

Exhibit 2: Comment Summary for the Clement Avenue Complete Street Concept Proposal (March through April 2015)

**(Transportation Commission – March 25, 2015)
(Community Workshop #3 – April 29, 2015)**

Development

- Not considering pending approval for developments is going to cause problems for the neighborhood. The developments are going to happen – plan for them.
- A lurking issue is future land uses along Clement Avenue. Whatever the current uses, nearby properties are already being developed to single-family homes (the only type legal for construction in Alameda, per Measure A). As these developments open, land values will rise beyond levels that make the remaining light industrial uses economic and those owners will sell. Why design a high-speed truck/parking/tiny bike lane corridor when future users will be walking and bicycling, and the only trucks will be moving trucks?

Flooding

- In significant rain, Lafayette to Schiller floods on the north side of Clement Avenue. City can confirm this with Alameda Marina owner.

Funding

- If I'm not mistaken, the money to cover the cost of this project is from a Federal grant. I don't care if it is covered by grant money. I still think city officials should be smart about how money is spent. After all, I helped fund that grant money with my federal taxes.

Intersections / Driveways

- Include removal of railroad crossing and tracks out of service signage on cross streets leading to Clement Avenue from Eagle.
- I'd also like to request consideration for crosswalks at all intersections, if only painted.
- The Best Solution to stop speeding and reduce traffic on Clement Avenue - one or two stop signs on Clement Avenue between Oak Street and Grand Street.
- Park Street: My biggest problem since 1992 has always been going east on Clement Avenue and crossing Park Street trying to get by the left turn cars. Sometimes there was parking allowed along the south side of Clement Avenue near Park Street or there

were no cars parked there - near the scooter store. Now, it is not possible to pass on Clement Avenue on the right due to striping changes. In the past few years, it has become very, very difficult to get past Park Street. This is true almost all the time except maybe very late at night. Eliminate the restriping on Clement Avenue near Park Street to allow cars to pass on the right. Provide a left-turn signal for vehicles turning left to go to the Park Street bridge. With new housing planned on Clement Avenue, these problems will increase significantly.

- Park Street: We think it would calm traffic very much if there were no right turn onto Park from Clement westbound.
- Park Street: Please do NOT do anything that will delay traffic that is approaching and crossing the Park Street bridge. The needs of a handful of cyclists do not take precedence over the thousands of people driving across the bridge every day. I have read that there are plans to change the lights at Clement and Park to accommodate cyclists, and that is absolutely unacceptable.
- Park Street: A protected green left turn arrow would ease congestion at the corner of Clement Avenue and Park Street next to the scooter store.
- Walnut Street: To me, the biggest issue is the women and children who cross Clement Avenue on foot. As a test one day last week, I tried crossing Clement Avenue at Walnut Street walking. It was very, very scary and I am very mobile.
- Walnut Street: Turning left from walnut on to clement to go west to alameda marina. Has been getting worse and worse for the past 5 years due to increased traffic on clement. Sometimes very difficult to see oncoming cars. Solution - don't allow cars to park close to Walnut on Clement side of the street. Sometimes I give up, turn right, and make a u turn after passing a few homes.

Other Corridors

- Blanding Avenue: At Blanding Avenue and Park Street, sometimes I could pass on the right. Now there are almost always cars parked there. Eliminate parking on the south side of Blanding Avenue to allow cars to pass. Provide a left-turn signal for vehicles turning left to go to the Park Street bridge.
- Buena Vista Avenue: For unknown reasons, many people have finally figured out that Clement Avenue is much faster than Buena Vista Avenue due to the lack of stop signs - only one between Park Street and Grand Street at Oak Street. Sometimes I go to Buena Vista Avenue to try to go across.
- Encinal Avenue: When going to Encinal Market, I take Oak Street to Encinal Avenue.

Parking

The participants at the community workshop on April 29, 2015 who completed comment cards stated the following:

Which Clement Avenue concept do you prefer for the Oak Street to Grand Street section?	Results
Traditional bike lane on each side of Clement Ave.	38%
Buffered bike lane on each side by removing parking on the north/estuary side	24%
Do not know	10%
Other	29%
Total Respondents	21

- Everything sounds good except eliminating parking spaces. On street sweeping days, it is already hard to find parking near my house. I don't want it to be worse. I live at the corner of Stanford and Eagle, so on Street sweeping days I often park on Clement at Stanford.
- I am against eliminating some parking, these business need all the parking they can get.
- I understand that there is not much residential use along Clement Avenue now so it is not a big problem. But, when the new housing developments are built, it will be a problem. On two to three blocks of the north side of Clement Avenue, there is no parking - the naval reserve facility. There are a lot of parked cars on Clement Avenue for football and soccer games. From high school age down to small children play and their parents come to see them play. The most parking is during high school football games.
- The suggestion to remove parking is also problematic; from 3:00 pm to 6:00 pm the parking area between Walnut and Union is pretty full with parents waiting for their students to finish their TaeKwonDo lessons, people picking up or checking on their cars at the auto body repair facility, visiting the hair salon or shopping at the golf or hobby stores. The street also provides parking for the Alameda High school sport field which is in use regularly.
- I own a retail business near the end of Clement, between Minturn and Union. I've seen the proposals and I'm very worried about the second one, where it removes all of the parking on one side of the street. I get the need for bike lanes, but the original proposal for one on each side would eliminate only a few parking spaces. As it is now, we're seeing more parking with other businesses in the neighborhood (we aren't the only retail business and we draw from 100 miles away so people expect parking). Typically my staff park on the side streets but losing 1/2 the parking on Clement would move a huge amount to the residential streets and seriously piss of the neighbors (who get

testy enough as it is). My business was originally on Park Street and then Webster and a huge reason I moved the business here, was parking. The farmers market on Saturday killed my Saturday business within 6 months of it moving to the Haight street lot (I was kitty corner to it) because my customers could never find a space to park until 2pm. So the idea that we might face that type of issue again is extremely stressful. Two of my staff are avid bikers and they just want a solution that works for all of us. They want a safe lane to ride a bike in but they too are concerned about the potential removal of so much parking. I thought the original proposal with a bike lane down each side was workable and would minimize parking impact. It seems the current proposal is designed for maximum pain for the businesses located along the street and by extension, the residents as well.

- If you remove parking from the north side, how are the sidewalks going to be wheelchair accessible? You show the sidewalks coming out into the street to get around telephone poles.
- More analysis of what the impacts would be to the businesses on Clement Avenue if parking removed and how they can be mitigated.
- Loss of street parking will kill our business and I am in favor of improving the street by removing the train tracks to slow down traffic you could put in stop signs and crosswalks.
- Not big on No Parking on the north side.
- Consider protected bike lanes both sides with parking on the outside.
- Do not remove parking!
- Bike lane with no loss of parking! As a retail business parking is my life blood. Loss of this would be a big problem. If it is a choice between taking out the tracks and losing parking – keep the tracks!
- Potential harmful impact on residents during Alameda High School football, soccer and graduation events.
- Need a business specific outreach if parking on the north side is eliminated – including inside the Marina. I would want strong support for removal.
- I am against removing parking on the north side of the street.

Railroad Track Removal

- The proposal to remove the railroad tracks? I get it. They are ugly. But again, this area is semi-industrial. I can only imagine that this process will be very costly. Is the benefit really worth the cost? I am guessing the answer is no. I drive along there all the time and don't find it that big of a deal.
- Very excited about railroad track removal.

Sidewalks

- If the city wants to fix the sidewalks on Clement, fine. I have walked over there and they are a disgrace. But quite honestly, so are many of the sidewalks in Alameda. My 8 year old and I ride all over the city and the sidewalks are very bad in many areas. I can't really imagine that there is a lot of foot traffic along Clement. This is a semi-industrial area.
- How is the pedestrian being accommodated? Are sidewalks able to be increased in width? Lots of talk about cars, trucks and bikes but not really pedestrians.

Street Trees

- I believe that street trees have been discussed as part of the project. However, the existing ca. 5' wide sidewalks are too narrow for street trees. The sidewalks will need to be widened to allow for at least 3' (preferably 4') wide tree wells and to improve pedestrian access. This probably means sidewalks that are at least 7' wide and preferably wider. Will it be possible to widen the sidewalks as part of this project? Alternatively, tree wells could be located within the parking lane, but this will not address pedestrian access issues.

Termini / End Points

- Broadway: I am still concerned with traffic and especially the traffic at Broadway and Clement with the idea of the 3 way stop signs. Recently the bridge closures has shown me yet another side of the traffic. Crazy busy on Broadway. I want to emphasize the need for synchronizing the light so that the cars do not pile up between Tilden and Clement on Broadway. It is a short distance, 1 bus and 4 cars will put the next car in the intersection at Tilden and Broadway. I also think that a crossing signal (like Park and Webb) for both directions, crossing Clement and crossing Broadway would be beneficial. I also hope that the City and the railroad can come to an agreement for the land at Tilden and Broadway. It is an eye sore as well as a potential fire hazard. I know that the fire dept has taken action in the past to clean it up and sent them the bill. I encourage and appreciate that.
- Broadway: We at the Broadway end of Clement would love to have an all-way stop and pedestrian "bulb outs" at the T of Clement and Broadway.
- Grand Street: By adding the lanes on Clement it forces the cyclist to make the dangerous left turn at Grand as Clement ends at Grand. While it is understandable that Clement may be extended through to Sherman that scenario will not happen for many years.

Truck Access / Industrial Street

- This Avenue is a Truck Route and safety for these truck is more important than bike lanes, without this you will lose business in the area.
- Clement Avenue is an industrial street that is very busy during the workweek. There are several large trucks that back into warehouses on an angle or perpendicular to traffic, which causes the bike riders now using the street to go into the lane of traffic which moves rapidly throughout the day.

- We have only a few industrial streets left in Alameda. Should this become a bike trail, it will be a hardship for the businesses located along this street and force relocation outside of the city as there is no other semi industrial place to locate.
- The plan to change Clement Avenue from a truck route to a section of the cross alameda trail complete with protected bike lanes would be a huge negative impact to maritime businesses that need truck services and have heavy equipment at times.
- Alameda Marina's letter is attached at the end of this comment compilation document.
- Maintain truck route at current width to accommodate large and wide loads.

Underground Utilities

- Underground overhead utilities will cost the business owner dearly. This item need to be discussed with the business owners.
- The proposal to underground overhead utility lines? Ridiculous. If the city wants to underground utilities, why not start the process in some residential neighborhoods?

Bikeway Concept: General

- I want to voice my strong support for a safe bikeway. We want to encourage our kids to bike when we can. I've seen way to many close calls with kids biking in the morning vs. cars. Let me add that ALL - yes, ALL of those incidents I personally witnessed had cyclists riding safely and following the law. Let's be "proactive" in creating a safe bikeway and not regret later when a close call becomes a tragic story.
- How about putting narrow "buffer" lines on both the parked car side and the traffic side between Broadway and Grand Street with a four foot inside-the-paint lane for riding?
- Any bike poles should only be used if large trucks or boats can still travel while maintaining traffic movement in the opposite direction.

Bikeway Concept: Two-Way Bikeway Favored

- Please support the Cross Alameda Trail and provide protected bike lanes. My children and I love the protected bike lanes that have been established on Shoreline. Protected bike lanes make it much, much safer for my children and I to travel through Alameda. Please reconsider this decision.
- My husband and I are both business tenants in the Alameda Marina and bicycle riders who live, work, and commute on and near Clement Ave several times a day, every day of the week. I do NOT feel safe currently and will NOT feel safe with simply a painted bike lane on a road where people routinely speed at 35 or 40 mph. I was unable to attend the Transportation Committee Meeting on March 25th but have since watched the meeting and comments on 5c (Clement Ave Complete Streets). I'm very concerned about comments business owners made about truck traffic amounts and access, perceived safety of drivers/truckers/bicyclists, and impacts on their business. First of all, no one substantiated "a lot of truck traffic" or how often wide load trucks come in and out of the marina or at what times of day. This requires study and substantiation. Many gates of the Alameda Marina are closed on the weekend and require keycard access. On the weekdays after 6PM only one egress is open at Schiller Ave. As a sailor also, I highly value the boat facilities along the estuary and want to ensure these businesses thrive and survive. But without data, we cannot effectively measure these impacts. People in the audience shaking their heads is not data. Furthermore, anecdotes about how people feel about how "unnatural" a protected bike lane would be is not substantiation either. In fact, a large contingent of bike traffic is recreational right now and they were not represented at this meeting. Another issue that will not be solved by simply adding a class 2 bike lane is that between late fall and mid-winter, the morning sun blinds drivers during commute hours heading from Grand Ave to Oak St. I have nearly been run off the road many times despite my tail lights and reflective jacket because of this phenomenon. In the summer, the same effect happens during the return commute in the Oak St to Grand Ave direction. Cycling should not only be available to those of us brave enough to suit up and take this risk. If we as a community want to encourage more people to get out of cars and on to bikes for recreation and everyday riding and commuting purposes, we need to look at success stories for how to make that reality possible in the US and abroad. For example, Paris, France - 700km of bike lanes currently plans to double that by 2020. <http://www.postpioneer.com/europe/paris-aims-to-grow-to-be-world-bike-capital-h2697.html> - much of that infrastructure is separate from vehicles. Should we not have protected bike lanes because the current bicycle traffic doesn't support it? Bicycle ridership is growing every year in the Bay Area. Bicycle infrastructure separate from vehicles encourages riding. It's a clear success story in many parts of Europe. This is an active battle across many communities in the Bay Area. See recent reporting in the East Bay Express on how Oakland can become a model bicycling community in the East Bay. It takes vision and leadership, often above the shouts and

complaints: <http://www.eastbayexpress.com/oakland/shifting-gears/Content?oid=4222704> Do we know how much parking we need to support on the North side of Clement Ave? The north side of Clement Ave is often spottily parked. Does this even create value for the businesses and homeowners? The Naval Operations Center already has a long red zone blocking parking in front of their facility. This draws out the question - do we need to find other ways to move people around or continue to marginalize bike riding as a real transportation opportunity at a time when the island's population is growing? Everyone loves to complain about how loss of streets parking will impact their home or business, despite data that shows how much value is created by giving up street parking for bike infrastructure. We are one of the only densely populated communities in the inner East Bay that does not have a paid parking zone system, which could raise revenue to support these types of projects. People in this town act like they own the space on the street in front of their house and fights can erupt over "taking someone's spot." It's a can of worms issue but needs to be seriously considered. Please do not let this amazing opportunity pass us by. We can encourage cycling AND meet the needs of industry along the North Shore. I urge you to get more data on success stories of protected bike infrastructure in front of the transportation committee and follow up with real data on truck delivery traffic from industry along the North Shore. I urge the committee to approach this with a little more creativity and vision. This community can really set an example for the rest of the East Bay and has an amazing opportunity to do so.

- Only anecdotal evidence was considered on the safety of traditional bike lanes alongside truck route. Traditional bike lanes are worse because people are biking within feet of fast moving trucks moving even the best bicyclist to use the "door zone". Consider parking removal to create wider turning radii. Clement is a truck priority AND bike priority street. The best facilities should be considered including removing parking. There is no place in the Transportation Element that prioritizes parking over bike lanes. Consider removing parking between Oak Street and Grand Ave where there is the most truck traffic and keep the two-way bike lanes along Clement Avenue. While studying the parking needs of the area, please consider the needs of people wanting to bike along this corridor. The rest of the Cross Alameda Trail will be protected from Main Street to Grand St. This is a key piece of the trail.
- I hope you will reconsider protected bike lanes on Clement Avenue. They have been supported in community meetings and this is a great opportunity to deliver on what the public wants. Concerns about truck access and turning and parking can be addressed within the scope of the protected bike lanes better than traditional bike lanes. Please put this item back on the agenda for the Transportation Commission's April meeting. Please also at that meeting consider real data on the pros and cons of protected bike lanes vs. traditional bike lanes. Traditional bike lanes do not allow for enough passing room by cars and are often full of road debris, a deterrent for many bikers. Protected bike lanes help encourage less seasoned bikers. With the Cross

Alameda Trail coming, protected bike lanes will provide great connectivity for the whole island. Alameda currently enjoys a Bronze level Bike Friendly Community Award status. Please keep and raise that status for the community. On a personal note, a protected bike lane would make me more comfortable allowing my 10 and 12 year olds to bike from our home at Alameda Ave and Benton to their Kung Fu studio at Park and Clement. I am assuming that any plan would call for the removal of the railroad tracks along Clement, which is a personal pet peeve as a bicyclist and a driver. Thank you for your consideration.

- I am disappointed that the Transportation Commission decided to ignore the overwhelming support for protected bike lanes from the community meetings. What is the point of giving my input if it is ignored in the public process. The comments made for concerns about truck access and turning can be addressed within the scope of the protected bike lanes better than traditional bike lanes. This item should return to the TC at their April meeting. Non anecdotal, real data should be presented for the pros and cons of traditional bike lanes and protected bike lanes next to a truck routes. The Commission made their decision without this information. Only anecdotal evidence was considered on the safety of traditional bike lanes alongside truck route. Traditional bike lanes are worse because people are biking within feet of fast moving trucks moving even the best bicyclist to use the “door zone”. Consider parking removal to create wider turning radii. Clement is a truck priority AND bike priority street. The best facilities should be considered including removing parking. There is no place in the Transportation Element that prioritizes parking over bike lanes. Consider removing parking between Oak Street and Grand Ave where there is the most truck traffic and keep the two-way bike lanes along Clement Avenue. While studying the parking needs of the area, please consider the needs of people wanting to bike along this corridor. The rest of the Cross Alameda Trail will be protected from Main Street to Grand St. This is a key piece of the trail.
- I'd like to register to the Commission at its 3/25/15 meeting my wholehearted support for a bikeway along Clement Avenue. I ride Clement from Lafayette to Broadway daily as part of my commute to the Oakland Coliseum Amtrak station, where I take the train to Santa Clara. The road can be quite dangerous with a lot of speeding and reckless overtaking. I will be commuting home (in part along Clement) during the meeting so cannot attend in person. With that said, I'd also ask that my comments be given equal weight to those of Mayor Spencer, should she attend the meeting to give one of her peculiar Citizen Spencer comments, as is her wont. And if Citizen Spencer should ask for a long consultation process with transparency, as also is her wont, I'd ask that this be done quickly to ensure public safety and to encourage biking in Alameda (a city with perfect weather and topography).
- Thank you for another well-run public process. I think the cycle track would work well, but the doubts raised would be hard to answer without actually building the protected bikeway. I hope your design for the grant application will make the infrastructure

improvements which could ultimately support the cycle track in the future with only a change in striping. I see the class B bikeways as an interim step, which will be replaced with a protected bikeway at some time in the future -- probably when elements of the Cross Alameda Trail are completed and connected to Clement. Thanks again for the good work you are doing, and particularly for the well run public input process.

- Your beautiful community is filled with people who love bikes, and even prefer them to cars. You have a great network of recreational paths but it's not safe to try to cross town on a bike, and that needs to change. I have been nearly swiped by buses, fast-moving trucks and distracted drivers on your streets. I am not a 30-something male on a fast road bike. I'm a senior. I have grandchildren who should be able to ride to parks, out for burgers and to the movies. We are not safe with just a painted strip between us and traffic, wedged between parked cars that could open or peel out at any moment and commercial vehicles whizzing by. I urge the city to rethink its recent ruling regarding bicycle safety lanes. You could be a leader in Bay Area community transportation design and still meet commercial needs along your 'thoroughfares'. Alternatives to using key avenues for auto storage are plentiful in Europe, for starters. I urge you to work with Bike Alameda to find more successful models for shared roads than your current plan. It's discriminatory and very dangerous, in my view.
- I was disappointed to hear that the Transportation Commission decided to not pursue protected bike lanes on Clement Ave. I was unable to voice my support for the protected bike lanes in person because I was busy coaching a Little League game. And it is those Little Leaguers--along with all who love to explore our island--who stand to benefit from those bike lanes. As a bike rider and a parent, I love protected bike lanes. The one along Shoreline makes it so much more fun and relaxing to ride along with my son. I don't have to worry that a moment of inattention will send him into traffic. A regular bike lane is certainly better than no bike lane, but the protected lanes make it so much safer, with the buffer between bikes and motor vehicle traffic. I am really excited about the prospect of more protected lanes on the island. Biking is such a great way to get around Alameda, and to be able to do that in a safe, relaxed way with my family gives me yet another reason to love living here. I respect others' concerns about truck routes and parking. But problems like those have been addressed in other protected bike lane situations to the satisfaction of all involved. I strongly encourage the Transportation Commission to reconsider its decision, and to make sure they have looked at the data—not just anecdotes—about how well protected bike lanes can work for bikes, pedestrians, and motorists alike.
- There are 24 states and 55 cities in the U.S. that currently have cycle tracks. This type of infrastructure has been popular in European countries for decades. They are not new and are proven to work well and are growing rapidly. More info on cycle tracks <http://www.honolulu.gov/bicycle/kingcycletrack.html> Maybe a similar page of how it's intended to work for cyclists, motorists and pedestrians could be sent out by the city

and posted on the city web page. I am disappointed that the Transportation Commission decided to ignore the overwhelming support for protected bike lanes from the community meetings. Protected bike lanes are vital to a community to attract young people. They are known to reduce car speeds, increase bicycle riding and make it easier for pedestrians to cross the street. I'm sure you have seen this on Shoreline Drive. These are all things that benefit Alameda. Protected bike lanes reduce crashes by 34% for all road users. Wouldn't you agree it's safer for a bicycle rider to ride in a protected lane than the car door zone of a bike lane? Less confused bicycle riders make it safer for car drivers as well.

- As a rider (and driver and, on unpleasant occasions when I've forgotten how narrow the sidewalks are, pedestrian) along Clement, I fully support the proposal as outlined. While the bike track would have been my first choice, I still support this.
- I am so strongly against putting the painted bike lanes in that put all cyclists right in the door zones. As a cycling instructor I feel this is a very irresponsible design plan. There also seems to be a bad habit of trucks to double park in the bike lanes. This is just the type of hazards that will keep parents from letting their kids bike to school. Is it possible to bike in a bike lane, yes. Is it safe enough for most parents to comfortably allow their kids to ride to practices at the point or to school at AOA, ACLC, ASTI and Nea? No.
- I support and encourage the use of protected bike lanes instead of the two separate bike lanes. This would provide the safest route for children and families to use the bike lanes and allow more room for the vehicles on the street including a truck route. I believe making the bicycle route the safest they could be would lead the most use by Alameda's residents and lead to less car traffic for all. I live by the new protected bike lanes at shoreline and have noticed a large increase in bicycle use from families with kids on training wheels to elderly couples on three wheeled bikes going for groceries.
- I am writing to voice my support for the addition of the protected bike lane on Clement Ave. I don't agree with the reasons given by those who are opposing this option. Providing a designated area for bike riders on this road is a good idea and has been carefully thought out by those who are spear heading this proposal. I have a son who rides to the Academy of Alameda and each time he takes his bike on the road to school I worry about his safety. I hope that the Transport Commission will revise their decision and support the implementation of the protected bike lane.
- I would like to encourage the city to add protected bike lanes on Clement Ave. I believe protected bike lanes would encourage more citizens to bike more frequently knowing they are not risking their safety when on the road. I have a young son who will be attending Academy of Alameda Middle School next year. I would like to have peace of mind knowing there are safe bike routes for him to get from the east end to the west end of the island. There are too many distracted drivers out there, and his safety would be in jeopardy if he had to ride on the road WITH the cars and trucks. If there was a protected bike lane, he could feel safe. I am enrolling him in bike safety class to give him as much education as I can to make sure he knows the rules of the road and how to anticipate what drivers are going to do. However, he is 11, and his decision making capability is not fully developed. He needs to feel comfortable,

confident and safe when biking to/from school on a daily basis. Again, I encourage you to put protected bike lanes along Clement Ave to ensure the safety of the youth.

- First of all, this is fantastic! The one thing I'd like to see in the final project is to have the bike lanes closest to the edge of the street, with parking for cars next in towards the middle, which gives some protection to cyclists- like it's been done on Shoreline. The photo below shows the cyclists very exposed to cars and trucks- in my opinion, this is the opposite of what's safer for cyclists.
- I am writing in support of a protected bike lane that runs along Clement Avenue, one that would remove parking from one side of Clement Avenue to make the lanes wide enough for a protected bike lane and to allow trucks to use the route. This would make a fantastic 3.5 mile northern bike route across Alameda making it safe and convenient to go to and from several schools and after school activities.
- I would like to register my support for the Clement Avenue Draft Preferred Idea that includes a two-way protected bikeway on the north side of the street. I have been commuting regularly by bike to and from the Fruitvale Bart Station from my home in the Marina Cove development for over a decade. I have benefited greatly from the exercise I get riding my bike. However, I have paid for this with two accidents and several close calls. My bike has been hit and damaged by an oncoming car making a left turn. I have fallen and broken bones when my front wheel got stuck in the railroad track. I have been surprised by car doors opening in my path. And I have been cut off by "parked" cars entering the roadway without using turn signals. These are not just my experiences. I share them with nearly all bikers. Have you seen how many cars are lined up on Clement Ave. and elsewhere to get off the island each day? I pass scores of them each day during my ride to Bart. Building protected bikeways will encourage more Alamedans to get out of their cars and minimize the car traffic that none of us wants to characterize our city. Have you seen how many bikers are using the south shore bikeway? What a great success! Those of us living on the north side of Alameda deserve equal courtesy and protection. I hear that truckers are upset with the Draft Preferred Idea. Will the design slow them down or force them to find another place to park, load or unload? Any serious design for Clement Avenue must allow trucks to use it. However, it is also clear that there are more bikers than trucks currently using this avenue. And looking to the future with more and more housing replacing worksites on Clement Ave., it only makes sense that the Transportation Commission give higher priority to bikers and pedestrians than to trucks. These are just a few of the reasons I urge the Public Works Department, Transportation Commission and other decision makers to implement a two-way protected bikeway on Clement Ave. Please share these thoughts with Public Works staff and the Commission on my behalf. I will do my best to attend the May meeting. It is time for the City of Alameda to show leadership in protecting its residents who bike.
- As a mother of a child who attends the Academy of Alameda, I would like my child to have a protected bike path on Clement Ave. so I can feel confident about her safety while she is riding to school from the East End. I feel firmly that the original plan with a protected path is the safest options for bicyclists. How lucky our island community would be to have a safe and protected path that will connect with the Alameda Cross Trail and also go through Jean Sweeny Park? As the West End continues its rapid course of development, people from the East End will be traveling to the West and vice versa, via bikes more than ever. As a community, we should create safe and

protected bike pathways which as a result will encourage biking by providing the best protection possible for those using them!

- Question posed: Did the concept get the big picture right? The part of the big picture that is missed is Clement Avenue as a part of the Cross Alameda Trail. That was not properly discussed. The proposal is not classy enough for the Cross Alameda Trail. A cycle track would be classy enough.
- Want a two-way bikeway: Safety first, no traditional bike lanes: car doors opening “door zone”; red light: car turns not seeing cyclist, the right hook, the left cross and rear end. We all need to slow down even trucks – narrower lanes force trucks to slow down. Poles are a good idea; otherwise, trucks double park. What about no vehicle streets? Bikes only.
- On an industrial street with moving and standing trucks, and 35 miles per hour driving speeds, traditional five foot bike lanes leave cyclists almost entirely in the door zone. An open door, a badly-parked vehicle, or an illegally-parked truck puts cyclists in direct conflict. Let us not create an effective gap in the Cross Alameda Trail.

Bikeway Concept: Two-Way Bikeway Opposed

- I do NOT want a protected bike lane on Clement Ave. I have been riding my bike on the streets of Alameda for 30 years. If you really want to increase safety on Clement Ave for bicyclists AND auto drivers - fix the pot holes. Clement Ave traffic is light enough that these "protected bike lanes" are wholly unnecessary. Greater attention should be paid to the standard maintenance of our streets.
- I am a cyclist in Alameda. Shoreline Drive is a hideous configuration and sight. Do not turn Clement Ave into another obstacle course.
- I would suggest plans for more protected bike lanes are put on hold until the effect of the new one on Shoreline have been observed over the summer season. I have a strong suspicion there will be an increase in property damage and maybe injuries caused by the parking area being pushed out into the street. It is quite obvious that there is insufficient room for people to debark from the left sides of vehicles parked there. It will take only one lawsuit to wipe out the \$500K in outside money used to build the lane. I am not against protected cycle lanes -- the one on Fernside from the school down to Otis is a vast improvement -- but on a street like Clement they probably have to replace parking rather than push it out into the main carriageway.
- Last week's edition of the Alameda Sun newspaper featured an Opinion letter from Bike Walk Alameda encouraging people to write to you in favor of a curbed bike lane on Clement Street. I'm writing you to express my opposition to that reconfiguration and to express my support of your sensible decision to vote down the original Clement Street proposal. I don't know why Clement Street is of such interest to Bike Walk Alameda or why Shore Line Drive was reconfigured in favor of the recreational bicyclists and to the dangerous disadvantage of the people who live on the block. I have a friend who with his wife and young children live in an apartment on Shore Line Drive. Not only do they now have to wait in line to leave their complex but they take their chance not getting hit by an oncoming car because traffic can't be seen – and that's specifically because of the new curbed bike lane! What's done is done on Shore Line Drive, I suppose, but I don't want to see this irresponsible, self-interest mistake repeated anywhere else in Alameda! There's no sound reasoning for it. So please, do not allow the return of the Clement Street curbed bike lane proposal at the Transportation Commission meeting on May 27th. You've already made the right decision. And please, keep the bad example of Shore Line Drive in mind when considering any future bike lane curbs on established Alameda streets. There's plenty of new development at The Point to design from the get-go safe and ample space for bicycles, joggers, pedestrians, motorists and street parking.
- Please DO NOT add protected bike lanes on Clement. I am a bike rider and do not want or need those type lanes there. This is a commercial street that needs the room to allow business to conduct business. Thanks you. P.S. The bike lanes on Shoreline are great, thanks.

- I'm concerned about the proposed two-way bike lanes. I use Shoreline Drive when going to the post office and car wash, and used to use it when going to South Shore, coming in the back side. It was a scenic drive to the shopping center, fun to see people walking their dogs and wind-surfing, and less crowded than Otis Drive. I now avoid Shoreline Drive. It is certainly less scenic, you can't even see the beach anymore, and more crowded because of the reduction of car lanes from four to two. But more than that, it feels unsafe. Aesthetically it looks "cluttered" and like something you would find in LA. There is too much happening there with all the paving, markings, curbs, etc.; confusing is a better term.
- Streets throughout California are being rebuilt to accommodate the increasing number of bicycles on the road. Due to narrow rights-of-way and the implementation of separate bicycle paths within preexisting roadway cross-sections, this process involves completely redesigning roadways. I applaud the efforts to make the roads safer for all users but alarmingly, less-than-minimum safety design standards are being applied. This practice is counter to the needs and desires of the public and it is happening here in Alameda. The city has been approving design concepts for these roadway reconstruction projects that violate minimum design criteria and with experimental designs like the Shore Line Bikeway followed swiftly by approval of grant applications for their final engineering and construction. The Clement Avenue and Central Avenue Complete Street Plans are moving in the same direction. Problematically, the city has no qualified civil engineers in responsible charge of these projects. All the city's four lead civil engineers have left. Clearly numerous safety and traffic delay problems are going unresolved. Would you hire a divorce attorney who is not licensed? Would you hire an obstetrician who is not licensed? Of course not. Nor should Alameda have only planners who hire planners to perform civil engineering functions who are not licensed nor qualified in that field. But that is exactly what is happening. I am very concerned that the city is moving forward with reconstruction of its streets with numerous safety problems and causing nightmarish congestion by what staff calls a road diet in the reduction of lanes. The same cycle path on Shore Line Drive was recently approved by Public Works staff and consultants to be built on the estuary side of Clement Avenue between Grand and Broadway. The city and consultant's staff, all planners, stated there were no major flaws. This was concerning, in and of itself. But little did they know that their design was particularly dangerous. Neither the drivers nor the bicyclists would have had adequate stopping sight distances to stop safely, and there were numerous violations of even the most minimum safety design criteria. Further their design with only one lane (11 feet wide) in each direction required a complete shutdown of Clement Avenue for the regular wide deliveries to the marinas. Their design also added an extra signal phase just for bicycles which would have required a reduction in signal time for autos at Park Street — severely increasing delay for all Alamedans leaving the Island in the morning through the Park Street/Clement Avenue intersection. There was no mention

whatsoever anywhere of this excessive increase in delay. Were they hoping Alamedans would not pay attention? Residents and business owners went to the Transportation Commission on March 25 to fight for what was right. It is heartening the Transportation Commission turned down the city staff and consultant's plan but with only a slim majority. Wouldn't you agree Alamedans should not have to go to City Hall and tell staff and consultants that their work has major flaws and the plan is biased and unsafe? Traffic safety issues are going unaddressed. Let me explain from personal experience. About 15 years ago, my Mom then in her early 80s, was hit by a bicyclist in a similar configuration as along Shore Line. She stepped out of the passenger side of the car into the path of bicyclist who was traveling quickly. Bicycles easily travel east along the new Shore Line path at 20 mph or much more with the usual tail wind. This, too, is in the same space where young children excitedly exit the cars to go to the beach. Building a "commuter cycle" track on Shore Line was inappropriate and unsafe for a recreational trail along a beach. It is a commuter bicycle concept to save time, not meant for recreation. A recreational trail should have been built like the one at Crissy Field or like those in Holland along the beaches. I beseech Alamedans to speak up at the City Council meeting before these poorly designed roadway plans for Shore Line Drive, as well as Central and Clement avenues cause serious injury. As I think you will agree, these roadway changes affect virtually every Alamedan. We applaud the efforts to make our roads safer. However, far greater care must be taken in keeping us safe. State law requires that qualified civil engineers design these roadways.

- I do not support creating any bikes lanes similar to those installed on Shoreline Drive. I find those to be obtrusive and unfortunately, while they were supposed to be "traffic calming", I think the City of Alameda has now put more people at risk. If the city wants to install bike lanes on Clement, fine. Get out and paint some lines on either side of the street. Easy, done. And I'm sure, the least expensive solution. I'm concerned about the proposed two-way bike lanes. I use Shoreline Drive when going to the post office and car wash, and used to use it when going to South Shore, coming in the back side. It was a scenic drive to the shopping center, fun to see people walking their dogs and wind-surfing, and less crowded than Otis Drive. I now avoid Shoreline Drive. It is certainly less scenic, you can't even see the beach anymore, and more crowded because of the reduction of car lanes from four to two. But more than that, it feels unsafe. Aesthetically it looks "cluttered" and like something you would find in LA. There is too much happening there with all the paving, markings, curbs, etc.; confusing is a better term. There is a lot more traffic in the city now. I took my niece to Target a couple Sundays ago. She got a gift card for Christmas that she wanted to use. She lives on Broadway, I picked her up at 2:00 and once we got to Webster Street and Santa Clara, it took over 30 minutes to get to Target. I appreciate the people who like to bicycle around the city, but narrowing the streets is no answer. I would hope the city would leave Clement as a thoroughfare when traveling to the Park Street Bridge and Broadway Street areas.

- I am baffled by this notion that bikers should be given the world. As in my previous email to you, I will again reference Shore Line. Just look at the money that has been spent totally for the benefit of bikers; neither pedestrians nor auto drivers are benefited by the changes. Actually, auto drivers have paid a price for the changes. When you take into account the number of bikers as opposed to the number of auto drivers, the economics make no sense. Based only on my observation, the number of biking accidents in Alameda is small. In my opinion, a biking education program would have been a much better approach to protect the bikers, and the main target of that program should have been the bikers. Bikers think they are both pedestrian and auto, and as a result, have the right to go anywhere they want at anytime they want. Bikers need to learn how to ride a bike, and they need to be made responsible for their own safety. As an aside, how many bikers have insurance to cover the accidents that are their responsibility? I hope some common sense will prevail in the decision to make improvements to Clement. I am concerned that this will not happen.
- I am very excited to know that Clement Avenue will be undergoing street improvements for all users in the near future. I am particularly excited about the removal of disused railroad tracks, repaving, potentially under-grounding utilities and creating dedicated bike lanes. However, I am not in agreement with the recommendation to install a two-way cycle track on the north side of Clement Avenue. From a safety standpoint for all concerned, I strongly feel that a designated truck route should not be modified to put parked cars (i.e. immovable objects) closer to moving vehicular traffic as would result from the two-way cycle track. By effectively narrowing the traffic lanes by having parked cars farther from the curb than on a traditional road, the City is effectively making the road less flexible by restricting the amount of space available for vehicles to maneuver around trucks loading/unloading, turning into businesses or simply being so wide that a car moving in the opposite direction needs to move over (if clear to do so) to provide more space for the on-coming truck to pass. As an alternative solution to the two-way cycle track, I strongly encourage the City to implement traditional bike lanes on each side of Clement -- similar to Broadway -- as part of the Clement Avenue street improvements. Traditional bike lanes would create a designated zone for bicyclists while maintaining the most flexible roadway for all users.
- New residences being built plus businesses need parking then when special events happen such as soccer on the weekends – where park? No cycle track!



ALAMEDA MARINA

- Alameda needs a wide truck route, and Clement is the most logical place for it because it already exists there. With the construction projects planned at Alameda Point and the Northern Waterfront in general, Alameda needs a route for trucks with big equipment like Cranes, Bulldozers, Pile Drivers, and so on. The Webster Tube with its narrow lanes and height restrictions, and the Oakland China Town traffic limitations, is not going to serve that purpose well for obvious reasons. Trucks will come over the Fruitvale Bridge and need a safe route across town.
- Alameda Marina owns five city blocks on the North side of Clement from the Navy Reserve Base at the intersection of Willow on the East, to Alameda Marina Drive, next to Alameda Power on the West. The Alameda marina is a commercial property, with 5 actively used driveways entering onto the property. There are two at the intersections at Stanford Street, one at Chestnut, one at Schiller and one at Alameda Marina Drive. It is home to over 500 RV's, trailer boats and close to 150 businesses, including Svendsen's Boat Works, the Hot Rod Shop, PK Safety, DOER and Alameda Golf Works. There is also an active marina with over 500 wet berths.
- To put it mildly there is a lot of traffic entering and exiting the Alameda Marina on a daily basis. This includes very large Class 13 trucks with boats or submarines being hauled as "wide loads" arriving to or departing Svendsen's Boat Works and DOER. Some of these boats are as wide as 15-16 feet, and the maritime commerce of offloading and onloading large boats like these is important to the City and jobs. At least 200 of these Class 13 trucks came and went to Svendsen's Boat Works in 2014, entering the gate at Chestnut, looping through the boatyard, and then exiting through the Schiller street gate. Numerous identical Class 13 trucks with large boats went down Clement to Grand Avenue, where they routed into the Boatyard at Grand Marina for the same offloading or onloading hauling reasons.
- There are also numerous delivery trucks entering and exiting Alameda Marina all day long, including tractor trailers which need wide turning radiuses. And of course there are your everyday Alamedans towing their trailer boats, or driving their RV's, in and out of the marina from some sort of day or weekend use.
- So, why is the proposed two way bike lane on the North side of Clement a bad idea?
 - It narrows the available lane width far much too much. The current lane width between the railroad tracks and a parked car is 13-14 feet, and it is actually is wider if a truck drives inside of the tracks. The scheme being proposed narrows the driving lanes to 11 feet. Please tell me how will a 15 foot wide truck with a boat on it make it down Clement without encroaching over the center line, and what will that do to oncoming traffic? You can't just ignore this issue because it represents a small amount of the overall traffic volume, and it directly contradicts your conclusion in the proposal that there are "no fatal flaws". If the roadway is reduced to 11 feet (and that's a very real 11 feet), it is entirely possible both Svendsen's Boat Works and the Boatyard at Grand


- Marina will lose this essential part of their businesses, as boat haulers may refuse to deliver or pickup here.
- Trucks turning into Alameda Marina or other driveways on the North Side of Clement will not be able to see bicycles because they will be obfuscated by the parked cars. So, a truck will start the turn, suddenly see an oncoming bike (hopefully), and then stop mid-turn? That back end of that truck will then be sticking half way out into the roadway, and you will see rear end collisions, near misses, or worse yet cars will go around the back end of trucks into oncoming traffic.
- Some tractor trailer trucks heading West on Clement currently stop and back up into the Alameda Marina driveway serving Fasco at Stanford Street. Fasco is a large commercial distributor of fasteners. Under the proposed scheme, a trucker backing up like this would have no clear view of cyclists heading West on the other side of the parked cars as he/she backs in.
- Trucks, and vehicles leaving Alameda Marina will have to first look for cycling traffic, and then go forward to look for vehicular traffic beyond the parked cars. When these trucks, trailers and RV's get to the second stopping point, they will then block the two way bicycle lane because of their overall length. And what will those cyclists do? They'll try to drive around the back ends of those large trucks, and who knows what tragedies will result from that as well.

If you really must put a designated bicycle route on the only legitimate truck route in Alameda, the most logical plan is therefore to:

1. Remove the railroad tracks and stripe down the middle of the roadway.
2. Create a one-way bicycle lane in each direction on the driver's side of the parked cars. We have these on other streets in Alameda already.

In conclusion, your own research states that research recommends a one-way bikeway when the number of right turns into a driveway is large. One way bike lanes on each side would mitigate many of the problems I've identified with shared commercial use of the roadway, and improve the overall corridor. Even those who attended the public forums were torn between the two way bicycle lane and the one-way lanes on each side. A two way bike lane might make sense along Shoreline where there are no driveways or commercial traffic to the inside of the bicycle lane, and only recreational uses for the most part, but it just doesn't make sense on either side of Clement Avenue.

Thank you,



Sean Svendsen
President