

QUESTION #4: What do you think of Alternative #3 (raised 1-way bikeways next to sidewalk)? Do you think it should be eliminated, due to the need for mature tree removal and high cost?

Supportive - Keep this alternative	4
Eliminate it – Don't want to remove trees	5
Eliminate it – Too costly	8
Eliminate it	16

- Total responses: 36

QUESTION #5: For Segment A (Shore Line to Otis), staff are planning to move forward with the Council-approved design for 2-way bikeways, using grant funds. Do you have any concerns with this approach?

No concerns	23
No, but concerns about 2-way bikeway	3
Concerned about safety crossing Grand Street	4
Prefer corridor be continuous design	1

- Total responses: 33

QUESTION #6: What other comments do you have on bikeways along Grand Street or the specific alternatives?

Thank you / Improved Alternatives	5
Please complete ASAP	4
Other various comments	17

- Total responses: 26

“Tell us what you think!” Comment Form

Written Responses

QUESTION #1

Would you prefer that the City stick with the Council-approved design on Segment B (Otis to Encinal)? And, then later extend this same design to Clement? Or use a different design on Segment C (Encinal to Clement)?

- Please, please stick with the current approved design on segment B. It is the safest for bicycles and has the largest separation from the cars. Same design on segment C.
- Yes, for segment A and B. For C, Alt #1
- Yes, use current design. Be consistent. No bollards. Ugly streetscape.
- Strong vote for Council Approved. Current design is unsafe and construction starting in seven years is slow. NIMBYs will likely delay or impede segment #3 [C].
- Do what the people and the council approved! Then, after some time to measure its efficacy, only then, should we be exploring other ideas.
- Yes, on segment B, and if necessary would choose Alternative #2 for Segment C. Prefer council approved for all, but understand parking is issued for Segment C.
- Maybe. It depends on whether Alternative #1 can be funded ASAP. If Alternative #1 takes too long, yes.
- No [x3]
- No, definitely not. I think it is a bad design, with many unsafe characteristics. It is less safe than the existing design.
- Definitely use a different design.
- NO, the current design is not feasible.
- No, not the Nov 1, 2022 “approved” design.
- No way!! Very poor design. Dangerous for all. Not realistic by taking parking away. Not only for parking but deliveries, garbage cans, safety for people going in and out of driveways.
- No. Two-way bike lanes are unsafe. Lots of serious conflicts at driveways and intersections.
- I do not like the meandering design. I would prefer the council approved plan to pick one side instead of alternating sides of the street. Attention would need to be paid to how bikes would safely transition from the two-way bike way to one-way bike lanes.
- No, do it right the first time and keep the entire street consistent with a 2 way cycle path.
- The November 2020 plan is awful! Please move on.
- Two way bike lanes all the way! It makes no sense to change it.

Grand Street Safety Improvements: Shore Line to Clement

Community Workshop, May 31, 2023

- I would prefer Alternative # 1 or 2 on segment B.
- I support whatever is safest and fastest. Council-approved plan for segment A should be in construction now. Since none of the alternatives changed that segment please start construction on A ASAP.
- As a cyclist, I'd prioritize speed of execution over Grand Street residents concern for parking. Alameda has the opportunity to do something concrete and useful. Continue the bollard design and get it done.
- No, I prefer one of the new designs. The chicanes are an eyesore and are not a viable option. Losing 70% of street parking is not a small thing, also there are four churches without parking lots that depend on street parking.
- No. Do not like the loss of parking, nor the forced crossing of Grand.
- No, please no chicanes.
- No. It was poorly designed without enough input.
- No thank you. We prefer Alternative #1 for Otis to Encinal.
- I do NOT support the council-approved design, especially regarding the segment C, Encinal to Clement, where housing density and parking needs are much greater. 60 to 70% loss of street parking is totally unacceptable for segment C.
- No, segments B and C should be alternative #1. And segment A too, if possible.
- No, don't want Council approved design.
- I would prefer Alt #1 the entire length of Grand.
- Alt #1 is better.
- I would prefer alternative #1 from Otis to Clement.
- First Choice - Alt #2, Second choice – Council-approved. Third choice-Alt #1, Most important: not having existing situation 1 year from now.
- I would prefer that the city leave Grand Street as it is.
- None of their ideas improve the street for bicycles.
- Prefer existing street design with better markings.

QUESTION #2

What do you think of Alternative #1 (raised 2-way bikeway) on Segments B and C (Otis to Clement), that would create a continuous 2-way bikeway on all of Grand Street?

- It is an improvement from the "Council approved" design. It is safer and more logical.
- It is a good option that addresses both safety and parking loss issues.
- It is a good approach that addresses multiple concerns.
- For segment C, yes.
- Like it. Like that it's the same facility for the entire corridor.
- I like alternative #1. It's a great improvement and works for both segments.
- This is a better option than the approved design.
- Prefer Alt #1, but #2 is also OK. Never liked the chicanes.

Grand Street Safety Improvements: Shore Line to Clement

Community Workshop, May 31, 2023

- I like this option. This would be my first choice in conjunction with safety measures at intersections to protect bikes from cars not expecting “wrong way” bike traffic.
- This is the best for cars, bikes, and pedestrians!
- Fantastic! These are the types of changes that we need to keep everyone safe and create a welcoming environment for new bikers.
- I am happy with this alternative.
- I support approved and Alts 1 and 2. They are all good!
- Yes
- Alternative #1 seems like the better option compared to the others. A large loss of parking spots is totally impractical to those of us who ride bikes and own cars.
- Like it best of the alternatives. I like the two bike lanes being together because it makes it easier for kids to pass each other. (There is one way traffic to school in the morning and one-way traffic from school in the afternoon.)
- Much better! What about four-way stops or road bumps?
- This is my preferred option. This would have a continuous path which is best for bicyclists.
- We should adopt this design. Fund from general fund and get it done quickly.
- I think this is a much better design all around than the council approved design. I think added value is worth the additional cost.
- In favor of Alt #1 the entire length of the Grand.
- Yes, given that Section A will be this design we think it's best to stay consistent.
- Better.
- Good. But 2030 is too slow. + Please do not make crossing buttons for lights, put crossing on timer. + Remove right on red at lights, it is very unsafe with two lanes of traffic.
- I like it, but worry about to delay. Want to safe biking as soon as possible.
- OK, but could be confusing for kids since there are no other bikeways like this.
- Good. Not my favorite, but better than chicanes and so-called “protected” bike lanes (not protected from driveways!)
- It's better than the current council design. Just concerned bicyclist will still ride on other side on sidewalk or street without a lane.
- Best option as long as there are safety measures built in for pedestrian crossings, and maintaining bike riders stopping at stop signals or flashing lights for pedestrians. Might be hard to manage it first because many bike riders ride to 2-3 across.
- I like it but I'm concerned about backing out of driveways with the two lane bike lanes. Bikes move so fast that you can look both ways and a bike seemingly comes out of nowhere.
- It's OK, but two-way bike lanes are tough for cyclists to navigate.
- Concerned about navigating the intersections.

Grand Street Safety Improvements: Shore Line to Clement

Community Workshop, May 31, 2023

- Two way on Grand is not appropriate. Too many driveways and uncontrolled intersections. Too expensive, too. Not enough room between bicycles and cars. Alt #1 has error in description: it is not the most separated.
- Two way bike lanes are dangerous. They are a poor design.
- No. Thank you.
- Terrible! Two-way bike ways are unsafe. Collisions at intersections, and between oncoming cyclists will be a problem and a liability to the city.
- It's an obvious attempt to delay the project so that the Mayor and her elite neighbors won't lose their precious street parking. What a travesty.
- We don't need enhanced bike lanes.

QUESTION #3

What do you think of Alternative #2 (raised 1-way bikeways)?

- Best plan
- Good.
- OK
- I like this design.
- My slight preference though I understand #1 is cheaper and will line up with bike lanes by Wood,/Rittler.
- I'm OK with this. I think it'll work
- Like it, if it can happen next year or sooner.
- Same as alternative #1 *[it is a good approach that addresses multiple concerns]*
- I am happy with this alternative also.
- Better than alternative #1 because hazards of two way bikeway are not present, however, still creates sightline hazards at all driveways and intersections, they tend to fill with debris, they are too narrow for one cyclist to safely pass another, and make it difficult for a cyclist to make left turns.
- Possible but not the best.
- Also a good option, but not enough added benefit to justify the extra cost versus Alt #1
- Not as good as Alt #1.
- I like this alternative better too, but not as much as #1.
- I don't think there is added value over Alternative #1 that justifies the cost.
- It's fine. #1 makes more sense.
- Not as good as alternative #1. I'd say no on alternative #2.
- Love it conceptually, but given the spacial limitation and additional cost I think Alternative #1 is the best bet for this situation.
- It's good, though I'm a little concerned about the impact on lane width. I'm about so-so on alternative 1 vs 2.

Grand Street Safety Improvements: Shore Line to Clement

Community Workshop, May 31, 2023

- Like it, but not as much as council approved. Seems like the second best option for segment C given parking concerns. Can we add a barrier if this is used?
- Nice but too disruptive and costly.
- It's the best from a cyclist perspective. But I'm not sure it's worth the time and money.
- As bicyclists, usually we prefer this design, but think the design should be consistent on all section of Grand.
- Not my first choice because of expense.
- Loses more parking, less "bandwidth" for going to/from school. Plus it cost more.
- This would require bicyclist to cross Grand at Otis, which is not as smooth as a path.
- What are the public health benefits compared to other alternatives? Such as car-biker or car-pedestrian accidents? Additional cost of alternatives 1 and 2 are good investments if they reduce public health risks
- Nope, too confusing and too much parking loss.
- Too long to implement. We need this implemented ASAP!!
- Bad. Unsafe. Will recommend my kid use sidewalk instead.
- Not good. Not enough buffer between bicyclist and door zone. The bike lane barely meets the minimum standard width.
- See previous answer *[It's an obvious attempt to delay the project so that the Mayor and her elite neighbors won't lose their precious street parking. What a travesty.]*
- No.
- It would be better to leave the street as is. Repaint it and stripe bike lanes in each direction.

QUESTION #4

(A) What do you think of Alternative #3 (raised 1-way bikeways next to sidewalk)?

(B) Do you think it should be eliminated, due to the need for mature tree removal and high cost?

4A

- Alternative #3 is my favorite, by quite a lot. My main question would be funding. If federal and or state grants are available, we should strongly consider it. I'm OK with longer timelines. The city has said Grand Street is important, so why not invest in the future?
- Fairy godmother needed. Love it!
- Nice, but not realistic.
- No, it should not be eliminated. Further discussion and analysis needs to be done with input.
- Let's use this design elsewhere. It's wonderful and what we should be striving for, but alternate #1 will get us 90% there and that's a HUGE improvement.
- I like the idea of totally rethinking the streetscape and undergrounding utilities.
- Great. But expensive and will take too long.
- Looks nice but too disruptive and expensive.

Grand Street Safety Improvements: Shore Line to Clement

Community Workshop, May 31, 2023

- I like the alternative but feel it should be eliminated.
- Not as good as #2
- Too expensive with no safety benefit
- Too much money, too long.
- Too long, too expensive
- If we were starting from scratch, I love it, but don't want to approve removal of mature trees.
- Sounds too expensive.
- Can the bike lane meander around the old trees?
- See previous answer *[It's an obvious attempt to delay the project so that the Mayor and her elite neighbors won't lose their precious street parking. What a travesty.]*
- Leave the street as it is.

4B

- Yes [x3]
- Yes, due to longer construction time and unnecessary costs.
- Yes, and because of closeness to pedestrians.
- Yes, please eliminate.
- Yes, this should be removed due to removing trees.
- Yes, it should be eliminated. Too expensive and loss of mature trees is not desirable.
- Too expensive
- That is a nonstarter.
- Not necessary - eliminate.
- Should be eliminated
- No!! Remove 100/60 year old trees? No way!!
- Grand is an historic street and should not be turned into a "sterile" look.
- Don't like this at all. Would have been good for a first layout, but lots of disruption, (and cost) for changing and existing configurations.
- No! Don't remove old lovely trees.
- Reject this
- Ha ha ha ha. (These trees are too beautiful and not better than alternative #1)
- Eliminate alternative #3 for those reasons plus has all the issues of alternative #2.

QUESTION #5

For **Segment A (Shore Line to Otis)**, staff are planning to move forward with the Council-approved design for 2-way bikeways, using grant funds. Do you have **any concerns with this approach?**

- No [x9]
- No concerns

Grand Street Safety Improvements: Shore Line to Clement

Community Workshop, May 31, 2023

- No concerns, because no intersections in that patch and biggest worry about two-way is at intersections.
- No, with collaboration with AUSD it seems like the safest approach.
- No, move forward
- Nope, great!
- I love it!
- No, it is good on that block.
- It should go forward.
- Only that it's not already under construction!
- I do not have any concerns about this. Especially if option #1 is chosen.
- It's better than nothing and paid for, let's move onto the next project.
- It's fine.
- I'm OK with it as long as this plan does NOT extend to segment C, which has a different character and needs.
- In general, we prefer 1 way bike lanes but since funds are secured, the Council-approved design is okay with us.
- That some bicyclists will still ride on opposite side without a bike lane.
- All the sports going on all year at Rittler Park. What happens to Lum parking lot in the long run and all the cars that park along Grand Street all the way to Palmera Court.
- How does street sweeping work on these bike lanes? The corners of Grand/Otis are usually messy. By Rittler, there's a pile of dirt in the bike lane at the corner. What's the plan for street sweeping there?
- If we do two 1-way lanes how will kids get to school safe? Will we add a scramble light?
- They should remain open to adapting alternatives in the future if needed.
- I'd like an "Alternative #1" treatment here for consistency with segments B and C. IF this is possible.
- I would prefer the entire corridor be the same design and I do not like the two way. I prefer one way on each side.
- Two way bike lanes are dangerous design.
- No. two way bikeways are dangerous and high stress!
- Yes, it sucks! Forces many extra crossings of Grant Street due to one-sided parking – will cause accidents!
- I defer to the residents of Segment A.

QUESTION #6

What other comments do you have on bikeways along Grand Street or the specific alternatives?

- Please address out of control speeding with added four-way stops at Clinton/Grand and/or San Jose/Grand and/or Dayton/Grand.

Grand Street Safety Improvements: Shore Line to Clement

Community Workshop, May 31, 2023

- 1). Public safety. This is the main thoroughfare for ambulance to the hospital. 2). Trash pick up. How does it happen. 3). Cleanliness. How are street sweepers etc. going to do their work? 4). Renter/homeowners. Why is there no consideration for this group?
- Need to consider how disruptions will impact the bike lanes; garbage bins, street sweeping, etc.
- I love the double bike lanes, but there will need to be a lot of caution at cross streets! Good signage, blinking lights, raised crosswalks/bikeways and clear site. P.S. the turn from Otis onto Grand coming from South shore. Is so bad for cars and bikes. Really hard to see bikes coming - needs bike ONLY light. Thank you!
- I think it's important to consider the beauty of Grand Street. Let's not cluttered up with chicanes and bollards. + Also, there have not been any bike fatalities on Grand Street. It is much more dangerous for pedestrians. + Alameda police needs to be part of the solution and enforce speed limits. Right now it's a free-for-all, and there are no APD officers there at all.
- I think a consideration should be increase car and bicycle citations to those not obeying red lights - Stop signs, speed limits.
- Where do we put EV chargers for on-street parking? + Children safe travel to school is a far more important priority than parking!
- Overall a great direction. Please complete project sooner. + Evaluate right on red removal. + Please ensure sufficient and equitable bike parking.
- Please implement!!! My kids currently attend Love and will attend Wood and they deserve a safe route to school. + Any improvements we can make for crossing Grand? Especially in the area of Clinton/San Jose.
- Whatever we do, we should complete the entire length of Grand as soon as possible.
- Neighbors should not get to determine the use of public property!! Build this is ASAP!
- I would hope that the Council would respect all citizens and not create major problems by removing 60 to 70% (or more on some blocks) of street parking. Can we balance bike safety and the needs of other citizens as well? This large loss of parking is totally unacceptable to me and the neighbors I've spoken to. If we are going to do this, we should do it right the first time, and do alternative #1 even if it cost more.
- #1 and 2 are so much better than the original plan!
- Alternative #1 is the only sensible approach for all of Grand.
- Be ambitious. Don't let an aging generation dictate the future mobility of the island. This bike lane will last for decades. Put the future in front.
- This is an incredibly important step towards making Alameda a safer and better place to live. The tiny loss of parking, minor inconveniences of construction, and financial investment are all small prices to pay for improving our city.
- Consider the lower cost option of repainting the street lines and adding other traffic slowing measures. I would likely still prefer alternative #1, but it would be helpful to have the option to compare all variables.

Grand Street Safety Improvements: Shore Line to Clement

Community Workshop, May 31, 2023

- An alternative #4 is needed. Keep Grand the way it is. Just re-pave it and make current bike lanes wider to allow staying in them while keeping out of the door zone. This would also make traffic lanes narrower to calm traffic. Also, would be by far the least expensive and wouldn't result in loss of parking.
- I think the high injury corridor label is misleading and due to accidents at the south end only. Also, we have not been shown statistics that indicate car versus bike, bike versus pedestrian, and car versus pedestrian, which would focus on different solutions. + Thank you for giving us more information, but an actual discussion with the group would be more effective.
- Appreciate the inclusion of plan for all of Grand Street. This was a huge flaw in the process previously. + When talking about Grand as a high injury corridor, it would help your point if you shared actual data. This process started in December 2021, and there has been no data shown at any point. If the city has the data show us! (See Otis project and Lincoln project slides.)
- Thanks for looking at additional alternatives. This meeting and design options should have taken place last year.
- Thank you [x3]
- Thank you for including the public in this process. We love bicycling in Alameda!
- Please don't ruin Grand Street for bicyclists the way you did on Clement.
- This is such a transparent sham. City staff, you're not fooling us.

From: [Jonathan Macmillan \(DH\)](#)
To: [Transportation](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Grand Street Comments
Date: Wednesday, May 24, 2023 8:46:27 AM

Hello,

I just wanted to send a note to advocate for the strongest possible protection for bike lanes on Grand. I bike on this street every single weekday and often on the weekends. I commute to Fruitvale BART during the week and two of our closest family friends live at each end of Grand and we prefer to bike. We are a family of three with an eight year old. Grand connects the trail at the beach, the Cross Alameda Trail, and the Bay Trail once those apartments at the end of Grand open up and Alameda is severely lacking in safe routes to connect these trails.

I got rid of my car during the pandemic and I have really tried to avoid getting a new one now that I am expected to be back at work in person. Please keep making the island safer for my family to get around so I don't add to the traffic and pollution to our city.

Thank you.

Jonathan, Christine, and Lucas MacMillan
728 Lincoln Ave

Statement of Confidentiality: The contents of this e-mail message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee. The information may also be confidential and/or legally privileged. This transmission is sent for the sole purpose of delivery to the intended recipient. If you have received this transmission in error, any use, reproduction, or dissemination of this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete this message and its attachments, if any.

E-mail is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC SS 2510-2521 and is legally privileged.

From: [Tony Ouyang](#)
To: [Transportation](#)
Cc: [Fei Ouyang](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public Comment: Grand Street Safety Improvements and Pavement Resurfacing
Date: Friday, May 26, 2023 3:12:57 PM

Hello Transportation Committee-

I'm not sure I'll be able to participate in the upcoming events for the Grand Street Corridor project, so wanted to provide a quick public comment.

My name is Tony Ouyang and our family of four (2 daughters ages 11 and 8) have been residents of Alameda since 2010 in the Grand Marina neighborhood (Grand St and Fortmann Way).

We're very much in support of the Grand St Safety Improvements extending from South Shore to Clement. We use Grande St pretty much on a daily basis driving. We also bike Grand St individually (adults only) or as a family since Grande St is a major road that links to all parts of the island.

We would probably bike more as a family and allow our daughters to bike on Grand St. alone by themselves *if* street conditions were a bit safer with a protected bike lane. The reasons we feel it is unsafe now are because:

- Cars often drive at a high speed on Grand St
- When driving South on Grande St during morning school hours, it's always a little testy when trying to make a right turn on Lincoln, Santa Clara, and Encinal streets because students are biking past.

As a driver I need to really make sure I don't cut any bikers off or they run into me.

As a biker I'm concerned that if I continue through the intersection cars traveling at a similar speed and turning right might not see me. If a car ahead is turning right I have to either a) stop and wait until the car turns and then continue through the intersection or b) take a risk and continue through the intersection hoping that the driver has seen me.

- Visibility of bikers is sometimes hard due to parked cars on the North end of the curb of Grand St.

Any improvements to a) slow down car traffic b) improve visibility of pedestrians and bikers and c) protected bike lanes would greatly enhance this transportation corridor.

Thanks for taking my comment into consideration.

Tony, Fei, Sophi, and Chloe Ouyang
1603 Fortmann Way
917.687.6173

From: [Sue Devine](#)
To: [Transportation](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Grand St Project
Date: Thursday, June 1, 2023 3:34:36 PM

In reviewing the options presented, and following my discussion with neighbors, we prefer option 1. None of us are fond of the idea, but since we are forced to choose something this option is the only one we can try to live with.

Thanks,

Sue Devine
811 Grand St
Alameda, Ca 94501
510-384-9996

Sent from my iPad

From: [Hank Lindemann](#)
To: [Transportation](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Grand Street Safety Improvements and Pavement Resurfacing
Date: Saturday, June 3, 2023 12:15:19 PM

Dear Council,

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now, take a look at the older and beautiful historic homes on Grand Street. Do we really want to erect a bunch of plastic barricades, paint up the streets, do expensive and dangerous bump-outs on a street that has historic homes? To make Grand Street look like shoreline, Otis and Grand, Park Street would be awful. Please preserve the character of the Island, historic district and keep a piece of the past alive. The current bike lanes are sufficient and were everywhere else too. Just cause

Oakland does it does not mean we have to. ABAG, OBAG may be a double edge sword for Alameda and we need to ask ourselves if aligning ourselves with these agencies is right for our City.

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

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

Sincerely,
Henry Lindemann
1817 Grand Street
Alameda, CA 94501

hankli@comcast.net

510-774-6548 Cell



Virus-free www.avg.com

From: Steve Gorman <sgorman1b@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 6, 2023 11:36 AM
To: CityCouncil-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Thank you for Grand St. presentation

Dear City Council members,

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration,
Steve Gorman
Alameda, CA