

## **Exhibit 5:**

### **Community Input**

- A. Summary of comments from 5/31/23 Community Workshop
- B. Comment Form responses from 5/31/23
- C. Email input from May 24, 2023 to June 6, 2023
- D. Comments + Questions from 6/13/23 Virtual Community Workshop
- E. Comments sent to Transportation Commission (for 6/21/23 meeting)
- F. Summary of online Comment Form responses (collected from  
06/06-28/23)

## **Exhibit 5A:**

### **Community Input**

Summary of comments from 5/31/23 Community Workshop

## 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

## **Exhibit 5B:**

### **Community Input**

Comment Form responses from 5/31/23

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

## **“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.



## **Exhibit 5C:**

### **Community Input**

Email input from May 24, 2023 to June 6, 2023

**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](http://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 31<sup>st</sup> 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

## **Exhibit 5D:**

### **Community Input**

Comments + Questions from 6/13/23 Virtual Community Workshop



## Comments + Questions from the Chat

*Individuals' names have been substituted with numbers to preserve anonymity.*

### General questions & comments:

---

18:59:06 From 001:

Side note: street design is far more effective at reducing traffic crashes than enforcement. I strongly support narrower streets, raised pedestrian and bike crossings. More trees along streets. Any proven design tools for slowing down cars will improve street safety, and we should use all of them that we can.

19:15:56 From 003:

There is a very old sign on the West side of Grand (hard to read because of wear and small) prohibiting any large trucks over 3 tons on Grand-it is ignored with tankers trucks etc using Grand-will this sign be made larger and this be enforced with the new improvements and put in both directions of Grand? It is not the delivery trucks I am talking about

19:25:57 From 001:

If we want trucks to be gone from certain streets, why not make them less desirable for trucks to drive down? (Another case for making streets narrow)

19:27:25 From 002:

That sign about no trucks is in the 1100 block of Grand.

19:26:25 From Rochelle Wheeler, City of Alameda, to Everyone:

Janine - If you'd like to email us the exact location of that sign, that would be helpful for us to see. Email to [Transportation@alamedaca.gov](mailto:Transportation@alamedaca.gov)

19:26:51 From 005:

Thanks for the presentation

19:29:38 From 007:

I just wanted to show my appreciation for the staff. I'm continually impressed by how forward thinking and evidence driven staff is when tackling tricky designs like this.

19:30:10 From 004:

I wonder if we can make our streets, like Balboa Island. One way on each street.

19:31:17 From 008:

YES! Thanks for the staff's dedication, hard work, and terrific skills across Alameda to make our streets safer and better for all roadway users!

19:32:15 From 009:



### Safety:

---

18:49:07 From 005:

On any plan, I fear for those backing out of their driveway into the narrowed traffic lanes.

Grand Street Safety Improvements: Shore Line to Clement  
Virtual Community Workshop, June 13, 2023

18:49:08 From 011:

The photo simulation of alternative #1 shows a car parked right up next to a driveway curb cut on the left. It looks as if this would obscure riders from drivers turning into the driveway from the street. I would hope the final design would have more daylighting to prevent these sorts of blind spots. (Also listed in Plan 1)

18:54:24 From 001:

Also in favor of removing "turn right on red" !

19:07:12 From 008:

Pedestrians' and cyclists' safety and convenience have long been treated as among the lowest priorities in transit affix design, including ion Alameda. Which alternatives will create the safest conditions for cyclists and pedestrians?

18:59:19 From 010:

Can you address pedestrian safety with the three alternatives?

18:52:21 From 002:

A 7.5 ft width still violates the minimum width for an ADA parking space, which is currently available the length of Grand. How will you get around that? minimum ADA width is 8 ft

---

**Traffic Enforcement / Speeding:**

18:49:43 From 010:

What plans are there for enforcing speed limits and ticketing dangerous driving?

18:51:06 From 005:

But not with the speed of traffic

18:56:44 From 003:

Also I would like to see four way stops for speeding cars at either Grand and Clinton or Grand and San Jose, in any of these alternatives adding four way stops have not been included

19:07:12 From 002:

why weren't new 4-way stops considered? wouldn't they be cheaper and more effective than many elements of these designs?

19:10:18 From 004:

I agree with the previous speakers. The drivers of these vehicles think we live on speedway.

19:14:19 From 002:

In SF out in the Sunset Avenues there are literally stop signs at every corner, regardless of the volume of cross traffic. They do seem very effective at slowing traffic there, despite the previous response from Mr. Vance.

19:16:00 From 004:

If I was able to get my hands on 'speed' reader and a license plate reader....and I sat on my front porch, I could make the city a bunch of \$\$\$.

19:27:46 From 008:

I heartily agree with the need for more APD officers on the streets enforcing traffic laws to make

Grand Street Safety Improvements: Shore Line to Clement  
Virtual Community Workshop, June 13, 2023

our streets safer for all. APD is down to 66 sworn officers from the 110-120 officers in APD when we moved here 25 years ago.

19:28:47 From 002:

Won't narrowing the street make it more difficult for APD to pull over speeders?

---

**Raised Bikeways:**

18:47:28 From 010:

How will street sweeping work on the raised bike lanes?

18:48:56 From 012:

If there is a raised bikeway, is it still legal for a bicyclist to ride in the street with cars if they want to

---

**2-way Bike lanes / Bicyclists:**

18:49:13 From 013:

I worry about having cyclists traveling in an opposite direction on one side of the street.

19:10:04 From 008:

I am gravely concerned t about any two-way cycle track options on Grand because there are so many cross streets, many of them quite busy. The intersections, where drivers will have to actively look for bikes traveling in BOTH directions at once, which they are NOT used to doing. Bikes are safer when they, too, follow the same "rules of the road" as other roadway users so the rules are as simple and as uniform as possible.

19:19:50 From 008:

The block of Grand between Shoreline and Otis has very few conflicts compared with the rest of Grand (Otis-Clement). The conflicts increase greatly as soon as you have residential housing and more cross streets on BOTH sides of Grand. The Wood School neighborhood is NOT the same as the rest of Grand! It is not a matter of the "novelty" of two-way cycle tracks but rather that they greatly increase the potential conflicts between road users - and the danger to younger cyclists.

19:21:28 From 005:

Kids biking to school will ride two abreast no matter what is said

---

**Parking:**

19:03:33 From 005:

Seems like all the % loss of parking suggestions will support the city's ultimate goal to "drive people out of their cars"

---

**General approval of Alternatives 1 or 2:**

18:47:13 From 013:

Hi everyone. Really appreciate all the hard work that's gone into this to have a first rate,

Grand Street Safety Improvements: Shore Line to Clement  
Virtual Community Workshop, June 13, 2023

continuous solution from Shoreline to Clement. Either alternative 1 or 2 is a much better step forward than the prior plan.

18:53:51 From 001:

Thanks all! Definite improvement to put more space between cars and bikes. Making sure that bikes aren't forced to ride between moving cars and sometimes moving cars (eg: parked) is huge! Also in favor of reducing the street width (as Andrew mentioned it slows cars down). Overall I think option 2 is best, but 1 is also a great improvement.

19:13:23 From 011:

Great presentation. Thank you staff for all your hard work. All the alternatives are better than current conditions.

---

**Alternative 1:**

18:51:11 From 007:

For alternative 1, what are the options at intersections to help bicyclists cross safely (especially considering Northbound, right turning traffic)?

18:52:43 From 012:

For alternative #1, is there any way to get a bigger buffer than the proposed 2' buffer? It seems like there might be a car door conflict with a 2' buffer.

19:00:43 From 003:

If Alternative 1 is implemented how will continuing the two way bike lane on the East side be done at the East intersection at Grand and Otis be done because it is already a bit of a mess there with cars turning North onto Grand from Otis and also those turning East from Grand onto Otis

19:02:20 From 011:

The Clement Avenue cycle track is similar to the alternative #1 and it is frequently blocked by parked cars and trucks. I have also seen several drivers accidentally enter the cycle track. Alternative #1 should have bollards at major intersections to prevent drivers from accidentally driving in the cycle track. Keeping the cycle track clear of parked cars will also require more enforcement than is currently happening in Alameda.

---

**Alternative 2:**

18:48:51 From 013:

Alternative 2 does seem easier for motorists to navigate since cyclists will be traveling in the same direction as autos on each side of the street.

18:54:30 From 003:

I believe that Alternative #2 is safer and best because bikers will still ride on the west side of the street (not in bike lanes) because they do that on Shoreline currently.

## **Exhibit 5E:**

### **Community Input**

Comments sent to Transportation Commission (for 6/21/23 meeting)

**From:** [Drew Dara-Abrams](#)  
**To:** [Transportation Commission](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] 6A Grand Street  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 20, 2023 10:41:16 AM

---

Dear Transportation Commission members and Planning staff,

To reiterate what has been said many times, Grand Street is an important north/south connector for people traveling by all modes around Alameda.

To just focus on the options being presented at this TC meeting: Alternative 1 is the ideal design to meet the needs of the vulnerable road users from students on bicycles to seniors on foot, while still providing ample on-street curb parking for residents of the blocks with multi-family and public uses. Alternative 1 along all three segments of Grand would serve as a "backbone" for a low-stress bike network across Alameda — the kind of network that parents would feel comfortable sending their kids out to cycle to school, and the kind of network that adults of all ages would see as an enjoyable alternative to using a car to drive to a drugstore or a similar kind of errand. (As you all know, transportation is the largest source of carbon emissions in Alameda, and short trips are the most common of auto-based trips by Alameda residents — it's all those short trips by gas cars where we have the most to gain by encouraging pollution-free modes of transport.)

However, the best plan is of no benefit for any of us if it's just a plan. A key question for Alternative 1 is how implementation would be funded for Segment B. According to the staff report, "If local funds are not identified for Segment B, construction would be delayed until grant funds are secured, possibly in 2026 or 2027." There's a real risk that by switching to Alternative 1 for the entire corridor, the segment of Grand between Otis and Encinal will have the exact same faded paint for unprotected Class II bike lanes and at-grade crosswalks as the end of this decade approaches.

Please consider encouraging City Council to only adopt Alternative 1 in place of the existing Council-approved Concept for Segment B if the difference in cost is covered by local city funds. If City Council is uncomfortable covering the difference in cost for the added benefits, then the Council-approved Concept for Segment B is still a reasonable outcome of incremental improvements. Please don't have the perfect be the enemy of the good in terms of improving the safety and utility of Grand Street.

Thank you for your time,  
Drew Dara-Abrams  
Calhoun Street

**From:** [Nuala Creedon](#)  
**To:** [Transportation Commission](#); [Lara Weisiger](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Transportation Commission Meeting, 6/21/23 - Item #6A  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 20, 2023 1:14:58 PM

---

Dear Transportation Commission Members,

RE: Grand Street Improvement Project, Agenda Item 6A.

Having considered the City's new proposals for Grand Street, we prefer Alternative #2, the one-way raised bike lanes on both sides of Grand. We think this is the safest option. Our reasons include:

- it shares the need to watch for cyclists more evenly.
- it is more intuitive for people entering or exiting driveways, and at intersections.
- it maintains symmetry, and the aesthetic character of the street.

Safety is the biggest concern for everyone who uses Grand Street, with pedestrians being the most at risk. Any changes must prioritize safety. We believe additional measures should be implemented, including:

- Enforcement of speed limits and other road laws.
- Reducing the speed limit to 20 mph on Grand Street.
- Adding speed bumps.
- Adding one or more four-way stops.

We attended the recent Community Meeting at Mastick Center to see the new City plans for Grand Street. We appreciate the City's decision to re-look at the plans for Grand Street, and to consider the full length of Grand Street when coming up with alternatives. We appreciate that all the new alternatives could work for all of Grand Street; the chicane plan clearly does not.

The City's Alternative #1 has some safety issues around the 2-way bike lanes - it's more complicated at intersections and driveways, and changes the balance of the street - but it is still much better than the chicane plan. We oppose implementation of

the chicane plan in Section B (Otis to Encinal). Multiple roadway designs, with differing requirements for pedestrians/ cyclists/ motorists, will not promote safety along Grand Street, so we encourage you not to move forward with that. We believe it's worth waiting to have a safer, more consistent roadway design. As an interim measure, the City could paint the bike lanes in Section B (they're basically non-existent right now); the rest of Grand Street has visible painted bike lanes already. Painted bike lanes are in use all over Alameda (and will be included on upcoming projects like Encinal and Lincoln/ Marshall Way), so they are familiar to all.

One area where further delay is unacceptable is in Section C with the absence of a true sidewalk from Eagle to Clement on the east side and Ellen Craig Avenue to Fortmann Way on the west. This area is tricky for pedestrians to navigate as is and impossible for anyone with mobility issues. Please prioritize sidewalk construction in this area - this should not be held up for 3-7 years (per the City's presentation).

Thank you,  
Nuala Creedon & Matt Anderson  
924 Grand Street.



**From:** [Carol Gottstein](#)  
**To:** [Transportation Commission](#); [City Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Transportation Commission Special Meeting Wed. 6-21-2023. Agenda Item 6A  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 21, 2023 1:01:37 PM  
**Attachments:** [21 June 2023 TC Special Meeting Agenda Item 6A.docx](#)

---

Dear Transportation Commission and Staff Members:

Attached is a 3-page Word document containing my comments for Agenda Item 6A, Grand Street Designs. Please add it to tonight's agenda 6A public comment file.

Thank you,

Carol Gottstein

## 21 June 2023 TC Special Meeting Agenda Item 6A: Grand Street

I oppose City staff's request to "Endorse" the "preferred Design Concept"... "for a continuous 2-way bikeway from Shoreline Drive to Clement Avenue."

I am a Segment B resident of modest means. I was fortunate to inherit a house my parents bought on Grand in 1949, when there was no Grand Street south of the lagoon. There was no lagoon, because the Bay hadn't been filled in yet. After The Fill, the width of the Grand Street extension (Segment A) was greatly expanded to accommodate future changes. But the original street width north of the fill (Segments B and C) remained.

I oppose the staff recommendation because one continuous design for the whole street only makes sense if the street is of uniform width and consistency from Shoreline to Clement, which it is not. There is a dramatic bottleneck in width at the lagoon bridge where the new street meets the old street. Alternative 1 makes sense for Segment A, the part of Grand Street that began its existence in 1955, but, because Grand Street north of the lagoon bridge retains the narrow width it has had since the 1890's, Alternative 1 literally tries to force a square peg into a round hole by forcing a wide cycle track onto the almost 150-year-old part of the street, at the expense of space for vehicles and parking. Since Federal and State minimums for disabled parking spaces are not accommodated by the Alternative 1 design, portions of the street could be found to be in violation of Federal and/or State law if built as shown in the designs. As of this writing, the Grand Street designs do not show specifications for establishing disabled parking spaces within the new rights-of-way.

I question how seriously the City is committed to disability accommodation. Since there has been 8 ft wide unmarked parking in front of my house for 100+ years (Existing Conditions), I had no need to request a designated DP space until I learned that the City is planning to remove parking or narrow the entire parking lane width below 8 ft minimum in order to provide more space for the new bike lanes.

On Dec 18, 2022, six months ago, I submitted a Residential DP Parking Space application to the City of Alameda for a dedicated space in front of my house. Although I received an acknowledgement that my application was received, I have received no further response at all, positive or negative! My in-person inquiries have been answered with excuses like: ask someone else, it will be fit into the final design, but we haven't decided yet, we are short on staff, etc. I have sent print correspondence to every Commission reviewing this street reconfiguration: Transportation Commission, Commission on Disability Issues, etc., but they have ignored my concerns. The City states in its written staff reports that the project is ADA compliant, but without parking specifics. I live on the east side of Grand, which will bear the entire burden of a one-sided 2-way cycle track (Alternative 1).

I will be lifting my walker into the passenger side of my car while standing in the cycle track. Given the dimensions in the exhibits, it is hard to understand how my request will be "shoehorned in".

FACTS: There are Federal and California State standards for the minimum width of an accessible parking space on a public street. The CA standard is 108 inches or 9 feet [May 20, 2020: Parking Code Regulations, California Building Code (CBC), Title 24 Part 2: Technical Specifications: 11B-502.2 Vehicle Spaces: "Car parking spaces shall be 108 inches (2743 mm) wide minimum, shall be marked to define the width, etc."].

The Federal standard is narrower, only 8 feet. Clearly, a space can be in Federal compliance while still being in violation of the CBC standards, i.e. State Law. You can see from the "Existing Conditions" slide that the current parking lane is considered to be 8 feet wide, whether or not there are any disabled markings. Both Alternatives #1 and #2 narrow the parking lanes down to 7.5'. For a City to deliberately narrow the parking lanes down below both Federal and State standards, removing accessible parking where it existed before, is asking for a future lawsuit.

Burdening the east side of the street with all of the bicycle track will decrease property values on the east side of the street. All of us will have to cross the 2-way bicycle track just to reach the driver's side of our vehicles. Unloading a car on the passenger side is currently done with the door open over the landscape strip. With Alternative 1, unloading of passengers and cargo will be done directly into the 2-way cycle track. Cars will be washed by spraying the hose through the passing bicyclists.

If I have to choose the lesser, and more fair, of two evils, I choose Alternative 2. At least it treats both sides of the street equally and bicycles will ride with the flow of traffic, as they would legally have to do wherever bike lanes are undefined.

However, having lived on Grand since before there were signaled intersections, I do not believe anything less than a new stop sign between Encinal and Otis is going to slow down speeders. The fear of getting a moving violation on your license jacking up your insurance premium is the only proven way to deter speeding. Installing a few 4-way stops on Grand would be a far simpler, cheaper, and quicker way to slow down traffic, provide traffic breaks so residents could safely pull out of and into driveways; and add safety to the street for all. If there is enough traffic to justify traffic calming measures proposed by these "alternatives", surely there is enough traffic to qualify Grand Street for additional 4-way stops! They are PROVEN to increase pedestrian safety. Yet city staff refuses to even consider adding 4-way stops to Grand Street.

It is a shame this project was presented to the public as if anything they chose would be possible. In a perfect world, streets would always be wide enough to accommodate everyone's desires: bicyclists, motorists, and parking spaces. But Alameda is not a perfect world. Some parts of Grand Street cannot be widened and there are already residents living there. The Federal laws established to protect the access of disabled residents have been in place for more than 30 years. Compromise is necessary. Please give more consideration to Alternative 2 and do not endorse Alternative 1.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Carol Gottstein  
1114 Grand Street, 94501  
21 June 2023

**From:** [Amy Cheng](#)  
**To:** [Transportation Commission](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Grand Street bikeways  
**Date:** Sunday, June 18, 2023 9:35:13 AM

---

Dear Alameda Transportation Commission,

I support Alternative #1, raised two-way bikeways, on both segments of Grand Street, for tonight's meeting.

I ride down Grand every day as part of my commute to the Main Street ferry terminal. I have narrowly escaped being doored (hit with an opening car door) multiple times. I occasionally see children and families riding bikes well within the dooring zone of cars parked on the side of the road.

I understand why, though: there isn't a good bike access route in Grand's direction on the island. If cyclists want to get to Jean Sweeney, Alameda Point, or the newly built waterfront parks, Grand is the current best option. Broadway is probably second best, but the lanes are even narrower.

I also ride down the the two-way protected bikeway on Ralph Appezzato every day. That dooring fear is entirely negated, which explains why so many more families seem willing to enjoy it.

With Alameda's new housing well under construction, transportation congestion on the island is guaranteed to grow. We should encourage alternatives to cars. In conjunction with the new bike-friendly water taxi pilot and the ferries, a network of protected bikeways will do just that.

Thank you,  
Amy Cheng



(510) 516-0497  
P.O. BOX 2732  
ALAMEDA, CA 94501  
[www.bikewalkalameda.org](http://www.bikewalkalameda.org)

**Board of  
Directors**

Denyse Trepanier  
*President*

Brian Fowler  
*Treasurer*

Tim Beloney  
*Secretary*

Cyndy Johnsen  
*Board Member*

Maria Piper  
*Board Member*

Lucy Gigli  
*Founder,  
non-voting*

June 19, 2023

RE: Item 6A: Grand Street Safety Improvement Project

Dear Transportation Commissioners,

Grand Street is a vital corridor in Alameda, and we're very eager to see it improved for all users as soon as possible. After reviewing the many proposed designs and evaluating the pros and cons of each, we share staff's preference for Alternative 1 — the raised 2-way bikeway on the east side of the street — for both Segments B and C, with qualifications as described below. The design's bike signals, dedicated bike signal phasing, and raised crossings go a long way in addressing our concerns about intersection safety for bicyclists. And we're reassured to hear about plans for short- and long-term maintenance of this facility (and others like it) going forward, since path maintenance has been a big issue elsewhere in Alameda.

Our remaining concern is around implementation timing. Our climate and street safety emergencies are not waiting for us, and we feel it's imperative to get infrastructure that allows people to make greener and safer transportation choices built as quickly as possible. One sure way to expedite implementation is to use local funds for Segment B, rather than competing for uncertain grant funding. Staff's presentation notes that the local funding option would save at least a year, probably two or more, which is significant. Staffing, contractor, and process enhancements other cities have adopted could speed implementation further. We hope you will join us in urging our Council and City Manager to explore those strategies. We have a backlog of other delayed transportation projects around Alameda that could benefit from these changes as well.

If the timeline for Segment B cannot be expedited, ideally to have construction beginning in 2024, our 'Plan B' preference would be for the Council-approved design for Segment B. This design has a clear advantage over the others in being considerably less expensive, and getting built next year.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Bike Walk Alameda

**From:** [Francisco Sprouse](#)  
**To:** [Transportation Commission](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Grand Street Improvmenets  
**Date:** Monday, June 19, 2023 9:03:58 AM

---

Dear Transportation Commission,

I'm writing to support Bike Walk Alameda's views on the upcoming Grand Street Improvements. We've waited long enough for this important project - the island's first low-stress north-south route and a vital path for our schoolchildren.

Let's get this done fast and efficiently. I'm behind both the council-approved design and Alternative 1, but only if we can speed up Alternative 1's implementation. We've seen too many delays with our low-stress bike improvements.

While I like the raised cycle track in Alternative 1, I don't want to let perfect stand in the way of progress. So, I'll only support it if we can speed things up by using local funds instead of waiting for grants.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Francisco "Paco" Sprouse

**From:** [Grand Street Neighbors](#)  
**To:** [Transportation Commission](#)  
**Cc:** [Lara Weisiger](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comments for 21 JUN Transportation Commission Meeting from Grand Street Neighbors regarding plans for Grand Street  
**Date:** Monday, June 19, 2023 8:24:43 AM

---

Dear Transportation Commission Commissioners,

Our neighborhood group, Grand Street Neighbors, supports the new plans being proposed by the City of Alameda for Grand Street. Specifically:

1. We believe having a consistent approach for the sections of Grand Street between Otis and Clement will create the safest environment for all modes of transportation.
2. We believe either Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 will work.
  - a. Some of us prefer Alternative 1 because it would a. provide a continuation of the 2-way bike lane in front of Wood Middle School and b. leave slightly more room for the bicycle buffer zone and for automobile traffic and parking lanes.
  - b. Some of us prefer Alternative 2 because it is a. more intuitive for drivers and safer for both cyclists and motorists because people backing out of driveways and turning at intersections would encounter bicycle traffic moving in the same direction as auto traffic, and b. from an esthetic standpoint it is more balanced.
3. To enhance pedestrian safety and reduce speeds, we believe either Alternative can be enhanced by flashing markers for pedestrian at cross walks. We further believe that 4 way stop signs at the two busiest intersections between Otis and Encinal, San Jose and Clinton, would further enhance safety by slowing traffic and ensuring pedestrians are seen at these busiest intersections on this section of Grand.
4. We further support the plans for Grand Street from Otis to Shoreline, adjacent to Wood School and Rittler Park. We believe these plans will coordinate well with either Alternative 1 or 2 and will facilitate and encourage students cycling to school.

We want to thank the City for creating these new alternatives that increase safety for all modes of transportation and preserve the usability of Grand Street for residents.

Respectfully,

Grand Street Neighbors

Sent by John Brennan on behalf of Grand Street Neighbors



**From:** [Grand Street Neighbors](#)  
**To:** [Lara Weisiger](#); [Transportation Commission](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Feedback on plans for Grand Street  
**Date:** Monday, June 19, 2023 10:15:06 PM

---

Dear Transportation Commission,

We want to send our family's perspectives on the proposed changes to Grand Street.

We believe either Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 will work and enhance the safety of Grand Street for all modes of transportation. Of the two, we prefer Alternative 2, as we believe bike lanes on both sides of the street that follow the direction of automobile traffic will make it easier and more natural for motorists to look for and see cyclists when turning in and out of driveways and side streets.

We also believe having a consistent approach on Grand Street from Otis through Clement is safest and easiest for cyclists and motorists to follow. We also support the current design for Grand adjacent to Wood Middle School and Rittler Park.

If we were designing from scratch, we find Alternative 3 to be the best. But given the built infrastructure and the expense, this seems unworkable.

We want to thank the City for revisiting the design of Grand Street, and feel these current Alternatives represent a very positive step.

John and Jean Brennan

**From:** [Sean McQuillan](#)  
**To:** [Transportation Commission](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comment on Grand St Bike lane  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 21, 2023 6:27:06 PM

---

Ahoy!

Sorry to email late - was planning on coming in tonight but am on last second baby duty.

General comments -

As a general policy for all projects, please ensure that all parking has equitable and impactful bike parking within 100ft of car all spots. The current bike lanes in the city are built without bike parking - making point to point trips to destinations along bike routes impossible.

Increasing bike parking is the single largest lever we can pull to encourage people to feel safe biking. It's cheap, easy to install, and makes bikes as useful for point to point trips inside Alameda as a car.

Writing in public comment:

I *oppose* delaying the project by nearly a decade in order to increase parking at the cost of several million unfunded dollars. A rough calculation shows that the staff recommendation plan costs about \$20,000 per parking space added - more than the market value of most of the cars parked on Grand Street today.

I *support* expedited improvements to this cross-town childrens bike lane. The sections north of encinal are definitely some of the most complicated biking in the city, and after Central is basically impossible for a child to navigate. Unfortunately that means north central Alameda students, who are too far to walk to school, cannot effectively use this plan.

The staff approved plan looks nice, but with no funding, staffing, or any serious proposal to complete the project it is a fantasy.

---

Comments on the staff approved plan (if adopted)

Separated bike lanes are used in one place in Alameda today and leave a *lot* to be desired as a cyclist who uses them daily. Separated one lane bike lanes are easier for both bikes and cars to navigate.

The current design of the cross Alameda trail has several very serious flaws that will translate to the Grand st corridor without intentional design.

1. Crossing all five stoplight roads are dangerous crossings that require a cyclist to ride on the sidewalk, push a button, and wait 1-3 minutes to cross.
2. Despite pedestrian control lights, cars are allowed to take a right on red, and consistently do so while bikes have priority. Please remove right on red where cars must turn across

bidirectional bike traffic - it is an unsafe maneuver for everyone.

3. All crossings are marked as a pedestrian crosswalk, despite being a high traffic bike lane. As a result, there is great confusion about who has priority and how to correctly navigate intersections. Reading the DMV drivers handbook has no instructions for either bikes or cars in crossings marked this way. Please avoid this style crossing on Grand.

4. Due to the use of crossing buttons, a bike approaching a stop light on the cross alameda trail must *always* come to a stop for 1-3 minutes. Even if the light is green on approach and there are no cars in the intersection. Please ensure that bikes are given equal priority at lights in the grand design.

5. Separated bike lane on Clement is used as daily all day parking by automobiles. No enforcement is done. As a result, bikes are forced to merge into truck traffic. Any design on Grand should intentionally use medians, poles, or other mechanisms to avoid the bike lane becoming a parking lot like Clement.

Thanks

Sean

--

Sean McQuillan

415.990.0854

## **Exhibit 5F:**

### **Community Input**

Summary of online Comment Form responses  
(collected from 06/06-28/23)

## Summary of Online Comment Form - 66 Responses

Segment B: Which design do you prefer for Grand Street from Otis to Encinal ?	%
Alternative #1: Two-way raised bikeway, on east side of street	38%
Either Alternative #1 or #2	18%
Keep striping as it is today, with standard bike lanes	9%
Council-approved: One-way parking/bollard-protected bikeways on both sides of street	8%
Alternative #2: One-way raised bikeways on both sides of street	8%
Other*	6%
Alternative #3: Enhanced raised one-way bikeways on both sides of street	5%
Either Alternative #2 or Council-approved	5%
Blank	5%
Grand Total	100%

### **\*\*Other" comments**

Other: 1 or council-approved

Other: Alternative #1 if it can be funded and built promptly or Council-approved

Other: Alternative #1, #2, or #3

Other: I recommend moving forward on the existing, council-approved bikeway project in the near term via the paving project, while also pursuing funding for a follow up upgrade to the Alternative 1 raised cycletrack - The cycletrack is a good idea but will take a lot of time for design/outreach and to secure funding, let alone construction - The safety needs on this street can't wait so the city needs to take a phased approach to move forward on near-term improvements ASAP

Segment C: Which design do you prefer for Grand Street from Encinal to Clement?	%
Alternative #1: Two-way raised bikeway, on east side of street	41%
Either Alternative #1 or #2	20%
Alternative #2: One-way raised bikeways on both sides of street	9%
Keep striping as it is today, with standard bike lanes	9%
Council-approved: One-way parking/bollard-protected bikeways on both sides of street	8%
Alternative #3: Enhanced raised one-way bikeways on both sides of street	5%
Either Alternative #2 or Council-approved	5%
Other*	3%
Blank	2%
Grand Total	100%

### **\*\*Other" comments**

Other: Alternative #1, #2, or #3

Other: I like the Alternate 1 cycletrack in theory, but this segment has a lot of signal-controlled intersections which introduce a lot of complexity, with regard to safe bike movements in all directions including right and left turns at each intersection - This usually requires dedicated bike signal phases and car turn restrictions, which can introduce a lot of delay and wait time - If there isn't enough funding and design detail to figure out good solutions to these needs then Alternative 2 might be the better option

On Grand St from Shore Line to Otis, next to Wood Middle School (Segment A), staff are planning to move forward with the Council-approved design for a two-way bikeway at the street-level if you have any concerns with this approach, please share them.

As long as the council approved design does NOT get implemented for all of Grand St., especially the more dense portion from Encinal to Clement (segment C), I don't really have a problem with the council approved design being used for the Shoreline to Otis segment. It might make more sense though, to just use the same Alternative #1 design the whole way.

From Otis to Clement, I support both protected bike lanes and auto parking on the street as well. In addition, I suggest secure sidewalk bike parking along the street in residential areas to replace auto parking. I might want to visit residential areas for various reasons (see friends, garage sales, tour rentals/home sales, etc) and want secure parking for my bike. Or, I will go back to using my car.

Get 'er done!

Historically, the city of Alameda has done a very poor job of maintaining any bikeway constructed. You do the initial work and walk away. Just look at the bike path along shoreline. Always full of weeds, dirt, sand and never kept clean. The bike path at Otis and Grand, right now along the park has tree roots, garbage and unsafe to ride a bike in the dedicated bike lane. Look at the bike path along Main out by Alameda Point. It doesn't even rival a third world country. Terrible bike path, hasn't been touched or maintained in at least 20 years. The gardeners do a half ass job pretending to weed the bike path and don't have clue. So, yes, this is a good idea for Grand but the score for City of Alameda public works and ability to maintain the paths (street sweep, road repair, potholes, etc.) is a big fat ZERO.

I support this project. Safety for all road users is a priority. Far too many people die on U.S. roads every year, including kids walking and biking to school and others aiming to move around their neighborhood. Further, I support the city's data-driven approach of investing in safety improvements along high-injury corridors, including along Grand Ave.

I am also supportive of this project from a quality of life perspective. I moved to Alameda in part to be able to bike and walk to my destinations. This project will improve my personal mobility and will help ensure others have safe mobility options. Lastly, I support the balanced approach of providing high-quality bike infrastructure while still retaining access (including parking) for residents. Studies show that high-quality biking infrastructure increases property values.

<https://trec.pdx.edu/research/project/1330>

I think there should be raised bikeways there as well, especially to allow safe access to Wood.

I would be so grateful to have a two-way bikeway on Grand between Shore Line and Otis. This is part of the route to pick up my daughter from day care and I would feel so much safer if this proposal were reality.

If we have two-way bike lanes that lead to one-way bike lanes, the crossing should be safe and efficient. It will increase travel times for those on a bicycle.

It would be ideal if the bike lane designs are consistent all the way through and raised bike paths are clearly preferred over the "gutter" lanes that currently and frequently fill up with debris and water is often impassable, leading to children mostly riding on sidewalks or veering into traffic.

It would be nice to have a consistent type of bike lane through the entire length of Grand St. Make it a raised bike lane on this portion too.

Narrowing the current structure will create havoc on trash pick up days, when deliveries are made, and when residents exit their driveways. I anticipate more bike accidents, not fewer, as you are claiming.

No concerns

No concerns. Looking forward to using the bike line as a north south connector with my child.

Originally, I had no concerns, since I don't live there. But I am not in favor of continuing the 2-way bike lane further north to Encinal and onward to Clement. Auto traffic is heaviest on Grand north of Otis; bikes should travel in the same direction as auto traffic in appropriate bike lanes on either side of the street. This teaches cyclists they have to obey rules of the road just like cars and trucks. Right now, many cyclists ride the wrong way even in the bike lanes made for them and swing over to the sidewalk as they please via driveways. No rules are enforced.

Plastic bollards are not enough. They need to be metal or concrete for true safety. Plastic is just a suggestion. You need something that will substantially damage a car and deter assholes

Please do not do the transfers idea, it just doesn't make sense. I love the protected bike lanes though, having a bike lane next to cars is very dangerous and although slightly raised, it doesn't protect children from veering off, which is why i love alternative 3.

Please keep in mind, that all bikeways do not require a camber or water runoff slope; please keep them level!

Please stop pushing these ridiculous configurations of our public streets. Unless the objection is to overcrowd the island and create backups and congestion, respect the input of those folks it impacts most- the people who live here and have done so for generations.

Raised bikeways prevent cars from using or encroaching on them. Safe by design.

So similar to "Alternative 1", just not raised? Sounds good so kids can safely ride to and from school. Seems fine.

Thank you for making Alameda more bike friendly! Let's get more people folks on people powered wheels :)

The change in biker behavior is the concern if this moves forward and the rest of Grand gets the alternative option. Better if we can remain consistent.

The intersection was just changed to more be more friendly to 1-way bike lanes and that already works. Since there is no alternative, keep it the way it is and take Alternative #2 for the other sections. Otherwise it should only be approved if Alternative #1 is simultaneously approved. A half-hearted approach that doesn't not build the full continuous route continuous, will fail.

The main downside of Alternative 1 for cyclists is going against the flow of traffic can be dangerous at driveways and intersections. People tend to look to the direction of traffic when backing out and turning. Alternative 2 would be safer in that regard in my opinion. However I still think Alternative 1 would preferable to the city council sproved option.

Very much for Alternative 2 or Alternative #3. To me, importantly is that bike flow coming from counter-car traffic direction is just too unsafe for so many crossings. (in my opinion). I'd be one of the ones making this crossing. Exiting in the morning, when traffic and exit opportunities are limited, will mean drivers exiting will be rushed and not as likely, or comprehensively able, to check in the counter flow direction (to the right). It's bad enough right now trying to time cars, bikes, and pedestrian traffic as is. Alternative 1 will be worse and unsafe. So I'm pretty strongly against Alt 1. Council approved at grade only without chicanes - but I feel it would be less safe than alt#2 and #3. All for increasing safety on Grand for pedestrians and bikes. Initial Council approved plan did not feel safer than existing.

what about one way on both sides of the street. Kids will do that anyway

Whatever you need to do to make it safe for children and pedestrians... prefer to narrow the street and optimize for safety (future bus should consider car lanes only and ideally no busses down Grand)

With all due respect to staff, asking this question makes no sense. Council already approved Segments A and B. I understand why there's interest in making more people happy about Segment B. But why try to draw out concerns about Segment A? It was councilmembers' direction in 2022 to do a two-way cycletrack on the east side of Segment A. You know the funding exists. You know the concept for Segment A is compatible with both the council-approved plans and alternative #1 for Segment B. Please just get started on Segment A already. And if there isn't staff time to get started on Segment A because of all of these rounds of new outreach, then staff leadership should weigh the pros and cons of trying to build consensus. Having the perfect plan is of zero use to middle school students on bicycles until it actually exists in reality.

Wood Middle school students need separation from traffic as they bike to school - a minimum raised bike lane if not a raised separated bike lane.

You already spent the money to redesign that section. You need to commit to your decisions and stick with them rather than constantly changing and redesigning and spending more of the taxpayers money.

You plan to move ahead, then ask our opinion? Shouldn't it be asking for community input first? Just exasperated with the way the city works, because we aren't really getting a say in anything. I do not like this plan. It should be one way each side in direction of traffic.

### Alternative #1 (raised two-way bikeway) Comments

alternative 1 and 2 are...fine. They're just fine. It's an improvement over today, sure, but the reality is both cars and bike veer off sometimes which is REALLY dangerous, especially for children. instead we should protect bike lanes by adding in buffer (as in council approved design), which is why i like alternative 3.

Alternative 1 is much better than the current meandering roadway plan. I do worry about having 2 way cycle traffic on one side of the street and requiring motorists both at intersections and driveways look for cycle traffic (which moves more quickly than pedestrians) in both directions, rather than the same direction as motorist traffic.

Best one. Cheapest. Arguably safest. The little whiny babies on Grand street have less to complain about

Concern about turning vehicles not having the right visibility to see fast moving bicycles on the bike lane, in particular children. This could be addressed with a raised crossing, which would slow down cars.

Drivers coming out of driveways have to be mindful of bikers in both directions.

Excellent. My first choice. The 2 way bikeway will make it more obvious to pedestrians to give the bikers the right of way compared to a single lane bikeway.

Good approach to balance safety and cost. Support the continuity (two-way bikeway along the whole corridor).

Good but I like #2 better. I do like that it's consistent with surrounding bike lanes

Good option

Great to connect the existing two way cycle ways on each side of the island with a similar treatment.

I echo Alameda Bike Walk's concerns about timing (not wanting to delay improvements).

I like this approach since I have often ridden the length of Grand Street and I dislike the difficulty of getting into/out of bike lanes or crossing the street. (I have a lot of trouble getting into the protected lane on Fernside going towards the Harbor Bay Bike Bridge from the unprotected lane, for example. I don't trust crossing at the cross-walk and with my heavy cargo bike, the angles make getting into the lane that way difficult. So I'd prefer to have one entrance/exit for those riding the length of the street. I'd also like clear guidance on how to get out of the lanes/make turns that cross the street.

I love this idea and would be a regular user of that bikeway

I prefer this option of all the ones presented.

Intersections could be tricky

It seems like a great idea. Similar to the path along shoreline. Shoreline seems very safe and secure almost you don't notice the cars.

It would be ideal to have a consistent bikeway the whole distance of grand to avoid unnecessary street crossings. Raised two-way feels the safest which is why I voted for that, but I defer to the experts who know the numbers.

It would have greater negative impact on those of use who live on the east side of the street, as we'd have to clear 2 lanes of bike traffic pulling out of or into our driveways. Also, looking both directions is counterintuitive.

Like the continuity. Worry a bit about going contra flow during school rush hour. Hope the raised crossings for intersections are high enough to really slow drivers (I've seen many that don't). More buffer between bike lane and parked cars would be better.

Love it, please pick this one. I love the idea of a two way protected bike lane all the way down. We like to bike along shoreline, but the current connection to the protected bike lane on the North side of the island is a little scary to take my little one on.

Lower cost because less disruption to landscape area (trees and poles). Wider travel lane and more parking on both sides of street. This is important below Central because there are more apartments and homes without driveways

Most sensible option. Balances parking and cyclists needs, plus continues the 2-way bike lane from Shoreline.

Mostly prefer this alternative because it's the least expensive and fastest to build. Would prefer if car lanes are limited to the recommended 10' width as "Lanes greater than 11 feet should not be used as they may cause unintended speeding and assume valuable right of way at the expense of other modes.

Not good for cycling. Not intuitive for riding my bike and a pain to cross over to the other side of traffic. Bikes should be able to ride in the same direction as cars. It seems we give over to autos way too much.

Not intuitive to look both ways. More dangerous. Impacts those who live on east side and not much for those on the west side.

Please keep in mind, that all bikeways do not require a camber or water runoff slope; please keep them level!

Raised and separated bike lanes are safer by design. The city should have a network of them that facilitates mode switching.



Since I live on the east side of Grand, I oppose this because our side of the street would have all the bicycle traffic. Only our side of the street would have to dodge bikes while crossing a bike lane to reach the sidewalk; and have more problems looking both ways for bikes backing out of driveways. I've already had neck surgery four times. I cannot deal with this alternative. I guess that is why the line dividing the Bronze Coast from the Gold Coast runs down the middle of Grand? Gold Coast gets the privileges! Coincidentally, it's also the Mayor's side of the street.

The issue with this is the limited room bikes have to pass each other. It also fails to narrow the lanes of the road. People will not slow down unless the road is narrower to navigate. Infrastructure is a better way to achieve this rather than relying on enforcement. Police have better things to do.

This alternative is preferred. Less loss of parking spots, and bicycle riders get their protected bike lanes.

This can be a good option but only if a lot of funding is available and bike-friendly signal design is prioritized. Concerns related to turn movements and increased delay/wait time at signalized intersections expressed in earlier comments.

This design would work well for cyclists along the entire corridor as long as it's very well delineated and protected at intersections. It's pretty easy to imagine at an intersection like Grand and Central that motorists turning left will keep an eye on opposing traffic, put their foot down on the accelerator during a gap, and gun it right into a cyclist in the cycletrack.

Alternative #1 would retain relatively more on-street parking on Segment C and that does look useful for those blocks. There is more multi-family housing and non-residential uses on those blocks -- they'll make good use of that on-street public parking.

Parking retention on Segment B is a bad reason for Alternative #1. Yes, a number of residents are complaining about "their" parking. But everyone can see with their own eyes how little of the on-street parking on Segment B is actually used throughout the day. Counts in the 2022 staff reports confirm how few on-street parking spots are used along Segment B. How much time and money should the ~80,000 residents of Alameda put toward the ability for a couple people to have a free place to stash their 3rd car when they are too lazy to shift their other cars in their extra long driveway?

This is the most elegant solution and will be a great improvement to the Grand corridor. This is more aesthetically appealing than the previously approved approach and is overall a better solution to the street - much simpler and easier for everyone to navigate.

This is the safest approach for cyclists and this is the best way to encourage and support cycling.

This one is the obvious choice, because it achieves a protected two-way bike lane, is the second least expensive, the second quickest to build, and does not impose an unrealistic and unfair 60-75% parking loss on the more densely population areas of Grand St.

unsafe. Confusing (having to look right and left while exiting/merging) and complex during high traffic times (school hours). There will be accidents. Already bad as existing. Speed of bicycle approach from non-traffic flow direction will be a real problem.

When considering all the alternatives and the rationale for why we should be making these updates, this seems to make the most sense in terms of continuity of the bike lanes from one end of Otis to the other. Though it took some time to get there, I appreciate the city making an effort to solicit community feedback on this project given the overall impact it will have on not only bikers/pedestrians, but on the residents of Grand St as well.

Wider lane, more parking and less disruption to landscape

Yes

## Alternative #2 (raised one-way bikeways) Comments

2nd best one. 2nd cheapest. Arguably safest. The little whiny babies on Grand street have less to complain about

alternative 1 and 2 are...fine. They're just fine. It's an improvement over today, sure, but the reality is both cars and bike veer off sometimes which is REALLY dangerous, especially for children. instead we should protect bike lanes by adding in buffer (as in council approved design), which is why i like alternative 3.

Alternative 1 is my preferred plan (although either 1 or 2 is better than the current meandering roadway plan). Alternative 2 is better than 1 since cycle and motorist traffic move in the same direction on each side of the street, which is more intuitive for motorists.

Better option

Better than #1 - but still gives over the space to cars.

Better. Only one direction (presumably) of higher speed crossing approach (bikes and cars).

Having two separate bikeways seems less efficient. On shoreline there is not always someone in the other direction. This means that one person can use the entire lane. Also it makes passing other bikers easier. This allows both family style bikers and racing types.

I could live with this because it not only treats both sides of the street equally, it teaches young cyclists the rules of the road: ride in the same direction as motor vehicle traffic; don't ride on the wrong side of the street. I still prefer enhanced Class 2 bike lanes with 4-way stops added at San Jose, and even other intersections to slow traffic. 4-way stops are a tried and true reliable method to break up long lines of traffic so pedestrians can cross more safely. Only the real threat of a moving violation for running a stop sign is going to make drivers slow down. Nothing else will be effective.

I could support this plan.

I feel its a little safer because lanes are going same direction as traffic. I love raised bike lane idea for both 1&2 you can see kids riding bikes and they won't be hidden behind parked cars.

I like this idea, but I'd be somewhat concerned about car doors on the passenger side opening into the bikeway area. Still, I find this significantly better than on-grade bike lanes, and would use these bikeways regularly.

I like this option, but it's pretty expensive and I don't see the expense being justified with the Alt 1 option on the table.

I think this is the most agreeable plan between the two sides of the issue. It's the least impact on parking

It seems hostile to make folks cross Grand twice when biking the full length of the corridor. When I think about kids trying to get to school I worry about this added danger.

Looks more balanced.

Much safer not having to watch 2 way bike traffic when backing out. A bike lane in each direction makes safer sense and is common practice.

My concerns with this one are the cost and whether or not it is easy to connect with the section south of Otis.

Narrow bike lanes and very narrow buffer. Council-approved plan had much wider bike lanes.

No advantages to this design

Not bad. My second choice.

Not wild about the narrow bike lanes, but still preferred over street level bike lanes. Seems like that the car lanes could be further reduced to 10'. From NACTO urban street design guide, "Lane widths of 10 feet are appropriate in urban areas and have a positive impact on a street's safety without impacting traffic operations. "

Preferred but didn't pick bc narrowest bike lane and still optimizing for cars

Preferred options. I suspect turning vehicles are more likely to see bicycles traveling in the direction of traffic. I'm still concerned with cars stopping pass the stop line and in the bike path. A bicycle traveling at speed might not be able to stop if a car enters the bike lane.

Road too narrow

Safer for all. Greater predictability for trained bike riders, drivers, and pedestrians, including especially for those with limited mobility.

Street too narrow.

Think this is better than #1.

This is my preference, but anything is better than nothing!

This is the best approach from all perspectives. It's a strictly safer way for bikes to travel and it narrows the road, which makes for safer traffic conditions as cars will be forced to navigate more slowly. The only issue is the plan to build past Otis drive with a 2-way bike lane. That ruins this option.
This method unnecessarily loses too many street parking spaces, creating a hardship. Very bad choice.
This option would be acceptable, but not as good as option #1
Too expensive relative to value added. Not worth losing more parking.
Totally unfair and unacceptable to impose a 60-75% parking loss on a busy street with numerous multi-family homes, apartments, churches and businesses. This could create unsafe conditions by forcing cars and delivery vehicles to double-park, block bike lanes, park on sidewalks and lawns, and crowd surrounding streets. I have submitted photos to city council members illustrating this point.
Would be okay.
Yes

### Alternative #3 (raised one-way bikeways next to sidewalk) Comments

alternative 1 and 2 are...fine. They're just fine. It's an improvement over today, sure, but the reality is both cars and bike veer off sometimes which is REALLY dangerous, especially for children. instead we should protect bike lanes by adding in buffer (as in council approved design), which is why i like alternative 3.

Cost prohibitive, with limited benefits compared to alt 2.

Great but too expensive

I get that you all are trying to lay out multiple alternatives in order to highlight contrasts. Still, it's kind of annoying to see city funds going to pay consultants to create plans and budgets that everyone can see are not realistic.

I love this idea and would be a regular user of that bikeway

I really like this design, except that it eliminates the mature trees. But if Alameda needed a new road built somewhere, or revamping a road that does not have the mature trees of grand street, I would be in favor of this plan.

If space were unlimited, it would be nice to have the sidewalks and bike lanes separated, but since compromises have to be made in any case, I think this is the best option. That is because this allows for the bikeways to be separated from the street which is much more pleasant, but also because in the case that faster bikers need to pass the slower bikers, there is space to do that when pedestrians are not present. The cons to this option are that pedestrians tend to take up the entire paved area (bikeway included), so some signage advising to stay off the bike path would be helpful. Otherwise though, that's not a big enough of a problem to detract from this option.

Least favorite as it brings pedestrians and cyclists into closer proximity which is sometimes a bad idea.

Least preferred, but from an aesthetic human-centered design point of view, this seems like it would be the best design, but due to the cost and timing involved it would seem impractical and I'm wary that this means that practically this would never be built. Would also anticipate a lot of pushback from removal of mature trees.

Also concerned about potential pedestrian/bicycle conflict.

Most expensive

Most expensive moving trees and poles. Bikes might take more than their share and be on sidewalk

Nice idea in theory, but way too disruptive, time-consuming and expensive. Plus, seeing mature trees taken down would be tragic.

Not sure why this was even proposed. Not a reasonable option due to cost and disruptive work.

Obviously most expensive; will remove trees and who knows what else. But if it finally undergrounds all the heavy power wiring hanging over my cars and my side of the street, I'm all for it! Unfortunately it is unlikely to be finished in my lifetime.

Probably best plan, but I don't see us spending the money and enduring the direction.

Removing mature trees is Non stater....

Seems better progression of #2 but may be costly.

such an additional expense

This doesn't help anyone.

This is nicer than #2, but still I think a combined bikeways is preferable.

This is the best option if there is room.

This may be the most expensive and 'disruptive' BUT it's the best alternative for bikes. As I cyclist who rides all over the island and not just for exercise, the 2-way path is awful and does not feel safe.

This would be great and is very expensive. I'd rather use the funds on other bike infrastructure improvement projects (like replacing/improving the wooden bridge to Bay Farm Island as one example) or the many bike paths that make riding on paths unpleasant.

Too expensive but beautiful

Too expensive, takes too long. Pity to get rid of mature trees.

Too impractical.

When a bike lane is right next to a pedestrian sidewalk to I wonder about pedestrian intrusion into the bike lane.

Would be great, seems there is zero will for it. Older trees is not a very good excuse.

## Overall Grand Street project Comments

Allow for some auto parking and install secure bike parking racks along street to replace auto parking being taken away.

alternative 1 and 2 are...fine. They're just fine. It's an improvement over today, sure, but the reality is both cars and bike veer off sometimes which is REALLY dangerous, especially for children. instead we should protect bike lanes by adding in buffer (as in council approved design), which is why i like alternative 3.

As an Alameda resident who uses a bike as my primary mode of transport, I think bollards are the safest and least stressful way to build a bikeway. The alternatives suggested seem less safe. I would strongly prefer protected bike lanes with bollards similar to the other protected bike lanes in Alameda

At the Mastic presentation, consultants cited three regional bodies in identifying Grand Street as a high-risk corridor. Those citations were incomplete - as no statistics were provided for APD traffic enforcement in that period.

1) if traffic enforcement in the same period has generated many moving citations - then those data would add weight to the high-risk assertion.

2) if traffic enforcement has been absent, then the city's presentations will continue to be incomplete without the necessary context for understanding the circumstances and conditions on Grand. From personal observations, a new Alternative 4 should be examined with equal attention - that is, that the city more aggressively manage enforcement of existing regulations on this high-use corridor.

Bollards are ineffective and, over time, are damaged or destroyed. The greater the buffer, the safer the cyclist (and all pedestrians).

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.

Definitely support improvements to Grand. It's pretty awful riding my bike down it and I find ways to avoid it now. Would rather see bike lanes on both sides of the street. As a cyclist, I don't feel safe being pushed in a 2-way lane with other cyclists. Cars need to accommodate bikes on the island. We bend over for cars!

First priority is safety, second priority is time to completion, third priority is cost. Rich people on Grand between Otis and Encinal are not to be taken seriously when they complain about loss of parking because literally anybody with eyeballs can see they're histrionic. Their other comments and "concerns" have likewise been falacious.

Good! Needs to happen to improve safety for cyclists of all ages and abilities.

Grand Street is currently in the exact same unsafe condition as it was when a majority of City Council members approved plans for Segments A and B last year. Slow Streets including San Jose Ave look exactly the same as before, with the same temporary barricades and no progress that the public can see toward permanent designs.

Yes, city staff want to make as many people happy as possible. Yes, the mayor wants to make as many people happy as possible.

But will this new process of design and outreach actually produce results that are real and results that are timely?

Grand Street is NOT a high-injury corridor! The data do not support this label! Pedestrians who were killed while crossing Otis near Grand by an AC Transit bus or Shoreline near Grand, after a cycle track was installed on Shoreline are not Grand Street casualties and changing Grand Street would not have prevented them. I am tired of the City of Alameda LYING about this to force wider bike lanes at the expense of auto lanes. Installing a few 4-way stops on Grand would be a far simpler, cheaper, and quicker way to slow down traffic, provide traffic breaks so residents could safely pull out of and into driveways; and add safety to the street for all. If there is enough traffic to justify traffic calming measures proposed by these "alternatives", surely there is enough traffic to qualify Grand Street for additional 4-way stops! They are PROVEN to increase pedestrian safety. All this other stuff is a naked pandering to the Bicycle Lobby and will not increase pedestrian or driver safety on Grand. Shame on Alameda!

Have a question on why in all of the alternatives, the street widths all exceed the NACTO recommended width of 10' in urban environments?

Please stop using plastic bollards and only use steel bollards? Plastic bollards seem frequently damaged and offer no real protection.

Additionally on sidewalk widths. Current widths of sidewalks are frequently too narrow. Especially if walking with family/company, it's awkward to walk with multiple people, particularly if strollers are involved or if people need to pass each other.

I have lived on Grand Street for 40 years. The total lack of traffic enforcement for the 25 mph speed limit is my main concern. This lack of enforcement seems to be pervasive throughout Alameda. Enhanced bicycle paths along Grand Street will undoubtedly benefit recreational bicycle riding, but they will not decrease automobile traffic and will not impact climate.

I love my bicycle but my block also has a need for a lot of street parking. There are more tenants moving into multi-family housing in my area and they all come with cars. Alternative #1 does a better job of preserving parking, while also providing the protected bike lanes cycling advocates say they want.

I love that all options involve making it safer for vulnerable road users I wish we didn't have to have such long conversations about each and every resurfacing. Protected bike lanes should be standard for all high speed and/or high traffic volume roads. Keeping people alive is more important than convenient places to park cars.

I love the ambition of alternative 3, but that timeline is too long. We need the strongest protection as soon as possible.

I wish it were in progress already and am frustrated by the delay.

In general, I think that it's nicer to bike through neighborhoods. So I'd prefer to have more dedicated streets for bikers. I'm Berkeley they have "bike boulevards." To me this is a better use of funds than improvements to a busy street.

It's too bad that the city didn't ask for input before this all began, and devised its own (terrible) plan. Then, it didn't follow its own rules. Shame on you.

Leave streets as they are with some designated bike lanes. These changes are ridiculous and make no sense. With all the over developing going on streets are becoming over congested for the first time in our history and these plans only worsen traffic. It's as if someone is purposefully ruining this city. Take a good look at SF and stop already!

Like the way it is. A big GRAND STREET with beautiful homes

Love it! Can't wait to have a safe North-South route for everyone!

Love love love it. There is very limited bike infrastructure going north-south right now and we desperately need this. Moving in the right direction. Infinitely better than the meandering roady way (so-called chicane plan). Either 1 or 2 (or 3) construct safe, reasonable cycle lanes. The chicane plan is actually unsafe as demonstrated by many studies showing them inappropriate for streets with multiple driveways and intersections.

My kids and family bike this route daily, I am glad additional time and input was allowed.

Needs to be build ASAP.

Please expedite however possible. This is such an important street and shouldn't take so long to make safer.

Please keep ugly white bollards to a minimum they are not maintained throughout the city and are blight. Please have a plan for maintaining bike lanes.

Please move forward on the previously council-approved project with paving in 2024, as the near term alternative, then also continue pursuing grant funding for more robust upgrades via the raised bikeway proposals but only in addition to and not instead of the existing project. The safety needs on Grand Ave are immediate and priority should be given to whatever work can be delivered the soonest.

Raised bikeways, or protected bikeways at a minimum are my main concerns for the project. I really need a safe north-south mid-island crossing to shift more trips for my family out of cars and onto foot/bikes.

See earlier comments on support for Segment A, also pasted below.

I support this project. Safety for all road users is a priority. Far too many people die on U.S. roads every year, including kids walking and biking to school and others aiming to move around their neighborhood. Further, I support the city's data-driven approach of investing in safety improvements along high-injury corridors, including along Grand Ave.

I am also supportive of this project from a quality of life perspective. I moved to Alameda in part to be able to bike and walk to my destinations. This project will improve my personal mobility and will help ensure others have safe mobility options. Lastly, I support the balanced approach of providing high-quality bike infrastructure while still retaining access (including parking) for residents. Studies show that high-quality biking infrastructure increases property values.

<https://trec.pdx.edu/research/project/1330>

see my previous comment

So excited for bike improvements on Grand.

The best alternative would be to spend the money repaving the entire street, put a stop light at Grand and San Jose, have countdown lights at every intersection so a bike knows how much time they have, keep the striping as is in good shape and ENFORCE CURRENT VEHICLE, BICYCLE, AND PEDESTRIAN LAWS.

The city had a golden opportunity to ask the neighbors what they wanted BEFORE it developed alternative plans, even if it were just for show. The city squandered that opportunity. Why is the city so eager to spend money, even if it comes from the Fed? It's wasteful & unnecessary. I would like to voice a complaint against Bike Walk Alameda forcing their agenda on city politicians. They don't live on Grand Street, yet want to control what happens here (and everywhere else, for that matter). 501C3s can't have lobbying as their main goal, and they do just that. Get them out of city politics.

The objective should be clear. More bikes being used, fewer cars on the road, and a safer road. Safe pedestrians. Parking and costs should be non-issues. They're not what this project was about. We have plenty of parking everywhere, need less with good biking infrastructure, and residence can more than afford this quality of life improvement.

The residents on Grand who value parking over safety sadden me. My wish is that we make this corridor serve all its users, not just the personal auto users. It's loony that people feel so entitled to park their private property in public space – for free – and then play the aggrieved party when the city endeavors to protect kids going to school. While these residents are gifted at making their voices loudest, by lawsuit or booing city staff during meetings, I hope the safety improvements are implemented.

The sooner we get this done, the better. Grand Street is plenty wide enough to accommodate these improvements and it will be a safer street for everyone!

There are no safe protected ways to get a bike from the North to the South side of the island. Prevents a lot of mode switching by families.

This bike safety project is so important for the Alameda cycling network. Thank you city staff! Whichever alignment is selected, ideally the whole corridor will have the same treatment. Tacking back and forth across multiple 1-side 2-side cycleways is unintuitive and dangerous

This process has been disjointed at best and has felt as if decisions were being driven based on arbitrary deadlines and budget availability vs. what is actually best for people who use Grand St as well as residents. What resulted have been ugly back and forths, project delays, and likely cost overruns.

Not only this, but because of the piecemeal approach to how the entire project has been handled (factoring in daylighting and the new intersections at Otis and Shoreline as well), bits of work have been undertaken and completed, which will now have to be re-done to match the master plan, namely the Otis intersection.

While I'm not a planning professional, I do understand that there can be a lot of influencing factors on how infrastructure projects are completed. That said, this process has strained my trust of those in charge of making decisions for the growth of the city. Hopefully this (painful) process is a learning for the city and lessons can be learned for how to best engage residents and neighborhoods on public works projects. I do believe that the residents of the Island want to be engaged and are willing to work toward compromise solution if given the appropriate forum.

This should be a priority for the city. This projects connects thousands of resident to the existing bike network. The current grand bike lane is unsafe to all, but very unsafe to children.

under no circumstances do I want to see the original approved plan implemented. I would rather it stay the current lay out than have that plan implemented.

Very needed.

Very pleased to see this project moving forward

Would like it to stay the way it is but I know bike people rule. My children rode their bikes to school and the swimming pool on the sidewalk and used a bell (required back then). Council plan has a narrow zig zag travel lane and loss of a lot of parking.

Yes please, get started asap!!

Yes this is great. I've been hesitant to let my kids ride to Wood. Unfortunately one has already graduated but another is going there in a couple years. This project would give me much more confidence to encourage her to ride there.

I drive the morning drop off to wood South on Grand frequently and with the amount of traffic on grand it feels dangerous for the kids cycling. One big issue is all of the unprotected left turns. Cars block the intersection waiting to turn left and other cars then swerve into the bike lane to go around them. I've seen some near misses with the kids riding to school. How does this plan address this issue? Will there be a center turn lane? Why are there not protected left turn signals at major intersections such as otis and grand and encinal and grand? The amount of people turning left onto otis east bound from grand southbound in the morning is high, and since there's no left turn signal they are waiting till the end of the signal and running the red light. This creates a dangerous situation for cyclists and pedestrians crossing. Please address this issue. Please observe traffic during school drop off and pick up times.