

From: [Scott Wikstrom](#)
To: [Lisa Foster](#)
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street
Date: Monday, July 13, 2026 8:07:27 PM

Lisa,

One more comment to add to the TC agenda...

Scott

From: Kenneth Levins <klevins@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2026 8:03 PM
To: Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov>
Cc: Erin Smith <ESmith@alamedaca.gov>; CITYCOUNCIL-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Hi Mri Wikstrom,

I did not initially intend to challenge the truck route designation as I understood there could be other means to challenge the parking removal. However, as I have researched further into the history of the various plans for Clement Avenue it has become obvious that there are significant inconsistencies with what the city planned for Clement Avenue, and what was eventually approved and built- and what was built has become incompatible with the establishment of a truck route on Clement.

Alameda's own general plans do not treat a truck route designation as a blank check. Across three adopted documents, the City has attached specific, enumerable requirements to designating and maintaining a truck route on Clement Avenue. I list them below, because the current proposal should be measured against them.

From the 1990 General Plan Transportation Element (as amended):

1. Limited-network purpose. The truck route network exists to confine through-truck traffic to a limited set of streets; trucks may leave the route to reach any destination. A designation is justified only where it serves that network function.
2. Neighborhood coordination (Policy 4.1.1.c). The truck route map must be implemented and maintained in coordination with the private sector and neighborhood representatives.
3. Land use predicate. Truck-oriented design belongs to the industrial street type, where wider lanes and larger turning radii serve adjacent industrial land uses.

4. Intersection design. Sufficient turning radii at intersections frequented by heavy trucks, with the plan's own acknowledgment that this may conflict with pedestrian, bicycle, and transit goals.
5. Roadway design. Sufficient lane width, up to 14 feet.
6. Balancing requirement. Truck accommodation must be balanced against other users based on the frequency of truck use on the specific segment.

From the 2007 Northern Waterfront General Plan Amendment — the document that created this designation:

7. Policy 10.6.e. Clement was to be extended from Grand to Sherman as a multimodal street serving trucks, transit, bicycles, and pedestrians, not as a truck-priority facility.

8. Policy 10.6.f. Non-residential uses should be located adjacent to the Clement Truck Route; if residential uses are proposed adjacent to it, the structures shall be adequately set back and/or designed to minimize disturbance. This was the core condition of the designation.

9. Policy 10.6.f, incorporating 10.8.f. Sound walls are prohibited as a buffer, setback and building design are the only permitted mitigations.

10. Policy 10.6.g. The designation was expressly paired with removing the truck route from Buena Vista and prohibiting its extension through the Beltline property; its purpose was to reduce residents' truck exposure, not relocate it.

11. Policy 10.6.h. Traffic calming must be implemented in and around the plan area to protect adjacent neighborhoods; calming and the truck route are required to coexist.

12. Policy 10.6.p. All streets and pedestrian pathways must include tree plantings.

From General Plan 2040 (adopted November 2021):

13. Policy ME-11(c). Truck routes must be clearly marked, with lanes no wider than 12 feet, and operated with the least impact on public health, safety, and general welfare. The City's turning-template exhibit states the 65-foot legal-maximum semi requires 14-foot lanes through the curves — a geometry the current plan does not permit.

14. Policy ME-7(g). Lane widths are limited to 10 feet citywide, 11 feet on truck and transit routes; additional clearance is reserved for fire apparatus and specific public-safety needs, not freight convenience.

15. Policy ME-5. Vision Zero is the guiding principle for all transportation planning and street design, implementing the 2019 Council policy establishing safety as the highest priority in all transportation decisions.

16. Policy ME-6, Action (b). The safest treatments are the default starting point and may be degraded only if necessary, and only after documenting the rationale. No such documentation

has been produced for removing the bulbouts, daylighting, or cycle-track protection.

17. Policy ME-6, Action (e). Minimized turning speeds, minimized crossing distances, sightlines within 20 feet of intersections, and high-visibility crosswalks with bulb-outs are required on arterials and collectors — including truck routes.

18. Policy HS-54. Truck routes must minimize the number of residents exposed to truck noise.

19. Street Classification Appendix. On a Neighborhood Connector carrying a truck route: 11-foot lanes with adequate turning radius; design must prioritize the safety of vulnerable roadway users; and the design balance rests on the frequency of truck use. Destination access for trucks survives regardless of designation.

Taken together, these plans impose seven live conditions on the Clement designation: adjacent non-residential uses or adequately set-back homes (unmet; the City approved homes fronting Clement in 2014 without the required buffer); lanes capped at 11–12 feet (incompatible with the exhibit's stated 14-foot requirement); preserved traffic calming and tree plantings (contradicted by the proposed removals); minimized resident noise exposure (inverted by the City's own land use approvals along the corridor); a documented necessity rationale before degrading safety treatments (not produced); a frequency-of-use justification supported by truck volume data (not presented); and ongoing coordination with neighborhood representatives.

The requirements the City itself attached to this truck route are the strongest evidence against implementing it as proposed. Every condition the plans impose is one the current proposal either fails to deliver, or affirmatively undoes. I respectfully request that the Council decline to approve the parking, bulbout, and tree removals between Balsa and Paru; direct staff to produce the ME-6(b) documented rationale and current truck volume data; and initiate reconsideration of the truck route designation between Sherman and Grand, consistent with the residential land use pattern this City approved.

As you say, this is a situation requiring substantial administrative and political effort. You will not find us wanting in that regard.

Best,
Ken Levins,
President
Marina Shores HOA

On Mon, Jul 13, 2026 at 7:45 PM Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov> wrote:

Hello Mr. Levins,

I look forward to meeting you tomorrow evening and setting a future time to meet with the Marina Shores HOA Board. Please note that the Transportation Commission meeting on July 22 will be informational and while the Transportation Commissioners may provide comments and feedback, they will not be asked to make a decision regarding the parking on Clement Avenue.

Although Staff has prepared a recommendation to remove parking along Clement to facilitate the truck route relocation, Staff's potential decision / determination to remove parking does not need to be rushed and certainly does not need to be made on or immediately after the July 22nd Transportation Commission meeting. We remain committed to working with the Marina Shores HOA and local residents to consider alternatives.

Please keep in mind that Alameda's [Sunshine Ordinance](#) requires that all documents material to a matter anticipated for discussion must accompany the agenda and be posted for a full seven days before the meeting. Below are quick and admittedly partial responses to your alternatives which will be included in the Transportation Commission agenda packet.

1. As you mention below, there are short tangent sections between curves on Clement. These straight sections of roadway, however, are not long enough for the truck trailers to fully return to the normal 11.5-foot-wide lane. Preserving on-street parking between Balsa Ct and Paru St is not possible.
2. Staff acknowledges the USPS mailboxes and will work with the Postal Service regarding a solution. If the mailboxes need to be relocated, it would be a City expense.
3. The truck turning template provided and included in the Transportation Commission agenda packet is for a WB-67 truck which mimics the largest California legal truck for non-interstate routes. The WB-67 truck represents the control vehicle or the largest anticipated as was evaluated to determine if these large vehicles could navigate the corridor. Staff also evaluated a WB-50 truck which are more common in Alameda and represents the design vehicle for analysis. Significant trailer offset occurs with either vehicle and parking cannot be preserved between Balsa St and Paru St.
4. Relocating the Truck Route from Clement to Lincoln Avenue or maintaining on Buena Vista Avenue would require a General Plan Amendment and a substantial administrative and political effort. Your original email acknowledges Clement Avenue as a truck route in the General Plan and did not challenge that designation. Furthermore, the CCR's for the Marina Shores contains the following disclosure on the front page, "Clement Avenue is designated as a truck route and will eventually be used as such as provided in the Transportation Element of the City's General Plan". While I

can acknowledge the relocation of the truck route to Lincoln Avenue or maintaining the truck route on Buena Vista may be technically feasible, I cannot comment on the viability of either option.

Scott Wikstrom, P.E.

City Engineer
City of Alameda
(510) 747-7937

From: Kenneth Levins <klevins@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, July 13, 2026 9:54 AM

To: Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov>

Cc: Erin Smith <ESmith@alamedaca.gov>; CITYCOUNCIL-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>; Gerry Beaudin <gbeaudin@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Dear Mr. Wikstrom:

Thank you for your detailed written response. The Association appreciates the time it reflects, and we gladly accept your offer to meet with the Marina Shores HOA Board; I will follow up separately with proposed dates. We also intend to participate in the July 14 community meeting and the July 22 Transportation Commission hearing.

Your letter closes by stating that Public Works "remains open to considering any additional feasible alternatives that can safely accommodate truck traffic while preserving on-street parking," and that you welcome the opportunity to evaluate such an alternative. The Association takes you up on that invitation. We ask that the following alternative package be evaluated and responded to in writing, element by element, before the July 22 hearing:

1. Partial parking retention based on the City's own geometry. Your letter states that the 14-foot lane requirement arises from trailer offtracking on the approximately 250-foot radius curves between Entrance Road and Hibbard. That rationale does not explain removing parking along straight (tangent) segments between Balsa Street and Paru Street. We propose that parking be removed only where the swept-path analysis demonstrates the wider lane is geometrically required, and retained elsewhere. Please provide a station-by-station (or block-by-block) exhibit identifying precisely where the 14-foot lane is needed, where the existing 11.5-foot lanes remain adequate, and the available curb-to-curb width at each constrained location, including the Stanton Street crossing discussed in item 8 below.

2. A marked carrier/loading zone at the cluster mailbox. Whatever the final design, a designated loading zone at the Marina Shores CBU would preserve mail delivery at negligible cost to truck operations. We ask that this be incorporated into the striping plan rather than treated as a question of relocating the residents' mailboxes. The Association does not consent to relocation of the CBU, and any proposal to relocate it should identify who bears the cost and confirm USPS growth management approval.

3. Design vehicle justification. We would like to clarify a point from your response. The Association's request concerned narrower design vehicles - the vehicle assumed for geometric design purposes (e.g., WB-67 versus WB-50 or a single-unit truck) - not regulation of vehicle width, which we agree is set federally at 8.5 feet. The selection of a design vehicle is a discretionary engineering judgment. Please identify the design vehicle assumed in the swept-path analysis, the basis for selecting it, and whether a smaller design vehicle with signed accommodation for occasional oversize movements was evaluated. We would also note that, contrary to the suggestion that local truck restrictions are unenforceable, California Vehicle Code section 35701 et seq. expressly authorizes cities to restrict commercial vehicles by weight on designated streets by ordinance. If staff's position is that a weight- or time-based restriction is inappropriate here as a matter of policy, we ask that the analysis supporting that judgment be provided in writing rather than stated as a conclusion.

4. A comparative evaluation of Lincoln Avenue as the through-truck route. The three alternatives staff evaluated were all confined to the Clement corridor itself or to Buena Vista. No other route appears to have been considered. Yet Lincoln Avenue is a four-lane arterial with a gentle curve transitioning directly onto Constitution Way and the tube approaches - a cross-section that appears to satisfy the 14-foot lane and offtracking requirements staff has identified without removing a single parking space, curb extension, or street tree, and without the pinch points that make Clement, in the City's own words, unable to accommodate trucks and parking together. We recognize that Lincoln has its own adjacent uses and that a route change would involve its own process, potentially including a General Plan Amendment. But as noted with respect to the Buena Vista alternative, the need for a discretionary approval is a procedural step, not a finding of infeasibility. Before permanent impacts are imposed on Clement Avenue residents, the Association requests that staff prepare and publish a comparative routing evaluation of Lincoln Avenue and Clement Avenue, addressing geometry, truck volumes and origins/destinations, adjacent land uses, and safety, so that the Transportation Commission can weigh the tradeoffs on a complete record.

Second, we request the following materials and information sufficiently in advance of July 22 for independent review:

5. A response addressing the deficiencies in the parking study, raised in my email to you of July 8th, regarding seasonality and time of day errors, in addition to the obviously incorrect assumptions regarding the fungibility of private driveway and public parking spaces.

6. The City's environmental determination. Your response does not address the California Environmental Quality Act. Please provide the City's written CEQA determination for the truck route relocation and associated physical changes (parking prohibition, restriping, signage, and any modification to existing pedestrian improvements), or the exemption finding and its factual basis if the City's position is that the action is exempt.

7. The decision record. You have confirmed that AMC Sections 8-1.2 and 8-1.3 provide no noticing requirement or appeal from a Public Works Director determination under Section 8-7.1. Given that, please confirm: (a) whether the Transportation Commission will take a formal vote on July 22 or is receiving the item as information only; (b) whether the Director will adopt written findings documenting the traffic engineering basis required by Section 8-7.1; and (c) whether the City Council may call the decision up for review. Because this action permanently eliminates parking serving identified households and a public park, with no appeal right, the Association formally requests that final action be referred to the City Council.

8. Scope confirmation, including the Stanton Street crossing. Your response cites the recently installed rapid flashing beacon at Stanton Street as a measure taken "in preparation for the truck route relocation." However, the curb extensions at that enhanced crossing narrow the roadway to less than 22 feet curb to curb. That width cannot accommodate even the existing pair of 11.5-foot travel lanes, much less a 14-foot truck lane opposed by an 11.5-foot lane (25.5 feet minimum). On the City's own engineering rationale, the truck route cannot function at this location without modifying or removing the very crossing improvement staff cites as a project benefit. Please reconcile this in writing: either the swept-path analysis did not account for this pinch point, or modification or removal of the Stanton Street crossing improvements is a contemplated but undisclosed component of this project. If it is the latter, the project scope, cost, stormwater treatment recalculation, pedestrian safety analysis, and environmental review must reflect it, and the public notice describing this project as a parking removal is materially incomplete. More broadly, please confirm in writing whether any curb extensions (bulb-outs), street trees, marked crosswalks, or the Stanton Street RRFB will be removed or modified as part of this project or as a foreseeable consequence of it.

9. Accessibility. Please confirm whether the City has evaluated the impacts of the parking removal on residents and park visitors with disabilities or limited mobility, including

caregivers transporting young children, strollers, and mobility devices, and whether any accessible parking or passenger loading provision will be included in the final design. These questions address all residents owning homes along Clement in our development, in addition to area visitors. The rapid flashing beacon addresses crossing safety; it does not address proximity or carrying distance - and, per item 8, its own geometry appears incompatible with the truck lane widths staff has identified as necessary.

Finally, on timing: the engineering and parking materials were made available only recently, and the Association is arranging independent traffic engineering review. If the written responses and materials requested above cannot be provided in time for meaningful review before July 22, the Association respectfully requests that the Transportation Commission continue the item to its next regular meeting. Nothing in the project schedule appears to require action on July 22, and a short continuance would allow the Commission to act on a complete record.

We appreciate your stated willingness to evaluate feasible alternatives and your offer to meet with the Board, and we look forward to a productive discussion at tomorrow's community meeting.

Sincerely,

Ken Levins
President
Marina Shores Homeowners Association

On Mon, Jul 13, 2026 at 8:40 AM Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov> wrote:

Mr. Levins, and members of the Marina Shore Homeowners Association,

The decision to recommend removing 21 on-street parking spaces on Clement Avenue was not made lightly. We recognize that this change will affect nearby residents, and we appreciate the HOA taking the time to provide thoughtful comments.

As noted in Response #4 below, the Alameda Municipal Code authorizes the Public Works Director to prohibit parking when traffic engineering principles indicate it is necessary to support public safety and the safe operation of the transportation system. While the Code does not require public notification or provide an appeal process for this type of decision, Public Works chose to conduct an extensive outreach effort because of the community interest and the potential impacts. That outreach includes mailed notices, a community meeting, and a public hearing before the Transportation Commission prior to implementation. The purpose of the outreach is twofold: to explain the engineering analysis and policy considerations that led to this

recommendation, and to hear from the community.

I've provided responses to the Requested Action portion of your email and a few additional notes. I look forward to continuing the discussion at the July 14 community meeting and the July 22 Transportation Commission meeting. As noted below, I'd also be happy to meet directly with the HOA.

1. Treat the elimination of on-street parking on Clement Avenue as a distinct decision from the truck route designation, requiring its own independent analysis and justification;

We believe we have treated the elimination of parking as separate issue, conducted an analysis and have justification for staff recommendation. Relocation of the truck route to Clement requires wider lanes than the existing 11.5 feet travel lanes. Large tractor-trailer trucks make wide turns. This is most obvious when these trucks make a 90 degree right turn at an intersection where the rear axle of the trailer can track several feet inboard of the front steering axle. An example truck turning template and overlay on Clement Avenue can be downloaded via the following link: [Clement Truck Route - Grand to Sherman](#) This offset tracking of a truck trailer also occurs when driving along curved roads such as the section of Clement between Entrance Road and Hibbard. The approximate 250-foot radius curves along Clement will require a minimum 14-foot lane to accommodate the trailer offset for a typical full-sized truck that regularly traverse Alameda. The existing road configuration cannot accommodate the wider lanes and the existing parking. Therefore, staff hired a consulting firm to perform an independent analysis of parking supply and demand. The results of that analysis show parking capacity on the side streets to accommodate the recommended loss of parking. More information is provided in responses #4 and #5 below.

2. Postpone any final decision on parking removal until the issues raised in this letter have been addressed in writing;

We are not intending to take action until after community engagement and the public hearing at the Transportation Commission. Please see response to #4 for more information.

3. Provide the full parking study and supporting traffic/geometric engineering analysis referenced in the City's June 18, 2026 notice, including specific analysis of parking demand generated by the adjacent park and playground;

The parking analysis can be downloaded via the following link: [Clement Truck Route - Grand to Sherman](#) The parking analysis did not complete a separate analysis of the parking demand generated by the adjacent park and playground. Because the park and playground already exist, parking demand is incorporated into the observed parking occupancy. There is an existing small parking lot opposite of Ohlone Street that serves

the park/playground and provides access to the Bay Trail and public shore which will be unaffected by the truck route. Staff also consulted with the Recreation and Parks Director about parking for the park. There are no known concerns about parking lot capacity and the parking analysis concludes capacity on the side streets. Additionally, the City recently installed a rapid flashing beacon at Stanton Street to assist pedestrians in crossing Clement Ave and access the park/playground in preparation for the truck route relocation. Current park visitors who didn't use the lot opposite of Ohlone Street are required to cross Clement to access the park. Elimination of parking on the south side of Clement and opposite of the park will not change the need for park visitors to cross Clement and the parking study confirms sufficient capacity on the adjacent streets.

4. Identify the specific decision-making body and procedural and Municipal Code requirements (including any required public hearing, findings, or appeal rights) applicable to the parking removal;

On-street parking in Alameda is regulated in Chapter VIII of the Alameda Municipal Code (AMC) and more specifically in Section 8-7, Parking Prohibitions. AMC Section 8-7.1, Parking – Prohibited at all times states, “The Public Works Director is hereby authorized, whenever traffic engineering studies or principles indicate for the safety or adequate flow of all modes of transportation, to establish streets or portions thereof where parking is prohibited at all times.” In the case of Clement Avenue the parking loss is necessary for truck traffic and would be a safety issue if not removed. Furthermore, AMC Section 8-1.2, Notice of Decisions, does not require public noticing or in Section AMC Section 8-1.3 provide for an appeal process for Public Works Director decisions made on the basis of adequate traffic flow and public safety. We recognize the impact of losing 21 on-street parking stalls and have elected to conduct public outreach in advance of completing the work. See also response #5.

5. Evaluate and respond in writing to alternative approaches that would allow trucks to use the route while avoiding or reducing the loss of resident and park visitor parking, including narrower design vehicles, designated passing/loading zones, partial parking retention, or time-of-day restrictions.

Staff evaluated alternatives related to truck route relocation, each of which had significant challenges. Staff recommends and is pursuing the removal of parking on Clement Avenue between Balsa Street and Paru Street as the least impactful alternative in consideration of the City's General Plan, Active Transportation Plan, and City Policies promulgated by City Council resolutions. The three other alternatives are:

- Eliminate the two-way cycle track between Entrance Road and Grand Street and return to the Class II bike lanes that existed until 2016. In this alternative, the trailer offset for large trucks would be accommodated within the Class II lane. A potential safety issue exists when a bicycle is travelling in the same direction and same time as a large truck. Additionally, transitions between two-way cycle tracks and Class II bike lanes are challenging and bicycle rider compliance with the transition can be expected to be low, resulting in a potentially increased

hazard for all roadway users.

- Relocate the two-way cycle track to the excess right-of-way north of Clement. There is a 17-foot wide “alternative vehicle corridor” that was included Clement Avenue dedication with Tract 7170. At the time, this corridor was being reserved for a potential light rail connection along the northern waterfront. Relocation of the cycle track to this excess right-of-way would impact the Waterfront Park, potentially remove mature trees, and require BCDC permitting and approval, with potentially significant construction costs.
- Maintain the Truck Route on Buena Vista. While this may appear to be the path of least resistance, this alternative would not be consistent with the General Plan or decades long promises to the community on Buena Vista. If the truck route remains on Buena Vista, a General Plan Amendment would need to occur recognizing the change. Even with this alternative, one-off trucks that mistakenly continue straight on Clement as the truck route may cause collisions along this stretch of roadway.

The alternatives considered by staff that would preserve on-street parking each involve significant tradeoffs. They would either require substantial public investment to relocate the cycle track, reduce the City's long-standing commitment to protected bicycle facilities along the Cross Alameda Trail, or require amendments to the General Plan to remove the designated truck route from this segment of Clement Avenue.

We appreciate the alternatives suggested by the HOA, which include narrower vehicles, designated passing zones, or time of day restrictions are not feasible. However, the maximum standard vehicle width in the United States is set at the federal level at 8.5-feet, exclusive of mirrors. Local restrictions on vehicle width would not be enforceable, nor would time of day restrictions be appropriate for a designated truck route.

6. Coordinate with USPS to confirm that mail delivery to the Marina Shores group mailbox on Clement Avenue can continue uninterrupted, and preserve a dedicated carrier loading zone adjacent to the mailbox in any final parking design.

We appreciate the consideration of the USPS mailbox location. Staff will reach out to USPS and seek guidance about parking or whether the mailboxes will need to be relocated.

7. Identify how families and caregivers will access the Clement Avenue park and playground if adjacent on-street parking is eliminated, including consideration of dedicated park visitor parking;

See response to #3 and #11.

8. Extend outreach, notice, and consideration of mitigation measures to all property owners directly fronting the affected segment of Clement Avenue

between Ohlone and Paru Street, including those outside Marina Shores.

Public notices were mailed to all residents within a 300-foot radius of the project study area which is bounded by Entrance Road to the west, Hibbard Road to the east, Clement Avenue to the north, and Buena Vista Avenue to the south.

9. Meet directly with the Marina Shores Homeowners Association Board, in addition to the scheduled community and Transportation Commission meetings, to discuss impacts specific to our eleven affected homes

I would be happy to meet with the Marina Shores Homeowners Association Board. Please let me know the meeting dates/times for the Board and we can coordinate a meeting time convenient for all.

In addition to the Requested Action section, I am providing responses to a few other points raised in your email:

10. The Parking Elimination Should Be Evaluated Under the City's Adopted Complete Streets and General Plan Policies.

The General Plan, Complete Streets Policy, and other supporting City Council Resolutions consistently identify on-street parking as the lowest priority when allocating right-of-way space. First consideration should be for people walking, bicycling, and using transit, followed by vehicular needs and public safety (General Plan, Mobility Element Policy ME-6, Action g., Space Priorities). The General Plan designation of Clement Avenue as a truck route, followed by the subsequent discretionary action of City Council to adopt the Cross Alameda Trail alignment in 2005, Bike Master Plan in 2010, and Improvement Plans for Marina Shores, Phase II which constructed the two-way cycle track on Clement in 2014 has led us to this result where parking is proposed for elimination. While the three other alternatives evaluated (see response #5) could preserve parking on the south side of Clement, each alternative has significant drawback with compromises greater than the loss of 21 on-street parking stalls on Clement Avenue.

11. Eleven homes within our Association front directly onto this stretch of Clement Avenue, and their residents rely on that on-street parking for direct access to their front doors

All homes within the Marina Shores development have access to a two car garage. Of the 11 homes referenced, only 5 homes "front" on Clement Avenue with doorways facing Clement. These include 1552, 1556, 1558, 1560, and 1568 Clement Avenue. Visitors and guests for these 5 homes would need to park on the adjacent streets and walk to the front doors, which we acknowledge is an inconvenience. Front doors for the other six homes face either Balsa Street, Stanton Street, or Ohlone Street and visitors and guests are not inconvenienced by the lack of parking on Clement.

Public Works remains open to considering any additional feasible alternatives that can safely accommodate truck traffic while preserving on-street parking. If such an alternative exists, we welcome the opportunity to evaluate it.

Thank you again for your thoughtful comments. We look forward to continuing the discussion at the July 14 community meeting and the July 22 Transportation Commission meeting.

Scott Wikstrom, P.E.

City Engineer
City of Alameda
(510) 747-7937

From: Scott Wikstrom

Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2026 8:12 AM

To: 'Kenneth Levins' <klevins@gmail.com>

Cc: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Michele Pryor <mpryor@alamedaca.gov>; Greg Boller <gboller@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>; Erin Smith <ESmith@alamedaca.gov>; Gerry Beaudin <gbeaudin@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Hello Mr. Levins,

Thank you for the detailed comments and questions. I will prepare a written response over the next few days and prepare a reply in advance of the July 14th meeting. Please note a typo in my notification letter, the Transportation Commission meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 22 at 6:30pm in the Council Chambers. I will be sending an updated notification to the Marina Shores neighborhood with the corrected Transportation Commission date and will include my responses to the questions below in the updated notification.

Scott Wikstrom, P.E.

City Engineer
City of Alameda
(510) 747-7937

From: Kenneth Levins <klevins@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2026 6:39 AM

To: Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov>

Cc: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Michele Pryor

<mpryor@alamedaca.gov>; Greg Boller <gboller@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Dear Mr. Wikstrom:

This letter is submitted on behalf of the Marina Shores Homeowners Association (“Marina Shores” or the “Association”) in response to the City’s June 18, 2026 notice regarding the proposed relocation of the Clement Avenue truck route and the associated elimination of approximately 21 on-street parking spaces between Balsa Court and Paru Street. The Association understands that the truck route designation itself reflects a long-standing component of the City’s General Plan, predating this notice, and we do not write to relitigate that designation here. Our objection is narrower and more specific: the elimination of on-street parking on Clement Avenue is a new and separate proposal, distinct from the truck route designation, and one the Association believes has not been adequately justified or analyzed. We note that the City’s own notice describes the parking loss only in conditional terms, stating that relocating the truck route “would result in” the loss of parking, which suggests to the Association that the City itself has not treated this specific outcome as foreclosed. We urge the City to treat it accordingly and to give it independent, serious consideration.

Eleven homes within our Association front directly onto this stretch of Clement Avenue, and their residents rely on that on-street parking for direct access to their front doors. Additional homes located between Ohlone and Paru Street, outside of the Association’s membership, front directly onto this same segment and will be similarly affected by the loss of on-street parking. The Association urges the City to treat this as a corridor-wide impact affecting all directly fronting households, not solely those within Marina Shores, and to ensure that outreach, notice, and any mitigation measures extend to every affected property owner along the segment, regardless of HOA membership.

1. The Proposed Parking Elimination Is Inconsistent With the City’s Own Recent Investments on This Same Corridor

The City’s stated rationale for removing parking, that Clement Avenue is too “tortuous” and narrow to safely accommodate truck traffic alongside parked cars, is difficult to reconcile with the City’s own recent capital investments in this exact corridor. Within the last several years, and independent of the truck route question, the City has:

- Constructed a two-lane, physically protected bicycle lane along this stretch of Clement Avenue, which by design narrows the available roadway width;
- Built a public park and playground fronting Clement Avenue in the immediately affected area, an investment that presupposes a calmer, more pedestrian- and family-oriented street environment;
- Installed a protected and enhanced "bulb-out" crosswalk within the very segment where parking removal is now proposed, an improvement typically justified on the basis of reduced vehicle speeds and reduced roadway width, and which by design narrows the roadway.

Each of these prior decisions reflects an affirmative City determination that this segment of Clement Avenue should function as a low-speed, multimodal, residential street. The Association recognizes that the truck route designation itself is largely a settled matter of long standing City policy. But the parking elimination now proposed is a new, separate decision layered on top of that settled designation, and it deserves independent scrutiny on its own terms. If the roadway is in fact too narrow to safely carry trucks and parked cars together, that narrowness is substantially the result of the City's own bicycle lane, park, and crosswalk construction. The City should not be permitted to invoke a condition it created to justify imposing the burden of that condition entirely on adjacent residents and park users, particularly where, as the City's own notice acknowledges, the parking loss is a consequence ("would result in") rather than a foregone necessity of the truck route decision itself.

2. The Parking Elimination Should Be Evaluated Under the City's Adopted Complete Streets and General Plan Policies

California's Complete Streets Act of 2008 (AB 1358, codified in relevant part at Government Code Section 65302(b)) requires that, upon substantive revision of a general plan circulation element, the City plan for a balanced, multimodal transportation network serving all users, not motor vehicles and goods movement alone. Consistent with this mandate, and with Metropolitan Transportation Commission Resolution No. 4035, the City of Alameda has adopted its own Complete Streets Policy and maintains a Transportation Element within its General Plan that commits the City to safe, multimodal streets for pedestrians, bicyclists, and residents, including specifically the City's Vision Zero Action Plan goal of eliminating severe and fatal pedestrian and bicycle collisions.

Removing all on-street parking on a narrowed residential segment that the City has only recently equipped with a protected bike lane, a park and playground serving children, and enhanced pedestrian crossings runs directly counter to these adopted policies, independent of whatever merit the truck route designation itself may have. Before proceeding with the parking removal specifically, the City should be required to demonstrate, through a written Complete Streets analysis or its equivalent, how eliminating parking on this segment is consistent with the Transportation Element, the Complete Streets Policy, and the Vision Zero Action

Plan, particularly given the presence of a playground and protected crosswalks within the affected segment.

3. The Parking Study Appears Not to Have Considered Loss of Parking for the Adjacent Park and Playground

The Clement Avenue park and playground built within this same segment relies in substantial part on the on-street parking now proposed for elimination. The Association is not aware of any dedicated off-street parking lot serving this park, meaning the 21 spaces proposed for removal likely constitute most or all of the parking currently available to families and caregivers visiting the playground, including those bringing young children, strollers, or mobility devices who cannot reasonably walk a significant distance from parking located elsewhere in the neighborhood. The City's June 18, 2026 notice and referenced early-2026 parking study describe the impact solely in terms of residential and general neighborhood parking capacity; neither appears to separately address the loss of parking serving park and playground visitors, a public recreational amenity the City itself recently built. The Association requests that the parking study, and any supplemental analysis, specifically evaluate (a) whether dedicated park visitor parking will be preserved or relocated, and (b) how families with young children and caregivers with limited mobility are expected to access the playground if adjacent on-street parking is eliminated.

4. The Parking Study and Engineering Basis for the Decision Should Be Disclosed and Independently Reviewed

The City's notice references a parking study "conducted in early 2026" that purportedly found sufficient parking capacity to absorb the loss of 21 spaces, and an engineering rationale concerning trailer offtracking and lane width. The Association requests that the City provide, in advance of the July 14, 2026 community meeting, the full parking study (including its methodology, the radius and time of day surveyed, and its treatment of overnight and resident parking demand), and the underlying traffic and geometric engineering analysis supporting the conclusion that Clement Avenue cannot safely accommodate both truck traffic and on-street parking. Residents are entitled to evaluate, and, where appropriate, to retain their own traffic engineer to evaluate, the technical basis for a decision that will permanently eliminate direct vehicle access to eleven homes.

The Association notes that a parking utilization study measuring area-wide "sufficient capacity" does not address the specific and substantial burden on residents who will lose the ability to park immediately in front of their own homes, including impacts on residents with mobility limitations, elderly residents, and families loading children, groceries, or equipment. A finding of adequate parking supply elsewhere in the neighborhood does not, without more, satisfy the City's obligation to consider the equity and access impacts on the specifically affected households.

5. Loss of Parking Will Interfere With U.S. Mail Delivery to the Group Mailbox

The Marina Shores cluster (“CBU”) is located directly on Clement Avenue within the segment proposed for parking removal. The USPS carrier currently relies on the ability to park immediately adjacent to the mailbox in order to load and deliver mail to the cluster box unit. Eliminating on-street parking along this segment, without provision of a dedicated loading or carrier stop, will directly interfere with the ability of the Postal Service to deliver mail to every household served by that mailbox, a consequence with federal as well as local implications, since USPS access standards generally require a safe, legal place for the carrier to stop. The Association requests that the City specifically evaluate carrier and mail delivery access as part of any parking removal plan, including consultation with the local USPS station, and that any final design preserve a marked loading zone or equivalent carrier stop immediately adjacent to the mailbox location.

6. Equity and Notice Concerns

The Association is concerned that a decision with this degree of permanent, concentrated impact on a small group of identifiable households (eliminating direct vehicle access in front of eleven Marina Shores homes and additional homes between Olohne and Paru Street, and removing parking serving a public park) is being advanced primarily through informational meetings rather than a noticed public hearing with formal findings specific to the parking removal itself. To the extent the removal of on-street parking requires action by the City Council, the Transportation Commission, or another decision-making body under the Alameda Municipal Code, the Association requests written confirmation of (a) which body holds final decision-making authority over the parking removal specifically, (b) what findings that body is required to make, and (c) what opportunity affected residents will have to formally contest the decision, including any administrative appeal process, before it is implemented.

The Association further requests that any final decision on parking removal be preceded by a site-specific traffic and circulation analysis evaluating whether a smaller-scale or partial parking removal, narrower truck design vehicles, traffic calming measures, designated loading/passing zones, or a reduced truck weight or time-of-day restriction on Clement Avenue could allow trucks to safely use the route while preserving direct resident and park visitor parking access.

7. Requested Action

The Marina Shores Homeowners Association respectfully requests that the City:

- Treat the elimination of on-street parking on Clement Avenue as a distinct decision from the truck route designation, requiring its own independent analysis and justification;
- Postpone any final decision on parking removal until the issues raised in this letter have been addressed in writing;
- Provide the full parking study and supporting traffic/geometric engineering

analysis referenced in the City's June 18, 2026 notice, including specific analysis of parking demand generated by the adjacent park and playground;

- Identify the specific decision-making body and procedural and Municipal Code requirements (including any required public hearing, findings, or appeal rights) applicable to the parking removal;
- Evaluate and respond in writing to alternative approaches that would allow trucks to use the route while avoiding or reducing the loss of resident and park visitor parking, including narrower design vehicles, designated passing/loading zones, partial parking retention, or time-of-day restrictions;
- Coordinate with USPS to confirm that mail delivery to the Marina Shores group mailbox on Clement Avenue can continue uninterrupted, and preserve a dedicated carrier loading zone adjacent to the mailbox in any final parking design;
- Identify how families and caregivers will access the Clement Avenue park and playground if adjacent on-street parking is eliminated, including consideration of dedicated park visitor parking;
- Extend outreach, notice, and consideration of mitigation measures to all property owners directly fronting the affected segment of Clement Avenue between Ohlone and Paru Street, including those outside Marina Shores; and
- Meet directly with the Marina Shores Homeowners Association Board, in addition to the scheduled community and Transportation Commission meetings, to discuss impacts specific to our eleven affected homes.

The Association and its affected residents intend to attend and provide comment at both the July 14, 2026 community meeting and the Transportation Commission meeting, and we reserve the right to supplement this letter with additional comments, including comments from a traffic engineer retained by the Association, as further information becomes available.

We appreciate the City's willingness to engage with the community on this issue and look forward to your prompt written response. Please direct any response or requested materials to the undersigned.

Sincerely,

Ken Levins

President

Marina Shores Homeowners Association

--

Kenneth Levins
1826 Balsa Street,
Alameda
CA 94501
(925) 980 8811
klevins@gmail.com

--

Kenneth Levins
1826 Balsa Street,
Alameda
CA 94501
(925) 980 8811
mailto:\\klevins@gmail.com

--

Kenneth Levins
1826 Balsa Street,
Alameda
CA 94501
(925) 980 8811
mailto:\\klevins@gmail.com

From: Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, July 8, 2026 6:15 PM

To: 'Kenneth Levins' <klevins@gmail.com>

Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Hi Mr. Levins,

Sorry for the delay in my reply. As you may know, Gerry Beaudin, our new City Manager started last week on June 30th. Each City Manager has a protocol for interactions involving City Council members and Gerry is establishing that protocol with staff as he gets up to speed in his role. Because your original email cc'd City Council, my full response to your comments and questions below is pending and will be sent to you and the City Council when reviewed.

In the meantime, I have attached the parking study for your use.

Regards,

Scott Wikstrom, P.E.

City Engineer

City of Alameda

(510) 747-7937

From: Scott Wikstrom

Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2026 8:12 AM

To: 'Kenneth Levins' <klevins@gmail.com>

Cc: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Michele Pryor <mpryor@alamedaca.gov>; Greg Boller <gboller@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>; Erin Smith <ESmith@alamedaca.gov>; Gerry Beaudin <gbeaudin@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Hello Mr. Levins,

Thank you for the detailed comments and questions. I will prepare a written response over the next few days and prepare a reply in advance of the July 14th meeting. Please note a typo in my notification letter, the Transportation Commission meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 22 at 6:30pm in the Council Chambers. I will be sending an updated notification to the Marina Shores neighborhood with the corrected Transportation Commission date and will include my responses to the questions below in the updated notification.

Scott Wikstrom, P.E.

City Engineer
City of Alameda
(510) 747-7937

From: Kenneth Levins <klevins@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2026 6:39 AM

To: Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov>

Cc: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Michele Pryor <mpryor@alamedaca.gov>; Greg Boller <gboller@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Dear Mr. Wikstrom:

This letter is submitted on behalf of the Marina Shores Homeowners Association ("Marina Shores" or the "Association") in response to the City's June 18, 2026 notice regarding the proposed relocation of the Clement Avenue truck route and the associated elimination of approximately 21 on-street parking spaces between Balsa Court and Paru Street. The Association understands that the truck route designation itself reflects a long-standing component of the City's General Plan, predating this notice, and we do not write to relitigate that designation here. Our objection is narrower and more specific: the elimination of on-street parking on Clement Avenue is a new and separate proposal, distinct from the truck route designation, and one the Association believes has not been adequately justified or analyzed. We note that the City's own notice describes the parking loss only in conditional terms, stating that relocating the truck route "would result in" the loss of parking, which suggests to the Association that the City itself has not treated this specific outcome as foreclosed. We urge the City to treat it accordingly and to give it independent, serious consideration.

Eleven homes within our Association front directly onto this stretch of Clement Avenue, and their residents rely on that on-street parking for direct access to their front doors. Additional homes located between Ohlone and Paru Street, outside of the Association's membership, front directly onto this same segment and will be similarly affected by the loss of on-street parking. The Association urges the City to treat this as a corridor-wide impact affecting all directly fronting households, not solely those within Marina Shores, and to ensure that outreach, notice, and any mitigation measures extend to every affected property owner along the segment, regardless of HOA membership.

1. The Proposed Parking Elimination Is Inconsistent With the City's Own Recent Investments on This Same Corridor

The City's stated rationale for removing parking, that Clement Avenue is too "tortuous" and narrow to safely accommodate truck traffic alongside parked cars, is difficult to

reconcile with the City's own recent capital investments in this exact corridor. Within the last several years, and independent of the truck route question, the City has:

- Constructed a two-lane, physically protected bicycle lane along this stretch of Clement Avenue, which by design narrows the available roadway width;
- Built a public park and playground fronting Clement Avenue in the immediately affected area, an investment that presupposes a calmer, more pedestrian- and family-oriented street environment;
- Installed a protected and enhanced "bulb-out" crosswalk within the very segment where parking removal is now proposed, an improvement typically justified on the basis of reduced vehicle speeds and reduced roadway width, and which by design narrows the roadway.

Each of these prior decisions reflects an affirmative City determination that this segment of Clement Avenue should function as a low-speed, multimodal, residential street. The Association recognizes that the truck route designation itself is largely a settled matter of long standing City policy. But the parking elimination now proposed is a new, separate decision layered on top of that settled designation, and it deserves independent scrutiny on its own terms. If the roadway is in fact too narrow to safely carry trucks and parked cars together, that narrowness is substantially the result of the City's own bicycle lane, park, and crosswalk construction. The City should not be permitted to invoke a condition it created to justify imposing the burden of that condition entirely on adjacent residents and park users, particularly where, as the City's own notice acknowledges, the parking loss is a consequence ("would result in") rather than a foregone necessity of the truck route decision itself.

2. The Parking Elimination Should Be Evaluated Under the City's Adopted Complete Streets and General Plan Policies

California's Complete Streets Act of 2008 (AB 1358, codified in relevant part at Government Code Section 65302(b)) requires that, upon substantive revision of a general plan circulation element, the City plan for a balanced, multimodal transportation network serving all users, not motor vehicles and goods movement alone. Consistent with this mandate, and with Metropolitan Transportation Commission Resolution No. 4035, the City of Alameda has adopted its own Complete Streets Policy and maintains a Transportation Element within its General Plan that commits the City to safe, multimodal streets for pedestrians, bicyclists, and residents, including specifically the City's Vision Zero Action Plan goal of eliminating severe and fatal pedestrian and bicycle collisions.

Removing all on-street parking on a narrowed residential segment that the City has only recently equipped with a protected bike lane, a park and playground serving children, and enhanced pedestrian crossings runs directly counter to these adopted policies, independent of whatever merit the truck route designation itself may have. Before proceeding with the parking removal specifically, the City should be required to demonstrate, through a written Complete Streets analysis or its equivalent, how eliminating parking on this segment is consistent with the Transportation Element, the Complete Streets Policy, and the Vision Zero Action Plan, particularly given the presence of a playground and protected crosswalks within the affected segment.

3. The Parking Study Appears Not to Have Considered Loss of Parking for the Adjacent Park and Playground

The Clement Avenue park and playground built within this same segment relies in substantial part on the on-street parking now proposed for elimination. The Association is not aware of any dedicated off-street parking lot serving this park, meaning the 21 spaces proposed for removal likely constitute most or all of the parking currently available to families and caregivers visiting the playground, including those bringing young children, strollers, or mobility devices who cannot reasonably walk a significant distance from parking located elsewhere in the neighborhood. The City's June 18, 2026 notice and referenced early-2026 parking study describe the impact solely in terms of residential and general neighborhood parking capacity; neither appears to separately address the loss of parking serving park and playground visitors, a public recreational amenity the City itself recently built. The Association requests that the parking study, and any supplemental analysis, specifically evaluate (a) whether dedicated park visitor parking will be preserved or relocated, and (b) how families with young children and caregivers with limited mobility are expected to access the playground if adjacent on-street parking is eliminated.

4. The Parking Study and Engineering Basis for the Decision Should Be Disclosed and Independently Reviewed

The City's notice references a parking study "conducted in early 2026" that purportedly found sufficient parking capacity to absorb the loss of 21 spaces, and an engineering rationale concerning trailer offtracking and lane width. The Association requests that the City provide, in advance of the July 14, 2026 community meeting, the full parking study (including its methodology, the radius and time of day surveyed, and its treatment of overnight and resident parking demand), and the underlying traffic and geometric engineering analysis supporting the conclusion that Clement Avenue cannot safely accommodate both truck traffic and on-street parking. Residents are entitled to evaluate, and, where appropriate, to retain their own traffic engineer to evaluate, the technical basis for a decision that will permanently eliminate direct vehicle access to eleven homes.

The Association notes that a parking utilization study measuring area-wide "sufficient capacity" does not address the specific and substantial burden on residents who will lose the ability to park immediately in front of their own homes, including impacts on residents with mobility limitations, elderly residents, and families loading children, groceries, or equipment. A finding of adequate parking supply elsewhere in the neighborhood does not, without more, satisfy the City's obligation to consider the equity and access impacts on the specifically affected households.

5. Loss of Parking Will Interfere With U.S. Mail Delivery to the Group Mailbox

The Marina Shores cluster ("CBU") is located directly on Clement Avenue within the segment proposed for parking removal. The USPS carrier currently relies on the ability to park immediately adjacent to the mailbox in order to load and deliver mail to the cluster box unit. Eliminating on-street parking along this segment, without provision of a dedicated loading or carrier stop, will directly interfere with the ability of the Postal

Service to deliver mail to every household served by that mailbox, a consequence with federal as well as local implications, since USPS access standards generally require a safe, legal place for the carrier to stop. The Association requests that the City specifically evaluate carrier and mail delivery access as part of any parking removal plan, including consultation with the local USPS station, and that any final design preserve a marked loading zone or equivalent carrier stop immediately adjacent to the mailbox location.

6. Equity and Notice Concerns

The Association is concerned that a decision with this degree of permanent, concentrated impact on a small group of identifiable households (eliminating direct vehicle access in front of eleven Marina Shores homes and additional homes between Olohne and Paru Street, and removing parking serving a public park) is being advanced primarily through informational meetings rather than a noticed public hearing with formal findings specific to the parking removal itself. To the extent the removal of on-street parking requires action by the City Council, the Transportation Commission, or another decision-making body under the Alameda Municipal Code, the Association requests written confirmation of (a) which body holds final decision-making authority over the parking removal specifically, (b) what findings that body is required to make, and (c) what opportunity affected residents will have to formally contest the decision, including any administrative appeal process, before it is implemented.

The Association further requests that any final decision on parking removal be preceded by a site-specific traffic and circulation analysis evaluating whether a smaller-scale or partial parking removal, narrower truck design vehicles, traffic calming measures, designated loading/passing zones, or a reduced truck weight or time-of-day restriction on Clement Avenue could allow trucks to safely use the route while preserving direct resident and park visitor parking access.

7. Requested Action

The Marina Shores Homeowners Association respectfully requests that the City:

- Treat the elimination of on-street parking on Clement Avenue as a distinct decision from the truck route designation, requiring its own independent analysis and justification;
- Postpone any final decision on parking removal until the issues raised in this letter have been addressed in writing;
- Provide the full parking study and supporting traffic/geometric engineering analysis referenced in the City's June 18, 2026 notice, including specific analysis of parking demand generated by the adjacent park and playground;
- Identify the specific decision-making body and procedural and Municipal Code requirements (including any required public hearing, findings, or appeal rights) applicable to the parking removal;
- Evaluate and respond in writing to alternative approaches that would allow trucks to use the route while avoiding or reducing the loss of resident and park visitor

parking, including narrower design vehicles, designated passing/loading zones, partial parking retention, or time-of-day restrictions;

- Coordinate with USPS to confirm that mail delivery to the Marina Shores group mailbox on Clement Avenue can continue uninterrupted, and preserve a dedicated carrier loading zone adjacent to the mailbox in any final parking design;
- Identify how families and caregivers will access the Clement Avenue park and playground if adjacent on-street parking is eliminated, including consideration of dedicated park visitor parking;
- Extend outreach, notice, and consideration of mitigation measures to all property owners directly fronting the affected segment of Clement Avenue between Ohlone and Paru Street, including those outside Marina Shores; and
- Meet directly with the Marina Shores Homeowners Association Board, in addition to the scheduled community and Transportation Commission meetings, to discuss impacts specific to our eleven affected homes.

The Association and its affected residents intend to attend and provide comment at both the July 14, 2026 community meeting and the Transportation Commission meeting, and we reserve the right to supplement this letter with additional comments, including comments from a traffic engineer retained by the Association, as further information becomes available.

We appreciate the City's willingness to engage with the community on this issue and look forward to your prompt written response. Please direct any response or requested materials to the undersigned.

Sincerely,

Ken Levins
President
Marina Shores Homeowners Association

--

Kenneth Levins
1826 Balsa Street,
Alameda
CA 94501
(925) 980 8811
klevins@gmail.com

From: [Kenneth Levins](#)
To: [Scott Wikstrom](#)
Cc: [Erin Smith](#); [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#); [Gerry Beaudin](#); [Transportation Commission](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street
Date: Monday, July 13, 2026 10:20:42 AM

Dear Mr. Wikstrom:

This letter supplements the Association's July 13 reply and addresses points in your written response that should be corrected or completed in the record before the Transportation Commission hearing on July 22. Please include it in the Commission's agenda packet.

1. The affected-household count is understated. Your response reduces the Association's eleven affected homes to five based on front-door orientation. Door orientation is not the measure of impact: the burden falls on every household that uses the affected curb - for visitors, caregivers, home health aides, service workers, deliveries, and loading. That includes all eleven Marina Shores homes and the non-Association households between Ohlone and Paru on the same curb. Garages do not serve any of those needs, as your response effectively concedes in acknowledging the "inconvenience" to guests. We ask that the staff report describe the affected population as all households using the curb, and analyze impacts - including on elderly and mobility-limited residents - from that baseline.
2. Policy ME-6, correctly applied, cuts against this proposal. The space-priority hierarchy staff cites ranks people walking, bicycling, and using transit first; truck through-movement is not at the top. This proposal serves a lower-priority goods-movement function while its side effects degrade the priority modes: with the curb cleared, postal and delivery vehicles will stand in the travel lane or against the bikeway, and heavy truck volumes will increase beside the Stanton Street crossing serving the park - whose visiting families, pedestrians, lose the parking that supports their access. The proposal takes space from one low-priority use to serve another, at the expense of the street's highest-priority users. We request a written ME-6 consistency analysis addressing these effects, not merely a citation to parking's rank.
3. The City is obligated to evaluate noise exposure before relocating the truck route. Government Code Section 65302(f) requires the General Plan noise element to analyze and quantify noise from major thoroughfares and truck routes, and the General Plan's own noise policies establish thresholds for increases in noise exposure affecting residences and other sensitive uses. Relocating the designated truck route onto a segment lined with homes and a public playground is precisely the change those provisions address, yet no noise study is referenced anywhere in the City's notice or your response. We request that the City complete and publish a noise exposure analysis - existing versus projected truck volumes and resulting noise levels at the adjacent residences and park - before any final action, and that this analysis be incorporated into the CEQA determination requested in our July 13 letter.
4. Record accuracy. Your response states the two-way cycle track was constructed in 2014 with the Marina Shores Phase II improvements, but elsewhere that Class II bike lanes "existed until 2016." Because this history will support a permanent, unappealable decision, we ask that the timeline be corrected in the staff report.

The Association reiterates the requests in our earlier July 13 letter and looks forward to staff's written responses in advance of July 22.

Sincerely,

Ken Levins
President
Marina Shores Homeowners Association

On Mon, Jul 13, 2026 at 8:40 AM Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov> wrote:

Mr. Levins, and members of the Marina Shore Homeowners Association,

The decision to recommend removing 21 on-street parking spaces on Clement Avenue was not made lightly. We recognize that this change will affect nearby residents, and we appreciate the HOA taking the time to provide thoughtful comments.

As noted in Response #4 below, the Alameda Municipal Code authorizes the Public Works Director to prohibit parking when traffic engineering principles indicate it is necessary to support public safety and the safe operation of the transportation system. While the Code does not require public notification or provide an appeal process for this type of decision, Public Works chose to conduct an extensive outreach effort because of the community interest and the potential impacts. That outreach includes mailed notices, a community meeting, and a public hearing before the Transportation Commission prior to implementation. The purpose of the outreach is twofold: to explain the engineering analysis and policy considerations that led to this recommendation, and to hear from the community.

I've provided responses to the Requested Action portion of your email and a few additional notes. I look forward to continuing the discussion at the July 14 community meeting and the July 22 Transportation Commission meeting. As noted below, I'd also be happy to meet directly with the HOA.

- 1. Treat the elimination of on-street parking on Clement Avenue as a distinct decision from the truck route designation, requiring its own independent analysis and justification;**

We believe we have treated the elimination of parking as separate issue, conducted an analysis and have justification for staff recommendation. Relocation of the truck route to Clement requires wider lanes than the existing 11.5 feet travel lanes. Large tractor-trailer trucks make wide turns. This is most obvious when these trucks make a 90 degree right turn at an intersection where the rear axle of the trailer can track several feet inboard of the front steering axle. An example truck turning template and overlay on Clement Avenue can be downloaded via the following link: [Clement Truck Route - Grand to Sherman](#) This offset tracking of a truck trailer also occurs when driving along curved roads such as the section of Clement between Entrance Road and Hibbard. The approximate 250-foot radius curves along Clement will require a minimum 14-foot lane to accommodate the trailer offset for a typical full-sized truck that regularly traverse Alameda. The existing road

configuration cannot accommodate the wider lanes and the existing parking. Therefore, staff hired a consulting firm to perform an independent analysis of parking supply and demand. The results of that analysis show parking capacity on the side streets to accommodate the recommended loss of parking. More information is provided in responses #4 and #5 below.

- 2. Postpone any final decision on parking removal until the issues raised in this letter have been addressed in writing;**

We are not intending to take action until after community engagement and the public hearing at the Transportation Commission. Please see response to #4 for more information.

- 3. Provide the full parking study and supporting traffic/geometric engineering analysis referenced in the City's June 18, 2026 notice, including specific analysis of parking demand generated by the adjacent park and playground;**

The parking analysis can be downloaded via the following link: [Clement Truck Route - Grand to Sherman](#). The parking analysis did not complete a separate analysis of the parking demand generated by the adjacent park and playground. Because the park and playground already exist, parking demand is incorporated into the observed parking occupancy. There is an existing small parking lot opposite of Ohlone Street that serves the park/playground and provides access to the Bay Trail and public shore which will be unaffected by the truck route. Staff also consulted with the Recreation and Parks Director about parking for the park. There are no known concerns about parking lot capacity and the parking analysis concludes capacity on the side streets. Additionally, the City recently installed a rapid flashing beacon at Stanton Street to assist pedestrians in crossing Clement Ave and access the park/playground in preparation for the truck route relocation. Current park visitors who didn't use the lot opposite of Ohlone Street are required to cross Clement to access the park. Elimination of parking on the south side of Clement and opposite of the park will not change the need for park visitors to cross Clement and the parking study confirms sufficient capacity on the adjacent streets.

- 4. Identify the specific decision-making body and procedural and Municipal Code requirements (including any required public hearing, findings, or appeal rights) applicable to the parking removal;**

On-street parking in Alameda is regulated in Chapter VIII of the Alameda Municipal Code (AMC) and more specifically in Section 8-7, Parking Prohibitions. AMC Section 8-7.1, Parking – Prohibited at all times states, “The Public Works Director is hereby authorized, whenever traffic engineering studies or principles indicate for the safety or adequate flow of all modes of transportation, to establish streets or portions thereof where parking is

prohibited at all times.” In the case of Clement Avenue the parking loss is necessary for truck traffic and would be a safety issue if not removed. Furthermore, AMC Section 8-1.2, Notice of Decisions, does not require public noticing or in Section AMC Section 8-1.3 provide for an appeal process for Public Works Director decisions made on the basis of adequate traffic flow and public safety. We recognize the impact of losing 21 on-street parking stalls and have elected to conduct public outreach in advance of completing the work. See also response #5.

5. Evaluate and respond in writing to alternative approaches that would allow trucks to use the route while avoiding or reducing the loss of resident and park visitor parking, including narrower design vehicles, designated passing/loading zones, partial parking retention, or time-of-day restrictions.

Staff evaluated alternatives related to truck route relocation, each of which had significant challenges. Staff recommends and is pursuing the removal of parking on Clement Avenue between Balsa Street and Paru Street as the least impactful alternative in consideration of the City’s General Plan, Active Transportation Plan, and City Policies promulgated by City Council resolutions. The three other alternatives are:

- Eliminate the two-way cycle track between Entrance Road and Grand Street and return to the Class II bike lanes that existed until 2016. In this alternative, the trailer offset for large trucks would be accommodated within the Class II lane. A potential safety issue exists when a bicycle is travelling in the same direction and same time as a large truck. Additionally, transitions between two-way cycle tracks and Class II bike lanes are challenging and bicycle rider compliance with the transition can be expected to be low, resulting in a potentially increased hazard for all roadway users.
- Relocate the two-way cycle track to the excess right-of-way north of Clement. There is a 17-foot wide “alternative vehicle corridor” that was included Clement Avenue dedication with Tract 7170. At the time, this corridor was being reserved for a potential light rail connection along the northern waterfront. Relocation of the cycle track to this excess right-of-way would impact the Waterfront Park, potentially remove mature trees, and require BCDC permitting and approval, with potentially significant construction costs.
- Maintain the Truck Route on Buena Vista. While this may appear to be the path of least resistance, this alternative would not be consistent with the General Plan or decades long promises to the community on Buena Vista. If the truck route remains on Buena Vista, a General Plan Amendment would need to occur recognizing the change. Even with this alternative, one-off trucks that mistakenly continue straight on Clement as the truck route may cause collisions along this stretch of roadway.

The alternatives considered by staff that would preserve on-street parking each involve significant tradeoffs. They would either require substantial public investment to relocate the cycle track, reduce the City's long-standing commitment to protected bicycle facilities along the Cross Alameda Trail, or require amendments to the General Plan to remove the

designated truck route from this segment of Clement Avenue.

We appreciate the alternatives suggested by the HOA, which include narrower vehicles, designated passing zones, or time of day restrictions are not feasible. However, the maximum standard vehicle width in the United States is set at the federal level at 8.5-feet, exclusive of mirrors. Local restrictions on vehicle width would not be enforceable, nor would time of day restrictions be appropriate for a designated truck route.

- 6. Coordinate with USPS to confirm that mail delivery to the Marina Shores group mailbox on Clement Avenue can continue uninterrupted, and preserve a dedicated carrier loading zone adjacent to the mailbox in any final parking design.**

We appreciate the consideration of the USPS mailbox location. Staff will reach out to USPS and seek guidance about parking or whether the mailboxes will need to be relocated.

- 7. Identify how families and caregivers will access the Clement Avenue park and playground if adjacent on-street parking is eliminated, including consideration of dedicated park visitor parking;**

See response to #3 and #11.

- 8. Extend outreach, notice, and consideration of mitigation measures to all property owners directly fronting the affected segment of Clement Avenue between Ohlone and Paru Street, including those outside Marina Shores.**

Public notices were mailed to all residents within a 300-foot radius of the project study area which is bounded by Entrance Road to the west, Hibbard Road to the east, Clement Avenue to the north, and Buena Vista Avenue to the south.

- 9. Meet directly with the Marina Shores Homeowners Association Board, in addition to the scheduled community and Transportation Commission meetings, to discuss impacts specific to our eleven affected homes**

I would be happy to meet with the Marina Shores Homeowners Association Board. Please let me know the meeting dates/times for the Board and we can coordinate a meeting time convenient for all.

In addition to the Requested Action section, I am providing responses to a few other points raised in your email:

10. The Parking Elimination Should Be Evaluated Under the City's Adopted Complete Streets and General Plan Policies.

The General Plan, Complete Streets Policy, and other supporting City Council Resolutions consistently identify on-street parking as the lowest priority when allocating right-of-way space. First consideration should be for people walking, bicycling, and using transit, followed by vehicular needs and public safety (General Plan, Mobility Element Policy ME-6, Action g., Space Priorities). The General Plan designation of Clement Avenue as a truck route, followed by the subsequent discretionary action of City Council to adopt the Cross Alameda Trail alignment in 2005, Bike Master Plan in 2010, and Improvement Plans for Marina Shores, Phase II which constructed the two-way cycle track on Clement in 2014 has led us to this result where parking is proposed for elimination. While the three other alternatives evaluated (see response #5) could preserve parking on the south side of Clement, each alternative has significant drawback with compromises greater than the loss of 21 on-street parking stalls on Clement Avenue.

11. Eleven homes within our Association front directly onto this stretch of Clement Avenue, and their residents rely on that on-street parking for direct access to their front doors

All homes within the Marina Shores development have access to a two car garage. Of the 11 homes referenced, only 5 homes "front" on Clement Avenue with doorways facing Clement. These include 1552, 1556, 1558, 1560, and 1568 Clement Avenue. Visitors and guests for these 5 homes would need to park on the adjacent streets and walk to the front doors, which we acknowledge is an inconvenience. Front doors for the other six homes face either Balsa Street, Stanton Street, or Ohlone Street and visitors and guests are not inconvenienced by the lack of parking on Clement.

Public Works remains open to considering any additional feasible alternatives that can safely accommodate truck traffic while preserving on-street parking. If such an alternative exists, we welcome the opportunity to evaluate it.

Thank you again for your thoughtful comments. We look forward to continuing the discussion at the July 14 community meeting and the July 22 Transportation Commission meeting.

Scott Wikstrom, P.E.

City Engineer

City of Alameda

(510) 747-7937

From: Scott Wikstrom

Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2026 8:12 AM

To: 'Kenneth Levins' <klevins@gmail.com>

Cc: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Michele Pryor <mpryor@alamedaca.gov>; Greg Boller <gboller@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>; Erin Smith <ESmith@alamedaca.gov>; Gerry Beaudin <gbeaudin@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Hello Mr. Levins,

Thank you for the detailed comments and questions. I will prepare a written response over the next few days and prepare a reply in advance of the July 14th meeting. Please note a typo in my notification letter, the Transportation Commission meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 22 at 6:30pm in the Council Chambers. I will be sending an updated notification to the Marina Shores neighborhood with the corrected Transportation Commission date and will include my responses to the questions below in the updated notification.

Scott Wikstrom, P.E.

City Engineer

City of Alameda

(510) 747-7937

From: Kenneth Levins <klevins@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2026 6:39 AM

To: Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov>

Cc: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Michele Pryor <mpryor@alamedaca.gov>; Greg Boller <gboller@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Dear Mr. Wikstrom:

This letter is submitted on behalf of the Marina Shores Homeowners Association (“Marina Shores” or the “Association”) in response to the City’s June 18, 2026 notice regarding the proposed relocation of the Clement Avenue truck route and the associated elimination of approximately 21 on-street parking spaces between Balsa Court and Paru Street. The Association understands that the truck route designation itself reflects a long-standing component of the City’s General Plan, predating this notice, and we do not write to relitigate that designation here. Our objection is narrower and more specific: the elimination of on-street parking on Clement Avenue is a new and separate proposal, distinct from the truck route designation, and one the Association believes has not been adequately justified or analyzed. We note that the City’s own notice describes the parking loss only in conditional terms, stating that relocating the truck route “would result in” the loss of parking, which suggests to the Association that the City itself has not treated this specific outcome as foreclosed. We urge the City to treat it accordingly and to give it independent, serious consideration.

Eleven homes within our Association front directly onto this stretch of Clement Avenue, and their residents rely on that on-street parking for direct access to their front doors. Additional homes located between Ohlone and Paru Street, outside of the Association’s membership, front directly onto this same segment and will be similarly affected by the loss of on-street parking. The Association urges the City to treat this as a corridor-wide impact affecting all directly fronting households, not solely those within Marina Shores, and to ensure that outreach, notice, and any mitigation measures extend to every affected property owner along the segment, regardless of HOA membership.

1. The Proposed Parking Elimination Is Inconsistent With the City’s Own Recent Investments on This Same Corridor

The City’s stated rationale for removing parking, that Clement Avenue is too “tortuous” and narrow to safely accommodate truck traffic alongside parked cars, is difficult to reconcile with the City’s own recent capital investments in this exact corridor. Within the last several years, and independent of the truck route question, the City has:

- Constructed a two-lane, physically protected bicycle lane along this stretch of Clement Avenue, which by design narrows the available roadway width;
- Built a public park and playground fronting Clement Avenue in the immediately affected area, an investment that presupposes a calmer, more pedestrian- and family-oriented street environment;
- Installed a protected and enhanced “bulb-out” crosswalk within the very segment where parking removal is now proposed, an improvement typically justified on the basis of reduced vehicle speeds and reduced roadway width, and which by design narrows the roadway.

Each of these prior decisions reflects an affirmative City determination that this segment of Clement Avenue should function as a low-speed, multimodal, residential street. The Association recognizes that the truck route designation itself is largely a settled matter of long standing City policy. But the parking elimination now proposed is a new, separate decision layered on top of that settled designation, and it deserves independent scrutiny on its own terms. If the roadway is in fact too narrow to safely carry trucks and parked cars together, that narrowness is substantially the result of the City's own bicycle lane, park, and crosswalk construction. The City should not be permitted to invoke a condition it created to justify imposing the burden of that condition entirely on adjacent residents and park users, particularly where, as the City's own notice acknowledges, the parking loss is a consequence ("would result in") rather than a foregone necessity of the truck route decision itself.

2. The Parking Elimination Should Be Evaluated Under the City's Adopted Complete Streets and General Plan Policies

California's Complete Streets Act of 2008 (AB 1358, codified in relevant part at Government Code Section 65302(b)) requires that, upon substantive revision of a general plan circulation element, the City plan for a balanced, multimodal transportation network serving all users, not motor vehicles and goods movement alone. Consistent with this mandate, and with Metropolitan Transportation Commission Resolution No. 4035, the City of Alameda has adopted its own Complete Streets Policy and maintains a Transportation Element within its General Plan that commits the City to safe, multimodal streets for pedestrians, bicyclists, and residents, including specifically the City's Vision Zero Action Plan goal of eliminating severe and fatal pedestrian and bicycle collisions.

Removing all on-street parking on a narrowed residential segment that the City has only recently equipped with a protected bike lane, a park and playground serving children, and enhanced pedestrian crossings runs directly counter to these adopted policies, independent of whatever merit the truck route designation itself may have. Before proceeding with the parking removal specifically, the City should be required to demonstrate, through a written Complete Streets analysis or its equivalent, how eliminating parking on this segment is consistent with the Transportation Element, the Complete Streets Policy, and the Vision Zero Action Plan, particularly given the presence of a playground and protected crosswalks within the affected segment.

3. The Parking Study Appears Not to Have Considered Loss of Parking for the Adjacent Park and Playground

The Clement Avenue park and playground built within this same segment relies in substantial part on the on-street parking now proposed for elimination. The Association is not aware of any dedicated off-street parking lot serving this park, meaning the 21 spaces proposed for removal likely constitute most or all of the parking currently available to families and caregivers visiting the playground, including those bringing young children, strollers, or mobility devices who cannot reasonably walk a significant distance from parking located elsewhere in the neighborhood. The City's June 18, 2026 notice and referenced early-2026 parking

study describe the impact solely in terms of residential and general neighborhood parking capacity; neither appears to separately address the loss of parking serving park and playground visitors, a public recreational amenity the City itself recently built. The Association requests that the parking study, and any supplemental analysis, specifically evaluate (a) whether dedicated park visitor parking will be preserved or relocated, and (b) how families with young children and caregivers with limited mobility are expected to access the playground if adjacent on-street parking is eliminated.

4. The Parking Study and Engineering Basis for the Decision Should Be Disclosed and Independently Reviewed

The City's notice references a parking study "conducted in early 2026" that purportedly found sufficient parking capacity to absorb the loss of 21 spaces, and an engineering rationale concerning trailer offtracking and lane width. The Association requests that the City provide, in advance of the July 14, 2026 community meeting, the full parking study (including its methodology, the radius and time of day surveyed, and its treatment of overnight and resident parking demand), and the underlying traffic and geometric engineering analysis supporting the conclusion that Clement Avenue cannot safely accommodate both truck traffic and on-street parking. Residents are entitled to evaluate, and, where appropriate, to retain their own traffic engineer to evaluate, the technical basis for a decision that will permanently eliminate direct vehicle access to eleven homes.

The Association notes that a parking utilization study measuring area-wide "sufficient capacity" does not address the specific and substantial burden on residents who will lose the ability to park immediately in front of their own homes, including impacts on residents with mobility limitations, elderly residents, and families loading children, groceries, or equipment. A finding of adequate parking supply elsewhere in the neighborhood does not, without more, satisfy the City's obligation to consider the equity and access impacts on the specifically affected households.

5. Loss of Parking Will Interfere With U.S. Mail Delivery to the Group Mailbox

The Marina Shores cluster ("CBU") is located directly on Clement Avenue within the segment proposed for parking removal. The USPS carrier currently relies on the ability to park immediately adjacent to the mailbox in order to load and deliver mail to the cluster box unit. Eliminating on-street parking along this segment, without provision of a dedicated loading or carrier stop, will directly interfere with the ability of the Postal Service to deliver mail to every household served by that mailbox, a consequence with federal as well as local implications, since USPS access standards generally require a safe, legal place for the carrier to stop. The Association requests that the City specifically evaluate carrier and mail delivery access as part of any parking removal plan, including consultation with the local USPS station, and that any final design preserve a marked loading zone or equivalent carrier stop immediately adjacent to the mailbox location.

6. Equity and Notice Concerns

The Association is concerned that a decision with this degree of permanent, concentrated impact on a small group of identifiable households (eliminating direct vehicle access in front of eleven Marina Shores homes and additional homes between Olohne and Paru Street, and removing parking serving a public park) is being advanced primarily through informational meetings rather than a noticed public hearing with formal findings specific to the parking removal itself. To the extent the removal of on-street parking requires action by the City Council, the Transportation Commission, or another decision-making body under the Alameda Municipal Code, the Association requests written confirmation of (a) which body holds final decision-making authority over the parking removal specifically, (b) what findings that body is required to make, and (c) what opportunity affected residents will have to formally contest the decision, including any administrative appeal process, before it is implemented.

The Association further requests that any final decision on parking removal be preceded by a site-specific traffic and circulation analysis evaluating whether a smaller-scale or partial parking removal, narrower truck design vehicles, traffic calming measures, designated loading/passing zones, or a reduced truck weight or time-of-day restriction on Clement Avenue could allow trucks to safely use the route while preserving direct resident and park visitor parking access.

7. Requested Action

The Marina Shores Homeowners Association respectfully requests that the City:

- Treat the elimination of on-street parking on Clement Avenue as a distinct decision from the truck route designation, requiring its own independent analysis and justification;
- Postpone any final decision on parking removal until the issues raised in this letter have been addressed in writing;
- Provide the full parking study and supporting traffic/geometric engineering analysis referenced in the City's June 18, 2026 notice, including specific analysis of parking demand generated by the adjacent park and playground;
- Identify the specific decision-making body and procedural and Municipal Code requirements (including any required public hearing, findings, or appeal rights) applicable to the parking removal;
- Evaluate and respond in writing to alternative approaches that would allow trucks to use the route while avoiding or reducing the loss of resident and park visitor parking, including narrower design vehicles, designated passing/loading zones, partial parking retention, or time-of-day restrictions;
- Coordinate with USPS to confirm that mail delivery to the Marina Shores group mailbox on Clement Avenue can continue uninterrupted, and preserve a dedicated carrier loading zone adjacent to the mailbox in any final parking design;
- Identify how families and caregivers will access the Clement Avenue park and

playground if adjacent on-street parking is eliminated, including consideration of dedicated park visitor parking;

- Extend outreach, notice, and consideration of mitigation measures to all property owners directly fronting the affected segment of Clement Avenue between Ohlone and Paru Street, including those outside Marina Shores; and
- Meet directly with the Marina Shores Homeowners Association Board, in addition to the scheduled community and Transportation Commission meetings, to discuss impacts specific to our eleven affected homes.

The Association and its affected residents intend to attend and provide comment at both the July 14, 2026 community meeting and the Transportation Commission meeting, and we reserve the right to supplement this letter with additional comments, including comments from a traffic engineer retained by the Association, as further information becomes available.

We appreciate the City's willingness to engage with the community on this issue and look forward to your prompt written response. Please direct any response or requested materials to the undersigned.

Sincerely,

Ken Levins

President

Marina Shores Homeowners Association

--

Kenneth Levins
1826 Balsa Street,
Alameda
CA 94501
(925) 980 8811
klevins@gmail.com

--

Kenneth Levins
1826 Balsa Street,
Alameda
CA 94501
(925) 980 8811

mailto:\\klevins@gmail.com

From: Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov>

Sent: Monday, July 13, 2026 7:45 PM

To: Kenneth Levins <klevins@gmail.com>

Cc: Erin Smith <ESmith@alamedaca.gov>; CITYCOUNCIL-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Hello Mr. Levins,

I look forward to meeting you tomorrow evening and setting a future time to meet with the Marina Shores HOA Board. Please note that the Transportation Commission meeting on July 22 will be informational and while the Transportation Commissioners may provide comments and feedback, they will not be asked to make a decision regarding the parking on Clement Avenue.

Although Staff has prepared a recommendation to remove parking along Clement to facilitate the truck route relocation, Staff's potential decision / determination to remove parking does not need to be rushed and certainly does not need to be made on or immediately after the July 22nd Transportation Commission meeting. We remain committed to working with the Marina Shores HOA and local residents to consider alternatives.

Please keep in mind that Alameda's [Sunshine Ordinance](#) requires that all documents material to a matter anticipated for discussion must accompany the agenda and be posted for a full seven days before the meeting. Below are quick and admittedly partial responses to your alternatives which will be included in the Transportation Commission agenda packet.

1. As you mention below, there are short tangent sections between curves on Clement. These straight sections of roadway, however, are not long enough for the truck trailers to fully return to the normal 11.5-foot-wide lane. Preserving on-street parking between Balsa Ct and Paru St is not possible.
2. Staff acknowledges the USPS mailboxes and will work with the Postal Service regarding a solution. If the mailboxes need to be relocated, it would be a City expense.
3. The truck turning template provided and included in the Transportation Commission agenda packet is for a WB-67 truck which mimics the largest California legal truck for non-interstate routes. The WB-67 truck represents the control vehicle or the largest anticipated as was evaluated to determine if these large vehicles could navigate the corridor. Staff also evaluated a WB-50 truck which are more common in Alameda and represents the design vehicle for analysis. Significant trailer offset occurs with either vehicle and parking cannot be preserved between Balsa St and Paru St.

4. Relocating the Truck Route from Clement to Lincoln Avenue or maintaining on Buena Vista Avenue would require a General Plan Amendment and a substantial administrative and political effort. Your original email acknowledges Clement Avenue as a truck route in the General Plan and did not challenge that designation. Furthermore, the CCR's for the Marina Shores contains the following disclosure on the front page, "Clement Avenue is designated as a truck route and will eventually be used as such as provided in the Transportation Element of the City's General Plan". While I can acknowledge the relocation of the truck route to Lincoln Avenue or maintaining the truck route on Buena Vista may be technically feasible, I cannot comment on the viability of either option.

Scott Wikstrom, P.E.

City Engineer
City of Alameda
(510) 747-7937

From: Kenneth Levins <klevins@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, July 13, 2026 9:54 AM

To: Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov>

Cc: Erin Smith <ESmith@alamedaca.gov>; CITYCOUNCIL-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>; Gerry Beaudin <gbeaudin@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Dear Mr. Wikstrom:

Thank you for your detailed written response. The Association appreciates the time it reflects, and we gladly accept your offer to meet with the Marina Shores HOA Board; I will follow up separately with proposed dates. We also intend to participate in the July 14 community meeting and the July 22 Transportation Commission hearing.

Your letter closes by stating that Public Works "remains open to considering any additional feasible alternatives that can safely accommodate truck traffic while preserving on-street parking," and that you welcome the opportunity to evaluate such an alternative. The Association takes you up on that invitation. We ask that the following alternative package be evaluated and responded to in writing, element by element, before the July 22 hearing:

1. Partial parking retention based on the City's own geometry. Your letter states that the 14-foot lane requirement arises from trailer offtracking on the approximately 250-foot radius curves between Entrance Road and Hibbard. That rationale does not explain removing parking along straight (tangent) segments between Balsa Street and Paru Street. We propose that parking be removed only where the swept-path analysis demonstrates the wider lane is geometrically required, and retained elsewhere. Please provide a station-by-station (or block-by-block) exhibit identifying precisely where the 14-foot lane is

needed, where the existing 11.5-foot lanes remain adequate, and the available curb-to-curb width at each constrained location, including the Stanton Street crossing discussed in item 8 below.

2. A marked carrier/loading zone at the cluster mailbox. Whatever the final design, a designated loading zone at the Marina Shores CBU would preserve mail delivery at negligible cost to truck operations. We ask that this be incorporated into the striping plan rather than treated as a question of relocating the residents' mailboxes. The Association does not consent to relocation of the CBU, and any proposal to relocate it should identify who bears the cost and confirm USPS growth management approval.

3. Design vehicle justification. We would like to clarify a point from your response. The Association's request concerned narrower design vehicles - the vehicle assumed for geometric design purposes (e.g., WB-67 versus WB-50 or a single-unit truck) - not regulation of vehicle width, which we agree is set federally at 8.5 feet. The selection of a design vehicle is a discretionary engineering judgment. Please identify the design vehicle assumed in the swept-path analysis, the basis for selecting it, and whether a smaller design vehicle with signed accommodation for occasional oversize movements was evaluated. We would also note that, contrary to the suggestion that local truck restrictions are unenforceable, California Vehicle Code section 35701 et seq. expressly authorizes cities to restrict commercial vehicles by weight on designated streets by ordinance. If staff's position is that a weight- or time-based restriction is inappropriate here as a matter of policy, we ask that the analysis supporting that judgment be provided in writing rather than stated as a conclusion.

4. A comparative evaluation of Lincoln Avenue as the through-truck route. The three alternatives staff evaluated were all confined to the Clement corridor itself or to Buena Vista. No other route appears to have been considered. Yet Lincoln Avenue is a four-lane arterial with a gentle curve transitioning directly onto Constitution Way and the tube approaches - a cross-section that appears to satisfy the 14-foot lane and offtracking requirements staff has identified without removing a single parking space, curb extension, or street tree, and without the pinch points that make Clement, in the City's own words, unable to accommodate trucks and parking together. We recognize that Lincoln has its own adjacent uses and that a route change would involve its own process, potentially including a General Plan Amendment. But as noted with respect to the Buena Vista alternative, the need for a discretionary approval is a procedural step, not a finding of infeasibility. Before permanent impacts are imposed on Clement Avenue residents, the Association requests that staff prepare and publish a comparative routing evaluation of Lincoln Avenue and Clement Avenue, addressing geometry, truck volumes and origins/destinations, adjacent land uses, and safety, so that the Transportation Commission can weigh the tradeoffs on a complete record.

Second, we request the following materials and information sufficiently in advance of July 22 for independent review:

5. A response addressing the deficiencies in the parking study, raised in my email to you of July 8th, regarding seasonality and time of day errors, in addition to the obviously incorrect assumptions regarding the fungibility of private driveway and public parking spaces.

6. The City's environmental determination. Your response does not address the California Environmental Quality Act. Please provide the City's written CEQA determination for the truck route relocation and associated physical changes (parking prohibition, restriping, signage, and any modification to existing pedestrian improvements), or the exemption finding and its factual basis if the City's position is that the action is exempt.

7. The decision record. You have confirmed that AMC Sections 8-1.2 and 8-1.3 provide no noticing requirement or appeal from a Public Works Director determination under Section 8-7.1. Given that, please confirm: (a) whether the Transportation Commission will take a formal vote on July 22 or is receiving the item as information only; (b) whether the Director will adopt written findings documenting the traffic engineering basis required by Section 8-7.1; and (c) whether the City Council may call the decision up for review. Because this action permanently eliminates parking serving identified households and a public park, with no appeal right, the Association formally requests that final action be referred to the City Council.

8. Scope confirmation, including the Stanton Street crossing. Your response cites the recently installed rapid flashing beacon at Stanton Street as a measure taken "in preparation for the truck route relocation." However, the curb extensions at that enhanced crossing narrow the roadway to less than 22 feet curb to curb. That width cannot accommodate even the existing pair of 11.5-foot travel lanes, much less a 14-foot truck lane opposed by an 11.5-foot lane (25.5 feet minimum). On the City's own engineering rationale, the truck route cannot function at this location without modifying or removing the very crossing improvement staff cites as a project benefit. Please reconcile this in writing: either the swept-path analysis did not account for this pinch point, or modification or removal of the Stanton Street crossing improvements is a contemplated but undisclosed component of this project. If it is the latter, the project scope, cost, stormwater treatment recalculation, pedestrian safety analysis, and environmental review must reflect it, and the public notice describing this project as a parking removal is materially incomplete. More broadly, please confirm in writing whether any curb extensions (bulb-outs), street trees, marked crosswalks, or the Stanton Street RRFB will be removed or modified as part of this project or as a foreseeable consequence of it.

9. Accessibility. Please confirm whether the City has evaluated the impacts of the parking removal on residents and park visitors with disabilities or limited mobility, including caregivers transporting young children, strollers, and mobility devices, and whether any accessible parking or passenger loading provision will be included in the final design. These questions address all residents owning homes along Clement in our development, in addition to area visitors. The rapid flashing beacon addresses crossing safety; it does not

address proximity or carrying distance - and, per item 8, its own geometry appears incompatible with the truck lane widths staff has identified as necessary.

Finally, on timing: the engineering and parking materials were made available only recently, and the Association is arranging independent traffic engineering review. If the written responses and materials requested above cannot be provided in time for meaningful review before July 22, the Association respectfully requests that the Transportation Commission continue the item to its next regular meeting. Nothing in the project schedule appears to require action on July 22, and a short continuance would allow the Commission to act on a complete record.

We appreciate your stated willingness to evaluate feasible alternatives and your offer to meet with the Board, and we look forward to a productive discussion at tomorrow's community meeting.

Sincerely,

Ken Levins
President
Marina Shores Homeowners Association

On Mon, Jul 13, 2026 at 8:40 AM Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov> wrote:

Mr. Levins, and members of the Marina Shore Homeowners Association,

The decision to recommend removing 21 on-street parking spaces on Clement Avenue was not made lightly. We recognize that this change will affect nearby residents, and we appreciate the HOA taking the time to provide thoughtful comments.

As noted in Response #4 below, the Alameda Municipal Code authorizes the Public Works Director to prohibit parking when traffic engineering principles indicate it is necessary to support public safety and the safe operation of the transportation system. While the Code does not require public notification or provide an appeal process for this type of decision, Public Works chose to conduct an extensive outreach effort because of the community interest and the potential impacts. That outreach includes mailed notices, a community meeting, and a public hearing before the Transportation Commission prior to implementation. The purpose of the outreach is twofold: to explain the engineering analysis and policy considerations that led to this recommendation, and to hear from the community.

I've provided responses to the Requested Action portion of your email and a few additional notes. I look forward to continuing the discussion at the July 14 community meeting and the July 22 Transportation Commission meeting. As noted below, I'd also be happy to meet directly with the HOA.

1. Treat the elimination of on-street parking on Clement Avenue as a distinct decision from the truck route designation, requiring its own independent analysis and justification;

We believe we have treated the elimination of parking as separate issue, conducted an analysis and have justification for staff recommendation. Relocation of the truck route to Clement requires wider lanes than the existing 11.5 feet travel lanes. Large tractor-trailer trucks make wide turns. This is most obvious when these trucks make a 90 degree right turn at an intersection where the rear axle of the trailer can track several feet inboard of the front steering axle. An example truck turning template and overlay on Clement Avenue can be downloaded via the following link: [Clement Truck Route - Grand to Sherman](#) This offset tracking of a truck trailer also occurs when driving along curved roads such as the section of Clement between Entrance Road and Hibbard. The approximate 250-foot radius curves along Clement will require a minimum 14-foot lane to accommodate the trailer offset for a typical full-sized truck that regularly traverse Alameda. The existing road configuration cannot accommodate the wider lanes and the existing parking. Therefore, staff hired a consulting firm to perform an independent analysis of parking supply and demand. The results of that analysis show parking capacity on the side streets to accommodate the recommended loss of parking. More information is provided in responses #4 and #5 below.

2. Postpone any final decision on parking removal until the issues raised in this letter have been addressed in writing;

We are not intending to take action until after community engagement and the public hearing at the Transportation Commission. Please see response to #4 for more information.

3. Provide the full parking study and supporting traffic/geometric engineering analysis referenced in the City's June 18, 2026 notice, including specific analysis of parking demand generated by the adjacent park and playground;

The parking analysis can be downloaded via the following link: [Clement Truck Route - Grand to Sherman](#) The parking analysis did not complete a separate analysis of the parking demand generated by the adjacent park and playground. Because the park and playground already exist, parking demand is incorporated into the observed parking occupancy. There is an existing small parking lot opposite of Ohlone Street that serves the park/playground and provides access to the Bay Trail and public shore which will be unaffected by the truck route. Staff also consulted with the Recreation and Parks Director about parking for the park. There are no known concerns about parking lot capacity and the parking analysis concludes capacity on the side streets. Additionally, the City recently installed a rapid flashing beacon at Stanton Street to assist pedestrians in crossing Clement Ave and access the park/playground in preparation for the truck route relocation. Current park visitors who didn't use the lot opposite of Ohlone Street are required to cross Clement to access the park. Elimination of parking on the south side of Clement and opposite of the park will not change the need for park visitors to cross Clement and the parking study confirms sufficient capacity on the adjacent streets.

4. Identify the specific decision-making body and procedural and Municipal Code requirements (including any required public hearing, findings, or appeal rights) applicable to the parking removal;

On-street parking in Alameda is regulated in Chapter VIII of the Alameda Municipal Code (AMC) and more specifically in Section 8-7, Parking Prohibitions. AMC Section 8-7.1, Parking – Prohibited at all times states, “The Public Works Director is hereby authorized, whenever traffic engineering studies or principles indicate for the safety or adequate flow of all modes of transportation, to establish streets or portions thereof where parking is prohibited at all times.” In the case of Clement Avenue the parking loss is necessary for truck traffic and would be a safety issue if not removed. Furthermore, AMC Section 8-1.2, Notice of Decisions, does not require public noticing or in Section AMC Section 8-1.3 provide for an appeal process for Public Works Director decisions made on the basis of adequate traffic flow and public safety. We recognize the impact of losing 21 on-street parking stalls and have elected to conduct public outreach in advance of completing the work. See also response #5.

5. Evaluate and respond in writing to alternative approaches that would allow trucks to use the route while avoiding or reducing the loss of resident and park visitor parking, including narrower design vehicles, designated passing/loading zones, partial parking retention, or time-of-day restrictions.

Staff evaluated alternatives related to truck route relocation, each of which had significant challenges. Staff recommends and is pursuing the removal of parking on Clement Avenue between Balsa Street and Paru Street as the least impactful alternative in consideration of the City's General Plan, Active Transportation Plan, and City Policies promulgated by City Council resolutions. The three other alternatives are:

- Eliminate the two-way cycle track between Entrance Road and Grand Street and return to the Class II bike lanes that existed until 2016. In this alternative, the trailer offset for large trucks would be accommodated within the Class II lane. A potential safety issue exists when a bicycle is travelling in the same direction and same time as a large truck. Additionally, transitions between two-way cycle tracks and Class II bike lanes are challenging and bicycle rider compliance with the transition can be expected to be low, resulting in a potentially increased hazard for all roadway users.
- Relocate the two-way cycle track to the excess right-of-way north of Clement. There is a 17-foot wide "alternative vehicle corridor" that was included Clement Avenue dedication with Tract 7170. At the time, this corridor was being reserved for a potential light rail connection along the northern waterfront. Relocation of the cycle track to this excess right-of-way would impact the Waterfront Park, potentially remove mature trees, and require BCDC permitting and approval, with potentially significant construction costs.
- Maintain the Truck Route on Buena Vista. While this may appear to be the path of least resistance, this alternative would not be consistent with the General Plan or decades long promises to the community on Buena Vista. If the truck route remains on Buena Vista, a General Plan Amendment would need to occur recognizing the change. Even with this alternative, one-off trucks that mistakenly continue straight on Clement as the truck route may cause collisions along this stretch of roadway.

The alternatives considered by staff that would preserve on-street parking each involve significant tradeoffs. They would either require substantial public investment to relocate the cycle track, reduce the City's long-standing commitment to protected bicycle facilities along the Cross Alameda Trail, or require amendments to the General Plan to remove the designated truck route from this segment of Clement Avenue.

We appreciate the alternatives suggested by the HOA, which include narrower vehicles, designated passing zones, or time of day restrictions are not feasible. However, the maximum standard vehicle width in the United States is set at the federal level at 8.5-feet, exclusive of mirrors. Local restrictions on vehicle width would not be enforceable, nor would time of day restrictions be appropriate for a designated truck route.

6. Coordinate with USPS to confirm that mail delivery to the Marina Shores group mailbox on Clement Avenue can continue uninterrupted, and preserve a dedicated carrier loading zone adjacent to the mailbox in any final parking design.

We appreciate the consideration of the USPS mailbox location. Staff will reach out to USPS and seek guidance about parking or whether the mailboxes will need to be relocated.

7. Identify how families and caregivers will access the Clement Avenue park and playground if adjacent on-street parking is eliminated, including consideration of dedicated park visitor parking;

See response to #3 and #11.

8. Extend outreach, notice, and consideration of mitigation measures to all property owners directly fronting the affected segment of Clement Avenue between Ohlone and Paru Street, including those outside Marina Shores.

Public notices were mailed to all residents within a 300-foot radius of the project study area which is bounded by Entrance Road to the west, Hibbard Road to the east, Clement Avenue to the north, and Buena Vista Avenue to the south.

9. Meet directly with the Marina Shores Homeowners Association Board, in addition to the scheduled community and Transportation Commission meetings, to discuss impacts specific to our eleven affected homes

I would be happy to meet with the Marina Shores Homeowners Association Board. Please let me know the meeting dates/times for the Board and we can coordinate a meeting time convenient for all.

In addition to the Requested Action section, I am providing responses to a few other points raised in your email:

10. The Parking Elimination Should Be Evaluated Under the City's Adopted Complete Streets and General Plan Policies.

The General Plan, Complete Streets Policy, and other supporting City Council Resolutions consistently identify on-street parking as the lowest priority when allocating right-of-way space. First consideration should be for people walking, bicycling, and using transit, followed by vehicular needs and public safety (General Plan, Mobility Element Policy ME-6, Action g., Space Priorities). The General Plan designation of Clement Avenue as a truck route, followed by the subsequent discretionary action of City Council to adopt the Cross Alameda Trail alignment in 2005, Bike Master Plan in 2010, and Improvement Plans for Marina Shores, Phase II which constructed the two-way cycle track on Clement in 2014 has led us to this result where parking is proposed for elimination. While the three other alternatives evaluated (see response #5) could preserve parking on the south side of Clement, each alternative has significant drawback with compromises greater than the loss of 21 on-street parking stalls on Clement Avenue.

11. Eleven homes within our Association front directly onto this stretch of Clement Avenue, and their residents rely on that on-street parking for direct access to their front doors

All homes within the Marina Shores development have access to a two car garage. Of the 11 homes referenced, only 5 homes "front" on Clement Avenue with doorways facing Clement. These include 1552, 1556, 1558, 1560, and 1568 Clement Avenue. Visitors and guests for these 5 homes would need to park on the adjacent streets and walk to the front doors, which we acknowledge is an inconvenience. Front doors for the other six homes face either Balsa Street, Stanton Street, or Ohlone Street and visitors and guests are not inconvenienced by the lack of parking on Clement.

Public Works remains open to considering any additional feasible alternatives that can safely accommodate truck traffic while preserving on-street parking. If such an alternative exists, we welcome the opportunity to evaluate it.

Thank you again for your thoughtful comments. We look forward to continuing the discussion at the July 14 community meeting and the July 22 Transportation Commission meeting.

Scott Wikstrom, P.E.

City Engineer

City of Alameda

(510) 747-7937

From: Scott Wikstrom

Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2026 8:12 AM

To: 'Kenneth Levins' <klevins@gmail.com>

Cc: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Michele Pryor <mpryor@alamedaca.gov>; Greg Boller <gboller@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>; Erin Smith <ESmith@alamedaca.gov>; Gerry Beaudin <gbeaudin@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Hello Mr. Levins,

Thank you for the detailed comments and questions. I will prepare a written response over the next few days and prepare a reply in advance of the July 14th meeting. Please note a typo in my notification letter, the Transportation Commission meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 22 at 6:30pm in the Council Chambers. I will be sending an updated notification to the Marina Shores neighborhood with the corrected Transportation Commission date and will include my responses to the questions below in the updated notification.

Scott Wikstrom, P.E.

City Engineer

City of Alameda

(510) 747-7937

From: Kenneth Levins <klevins@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2026 6:39 AM

To: Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov>

Cc: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Michele Pryor <mpryor@alamedaca.gov>; Greg Boller <gboller@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Tracy Jensen

<tjensen@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk
<CLERK@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Dear Mr. Wikstrom:

This letter is submitted on behalf of the Marina Shores Homeowners Association (“Marina Shores” or the “Association”) in response to the City’s June 18, 2026 notice regarding the proposed relocation of the Clement Avenue truck route and the associated elimination of approximately 21 on-street parking spaces between Balsa Court and Paru Street. The Association understands that the truck route designation itself reflects a long-standing component of the City’s General Plan, predating this notice, and we do not write to relitigate that designation here. Our objection is narrower and more specific: the elimination of on-street parking on Clement Avenue is a new and separate proposal, distinct from the truck route designation, and one the Association believes has not been adequately justified or analyzed. We note that the City’s own notice describes the parking loss only in conditional terms, stating that relocating the truck route “would result in” the loss of parking, which suggests to the Association that the City itself has not treated this specific outcome as foreclosed. We urge the City to treat it accordingly and to give it independent, serious consideration.

Eleven homes within our Association front directly onto this stretch of Clement Avenue, and their residents rely on that on-street parking for direct access to their front doors. Additional homes located between Ohlone and Paru Street, outside of the Association’s membership, front directly onto this same segment and will be similarly affected by the loss of on-street parking. The Association urges the City to treat this as a corridor-wide impact affecting all directly fronting households, not solely those within Marina Shores, and to ensure that outreach, notice, and any mitigation measures extend to every affected property owner along the segment, regardless of HOA membership.

1. The Proposed Parking Elimination Is Inconsistent With the City’s Own Recent Investments on This Same Corridor

The City’s stated rationale for removing parking, that Clement Avenue is too “tortuous” and narrow to safely accommodate truck traffic alongside parked cars, is difficult to reconcile with the City’s own recent capital investments in this exact corridor. Within the last several years, and independent of the truck route question, the City has:

- Constructed a two-lane, physically protected bicycle lane along this stretch of Clement Avenue, which by design narrows the available roadway width;
- Built a public park and playground fronting Clement Avenue in the immediately affected area, an investment that presupposes a calmer, more pedestrian- and family-oriented street environment;
- Installed a protected and enhanced "bulb-out" crosswalk within the very segment where parking removal is now proposed, an improvement typically justified on the basis of reduced vehicle speeds and reduced roadway width, and which by design narrows the roadway.

Each of these prior decisions reflects an affirmative City determination that this segment of Clement Avenue should function as a low-speed, multimodal, residential street. The Association recognizes that the truck route designation itself is largely a settled matter of long standing City policy. But the parking elimination now proposed is a new, separate decision layered on top of that settled designation, and it deserves independent scrutiny on its own terms. If the roadway is in fact too narrow to safely carry trucks and parked cars together, that narrowness is substantially the result of the City's own bicycle lane, park, and crosswalk construction. The City should not be permitted to invoke a condition it created to justify imposing the burden of that condition entirely on adjacent residents and park users, particularly where, as the City's own notice acknowledges, the parking loss is a consequence ("would result in") rather than a foregone necessity of the truck route decision itself.

2. The Parking Elimination Should Be Evaluated Under the City's Adopted Complete Streets and General Plan Policies

California's Complete Streets Act of 2008 (AB 1358, codified in relevant part at Government Code Section 65302(b)) requires that, upon substantive revision of a general plan circulation element, the City plan for a balanced, multimodal transportation network serving all users, not motor vehicles and goods movement alone. Consistent with this mandate, and with Metropolitan Transportation Commission Resolution No. 4035, the City of Alameda has adopted its own Complete Streets Policy and maintains a Transportation Element within its General Plan that commits the City to safe, multimodal streets for pedestrians, bicyclists, and residents, including specifically the City's Vision Zero Action Plan goal of eliminating severe and fatal pedestrian and bicycle collisions.

Removing all on-street parking on a narrowed residential segment that the City has only recently equipped with a protected bike lane, a park and playground serving children, and enhanced pedestrian crossings runs directly counter to these adopted policies, independent of whatever merit the truck route designation itself may have. Before proceeding with the parking removal specifically, the City should be required to demonstrate, through a written Complete Streets analysis or its equivalent, how eliminating parking on this segment is consistent with the Transportation Element, the Complete Streets Policy, and the Vision Zero Action Plan, particularly given the presence of a playground and protected crosswalks within the affected segment.

3. The Parking Study Appears Not to Have Considered Loss of Parking for the Adjacent Park and Playground

The Clement Avenue park and playground built within this same segment relies in substantial part on the on-street parking now proposed for elimination. The Association is not aware of any dedicated off-street parking lot serving this park, meaning the 21 spaces proposed for removal likely constitute most or all of the parking currently available to families and caregivers visiting the playground, including those bringing young children, strollers, or mobility devices who cannot reasonably walk a significant distance from parking located elsewhere in the neighborhood. The City's June 18, 2026 notice and referenced early-2026 parking study describe the impact solely in terms of residential and general neighborhood parking capacity; neither appears to separately address the loss of parking serving park and playground visitors, a public recreational amenity the City itself recently built. The Association requests that the parking study, and any supplemental analysis, specifically evaluate (a) whether dedicated park visitor parking will be preserved or relocated, and (b) how families with young children and caregivers with limited mobility are expected to access the playground if adjacent on-street parking is eliminated.

4. The Parking Study and Engineering Basis for the Decision Should Be Disclosed and Independently Reviewed

The City's notice references a parking study "conducted in early 2026" that purportedly found sufficient parking capacity to absorb the loss of 21 spaces, and an engineering rationale concerning trailer offtracking and lane width. The Association requests that the City provide, in advance of the July 14, 2026 community meeting, the full parking study (including its methodology, the radius and time of day surveyed, and its treatment of overnight and resident parking demand), and the underlying traffic and geometric engineering analysis supporting the conclusion that Clement Avenue cannot safely accommodate both truck traffic and on-street parking. Residents are entitled to evaluate, and, where appropriate, to retain their own traffic engineer to evaluate, the technical basis for a decision that will permanently eliminate direct vehicle access to eleven homes.

The Association notes that a parking utilization study measuring area-wide "sufficient capacity" does not address the specific and substantial burden on residents who will lose the ability to park immediately in front of their own homes, including impacts on residents with mobility limitations, elderly residents, and families loading children, groceries, or equipment. A finding of adequate parking supply elsewhere in the neighborhood does not, without more, satisfy the City's obligation to consider the equity and access impacts on the specifically affected households.

5. Loss of Parking Will Interfere With U.S. Mail Delivery to the Group Mailbox

The Marina Shores cluster ("CBU") is located directly on Clement Avenue within the segment proposed for parking removal. The USPS carrier currently relies on the ability

to park immediately adjacent to the mailbox in order to load and deliver mail to the cluster box unit. Eliminating on-street parking along this segment, without provision of a dedicated loading or carrier stop, will directly interfere with the ability of the Postal Service to deliver mail to every household served by that mailbox, a consequence with federal as well as local implications, since USPS access standards generally require a safe, legal place for the carrier to stop. The Association requests that the City specifically evaluate carrier and mail delivery access as part of any parking removal plan, including consultation with the local USPS station, and that any final design preserve a marked loading zone or equivalent carrier stop immediately adjacent to the mailbox location.

6. Equity and Notice Concerns

The Association is concerned that a decision with this degree of permanent, concentrated impact on a small group of identifiable households (eliminating direct vehicle access in front of eleven Marina Shores homes and additional homes between Olohne and Paru Street, and removing parking serving a public park) is being advanced primarily through informational meetings rather than a noticed public hearing with formal findings specific to the parking removal itself. To the extent the removal of on-street parking requires action by the City Council, the Transportation Commission, or another decision-making body under the Alameda Municipal Code, the Association requests written confirmation of (a) which body holds final decision-making authority over the parking removal specifically, (b) what findings that body is required to make, and (c) what opportunity affected residents will have to formally contest the decision, including any administrative appeal process, before it is implemented.

The Association further requests that any final decision on parking removal be preceded by a site-specific traffic and circulation analysis evaluating whether a smaller-scale or partial parking removal, narrower truck design vehicles, traffic calming measures, designated loading/passing zones, or a reduced truck weight or time-of-day restriction on Clement Avenue could allow trucks to safely use the route while preserving direct resident and park visitor parking access.

7. Requested Action

The Marina Shores Homeowners Association respectfully requests that the City:

- Treat the elimination of on-street parking on Clement Avenue as a distinct decision from the truck route designation, requiring its own independent analysis and justification;
- Postpone any final decision on parking removal until the issues raised in this letter have been addressed in writing;
- Provide the full parking study and supporting traffic/geometric engineering analysis referenced in the City's June 18, 2026 notice, including specific analysis of parking demand generated by the adjacent park and playground;

- Identify the specific decision-making body and procedural and Municipal Code requirements (including any required public hearing, findings, or appeal rights) applicable to the parking removal;
- Evaluate and respond in writing to alternative approaches that would allow trucks to use the route while avoiding or reducing the loss of resident and park visitor parking, including narrower design vehicles, designated passing/loading zones, partial parking retention, or time-of-day restrictions;
- Coordinate with USPS to confirm that mail delivery to the Marina Shores group mailbox on Clement Avenue can continue uninterrupted, and preserve a dedicated carrier loading zone adjacent to the mailbox in any final parking design;
- Identify how families and caregivers will access the Clement Avenue park and playground if adjacent on-street parking is eliminated, including consideration of dedicated park visitor parking;
- Extend outreach, notice, and consideration of mitigation measures to all property owners directly fronting the affected segment of Clement Avenue between Ohlone and Paru Street, including those outside Marina Shores; and
- Meet directly with the Marina Shores Homeowners Association Board, in addition to the scheduled community and Transportation Commission meetings, to discuss impacts specific to our eleven affected homes.

The Association and its affected residents intend to attend and provide comment at both the July 14, 2026 community meeting and the Transportation Commission meeting, and we reserve the right to supplement this letter with additional comments, including comments from a traffic engineer retained by the Association, as further information becomes available.

We appreciate the City's willingness to engage with the community on this issue and look forward to your prompt written response. Please direct any response or requested materials to the undersigned.

Sincerely,

Ken Levins

President

Marina Shores Homeowners Association

From: [Kenneth Levins](#)
To: [Scott Wikstrom](#); [Gerry Beaudin](#)
Cc: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#); [City Clerk](#); [Transportation Commission](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] City of Alameda- truck turning study, Clement Avenue (attached)
Date: Monday, July 13, 2026 2:09:42 PM
Attachments: [Exhibit 1 - Truck Turning Clement.pdf](#)

Mr Swikstrom,

Thank you for sending over the link to the truck turning study conducted on the tortuous section of Clement between Paru and Balsa- attached here. This study is obviously a geometry check, not a justification. It asks one question: Can the largest semi-tractor trailer California law permits (65 feet, 40-foot kingpin-to-rear-axle) sweep through Clement Avenue's curves without touching anything, and the answer, by the exhibit's own admission, is no. It contains no truck volume counts, no origin-destination data, no crash analysis, no alternatives evaluation, and no holistic evaluation of impact to the neighborhood. Everything beyond the geometry is a policy choice about what to demolish.

What implementation would demolish, per the exhibit itself: on-street parking through essentially the entire curved corridor (the swept paths overlap the parking lane from Balsa through Sakas to Ohlone, preserving parking only on the straight ends); the curb extensions and cycle track buffer at Stanton, the crossing bulb outs serving the waterfront park and playground; and, by unavoidable implication, curbside trees, since the bulbouts host plantings and a trailer's body and rear overhang swing wider than the wheel paths the exhibit draws, intruding into curb-zone canopy including the mature tree row along the park frontage.

Every one of these changes degrades safety. The curves currently function as built-in traffic calming; removing parking and clearing a 14-foot channel converts them into a swooping alignment that ordinary cars will carry speed through, 24 hours a day, for the overwhelming majority of vehicles that are not trucks. Shaving the Stanton bulbouts lengthens and darkens a crossing children use to reach a playground, the opposite of the daylighting that state law (AB 413) now mandates at crosswalks. Narrowing the cycle track buffer places two-way Cross Alameda Trail bicycle traffic against maximum trailer sweep at the exact curve apex where drivers can least see their own trailer's path. And removing the parked-car buffer moves truck traffic roughly eight feet closer to front doors with minimal setbacks.

The study also inverts standard engineering methodology. Accepted practice (NACTO; consistent with Caltrans guidance) distinguishes the design vehicle, accommodated cleanly and regularly, from the control vehicle, the rare largest vehicle, permitted to encroach into the opposing lane at crawl speed when it appears. Nothing in Exhibit 1 demonstrates that legal-maximum semis use this segment with any frequency, and the industrial destinations that once generated them have been replaced by housing through the City's own approvals. Designing permanent infrastructure removal around a worst-case vehicle of undemonstrated frequency is over-design, and it fails the General Plan's own test: Policy ME-6(b) requires that the safest treatments be the default, degraded "only if necessary and after documenting rationale." Exhibit 1 documents geometry; it does not document necessity.

Before any redesign proceeds, I ask the City to provide: (1) current and projected truck volumes by vehicle class for this segment; (2) an inventory of trees within the swept path plus overhang clearance; (3) the ME-6(b) documented rationale; and (4) an alternatives analysis including designation of a smaller design vehicle (e.g., SU-30/SU-40, which fully serves

residential deliveries and moving vans), control-vehicle encroachment for rare large vehicles, removal of the truck route designation between Sherman and Grand, noting that under the City's own truck route policy, destination access for trucks is preserved by right regardless of designation.

The exhibit set out to prove the street can be made to fit the truck. It proved instead that the truck does not fit the street.

Best,
Ken

--

Kenneth Levins
1826 Balsa Street,
Alameda
CA 94501
(925) 980 8811
mailto:\\klevins@gmail.com

From: Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov>

Sent: Monday, July 13, 2026 8:41 AM

To: 'Kenneth Levins' <klevins@gmail.com>

Cc: Erin Smith <ESmith@alamedaca.gov>; CITYCOUNCIL-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>; Gerry Beaudin <gbeaudin@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Mr. Levins, and members of the Marina Shore Homeowners Association,

The decision to recommend removing 21 on-street parking spaces on Clement Avenue was not made lightly. We recognize that this change will affect nearby residents, and we appreciate the HOA taking the time to provide thoughtful comments.

As noted in Response #4 below, the Alameda Municipal Code authorizes the Public Works Director to prohibit parking when traffic engineering principles indicate it is necessary to support public safety and the safe operation of the transportation system. While the Code does not require public notification or provide an appeal process for this type of decision, Public Works chose to conduct an extensive outreach effort because of the community interest and the potential impacts. That outreach includes mailed notices, a community meeting, and a public hearing before the Transportation Commission prior to implementation. The purpose of the outreach is twofold: to explain the engineering analysis and policy considerations that led to this recommendation, and to hear from the community.

I've provided responses to the Requested Action portion of your email and a few additional notes. I look forward to continuing the discussion at the July 14 community meeting and the July 22 Transportation Commission meeting. As noted below, I'd also be happy to meet directly with the HOA.

1. Treat the elimination of on-street parking on Clement Avenue as a distinct decision from the truck route designation, requiring its own independent analysis and justification;

We believe we have treated the elimination of parking as separate issue, conducted an analysis and have justification for staff recommendation. Relocation of the truck route to Clement requires wider lanes than the existing 11.5 feet travel lanes. Large tractor-trailer trucks make wide turns. This is most obvious when these trucks make a 90 degree right turn at an intersection where the rear axle of the trailer can track several feet inboard of the front steering axle. An example truck turning template and overlay on Clement Avenue can be downloaded via the following link: [Clement Truck Route - Grand to Sherman](#) This offset tracking of a truck trailer also occurs when driving along curved roads such as the section of Clement between Entrance Road and Hibbard. The approximate 250-foot radius curves along Clement will require a minimum 14-foot lane to accommodate the trailer offset for a

typical full-sized truck that regularly traverse Alameda. The existing road configuration cannot accommodate the wider lanes and the existing parking. Therefore, staff hired a consulting firm to perform an independent analysis of parking supply and demand. The results of that analysis show parking capacity on the side streets to accommodate the recommended loss of parking. More information is provided in responses #4 and #5 below.

2. Postpone any final decision on parking removal until the issues raised in this letter have been addressed in writing;

We are not intending to take action until after community engagement and the public hearing at the Transportation Commission. Please see response to #4 for more information.

3. Provide the full parking study and supporting traffic/geometric engineering analysis referenced in the City's June 18, 2026 notice, including specific analysis of parking demand generated by the adjacent park and playground;

The parking analysis can be downloaded via the following link: [Clement Truck Route - Grand to Sherman](#). The parking analysis did not complete a separate analysis of the parking demand generated by the adjacent park and playground. Because the park and playground already exist, parking demand is incorporated into the observed parking occupancy. There is an existing small parking lot opposite of Ohlone Street that serves the park/playground and provides access to the Bay Trail and public shore which will be unaffected by the truck route. Staff also consulted with the Recreation and Parks Director about parking for the park. There are no known concerns about parking lot capacity and the parking analysis concludes capacity on the side streets. Additionally, the City recently installed a rapid flashing beacon at Stanton Street to assist pedestrians in crossing Clement Ave and access the park/playground in preparation for the truck route relocation. Current park visitors who didn't use the lot opposite of Ohlone Street are required to cross Clement to access the park. Elimination of parking on the south side of Clement and opposite of the park will not change the need for park visitors to cross Clement and the parking study confirms sufficient capacity on the adjacent streets.

4. Identify the specific decision-making body and procedural and Municipal Code requirements (including any required public hearing, findings, or appeal rights) applicable to the parking removal;

On-street parking in Alameda is regulated in Chapter VIII of the Alameda Municipal Code (AMC) and more specifically in Section 8-7, Parking Prohibitions. AMC Section 8-7.1, Parking – Prohibited at all times states, “The Public Works Director is hereby authorized, whenever traffic engineering studies or principles indicate for the safety or adequate flow of all modes of transportation, to establish streets or portions thereof where parking is prohibited at all times.” In the case of Clement Avenue the parking loss is necessary for truck traffic and would be a safety issue if not removed. Furthermore, AMC Section 8-1.2, Notice of Decisions, does not require public noticing or in Section AMC Section 8-1.3 provide for an appeal process for Public Works Director decisions made on the basis of adequate traffic flow and public safety. We recognize the impact of losing 21 on-street parking stalls and have elected to conduct public outreach in advance of completing the work. See also response #5.

5. Evaluate and respond in writing to alternative approaches that would allow trucks to use the route while avoiding or reducing the loss of resident and park visitor parking, including narrower design vehicles, designated passing/loading zones, partial parking retention, or time-of-day restrictions.

Staff evaluated alternatives related to truck route relocation, each of which had significant challenges. Staff recommends and is pursuing the removal of parking on Clement Avenue between Balsa Street and Paru Street as the least impactful alternative in consideration of the City’s General Plan, Active Transportation Plan, and City Policies promulgated by City Council resolutions. The three other alternatives are:

- Eliminate the two-way cycle track between Entrance Road and Grand Street and return to the Class II bike lanes that existed until 2016. In this alternative, the trailer offset for large trucks would be accommodated within the Class II lane. A potential safety issue exists when a bicycle is travelling in the same direction and same time as a large truck. Additionally, transitions between two-way cycle tracks and Class II bike lanes are challenging and bicycle rider compliance with the transition can be expected to be low, resulting in a potentially increased hazard for all roadway users.
- Relocate the two-way cycle track to the excess right-of-way north of Clement. There is a 17-foot wide “alternative vehicle corridor” that was included Clement Avenue dedication with Tract 7170. At the time, this corridor was being reserved for a potential light rail connection along the northern waterfront. Relocation of the cycle track to this excess right-of-way would impact the Waterfront Park, potentially remove mature trees, and require BCDC permitting and approval, with potentially significant construction costs.
- Maintain the Truck Route on Buena Vista. While this may appear to be the path of least resistance, this alternative would not be consistent with the General Plan or

decades long promises to the community on Buena Vista. If the truck route remains on Buena Vista, a General Plan Amendment would need to occur recognizing the change. Even with this alternative, one-off trucks that mistakenly continue straight on Clement as the truck route may cause collisions along this stretch of roadway.

The alternatives considered by staff that would preserve on-street parking each involve significant tradeoffs. They would either require substantial public investment to relocate the cycle track, reduce the City's long-standing commitment to protected bicycle facilities along the Cross Alameda Trail, or require amendments to the General Plan to remove the designated truck route from this segment of Clement Avenue.

We appreciate the alternatives suggested by the HOA, which include narrower vehicles, designated passing zones, or time of day restrictions are not feasible. However, the maximum standard vehicle width in the United States is set at the federal level at 8.5-feet, exclusive of mirrors. Local restrictions on vehicle width would not be enforceable, nor would time of day restrictions be appropriate for a designated truck route.

6. Coordinate with USPS to confirm that mail delivery to the Marina Shores group mailbox on Clement Avenue can continue uninterrupted, and preserve a dedicated carrier loading zone adjacent to the mailbox in any final parking design.

We appreciate the consideration of the USPS mailbox location. Staff will reach out to USPS and seek guidance about parking or whether the mailboxes will need to be relocated.

7. Identify how families and caregivers will access the Clement Avenue park and playground if adjacent on-street parking is eliminated, including consideration of dedicated park visitor parking;

See response to #3 and #11.

8. Extend outreach, notice, and consideration of mitigation measures to all property owners directly fronting the affected segment of Clement Avenue between Ohlone and Paru Street, including those outside Marina Shores.

Public notices were mailed to all residents within a 300-foot radius of the project study area which is bounded by Entrance Road to the west, Hibbard Road to the east, Clement Avenue to the north, and Buena Vista Avenue to the south.

9. Meet directly with the Marina Shores Homeowners Association Board, in addition to the scheduled community and Transportation Commission meetings, to discuss impacts specific to our eleven affected homes

I would be happy to meet with the Marina Shores Homeowners Association Board. Please let me know the meeting dates/times for the Board and we can coordinate a meeting time convenient for all.

In addition to the Requested Action section, I am providing responses to a few other points raised in your email:

10. The Parking Elimination Should Be Evaluated Under the City's Adopted Complete Streets and General Plan Policies.

The General Plan, Complete Streets Policy, and other supporting City Council Resolutions consistently identify on-street parking as the lowest priority when allocating right-of-way space. First consideration should be for people walking, bicycling, and using transit, followed by vehicular needs and public safety (General Plan, Mobility Element Policy ME-6, Action g., Space Priorities). The General Plan designation of Clement Avenue as a truck route, followed by the subsequent discretionary action of City Council to adopt the Cross Alameda Trail alignment in 2005, Bike Master Plan in 2010, and Improvement Plans for Marina Shores, Phase II which constructed the two-way cycle track on Clement in 2014 has led us to this result where parking is proposed for elimination. While the three other alternatives evaluated (see response #5) could preserve parking on the south side of Clement, each alternative has significant drawback with compromises greater than the loss of 21 on-street parking stalls on Clement Avenue.

11. Eleven homes within our Association front directly onto this stretch of Clement Avenue, and their residents rely on that on-street parking for direct access to their front doors

All homes within the Marina Shores development have access to a two car garage. Of the 11 homes referenced, only 5 homes "front" on Clement Avenue with doorways facing Clement. These include 1552, 1556, 1558, 1560, and 1568 Clement Avenue. Visitors and guests for these 5 homes would need to park on the adjacent streets and walk to the front

doors, which we acknowledge is an inconvenience. Front doors for the other six homes face either Balsa Street, Stanton Street, or Ohlone Street and visitors and guests are not inconvenienced by the lack of parking on Clement.

Public Works remains open to considering any additional feasible alternatives that can safely accommodate truck traffic while preserving on-street parking. If such an alternative exists, we welcome the opportunity to evaluate it.

Thank you again for your thoughtful comments. We look forward to continuing the discussion at the July 14 community meeting and the July 22 Transportation Commission meeting.

Scott Wikstrom, P.E.

City Engineer
City of Alameda
(510) 747-7937

From: Scott Wikstrom

Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2026 8:12 AM

To: 'Kenneth Levins' <klevins@gmail.com>

Cc: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Michele Pryor <mpryor@alamedaca.gov>; Greg Boller <gboller@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>; Erin Smith <ESmith@alamedaca.gov>; Gerry Beaudin <gbeaudin@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Hello Mr. Levins,

Thank you for the detailed comments and questions. I will prepare a written response over the next few days and prepare a reply in advance of the July 14th meeting. Please note a typo in my notification letter, the Transportation Commission meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 22 at 6:30pm in the Council Chambers. I will be sending an updated notification to the Marina Shores neighborhood with the corrected Transportation Commission date and will include my responses to the questions below in the updated notification.

Scott Wikstrom, P.E.

City Engineer
City of Alameda

(510) 747-7937

From: Kenneth Levins <klevins@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2026 6:39 AM

To: Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov>

Cc: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Michele Pryor <mpryor@alamedaca.gov>; Greg Boller <gboller@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Dear Mr. Wikstrom:

This letter is submitted on behalf of the Marina Shores Homeowners Association ("Marina Shores" or the "Association") in response to the City's June 18, 2026 notice regarding the proposed relocation of the Clement Avenue truck route and the associated elimination of approximately 21 on-street parking spaces between Balsa Court and Paru Street. The Association understands that the truck route designation itself reflects a long-standing component of the City's General Plan, predating this notice, and we do not write to relitigate that designation here. Our objection is narrower and more specific: the elimination of on-street parking on Clement Avenue is a new and separate proposal, distinct from the truck route designation, and one the Association believes has not been adequately justified or analyzed. We note that the City's own notice describes the parking loss only in conditional terms, stating that relocating the truck route "would result in" the loss of parking, which suggests to the Association that the City itself has not treated this specific outcome as foreclosed. We urge the City to treat it accordingly and to give it independent, serious consideration.

Eleven homes within our Association front directly onto this stretch of Clement Avenue, and their residents rely on that on-street parking for direct access to their front doors. Additional homes located between Ohlone and Paru Street, outside of the Association's membership, front directly onto this same segment and will be similarly affected by the loss of on-street parking. The Association urges the City to treat this as a corridor-wide impact affecting all directly fronting households, not solely those within Marina Shores, and to ensure that outreach, notice, and any mitigation measures extend to every affected property owner along the segment, regardless of HOA membership.

1. The Proposed Parking Elimination Is Inconsistent With the City's Own Recent Investments on This Same Corridor

The City's stated rationale for removing parking, that Clement Avenue is too "tortuous" and narrow to safely accommodate truck traffic alongside parked cars, is difficult to reconcile with the City's own recent capital investments in this exact corridor. Within the last several years, and independent of the truck route question, the City has:

- Constructed a two-lane, physically protected bicycle lane along this stretch of Clement Avenue, which by design narrows the available roadway width;
- Built a public park and playground fronting Clement Avenue in the immediately affected area, an investment that presupposes a calmer, more pedestrian- and family-oriented street environment;
- Installed a protected and enhanced "bulb-out" crosswalk within the very segment where parking removal is now proposed, an improvement typically justified on the basis of reduced vehicle speeds and reduced roadway width, and which by design narrows the roadway.

Each of these prior decisions reflects an affirmative City determination that this segment of Clement Avenue should function as a low-speed, multimodal, residential street. The Association recognizes that the truck route designation itself is largely a settled matter of long standing City policy. But the parking elimination now proposed is a new, separate decision layered on top of that settled designation, and it deserves independent scrutiny on its own terms. If the roadway is in fact too narrow to safely carry trucks and parked cars together, that narrowness is substantially the result of the City's own bicycle lane, park, and crosswalk construction. The City should not be permitted to invoke a condition it created to justify imposing the burden of that condition entirely on adjacent residents and park users, particularly where, as the City's own notice acknowledges, the parking loss is a consequence ("would result in") rather than a foregone necessity of the truck route decision itself.

2. The Parking Elimination Should Be Evaluated Under the City's Adopted Complete Streets and General Plan Policies

California's Complete Streets Act of 2008 (AB 1358, codified in relevant part at Government Code Section 65302(b)) requires that, upon substantive revision of a general plan circulation element, the City plan for a balanced, multimodal transportation network serving all users, not motor vehicles and goods movement alone. Consistent with this mandate, and with Metropolitan Transportation Commission Resolution No. 4035, the City of Alameda has adopted its own Complete Streets Policy and maintains a Transportation Element within its General Plan that commits the City to safe, multimodal streets for pedestrians, bicyclists, and residents, including specifically the City's Vision Zero Action Plan goal of eliminating severe and fatal pedestrian and bicycle collisions.

Removing all on-street parking on a narrowed residential segment that the City has only recently equipped with a protected bike lane, a park and playground serving children,

and enhanced pedestrian crossings runs directly counter to these adopted policies, independent of whatever merit the truck route designation itself may have. Before proceeding with the parking removal specifically, the City should be required to demonstrate, through a written Complete Streets analysis or its equivalent, how eliminating parking on this segment is consistent with the Transportation Element, the Complete Streets Policy, and the Vision Zero Action Plan, particularly given the presence of a playground and protected crosswalks within the affected segment.

3. The Parking Study Appears Not to Have Considered Loss of Parking for the Adjacent Park and Playground

The Clement Avenue park and playground built within this same segment relies in substantial part on the on-street parking now proposed for elimination. The Association is not aware of any dedicated off-street parking lot serving this park, meaning the 21 spaces proposed for removal likely constitute most or all of the parking currently available to families and caregivers visiting the playground, including those bringing young children, strollers, or mobility devices who cannot reasonably walk a significant distance from parking located elsewhere in the neighborhood. The City's June 18, 2026 notice and referenced early-2026 parking study describe the impact solely in terms of residential and general neighborhood parking capacity; neither appears to separately address the loss of parking serving park and playground visitors, a public recreational amenity the City itself recently built. The Association requests that the parking study, and any supplemental analysis, specifically evaluate (a) whether dedicated park visitor parking will be preserved or relocated, and (b) how families with young children and caregivers with limited mobility are expected to access the playground if adjacent on-street parking is eliminated.

4. The Parking Study and Engineering Basis for the Decision Should Be Disclosed and Independently Reviewed

The City's notice references a parking study "conducted in early 2026" that purportedly found sufficient parking capacity to absorb the loss of 21 spaces, and an engineering rationale concerning trailer offtracking and lane width. The Association requests that the City provide, in advance of the July 14, 2026 community meeting, the full parking study (including its methodology, the radius and time of day surveyed, and its treatment of overnight and resident parking demand), and the underlying traffic and geometric engineering analysis supporting the conclusion that Clement Avenue cannot safely accommodate both truck traffic and on-street parking. Residents are entitled to evaluate, and, where appropriate, to retain their own traffic engineer to evaluate, the technical basis for a decision that will permanently eliminate direct vehicle access to eleven homes.

The Association notes that a parking utilization study measuring area-wide "sufficient capacity" does not address the specific and substantial burden on residents who will lose the ability to park immediately in front of their own homes, including impacts on residents with mobility limitations, elderly residents, and families loading children, groceries, or equipment. A finding of adequate parking supply elsewhere in the

neighborhood does not, without more, satisfy the City's obligation to consider the equity and access impacts on the specifically affected households.

5. Loss of Parking Will Interfere With U.S. Mail Delivery to the Group Mailbox

The Marina Shores cluster ("CBU") is located directly on Clement Avenue within the segment proposed for parking removal. The USPS carrier currently relies on the ability to park immediately adjacent to the mailbox in order to load and deliver mail to the cluster box unit. Eliminating on-street parking along this segment, without provision of a dedicated loading or carrier stop, will directly interfere with the ability of the Postal Service to deliver mail to every household served by that mailbox, a consequence with federal as well as local implications, since USPS access standards generally require a safe, legal place for the carrier to stop. The Association requests that the City specifically evaluate carrier and mail delivery access as part of any parking removal plan, including consultation with the local USPS station, and that any final design preserve a marked loading zone or equivalent carrier stop immediately adjacent to the mailbox location.

6. Equity and Notice Concerns

The Association is concerned that a decision with this degree of permanent, concentrated impact on a small group of identifiable households (eliminating direct vehicle access in front of eleven Marina Shores homes and additional homes between Olohne and Paru Street, and removing parking serving a public park) is being advanced primarily through informational meetings rather than a noticed public hearing with formal findings specific to the parking removal itself. To the extent the removal of on-street parking requires action by the City Council, the Transportation Commission, or another decision-making body under the Alameda Municipal Code, the Association requests written confirmation of (a) which body holds final decision-making authority over the parking removal specifically, (b) what findings that body is required to make, and (c) what opportunity affected residents will have to formally contest the decision, including any administrative appeal process, before it is implemented.

The Association further requests that any final decision on parking removal be preceded by a site-specific traffic and circulation analysis evaluating whether a smaller-scale or partial parking removal, narrower truck design vehicles, traffic calming measures, designated loading/passing zones, or a reduced truck weight or time-of-day restriction on Clement Avenue could allow trucks to safely use the route while preserving direct resident and park visitor parking access.

7. Requested Action

The Marina Shores Homeowners Association respectfully requests that the City:

- Treat the elimination of on-street parking on Clement Avenue as a distinct decision from the truck route designation, requiring its own independent analysis and justification;

- Postpone any final decision on parking removal until the issues raised in this letter have been addressed in writing;
- Provide the full parking study and supporting traffic/geometric engineering analysis referenced in the City's June 18, 2026 notice, including specific analysis of parking demand generated by the adjacent park and playground;
- Identify the specific decision-making body and procedural and Municipal Code requirements (including any required public hearing, findings, or appeal rights) applicable to the parking removal;
- Evaluate and respond in writing to alternative approaches that would allow trucks to use the route while avoiding or reducing the loss of resident and park visitor parking, including narrower design vehicles, designated passing/loading zones, partial parking retention, or time-of-day restrictions;
- Coordinate with USPS to confirm that mail delivery to the Marina Shores group mailbox on Clement Avenue can continue uninterrupted, and preserve a dedicated carrier loading zone adjacent to the mailbox in any final parking design;
- Identify how families and caregivers will access the Clement Avenue park and playground if adjacent on-street parking is eliminated, including consideration of dedicated park visitor parking;
- Extend outreach, notice, and consideration of mitigation measures to all property owners directly fronting the affected segment of Clement Avenue between Ohlone and Paru Street, including those outside Marina Shores; and
- Meet directly with the Marina Shores Homeowners Association Board, in addition to the scheduled community and Transportation Commission meetings, to discuss impacts specific to our eleven affected homes.

The Association and its affected residents intend to attend and provide comment at both the July 14, 2026 community meeting and the Transportation Commission meeting, and we reserve the right to supplement this letter with additional comments, including comments from a traffic engineer retained by the Association, as further information becomes available.

We appreciate the City's willingness to engage with the community on this issue and look forward to your prompt written response. Please direct any response or requested materials to the undersigned.

Sincerely,

Ken Levins

President

Marina Shores Homeowners Association

From: [Scott Wikstrom](#)
To: ["Kenneth Levins"](#)
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2026 6:15:00 PM
Attachments: [20260409 DIXON Alameda Clement Avenue Truck Route Parking Utilization Study Memo FINAL.pdf](#)

Hi Mr. Levins,

Sorry for the delay in my reply. As you may know, Gerry Beaudin, our new City Manager started last week on June 30th. Each City Manager has a protocol for interactions involving City Council members and Gerry is establishing that protocol with staff as he gets up to speed in his role. Because your original email cc'd City Council, my full response to your comments and questions below is pending and will be sent to you and the City Council when reviewed.

In the meantime, I have attached the parking study for your use.

Regards,

Scott Wikstrom, P.E.

City Engineer
City of Alameda
(510) 747-7937

From: Scott Wikstrom
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2026 8:12 AM
To: 'Kenneth Levins' <klevins@gmail.com>
Cc: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Michele Pryor <mpryor@alamedaca.gov>; Greg Boller <gboller@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>; Erin Smith <ESmith@alamedaca.gov>; Gerry Beaudin <gbeaudin@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Hello Mr. Levins,

Thank you for the detailed comments and questions. I will prepare a written response over the next few days and prepare a reply in advance of the July 14th meeting. Please note a typo in my notification letter, the Transportation Commission meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 22 at 6:30pm in the Council Chambers. I will be sending an updated notification to the Marina Shores neighborhood with the corrected Transportation

Commission date and will include my responses to the questions below in the updated notification.

Scott Wikstrom, P.E.

City Engineer
City of Alameda
(510) 747-7937

From: Kenneth Levins <klevins@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2026 6:39 AM

To: Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov>

Cc: Marilyn Ezy Ashcraft <MEzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Michele Pryor <mpryor@alamedaca.gov>; Greg Boller <gboller@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Dear Mr. Wikstrom:

This letter is submitted on behalf of the Marina Shores Homeowners Association ("Marina Shores" or the "Association") in response to the City's June 18, 2026 notice regarding the proposed relocation of the Clement Avenue truck route and the associated elimination of approximately 21 on-street parking spaces between Balsa Court and Paru Street. The Association understands that the truck route designation itself reflects a long-standing component of the City's General Plan, predating this notice, and we do not write to relitigate that designation here. Our objection is narrower and more specific: the elimination of on-street parking on Clement Avenue is a new and separate proposal, distinct from the truck route designation, and one the Association believes has not been adequately justified or analyzed. We note that the City's own notice describes the parking loss only in conditional terms, stating that relocating the truck route "would result in" the loss of parking, which suggests to the Association that the City itself has not treated this specific outcome as foreclosed. We urge the City to treat it accordingly and to give it independent, serious consideration.

Eleven homes within our Association front directly onto this stretch of Clement Avenue, and their residents rely on that on-street parking for direct access to their front doors. Additional homes located between Ohlone and Paru Street, outside of the Association's membership, front directly onto this same segment and will be similarly affected by the loss of on-street parking. The Association urges the City to treat this as a corridor-wide impact affecting all directly fronting households, not solely those within Marina Shores, and to ensure that outreach, notice, and any mitigation measures extend to every affected property owner along the segment, regardless of HOA membership.

1. The Proposed Parking Elimination Is Inconsistent With the City's Own Recent Investments on This Same Corridor

The City's stated rationale for removing parking, that Clement Avenue is too "tortuous" and narrow to safely accommodate truck traffic alongside parked cars, is difficult to reconcile with the City's own recent capital investments in this exact corridor. Within the last several years, and independent of the truck route question, the City has:

- Constructed a two-lane, physically protected bicycle lane along this stretch of Clement Avenue, which by design narrows the available roadway width;
- Built a public park and playground fronting Clement Avenue in the immediately affected area, an investment that presupposes a calmer, more pedestrian- and family-oriented street environment;
- Installed a protected and enhanced "bulb-out" crosswalk within the very segment where parking removal is now proposed, an improvement typically justified on the basis of reduced vehicle speeds and reduced roadway width, and which by design narrows the roadway.

Each of these prior decisions reflects an affirmative City determination that this segment of Clement Avenue should function as a low-speed, multimodal, residential street. The Association recognizes that the truck route designation itself is largely a settled matter of long standing City policy. But the parking elimination now proposed is a new, separate decision layered on top of that settled designation, and it deserves independent scrutiny on its own terms. If the roadway is in fact too narrow to safely carry trucks and parked cars together, that narrowness is substantially the result of the City's own bicycle lane, park, and crosswalk construction. The City should not be permitted to invoke a condition it created to justify imposing the burden of that condition entirely on adjacent residents and park users, particularly where, as the City's own notice acknowledges, the parking loss is a consequence ("would result in") rather than a foregone necessity of the truck route decision itself.

2. The Parking Elimination Should Be Evaluated Under the City's Adopted Complete Streets and General Plan Policies

California's Complete Streets Act of 2008 (AB 1358, codified in relevant part at Government Code Section 65302(b)) requires that, upon substantive revision of a general plan circulation element, the City plan for a balanced, multimodal transportation network serving all users, not motor vehicles and goods movement alone. Consistent with this mandate, and with Metropolitan Transportation Commission Resolution No. 4035, the City of Alameda has adopted its own Complete Streets Policy and maintains a Transportation Element within its General Plan that commits the City to safe, multimodal streets for pedestrians, bicyclists, and residents, including specifically the City's Vision Zero Action Plan goal of eliminating severe and fatal pedestrian and bicycle collisions.

Removing all on-street parking on a narrowed residential segment that the City has only recently equipped with a protected bike lane, a park and playground serving children, and enhanced pedestrian crossings runs directly counter to these adopted policies, independent of whatever merit the truck route designation itself may have. Before proceeding with the parking removal specifically, the City should be required to demonstrate, through a written Complete Streets analysis or its equivalent, how eliminating parking on this segment is consistent with the Transportation Element, the Complete Streets Policy, and the Vision Zero Action Plan, particularly given the presence of a playground and protected crosswalks within the affected segment.

3. The Parking Study Appears Not to Have Considered Loss of Parking for the Adjacent Park and Playground

The Clement Avenue park and playground built within this same segment relies in substantial part on the on-street parking now proposed for elimination. The Association is not aware of any dedicated off-street parking lot serving this park, meaning the 21 spaces proposed for removal likely constitute most or all of the parking currently available to families and caregivers visiting the playground, including those bringing young children, strollers, or mobility devices who cannot reasonably walk a significant distance from parking located elsewhere in the neighborhood. The City's June 18, 2026 notice and referenced early-2026 parking study describe the impact solely in terms of residential and general neighborhood parking capacity; neither appears to separately address the loss of parking serving park and playground visitors, a public recreational amenity the City itself recently built. The Association requests that the parking study, and any supplemental analysis, specifically evaluate (a) whether dedicated park visitor parking will be preserved or relocated, and (b) how families with young children and caregivers with limited mobility are expected to access the playground if adjacent on-street parking is eliminated.

4. The Parking Study and Engineering Basis for the Decision Should Be Disclosed and Independently Reviewed

The City's notice references a parking study "conducted in early 2026" that purportedly found sufficient parking capacity to absorb the loss of 21 spaces, and an engineering rationale concerning trailer offtracking and lane width. The Association requests that the City provide, in advance of the July 14, 2026 community meeting, the full parking study (including its methodology, the radius and time of day surveyed, and its treatment of overnight and resident parking demand), and the underlying traffic and geometric engineering analysis supporting the conclusion that Clement Avenue cannot safely accommodate both truck traffic and on-street parking. Residents are entitled to evaluate, and, where appropriate, to retain their own traffic engineer to evaluate, the technical basis for a decision that will permanently eliminate direct vehicle access to eleven homes.

The Association notes that a parking utilization study measuring area-wide "sufficient capacity" does not address the specific and substantial burden on residents who will lose the ability to park immediately in front of their own homes, including impacts on

residents with mobility limitations, elderly residents, and families loading children, groceries, or equipment. A finding of adequate parking supply elsewhere in the neighborhood does not, without more, satisfy the City's obligation to consider the equity and access impacts on the specifically affected households.

5. Loss of Parking Will Interfere With U.S. Mail Delivery to the Group Mailbox

The Marina Shores cluster ("CBU") is located directly on Clement Avenue within the segment proposed for parking removal. The USPS carrier currently relies on the ability to park immediately adjacent to the mailbox in order to load and deliver mail to the cluster box unit. Eliminating on-street parking along this segment, without provision of a dedicated loading or carrier stop, will directly interfere with the ability of the Postal Service to deliver mail to every household served by that mailbox, a consequence with federal as well as local implications, since USPS access standards generally require a safe, legal place for the carrier to stop. The Association requests that the City specifically evaluate carrier and mail delivery access as part of any parking removal plan, including consultation with the local USPS station, and that any final design preserve a marked loading zone or equivalent carrier stop immediately adjacent to the mailbox location.

6. Equity and Notice Concerns

The Association is concerned that a decision with this degree of permanent, concentrated impact on a small group of identifiable households (eliminating direct vehicle access in front of eleven Marina Shores homes and additional homes between Olohne and Paru Street, and removing parking serving a public park) is being advanced primarily through informational meetings rather than a noticed public hearing with formal findings specific to the parking removal itself. To the extent the removal of on-street parking requires action by the City Council, the Transportation Commission, or another decision-making body under the Alameda Municipal Code, the Association requests written confirmation of (a) which body holds final decision-making authority over the parking removal specifically, (b) what findings that body is required to make, and (c) what opportunity affected residents will have to formally contest the decision, including any administrative appeal process, before it is implemented.

The Association further requests that any final decision on parking removal be preceded by a site-specific traffic and circulation analysis evaluating whether a smaller-scale or partial parking removal, narrower truck design vehicles, traffic calming measures, designated loading/passing zones, or a reduced truck weight or time-of-day restriction on Clement Avenue could allow trucks to safely use the route while preserving direct resident and park visitor parking access.

7. Requested Action

The Marina Shores Homeowners Association respectfully requests that the City:

- Treat the elimination of on-street parking on Clement Avenue as a distinct decision from the truck route designation, requiring its own independent

analysis and justification;

- Postpone any final decision on parking removal until the issues raised in this letter have been addressed in writing;
- Provide the full parking study and supporting traffic/geometric engineering analysis referenced in the City's June 18, 2026 notice, including specific analysis of parking demand generated by the adjacent park and playground;
- Identify the specific decision-making body and procedural and Municipal Code requirements (including any required public hearing, findings, or appeal rights) applicable to the parking removal;
- Evaluate and respond in writing to alternative approaches that would allow trucks to use the route while avoiding or reducing the loss of resident and park visitor parking, including narrower design vehicles, designated passing/loading zones, partial parking retention, or time-of-day restrictions;
- Coordinate with USPS to confirm that mail delivery to the Marina Shores group mailbox on Clement Avenue can continue uninterrupted, and preserve a dedicated carrier loading zone adjacent to the mailbox in any final parking design;
- Identify how families and caregivers will access the Clement Avenue park and playground if adjacent on-street parking is eliminated, including consideration of dedicated park visitor parking;
- Extend outreach, notice, and consideration of mitigation measures to all property owners directly fronting the affected segment of Clement Avenue between Ohlone and Paru Street, including those outside Marina Shores; and
- Meet directly with the Marina Shores Homeowners Association Board, in addition to the scheduled community and Transportation Commission meetings, to discuss impacts specific to our eleven affected homes.

The Association and its affected residents intend to attend and provide comment at both the July 14, 2026 community meeting and the Transportation Commission meeting, and we reserve the right to supplement this letter with additional comments, including comments from a traffic engineer retained by the Association, as further information becomes available.

We appreciate the City's willingness to engage with the community on this issue and look forward to your prompt written response. Please direct any response or requested materials to the undersigned.

Sincerely,

Ken Levins

President

Marina Shores Homeowners Association

--

Kenneth Levins

1826 Balsa Street,

Alameda

CA 94501

(925) 980 8811

klevins@gmail.com

From: Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov>

Sent: Monday, July 13, 2026 8:41 AM

To: 'Kenneth Levins' <klevins@gmail.com>

Cc: Erin Smith <ESmith@alamedaca.gov>; CITYCOUNCIL-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>; Gerry Beaudin <gbeaudin@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Mr. Levins, and members of the Marina Shore Homeowners Association,

The decision to recommend removing 21 on-street parking spaces on Clement Avenue was not made lightly. We recognize that this change will affect nearby residents, and we appreciate the HOA taking the time to provide thoughtful comments.

As noted in Response #4 below, the Alameda Municipal Code authorizes the Public Works Director to prohibit parking when traffic engineering principles indicate it is necessary to support public safety and the safe operation of the transportation system. While the Code does not require public notification or provide an appeal process for this type of decision, Public Works chose to conduct an extensive outreach effort because of the community interest and the potential impacts. That outreach includes mailed notices, a community meeting, and a public hearing before the Transportation Commission prior to implementation. The purpose of the outreach is twofold: to explain the engineering analysis and policy considerations that led to this recommendation, and to hear from the community.

I've provided responses to the Requested Action portion of your email and a few additional notes. I look forward to continuing the discussion at the July 14 community meeting and the July 22 Transportation Commission meeting. As noted below, I'd also be happy to meet directly with the HOA.

1. Treat the elimination of on-street parking on Clement Avenue as a distinct decision from the truck route designation, requiring its own independent analysis and justification;

We believe we have treated the elimination of parking as separate issue, conducted an analysis and have justification for staff recommendation. Relocation of the truck route to Clement requires wider lanes than the existing 11.5 feet travel lanes. Large tractor-trailer trucks make wide turns. This is most obvious when these trucks make a 90 degree right turn at an intersection where the rear axle of the trailer can track several feet inboard of the front steering axle. An example truck turning template and overlay on Clement Avenue can be downloaded via the following link: [Clement Truck Route - Grand to Sherman](#) This offset tracking of a truck trailer also occurs when driving along curved roads such as the section of Clement between Entrance Road and Hibbard. The approximate 250-foot radius curves along Clement will require a minimum 14-foot lane to accommodate the trailer offset for a

typical full-sized truck that regularly traverse Alameda. The existing road configuration cannot accommodate the wider lanes and the existing parking. Therefore, staff hired a consulting firm to perform an independent analysis of parking supply and demand. The results of that analysis show parking capacity on the side streets to accommodate the recommended loss of parking. More information is provided in responses #4 and #5 below.

2. Postpone any final decision on parking removal until the issues raised in this letter have been addressed in writing;

We are not intending to take action until after community engagement and the public hearing at the Transportation Commission. Please see response to #4 for more information.

3. Provide the full parking study and supporting traffic/geometric engineering analysis referenced in the City's June 18, 2026 notice, including specific analysis of parking demand generated by the adjacent park and playground;

The parking analysis can be downloaded via the following link: [Clement Truck Route - Grand to Sherman](#). The parking analysis did not complete a separate analysis of the parking demand generated by the adjacent park and playground. Because the park and playground already exist, parking demand is incorporated into the observed parking occupancy. There is an existing small parking lot opposite of Ohlone Street that serves the park/playground and provides access to the Bay Trail and public shore which will be unaffected by the truck route. Staff also consulted with the Recreation and Parks Director about parking for the park. There are no known concerns about parking lot capacity and the parking analysis concludes capacity on the side streets. Additionally, the City recently installed a rapid flashing beacon at Stanton Street to assist pedestrians in crossing Clement Ave and access the park/playground in preparation for the truck route relocation. Current park visitors who didn't use the lot opposite of Ohlone Street are required to cross Clement to access the park. Elimination of parking on the south side of Clement and opposite of the park will not change the need for park visitors to cross Clement and the parking study confirms sufficient capacity on the adjacent streets.

4. Identify the specific decision-making body and procedural and Municipal Code requirements (including any required public hearing, findings, or appeal rights) applicable to the parking removal;

On-street parking in Alameda is regulated in Chapter VIII of the Alameda Municipal Code (AMC) and more specifically in Section 8-7, Parking Prohibitions. AMC Section 8-7.1, Parking – Prohibited at all times states, “The Public Works Director is hereby authorized, whenever traffic engineering studies or principles indicate for the safety or adequate flow of all modes of transportation, to establish streets or portions thereof where parking is prohibited at all times.” In the case of Clement Avenue the parking loss is necessary for truck traffic and would be a safety issue if not removed. Furthermore, AMC Section 8-1.2, Notice of Decisions, does not require public noticing or in Section AMC Section 8-1.3 provide for an appeal process for Public Works Director decisions made on the basis of adequate traffic flow and public safety. We recognize the impact of losing 21 on-street parking stalls and have elected to conduct public outreach in advance of completing the work. See also response #5.

5. Evaluate and respond in writing to alternative approaches that would allow trucks to use the route while avoiding or reducing the loss of resident and park visitor parking, including narrower design vehicles, designated passing/loading zones, partial parking retention, or time-of-day restrictions.

Staff evaluated alternatives related to truck route relocation, each of which had significant challenges. Staff recommends and is pursuing the removal of parking on Clement Avenue between Balsa Street and Paru Street as the least impactful alternative in consideration of the City’s General Plan, Active Transportation Plan, and City Policies promulgated by City Council resolutions. The three other alternatives are:

- Eliminate the two-way cycle track between Entrance Road and Grand Street and return to the Class II bike lanes that existed until 2016. In this alternative, the trailer offset for large trucks would be accommodated within the Class II lane. A potential safety issue exists when a bicycle is travelling in the same direction and same time as a large truck. Additionally, transitions between two-way cycle tracks and Class II bike lanes are challenging and bicycle rider compliance with the transition can be expected to be low, resulting in a potentially increased hazard for all roadway users.
- Relocate the two-way cycle track to the excess right-of-way north of Clement. There is a 17-foot wide “alternative vehicle corridor” that was included Clement Avenue dedication with Tract 7170. At the time, this corridor was being reserved for a potential light rail connection along the northern waterfront. Relocation of the cycle track to this excess right-of-way would impact the Waterfront Park, potentially remove mature trees, and require BCDC permitting and approval, with potentially significant construction costs.
- Maintain the Truck Route on Buena Vista. While this may appear to be the path of least resistance, this alternative would not be consistent with the General Plan or

decades long promises to the community on Buena Vista. If the truck route remains on Buena Vista, a General Plan Amendment would need to occur recognizing the change. Even with this alternative, one-off trucks that mistakenly continue straight on Clement as the truck route may cause collisions along this stretch of roadway.

The alternatives considered by staff that would preserve on-street parking each involve significant tradeoffs. They would either require substantial public investment to relocate the cycle track, reduce the City's long-standing commitment to protected bicycle facilities along the Cross Alameda Trail, or require amendments to the General Plan to remove the designated truck route from this segment of Clement Avenue.

We appreciate the alternatives suggested by the HOA, which include narrower vehicles, designated passing zones, or time of day restrictions are not feasible. However, the maximum standard vehicle width in the United States is set at the federal level at 8.5-feet, exclusive of mirrors. Local restrictions on vehicle width would not be enforceable, nor would time of day restrictions be appropriate for a designated truck route.

6. Coordinate with USPS to confirm that mail delivery to the Marina Shores group mailbox on Clement Avenue can continue uninterrupted, and preserve a dedicated carrier loading zone adjacent to the mailbox in any final parking design.

We appreciate the consideration of the USPS mailbox location. Staff will reach out to USPS and seek guidance about parking or whether the mailboxes will need to be relocated.

7. Identify how families and caregivers will access the Clement Avenue park and playground if adjacent on-street parking is eliminated, including consideration of dedicated park visitor parking;

See response to #3 and #11.

8. Extend outreach, notice, and consideration of mitigation measures to all property owners directly fronting the affected segment of Clement Avenue between Ohlone and Paru Street, including those outside Marina Shores.

Public notices were mailed to all residents within a 300-foot radius of the project study area which is bounded by Entrance Road to the west, Hibbard Road to the east, Clement Avenue to the north, and Buena Vista Avenue to the south.

9. Meet directly with the Marina Shores Homeowners Association Board, in addition to the scheduled community and Transportation Commission meetings, to discuss impacts specific to our eleven affected homes

I would be happy to meet with the Marina Shores Homeowners Association Board. Please let me know the meeting dates/times for the Board and we can coordinate a meeting time convenient for all.

In addition to the Requested Action section, I am providing responses to a few other points raised in your email:

10. The Parking Elimination Should Be Evaluated Under the City's Adopted Complete Streets and General Plan Policies.

The General Plan, Complete Streets Policy, and other supporting City Council Resolutions consistently identify on-street parking as the lowest priority when allocating right-of-way space. First consideration should be for people walking, bicycling, and using transit, followed by vehicular needs and public safety (General Plan, Mobility Element Policy ME-6, Action g., Space Priorities). The General Plan designation of Clement Avenue as a truck route, followed by the subsequent discretionary action of City Council to adopt the Cross Alameda Trail alignment in 2005, Bike Master Plan in 2010, and Improvement Plans for Marina Shores, Phase II which constructed the two-way cycle track on Clement in 2014 has led us to this result where parking is proposed for elimination. While the three other alternatives evaluated (see response #5) could preserve parking on the south side of Clement, each alternative has significant drawback with compromises greater than the loss of 21 on-street parking stalls on Clement Avenue.

11. Eleven homes within our Association front directly onto this stretch of Clement Avenue, and their residents rely on that on-street parking for direct access to their front doors

All homes within the Marina Shores development have access to a two car garage. Of the 11 homes referenced, only 5 homes "front" on Clement Avenue with doorways facing Clement. These include 1552, 1556, 1558, 1560, and 1568 Clement Avenue. Visitors and guests for these 5 homes would need to park on the adjacent streets and walk to the front

doors, which we acknowledge is an inconvenience. Front doors for the other six homes face either Balsa Street, Stanton Street, or Ohlone Street and visitors and guests are not inconvenienced by the lack of parking on Clement.

Public Works remains open to considering any additional feasible alternatives that can safely accommodate truck traffic while preserving on-street parking. If such an alternative exists, we welcome the opportunity to evaluate it.

Thank you again for your thoughtful comments. We look forward to continuing the discussion at the July 14 community meeting and the July 22 Transportation Commission meeting.

Scott Wikstrom, P.E.

City Engineer
City of Alameda
(510) 747-7937

From: Scott Wikstrom

Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2026 8:12 AM

To: 'Kenneth Levins' <klevins@gmail.com>

Cc: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Michele Pryor <mpryor@alamedaca.gov>; Greg Boller <gboller@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>; Erin Smith <ESmith@alamedaca.gov>; Gerry Beaudin <gbeaudin@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Hello Mr. Levins,

Thank you for the detailed comments and questions. I will prepare a written response over the next few days and prepare a reply in advance of the July 14th meeting. Please note a typo in my notification letter, the Transportation Commission meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 22 at 6:30pm in the Council Chambers. I will be sending an updated notification to the Marina Shores neighborhood with the corrected Transportation Commission date and will include my responses to the questions below in the updated notification.

Scott Wikstrom, P.E.

City Engineer
City of Alameda

(510) 747-7937

From: Kenneth Levins <klevins@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2026 6:39 AM

To: Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov>

Cc: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Michele Pryor <mpryor@alamedaca.gov>; Greg Boller <gboller@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Dear Mr. Wikstrom:

This letter is submitted on behalf of the Marina Shores Homeowners Association ("Marina Shores" or the "Association") in response to the City's June 18, 2026 notice regarding the proposed relocation of the Clement Avenue truck route and the associated elimination of approximately 21 on-street parking spaces between Balsa Court and Paru Street. The Association understands that the truck route designation itself reflects a long-standing component of the City's General Plan, predating this notice, and we do not write to relitigate that designation here. Our objection is narrower and more specific: the elimination of on-street parking on Clement Avenue is a new and separate proposal, distinct from the truck route designation, and one the Association believes has not been adequately justified or analyzed. We note that the City's own notice describes the parking loss only in conditional terms, stating that relocating the truck route "would result in" the loss of parking, which suggests to the Association that the City itself has not treated this specific outcome as foreclosed. We urge the City to treat it accordingly and to give it independent, serious consideration.

Eleven homes within our Association front directly onto this stretch of Clement Avenue, and their residents rely on that on-street parking for direct access to their front doors. Additional homes located between Ohlone and Paru Street, outside of the Association's membership, front directly onto this same segment and will be similarly affected by the loss of on-street parking. The Association urges the City to treat this as a corridor-wide impact affecting all directly fronting households, not solely those within Marina Shores, and to ensure that outreach, notice, and any mitigation measures extend to every affected property owner along the segment, regardless of HOA membership.

1. The Proposed Parking Elimination Is Inconsistent With the City's Own Recent Investments on This Same Corridor

The City's stated rationale for removing parking, that Clement Avenue is too "tortuous" and narrow to safely accommodate truck traffic alongside parked cars, is difficult to reconcile with the City's own recent capital investments in this exact corridor. Within the last several years, and independent of the truck route question, the City has:

- Constructed a two-lane, physically protected bicycle lane along this stretch of Clement Avenue, which by design narrows the available roadway width;
- Built a public park and playground fronting Clement Avenue in the immediately affected area, an investment that presupposes a calmer, more pedestrian- and family-oriented street environment;
- Installed a protected and enhanced "bulb-out" crosswalk within the very segment where parking removal is now proposed, an improvement typically justified on the basis of reduced vehicle speeds and reduced roadway width, and which by design narrows the roadway.

Each of these prior decisions reflects an affirmative City determination that this segment of Clement Avenue should function as a low-speed, multimodal, residential street. The Association recognizes that the truck route designation itself is largely a settled matter of long standing City policy. But the parking elimination now proposed is a new, separate decision layered on top of that settled designation, and it deserves independent scrutiny on its own terms. If the roadway is in fact too narrow to safely carry trucks and parked cars together, that narrowness is substantially the result of the City's own bicycle lane, park, and crosswalk construction. The City should not be permitted to invoke a condition it created to justify imposing the burden of that condition entirely on adjacent residents and park users, particularly where, as the City's own notice acknowledges, the parking loss is a consequence ("would result in") rather than a foregone necessity of the truck route decision itself.

2. The Parking Elimination Should Be Evaluated Under the City's Adopted Complete Streets and General Plan Policies

California's Complete Streets Act of 2008 (AB 1358, codified in relevant part at Government Code Section 65302(b)) requires that, upon substantive revision of a general plan circulation element, the City plan for a balanced, multimodal transportation network serving all users, not motor vehicles and goods movement alone. Consistent with this mandate, and with Metropolitan Transportation Commission Resolution No. 4035, the City of Alameda has adopted its own Complete Streets Policy and maintains a Transportation Element within its General Plan that commits the City to safe, multimodal streets for pedestrians, bicyclists, and residents, including specifically the City's Vision Zero Action Plan goal of eliminating severe and fatal pedestrian and bicycle collisions.

Removing all on-street parking on a narrowed residential segment that the City has only recently equipped with a protected bike lane, a park and playground serving children,

and enhanced pedestrian crossings runs directly counter to these adopted policies, independent of whatever merit the truck route designation itself may have. Before proceeding with the parking removal specifically, the City should be required to demonstrate, through a written Complete Streets analysis or its equivalent, how eliminating parking on this segment is consistent with the Transportation Element, the Complete Streets Policy, and the Vision Zero Action Plan, particularly given the presence of a playground and protected crosswalks within the affected segment.

3. The Parking Study Appears Not to Have Considered Loss of Parking for the Adjacent Park and Playground

The Clement Avenue park and playground built within this same segment relies in substantial part on the on-street parking now proposed for elimination. The Association is not aware of any dedicated off-street parking lot serving this park, meaning the 21 spaces proposed for removal likely constitute most or all of the parking currently available to families and caregivers visiting the playground, including those bringing young children, strollers, or mobility devices who cannot reasonably walk a significant distance from parking located elsewhere in the neighborhood. The City's June 18, 2026 notice and referenced early-2026 parking study describe the impact solely in terms of residential and general neighborhood parking capacity; neither appears to separately address the loss of parking serving park and playground visitors, a public recreational amenity the City itself recently built. The Association requests that the parking study, and any supplemental analysis, specifically evaluate (a) whether dedicated park visitor parking will be preserved or relocated, and (b) how families with young children and caregivers with limited mobility are expected to access the playground if adjacent on-street parking is eliminated.

4. The Parking Study and Engineering Basis for the Decision Should Be Disclosed and Independently Reviewed

The City's notice references a parking study "conducted in early 2026" that purportedly found sufficient parking capacity to absorb the loss of 21 spaces, and an engineering rationale concerning trailer offtracking and lane width. The Association requests that the City provide, in advance of the July 14, 2026 community meeting, the full parking study (including its methodology, the radius and time of day surveyed, and its treatment of overnight and resident parking demand), and the underlying traffic and geometric engineering analysis supporting the conclusion that Clement Avenue cannot safely accommodate both truck traffic and on-street parking. Residents are entitled to evaluate, and, where appropriate, to retain their own traffic engineer to evaluate, the technical basis for a decision that will permanently eliminate direct vehicle access to eleven homes.

The Association notes that a parking utilization study measuring area-wide "sufficient capacity" does not address the specific and substantial burden on residents who will lose the ability to park immediately in front of their own homes, including impacts on residents with mobility limitations, elderly residents, and families loading children, groceries, or equipment. A finding of adequate parking supply elsewhere in the

neighborhood does not, without more, satisfy the City's obligation to consider the equity and access impacts on the specifically affected households.

5. Loss of Parking Will Interfere With U.S. Mail Delivery to the Group Mailbox

The Marina Shores cluster ("CBU") is located directly on Clement Avenue within the segment proposed for parking removal. The USPS carrier currently relies on the ability to park immediately adjacent to the mailbox in order to load and deliver mail to the cluster box unit. Eliminating on-street parking along this segment, without provision of a dedicated loading or carrier stop, will directly interfere with the ability of the Postal Service to deliver mail to every household served by that mailbox, a consequence with federal as well as local implications, since USPS access standards generally require a safe, legal place for the carrier to stop. The Association requests that the City specifically evaluate carrier and mail delivery access as part of any parking removal plan, including consultation with the local USPS station, and that any final design preserve a marked loading zone or equivalent carrier stop immediately adjacent to the mailbox location.

6. Equity and Notice Concerns

The Association is concerned that a decision with this degree of permanent, concentrated impact on a small group of identifiable households (eliminating direct vehicle access in front of eleven Marina Shores homes and additional homes between Olohne and Paru Street, and removing parking serving a public park) is being advanced primarily through informational meetings rather than a noticed public hearing with formal findings specific to the parking removal itself. To the extent the removal of on-street parking requires action by the City Council, the Transportation Commission, or another decision-making body under the Alameda Municipal Code, the Association requests written confirmation of (a) which body holds final decision-making authority over the parking removal specifically, (b) what findings that body is required to make, and (c) what opportunity affected residents will have to formally contest the decision, including any administrative appeal process, before it is implemented.

The Association further requests that any final decision on parking removal be preceded by a site-specific traffic and circulation analysis evaluating whether a smaller-scale or partial parking removal, narrower truck design vehicles, traffic calming measures, designated loading/passing zones, or a reduced truck weight or time-of-day restriction on Clement Avenue could allow trucks to safely use the route while preserving direct resident and park visitor parking access.

7. Requested Action

The Marina Shores Homeowners Association respectfully requests that the City:

- Treat the elimination of on-street parking on Clement Avenue as a distinct decision from the truck route designation, requiring its own independent analysis and justification;

- Postpone any final decision on parking removal until the issues raised in this letter have been addressed in writing;
- Provide the full parking study and supporting traffic/geometric engineering analysis referenced in the City's June 18, 2026 notice, including specific analysis of parking demand generated by the adjacent park and playground;
- Identify the specific decision-making body and procedural and Municipal Code requirements (including any required public hearing, findings, or appeal rights) applicable to the parking removal;
- Evaluate and respond in writing to alternative approaches that would allow trucks to use the route while avoiding or reducing the loss of resident and park visitor parking, including narrower design vehicles, designated passing/loading zones, partial parking retention, or time-of-day restrictions;
- Coordinate with USPS to confirm that mail delivery to the Marina Shores group mailbox on Clement Avenue can continue uninterrupted, and preserve a dedicated carrier loading zone adjacent to the mailbox in any final parking design;
- Identify how families and caregivers will access the Clement Avenue park and playground if adjacent on-street parking is eliminated, including consideration of dedicated park visitor parking;
- Extend outreach, notice, and consideration of mitigation measures to all property owners directly fronting the affected segment of Clement Avenue between Ohlone and Paru Street, including those outside Marina Shores; and
- Meet directly with the Marina Shores Homeowners Association Board, in addition to the scheduled community and Transportation Commission meetings, to discuss impacts specific to our eleven affected homes.

The Association and its affected residents intend to attend and provide comment at both the July 14, 2026 community meeting and the Transportation Commission meeting, and we reserve the right to supplement this letter with additional comments, including comments from a traffic engineer retained by the Association, as further information becomes available.

We appreciate the City's willingness to engage with the community on this issue and look forward to your prompt written response. Please direct any response or requested materials to the undersigned.

Sincerely,

Ken Levins

President

Marina Shores Homeowners Association

From: [Scott Wikstrom](#)
To: [Kenneth Levins](#)
Cc: [Erin Smith](#); [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#); [Transportation Commission](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street
Date: Monday, July 13, 2026 7:44:00 PM
Attachments: [Exhibit 1 - Truck Turning Clement.pdf](#)

Hello Mr. Levins,

I look forward to meeting you tomorrow evening and setting a future time to meet with the Marina Shores HOA Board. Please note that the Transportation Commission meeting on July 22 will be informational and while the Transportation Commissioners may provide comments and feedback, they will not be asked to make a decision regarding the parking on Clement Avenue.

Although Staff has prepared a recommendation to remove parking along Clement to facilitate the truck route relocation, Staff's potential decision / determination to remove parking does not need to be rushed and certainly does not need to be made on or immediately after the July 22nd Transportation Commission meeting. We remain committed to working with the Marina Shores HOA and local residents to consider alternatives.

Please keep in mind that Alameda's [Sunshine Ordinance](#) requires that all documents material to a matter anticipated for discussion must accompany the agenda and be posted for a full seven days before the meeting. Below are quick and admittedly partial responses to your alternatives which will be included in the Transportation Commission agenda packet.

1. As you mention below, there are short tangent sections between curves on Clement. These straight sections of roadway, however, are not long enough for the truck trailers to fully return to the normal 11.5-foot-wide lane. Preserving on-street parking between Balsa Ct and Paru St is not possible.
2. Staff acknowledges the USPS mailboxes and will work with the Postal Service regarding a solution. If the mailboxes need to be relocated, it would be a City expense.
3. The truck turning template provided and included in the Transportation Commission agenda packet is for a WB-67 truck which mimics the largest California legal truck for non-interstate routes. The WB-67 truck represents the control vehicle or the largest anticipated as was evaluated to determine if these large vehicles could navigate the corridor. Staff also evaluated a WB-50 truck which are more common in Alameda and represents the design vehicle for

analysis. Significant trailer offset occurs with either vehicle and parking cannot be preserved between Balsa St and Paru St.

4. Relocating the Truck Route from Clement to Lincoln Avenue or maintaining on Buena Vista Avenue would require a General Plan Amendment and a substantial administrative and political effort. Your original email acknowledges Clement Avenue as a truck route in the General Plan and did not challenge that designation. Furthermore, the CCR's for the Marina Shores contains the following disclosure on the front page, "Clement Avenue is designated as a truck route and will eventually be used as such as provided in the Transportation Element of the City's General Plan". While I can acknowledge the relocation of the truck route to Lincoln Avenue or maintaining the truck route on Buena Vista may be technically feasible, I cannot comment on the viability of either option.

Scott Wikstrom, P.E.

City Engineer
City of Alameda
(510) 747-7937

From: Kenneth Levins <klevins@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, July 13, 2026 9:54 AM

To: Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov>

Cc: Erin Smith <ESmith@alamedaca.gov>; CITYCOUNCIL-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>; Gerry Beaudin <gbeaudin@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Dear Mr. Wikstrom:

Thank you for your detailed written response. The Association appreciates the time it reflects, and we gladly accept your offer to meet with the Marina Shores HOA Board; I will follow up separately with proposed dates. We also intend to participate in the July 14 community meeting and the July 22 Transportation Commission hearing.

Your letter closes by stating that Public Works "remains open to considering any additional feasible alternatives that can safely accommodate truck traffic while preserving on-street parking," and that you welcome the opportunity to evaluate such an alternative. The Association takes you up on that invitation. We ask that the following alternative package be evaluated and responded to in writing, element by element, before the July 22 hearing:

1. Partial parking retention based on the City's own geometry. Your letter states that the 14-foot lane requirement arises from trailer offtracking on the approximately 250-foot radius curves between Entrance Road and Hibbard. That rationale does not explain removing parking along straight (tangent) segments between Balsa Street and Paru Street. We propose that parking be removed only where the swept-path analysis demonstrates the wider lane is geometrically required, and retained elsewhere. Please provide a station-by-station (or block-by-block) exhibit identifying precisely where the 14-foot lane is needed, where the existing 11.5-foot lanes remain adequate, and the available curb-to-curb width at each constrained location, including the Stanton Street crossing discussed in item 8 below.

2. A marked carrier/loading zone at the cluster mailbox. Whatever the final design, a designated loading zone at the Marina Shores CBU would preserve mail delivery at negligible cost to truck operations. We ask that this be incorporated into the striping plan rather than treated as a question of relocating the residents' mailboxes. The Association does not consent to relocation of the CBU, and any proposal to relocate it should identify who bears the cost and confirm USPS growth management approval.

3. Design vehicle justification. We would like to clarify a point from your response. The Association's request concerned narrower design vehicles - the vehicle assumed for geometric design purposes (e.g., WB-67 versus WB-50 or a single-unit truck) - not regulation of vehicle width, which we agree is set federally at 8.5 feet. The selection of a design vehicle is a discretionary engineering judgment. Please identify the design vehicle assumed in the swept-path analysis, the basis for selecting it, and whether a smaller design vehicle with signed accommodation for occasional oversize movements was evaluated. We would also note that, contrary to the suggestion that local truck restrictions are unenforceable, California Vehicle Code section 35701 et seq. expressly authorizes cities to restrict commercial vehicles by weight on designated streets by ordinance. If staff's position is that a weight- or time-based restriction is inappropriate here as a matter of policy, we ask that the analysis supporting that judgment be provided in writing rather than stated as a conclusion.

4. A comparative evaluation of Lincoln Avenue as the through-truck route. The three alternatives staff evaluated were all confined to the Clement corridor itself or to Buena Vista. No other route appears to have been considered. Yet Lincoln Avenue is a four-lane arterial with a gentle curve transitioning directly onto Constitution Way and the tube approaches - a cross-section that appears to satisfy the 14-foot lane and offtracking requirements staff has identified without removing a single parking space, curb extension, or street tree, and without the pinch points that make Clement, in the City's

own words, unable to accommodate trucks and parking together. We recognize that Lincoln has its own adjacent uses and that a route change would involve its own process, potentially including a General Plan Amendment. But as noted with respect to the Buena Vista alternative, the need for a discretionary approval is a procedural step, not a finding of infeasibility. Before permanent impacts are imposed on Clement Avenue residents, the Association requests that staff prepare and publish a comparative routing evaluation of Lincoln Avenue and Clement Avenue, addressing geometry, truck volumes and origins/destinations, adjacent land uses, and safety, so that the Transportation Commission can weigh the tradeoffs on a complete record.

Second, we request the following materials and information sufficiently in advance of July 22 for independent review:

5. A response addressing the deficiencies in the parking study, raised in my email to you of July 8th, regarding seasonality and time of day errors, in addition to the obviously incorrect assumptions regarding the fungibility of private driveway and public parking spaces.

6. The City's environmental determination. Your response does not address the California Environmental Quality Act. Please provide the City's written CEQA determination for the truck route relocation and associated physical changes (parking prohibition, restriping, signage, and any modification to existing pedestrian improvements), or the exemption finding and its factual basis if the City's position is that the action is exempt.

7. The decision record. You have confirmed that AMC Sections 8-1.2 and 8-1.3 provide no noticing requirement or appeal from a Public Works Director determination under Section 8-7.1. Given that, please confirm: (a) whether the Transportation Commission will take a formal vote on July 22 or is receiving the item as information only; (b) whether the Director will adopt written findings documenting the traffic engineering basis required by Section 8-7.1; and (c) whether the City Council may call the decision up for review. Because this action permanently eliminates parking serving identified households and a public park, with no appeal right, the Association formally requests that final action be referred to the City Council.

8. Scope confirmation, including the Stanton Street crossing. Your response cites the recently installed rapid flashing beacon at Stanton Street as a measure taken "in preparation for the truck route relocation." However, the curb extensions at that enhanced crossing narrow the roadway to less than 22 feet curb to curb. That width

cannot accommodate even the existing pair of 11.5-foot travel lanes, much less a 14-foot truck lane opposed by an 11.5-foot lane (25.5 feet minimum). On the City's own engineering rationale, the truck route cannot function at this location without modifying or removing the very crossing improvement staff cites as a project benefit. Please reconcile this in writing: either the swept-path analysis did not account for this pinch point, or modification or removal of the Stanton Street crossing improvements is a contemplated but undisclosed component of this project. If it is the latter, the project scope, cost, stormwater treatment recalculation, pedestrian safety analysis, and environmental review must reflect it, and the public notice describing this project as a parking removal is materially incomplete. More broadly, please confirm in writing whether any curb extensions (bulb-outs), street trees, marked crosswalks, or the Stanton Street RRFB will be removed or modified as part of this project or as a foreseeable consequence of it.

9. Accessibility. Please confirm whether the City has evaluated the impacts of the parking removal on residents and park visitors with disabilities or limited mobility, including caregivers transporting young children, strollers, and mobility devices, and whether any accessible parking or passenger loading provision will be included in the final design. These questions address all residents owning homes along Clement in our development, in addition to area visitors. The rapid flashing beacon addresses crossing safety; it does not address proximity or carrying distance - and, per item 8, its own geometry appears incompatible with the truck lane widths staff has identified as necessary.

Finally, on timing: the engineering and parking materials were made available only recently, and the Association is arranging independent traffic engineering review. If the written responses and materials requested above cannot be provided in time for meaningful review before July 22, the Association respectfully requests that the Transportation Commission continue the item to its next regular meeting. Nothing in the project schedule appears to require action on July 22, and a short continuance would allow the Commission to act on a complete record.

We appreciate your stated willingness to evaluate feasible alternatives and your offer to meet with the Board, and we look forward to a productive discussion at tomorrow's community meeting.

Sincerely,

Ken Levins

President
Marina Shores Homeowners Association

On Mon, Jul 13, 2026 at 8:40 AM Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov> wrote:

Mr. Levins, and members of the Marina Shore Homeowners Association,

The decision to recommend removing 21 on-street parking spaces on Clement Avenue was not made lightly. We recognize that this change will affect nearby residents, and we appreciate the HOA taking the time to provide thoughtful comments.

As noted in Response #4 below, the Alameda Municipal Code authorizes the Public Works Director to prohibit parking when traffic engineering principles indicate it is necessary to support public safety and the safe operation of the transportation system. While the Code does not require public notification or provide an appeal process for this type of decision, Public Works chose to conduct an extensive outreach effort because of the community interest and the potential impacts. That outreach includes mailed notices, a community meeting, and a public hearing before the Transportation Commission prior to implementation. The purpose of the outreach is twofold: to explain the engineering analysis and policy considerations that led to this recommendation, and to hear from the community.

I've provided responses to the Requested Action portion of your email and a few additional notes. I look forward to continuing the discussion at the July 14 community meeting and the July 22 Transportation Commission meeting. As noted below, I'd also be happy to meet directly with the HOA.

1. Treat the elimination of on-street parking on Clement Avenue as a distinct decision from the truck route designation, requiring its own independent analysis and justification;

We believe we have treated the elimination of parking as separate issue, conducted an analysis and have justification for staff recommendation. Relocation of the truck route to Clement requires wider lanes than the existing 11.5 feet travel lanes. Large tractor-trailer trucks make wide turns. This is most obvious when these trucks make a 90 degree right turn at an intersection where the rear axle of the trailer can track several feet inboard of the front steering axle. An example truck turning template and overlay on Clement Avenue can be downloaded via the following link: [Clement Truck Route - Grand to Sherman](#) This offset tracking of a truck trailer also occurs when driving along curved roads such as the section of Clement between Entrance Road and Hibbard. The approximate 250-foot radius curves along Clement will require a minimum 14-foot lane to accommodate the trailer offset for a typical full-sized truck that regularly traverse Alameda. The existing road configuration cannot accommodate the wider lanes and the existing parking. Therefore, staff hired a consulting firm to perform an independent analysis of parking supply and demand. The results of that analysis show parking capacity on the side streets to accommodate the recommended loss of parking. More information is provided in

responses #4 and #5 below.

2. Postpone any final decision on parking removal until the issues raised in this letter have been addressed in writing;

We are not intending to take action until after community engagement and the public hearing at the Transportation Commission. Please see response to #4 for more information.

3. Provide the full parking study and supporting traffic/geometric engineering analysis referenced in the City's June 18, 2026 notice, including specific analysis of parking demand generated by the adjacent park and playground;

The parking analysis can be downloaded via the following link: [Clement Truck Route - Grand to Sherman](#). The parking analysis did not complete a separate analysis of the parking demand generated by the adjacent park and playground. Because the park and playground already exist, parking demand is incorporated into the observed parking occupancy. There is an existing small parking lot opposite of Ohlone Street that serves the park/playground and provides access to the Bay Trail and public shore which will be unaffected by the truck route. Staff also consulted with the Recreation and Parks Director about parking for the park. There are no known concerns about parking lot capacity and the parking analysis concludes capacity on the side streets. Additionally, the City recently installed a rapid flashing beacon at Stanton Street to assist pedestrians in crossing Clement Ave and access the park/playground in preparation for the truck route relocation. Current park visitors who didn't use the lot opposite of Ohlone Street are required to cross Clement to access the park. Elimination of parking on the south side of Clement and opposite of the park will not change the need for park visitors to cross Clement and the parking study confirms sufficient capacity on the adjacent streets.

4. Identify the specific decision-making body and procedural and Municipal Code requirements (including any required public hearing, findings, or appeal rights) applicable to the parking removal;

On-street parking in Alameda is regulated in Chapter VIII of the Alameda Municipal Code (AMC) and more specifically in Section 8-7, Parking Prohibitions. AMC Section 8-7.1, Parking – Prohibited at all times states, "The Public Works Director is hereby authorized, whenever traffic engineering studies or principles indicate for the safety or adequate flow of all modes of transportation, to establish streets or portions thereof where parking is prohibited at all times." In the case of Clement Avenue the parking loss is necessary for truck traffic and would be a safety issue if not removed. Furthermore, AMC Section 8-1.2, Notice of Decisions, does not require public

noticing or in Section AMC Section 8-1.3 provide for an appeal process for Public Works Director decisions made on the basis of adequate traffic flow and public safety. We recognize the impact of losing 21 on-street parking stalls and have elected to conduct public outreach in advance of completing the work. See also response #5.

5. Evaluate and respond in writing to alternative approaches that would allow trucks to use the route while avoiding or reducing the loss of resident and park visitor parking, including narrower design vehicles, designated passing/loading zones, partial parking retention, or time-of-day restrictions.

Staff evaluated alternatives related to truck route relocation, each of which had significant challenges. Staff recommends and is pursuing the removal of parking on Clement Avenue between Balsa Street and Paru Street as the least impactful alternative in consideration of the City's General Plan, Active Transportation Plan, and City Policies promulgated by City Council resolutions. The three other alternatives are:

- Eliminate the two-way cycle track between Entrance Road and Grand Street and return to the Class II bike lanes that existed until 2016. In this alternative, the trailer offset for large trucks would be accommodated within the Class II lane. A potential safety issue exists when a bicycle is travelling in the same direction and same time as a large truck. Additionally, transitions between two-way cycle tracks and Class II bike lanes are challenging and bicycle rider compliance with the transition can be expected to be low, resulting in a potentially increased hazard for all roadway users.
- Relocate the two-way cycle track to the excess right-of-way north of Clement. There is a 17-foot wide "alternative vehicle corridor" that was included Clement Avenue dedication with Tract 7170. At the time, this corridor was being reserved for a potential light rail connection along the northern waterfront. Relocation of the cycle track to this excess right-of-way would impact the Waterfront Park, potentially remove mature trees, and require BCDC permitting and approval, with potentially significant construction costs.
- Maintain the Truck Route on Buena Vista. While this may appear to be the path of least resistance, this alternative would not be consistent with the General Plan or decades long promises to the community on Buena Vista. If the truck route remains on Buena Vista, a General Plan Amendment would need to occur recognizing the change. Even with this alternative, one-off trucks that mistakenly continue straight on Clement as the truck route may cause collisions along this stretch of roadway.

The alternatives considered by staff that would preserve on-street parking each involve significant tradeoffs. They would either require substantial public investment to relocate the cycle track, reduce the City's long-standing commitment to protected bicycle facilities along the Cross Alameda Trail, or require amendments to the General Plan to remove the designated truck route from this segment of Clement

Avenue.

We appreciate the alternatives suggested by the HOA, which include narrower vehicles, designated passing zones, or time of day restrictions are not feasible. However, the maximum standard vehicle width in the United States is set at the federal level at 8.5-feet, exclusive of mirrors. Local restrictions on vehicle width would not be enforceable, nor would time of day restrictions be appropriate for a designated truck route.

6. **Coordinate with USPS to confirm that mail delivery to the Marina Shores group mailbox on Clement Avenue can continue uninterrupted, and preserve a dedicated carrier loading zone adjacent to the mailbox in any final parking design.**

We appreciate the consideration of the USPS mailbox location. Staff will reach out to USPS and seek guidance about parking or whether the mailboxes will need to be relocated.

7. **Identify how families and caregivers will access the Clement Avenue park and playground if adjacent on-street parking is eliminated, including consideration of dedicated park visitor parking;**

See response to #3 and #11.

8. **Extend outreach, notice, and consideration of mitigation measures to all property owners directly fronting the affected segment of Clement Avenue between Ohlone and Paru Street, including those outside Marina Shores.**

Public notices were mailed to all residents within a 300-foot radius of the project study area which is bounded by Entrance Road to the west, Hibbard Road to the east, Clement Avenue to the north, and Buena Vista Avenue to the south.

9. **Meet directly with the Marina Shores Homeowners Association Board, in addition to the scheduled community and Transportation Commission meetings, to discuss impacts specific to our eleven affected homes**

I would be happy to meet with the Marina Shores Homeowners Association Board. Please let me know the meeting dates/times for the Board and we can coordinate a meeting time convenient for all.

In addition to the Requested Action section, I am providing responses to a few other points raised in your email:

10. **The Parking Elimination Should Be Evaluated Under the City's Adopted Complete Streets and General Plan Policies.**

The General Plan, Complete Streets Policy, and other supporting City Council Resolutions consistently identify on-street parking as the lowest priority when allocating right-of-way space. First consideration should be for people walking,

bicycling, and using transit, followed by vehicular needs and public safety (General Plan, Mobility Element Policy ME-6, Action g., Space Priorities). The General Plan designation of Clement Avenue as a truck route, followed by the subsequent discretionary action of City Council to adopt the Cross Alameda Trail alignment in 2005, Bike Master Plan in 2010, and Improvement Plans for Marina Shores, Phase II which constructed the two-way cycle track on Clement in 2014 has led us to this result where parking is proposed for elimination. While the three other alternatives evaluated (see response #5) could preserve parking on the south side of Clement, each alternative has significant drawback with compromises greater than the loss of 21 on-street parking stalls on Clement Avenue.

11. Eleven homes within our Association front directly onto this stretch of Clement Avenue, and their residents rely on that on-street parking for direct access to their front doors

All homes within the Marina Shores development have access to a two car garage. Of the 11 homes referenced, only 5 homes “front” on Clement Avenue with doorways facing Clement. These include 1552, 1556, 1558, 1560, and 1568 Clement Avenue. Visitors and guests for these 5 homes would need to park on the adjacent streets and walk to the front doors, which we acknowledge is an inconvenience. Front doors for the other six homes face either Balsa Street, Stanton Street, or Ohlone Street and visitors and guests are not inconvenienced by the lack of parking on Clement.

Public Works remains open to considering any additional feasible alternatives that can safely accommodate truck traffic while preserving on-street parking. If such an alternative exists, we welcome the opportunity to evaluate it.

Thank you again for your thoughtful comments. We look forward to continuing the discussion at the July 14 community meeting and the July 22 Transportation Commission meeting.

Scott Wikstrom, P.E.

City Engineer
City of Alameda
(510) 747-7937

From: Scott Wikstrom

Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2026 8:12 AM

To: 'Kenneth Levins' <klevins@gmail.com>

Cc: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Michele Pryor <mpryor@alamedaca.gov>; Greg Boller <gboller@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>; Erin Smith <ESmith@alamedaca.gov>; Gerry Beaudin <gbeaudin@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Hello Mr. Levins,

Thank you for the detailed comments and questions. I will prepare a written response over the next few days and prepare a reply in advance of the July 14th meeting. Please note a typo in my notification letter, the Transportation Commission meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 22 at 6:30pm in the Council Chambers. I will be sending an updated notification to the Marina Shores neighborhood with the corrected Transportation Commission date and will include my responses to the questions below in the updated notification.

Scott Wikstrom, P.E.

City Engineer

City of Alameda

(510) 747-7937

From: Kenneth Levins <klevins@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2026 6:39 AM

To: Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov>

Cc: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Michele Pryor <mpryor@alamedaca.gov>; Greg Boller <gboller@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Dear Mr. Wikstrom:

This letter is submitted on behalf of the Marina Shores Homeowners Association ("Marina Shores" or the "Association") in response to the City's June 18, 2026 notice regarding the proposed relocation of the Clement Avenue truck route and the associated elimination of approximately 21 on-street parking spaces between Balsa Court and Paru Street. The Association understands that the truck route designation itself reflects a long-standing component of the City's General Plan,

predating this notice, and we do not write to relitigate that designation here. Our objection is narrower and more specific: the elimination of on-street parking on Clement Avenue is a new and separate proposal, distinct from the truck route designation, and one the Association believes has not been adequately justified or analyzed. We note that the City's own notice describes the parking loss only in conditional terms, stating that relocating the truck route "would result in" the loss of parking, which suggests to the Association that the City itself has not treated this specific outcome as foreclosed. We urge the City to treat it accordingly and to give it independent, serious consideration.

Eleven homes within our Association front directly onto this stretch of Clement Avenue, and their residents rely on that on-street parking for direct access to their front doors. Additional homes located between Ohlone and Paru Street, outside of the Association's membership, front directly onto this same segment and will be similarly affected by the loss of on-street parking. The Association urges the City to treat this as a corridor-wide impact affecting all directly fronting households, not solely those within Marina Shores, and to ensure that outreach, notice, and any mitigation measures extend to every affected property owner along the segment, regardless of HOA membership.

1. The Proposed Parking Elimination Is Inconsistent With the City's Own Recent Investments on This Same Corridor

The City's stated rationale for removing parking, that Clement Avenue is too "tortuous" and narrow to safely accommodate truck traffic alongside parked cars, is difficult to reconcile with the City's own recent capital investments in this exact corridor. Within the last several years, and independent of the truck route question, the City has:

- Constructed a two-lane, physically protected bicycle lane along this stretch of Clement Avenue, which by design narrows the available roadway width;
- Built a public park and playground fronting Clement Avenue in the immediately affected area, an investment that presupposes a calmer, more pedestrian- and family-oriented street environment;
- Installed a protected and enhanced "bulb-out" crosswalk within the very segment where parking removal is now proposed, an improvement typically justified on the basis of reduced vehicle speeds and reduced roadway width, and which by design narrows the roadway.

Each of these prior decisions reflects an affirmative City determination that this segment of Clement Avenue should function as a low-speed, multimodal, residential street. The Association recognizes that the truck route designation itself is largely a settled matter of long standing City policy. But the parking elimination now proposed is a new, separate decision layered on top of that settled

designation, and it deserves independent scrutiny on its own terms. If the roadway is in fact too narrow to safely carry trucks and parked cars together, that narrowness is substantially the result of the City's own bicycle lane, park, and crosswalk construction. The City should not be permitted to invoke a condition it created to justify imposing the burden of that condition entirely on adjacent residents and park users, particularly where, as the City's own notice acknowledges, the parking loss is a consequence ("would result in") rather than a foregone necessity of the truck route decision itself.

2. The Parking Elimination Should Be Evaluated Under the City's Adopted Complete Streets and General Plan Policies

California's Complete Streets Act of 2008 (AB 1358, codified in relevant part at Government Code Section 65302(b)) requires that, upon substantive revision of a general plan circulation element, the City plan for a balanced, multimodal transportation network serving all users, not motor vehicles and goods movement alone. Consistent with this mandate, and with Metropolitan Transportation Commission Resolution No. 4035, the City of Alameda has adopted its own Complete Streets Policy and maintains a Transportation Element within its General Plan that commits the City to safe, multimodal streets for pedestrians, bicyclists, and residents, including specifically the City's Vision Zero Action Plan goal of eliminating severe and fatal pedestrian and bicycle collisions.

Removing all on-street parking on a narrowed residential segment that the City has only recently equipped with a protected bike lane, a park and playground serving children, and enhanced pedestrian crossings runs directly counter to these adopted policies, independent of whatever merit the truck route designation itself may have. Before proceeding with the parking removal specifically, the City should be required to demonstrate, through a written Complete Streets analysis or its equivalent, how eliminating parking on this segment is consistent with the Transportation Element, the Complete Streets Policy, and the Vision Zero Action Plan, particularly given the presence of a playground and protected crosswalks within the affected segment.

3. The Parking Study Appears Not to Have Considered Loss of Parking for the Adjacent Park and Playground

The Clement Avenue park and playground built within this same segment relies in substantial part on the on-street parking now proposed for elimination. The Association is not aware of any dedicated off-street parking lot serving this park, meaning the 21 spaces proposed for removal likely constitute most or all of the parking currently available to families and caregivers visiting the playground, including those bringing young children, strollers, or mobility devices who cannot reasonably walk a significant distance from parking located elsewhere in the neighborhood. The City's June 18, 2026 notice and referenced early-2026 parking study describe the impact solely in terms of residential and general neighborhood parking capacity; neither appears to separately address the loss of parking serving park and playground visitors, a public recreational amenity the City itself recently built. The Association requests that the parking study, and any supplemental

analysis, specifically evaluate (a) whether dedicated park visitor parking will be preserved or relocated, and (b) how families with young children and caregivers with limited mobility are expected to access the playground if adjacent on-street parking is eliminated.

4. The Parking Study and Engineering Basis for the Decision Should Be Disclosed and Independently Reviewed

The City's notice references a parking study "conducted in early 2026" that purportedly found sufficient parking capacity to absorb the loss of 21 spaces, and an engineering rationale concerning trailer offtracking and lane width. The Association requests that the City provide, in advance of the July 14, 2026 community meeting, the full parking study (including its methodology, the radius and time of day surveyed, and its treatment of overnight and resident parking demand), and the underlying traffic and geometric engineering analysis supporting the conclusion that Clement Avenue cannot safely accommodate both truck traffic and on-street parking. Residents are entitled to evaluate, and, where appropriate, to retain their own traffic engineer to evaluate, the technical basis for a decision that will permanently eliminate direct vehicle access to eleven homes.

The Association notes that a parking utilization study measuring area-wide "sufficient capacity" does not address the specific and substantial burden on residents who will lose the ability to park immediately in front of their own homes, including impacts on residents with mobility limitations, elderly residents, and families loading children, groceries, or equipment. A finding of adequate parking supply elsewhere in the neighborhood does not, without more, satisfy the City's obligation to consider the equity and access impacts on the specifically affected households.

5. Loss of Parking Will Interfere With U.S. Mail Delivery to the Group Mailbox

The Marina Shores cluster ("CBU") is located directly on Clement Avenue within the segment proposed for parking removal. The USPS carrier currently relies on the ability to park immediately adjacent to the mailbox in order to load and deliver mail to the cluster box unit. Eliminating on-street parking along this segment, without provision of a dedicated loading or carrier stop, will directly interfere with the ability of the Postal Service to deliver mail to every household served by that mailbox, a consequence with federal as well as local implications, since USPS access standards generally require a safe, legal place for the carrier to stop. The Association requests that the City specifically evaluate carrier and mail delivery access as part of any parking removal plan, including consultation with the local USPS station, and that any final design preserve a marked loading zone or equivalent carrier stop immediately adjacent to the mailbox location.

6. Equity and Notice Concerns

The Association is concerned that a decision with this degree of permanent, concentrated impact on a small group of identifiable households (eliminating direct vehicle access in front of eleven Marina Shores homes and additional homes

between Olohne and Paru Street, and removing parking serving a public park) is being advanced primarily through informational meetings rather than a noticed public hearing with formal findings specific to the parking removal itself. To the extent the removal of on-street parking requires action by the City Council, the Transportation Commission, or another decision-making body under the Alameda Municipal Code, the Association requests written confirmation of (a) which body holds final decision-making authority over the parking removal specifically, (b) what findings that body is required to make, and (c) what opportunity affected residents will have to formally contest the decision, including any administrative appeal process, before it is implemented.

The Association further requests that any final decision on parking removal be preceded by a site-specific traffic and circulation analysis evaluating whether a smaller-scale or partial parking removal, narrower truck design vehicles, traffic calming measures, designated loading/passing zones, or a reduced truck weight or time-of-day restriction on Clement Avenue could allow trucks to safely use the route while preserving direct resident and park visitor parking access.

7. Requested Action

The Marina Shores Homeowners Association respectfully requests that the City:

- Treat the elimination of on-street parking on Clement Avenue as a distinct decision from the truck route designation, requiring its own independent analysis and justification;
- Postpone any final decision on parking removal until the issues raised in this letter have been addressed in writing;
- Provide the full parking study and supporting traffic/geometric engineering analysis referenced in the City's June 18, 2026 notice, including specific analysis of parking demand generated by the adjacent park and playground;
- Identify the specific decision-making body and procedural and Municipal Code requirements (including any required public hearing, findings, or appeal rights) applicable to the parking removal;
- Evaluate and respond in writing to alternative approaches that would allow trucks to use the route while avoiding or reducing the loss of resident and park visitor parking, including narrower design vehicles, designated passing/loading zones, partial parking retention, or time-of-day restrictions;
- Coordinate with USPS to confirm that mail delivery to the Marina Shores group mailbox on Clement Avenue can continue uninterrupted, and preserve a dedicated carrier loading zone adjacent to the mailbox in any final parking design;
- Identify how families and caregivers will access the Clement Avenue park and

playground if adjacent on-street parking is eliminated, including consideration of dedicated park visitor parking;

- Extend outreach, notice, and consideration of mitigation measures to all property owners directly fronting the affected segment of Clement Avenue between Ohlone and Paru Street, including those outside Marina Shores; and
- Meet directly with the Marina Shores Homeowners Association Board, in addition to the scheduled community and Transportation Commission meetings, to discuss impacts specific to our eleven affected homes.

The Association and its affected residents intend to attend and provide comment at both the July 14, 2026 community meeting and the Transportation Commission meeting, and we reserve the right to supplement this letter with additional comments, including comments from a traffic engineer retained by the Association, as further information becomes available.

We appreciate the City's willingness to engage with the community on this issue and look forward to your prompt written response. Please direct any response or requested materials to the undersigned.

Sincerely,

Ken Levins

President

Marina Shores Homeowners Association

--

Kenneth Levins
1826 Balsa Street,
Alameda
CA 94501
(925) 980 8811
klevins@gmail.com

--

Kenneth Levins
1826 Balsa Street,

Alameda

CA 94501

(925) 980 8811

mailto:\\klevins@gmail.com

From: Kenneth Levins <klevins@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, July 13, 2026 10:20 AM

To: Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov>

Cc: Erin Smith <ESmith@alamedaca.gov>; CITYCOUNCIL-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>; Gerry Beaudin <gbeaudin@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Dear Mr. Wikstrom:

This letter supplements the Association's July 13 reply and addresses points in your written response that should be corrected or completed in the record before the Transportation Commission hearing on July 22. Please include it in the Commission's agenda packet.

1. The affected-household count is understated. Your response reduces the Association's eleven affected homes to five based on front-door orientation. Door orientation is not the measure of impact: the burden falls on every household that uses the affected curb - for visitors, caregivers, home health aides, service workers, deliveries, and loading. That includes all eleven Marina Shores homes and the non-Association households between Ohlone and Paru on the same curb. Garages do not serve any of those needs, as your response effectively concedes in acknowledging the "inconvenience" to guests. We ask that the staff report describe the affected population as all households using the curb, and analyze impacts - including on elderly and mobility-limited residents - from that baseline.

2. Policy ME-6, correctly applied, cuts against this proposal. The space-priority hierarchy staff cites ranks people walking, bicycling, and using transit first; truck through-movement is not at the top. This proposal serves a lower-priority goods-movement function while its side effects degrade the priority modes: with the curb cleared, postal and delivery vehicles will stand in the travel lane or against the bikeway, and heavy truck volumes will increase beside the Stanton Street crossing serving the park - whose visiting families, pedestrians, lose the parking that supports their access. The proposal takes space from one low-priority use to serve another, at the expense of the street's highest-priority users. We request a written ME-6 consistency analysis addressing these effects, not merely a citation to parking's rank.

3. The City is obligated to evaluate noise exposure before relocating the truck route. Government Code Section 65302(f) requires the General Plan noise element to analyze and quantify noise from major thoroughfares and truck routes, and the General Plan's own noise policies establish thresholds for increases in noise exposure affecting residences and other sensitive uses. Relocating the designated truck route onto a segment lined with homes and a public playground is precisely the change those provisions address, yet no noise study is referenced anywhere in the City's notice or your response. We request that the City complete and publish a noise exposure analysis - existing versus projected truck

volumes and resulting noise levels at the adjacent residences and park - before any final action, and that this analysis be incorporated into the CEQA determination requested in our July 13 letter.

4. Record accuracy. Your response states the two-way cycle track was constructed in 2014 with the Marina Shores Phase II improvements, but elsewhere that Class II bike lanes "existed until 2016." Because this history will support a permanent, unappealable decision, we ask that the timeline be corrected in the staff report.

The Association reiterates the requests in our earlier July 13 letter and looks forward to staff's written responses in advance of July 22.

Sincerely,

Ken Levins
President
Marina Shores Homeowners Association

On Mon, Jul 13, 2026 at 8:40 AM Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov> wrote:

Mr. Levins, and members of the Marina Shore Homeowners Association,

The decision to recommend removing 21 on-street parking spaces on Clement Avenue was not made lightly. We recognize that this change will affect nearby residents, and we appreciate the HOA taking the time to provide thoughtful comments.

As noted in Response #4 below, the Alameda Municipal Code authorizes the Public Works Director to prohibit parking when traffic engineering principles indicate it is necessary to support public safety and the safe operation of the transportation system. While the Code does not require public notification or provide an appeal process for this type of decision, Public Works chose to conduct an extensive outreach effort because of the community interest and the potential impacts. That outreach includes mailed notices, a community meeting, and a public hearing before the Transportation Commission prior to implementation. The purpose of the outreach is twofold: to explain the engineering analysis and policy considerations that led to this recommendation, and to hear from the community.

I've provided responses to the Requested Action portion of your email and a few additional notes. I look forward to continuing the discussion at the July 14 community meeting and the July 22 Transportation Commission meeting. As noted below, I'd also be happy to meet directly with the HOA.

1. Treat the elimination of on-street parking on Clement Avenue as a distinct decision from the truck route designation, requiring its own independent analysis and justification;

We believe we have treated the elimination of parking as separate issue, conducted an analysis and have justification for staff recommendation. Relocation of the truck route to Clement requires wider lanes than the existing 11.5 feet travel lanes. Large tractor-trailer trucks make wide turns. This is most obvious when these trucks make a 90 degree right turn at an intersection where the rear axle of the trailer can track several feet inboard of the front steering axle. An example truck turning template and overlay on Clement Avenue can be downloaded via the following link: [Clement Truck Route - Grand to Sherman](#) This offset tracking of a truck trailer also occurs when driving along curved roads such as the section of Clement between Entrance Road and Hibbard. The approximate 250-foot radius curves along Clement will require a minimum 14-foot lane to accommodate the trailer offset for a typical full-sized truck that regularly traverse Alameda. The existing road configuration cannot accommodate the wider lanes and the existing parking. Therefore, staff hired a consulting firm to perform an independent analysis of parking supply and demand. The results of that analysis show parking capacity on the side streets to accommodate the recommended loss of parking. More information is provided in responses #4 and #5 below.

2. Postpone any final decision on parking removal until the issues raised in this letter have been addressed in writing;

We are not intending to take action until after community engagement and the public hearing at the Transportation Commission. Please see response to #4 for more information.

3. Provide the full parking study and supporting traffic/geometric engineering analysis referenced in the City's June 18, 2026 notice, including specific analysis of parking demand generated by the adjacent park and playground;

The parking analysis can be downloaded via the following link: [Clement Truck Route - Grand to Sherman](#) The parking analysis did not complete a separate analysis of the parking demand generated by the adjacent park and playground. Because the park and playground already exist, parking demand is incorporated into the observed parking occupancy. There

is an existing small parking lot opposite of Ohlone Street that serves the park/playground and provides access to the Bay Trail and public shore which will be unaffected by the truck route. Staff also consulted with the Recreation and Parks Director about parking for the park. There are no known concerns about parking lot capacity and the parking analysis concludes capacity on the side streets. Additionally, the City recently installed a rapid flashing beacon at Stanton Street to assist pedestrians in crossing Clement Ave and access the park/playground in preparation for the truck route relocation. Current park visitors who didn't use the lot opposite of Ohlone Street are required to cross Clement to access the park. Elimination of parking on the south side of Clement and opposite of the park will not change the need for park visitors to cross Clement and the parking study confirms sufficient capacity on the adjacent streets.

4. Identify the specific decision-making body and procedural and Municipal Code requirements (including any required public hearing, findings, or appeal rights) applicable to the parking removal;

On-street parking in Alameda is regulated in Chapter VIII of the Alameda Municipal Code (AMC) and more specifically in Section 8-7, Parking Prohibitions. AMC Section 8-7.1, Parking – Prohibited at all times states, “The Public Works Director is hereby authorized, whenever traffic engineering studies or principles indicate for the safety or adequate flow of all modes of transportation, to establish streets or portions thereof where parking is prohibited at all times.” In the case of Clement Avenue the parking loss is necessary for truck traffic and would be a safety issue if not removed. Furthermore, AMC Section 8-1.2, Notice of Decisions, does not require public noticing or in Section AMC Section 8-1.3 provide for an appeal process for Public Works Director decisions made on the basis of adequate traffic flow and public safety. We recognize the impact of losing 21 on-street parking stalls and have elected to conduct public outreach in advance of completing the work. See also response #5.

5. Evaluate and respond in writing to alternative approaches that would allow trucks to use the route while avoiding or reducing the loss of resident and park visitor parking, including narrower design vehicles, designated passing/loading zones, partial parking retention, or time-of-day restrictions.

Staff evaluated alternatives related to truck route relocation, each of which had significant challenges. Staff recommends and is pursuing the removal of parking on Clement Avenue

between Balsa Street and Paru Street as the least impactful alternative in consideration of the City's General Plan, Active Transportation Plan, and City Policies promulgated by City Council resolutions. The three other alternatives are:

- Eliminate the two-way cycle track between Entrance Road and Grand Street and return to the Class II bike lanes that existed until 2016. In this alternative, the trailer offset for large trucks would be accommodated within the Class II lane. A potential safety issue exists when a bicycle is travelling in the same direction and same time as a large truck. Additionally, transitions between two-way cycle tracks and Class II bike lanes are challenging and bicycle rider compliance with the transition can be expected to be low, resulting in a potentially increased hazard for all roadway users.
- Relocate the two-way cycle track to the excess right-of-way north of Clement. There is a 17-foot wide "alternative vehicle corridor" that was included Clement Avenue dedication with Tract 7170. At the time, this corridor was being reserved for a potential light rail connection along the northern waterfront. Relocation of the cycle track to this excess right-of-way would impact the Waterfront Park, potentially remove mature trees, and require BCDC permitting and approval, with potentially significant construction costs.
- Maintain the Truck Route on Buena Vista. While this may appear to be the path of least resistance, this alternative would not be consistent with the General Plan or decades long promises to the community on Buena Vista. If the truck route remains on Buena Vista, a General Plan Amendment would need to occur recognizing the change. Even with this alternative, one-off trucks that mistakenly continue straight on Clement as the truck route may cause collisions along this stretch of roadway.

The alternatives considered by staff that would preserve on-street parking each involve significant tradeoffs. They would either require substantial public investment to relocate the cycle track, reduce the City's long-standing commitment to protected bicycle facilities along the Cross Alameda Trail, or require amendments to the General Plan to remove the designated truck route from this segment of Clement Avenue.

We appreciate the alternatives suggested by the HOA, which include narrower vehicles, designated passing zones, or time of day restrictions are not feasible. However, the maximum standard vehicle width in the United States is set at the federal level at 8.5-feet, exclusive of mirrors. Local restrictions on vehicle width would not be enforceable, nor would time of day restrictions be appropriate for a designated truck route.

6. Coordinate with USPS to confirm that mail delivery to the Marina Shores group mailbox on Clement Avenue can continue uninterrupted, and preserve a dedicated carrier loading zone adjacent to the mailbox in any final parking design.

We appreciate the consideration of the USPS mailbox location. Staff will reach out to USPS and seek guidance about parking or whether the mailboxes will need to be relocated.

7. Identify how families and caregivers will access the Clement Avenue park and playground if adjacent on-street parking is eliminated, including consideration of dedicated park visitor parking;

See response to #3 and #11.

8. Extend outreach, notice, and consideration of mitigation measures to all property owners directly fronting the affected segment of Clement Avenue between Ohlone and Paru Street, including those outside Marina Shores.

Public notices were mailed to all residents within a 300-foot radius of the project study area which is bounded by Entrance Road to the west, Hibbard Road to the east, Clement Avenue to the north, and Buena Vista Avenue to the south.

9. Meet directly with the Marina Shores Homeowners Association Board, in addition to the scheduled community and Transportation Commission meetings, to discuss impacts specific to our eleven affected homes

I would be happy to meet with the Marina Shores Homeowners Association Board. Please let me know the meeting dates/times for the Board and we can coordinate a meeting time convenient for all.

In addition to the Requested Action section, I am providing responses to a few other points raised in your email:

10. The Parking Elimination Should Be Evaluated Under the City's Adopted Complete Streets and General Plan Policies.

The General Plan, Complete Streets Policy, and other supporting City Council Resolutions consistently identify on-street parking as the lowest priority when allocating right-of-way space. First consideration should be for people walking, bicycling, and using transit, followed by vehicular needs and public safety (General Plan, Mobility Element Policy ME-6, Action g., Space Priorities). The General Plan designation of Clement Avenue as a truck route, followed by the subsequent discretionary action of City Council to adopt the Cross Alameda Trail alignment in 2005, Bike Master Plan in 2010, and Improvement Plans for Marina Shores, Phase II which constructed the two-way cycle track on Clement in 2014 has led us to this result where parking is proposed for elimination. While the three other alternatives evaluated (see response #5) could preserve parking on the south side of Clement, each alternative has significant drawback with compromises greater than the loss of 21 on-street parking stalls on Clement Avenue.

11. Eleven homes within our Association front directly onto this stretch of Clement Avenue, and their residents rely on that on-street parking for direct access to their front doors

All homes within the Marina Shores development have access to a two car garage. Of the 11 homes referenced, only 5 homes “front” on Clement Avenue with doorways facing Clement. These include 1552, 1556, 1558, 1560, and 1568 Clement Avenue. Visitors and guests for these 5 homes would need to park on the adjacent streets and walk to the front doors, which we acknowledge is an inconvenience. Front doors for the other six homes face either Balsa Street, Stanton Street, or Ohlone Street and visitors and guests are not inconvenienced by the lack of parking on Clement.

Public Works remains open to considering any additional feasible alternatives that can safely accommodate truck traffic while preserving on-street parking. If such an alternative exists, we welcome the opportunity to evaluate it.

Thank you again for your thoughtful comments. We look forward to continuing the discussion at the July 14 community meeting and the July 22 Transportation Commission meeting.

Scott Wikstrom, P.E.

City Engineer

City of Alameda

(510) 747-7937

From: Scott Wikstrom

Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2026 8:12 AM

To: 'Kenneth Levins' <klevins@gmail.com>

Cc: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Michele Pryor <mpryor@alamedaca.gov>; Greg Boller <gboller@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>; Erin Smith <ESmith@alamedaca.gov>; Gerry Beaudin <gbeaudin@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Hello Mr. Levins,

Thank you for the detailed comments and questions. I will prepare a written response over the next few days and prepare a reply in advance of the July 14th meeting. Please note a typo in my notification letter, the Transportation Commission meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 22 at 6:30pm in the Council Chambers. I will be sending an updated notification to the Marina Shores neighborhood with the corrected Transportation Commission date and will include my responses to the questions below in the updated notification.

Scott Wikstrom, P.E.

City Engineer

City of Alameda

(510) 747-7937

From: Kenneth Levins <klevins@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2026 6:39 AM

To: Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov>

Cc: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Michele Pryor <mpryor@alamedaca.gov>; Greg Boller <gboller@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Dear Mr. Wikstrom:

This letter is submitted on behalf of the Marina Shores Homeowners Association ("Marina Shores" or the "Association") in response to the City's June 18, 2026 notice regarding the proposed relocation of the Clement Avenue truck route and the associated elimination of approximately 21 on-street parking spaces between Balsa Court and Paru Street. The Association understands that the truck route designation itself reflects a long-standing component of the City's General Plan, predating this notice, and we do not write to relitigate that designation here. Our objection is narrower and more specific: the elimination of on-street parking on Clement Avenue is a new and separate proposal, distinct from the truck route designation, and one the Association believes has not been adequately justified or analyzed. We note that the City's own notice describes the parking loss only in conditional terms, stating that relocating the truck route "would result in" the loss of parking, which suggests to the Association that the City itself has not treated this specific outcome as foreclosed. We urge the City to treat it accordingly and to give it independent, serious consideration.

Eleven homes within our Association front directly onto this stretch of Clement Avenue, and their residents rely on that on-street parking for direct access to their front doors. Additional homes located between Ohlone and Paru Street, outside of the Association's membership, front directly onto this same segment and will be similarly affected by the loss of on-street parking. The Association urges the City to treat this as a corridor-wide impact affecting all directly fronting households, not solely those within Marina Shores, and to ensure that outreach, notice, and any mitigation measures extend to every affected property owner along the segment, regardless of HOA membership.

1. The Proposed Parking Elimination Is Inconsistent With the City's Own Recent Investments on This Same Corridor

The City's stated rationale for removing parking, that Clement Avenue is too "tortuous" and narrow to safely accommodate truck traffic alongside parked cars, is difficult to reconcile with the City's own recent capital investments in this exact corridor. Within the last several years, and independent of the truck route question, the City has:

- Constructed a two-lane, physically protected bicycle lane along this stretch of Clement Avenue, which by design narrows the available roadway width;
- Built a public park and playground fronting Clement Avenue in the immediately affected area, an investment that presupposes a calmer, more pedestrian- and family-oriented street environment;
- Installed a protected and enhanced "bulb-out" crosswalk within the very segment where parking removal is now proposed, an improvement typically justified on the

basis of reduced vehicle speeds and reduced roadway width, and which by design narrows the roadway.

Each of these prior decisions reflects an affirmative City determination that this segment of Clement Avenue should function as a low-speed, multimodal, residential street. The Association recognizes that the truck route designation itself is largely a settled matter of long standing City policy. But the parking elimination now proposed is a new, separate decision layered on top of that settled designation, and it deserves independent scrutiny on its own terms. If the roadway is in fact too narrow to safely carry trucks and parked cars together, that narrowness is substantially the result of the City's own bicycle lane, park, and crosswalk construction. The City should not be permitted to invoke a condition it created to justify imposing the burden of that condition entirely on adjacent residents and park users, particularly where, as the City's own notice acknowledges, the parking loss is a consequence ("would result in") rather than a foregone necessity of the truck route decision itself.

2. The Parking Elimination Should Be Evaluated Under the City's Adopted Complete Streets and General Plan Policies

California's Complete Streets Act of 2008 (AB 1358, codified in relevant part at Government Code Section 65302(b)) requires that, upon substantive revision of a general plan circulation element, the City plan for a balanced, multimodal transportation network serving all users, not motor vehicles and goods movement alone. Consistent with this mandate, and with Metropolitan Transportation Commission Resolution No. 4035, the City of Alameda has adopted its own Complete Streets Policy and maintains a Transportation Element within its General Plan that commits the City to safe, multimodal streets for pedestrians, bicyclists, and residents, including specifically the City's Vision Zero Action Plan goal of eliminating severe and fatal pedestrian and bicycle collisions.

Removing all on-street parking on a narrowed residential segment that the City has only recently equipped with a protected bike lane, a park and playground serving children, and enhanced pedestrian crossings runs directly counter to these adopted policies, independent of whatever merit the truck route designation itself may have. Before proceeding with the parking removal specifically, the City should be required to demonstrate, through a written Complete Streets analysis or its equivalent, how eliminating parking on this segment is consistent with the Transportation Element, the Complete Streets Policy, and the Vision Zero Action Plan, particularly given the presence of a playground and protected crosswalks within the affected segment.

3. The Parking Study Appears Not to Have Considered Loss of Parking for the Adjacent Park and Playground

The Clement Avenue park and playground built within this same segment relies in substantial part on the on-street parking now proposed for elimination. The Association is not aware of any dedicated off-street parking lot serving this park, meaning the 21 spaces proposed for removal likely constitute most or all of the parking currently

available to families and caregivers visiting the playground, including those bringing young children, strollers, or mobility devices who cannot reasonably walk a significant distance from parking located elsewhere in the neighborhood. The City's June 18, 2026 notice and referenced early-2026 parking study describe the impact solely in terms of residential and general neighborhood parking capacity; neither appears to separately address the loss of parking serving park and playground visitors, a public recreational amenity the City itself recently built. The Association requests that the parking study, and any supplemental analysis, specifically evaluate (a) whether dedicated park visitor parking will be preserved or relocated, and (b) how families with young children and caregivers with limited mobility are expected to access the playground if adjacent on-street parking is eliminated.

4. The Parking Study and Engineering Basis for the Decision Should Be Disclosed and Independently Reviewed

The City's notice references a parking study "conducted in early 2026" that purportedly found sufficient parking capacity to absorb the loss of 21 spaces, and an engineering rationale concerning trailer offtracking and lane width. The Association requests that the City provide, in advance of the July 14, 2026 community meeting, the full parking study (including its methodology, the radius and time of day surveyed, and its treatment of overnight and resident parking demand), and the underlying traffic and geometric engineering analysis supporting the conclusion that Clement Avenue cannot safely accommodate both truck traffic and on-street parking. Residents are entitled to evaluate, and, where appropriate, to retain their own traffic engineer to evaluate, the technical basis for a decision that will permanently eliminate direct vehicle access to eleven homes.

The Association notes that a parking utilization study measuring area-wide "sufficient capacity" does not address the specific and substantial burden on residents who will lose the ability to park immediately in front of their own homes, including impacts on residents with mobility limitations, elderly residents, and families loading children, groceries, or equipment. A finding of adequate parking supply elsewhere in the neighborhood does not, without more, satisfy the City's obligation to consider the equity and access impacts on the specifically affected households.

5. Loss of Parking Will Interfere With U.S. Mail Delivery to the Group Mailbox

The Marina Shores cluster ("CBU") is located directly on Clement Avenue within the segment proposed for parking removal. The USPS carrier currently relies on the ability to park immediately adjacent to the mailbox in order to load and deliver mail to the cluster box unit. Eliminating on-street parking along this segment, without provision of a dedicated loading or carrier stop, will directly interfere with the ability of the Postal Service to deliver mail to every household served by that mailbox, a consequence with federal as well as local implications, since USPS access standards generally require a safe, legal place for the carrier to stop. The Association requests that the City specifically evaluate carrier and mail delivery access as part of any parking removal

plan, including consultation with the local USPS station, and that any final design preserve a marked loading zone or equivalent carrier stop immediately adjacent to the mailbox location.

6. Equity and Notice Concerns

The Association is concerned that a decision with this degree of permanent, concentrated impact on a small group of identifiable households (eliminating direct vehicle access in front of eleven Marina Shores homes and additional homes between Olohne and Paru Street, and removing parking serving a public park) is being advanced primarily through informational meetings rather than a noticed public hearing with formal findings specific to the parking removal itself. To the extent the removal of on-street parking requires action by the City Council, the Transportation Commission, or another decision-making body under the Alameda Municipal Code, the Association requests written confirmation of (a) which body holds final decision-making authority over the parking removal specifically, (b) what findings that body is required to make, and (c) what opportunity affected residents will have to formally contest the decision, including any administrative appeal process, before it is implemented.

The Association further requests that any final decision on parking removal be preceded by a site-specific traffic and circulation analysis evaluating whether a smaller-scale or partial parking removal, narrower truck design vehicles, traffic calming measures, designated loading/passing zones, or a reduced truck weight or time-of-day restriction on Clement Avenue could allow trucks to safely use the route while preserving direct resident and park visitor parking access.

7. Requested Action

The Marina Shores Homeowners Association respectfully requests that the City:

- Treat the elimination of on-street parking on Clement Avenue as a distinct decision from the truck route designation, requiring its own independent analysis and justification;
- Postpone any final decision on parking removal until the issues raised in this letter have been addressed in writing;
- Provide the full parking study and supporting traffic/geometric engineering analysis referenced in the City's June 18, 2026 notice, including specific analysis of parking demand generated by the adjacent park and playground;
- Identify the specific decision-making body and procedural and Municipal Code requirements (including any required public hearing, findings, or appeal rights) applicable to the parking removal;
- Evaluate and respond in writing to alternative approaches that would allow trucks to use the route while avoiding or reducing the loss of resident and park visitor parking, including narrower design vehicles, designated passing/loading zones, partial parking retention, or time-of-day restrictions;

- Coordinate with USPS to confirm that mail delivery to the Marina Shores group mailbox on Clement Avenue can continue uninterrupted, and preserve a dedicated carrier loading zone adjacent to the mailbox in any final parking design;
- Identify how families and caregivers will access the Clement Avenue park and playground if adjacent on-street parking is eliminated, including consideration of dedicated park visitor parking;
- Extend outreach, notice, and consideration of mitigation measures to all property owners directly fronting the affected segment of Clement Avenue between Ohlone and Paru Street, including those outside Marina Shores; and
- Meet directly with the Marina Shores Homeowners Association Board, in addition to the scheduled community and Transportation Commission meetings, to discuss impacts specific to our eleven affected homes.

The Association and its affected residents intend to attend and provide comment at both the July 14, 2026 community meeting and the Transportation Commission meeting, and we reserve the right to supplement this letter with additional comments, including comments from a traffic engineer retained by the Association, as further information becomes available.

We appreciate the City's willingness to engage with the community on this issue and look forward to your prompt written response. Please direct any response or requested materials to the undersigned.

Sincerely,

Ken Levins

President

Marina Shores Homeowners Association

Kenneth Levins
1826 Balsa Street,
Alameda
CA 94501
(925) 980 8811
klevins@gmail.com

From: [Kenneth Levins](#)
To: [Scott Wikstrom](#)
Cc: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Michele Pryor](#); [Greg Boller](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Tracy Jensen](#); [Transportation Commission](#); [City Clerk](#); [Gerry Beaudin](#)
Subject: Re: FW: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2026 7:00:23 PM
Attachments: [20260409_DIXON Alameda Clement Avenue Truck Route Parking Utilization Study Memo_FINAL.pdf](#)

Hi Scott,

Thanks for sending this over; it is very helpful. A cursory review of the study reveals quite a few fundamental errors.

1. **Seasonality:** All data comes from late January and early February- the rainy, low-demand trough of the year. The study area borders a marina and waterfront where recreational parking demand peaks in the summer, and the spaces slated for removal are those most likely to serve visitors to the park, playground and marina. Because no seasonal adjustment was applied and no summer validation count was recommended, the "sufficient capacity" finding is built entirely on off-peak data.
2. **Uncommitted Restriping:** The study's conclusions depend on uncommitted restriping. Without the approximately 15 Buena Vista spaces, supply in the study area drops to 172 spaces. At the observed winter peak of roughly 147 vehicles, that already represents about 85% occupancy—the study's own failure threshold, before any summer uplift. The scenario without restriping was never modeled.
3. **Inadequate Sampling:** The study relies on only five days of data, one of which was contaminated by street sweeping yet still included in the averages. Furthermore, no counts were taken after 6 p.m., even though occupancy rose toward 6 p.m. on nearly every survey day. This means the true residential evening and overnight peaks fell outside the survey window. No Sunday or Friday evening data was collected.
4. **Coarse Length-of-Stay Method:** The use of three-hour snapshots with midpoint-estimated departures carries a ± 1.5 -hour margin of error, and truncated overnight parking likely undercounts long-stay residential storage.
5. **Averages Hide Local Strain:** Adjacent streets already average over 70% occupancy, with block faces occasionally exceeding 85%. Displaced vehicles will pool on these nearest blocks, but the projection unrealistically spreads demand evenly across the entire 187-space supply.
6. **Misuse of Private Driveways:** Comparing 109 driveways to approximately 74 parked vehicles says nothing about actual availability, as private driveways cannot absorb displaced public demand.
7. **Documentation Errors:** The report contains duplicate figure numbers (two "Figure 4"s; figures 5–9 are reused), citations to nonexistent figures (Figures 31–35), and misdirected figure references. Additionally, there is no analysis of how the truck route itself will affect remaining curb space.

Ultimately, the study's conclusions rest on winter data, an unbuilt mitigation, and an unrealistic even-spread displacement assumption. A summer recount, evening and Sunday

observations, and a no-restriping model are necessary before "sufficient capacity" can be credibly claimed.

Best,
Ken

--

Kenneth Levins
1826 Balsa Street,
Alameda
CA 94501
(925) 980 8811
mailto:\\klevins@gmail.com

From: Kenneth Levins <klevins@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, July 8, 2026 7:00 PM

To: Scott Wikstrom <swikstrom@alamedaca.gov>

Cc: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Michele Pryor <mpryor@alamedaca.gov>; Greg Boller <gboller@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Tracy Jensen <tjensen@alamedaca.gov>; Transportation Commission <tc@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>; Gerry Beaudin <gbeaudin@alamedaca.gov>

Subject: Re: FW: [EXTERNAL] Re: Formal Objection to Proposed Elimination of On-Street Parking on Clement Avenue Between Balsa Court and Paru Street

Hi Scott,

Thanks for sending this over; it is very helpful. A cursory review of the study reveals quite a few fundamental errors.

1. **Seasonality:** All data comes from late January and early February- the rainy, low-demand trough of the year. The study area borders a marina and waterfront where recreational parking demand peaks in the summer, and the spaces slated for removal are those most likely to serve visitors to the park, playground and marina. Because no seasonal adjustment was applied and no summer validation count was recommended, the "sufficient capacity" finding is built entirely on off-peak data.
2. **Uncommitted Restriping:** The study's conclusions depend on uncommitted restriping. Without the approximately 15 Buena Vista spaces, supply in the study area drops to 172 spaces. At the observed winter peak of roughly 147 vehicles, that already represents about 85% occupancy—the study's own failure threshold, before any summer uplift. The scenario without restriping was never modeled.
3. **Inadequate Sampling:** The study relies on only five days of data, one of which was contaminated by street sweeping yet still included in the averages. Furthermore, no counts were taken after 6 p.m., even though occupancy rose toward 6 p.m. on nearly every survey day. This means the true residential evening and overnight peaks fell outside the survey window. No Sunday or Friday evening data was collected.
4. **Coarse Length-of-Stay Method:** The use of three-hour snapshots with midpoint-estimated departures carries a ± 1.5 -hour margin of error, and truncated overnight parking likely undercounts long-stay residential storage.
5. **Averages Hide Local Strain:** Adjacent streets already average over 70% occupancy, with block faces occasionally exceeding 85%. Displaced vehicles will pool on these nearest blocks, but the projection unrealistically spreads demand evenly across the entire 187-space supply.
6. **Misuse of Private Driveways:** Comparing 109 driveways to approximately 74 parked

vehicles says nothing about actual availability, as private driveways cannot absorb displaced public demand.

7. Documentation Errors: The report contains duplicate figure numbers (two "Figure 4"s; figures 5–9 are reused), citations to nonexistent figures (Figures 31–35), and misdirected figure references. Additionally, there is no analysis of how the truck route itself will affect remaining curb space.

Ultimately, the study's conclusions rest on winter data, an unbuilt mitigation, and an unrealistic even-spread displacement assumption. A summer recount, evening and Sunday observations, and a no-restriping model are necessary before "sufficient capacity" can be credibly claimed.

Best,
Ken

--

Kenneth Levins
1826 Balsa Street,
Alameda
CA 94501
(925) 980 8811
[mailto:\\klevins@gmail.com](mailto:klevins@gmail.com)