



## I Drive Alameda

A driver advocacy group.

*"Because our interests are being neglected,  
and we need to be heard!"*

---

June 22, 2015

Dear Public Works Department, Transportation Commission, City Manager's Office, City Council, and Mayor,

Thank you for including "minimum disruption to motorists" as a project goal. However, this statement is unclear, very general, and only implies a minimum disruption to traffic flow. Our significantly supported petition stated opposition to a reduction of travel lanes **as well as the removal of parking. Any parking.**

### Impacts to Parking

**The removal of parking is easily the biggest concern of our supporters, and has yet to be addressed.** During the Transportation Commission meeting, you said that there would be no reduction of parking. **This is untrue.** You actually propose to remove parking to improve visibility, which was predicted in our original comments. You describe this as "daylighting" and include bulb-outs as possible treatment.

You also continue to disregard multi-unit residents and businesses. You only acknowledge impacts to parking and driveways of **single-family homes**. This is unfair and unjust. The parking in these dense, multi-unit areas are already bad. Residents have to park 2 to 3 blocks away from their home. The residents and businesses cannot afford to have any parking taken away from them (see public comments from the Transportation Commission meeting). The amount of residents in these areas and their parking needs far outweigh any sacrifice to parking.

### Impacts to Traffic

You and the consultant casually disregard the impacts to key intersections, which is worrisome. Delay and congestion are already poor and we question your analysis. Your June Workshop presentation shows the existing conditions of all intersections as operating below capacity. Experience at Central/Webster and Central/Eighth proves otherwise.

Additionally, the 2035 analysis shows travel times increasing by 10, 20, and 40 minutes. This was easily shrugged off (during the Transportation Commission meeting), which exposed that this is a bike/ped project rather than a complete streets project. If this was a complete streets project, and if this was reviewed by an actual traffic engineer, these impacts would have been taken more seriously.

A traffic engineer would have also understood the impacts to trucks on this truck route. You have yet to provide proper lane widths for trucks, especially ones towing boats. You state that you will review "truck turning radii" as your sole way to address trucks. This is simply ignorant and wrong. Trucks are not traveling down Central to turn on Fifth, Page, or McKay. You are addressing the situation improperly. The oversight and naivety will cause problems for all users and the project will not be an improvement for anyone.

### **Final Remarks**

'I Drive Alameda' is requesting that this project be **shelved** until:

1. The City has a proper understanding of traffic impacts of road diets on our specific, unique network. This could be achieved through the analysis of the Shoreline project, which was a **pilot** project for that very reason. The Central Avenue and Clement Avenue projects are being rushed for specific interests, to avoid possible push back, without proper comprehension. These projects will have significant impacts on our network and should not be hurried.
2. The proper staff, resources, and attention can be given to this type of high level project. To our knowledge, there is no City traffic engineer reviewing these plans. You must have experienced staff checking the work of a consultant. It's basic quality control. Otherwise, they will just tell you what you want to hear, which is exactly what's happening - *"a staff bicycle advocate is advancing a bike/ped project, masked as a complete streets project, and the consultant is saying that the impacts to motorists are not a big deal."* The analysis must be done by a properly trained, unbiased professional.

We also request, that if this project is not shelved, that there be at least **no reduction of parking spaces**. We still do not want a reduction of travel lanes, but would like to emphasize that the residents and businesses cannot afford to lose any parking. We will continue to fight for our supporters as we take their words seriously. We simply ask that you take our words seriously, as well.