

From: [LARA WEISIGER](#)  
To: [NANCY McPeak](#); [ERIN GARCIA](#)  
Subject: Fwd: Scope of the Encinal Terminals FSEIR  
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:04:46 PM

---

FYI

Begin forwarded message:

**Resent-From:** <[clerk@alamedaca.gov](mailto:clerk@alamedaca.gov)>  
**From:** Travis Wilson <[trav@westalameda.org](mailto:trav@westalameda.org)>  
**Date:** May 23, 2016 at 2:45:28 PM PDT  
**To:** ANDREW THOMAS <[ATHOMAS@alamedaca.gov](mailto:ATHOMAS@alamedaca.gov)>, City Clerk  
<[CLERK@alamedaca.gov](mailto:CLERK@alamedaca.gov)>  
**Subject:** Scope of the Encinal Terminals FSEIR

Please include this comment in tonight's Planning Board agenda item (May 23, Item 7-A, File# 2016-2928).

I strongly support the FSEIR's intent to provide new analysis of issues such as transportation and traffic, air quality, and so forth.

I also strongly prefer that the FSEIR address all of the issues that were not indicated for review by the Initial Study. This is a bold and expensive general request, but the fact is that Alameda's projected population is significantly higher than it was in 2008. Population size affects the impact of every issue on the list.

Also, the state of Alameda's waterfront industry ("Cultural Resources"), especially Alameda Marina, faces potential changes that it didn't in 2008. I'd expect an EIR to anticipate these.

Finally, stepping back a little: I would also suggest that your proposed FSEIR process is premature. North Waterfront Cove's proposed 589 residential units is in excess of the realistic capacity (234) that our current Housing Element (negotiated amidst overwhelming popular pressure to minimize congestion) specifies for the Encinal Terminals property. Also, as staff reports, North Waterfront Cove's Master Plan violates Alameda's General Plan to some extent. There is no clear and present circumstance here which would justify making egregious exceptions.

Thus I would prefer the applicant first revise the proposal to comply with our regulations, and then the FSEIR should be prepared against that revision. Otherwise we risk running the FSEIR process all over again, and you know how Staff doesn't enjoy that.

Thanks,  
Travis Wilson  
737 Haight Ave, Alameda

**From:** [Lucy Gigli](#)  
**To:** [ANDREW THOMAS](#); [ERIN GARCIA](#)  
**Subject:** Planning Board Comments - Alameda Landing and Encinal Terminal  
**Date:** Monday, May 23, 2016 11:31:49 AM

---

Hi,

Please forward these comments to planning board members.  
While we realize this is early in the process, we would like to ensure that the best possible biking and walking facilities are built.

### **Alameda Landing:**

Water shuttle - the shuttle will fill a current need to get pedestrians and bicyclists across the estuary given the lack of alternatives of efficient and economical alternatives. We spoke about ensuring that the shuttle is available to those who can't currently afford alternatives.

bike facilities -it would be more helpful if the bicycle circulation plan clearly shows the type of bikeway on the street. Protected bikeways are the norm at Alameda Point, and should be included as much as possible at Alameda Landing.

A protected bikeway is recommended on Mitchell Ave

Since 5th Avenue is the main biking street to the water shuttle, which would be used a transportation corridor, 5th street should have protected bike lanes. If parking is placed on the street, these lanes could the parking as the protection barrier.

Since the Bette street path is a direct connection to the waterfront from a main biking facility - Stargell- it should meet or exceed the minimum shared biking and walking requirements.

### **Encinal Terminals**

The Draft master plan indicates that there will be NO bike facilities within the Encinal Terminals AND the bay trail portion of the plan shows a sub-standard width of 12'.

This project promises to be a major waterfront access area and an area with a large number of homes and car travel. The roadways should be configured for safe bicycle access. Cross sections B and C, G and J show little to no safe bicycle access to the mixed- use areas within the project. In fact, the perpendicular parking is dangerous for bicyclists and should be avoided for bicyclists' safety.

Please ensure that a valid plan for bicyclists' access to the waterfront is integrated into the Encinal Terminals Master Plan.

thanks,  
lucy

-----

L. Gigli (pronounced "jeel-yee")

President, Bike Walk Alameda

<http://www.bikewalkalameda.org>

510-595-4690

WE DID IT!

The City Council unanimously approved a safer Central Avenue.

*Preserving the Planet for Future Generations by Creating a safe and enjoyable place to walk and bike.*

*Shoreline Cycletrack, Cross Alameda Trail, better ferry access.*