

Climate Action Plan Update

Let us know what you think about the Climate Action Plan update.

All Responses sorted chronologically

As of October 24, 2017, 12:16 PM



Open Forum is not a certified voting system or ballot box. As with any public comment process, participation in Open Forum is voluntary. The responses in this record are not necessarily representative of the whole population, nor do they reflect the opinions of any government agency or elected officials.

Climate Action Plan Update

Let us know what you think about the Climate Action Plan update.

As of October 24, 2017, 12:16 PM, this forum had:

Attendees: 206

All Responses: 140

Hours of Public Comment: 7.0

This topic started on September 18, 2017, 4:21 PM.

This topic ended on October 24, 2017, 12:10 PM.

Climate Action Plan Update

Let us know what you think about the Climate Action Plan update.

Responses

What should the City's focus be in reducing the greenhouse gas emissions that cause damage to the climate? (rank in terms of importance with 1 being the most important and 8 being the least important)

Average Priorities

- Transportation
- Land use/buildings
- Waste
- Natural environment
- Electricity
- Water
- Natural gas
- Other

If you prioritized "other" please specify:

Answered	25
Skipped	115

air alameda bring building **buildings** climate control **energy** especially **focus**
food **gasses** greenhouse grown **new pollution** population public s **solar**
specifically stop too **waste** wetlands which

Do you think the City of Alameda should include adaptation in the Climate Action Plan update?

	%	Count
Yes	95.5%	128
No	4.5%	6

Please elaborate:

Answered	77
Skipped	63

Climate Action Plan Update

Let us know what you think about the Climate Action Plan update.

action adaptation **alameda** all also **areas bay change**
climate course development do flooding from future how island level
like may more most **need** now other plan rise rising risk s **sea**
so **some** sustainable they time transportation water **wetlands what**

Please rank the following citywide issues (rank in terms of importance with 1 being the most important and 6 being the least important):

Average Priorities

- Traffic congestion relief
- Disaster preparedness
- Adaptation
- Economic development and local job creation
- Emergency services
- Transitional housing for the homeless and support services

Are you willing to bear higher fees or taxes to help Alameda adapt and prepare the city for climate change impacts such as sea level rise?

		%	Count
Yes		61.9%	86
No		10.1%	14
Not sure		28.1%	39

If so, how much annually?

Average	737.47
Total	39,086.00
Count	53

Climate Action Plan Update

Let us know what you think about the Climate Action Plan update.

Skipped

87

Additional Comments:

Answered

59

Skipped

81

- **alameda** all bay **bike** change **climate** congestion development **do**
fees from **get** going housing **island** just like local **make** money
more need other **pay people S** shuttle so stop **t tax taxes**
traffic transportation was way what **who willing**

Web Survey Open Ended Responses – September/October 2017

Questions

1. What should the City's focus be in reducing the greenhouse gas emissions that cause damage to the climate? If you prioritized "other" please specify:

- New construction
- Incorporate Leed and Sustainable design building requirements into new developments.
- Promoting locally grown food, and organically grown food to minimize reliance on Big Agriculture- which has extreme carbon footprint
- energy, (electricity and heat/cooling). pollution, emissions
- Rather than any one focus: bring all together in a coordinated plan with the sole focus being "We are in a Climate Emergency - let's act accordingly"
- Food Waste should be included in the waste selection specifically.
- Wood smoke pollution/air quality
- For waste, specifically food waste. Does AUSD donate leftover food?
<http://www.pe.com/2017/09/29/new-law-allows-lausd-and-rest-of-states-schools-to-donate-uneaten-food/>
- Solar panels covering parking lots, schools and office buildings.
- Renewable energy like solar
- Public education/outreach
- Human generated greenhouse gasses have minimal effect on climate change (commonly cited scientist consensus figures are bogus). Pollution is the real issue.
- fire places
- Stop building houses.
- Don't understand question
- Encourage the implementation of solar cells on public and private buildings
- Do something with the Naval Air Station Property.
- Better flow of traffic patterns & timed signals so cars are not idling at lights, emitting greenhouse gasses, polluting the air, wasting time and speeding around the Island to catch the next green light
- Some of these options seem unnecessary and will likely lead to too much government control, which I am against. Especially with Democrats in charge.
- Development of transitional natural wetlands.
- No plastic bags/straws/utensils
- This should be determined by science, not opinion
- Encouraging Alameda businesses to embrace Alameda's climate direction and offer incentives to residents who take action (ride bikes, bring their own metal straw, etc.)
- Wetlands restoration, especially at Alameda Point
- Population control (too many people here! Stop overbuilding!)Population control (this city is overpopulated)

2. Do you think the City of Alameda should include adaptation in the Climate Action Plan update? Please elaborate:

- "Yes, we need to address both how Alameda will be leader in reducing climate change and its impacts on sea level rise and how Alameda can adapt to changing climate conditions and the impacts on sea level rise. "
- Reduce emissions
- Yes, adaptation is critical to resiliency planning and risk analysis and should be considered in the evaluation and prioritization of issues, strategies and outcomes.
- Wetlands help clean the bay and absorb rising water. Also we're an island. Obviously we need to be on top of adapting to climate change.
- "Adaptation" and the "most sustainable course of action" should be included to the Climate Action Plan, as Alameda should do as much as it can on the ground to improve it's wetlands and capacity for resilience against sea level rise. At the sametime, expansion and improvement in the health of Alameda's wetlands will also increase the health of the SF Bay, and thus contribute to Alameda's capacity to sink carbon locally. Wetlands health is paramount to any sustainable course of action.
- "There are two different type of issues affecting Alameda: 1.) global effects 2.) local effects"
- I live on the water as do many others. I am concerned that we plan ahead on how to mitigate sea level rising.
- I don't see how a levee would ever be "the most sustainable course of action" in a true environmental sense. If you think you need a levee, then what you needed was to not build there in the first place, and the best solution is a wetland. AMP should be sourcing 100% from sustainable sources (wind, solar, etc.). Also, there should not be a cap on the number of homes/buildings who can install their own solar panels and go off the grid. If someone's roof complies with building requirements during installation, they should be permitted to install solar.
- My goodness...of course you must adopt (not adapt) but "adopt" the plan....and then "adapt" the City to the plan from here going forward. Create a task force of all relevant bodies to work together on ONE committee (Transportation, Planning, City Council, Task Force) so everyone's on the same page out of the gate. Vet it very carefully and be even more stringent. It cannot be stressed enough that we are indeed in the very midst of a climate change emergency and "incrementalization" just won't work. We teeter on the bring of people no longer able to care the impact is so visibly severe.
- The city should consider any proven means of addressing climate change
- Yes, even best case scenario involves some sea level rise which will require adaptation.
- Implement/ restore wetlands
- "Implement themes sustainable course of action when plan are drawn for new construction and transportation."
- Alameda will start to see regular flooding from sea level rise sometime this century "it's not an "if", but a "when". Adaptation is the only thing that will keep the island viable.
- Adaptation is the "treatment" Sustainability is the "cure" They are related, but different and each deserves its own plan
- I think adaptation should have a separate plan. Adaptation is reactive. Climate Action Plan is proactive-- they are different things with different goals.

- It will be critical to both protect the island against rising waters with barriers, and mitigate by enlarging and creating wetlands, and restorative green space throughout our city.
- Replace some or most of the beach area with marsh land. Marshes are a buffer in storms. We also need to prevent housing developments too close to the water.
- We live on an island, and therefore we are more vulnerable to climate change than other municipalities. Climate change is inevitable at this point, so we must change our development and land management policies to be compatible with new realities.
- Because we are on an island, it is necessary to have a contingency plan for storm surges or sea level rise.
- The city is fundamentally at risk if sea levels rise.
- We have laid cement and tarmac over lands only quite recently. Within reason, we need to revert back to green; biking lanes, public transportation, walking, anything but cars.
- Keeping rising bay waters out of Alameda requires a plan that would include adaptation.
- Given the amount of development that the city is involved with, it's a waste of time to focus on climate change. The increase in automobiles, and people will reduce our ability to control many items that cause environmental problems.
- "Larger setbacks from the shoreline, especially for housing.
- Identify areas where a second or third story of apartments could be added over existing commercial space
- Much more emphasis on restoration of natural storm barriers and storm water bioswalea"
- The city will need a plan to deal with sea level change. We will have levees? Will we move people? Are there plans to modernize and protect the Webster tube? What about shoreline protection, native marsh grasses, native beach plants, and other natives?
- we need to prepare for rising water levels, preferably with natural solutions such as wetlands
- This is something all communities should do.
- Technology changes all the time; need to be flexible
- Sea level rise projections are overblown. Phase in mitigating measures only if a future drastic rise becomes apparent. Rise for this geologic period is only about seven inches per century (not human caused). Plan on that for now.
- As a 25 year resident of Alameda, I would very much like to stay here and when I downsize buy another home/condo here but have begun to eliminate this possibility. The anticipated sea rise will swamp much of Alameda in the next decades. I like many anticipate now needing to move and invest in property at higher ground. Given the best estimates, we may well be past preventing this overall rise with bandaids now and it is foolish to add more expensive homes to the areas close to water. Much of the point development is also anticipated to be underwater. Adaption will mean common sensical measures. I understand not wanting citizens to panic or move but anyone who looks into it seems the water on the walls.
- We should know which places are going to liquefy so we can take action....
- The city needs to fast track alternative transportation options from everyone driving cars to making biking, walking, and shuttles easily usable for citizens of ALL ages.
- persons next to marinas are at particular risk.
- Response to the many environmental aspects of climate change will require a multi-disciplinary approach to the human intervention and mitigation.
- Don't trade wetlands for new construction.

- We all know we live on an island that will be prone to sea level rise, constructed wetlands are natural way to help combat some of that. And of course restore what was here before the island was expanded with fill.
- my understanding of including adaptation would mean looking at areas of the plan that may need to take precedence as climate change evolves so I think that is necessary in order to focus efforts on the most vulnerable areas
- Sea level is a huge risk for Alameda and it is already happening. As more development is planned along the shoreline, Alameda has some critical vulnerabilities that we must address to prevent permanent flooding of existing and future residential and commercial neighborhoods.
- It's clear that climate is changing, but we have no idea what impacts may be, how they may evolve. While we need to address sea level rise for sure, if climate changes in other ways, some efforts may be more effective than others. Like what plants may thrive in a wetland with less rainfall and higher temperatures.
- Raising sea walls
- The clock is ticking on Alameda's ability to withstand rising seas and we must aggressively explore all possible options to protect our island. I'm not an engineer, but I do know that other countries have implemented and maintained systems that have secured their lands.
- Growth in Alameda has been haphazard throughout its history and the city needs to assess what this has done to the future of the land.
- Transportation is such a big issue that addressing ancillary issues avoids the main problem
- levees, wetlands and sea walls will become a necessity as sea levels rise
- The City of Alameda absolutely should start adaptation planning. We are at risk to significant future climate change impacts like sea level rise flooding and mitigation alone will not eliminate our growing risks over time. Planning adaptation now can help enable the city to adjust to new future conditions.
- Be aware of rising sea level and avoid new development along shorelines. Make plans now for protection of the current development along shorelines.
- I can see no real drawback to adapting the Climate Action Plan.
- Couldn't answer--what does this mean?
- "No amount of reduction will eliminate the need to prepare for the effects of climate change. Sea level rise and changing weather patterns are likely to continue for the foreseeable future.
- As far as reducing transportation emissions. I strongly support making it easier and simpler to get to transit options for commute and mid day that allow use of bicycles and walking on the island with stations connecting to transit. a gondola from Alameda Landing area to Jack London Square and on to 12th Street BART would be an effective way to solve last mile issues for the island's west end and meet the Coast Guards need for unfettered access to the Bay. An added benefit would bring shoppers to Alameda Landing from JLS area."
- If we watch and learn from history, and current events, we have to be adaptable to what might come. We cannot be stuck in old thought patterns just because that was what was needed 10 years ago.
- At a city level, efforts to reduce greenhouse gases is a waste of time, focus and effort. As the third world and China modernize, their increase in greenhouse gas pollution will dwarf and city based savings. State and Federal should focus on emissions. As a city that is at sea level we should put

100% of our efforts into adaptation. Sea level rise will happen. Not starting the adaptation process now would be a failure of leadership.

- We need to be thinking about sea level rise and how it will impact our city in the next century.
- A rise in the level of the bay waters will flood parts of the Main island and Bay Farm; start now to convert those areas back to marsh land.
- What you said
- "As long as it can be voted on (by citizens) when adaptations take place."
- Once you identify adaptation you've acknowledged a broad range of courses to consider
- I would like to see research into levees or other supports to deter flooding.
- There's a pretty good chance that Alameda will flood at some century, especially areas already on landfill in flood zones.
- I think the City in general has their collective heads in the sand regarding the effects of Climate Change. They like to talk the talk but when it comes to actually doing something proactive they take the easy way out. It is coming and accelerating faster than previous projections. De Pave Park is a glaring example. Here there is an opportunity to establish a Wetland that will actually mitigate rising waters and it comes before the City and they just renew the Lease and kick the problem down the road for five years where again they will do the same. Polls are useless and a waste of time without ACTION. This is a City that loves polls but takes very little real action.
- Given the proximity to the bay and rising sea levels due to climate change we would be most impacted.
- In the same way that we have assessed environmental impacts, climate change is no different and is actually part of that conversation.
- "They should encourage more green building, the use of solar, and recycled water for landscaping. Encourage the use of more public transportation, and electric/hybrid cars. Provide more charging stations for electric cars. Time the lights so that you have less cars waiting for long period at intersections. (Webster St.)
- Restoration of wetlands should be a priority.
- Climate change is real and we are starting to see its effects. We need to prepare for rising sea levels and increased coastal flooding.
- Sadly, we will be facing greater and greater risk. A yearly update that takes into consideration climate impact would be helpful. It will also raise consciousness about climate change and what we can all do to help.
- There will be areas of the island that it does not make sense to try to protect long term if we get substantial sea level rise due to global warming. We should plan for changes that include creating wetlands to buffer the island, allowing some areas to revert back to bay or wetlands, and just not using some areas for residential and commercial use, long term.
- Adapt or relocate to higher ground!
- This is critical since all of Bay Farm, most of Alameda Point, and numerous other sub-neighborhood areas will be impacted by sea level rise, even in the more moderate rise scenarios.
- Yes. If this relates to how we deal with Sea Level Rise this should 100% be part of the Plan.
- Horizontal levees and other storm protection. Planned retreat. Levees. Storm water handling.
- We need accept that climate change is here and deal with it. Sea level rise is a real threat to Alameda, and we need to examine ways we can avoid flooding in our community.
- The alternative to adaptation is relocation.

- Wetlands restoration needed, especially at Alameda Point.
- As we have passed a point where reducing GHGs will stop sea level rise, a low-lying island city would be foolish not to have a plan for this.
- If you stopped building on every square foot of the entire island maybe would could really be a green island but so far you are destroying the island and mismanaging it. Alameda should not be the name of our island for there are no trees left because of overbuilding. This island has become a giant cement city. Maybe the city council and planning department should get together and read "The Lorax" by Dr. Suess and get some insight of what they are doing to Alameda! (I'm not kidding.)
- Given that we are an island that is likely to be partially inundated by 2100, I am not really sure how we don't talk about this as an option.

3. Additional Comments

General Support

- We need to do whatever it takes. We have no choice.
- When the tides raise, we will be flooded
- We need to do something about rising tides while we can!
- Willing to pay for wetlands restoration.
- Install solar panels on all city buildings, replace all city vehicles with plug in electrics, and plant more trees (and have an event to give away free trees, maybe even partnering with the plant nurseries on the island).

General Issues

- Why is "Carbon Reduction" not listed as a city-wide issue? Especially when this is supposed to be a survey for input for the Climate Action Plan Update????
- Homeless housing and services are important but that is not as much of an issue for Alameda as lack of affordable housing is for low-, very low- and extremely low-income households. If "lack of affordable housing" were an option, I would make that my 1st or 2nd priority.

Adaptation

- Can the actions to prepare for sea level rise have advantages in addition to just sea level protection? Advantages which can help offset the costs?"
- "How can it be done?"
- How much will it take?"
- "Education about the adaptation is a MUST."
- We need local and regional agreements in place that commit all governments in the bay area to planning for and addressing health, safety, and property issues resulting from climate change, but Alameda is at increased risk due to our intimate relationship with the bay. We shouldn't wait for everybody else.
- I think Alameda needs to hurry up and get started. I perceive that Alameda is behind in responding to climate change impact.

- Discuss population control as an adaptation technique. Irresponsible reproduction is an urge, not a right.

Climate Change Data

- "I urge staff and City officials to do their own research on anthropogenic climate change and not just rely on mass media propaganda and hype. Here are some links to get started:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GujLcfdovE8>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ExgKJpJyDXQ>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4YMttEhtgpk>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RrQxidb4xSQ>"

Costs

- Let's assess costs
- I would certainly be willing to pay taxes and fees for wise adaption projects. But I am unwilling, or less willing, to pay taxes and fees for "adaption" that is necessary as a result of unsustainable new development.
- We should find a way using existing tax money.
- "No way to answer a question like this last one without knowing the details.
- I'm definitely open to paying more to support adaptation efforts.
- I would want to see the adaption proposal before naming an amount I would be willing to contribute annually.
- We already have tons of taxes that are being wasted. For example, \$300 parcel tax for Alameda Hospital to retrofit for Seismic events. Where is that money?
- Between \$500 and \$1000 per year to protect our homes and investments.
- It should be prorated based on income, worth, property ownership and value.
- Willing to provide expertise and volunteer effort but not money. More will come from following community engagement path than a fee based path.
- Should be included in property taxes
- We are retired and have very little outside income, so increased taxes are particularly difficult.
- This should be something the City was planning for all along, and the City's budget should have an allowance for this without raising taxes.
- Equalizing the burden would be the first step in funding necessary adaptation. Alameda needs to stop capping the taxes of large landowners and businesses.
- The fee should be on ALL RESIDENTS - NOT JUST HOMEOWNERS!
- Scoping of the fees or taxes should be discussed at community meetings and align with the costs of actual projects. Letting residents know when increased fees might come in the future when next phases of adaptation are needed would be a helpful way to prepare people for the idea.
- We have no choice, either pay a little now to complete our infrastructure or pay a lot more after disaster strikes. I am shocked by how little the City of Alameda is prepared for a major earthquake. Many Bay Area cities are way better prepared then we are. I have been told by a member of the Fire Dept that we don't even have the proper radios to communicate with outside agencies. Auto/Bike/Pedestrian traffic on some of our more congested streets is really dangerous especially

at dawn and dusk. Speaking of streets, some of ours look and feel like we are driving down a third world nations road system. (You want an example - Encinal is really rough and broken apart in many places.)

- Before committing to a dollar amount, we need to understand the risk mitigation and benefits and investigate the costs and benefits for different courses of action.
- Depends on what our taxes will actually be going towards. The frustrating thing about taxes is that we don't get to truly see what our tax dollars go towards. Or they are wasted. Lum school had all this construction work done last year and this year they closed it. Tax dollars wasted. Just an example. If the taxes make sense and I know what they are going towards, I'm supportive. Or perhaps current tax dollars could be re-distributed. Seems like we're asked of an awful lot of money each year as property owners and with housing going up (and more housing being built), the city should be getting more money as it is. Also, be mindful that the more housing you put on the island, the more cars there will be. It took me an hour to get to mid Berkeley yesterday morning and I left 15 minutes earlier (7:50am to see a 9am patient). The most grid lock was in Alameda where I waited at the light at Atlantic 3 rounds before moving. There was no accident. Imagine if the tube was closed or blocked with an accident. It's just unsafe in an emergency much less regular commute hours. It even took me 45 minutes to get back from Berkeley to the island at 11am--most of the traffic waiting to enter the tube. Please stop building until there are other ways on/off the island.
- I'm not able to put this in the box, but the amount I'm willing to pay in taxes depends on what it is going towards. Some things I feel are necessary, other things (like rain gardens?!) seem unnecessary and a waste of tax money. Also STOP BUILDING! If a developer wishes to build on our Island, tax THEM, not the citizens. The amount of development on the island recently is ridiculous, and is causing more traffic congestion and pollution than ever. And no, more busses/public transportation/carpooling ISN'T WORKING and is a ridiculous "solution". People need their cars to get off the island to get to their jobs. Listen to your citizens!
- Any fees must be assessed to all Alamedans - - not just property owners. If this is acknowledged I will support an ad valorem fee
- Additional taxes are not an option until other taxes from existing temporary measures are removed or fulfilled.
- Depends on the plan so hard to put a number out there
- Depends on if the tax is directly toward items in the climate action plan. If it's started out as a small amount, people are more likely to vote for it. Any waste, then no.
- I picked \$100 a month. As a Crown Harbor resident, sea level rise is a real concern.
- The amount I am willing to bear really depends on the quality of the plan and the services that are being provided.
- The city is half renters - not sure if this fee will pass thru to renters or not.
- Alameda already commits 80% (or more??) of it's General Fund to Emergency Services (and police/fire fighter pensions in place). However, we are lagging behind other nearby cities who are doing this AND demonstrating their commitment to the environment. As a unique city/island in the heart of the "Bay" we have an opportunity to show sustainable leadership (almost a duty)... and can build a model others can follow. Designing more sustainable practices into Alameda will likely help us to innovate and improve our local economy as well!

- What would we get for the higher fees or taxes? I can't answer this question because it seems incomplete to me.
- Depends on what our options and needs are.

Economic Development

- If this is a survey about climate why are we talking job creation, homeless, etc? This is making me remember the Rockefeller Grant we failed to get are we staying focused on climate change? Let's make sure economic development supports the local industries that exist currently such as marine industries. It is the right thing to do given our history and island culture and geography. I do think marine industry is more conscious of climate change, at least is is now, compared with huge property developers.

Electricity

- Please find out what the "47% unknown" energy sources are with AMP. Most suspect the energy is derived from the result of fracking and no matter how you cut it, that's not cool any more. We have to think global..and act local accordingly. I know AMP is making strides..but it's like a hibernating animal coming out of the cave blinded by the reality hitting them.
- AMP currently has a surcharge for the Alameda Green program. This makes no sense in the face of climate change. Why do customers who contribute to climate change receive discounts for doing so? End the current default AMP program of "Alameda Oil, Coal, and Dirty Energy." Then let's start talking about a real Alameda Green program that expands local residential and commercial solar (including Mount Trashmore), coupled with AMP battery storage, and investigate local wind generation as well (although challenging with local flight paths).

New Development

- If we ARE talking housing, ensure and fund more BMR housing for people who actually live and work here (or near here). Discourage million dollar + homes for people who will DRIVE to the city or to south bay every day and increase traffic and emissions.
- New developments of the island, should be required to pay "impact fees" to help address newly created demands on transportation systems, utilities, and emergency services and to enable disaster response and climate adaptation programs to be effective.
- every time new house or building is built, they pay extra high fee to put towards climate change
- It is impossible to answer a vague question like this. What would the taxes be used on? Are we incurring expenses because the City planning department green-lighted a plan that was clearly doomed from the outset? (e.g., because the City approved more housing on the waterfront, or construction on landfill) Are we putting the needs of cars before other viable, green transportation alternatives on the island? Are we building levees before considering wetland restoration? If so, count me out. Alameda alone cannot change the course of climate change but it can mitigate risks to itself by being smart about population size, development, transportation, and preservation/restoration of the natural environment. Sadly, the planning department's and City Council's actions over the past several years do not instill confidence that anything is being done to seriously address these concerns.
- You need to make developers pay for increased public transit- a commuter shuttle service to connect to bus lines. Make them buy a ferry.
- Stop development along shorelines NOW. This includes Alameda Point.

- Stop building housing at edge of bay, such as Alameda Marina. Save for maritime use & plant marshes & oysters on vacant or reclaimed land by bay
- Again, please stop overpopulating Alameda and be sure to read "The Lorax", because in the words of Dr. Suess "Unless someone like you...cares a whole awful lot...nothing is going to get better...It's not."

Transportation

- Traffic congestion needs to be addressed, as does traffic safety. But no way I would bike commute or let my kid to so the way people are driving in Alameda these days. I can't understand why there is no main island shuttle loop to make it easier for folks to move around the island. The only people who are going to use AC Transit to get around the island are folks who have a lot of time on their hands or who have no other choice. Make it easy so I can walk 3-4 blocks max to pick up the shuttle, have it come often. Oh, and be sure the shuttle/bus drivers don't have a death wish - I've been on AC Transit busses numerous times when I was sure we wouldn't make it home alive. The speeding, the jerking starts and stops. No thanks. 3 suggestions which I think would solve many of the issues:

1) main island shuttle loop - never leaves the island

2) shuttles to BART & Ferry

3) dedicated bike routes - why not take a couple of east/west streets that run most of the length of alameda - for example, and off the top of my head, santa clara and pacific - make on direction of traffic one way only and the other side of the street bikes/scooters. the same could be done on a few north/south connector streets. bike highways that could make it safer and easier for people to get around on bike and reduce friction between cyclists and drivers, especially with alameda's many narrow streets."

- The above list of "citywide issues" does not include issues that are important to me. It is a misleading list of someone else's priorities. What is important to me is safe bike lanes. It is not on the list.
- Traffic congestion needs to be your #1 priority!!! We need a bus/shuttle to the Main St Ferry station!!!
- To elaborate, I ranked Traffic congestion relief first because I believe it should include encouraging bike use and public transportation, which we need more of in Alameda. I don't think it means adding car lanes.
- This is to expand on priority #1 - Transportation & traffic congestion relief: better traffic flow mgmt MUST be accomplished by city engineers along the Park St corridor. Suggestions would include such changes as NO left turns permitted, improved traffic sensing at intersections for light changes, NO pedestrian crossing unless the cross button is pushed, better timing of green lights to move traffic through consecutive intersections, etc.
- There is a serious need for alternative transportation options on the island. With the additional housing that is being built on Alameda point, its going to cause even more congestion in the tube. Without another means of getting to Oakland other than the ferry or a bus; neither of which someone with a car would choose over driving themselves, there is going to be more issues than what we are doing now. A pedestrian bridge doesn't seem to be feasible, so a ferry that operates

exclusively from Alameda to Oakland would be one option for those of us who are willing to bike and walk to Oakland. As a resident of 3 years, I just don't see an appeal to living here in the long term with the complete lack of bike/walk support that Oakland seems to have.

- Number one issue the city faces is transportation. Each new house comes with 2 cars regardless of the number of buses that come here. This increases intra-island traffic. And makes getting on and off the island around rush hour a 30 minute process. Stop approving any housing until someone figures out another bridge or tunnel on the west end. Fight any state mandates for development. We are an island. Please.