

## MEMORANDUM

DATE September 4, 2015  
TO Gail Payne, Project Manager  
City of Alameda  
FROM Sarah Sutton, Principal  
SUBJECT Summary of Community Comments

This memorandum consolidates the community comments received thus far for the Central Avenue Complete Street Concept Proposal, addressing potential multimodal improvements along this prominent corridor in the City of Alameda. Funded in part by a Caltrans' Community-based Transportation Planning grant, the planning process includes a significant community-engagement component.

Throughout the planning process, which began in March 2015 and will continue until February 2016, there have been multiple open channels for the community to convey their thoughts and opinions about the project, not only at the two community workshops thus far, but also through an online open forum. The open forum is an online engagement tool that enables community members to post comments, questions, and concerns that can be viewed publically. It is located at: <http://alamedaca.gov/public-works/open-forum>, and there are currently three topic areas: Revised Goals, Bikeway Options, and Goals (closed topic). Launched in early 2015, the open forum has received 246 posts to date. In addition to posting comments online, stakeholders have sent emails and letters directly to the City regarding this project.

The public input process began with a community workshop on April 14, 2015 at Encinal High School, and approximately 75 people were in attendance. The purpose of the workshop was to introduce the project, solicit input on the preliminary list of goals, and present the existing conditions of the corridor. Community members worked together in small groups to discuss and prioritize the goals, and identify specific needs and opportunities along Central Avenue. At the end of the workshop, comment cards were collected and the online open forum was advertised.

Based on the input received at the first workshop, as well as input posted online, the project team refined the list of goals. The revised goals, as listed below, provide a framework for decision-making and discussion throughout the planning process.



Community Meeting #1



Community Meeting #2

1. Safety
2. Encourage bicycling and walking
3. Traffic calming
4. Minimize disruption to motorists
5. Improve the streetscape
6. Encourage transit use
7. Improve public access to the SF Bay
8. Revitalize West Alameda
9. Improve truck access

After the first community meeting, the consultant team also conducted additional traffic analysis and developed a series of design options for the roadway. A preferred design was designated for each segment of the corridor, based on the right-of-way and adjacent land uses. The four segments, west to east, are as follows:

- Corridor Segment 1: Pacific/Main to Boat Ramp Road/Encinal High School (EHS)
- Corridor Segment 2: Boat Ramp Road/EHS to Third/Taylor
- Corridor Segment 3: Third/Taylor to Fourth/Ballena
- Corridor Segment 4: Fourth/Ballena to Sherman/Encinal

All design options, as well as the preferred design, were presented to the public at a second community workshop on June 4, 2015. This workshop was also held at Encinal High School and 80 community members were in attendance. Following a presentation by the City and consultant team on the traffic analysis and design options, the community members worked in small groups to further discuss the project goals and to provide input on the design for each of the four corridor segments.

Following the second community meeting, the project team consolidated all public input received to date, including comments provided at the community workshops, posted online, or mailed directly to the City. The consolidated list presents the comments verbatim to how they were submitted, and is organized by source and by the community-identified project goals. The list is attached as Appendix A, and the letters sent to the City via postage are attached as Appendix B.

Based on all the community feedback, the City and the consultant team are currently in the process of refining the preferred option, which will be presented and vetted by the public at a third community workshop scheduled for September 17, 2015.

APPENDIX A

**CONSOLIDATED LIST OF  
COMMUNITY COMMENTS**

JULY 2015





**Community Comments on the  
*Central Avenue Complete Street Concept Proposal*  
(as of July 31, 2015)**

## GENERAL STATEMENTS

- I'm so happy to live in a town that looks to make positive improvements. Thank you!
- Our household will follow this project intently. Thank you!
- I do not see the problem with Central Avenue. Why fix what isn't broken?
- I look forward to hearing more information about this project.
- I am a resident of Taylor Avenue and am affected by traffic on Central Avenue. I often have problems driving, bicycling and walking on the segment designated for redesign.
- Remember that there is over 400 years of experience with traffic, especially in Europe, so do some study.
- Although earlier "city plans" were open to the citizens, most citizens did not know such earlier decisions would be binding upon them forever. In other words, previous "plans" should not be considered "set in stone" as unanimously approved.
- I appreciate the work and thought that has gone into this project. I hope it moves forward. Thank you.
- Prevent traffic increase by having a moratorium on all residential construction in Alameda until the drought is declared over.
- Traffic is already horrible to the tube with all the new residential and businesses we're acquiring – the City is overlooking these issues and trying to accomplish good things with poor decision making for our future.
- With the number of new construction underway and planned for Alameda Point, the real looming "monster" facing safety and traffic calming will not be on the West End streets. It will be with how this City deals with ingress and egress to our Island.
- Consider that the Cross Alameda Trail can be the solution and no bike lanes are needed on Central.
- Other streets are more appropriate. Development of Alameda Point is not being considered. Picked the wrong street.
- Why doesn't this scope stop at 8th street, where the Washington Park/Shoreline bike lanes meet up with Central?
- Consider another location other than Central.
- Central Ave will not work. Please consider Lincoln Ave or another street.
- I don't think Central Ave is the best choice. Why not Lincoln which is a much wider street that wouldn't be impacted as much.

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

- Move bike lanes to Lincoln – much safer!! Much less traffic, much broader. Visibility on Central to turn onto it is AWFUL.
- Far too many cars in Alameda!!!
- There are co-benefits of this project such as reduction of greenhouse gas emission & reduction in obesity.
- AC Transit drivers must stay in their lanes!
- Don't take Central Ave. Use the side streets.
- Stop this project now. It will cause congestion and accidents.
- Wait to see how Shoreline really works before implementing something similar.
- Not a valid approach to improving Central or West End.
- Lincoln could accommodate bikes.
- Are there other streets where bike facilities could be accommodated?
- 'I Drive Alameda' is requesting that this project be shelved until:
  - The City has a proper understanding of traffic impacts of road diets on our specific, unique network. This could be achieved through the analysis of the Shoreline project, which was a pilot project for that very reason. The Central Avenue and Clement Avenue projects are being rushed for specific interests, to avoid possible push back, without proper comprehension. These projects will have significant impacts on our network and should not be hurried.
  - The proper staff, resources, and attention can be given to this type of high level project. To our knowledge, there is no City traffic engineer reviewing these plans. You must have experienced staff checking the work of a consultant. It's basic quality control. Otherwise, they will just tell you what you want to hear, which is exactly what's happening - "a staff bicycle advocate is advancing a bike/ped project, masked as a complete streets project, and the consultant is saying that the impacts to motorists are not a big deal." The analysis must be done by a properly trained, unbiased professional.
- City planners view community meetings as a necessary evil, at least in this case, but as advocates themselves they really already plan on going ahead.
- The planners are not really interested in hearing the community, so "time constraints" are invoked to avoid hearing the opposition more than minimally.
- Charts and Powerpoint slides suit the intended outcome with a sales pitch, avoiding the issues residents and drivers experience everyday on Central.
- The concept serves a very small but vocal group, the bicycle lobby, it gets its impetus from the grant of funds that must be spent or lost to the city, it can get warped to the fit the oft quoted "best practices" from the U.S. Department of Transportation.
- It does not adequately address issues that are apparent to the residents of the area and the police force (if they are permitted to speak on the issues).

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

Comment Card Workshop 6/4

Comment Card Table Talk 6/4

Targeted Design Comments 6/4

Letter Comments – Drive Alameda

Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers

Email Comments – General

- It uses euphemisms, like “traffic calming” to avoid using terms residents or drivers would use, like “traffic choke point”.
- It does not consider adequately the issues experienced by drivers entering Central from Fifth, McKay or Crown Drive.
- It does not adequately consider the impact of the development of Alameda Point;
- It does not consider at all the use of lanes for deliveries or for moving vans at the many apartment buildings on Central.
- It inadequately considers the three schools on Central and the impact of dropping off and picking up children.
- Why wouldn't the city put the bicycle path on that street instead of the more heavily traveled Central Avenue?
- I think the best answer to Alameda's need for more car and bike traffic lanes is to keep Central Avenue's four lanes but turn two other streets (Lincoln and Santa Clara?) into one-way traffic for bikes and cars. There are a number of other streets that should now become one-way as well. Alameda needs a TOTAL reconfiguration of ALL its traffic lanes, and one-way streets are the best answer to alleviate the city's present and future traffic problems.
- That was an excellent presentation last night. Sorry that some attending felt the need to dominate the discussion. Next time, you may want to consider having a moderator who is not a presenter. It is difficult to be in both roles at the same time.
- Instead of a median turn lane, have two lanes going east and one lane going west.
- Where did these preferred options come from? We attended the first meeting at Encinal High, but we were unable to attend the second meeting. Now you are asking to respond to options that we did not show any support for (except the signal at 3rd St. and Central). What's up with this process? It appears the planners are pushing a certain agenda here (bike lanes like on Shoreline).
- I attended the Central Avenue meeting on 14 May and left with the conclusion that the chief obstacle to pedestrian safety on Central Avenue, as elsewhere in Alameda, is **lack of traffic control**. Now, five weeks later, I have gone over it all again and my opinion is still the same. In the course of living for a long time in various parts of Britain, Canada and the US I have seen a fair sampling of heavy and light traffic on which to base an opinion. I have also seen in the early 1960s how well heavy traffic used to behave in Los Angeles - in striking contrast to the Boston area - when it was rigorously policed. Then we moved to the Bay area in 1967 and again found a marked change - lax policing and consequently careless driving. The two factors go together consistently, so if you really want to do something for pedestrians or cyclists you need to start with the main problem. Since I retired I have been experimenting in Alameda with observing the 25 mph speed limit and all traffic signs. The result is that I find driving far more relaxing while the time from A to B does not change appreciably. For the aggressive tailgaters I simply try to get out of their way and hope

#### Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

they get a ticket or two. And in view of this unreasonable municipal practice of tacking on huge extra charges, which I believe is really unequal taxation, I find that observing the rules as well as I can is easier on the wallet. I have concluded that aggressive drivers are also assertive by nature, so the real need is instilling good manners in the young, but that is perhaps a story for another day. With best wishes for finding a way to improve traffic, and with it our safety, in Alameda.

- Just this morning, Sunday, June 28 at about 4am someone ran over two traffic lights at the corner of Pacific & Central, speeding (I assume) from Main Street onto Central Ave. I live at 111 Central and the disabled car was located right in front of my house.
- What a mess! This is not the first time since I lived there that a traffic light was run over by a car late at night. I'm also very disturbed & annoyed by how fast people drive on the section of Central Ave. from before Encinal High School back and forth to the Ferry Terminal. It's awful and they "fly" through the traffic light at Pacific & Central frequently disobeying the red light.
- Also, my friend suggested that perhaps the easiest thing would be to have Public Works close the two center lanes (left turns allowed) for one day. This would provide an actual dry run of the project and would give the Transportation Commission some actual evidence of what this project's effect on traffic would be.
- Instead of a median turn lane, have two lanes going east and one lane going west.
- To encourage drivers to share the road with all of the other travelers along the way:
  - one lane each way for cars
  - one lane each way for bicycles
  - one sidewalk on each side for pedestrians

### *Costs*

- As part of that, the costs of doing this, the construction time (e.g., how would this work with the school calendar) should be part of the conversation throughout, not just at the end. Spending months working on a dream scenario that won't work in reality would be the wrong approach.
- It is a **VERY LOW PRIORITY** project compared to spending on schools. And the yearly maintenance will increase taxes or parking meter fees.

### *Outreach*

- Need to include more business orientation. Inform West Alameda Business Association of hits to parking and truck route access.
- Although the meeting was well attended, it looked to me like the majority of people there were not from the neighborhood. More and better outreach would be helpful.
- We had nine people at our table and only 20 minutes to introduce ourselves and begin to talk about all the complex issues involved. That was nowhere near adequate time. If the report outs (which someone was summarizing on a paper) are later going

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

to be used as evidence of what the neighborhood thinks about this. That will not be valid. Summaries of nine person 20 minute conversations did not even capture all the points raised at our table in that short amount of time, let alone reflect the range of issues and concerns involved. Also, I don't think a single report out was given by someone from the neighborhood, though perhaps one or two were.

- Finally, I would hope that you are inclusive in your workshops and input sessions. I suggest scheduling meetings at locales such as the Mastick Senior Center for senior input on crossing streets, at Encinal High and Paden School parents' and students' meetings (for those that drive, walk, or bike to school). Also have a comments booth at the Fireside/Westside Cafe/Jolie or best at the Farmers Market to get opinion from those who use the Webster shopping area.
- I look forward to seeing more details about the potential design options; please post them online, since it's difficult for many of us to attend public hearings and meetings.
- This was a lot of detail to take in, especially in a venue that is opened to debate so quickly

## PROJECT GOALS

### GOAL 1: IMPROVE SAFETY

#### *General Comments*

- Speak up for Safe Streets in Alameda petition:  
<http://www.thepetitionsite.com/185/431/429/speak-up-for-safe-streets-in-alameda/>
- GJEL Accident Attorneys web page article: "I Drive Alameda" advocates for unsafe status quo on Central Avenue: <http://www.gjel.com/blog/i-drive-alameda-advocates-for-unsafe-status-quo-on-central-avenue.html>
- Safety for all the goals run through each of them.
- Safety is the #1 concern!
- I am excited about this proposal. As more drivers are distracted with mobile devices, this plan (with proper bike training) will protect our children.
- Safety – especially for children commuting to West End Schools.
- Safety for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers.
- Other goal to be added should be to reduce the potential pedestrian and cycling injuries by segregating bicyclists and pedestrians.
- Safety is needed for bicyclists and avoidance of irritation towards drivers.
- Provide safer access to Central for times when people choose to walk and bicycle. Central Avenue is one of the few true cross-island streets, safe bicycle infrastructure is a must.
- I coach the cross country and track teams at Encinal High School. In the past eight years, three of my team members have been hit and injured by cars while riding their bikes, and some parents won't allow their students to bike this corridor because of

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

safety concerns. Nevertheless, many Encinal students continue to bike to school, as witnessed by the crowded bike parking lots daily at the school.

- There is an issue with visibility of drainage grates.
- Want safe bike access along the corridor.
- Safe routes for kids to school is important.
- We all agree that safety is paramount for those sharing our streets which leads to the need for traffic calming at certain problematic locations. The speed limit throughout our major streets is 25 mph, not 30 mph and not 35 mph. During the school week, a City traffic guard is posted at the crosswalk of Fifth Street and Central Avenue to direct safe crossing for pedestrians. The intersection is further traffic calmed by Stop Signs. Obeying traffic signs is Law. Yet, bicyclists seemed to believe they are exempt from traffic signs. Here is a clear example--there is a traffic sign in front of the Bookstore next to the crosswalk informing bicyclists to walk their bikes. This Sign is IGNORED 99 percent of the time. The concern for safety for the residents three doors east from Wilmot Bookstore; Harbor Bay Residence for Assisted Living is lost. The safety for residents coming out of my building and the large multi-plex building next door is lost. If motorists and pedestrians must respect the law for the mechanics of safety and traffic calming to work seamlessly, it makes just as much sense for bicyclists do the same. The act does not require further traffic calming, and does not require further enhancing of pedestrian access. It does not even require installing a bikeway. It only demands our respect to observe what is already in place.
- Accidents in front of my House Catherine & St Charles: Central Ave. Speeding Car passing right other car lane changes Right, speeding passing car crashes into parked cars. Speeding Car same scenario opposite side of street car crashes into parked vehicles. Truck in right Lane strikes tree trunk ripping trailer, tree trunk falls, effectively blocking 3 lanes of moving traffic. Nearby: Illegal U Turn with Four lanes of 2 way traffic wipes out vehicle passing on left Lane. Passing: vehicle stops for pedestrian on crosswalk another car switches lane to pass and wipes out pedestrian unto the windshield - with many near misses. Speeding, Speeding from Sherman to the next traffic light on 8th Street & Vice Versa - cyclists are already making the connection on Central to the established bicycle lanes, without the protective Lane on the proposed plan, they are in grave danger, please help to save that Life that will be Lost - Establish Your Planned Proposal - Thank You for the Forum.
- Thank you for soliciting input. Our kids go to school three miles from our house. Making this corridor safe for biking would allow them to bike to school! Other priorities, in addition to making this safe for young cyclists, would be to install "dark sky" lighting. This benefits birds and peoples' safety and begins to take back our access to the night sky.

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

- Please ensure we have the safe bike path. Having biked across the island with my children I've seen way too many close calls with vehicles.
- Replace street lights with less light polluting, more down-focused options. We don't have any lights on our street, yet the ones from blocks away light up our home every night.
- #1 goal is to have safe routes to schools. Safe biking – fence cars dropping off students. Really appreciate the many opportunities for public input – thank you. Let's get some “3 feet it's the law” signs in Alameda! Need safer crossing of Central at 9<sup>th</sup> St. Fewer lanes, clear crosswalks pedestrian signs, flashing lights would help. Most critical areas for project – 5<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup>.
- Broadway has zero use by use, because the design does not encouraging safe use
- I don't want trees in sections 1 & 2 b/c it'd reduce visibility near the schools.
- Concerned about folks who want to bike fast to the ferry (bike lane on north side) may also want to bike quickly home.
- Make sure intersections are designed safely for all users, particularly when differing bikeway treatments meet.
- 5 of 6 people agree with idea of making safety and traffic calming as priorities.
- Prioritize safety, making schools accessible, serving people on bikes and people in cars.
- Make sure RRFBs also flash in direction of people walking so that they know it is time to cross.
- I live near that area and traffic often backs up on Webster turning east on Central. Even with two lanes on Webster going into two lanes on Central, traffic often backs up to Taylor blocking the intersection and crosswalks. This creates unsafe conditions, especially for pedestrians.
- Is the intersection of Central and Sixth planned to have a pedestrian beacon? If not, I would encourage that it be included.
- Just a note to mention that the 6th & Central intersection is difficult not only for pedestrians in the crosswalk at Central, but also for drivers on 6th Street making left turn onto Central. In addition, I am concerned about the high speed of cars making right turns from Central onto 6th Street. Pedestrians crossing 6th Street heading west, need to watch their backs as they cross. Crossing the street from a parked car to get to St Barnabas school (or vice versa) can also be quite scary. There is poor visibility for both driver and pedestrian, and drivers need to slow down to make the right turn.

### *Red Zones at Intersections and Driveways*

- Have red zones at intersections so cars do not have to “creep out” to see traffic.
- Ensure visibility for driveway egress.
- Lines of sight – red zones of no parking at corners.

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

- Visual clearance enhancements at all intersections will increase pedestrian safety through better driver recognition.
- Need site lines – RV height restrictions.
- Need to address driver visibility at existing driveways such as with red zones at cutouts to prevent parking too close.
- My wife and I are quite concerned about the number of driveways and business access drives (Mountain Mikes, Foster Freeze, O'Reilly's, and Macdonalds) along with the shopping center (currently dead but being resuscitated with Paganos rising.) These make it difficult to drive when the cars entering the roadway continually poke their cars out into the drive path (as on South Shore Drive after the recent changes).
- There are a lot of driveways on Central Avenue, which are extremely narrow--not your standard size driveways. It is very dangerous under ordinary circumstances to back out of driveways as visibility is low with parked cars on either side of driveway blocking vision. This makes it a safety problem for me, for bicyclists, pedestrians and other cars. I read that there is some kind of a manual somewhere on putting in bike paths and it is not recommended where there are too many driveways.
- *Concerned about intersections –Webster & 8<sup>th</sup>. Can we see current options to comment on?*
- *Concern about getting in and out of Encinal HS.*

## **GOAL 2: ENCOURAGE BICYCLING AND WALKING**

### *Encouraging Bicycling: Class II Bike Lanes*

- A bike lane may make sense as long as the lane went on the outside of the existing street parking.
- Want Class II bike lanes all the way to the ferry.
- Provide Class 2 bike lanes.
- Keep what works. Copy Broadway and Santa Clara Avenue and do it on Central Avenue like is done to Grand Street and Park Street. I prefer a Class 2 bikeway.
- Continue Class II bike lanes on Central Avenue from Park Street to Sherman Street all the way to the ferry dock and road diets.
- One bike lane each way is preferred to keep parking in every neighborhood on Central Avenue. Contact west end business district. Paganos needs street parking.
- Two concepts: 2 traffic lanes, 2 bike lanes with buffer or have parking protected bike lanes.
- I would highly encourage the green bike paths running along in the direction of traffic. Class II. It will encourage bicyclists to stay on their path and be obvious to the engineers when the paths are not connected if the path is green. The green area provides a safety zone.

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

- Bike lanes along Central would be great. We need to continue to find ways to make biking in our town safer. Dedicated bike lanes on each side of the street, adjacent to the sidewalks would provide a safe route to the schools along Central.
- As a cyclist myself, I do not have an issue with adding bike lanes, but they should be the standard, painted lanes on both sides of the street, not these 'curbed monstrosities' that have been installed on Shoreline Dr. These curbed lanes do not enforce the idea of 'share the road' which should be instilled in cyclists and drivers alike.
- I live on Central and am also a cyclist. I'm absolutely not in favor of creating a cycle track similar to Shoreline. I don't think there is sufficient bike traffic to warrant a protected lane of that sort. That said, I'm all in favor of well striped bike lanes. I ride down Central frequently and rarely feel so unsafe that I would want an ugly parked car as my protective barrier.
- Please consider removing street parking on both sides of Central, and with this a cross-section for two lanes in each direction. Center median left-turn lane and bike lanes in both directions, can be accommodated.
- Road diet w/ class II is a reasonable compromise.
- Like option C – class II bike lanes improve safety at 6th & Central for pedestrians.
- Approve of plan for conventional class II on east end of Central.

### *Encouraging Bicycling: Cycle Track*

- Want before/after traffic count and speed data on the Fernside and Shore Line cycle tracks.
- If cycle track, do it like on Fernside Blvd. where there also are Class 2 bike lanes. Too many driveways for a cycle track.
- Prefer bike lanes and not a cycle track. Okay to pull back curb into Washington Park to make the Eighth Street/Central Avenue intersection work better.
- No two-way cycle track. Prefer buffered bike lane. Broadway and Santa Clara Avenue work well as bike lanes.
- Do not put a two-way cycle track. Use what works – Central Avenue bike lanes from Park Street to Sherman Street.
- Cycle track is the only way to go with getting more people riding bikes, less car traffic, less parking problems. Kids need a safe way all the way on the trail.
- I am opposed to cycle tracks on Central Avenue – they work on Fernside Blvd, not so well on Shore Line Drive.
- Cycle track down the middle protected by curbs. Not sure how entry/exit would work. Left turns across the cycle track could be problematic.
- Concerned with driveway access (e.g., if there were to be a cycle track built since, unlike Shoreline where there was no housing on the Bay side of the street, all along

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

Central there are many driveways on both sides of the street so any cycle track (as opposed to a bike lane) would be interacting with many driveways).

- I consider Shoreline Dr to be a model for what this city and its residents can create -- safe, welcoming, and professional. While, as an adult, am comfortable riding with traffic, for smaller children, this can be intimidating and I believe dedicated bike lanes, especially for kids going to school, is needed for safety.
- This all feels on the right track towards a road diet. Interested in cycle track & protected options for [Eighth to Sherman/Encinal].
- Class 2 bike lanes are not enough for safety. Encouraging other transportation reviews car traffic. Only cycle truck or buffered lanes accomplish safety goal.
- Consider bike lane in one direction on Central and bike lane in other direction on a parallel street—but doesn't seem logical given width of nearby parallel streets.

### *Encourage Bicycling: Protected/Buffered Bikeways*

- Have buffered bike lanes – buffered on both sides.
- Buffered bike lanes are essential to getting more folks young and old on the road. More bikes equals less cars.
- Interested in where the bike lane would be located and how it would interact with parking. A bike lane next to the sidewalk would be better.
- Need to complete bikeways – protected.
- Separated bikeway as long as chokepoints are mitigated.
- I would only bike if there was a path.
- I support looking at two lanes with a protected bike lane that is separate from pedestrian walkway.
- Protected bike lanes on each side – good for driveway visibility.
- I think parking buffered bike lanes would be ideal along Central, especially west of 8th.
- Extending the Central Avenue bike lane is a great idea, and having it be protected is all the better. Alameda could be such a pleasant place to bike through if it just had more bicycle facilities. So glad the City is making positive changes.
- I would like to see a protected bike path, similar to the one on Shoreline, all along Central Avenue to at least Broadway. The current bike path is not very safe for bikes particularly where central crosses Park Street.
- Physically protected bike lanes are absolutely necessary to enable more Alameda families to get around by bike safely and conveniently. New bike lanes may need to be wider than Shoreline's bikeway to be comfortable for everyone to use. No one should have to walk or bike in fear on Central or any Alameda street.
- I really hope we can include protected bike lanes in this project. As a parent, I feel so much more comfortable having my child ride his bike when there is a buffer between cars and bikes. Thank you!

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

- Make the Central bike lane consistent with the existing lane from Sherman towards Park St. I prefer a buffered bike lane as far as you can take it towards Encinal High.
- I think a lot of the angst in Crown Harbor is about the protected bicycle lane option that would move the row of parked cars about a half lane further from the curb than where the cars are parked now. Moving the parked cars more towards the center of the avenue would restrict visibility coming out of Crown Harbor even more than it is now. It's hard to make a left when exiting Crown Harbor because drivers can't see the oncoming traffic. The option of having the cyclists share the lane with the parked cars would have less impact on Crown Harbor.

### *Encourage Bicycling: General Central Avenue*

- I'd like to feel comfortable sending my kids biking along this primary corridor.
- I hope we can restrict portions of Central to two lanes, or reduce street parking, and use the extra space for dedicated green bicycle lanes. Not only will this help me ride to Webster Street or Park Street (increasing business in those areas), it also will increase our property value.
- It would be so wonderful to be able to stay on Central Avenue when biking with my two small children from our central Alameda house to Webster Street shops or out to Bladium. Right now, we have to switch over to Santa Clara Avenue at Sherman Street, and Santa Clara Avenue is scary for biking with kids - faster traffic and multiple bus lines.
- I bike from the Main St ferry terminal every day along with dozens of other bikers in high commute hours - we need safer options to get across the island, especially on Main Street and west of Webster Street!
- **Bay Trail/Crown Drive:** Bike access is difficult; storefronts also exist.
- **McKay Avenue:** The major issue for bike safety is crossing Central Ave after getting out of Crab Cove (McKay Ave); there's no crosswalk, 4 lanes of fast traffic, and the sidewalk to the next crosswalk (Sixth Street) is very narrow. Cars rarely stop at that crosswalk. When driving, lanes are often blocked by left-turners into Paden school (going west), or left turners into Webster (going east) - so 2 lanes plus turn-lanes should not reduce the car capacity significantly.
- **Ninth Street:** Bicycle improvements need to have a solution for coming from San Antonio Avenue to Ninth Street to Central Avenue (toward Eighth Street).
- **Paden:** Paden has opening ceremony every morning and parents drive into the back driveway – something to consider.
- **Paden/Encinal High School:** How to handle area at Paden School and Encinal High School with the loading activity. Want a school loading zone study. Look to Lincoln Middle School as an example.
- **Paden/Encinal High School:** Concerned about schools (especially with the traffic/drop off constraints at Paden and Encinal); also, the idea of impacting the new-

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

ish electronic bulletin board on the lawn in front of Encinal or the lawn area with the Jet via the City trying to claim/re-claim some of that property is very problematic).

- **Sherman Street/Encinal Avenue:** Continuity of the Central Avenue bike lane from Sherman Street/Encinal Avenue – some configuration is OK all the way down the street.
- **Third Street and McKay Street:** Top priority – bike lane between Encinal High School and Foster Freeze.
- **Webster Street:** Connecting bikes to Webster Street business district is key.
- Extend bikeway to ferry terminal.
- Concerned with how bikeway could possibly work on Central Avenue with all the houses/driveways, trucks and school traffic.
- Need bike sharing stations that are usable on the bike path to encourage bike riding.
- Is there options on what side of the street the bike lanes can be on? Will it matter which side of the street they are on?
- Bike path is the future. Please include.
- As a West End home owning family of cyclists with a child entering Paden in the fall and other family living on Central near Webster, the cycling situation on Central is a constant frustration. The move of ACLC to our end of town, which we welcome, has increased the urgency of the issue, as the students riding to and from school don't have a safe way to cross Central Avenue at Third Street or Fourth Street and continue east. Please give us a bike track, and move a step closer to bringing Alameda into the 21st century.
- I fully support creating a protected bikeway that would go from Shoreline to Alameda Point. It would be a huge improvement to accessibility in our city. I live on the east end and mostly do loops out to Bay Farm and back because it feels safe. If we had a protected bikeway that went from Shoreline out to the Point, I would start biking with my family to the Point and back with stops on Webster Street for lunch at Otaez, dessert at Cookie Bar or Foster Freeze, and many more places along the route and along Webster Street. We don't do that now, because it does not feel like there is a safe and enjoyable route.
- We support the plan as explained by Bike Walk Alameda. We frequently use our bikes in lieu of driving and hope to expand that ability.
- There is a pressing need for a bike path on this corridor. The sidewalks are too narrow and filled with pedestrians walking to and from Encinal High School and Paden. There are no other feasible bike routes. Taylor Avenue is narrow, convoluted, and partially one way. Santa Clara Avenue west of Webster Street is narrow, and the bike lane strip is filled with parked cars. Haight Avenue is OK, but is out of the way, and getting to and from Haight Avenue is a problem--Third Street to the high school is narrow and has a lot of vehicle traffic.

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

- As to the question of whether the bike lanes should be on both sides of Central or bi-directional on one side: Either option would work. If bi-directional on one side, it should be on the south side to facilitate easy access to the schools, Bay Trail, etc.
- Want to see projections on commercial growth from increased bike traffic versus motor vehicle traffic because studies show that bicyclists make more frequent trips to local businesses and spend more money.
- Information that bicyclists attract motorists to stop and shop at smaller stores may be true on major streets on the East End. It is not the case along Central Avenue. The proprietor of Wilmot Bookstore will attest to the fact that most of his business is supported by motorists and not by bicyclists.
- VIP next meeting – have a map grid of all existing bike routes and proposed new bike routes to connect to parks of Central to utilize it as a bike route but not in congested areas between 5th & 9<sup>th</sup>.

### *Encourage Bicycling: General*

- Having driven for 30 years and based on riding a bike to work for 3 years recently, I can attest it is horrific to try to navigate on bike. Anything that encourages cycling/walking over driving cars is good for Alameda, its people, and the planet. Short of banning cars, which is impractical, I highly support bike lanes and pedestrian access in this town. If car drivers (such as my wife and I) are inconvenienced or slowed down, so be it. Government must take the bigger picture long-term approach and that means cycle and pedestrian access.
- I am delighted that Alameda is beginning to prioritize bicycle and pedestrian traffic.
- Have sharrows and signs to share the road for the whole city.
- School kid bike access is important.
- Egress into driveways with bike lanes – how does that work?
- Connected and thoughtful planning – bike lanes should connect and make sense.
- West side businesses will get more bike traffic.
- Make it easier to bike to businesses in the west end.
- Like idea of connecting all the bike lanes in Alameda so there is at least one safe way to get from the east to west end.
- Improve connections between the piecemeal bike lanes.
- Need more marketing of bicycle riding as an alternative.
- Not enough bicycle shops, bike sharing stations, marketing programs to encourage bicycling.
- Creating easy bicycling access to businesses like mine (Bladium) on Alameda Point is a great thing. This not only encourages families to keep fit on their way to my business, it reduces parking problems and offers Alameda residents an enjoyable outing as transportation and creates opportunities for them to stop on Webster Street to eat or shop.

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

- Increasing the safe routes for biking is definitely a priority.
- I am very excited to see an organized cycling system throughout this island city. Thank you!
- Alameda...”The Island that Bikes”. Kids would be able to get to school safely. I think it will improve property values. It would increase the use of businesses on Webster Street. Alameda could be marketed as “the Island that Bikes”. The cycle lanes would create a more neighborly and community friendly atmosphere.
- Adding more, well-marked bike paths within our great city is essential as we ARE a walking/biking/rolling community. We deserve the peace of mind that this kind of safety will bring us when we put ourselves and our children on bikes and head out to enjoy the city together.
- I love the Shoreline and Fernside bike lanes and I would love to see more like them in Alameda! The Shoreline one especially makes our city feel like a recreation destination. The more protected bike paths we have, the more people will ride their bikes, especially children. This is not only great on an individual health and wellness level, but fantastic for our community (and environment!) as well. I really hope Alameda continues building more bike trails/lanes/paths!
- I would like to encourage the City Council to approve a safe biking path from the East end to the West end of town. Many children from the East end are beginning to ride their bikes to the West end to attend school. A safe path for them to travel would improve their safety, decrease car traffic, decrease car congestion at drop-off and pick-up at individual schools, be better for the environment, and encourage children to becoming more physically active. Thank you.
- I fully support this proposal and am anxious to see it implemented. It would - Improve access for students at Paden, Encinal HS and Junior Jets to safely get to school on bikes or foot - Calm traffic along Central in front of Paden, Encinal and Junior Jets. - Reduce car traffic on an increasingly growing west-end population by making biking/walking safer - Allow for those on Bay Farm and the east end to access the west end all the way to Alameda Point easily by bike - Allow those on the West end to more easily access the east end by bike As a parent of school aged children, I want to make Alameda a bike friendly community. I strongly believe this means making Alameda bike-safe and bike-accessible. This project would further parents’ peace of mind and allow kids the ability to build independence through cycling along safe routes all across Alameda.
- Encourage “bike pooling” at schools where students bike together to/from school.
- I am glad the City of Alameda is undertaking this “complete streets” project. If you are not already familiar with it, I suggest you acquire a copy of *Street Design: the Secret to Great Cities and Towns* by Victor Dover and John Massengale. The impetus for the book was the fact that cities were recognizing the need to improve

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

the public way for both pedestrians and bicyclists but were often spending their scarce financial resources unwisely.

- Encourage bicycling how? I already ride my bike around just fine and safely. However to really encourage me would be to help me get to a BART station. Why not use the transportation funds working on how to get me to a BART station a lot easier? This is a very stupid plan to remove parking spaces and lanes on central turning it into what shore line looks like as well as adding huge islands that stick out into the street with plants like you see on Webster Street. The problem isn't being able to ride or walk around Alameda safely nor is it one too many traffic lanes. The problem is getting me to the ferry or to BART. All traffic studies that have been conducted in Alameda all came to one conclusion. Lack of access to bay area transit. Why doesn't the planning department post the true graphic lay out of this plan instead of just posting this google satellite picture of central with cute yellow circles? You've had the real plans drawn out a couple of years ago. Why not post it?
- We love the shoreline bike lanes but they need to connect up with other parts of the island!
- Bike parking in bulbouts.
- Daylighting at the intersections, protect bicyclists.
- Make biking safer, this will reduce car traffic.
- I strongly encourage the development of infrastructure to encourage bicycling & walking.
- Why Central Instead of a more industrial street like Lincoln Ave for bike lanes?
- Put bike lanes on Lincoln instead. Why not one way on each of two streets.
- Remove all on-street parking on eastern portion of corridor.
- Overall, supportive of preferred option.

### *Encourage Walking*

- **Fifth Street:** The intersection of Fifth Street and Central Avenue has no crosswalk and no disabled access on the eastern leg crossing Central. Will this be changed?
- **Sixth Street:** Better street crossing needed.
- **McKay Street:** Difficult for pedestrians to cross.
- **Ninth Street:** Difficult for pedestrians to cross.
- **Page Street:** Improvements to the pedestrian crosswalk at Central and Page (such as flashing lights) are a MUST.
- Please consider folks with special needs as a priority. Many elderly in my neighborhood on the west end enjoy the closeness of crab cove etc., making crosswalks, good lighting and safe routes essential.
- Flashing lights for pedestrians may make sense, however at an intersection with a four way stop, IE: Webster and Central, this seems to be a bit much.

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

- I am concerned with the intersection of Lincoln Avenue and Central Avenue. There should be a yellow flashing light to make cars aware of people crossing.
- Mark all the crosswalks.
- Need street crossing signals.
- Make all intersections have a shorter pedestrian crossing distance.
- Well lit pedestrian crosswalks.
- Add pedestrian controlled walk signals with flashing lights at cross streets that don't currently have traffic lights. Flashing lights at crosswalks help drivers see pedestrians.
- I would like highly visible crossing indicators at all pedestrian crossings (I like traffic lights even better). I find the buried crossing lights on Park next to useless--I cannot see them during the day and I cannot see the pedestrian well at night. I like the ones in Berkeley (which are similar to the ones on Otis Drive at Mound Street).
- Encouraging walking how? Removing travel lanes on central? I thought we walked on sidewalks? But removing lanes will encourage me to walk? I am just fine walking down the block with 4 lanes painted on the street thanks.
- The sidewalks are too narrow along many sections, given the number of strollers, families, and people with limited mobility I see out and about on a regular basis.
- When there are blinking pedestrian crossing lights, include a visual indicator for the pedestrian to see as well (a blinking light aimed at pedestrian added would work).

### GOAL 3: TRAFFIC CALMING

- **Third Street:** Need traffic light to control Central Avenue/Third Street/Taylor Avenue like at the Encinal Avenue/Central Avenue/Sherman Street intersection.
- **Fifth Street to Webster Street:** Central Avenue between Fifth Street and Webster Street needs help! Speeders, u-turns, rolling stop signs, vehicles not stopping or slowing at crosswalk at Sixth and Central. Large heavy trucks + speeding builders 4x4 trucks using Central as shortcut to former base and building project. Noise, speeding, using cell phones while driving.
- **Fifth Street and Webster Street:** The crossing at Central Avenue and Sixth Street and the issue of speeding on Central Avenue between Webster Street and Fifth Street could be addressed inexpensively by better signs, painting, crossing lights or perhaps just an old fashioned STOP sign for far less money than almost any other alternative.
- **Sixth Street:** I am concerned about the intersection of Central Avenue and Sixth Street in this proposal. While Webster Street and Central Avenue has a traffic signal and Fifth Street and Central Avenue is an all way stop, speeding and failure to yield to pedestrians is a problem at Sixth Street. The intersection is adjacent to a school and is a school crossing. Currently, there is a long red visibility zone on the northeast corner. Is that visibility zone maintained in the plans? There are a lot of

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

bicyclists and pedestrians who use Sixth Street to access McKay, Neptune Plaza and shoreline access near Crown Drive. What are the plans to improve safety and access at this intersection? Pedestrian and bicycle use in the area will likely increase with the opening of Paganos and improvements at Crab Cove.

- **Webster Street.** The traffic light eastbound at Central Avenue & Webster Street should have a turning light when there's an unnecessary turning light northbound on Webster coming out of Park Webster....?
- **Webster Street to Eighth Street.** Traffic calming (and enforcement) is especially needed on Central between Eighth and Webster, which is treated like a superhighway by some drivers.
- **Eighth Street to Sherman Street.** We need to improve safety, ideally via traffic calming.
- **Ninth Street.** I would say that my main concern is speeding. I live on south side of Taylor Ave, (that is 1/2 block from Central) at Ninth St. I sometimes see people speeding along that stretch of Central. The expected 25 mph limit is for protecting kids, elderly people, pets and basically everyone else too. In San Francisco, 2 of my best friends were hit by cars as pedestrians (one on Divisadero & the other Fulton) they each survived miraculously, but they both spent weeks in the ICU units with their family and friends waiting on outcomes after multiple surgeries.
- Enforce the 25 mph speed limit.
- No such thing as "traffic calming." Speed limits are already at 25 mph. Bikes, Cars, pedestrians have always worked in harmony in Alameda and have always yielded to each other. As far as the street being "complete" it's been complete. It's in use duh. You will ruin the beauty of this city with all of your MTC, SFTMA street plans. "traffic calming" "complete street" "road diets" is all their language. We know now who your really working for. Obviously not the city of Alameda. This is the safest city to bike, walk or drive. However, just like shoreline you will ignore everyone and get this done anyway. Instead of creating problems in Alameda that don't exist you should be using this city as an example of how to "share the road" as we have for a long long time. Hence children ride their bikes and walk in the streets safely. All of this over development and wanting to change all of the streets is part of the greater bay area plan set up by the SFMTA through the MTC. I'm looking forward to bringing this up at the next meeting. Too many lies. I'm sure my post will be removed as it is against your "agenda" which is fine by me. I'll be at all of the meetings coming up saying this out loud publicly. Thank you.
- With regards to slowing traffic, speed awareness signs have been helpful with slowing traffic.
- Revisit traffic lights between Central Avenue and Main Street.
- Be sure that decisions are based on well-established traffic engineering standards, not on speeding, traffic flow through town.

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

- Need strong emphasis on improving manners of all participants, particularly cars.
- Provide data on average speeds and traffic counts for Fernside Blvd and Shore Line Drive.
- There is an existing bike lane on Santa Clara Avenue already and it is a less traveled street. Develop it as a bike lane and use other techniques for traffic calming on Central Avenue.
- There may be a number other ways to do traffic calming besides going down to two lanes. I noticed on some other streets crosswalks are made more visible by more striping on them. Speed limit signs where it shows how fast you are going. More stop signs would slow traffic down considerably. One of the reasons people race down the street is that it seems like a freeway and they built up speed.
- Consider alternatives for traffic calming – more police enforcement, pedestrian crossing signs, etc.
- Consider the number of vehicles going in and out of the apartment complex driveways between the high school and Webster.
- Questions about traffic flow, travel times.
- Request for an independent group to analyze traffic.
- Concern about slowing traffic with the road diet.
- You and the consultant casually disregard the impacts to key intersections, which is worrisome. Delay and congestion are already poor and we question your analysis. Your June Workshop presentation shows the existing conditions of all intersections as operating below capacity. Experience at Central/Webster and Central/Eighth proves otherwise.
- Additionally, the 2035 analysis shows travel times increasing by 10, 20, and 40 minutes. This was easily shrugged off (during the Transportation Commission meeting), which exposed that this is a bike/ped project rather than a complete streets project. If this was a complete streets project, and if this was reviewed by an actual traffic engineer, these impacts would have been taken more seriously.
- A traffic light at Sixth and Central would achieve most of the "calming" needed
- The widening of the street and rationalization of the intersection at Main and Pacific.
- I attended the Central Avenue meeting on 14 May and left with the conclusion that the chief obstacle to pedestrian safety on Central Avenue, as elsewhere in Alameda, is lack of traffic control.
- Moving the parked cars more towards the center of the avenue would restrict visibility coming out of Crown Harbor even more than it is now. It's hard to make a left when exiting Crown Harbor because drivers can't see the oncoming traffic. The option of having the cyclists share the lane with the parked cars would have less impact on Crown Harbor.
- I was at the last meeting for the Central bike suggestion request. I have driven up and down and I am both driver and bike rider. I like the buffered bike lanes and

#### Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

middle right and left turn lanes for cars. However, Central does have another school (Paden) and parents usually double park and make lots of U turns in the middle of the road (another issue). How about a traffic circle?? especially by Encinal High at the huge intersection where 5 streets come together. Traffic circles do slow cars down and might be able to be put into place faster than the bike lanes. That intersection Central, Third and Taylor is very fast and large, a left from Third to Central difficult due to visibility and speed of cars on Central. Traffic circles is my suggestion and maybe incorporated with the bike lanes.

## **GOAL 4: MINIMIZE DISRUPTIONS TO MOTORISTS**

### *Road Diet Support*

- Road diet is a perfect idea. I would consider the current example of Shore Line is a model for what Central Avenue could be – two lanes traffic, dedicated bike lanes. This would be perfect.
- Two lanes from Sherman Street to the west end.
- This meeting showed a clear, strong call for safe biking and walking, and a willingness to do a road diet with six out of the nine tables in favor of it.
- Road diet to three lanes with a center turn lane.
- I think a road diet is great, beautiful and functional and also more safe.
- Four lanes to two lanes is good using a continuous left turn lane.
- Yes to road diet. Yes to buffered bike lanes.
- I am in support of adding a safe lane for people to walk, ride bicycles, skateboard, scooter or travel by wheelchair (for those that are unable to bike). The plan should allow those with cars to have easy access opening and closing car doors and not be in very close proximity of oncoming vehicle traffic. I have seen people having difficulty entering their car and nearly hit while parked on the new shoreline path. The plan also needs to allow for delivery trucks, moving vans, street cleaners, buses or other large vehicles the ability to stop along the road while not stalling the rest of the traffic behind them or in the surrounding areas.
- I fully support the addition of bike lanes and reducing number of car lanes, and adding them would definitely reduce my family's car use on Central (and 1 less car parked at the ferry terminal).
- I think the most reasonable solution is to reduce the number of lanes on Central from four to three--with one lane each direction and a middle bi-directional lane for left turns, similar to the left turn lane on Otis by South Shore and on Eighth Street between the dog park and Westline Drive. It is my observation that the biggest traffic and safety problem on Central for cars, bikes, and pedestrians is left-turners coming from both directions. Cars swerve into the other lane to avoid getting stuck behind a left-turner. Having a dedicated left-turn lane will ease traffic congestion and eliminate the need to change lanes.

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

- There's a lot of neighborhood sensitivity about parking, and I think one lane each direction + center turn lane could easily handle the current amount of traffic. A center turn lane would also alleviate some of the concerns about emergency vehicle access and double-parking by providing enough room to pass without entering the oncoming traffic lane.
- I drive Central Avenue from Fourth Street to Eighth Street each morning as the start of my commute. Other than 15 minutes each morning around 8 AM, when SUVs disgorge children at the schools, the traffic density does not seem sufficient to justify two lanes in both directions.
- I would gladly prefer to see these lanes reduced (aka 'road diet'), to allow a greater diversity of types of users of the roadway. Alameda is such a beautiful city, projects such as this (and Shoreline) exemplify positive, 21st century transportation models are coming here. Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback, as well as read and try to understand the hopes and concerns from my neighbors.
- One suggestion would be to reduce Central to 3 lanes (one in each direction with a middle turn lane) and add painted bike lanes to each side of the street. It would reduce traffic, add bike ways, and preserve parking.
- We should take this opportunity to make Central Avenue the safest, calmest street it can be. Central needs no more than two thru lanes for private auto traffic (the volume of cars is nowhere near its current capacity), and a narrower roadway causes drivers to drive more slowly and carefully -- and everyone will get to go where they need to go.
- I would like to see the 4 lanes on Central reduced to 2 lanes, with bicycle lanes on both sides of the street. This would encourage drivers to slow down, and to yield to pedestrians and bicycles, just as they do on any neighborhood street. There are 2 public schools located on the west side Central, and many young people cross the street on 2 wheels or on 2 feet. The 4 lanes encourage drivers to feel like they own the road, drive too fast, and potentially put others in harm's way.

### *Minimize Parking Loss*

- I am mostly concerned that we lose little or no parking in the area.
- Eliminating parking in and around the Webster Street and Central Avenue intersection would be very difficult for us and our six tenants to support. As commercial property owners we have worked hard to keep our Tenants, Alameda residents in Alameda homes, in Alameda Schools, in Alameda businesses. Our businesses have supported the City of Alameda with ongoing sales tax dollars, property tax dollars (both commercial and residential), Alameda schools and WABA in the past. While a board member of WABA when the streetscape was being developed and implemented we lost parking, this was not a good thing. The buttresses/planter boxes have already cost parking stalls and addressed pedestrian

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

access and visibility. The sale/loss of the parking lot on Taylor Street and Webster Street for a potential building was not good either.

- Taking away parking spots would greatly affect neighborhood comfort level and create more tension.
- Do not remove parking spots.
- Consider a resident parking pass.
- Concerns: more parking on Webster Street.
- You could build a parking structure on Webster Street.
- Will parking be reduced as it has been on Shoreline?
- Concerned about reduced parking for residents along Central under certain possible scenarios.
- Parking removal would put several small business out of business on Central Avenue at Ninth Street.
- Parking on the street can get very crowded. Many times I cannot even park in front of my house and I have to park way down the street or around the corner.
- I have lived at the small cottages across from Paden School, for nearly 20 years. The cottages were built about 105 years ago, when they didn't think too much about off-street parking. 20 years ago, finding parking on the street wasn't a problem at all. In the last several years, as rents have gone up, there has been an increase in the density of renters per unit in the surrounding apartments, and this has made street parking increasingly difficult. Does the proposed Central Ave Concept includes segregated bike lanes, result in loss of street parking?
- Maintain/improve parking! On Central, across from Paden School, parking is already severely impacted,(as I am sure it is elsewhere on Central). Getting home after 7:00 p.m. means walking at least 2 blocks. Losing even one parking space in this area is unacceptable. My house was built in 1912 and does not include parking - I have no other option than street parking.
- In addition, the resulting reduction of parking spaces on Central Avenue would encourage nearby residents to use Crown Harbor public path spaces for their routine parking. Crown Harbor makes these spots available in 4 hour slots so visitors may walk and enjoy the view from the bicycle path that we maintain at our expense.
- Do nothing leave the Central Ave, Webster alone, do not remove any parking.
- If anything needs to change option C seems fair. Please keep parking near businesses
- Concerned about parking in commercial areas—want to avoid adverse effects to businesses.
- Do not eliminate parking.
- Could the traffic analysis be enhanced to more fully consider effects to the full corridor rather than at select locations?

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

- The removal of parking is easily the biggest concern of our supporters, and has yet to be addressed.

## **GOAL 5: IMPROVE THE STREETScape**

- Adding curb-cuts to divert rain water to street trees and median 'gardens' would help keep our ground water recharge and would improve the neighborhood.
- Undergrounded utilities is desired.
- East of Webster Street, I think Central Avenue looks very attractive and just needs a bike lane.
- West of Webster Street, much could be done to emphasize beach access and beautify the area.
- Beautifying Alameda by burying the utilities – electric, phone, cable – would be fantastic.
- Trees on Central Avenue are beautiful but they block out light from the street lights so I think they are a problem. Also need to get cyclists off the sidewalks.
- Want more trees, plant median at Sherman Street intersection.
- Underground utilities are a high priority and more trees.
- I would not like trees in the west end segment. I like the open sky and beautiful sunsets. I think trees would inhibit visibility.
- More trees/canopy along this segment of Central Avenue.
- Bike allocated parking to protect against theft or damage.
- Underground utilities – essential when street redone – involve Alameda Power Company.
- Need more bicycle signage.
- Integrated parklets or mini-destinations along the bike path to encourage public use of path.
- Central is a pretty street with lots of trees and any projects should not reduce the number of mature trees.
- Want lighting improvements.
- Want to extend the tree canopy being conscious about the drought.
- Shadows from the trees present a visibility problem and a challenge to drivers.
- Has anyone addressed the water issues on Central Ave? When it rains, water doesn't drain well at, at least on 400 block of Central. This is the way it has been for 20 years. I think it may have more to do with the water level (the tides?) than the actual drains, but bike lanes would be unusable during any rain.

## **GOAL 6: ENCOURAGE TRANSIT USE**

- BART station at the naval base with bike paths and safe bike parking available.
- Free shuttles around the island and to BART.

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

- Build a monorail from Alameda to BART either from the west side to Merritt BART station or east side to Fruitvale BART station.
- Need for increase of public transportation to and from Encinal High School.
- Need more attention to good public transit – currently not enough of it.
- Encourage transit use? How exactly? most people have an issue with transit leaving the island or getting to BART in Oakland not around the island. Oh wait I get it. Reduce the lanes on central so that traffic gets so bad on the street that an AC transit bus get's stuck behind it? Again genius!
- Additional transit option such as express bus or a restored trolley to the ferry service would be much more traffic calming and beneficial to the people of this island and our property values.
- With a ferry likely coming to Seaplane Lagoon, it is VERY important to have the option to take a quick bus with only a few stops across the Island from Park to Webster to a termination point at the new ferry terminal. A single dedicated bus rapid transit to the ferry that goes along Central and is coordinated with the ferry schedule will be the single greatest improvement towards reducing tunnel and bridge traffic off the Island. I'm very pro-bicycle, and even I still don't think reducing Central to a single lane that removes the possibility of a future rapid bus to the new ferry is a remotely good idea.
- We would love for public transit to be a better option, but it's terrible in its current state. What use is it to make buses more accessible when they're regularly full (sometimes passing up commuters), packed like a tin can of sardines, often late (or don't come at all!), and the drivers are mean/ rude. Why would anyone in their right mind give up the comfort and convenience of their car to be put through that experience?! We tried commuting via bus from Webster St. when we first moved back to Alameda and the experience was awful. I'm sick of seeing proposals to alleviate traffic on the west end by encouraging public transit use when it's clearly not up to the job.
- Also, no more AC Transit down Central, that should go down Atlantic.

## **GOAL 7: IMPROVE PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY**

- **Crab Cove:** Improved/safer access to Crab Cove – both McKay Avenue and the public access path.
- **Fifth Street:** There is a heavy amount of pedestrian and bicycle traffic, with many people walking to Crown beach/Crab Cove. Improving access to the beach would improve the character and desirability of the neighborhood.

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

## **GOAL 8: REVITALIZE WEST ALAMEDA**

### *General Comments*

- Does "Revitalize West Alameda" mean encouraging redevelopment of unattractive / underutilized properties on Webster Street (such as Discount City or Neptune Plaza or the Roadway Inn)? Or does it mean building a Safeway gas station so we can greet visitors entering our city with "Save at the pump!" banners?
- A revitalized West Alameda will come with a better road system and streetscape.
- Research from Portland, New York, San Francisco and Toronto shows residents and visitors who walk and bicycle spend more money than people who drive. Pedestrians and bicyclists are the best customers because drivers do not window shop and speeding traffic does not stop to shop at all especially when they can't find parking.
- Concerned about the noise level of cars and trucks going slower with blasting radios. Concerned about how this will affect neighborhood and the noise level. Need noise abatement studies.

### *Minimize Impact to Neighborhood*

- Minimize negative impact of project on neighborhood including on schools, reduced parking, driveway access and spillover on other neighborhood street if road diet moves cars off of Central Avenue.
- Road diet of Central Avenue will shift some traffic to other streets.
- Given the designs to change Central Avenue from Sherman Street to Encinal High School, where will the traffic go that may feel that Central Avenue is too congested with only one lane in each direction?
- Will the changes negatively impact surrounding neighborhood streets? If they did, we would be against the changes.
- What are the current numbers relative to traffic on side streets now?
- Concerned with spillover traffic on other narrower neighborhood streets if a Central Avenue "road diet" moves significant cars off of Central Avenue as some seem to want (e.g., what will happen on Taylor Avenue, Santa Clara Avenue and Haight Avenue? What will happen if more cars move to Santa Clara Avenue where there is currently significant student bike traffic due to the bike lane that runs on most of Santa Clara Avenue all the way to Webster Street)?
- Central Avenue is already noisy and busy. You are suggesting now that it be used even more frequently---more walkers, bikers. More noise.
- Planners and others are thinking that taking it down to 2 lanes may encouraged people to use other streets. No one is sure that this will happen.
- Adding a bike lane on Central would increase safety for bicyclists (quite a few students); however, the impact on the surrounding neighborhood should be considered. It will greatly increase traffic on side streets as people divert from

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

Central. Garbage and delivery trucks will cause passing issues for motorists (Shoreline is now an unsafe nightmare when a vehicle is stopped in one of the lanes).

#### *Other Corridors*

- ***Eighth Street:***
  - Need to connect Shore Line bikeway with Central Avenue. Need to re-work Eighth Street so it is bike friendly.
  - How can Washington Park, Burbank Street etc be improved for access to the Shore Line bikeway?
- ***Fifth Street:*** We live on Fifth Street between Central and Taylor. Our stretch of Fifth Street is quite busy and dangerous with motorists speeding (up to 40 miles per hour) up and down the street. It is not only dangerous for pedestrians and bicyclists, but for us as we try to pull in and out of our driveway. In the past, I have reached out to someone at the city supposedly responsible for traffic calming measures, but have not gotten a response. We really need some traffic calming measure on our street - a traffic circle, speed bumps, something, or block the street 1/2 way down like they do in Berkeley - that would radically improve the neighborhood character.
- ***Lincoln Avenue:***
  - Are any other routes/alternatives possible to become part of this conversation, such as using Lincoln instead of Central? That would probably work better in many ways, including for many schools. I understand Central was identified in past plans, but plans can change.
  - We also need to make Lincoln Avenue more safe-especially at Fourth Street and Marshall Way. That intersection is so unsafe for the children crossing each morning and afternoon. They bike and walk to all the West End schools at that intersection. Please fix the crosswalk there.
  - Has more space than Central Avenue.
- ***Otis Drive:*** Otis is much wider, never traffic problems and a direct shot to the Seaplane Lagoon making infinitely a better choice. Midway on the island to give better access for the residents etc. north of Central as well.
- ***Posey Tube:*** Meanwhile, each morning hundreds of vehicles sit idling trying to get through the Posey Tube. Although at times it seems like our city spends more money on studies than solutions, I applaud the City Council for voting to initiate a citywide transportation plan. I would encourage Public Works to frame this project within that plan (which presumably will prioritize reducing the number of vehicles going through tubes and over bridges).
- ***Santa Clara Avenue:***
  - Suggest bicyclists to use side streets, Santa Clara Avenue, etc. and not Central Avenue.

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

- Has more space than Central Avenue.
- How is the road diet going to impact other streets such as Santa Clara Avenue?
- **Shore Line Drive:**
  - Shoreline is a traffic problem already with traffic backed up for 2 blocks during the week at 2pm! The weekends will be a mess. The bike lane should have been constructed on the land by the walking trail and the beach berm.
  - I would like it noted that on the Shoreline Drive bikeway project, the City of Alameda dismissed an alternative based on a study conducted in 1989 that nobody can produce - not the city, not the parks district. The alternative was summarily dismissed without revisiting a 25+ year old study.
  - Congrats on completing shoreline drive bikeway. It's great.
  - Shore Line is now a MESS. Someone will be hit. Cars parked are not good where they are in the middle of the street.
  - Like the reconfiguration of Shoreline Drive, this project sounds like another solution in search of a problem. A "Complete Street" should be contextualized within its surroundings (in this instance, a largely historic residential neighborhood) as well as within the transportation fabric of a city – as opposed to an isolated, textbook design exercise with no objective measures of project success or failure. Installing some bike racks and a two-mile bikeway going from and to nowhere (this particular proposed “corridor” appears to extend from Pacific Avenue – i.e. short of the “Cross Alameda Trail” and short of the current / proposed ferry terminals – to Sherman Street – i.e. short of... well, anything).
  - (As shared by the police department) Shoreline stats vindicate road dieting can be less safe. I would like to know more about the origins of this project; when did the voters approve this project.
  - Don't duplicate Shoreline fiasco!!!
- **Third Street:** Branch out bikeway along Third Street to reach ACLC/Nea/Academy.
- **Webster Street:** When will we see the plan for making Webster a safer biking and walking street?

## GOAL 9: IMPROVE TRUCK ACCESS

- Restrict trucks.
- Restrict truck traffic during commute hours.
- For truck access, there also needs to be a place where truck drivers can park their vehicles without disturbing the neighborhoods.
- Trucks should use Lincoln Avenue or Atlantic Avenue.
- Why do the trucks have to be on Central Avenue? Would Lincoln Avenue not be suited?
- Need to accommodate travel lane widths needed for trucks.
- This is a truck route and there are a number of very, very oversized trucks that come

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

down Central Avenue if it became only two lanes that may create a dangerous and crowded situation.

- There are delivery trucks that double park and block a lane. If there would only be two lanes, large trucks, cars, etc. I can foresee traffic problems.
- Improving truck access? Removing 2 lanes on central will supposedly improve a big wide truck's access through 2 park zones and 3 school zones? What a genius idea!!!
- Concerns about garbage trucks, delivery trucks, emergency vehicles.
- When any reduction of traffic lanes, trucks and buses need a place to park. I would want more clarification on segment one.
- Does the preferred option presented tonight include consideration of trucks and buses? Where could trucks stop if a road diet is implemented?
- Concerned about trucks, deliveries, emergency vehicles with road diet.
- Is it legal to drive around a vehicle that is parked in a travel lane (such as a delivery vehicle)?
- Concern about trucks—loading.
- A traffic engineer would have also understood the impacts to trucks on this truck route. You have yet to provide proper lane widths for trucks, especially ones towing boats. You state that you will review "truck turning radii" as your sole way to address trucks. This is simply ignorant and wrong. Trucks are not traveling down Central to turn on Fifth, Page, or McKay. You are addressing the situation improperly. The oversight and naivety will cause problems for all users and the project will not be an improvement for anyone.

## TARGETED DESIGN COMMENTS

### Corridor Segment #1: Pacific/Main to Boat Ramp Road/EHS

#### Goal 1: Improve Safety

- Part of a blind curve northbound, needs visibility. The Pacific/Main transition is extremely bad, southbound, especially as a bike turning left.

#### Goal 2: Encourage Bicycling and Walking

- Should it be a coup? Class II would be the most viable.
- 3 lanes, class II
- Like having cycle track plus class 2 bike lanes.
- Off street cycle track.
- For segments 1 through 3, I'd accept the cycle track & bike lane option as a compromise option for road diet. The bike lane really needs to be a buffered bike lane – right now it's squeezed between car doors and moving traffic.

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

- Definitely no cycle track. Businesses at Ralph Appezato & Main St need access in & out from multiple directions, e.g. how does westbound on Appezato visit the businesses no the corner?
- Ok with this cycle track on school side.
- Two way cycle track or like Fernside area is ok.
- Concerned about seemingly “disjointed” paths & infrastructure. I strongly believe that having a proper network for bicycling will encourage alternative modes of transport (non-car) and reduce congestion, and be good for the city (reduce need for parking).
- Very reasonable, not as sure loading space as a priority, but love encouraging bikes.

#### Goal 5: Improve the Streetscape

- Reduce sidewalk width and remove “fast” bike land so you can add a center 2-way turn lane.

#### General Statements/Suggestions

- Good.
- Great.
- This is good.
- Like the concept as presented – best practices!
- Ok.
- No comment x 3 don’t shoreline it!! 1 in form
- Option A.
- This is where I live on Central and I like the preferred option the best
- Projected utilization? Why Central and why not Lincoln?
- Ok.
- Like.
- Group recommendation.
- Go to Lincoln Ave.
- This is ok.
- Good idea.
- Good idea.
- Cars provide jobs, school access. Leave maximum lanes open! Bikes are for exercise & fun not to enjoy and in incorrect go shopping. Bikes don’t work for senior citizens!
- Sky is limit/no problem with it.
- Concern about disjointed paths:
  - Concerned about seemingly “disjointed” paths & infrastructure. I strongly believe that having a proper network for bicycling will encourage alternative modes of transport (non-car) and reduce congestion, and be good for the city (reduce need for parking)

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

- Proposal is excellent – we want to minimize the number of transitions so we think sections 1, 2 & 3 should be cohesive and connect with the plans for the point.
- If part of the goal is to encourage biking to the ferries, how is it going to blend onto main? Most bicyclists use one lane of main (35mph) instead of the paths on either side because the paths are in disrepair. Keep it aesthetically pleasing, unlike Shoreline.
- Please clarify cross-section for segment 1 (like you did for 2,3,4)

## **Corridor Segment #2: Boat Ramp Road/EHS to Third Street/Taylor Avenue**

### Goal 1: Improve Safety

- Part of a blind curve northbound, needs visibility. The Pacific/Main transition is extremely bad, southbound, especially as a bike turning left.
- No signal at five legged Taylor intersection. That'd be too much congestion. Otherwise I like the preferred option.
- This is the most confusing set of changes given the high toned safety concern for school children, I feel this would be very stressful and thus more dangerous.
- No turning lane is potential problem.

### Goal 2: Encourage Bicycling and Walking

- I'm ok with this but would rather see class II lanes on the street in both directions. That would decimate residential parking, however. How do you transition from cycle tracks e-bond to class II lanes @ Third & Taylor????? (Adjacent to auto travel lanes, not behind parked cars!)
- 3 lanes class II.
- Like having cycle track and bike lane.
- Cycle track.
- Two lanes here, ok. Cycle track on school side. Ok with this as long as they don't remove any parking & have family visiting & my neighbors have 3 cars.
- Great to have separate cycle track for school & those of us who bike to the Point with kids!
- Two way cycle track or like Fernside area is ok.
- Why extra wide travel lane 5' buffered bike lane better.
- Concerned about seemingly "disjointed" paths & infrastructure. I strongly believe that having a proper network for bicycling will encourage alternative modes of transport (non-car) and reduce congestion, and be good for the city (reduce need for parking).
- Reconsider bike lanes and cycle track along segment 2.
- A little confusing about cycle track starting and stopping. Where are cyclists supposed to be? (segments 1 and 2)

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

Comment Card Workshop 6/4

Comment Card Table Talk 6/4

Targeted Design Comments 6/4

Letter Comments – Drive Alameda

Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers

Email Comments – General

- Confused by the transitions between segments where facility type changes.
- Seems disjointed at the segment end points where facility types change.

**Goal 4: Minimize Disruptions to Motorists – Road Diet Concerns**

- No road diets or bike lanes.

**Goal 5: Improve the Streetscape**

- Move south curb to add left turn lane.
- Reduce sidewalk width and remove “fast” bike lane so you can add a center 2-way turn lane. A left turn lane is especially important in front of Encinal HS.
- Include center turn lane.

**General Statements**

- Great.
- I like preferred option.
- Like the concept as presented.
- 4 ok.
- Shoreline Drive used to be a scenic, relaxing drive, not it is a stressful drive and you want to do the same now to Central Street.
- Projected utilization.
- Ok.
- No change needed. Painted lanes only maybe, B or C. definitely no cycle track.
- It would be nice to see a map of how this segment merges with segments #1 and #3 consider a left turn lane instead of a fast bike lane. Also, emergency vehicle corridor.
- Like.
- Group agreement w/?
- Ok.
- Same as above.
- Why isn't this plan for Lincoln – more space for everyone?

**Corridor Segment #3: Third Street to Fourth Street/Ballena Boulevard**

**Goal 2: Encourage Bicycling and Walking**

- Option C – Class II bike lanes – 3 lanes full turning lane – Santa Clara divide 4th – 8th – 4B Sherman.
- 3 lanes class II.
- Cycle track.
- 2-way cycle track to Fourth to connection to Shoreline path.
- Two way on the south side is preferred.
- Two way cycle track good – 7 foot parking better than 8 stripe a buffer right of bike lane.

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

- Use one way cycle track.
- Option B.
- Option 2 – one-way cycle track.
- Two way cycle track for next cyclist use to school.
- Two way cycle track.
- Buffered bike lanes with a LH-turn lane are the only option I can support – far too much confusion @ intersections when 2-way cycle tracks cross intersections and encounter on coming/crossing traffic.
- Prefer buffered bike lanes.
- Prefer buffered bike lanes.
- Keep turning lane, with buffered bike lanes.
- The 3 “segments” within this segment make sense, so again we can bike with kids to Point.
- Again concerned about choice to place bike lane only on one side of street on segment 3.
- Questions about why not buffered on both sides of segment 3 if cross section would allow them.

#### Goal 3: Traffic Calming

- Concern with #2 to #4 – degree of traffic 7:45 am to 8:30 am when tons of parents are dropping off children at the 6 to 7 schools in the west end. Too much traffic as it is concern the proposal will cause more traffic by cars diverting off Central.

#### Goal 4: Minimize Disruptions to Motorists

- Too much traffic for school kid transportation to allow for a road diet. A reduction of lanes makes bus traffic too problematic. PUT BUSES UPON NEED LIST.

#### General Statements

- Need bike lanes. Maybe a roundabout at Central/3rd St, where 5 roads intersect. Presented concept is good.
- Projected utilization.
- Ok.
- No change needed. Painted lanes only... maybe. B or C. Definitely no cycle tract.
- How will bikes west bound enter cycle track?
- Why did you spend most of the time talking (A hand out instead) & little time listening?
- Ok with this turn left lane or keep save.
- Move of the same.
- Concern about disjointed paths:
  - I'd want to know how cycle track in option 1 & 2 would transition here to choose between the options

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

Comment Card Workshop 6/4

Comment Card Table Talk 6/4

Targeted Design Comments 6/4

Letter Comments – Drive Alameda

Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers

Email Comments – General

- Concerned about seemingly “disjointed” paths & infrastructure. I strongly believe that having a proper network for bicycling will encourage alternative modes of transport (non-car) and reduce congestion, and be good for the city (reduce need for parking)
- Keep this consistent with segment 2
- Ensure a smooth transition between all sections

## **Corridor Segment #4: Fourth/Ballena to Sherman/Encinal**

### Goal 1: Improve Safety

- A bike lane is a huge improvement, but the protected bike lane feels worse as a cyclist due to midday turning vehicles
- Like need several crosswalks added
- How about a traffic light at Encinal High School to let students cross central safely? Cars wait approx. 5 minutes for students to cross.

### Goal 2: Encourage Bicycling and Walking

- Option C – Class II bike lanes – 3 lanes full turning lane – Santa Clara divide 4th – 8th – 4B Sherman Continue C.
- Option B or C - Making left hand turns at Central & 8th is very difficult at rush hour. Using more traffic light stop signs turn signals is preferable to reducing lane in general.
- Bike park drive park bike - separate bike lane from traffic with parking lane on both sides.
- Class II bike lanes w/LH turn lanes work for me – safest, least disruptive option
- .. to Sherman/Encinal (bike lanes Option C - II bike lanes). Think this is segment best option – need turn lane for trucks buses & autos so car lanes aren't blocked by garbage trucks, moving vans etc. Park of Central is a State Highway 61.
- Is it at all a possibility to suggest a two lane road – no turn lane to allow for the continuation of the cycle track. Due to the number of driveways, I recommend a three lane road with Central turn lane and bike lane in either direction. I really like the bump out at the corners for pedestrians.
- Approve class II lanes here. But do not put lanes in door zones!!!
- 3 lanes class II.
- Works fine.
- Option C!
- Support preferred option.
- Two way cycle track.
- McKay through 4th protected bike way – Sherman through McKay bike lanes.
- Would prefer buffered lanes.

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

- Consider 4A 4th to 8th & 4B 8th to Sherman – 4B two travel lanes only/4A 3 travel lanes with protected lanes.
- Preferred option is good – no loss of parking, easier to cross street, clear that bikes have a place on the road.
- I like preferred option.
- I like the preferred option.
- Strongly support.
- Disagree that only one option is viable on segment 4. Consider two lanes instead of three and provide buffering or protected bike lanes. Broadway and Santa Clara are two-lane streets with parking and bike lanes and super gridlock is not present. Personal observations of those streets don't show gridlock.

#### Goal 4: Minimize Disruptions to Motorists

- Changes to this section are too impacting on motorists. I suggest using Taylor with a new concept.
- Road diet, yes! Bike lanes are too close to car doors and should be buffered. I don't want sharrows at intersections – these are the trick rest places for cyclists and should be the safest location, not where we're let to mix with traffic.
- #1 Need crosswalk at 6th St. 550 Central Ave – Villa Marina #2 Keep parking on both sides of street – for apartments complexes that only provide one off street parking space per 1-2 bedroom apartments #3 What about bike route connection to Bart at 12th St.
- Options A, B, C only. Keep 4 lanes at all intersections! Must accommodate HDCP parking width. Main design is beautiful “as is”. Do not ruin it. Make small street changes first such as one or more signals or stop signs to help pedestrian & bikes cross Central Ave easier.
- Regarding segment 4, like preferred option because no parking loss and addresses street crossing issues.

#### Goal 9: Improve Truck Access

- Driveway concerns and trucks, center turn lane is important, apartment complexes have high level of “ins & outs” for a single driveway.
- A major portion (- 60%) is CA St RT 61. It is a major truck route.

#### General Statements

- I do not support segment 4. Remove turning lane to create safer cycling. Please review Broadway as 2 lane traffic with no commute? Show what people know that there are deliveries on Broadway. Works to calm traffic fears.
- Remove street parking. Look at utilizing underused lots to create off-street parking or constructing a parking garage.

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

Comment Card Workshop 6/4

Comment Card Table Talk 6/4

Targeted Design Comments 6/4

Letter Comments – Drive Alameda

Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers

Email Comments – General

- With this proposal... Will they restore the area of no parking on 1/3 of the street on both sides – give back much needed parking? The end closet to 5th street.
- Concern/question: Can a motorist go into the turning lane to go around a car that is parallel parking?
- Ok.
- Consider eliminating parking on s. side of Central from Webster to 8th to preserve 4 lanes.
- 4A – Sherman to 8th should just continue as Central is to the east. 4B – Use option C to the west of 8<sup>th</sup>.
- Projected utilization.
- Options A, B, C only. Keep 4 lanes at all intersections! Must accommodate HDPC parking width. Main design is beautiful “as is”. Do not ruin it. Make small street changes first such as one or more signals or stop signs to help pedestrian & bikes cross Central Ave easier.
- Leave as is – do nothing.
- Leave it alone.
- Too long.
- I do not support segment 4. Remove turning lane to create safer cycling. Please review Broadway as 2 lane traffic with no commute? Show what people know that there are deliveries on Broadway. Works to calm traffic fears.
- Move the bike to the walking trails thru East Bay Parks. Add a new path and use crushed granite.
- Have to address intersections at 8th and especially Webster.
- Turning lane essential.
- A nightmare! Don't screw up Alameda's beautiful thoroughfare! Bikes use Santa Clara!
- Bike lanes already exist 1 block away on Santa Clara – a much wider street.
- Like segment 4 preferred option.
- Segment 4 may deserve segmentation to consider variation in need along lengthy stretch.

Draft Comment Summary – Central Avenue Concept Proposal – May 2015

[Comment Card Workshop 6/4](#)

[Comment Card Table Talk 6/4](#)

[Targeted Design Comments 6/4](#)

[Letter Comments – Drive Alameda](#)

[Letter Comments – Charles K. Myers](#)

[Email Comments – General](#)

APPENDIX B

LETTERS SENT TO  
THE CITY OF ALAMEDA





June 22, 2015

Dear Public Works Department, Transportation Commission, City Manager's Office, City Council, and Mayor,

Thank you for including "minimum disruption to motorists" as a project goal. However, this statement is unclear, very general, and only implies a minimum disruption to traffic flow. Our significantly supported petition stated opposition to a reduction of travel lanes **as well as the removal of parking. Any parking.**

### **Impacts to Parking**

**The removal of parking is easily the biggest concern of our supporters, and has yet to be addressed.** During the Transportation Commission meeting, you said that there would be no reduction of parking. **This is untrue.** You actually propose to remove parking to improve visibility, which was predicted in our original comments. You describe this as "daylighting" and include bulb-outs as possible treatment.

You also continue to disregard multi-unit residents and businesses. You only acknowledge impacts to parking and driveways of **single-family homes**. This is unfair and unjust. The parking in these dense, multi-unit areas are already bad. Residents have to park 2 to 3 blocks away from their home. The residents and businesses cannot afford to have any parking taken away from them (see public comments from the Transportation Commission meeting). The amount of residents in these areas and their parking needs far outweigh any sacrifice to parking.

### **Impacts to Traffic**

You and the consultant casually disregard the impacts to key intersections, which is worrisome. Delay and congestion are already poor and we question your analysis. Your June Workshop presentation shows the existing conditions of all intersections as operating below capacity. Experience at Central/Webster and Central/Eighth proves otherwise.

Additionally, the 2035 analysis shows travel times increasing by 10, 20, and 40 minutes. This was easily shrugged off (during the Transportation Commission meeting), which exposed that this is a bike/ped project rather than a complete streets project. If this was a complete streets project, and if this was reviewed by an actual traffic engineer, these impacts would have been taken more seriously.

A traffic engineer would have also understood the impacts to trucks on this truck route. You have yet to provide proper lane widths for trucks, especially ones towing boats. You state that you will review "truck turning radii" as your sole way to address trucks. This is simply ignorant and wrong. Trucks are not traveling down Central to turn on Fifth, Page, or McKay. You are addressing the situation improperly. The oversight and naivety will cause problems for all users and the project will not be an improvement for anyone.

### **Final Remarks**

'I Drive Alameda' is requesting that this project be **shelved** until:

1. The City has a proper understanding of traffic impacts of road diets on our specific, unique network. This could be achieved through the analysis of the Shoreline project, which was a **pilot** project for that very reason. The Central Avenue and Clement Avenue projects are being rushed for specific interests, to avoid possible push back, without proper comprehension. These projects will have significant impacts on our network and should not be hurried.
2. The proper staff, resources, and attention can be given to this type of high level project. To our knowledge, there is no City traffic engineer reviewing these plans. You must have experienced staff checking the work of a consultant. It's basic quality control. Otherwise, they will just tell you what you want to hear, which is exactly what's happening - *"a staff bicycle advocate is advancing a bike/ped project, masked as a complete streets project, and the consultant is saying that the impacts to motorists are not a big deal."* The analysis must be done by a properly trained, unbiased professional.

We also request, that if this project is not shelved, that there be at least **no reduction of parking spaces**. We still do not want a reduction of travel lanes, but would like to emphasize that the residents and businesses cannot afford to lose any parking. We will continue to fight for our supporters as we take their words seriously. We simply ask that you take our words seriously, as well.

Mayor Trish Herrera Spencer  
Vice Mayor Frank Matarrese  
Councilmember Tony Daysog  
Councilmember Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft  
Councilmember Jim Oddie

I recently attended a meeting regarding the Central Avenue Complete Street Concept Proposal and have these observations about the concept and the process.

The process left many attendees disappointed and with these negative impressions:

- City planners view community meetings as a necessary evil, at least in this case, but as advocates themselves they really already plan on going ahead;
- The planners are not really interested in hearing the community, so "time constraints" are invoked to avoid hearing the opposition more than minimally; and
- Charts and Powerpoint slides suit the intended outcome with a sales pitch, avoiding the issues residents and drivers experience everyday on Central.

The concept has these apparent flaws:

- It serves a very small but vocal group, the bicycle lobby;
- It gets its impetus from the grant of funds that must be spent or lost to the city;
- It can be warped to fit the oft quoted "best practices" from the U.S. Department of Transportation;
- It does not adequately address issues that are apparent to the residents of the area and the police force (if they are permitted to speak on the issues);
- It uses euphemisms, like "traffic calming" to avoid using terms residents or drivers would use, like "traffic choke point";
- It does not consider adequately the issues experienced by drivers entering Central from Fifth, McKay or Crown Drive;
- It does not adequately consider the impact of the development of Alameda Point;
- It does not consider at all the use of lanes for deliveries or for moving vans at the many apartment buildings on Central; and
- It inadequately considers the three schools on Central and the impact of dropping off and picking up children.

There are aspects of the "proposal" that do make sense and achieve what residents would like to see without making Central a parking lot impossible to enter from driveways and intersections not controlled by traffic signs or lights:

There are aspects of the "proposal" that do make sense and achieve what residents would like to see without making Central a parking lot impossible to enter from driveways and intersections not controlled by traffic signs or lights:

- A traffic light at Sixth and Central would achieve most of the "calming" needed; and
- The widening of the street and rationalization of the intersection at Main and Pacific .

The voters of Alameda, particularly those in the West End, expect the Council to consider all of the aspects of this proposal - and alternatives that are less disruptive, such as parallel streets - and to rein in those who would serve the vocal minority at the expense your constituents who live and drive in the area. There are alternatives to using the main artery of Central and no proposals seem to match that possibility.