LARA WEISIGER

From: Brian McGuire <brianrmcguire@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2017 11:20 AM
To: LARA WEISIGER; Trish Spencer; Malia Vella; Jim Oddie; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Frank Matarrese; Jill Keimach
Cc: Lucy Gigli; cyndy johnsen; Denyse Trepanier; Jennifer Ott; Rochelle Wheeler
Subject: Feb. 17 strategic planning workshop
Attachments: BikeWalkAlameda-Feb-Strategic-Workshop.pdf

Good Morning,

On behalf of Bike Walk Alameda's advocacy committee, thank you for considering our attached comments for your upcoming strategic planning workshop.

Respectfully,

Brian McGuire

www.bikewalkalameda.org
(510)595-4690
PO BOX 2732
ALAMEDA, CA 94501

February 15, 2017

Dear Councilmembers and Staff,

Bike Walk Alameda appreciates your commitment to prioritize efforts to make this city a safe and enjoyable place to bike and walk. We look forward to continuing to work closely with you in 2017. We look forward to successful construction of Cross Alameda Trail segments from Main Street to Jean Sweeney Open Space Park and Del Monte, with a safe connection on Atlantic Avenue between Webster and Constitution. We are also eager to help with the much needed update to our Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and putting deed to word when it comes to our Vision Zero commitments. Additionally, 2017 is the year we think Alameda will take the critical first steps to realize the vision of constructing a bicycle and pedestrian bridge on Alameda's west end.

In its October 18 meeting, Council voted unanimously to support moving forward with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Moveable Bridge initiative. One of the items requested by Bike Walk Alameda and supported by staff was the hiring of a maritime engineer to gather more information, to essentially take off where the 2009 Estuary Crossing Study left off. We ask that you include this commitment as priority in the upcoming strategic workshop on February 17. Below we've outlined what information we think would be most valuable to gather, and how we envision the effort organized.

Part 1: General Fact-finding

1. The 600' opening constraint of the bridge proposed in the 2009 Estuary Crossing study made the proposed bridge infeasible. But per page 69 of the study, "If part of the 600 feet were in waters too shallow to navigate then the US Coast guard would consider reducing the horizontal clearance." **We need to determine what the actual navigable channel widths are.** We have unofficial data that a significant part of the estuary may be too shallow for Coast Guard cutters to operate safely. To answer this question officially, we need to (a) determine water depths at the proposed alignments and (b) map that against the needs of the 22.5' draft of the Coast Guard cutters.

2. **Determine the ideal closed height for a bridge that best accommodates all users, balancing the access needs of bicyclists and pedestrians with the needs of maritime traffic.** The goal is to have the bridge closed as much as possible while accommodating the majority of current and future maritime traffic, and, minimizing reliance on elevators and/or steep

ramps for bicyclists and pedestrians. Aside: it is understood that large Coast Guard cutters cannot be restricted, and openings for them would happen on demand. The 2009 Study proposed a height of 45' in closed position. It would be good to better understand what that proposed height means. Would it allow for 70%, 80% or 90% of the recreational sailing traffic through without opening? If the bridge were to remain closed during rush hour periods, how would recreational maritime traffic be impacted? If there weren't any rush hour opening restrictions, what would the bridge opening frequency be? With a shorter horizontal clearance, how much faster could the bridge open and close for maritime traffic?

3. Review current "open sky" bridge types like drawbridges, swing bridges, and retractable bridges (as opposed to just the lift bridge proposed in the 2009 Study) and **explore some scenarios** using the data gathered above such as: if the horizontal clearance were 300 feet, the closed height was 45', and the bridge were 15' wide (as proposed the 2009 Study), how quickly might we expect the bridge to open and close? What kind of ADA-accessible ramps on either side would be possible? What would a typical workday look like in terms of opening and closing?

Part 2: Coast Guard-specific questions and discussions. With Part 1 initial findings in hand, engage the Coast Guard to confirm/gather more information and formally reexamine constraints, namely:

1. **Confirm the dimensions and draft needs** for Coast Guard vessel traffic that would require a bridge opening. Refer to bathymetric studies of the estuary near the Posey and Webster tubes and examine if and how real world conditions affect how Coast Guard vessels operate.

2. **Determine operational needs of Coast Guard** estuary traffic. What is the historical and projected frequency of vessels (stationed, visiting, patrols, emergencies) which would likely require a bridge opening? Are there specific timing/notice requirements for opening the bridge that need specific consideration?

3. **Determine if there is precedent** for the Coast Guard to operate in locations with less than 600' horizontal clearance due to physical constraints, natural or manmade.

We expect that this information could be gathered with funds available. It would signal to all stakeholders that Alameda is committed to this project.

Thanks for your consideration and support. Please let us know how we can assist further in moving this transformational project along.

Respectfully,

Brian McGuire
Vice-President, Bike Walk Alameda