

## Gail Payne

---

**From:** Heather Little <heatherlittle9691@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 18, 2017 4:09 PM  
**To:** ANDREW THOMAS; Gail Payne; Jennifer Ott  
**Subject:** Re: Transportation Choices Plan

Good afternoon everyone,

If permitted, I did realize one additional component of the Main Street Bikeway plan that I would like to see included: reducing the speed limit from 35 to 25 mph on that stretch of road. If we want to encourage bike riding to the Main Street Ferry, increasing the safety aspect of the commute by reducing general traffic speed allowance is a critical component. Please let me know if you have any questions. Additionally, I believe that Tilden (or a portion of Tilden) may also be 35 mph currently, but I am not sure. If this is the case, I would like this requirement to be added to the scope of work for the Tilden/Fruitvale Bikeway project as well.

Thanks! Heather

On Mon, Sep 18, 2017 at 11:00 AM, Heather Little <[heatherlittle9691@gmail.com](mailto:heatherlittle9691@gmail.com)> wrote:  
Good morning Jennifer, Gail and Andrew,

I wanted to take a moment to thank you for taking the time to put together such a comprehensive document to address Alameda's short/long term transportation issues.

After having reviewed the document independently, I had an opportunity to meet with John Knox White for a discussion about it, during which we were able to agree that we support the plan moving forward, excepting a few critical requests that I believe were captured in a letter that was sent to you this morning.

I wanted to let you know that I fully support the requests that John made in his letter, and think that with those changes, we will have a much more solid plan to address transportation in Alameda. I specifically want to emphasize my hopes that making the improvements to increase bike usage are moved up in priority and placed into a short term category.

In appreciation of all your work,

Thanks! Heather Little  
Nosey Community Member

Jennifer, Gail and Andrew,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Transportation Choices Plan. This plan has been so long in the making, it's great to see a nearly complete product. At this point, the document appears ready to move forward to the City Council for approval, with a few easy, but significant adjustments and additions. I have five overarching comments about the current draft, as well as feedback on the project descriptions:

1. It is excellent that the new plan has a measurable goal proposed, this is definitely a step in the right direction. However, the 15-year mode-shift goals appear extremely conservative and is actually lower than this plan identifies from the most recently reported six-year timeline in the document. (4-5% reduction in six years). As a long-term plan, this document should be laying out stretch goals of where we want to end up, not going soft so that goals will be easily met.
2. It would be good to include total trip numbers, as the City grows, trip rates don't tell the whole story, it will be possible for the SOV trip rate to decrease and actual trip numbers increase, being clear that we are looking to reduce or maintain trips through the tubes/bridges will help future staff, boards and councils to interpret success and need in achieving the goals of the plan.
3. The reporting of the likely impact of each strategy is opaque. Why some strategies are rated "+" and others "+++" is unreported. The scoring for each should be released before the public hearing. As noted later, there are some projects that are highly rated for impact where it is highly unlikely that they'll have much impact at all. Understanding how the consultant determined this will allow the Planning Board, the Transportation Commission and the City Council to weigh the full meaning of the report.
4. It is unclear how the timing of projects is set. It would be helpful to have a tentative timeline for the actual implementation of projects—some short-term projects are listed as implementing in mid-term for example--the timelines are not really clear, are projects starting the planning process in 3 years, or finishing, etc. What is clear is that as traffic and future traffic are significant concerns for Alamedans, we need to do more, faster.
5. Insufficient staffing to tackle multiple projects and programs should be highlighted as a constraint, and the addition of transportation staff a short-term recommendation. Alamedans shouldn't have to wait up to 10 years for things like transit passes and a real bicycle network. Ten years from now, Alameda should have a fully realized network of bikeways, safe bicycle parking and increased local and transbay bus service. This plan doesn't achieve that as written, it barely begins it.

On a project level, it is striking that there is no new bicycle planning in the short term. Simply an updated Bicycle Master Plan, a plan that was supposed to have been completed concurrently with this plan--thus why bicycle network planning was not included in this document. Therefore, I'd like to see two long-sought projects moved to the short-term list: Main Street Bikeway and Tilden/Fruitvale bikeways. Neither of these projects require intense engineering and planning, they can easily be piloted at low cost and implemented within the three-year short-term timeline. Additionally, this plan should not assume that because other projects were planned years ago, therefore that work counts as short-term planning in this new plan. The plan should consider moving funded/planned projects to a "in the

pipeline” section with expected completion dates, rather than burying them in the document in long lists of projects that have barely been vetted.

#### **Individual Project Comments:**

##### **Project 2-Bus stop improvements:**

For some reason this project specifically calls out creating right-turn only lanes as a part of a bus stop improvement program. This is an implementation that we have working to avoid ever since the 2009 Transportation Element was updated. Right Turn only lanes increase pedestrian safety issues and provide little actual benefit on Alameda’s streets. As this is listed in a “may include” list, it should be removed, rather than giving direction that this is something that should be specifically pursued, as is currently suggested.

##### **Project 6: Transit Signal Priority – provide support from existing**

While this project will create quicker transit, much of the past implementation has been focused on SOV and to my knowledge has not produced meaningful time savings. How this is a +++ project is unclear, would you please provide the analysis to support. Before moving this forward as a short term priority, please identify the evaluation of the existing project on Webster street that has shown that transit run times through this corridor have been significantly reduced.

##### **Project 8: bike Share - Remove**

Remove. This project is about to launch. We shouldn’t be listing nearly completed projects as short-term strategies. This is launching because private companies are interested in putting their technology in the city, not because this is a strategy that has been identified to meet either of the two goals identified in this plan.

##### **Project 10: Constitution Way Carpool – Remove or reconsider**

Listed as a short term project, but not implemented in that timeline. What is the plan for enforcement? As the addition of the third lane, this project moves in the wrong direction of increasing the crossing danger on one of the west end’s most dangerous corridors and creating a 5-6 lane freeway through the middle of the island. As proposed, the design of this project is counter to Alameda’s general plan goals. Identify a road-diet plan or eliminate. Road expansion is not a solution to reducing trips, the goal of this plan.

##### **Project 11: Decouple the Estuary crossing shuttle and the WETA solution**

WETA may reverse their commute, but it is unreasonable to assume that bicyclists and pedestrians heading to downtown Oakland will ride/walk an extra mile to the Main Street Ferry to catch an infrequent ferry. This project needs to be refocused on the need of getting people living west of chestnut over the estuary and the map should show a routing from alameda landing or pasta pelican that does this.

##### **Project 14: Transportation Awareness campaign – costs too low**

This project is going to cost at least \$50-100k per year, plus consultant costs for designing a campaign with impact.

### **Project 16: Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements – out of date list**

This is a list of projects from the out-of-date bike plan. The text needs to highlight this and that the list of projects will be updated upon completion of the new bike plan. Additionally, many of the projects listed here have no connection to reducing on-island trips or cross estuary trips, they are recreational paths not commute/daily-use routes and should be removed. Best example: Alameda Point Bay Trail, a great project from a recreational/access to the Bay perspective, but not a single person is going to ride/walk it to get anywhere, it is literally the destination, not a way to get somewhere. Also, the tubes, spending \$10 million on adding a new terrible tube path is not going to shift many trips, this should not be in the plan, the funding should go to the estuary shuttle which might actually be used:

Remove: A, C, E, H, J

Move to Short Term: G

### **Project 18: Crosstown Express bus service – support needed**

This alignment makes no sense, connecting a day-long 20-minute bus with ferries that don't run on that frequency (and often aren't running during much of the run time of the proposed bus) and serves areas already served by transit (what is the Line 21 ridership? How does this support more than doubling the service?) The reason there is not a cross-island transit line is because all past forms of this line were not well used. Before this goes to council, an analysis from AC Transit of the likely ridership and cost per rider per revenue hour should be requested and a finding that this would rank as a priority project. The idea that this project is a +++ is shocking, would you please provide the ridership analysis that was done to support the inclusion of the project and the rating as one of the most effective trip reduction strategies in the plan.

### **Project 21: Increased transit frequency – missing key lines**

Alameda has one of the most heavily used bus lines in the AC Transit district, the Line 51A. The bus is uncomfortably crowded at commute times, that there is not consideration of increasing frequency on this line is surprising. The lines identified are low ridership with difficult rider catchment areas that won't alleviate Line 51A crowding (which virtually eliminates the ability to add riders at key times). What analysis was done to show these lines were the place to expand transit service?

### **Project 22: Increased transbay frequency – missing key lines/areas of the city**

Where is Line O? It's at standing room leaving the city most mornings, what is the plan to alleviate that? This plan ignores transbay ridership from the entire west of Webster, central Alameda and northern waterfront areas. Why?

### **Project 25: Express bus – re-route for better effectiveness**

Another 20-minute frequency bus to the main street ferry, yet ignoring that most drivers are going to inner east bay. In not connecting to downtown Oakland and instead serving Fruitvale (cheap, available parking with its cheap available parking), this bus is not addressing significant known transit needs that will reduce cross estuary trips.

### **Project 27: Vision Zero improvements – remove funded program, adjust project list**

So many already funded projects here on the mid-term list. Why are we waiting 3 years to start projects that we received funding for last year (Central, Clement, etc.).

Additionally, decouple main Street bicycle lanes to the ferry from improved parking. Parking is not a Vision Zero project. Move main Street bike lanes to short term, couple paid-parking reform at the ferries with transit service (until parking is paid, then buses will run mostly empty).

**Project 30- faster 51A – short term**

This is a project that's been around for 10 years or more. It's time to move on it. Move to short-term.

**Project 32 – Main street ferry – consider removing, or at least remove redundancy**

Outreach for this was done 2-3 years ago, all of the non-driving encouragement projects are now pushed off into the 3-8 year range with no specific recommendations. Decouple the bike access and move to short term. Couple the transit service with paid parking and commit. This item is really a rehash of other items (see estimated costs for a list of where they are), consider removing as it's not adding anything.

**Missing from the list:**

It's clear that the City is looking to add transit options to the ferries, a worthy goal. Rather than trying to identify all-day service that will run empty a lot of the time, this document should identify a near-term two-year pilot project to run a ferry only shuttle. Based on the resulting ridership, new service can be designed to meet the needs and use. Until then, we have a bus to the ferry at Harbor Bay, with the changes in parking (still not paid, but reduced), the ridership (percent of ferry riders using the bus) should be included in the support for dramatically increasing bus service to these areas. We have data, it should be used to support the recommendations made in this report.

Given what appears to be the level of deep analysis that has gone into the projects in the plan, any of the above recommendations should be easy to incorporate into a revised draft that goes to the city council. Please let me know if you have any questions, while I won't be able to attend the Planning Board, I'd be happy to connect to discuss my comments before this document moves forward to the council.

Congratulations on getting it this far.

Respectfully,

John Knox White