

Summary of Online Comment Form - 66 Responses

Segment B: Which design do you prefer for Grand Street from Otis to Encinal ?	%
Alternative #1: Two-way raised bikeway, on east side of street	38%
Either Alternative #1 or #2	18%
Keep striping as it is today, with standard bike lanes	9%
Council-approved: One-way parking/bollard-protected bikeways on both sides of street	8%
Alternative #2: One-way raised bikeways on both sides of street	8%
Other*	6%
Alternative #3: Enhanced raised one-way bikeways on both sides of street	5%
Either Alternative #2 or Council-approved	5%
Blank	5%
Grand Total	100%

****Other" comments**

Other: 1 or council-approved

Other: Alternative #1 if it can be funded and built promptly or Council-approved

Other: Alternative #1, #2, or #3

Other: I recommend moving forward on the existing, council-approved bikeway project in the near term via the paving project, while also pursuing funding for a follow up upgrade to the Alternative 1 raised cycletrack - The cycletrack is a good idea but will take a lot of time for design/outreach and to secure funding, let alone construction - The safety needs on this street can't wait so the city needs to take a phased approach to move forward on near-term improvements ASAP

Segment C: Which design do you prefer for Grand Street from Encinal to Clement?	%
Alternative #1: Two-way raised bikeway, on east side of street	41%
Either Alternative #1 or #2	20%
Alternative #2: One-way raised bikeways on both sides of street	9%
Keep striping as it is today, with standard bike lanes	9%
Council-approved: One-way parking/bollard-protected bikeways on both sides of street	8%
Alternative #3: Enhanced raised one-way bikeways on both sides of street	5%
Either Alternative #2 or Council-approved	5%
Other*	3%
Blank	2%
Grand Total	100%

****Other" comments**

Other: Alternative #1, #2, or #3

Other: I like the Alternate 1 cycletrack in theory, but this segment has a lot of signal-controlled intersections which introduce a lot of complexity, with regard to safe bike movements in all directions including right and left turns at each intersection - This usually requires dedicated bike signal phases and car turn restrictions, which can introduce a lot of delay and wait time - If there isn't enough funding and design detail to figure out good solutions to these needs then Alternative 2 might be the better option

On Grand St from Shore Line to Otis, next to Wood Middle School (Segment A), staff are planning to move forward with the Council-approved design for a two-way bikeway at the street-level. If you have any concerns with this approach, please share them.

As long as the council approved design does NOT get implemented for all of Grand St., especially the more dense portion from Encinal to Clement (segment C), I don't really have a problem with the council approved design being used for the Shoreline to Otis segment. It might make more sense though, to just use the same Alternative #1 design the whole way.

From Otis to Clement, I support both protected bike lanes and auto parking on the street as well. In addition, I suggest secure sidewalk bike parking along the street in residential areas to replace auto parking. I might want to visit residential areas for various reasons (see friends, garage sales, tour rentals/home sales, etc) and want secure parking for my bike. Or, I will go back to using my car.

Get 'er done!

Historically, the city of Alameda has done a very poor job of maintaining any bikeway constructed. You do the initial work and walk away. Just look at the bike path along shoreline. Always full of weeds, dirt, sand and never kept clean. The bike path at Otis and Grand, right now along the park has tree roots, garbage and unsafe to ride a bike in the dedicated bike lane. Look at the bike path along Main out by Alameda Point. It doesn't even rival a third world country. Terrible bike path, hasn't been touched or maintained in at least 20 years. The gardeners do a half ass job pretending to weed the bike path and don't have clue. So, yes, this is a good idea for Grand but the score for City of Alameda public works and ability to maintain the paths (street sweep, road repair, potholes, etc.) is a big fat ZERO.

I support this project. Safety for all road users is a priority. Far too many people die on U.S. roads every year, including kids walking and biking to school and others aiming to move around their neighborhood. Further, I support the city's data-driven approach of investing in safety improvements along high-injury corridors, including along Grand Ave.

I am also supportive of this project from a quality of life perspective. I moved to Alameda in part to be able to bike and walk to my destinations. This project will improve my personal mobility and will help ensure others have safe mobility options. Lastly, I support the balanced approach of providing high-quality bike infrastructure while still retaining access (including parking) for residents. Studies show that high-quality biking infrastructure increases property values.

<https://trec.pdx.edu/research/project/1330>

I think there should be raised bikeways there as well, especially to allow safe access to Wood.

I would be so grateful to have a two-way bikeway on Grand between Shore Line and Otis. This is part of the route to pick up my daughter from day care and I would feel so much safer if this proposal were reality.

If we have two-way bike lanes that lead to one-way bike lanes, the crossing should be safe and efficient. It will increase travel times for those on a bicycle.

It would be ideal if the bike lane designs are consistent all the way through and raised bike paths are clearly preferred over the "gutter" lanes that currently and frequently fill up with debris and water is often impassable, leading to children mostly riding on sidewalks or veering into traffic.

It would be nice to have a consistent type of bike lane through the entire length of Grand St. Make it a raised bike lane on this portion too.

Narrowing the current structure will create havoc on trash pick up days, when deliveries are made, and when residents exit their driveways. I anticipate more bike accidents, not fewer, as you are claiming.

No concerns

No concerns. Looking forward to using the bike line as a north south connector with my child.

Originally, I had no concerns, since I don't live there. But I am not in favor of continuing the 2-way bike lane further north to Encinal and onward to Clement. Auto traffic is heaviest on Grand north of Otis; bikes should travel in the same direction as auto traffic in appropriate bike lanes on either side of the street. This teaches cyclists they have to obey rules of the road just like cars and trucks. Right now, many cyclists ride the wrong way even in the bike lanes made for them and swing over to the sidewalk as they please via driveways. No rules are enforced.

Plastic bollards are not enough. They need to be metal or concrete for true safety. Plastic is just a suggestion. You need something that will substantially damage a car and deter assholes

Please do not do the transfers idea, it just doesn't make sense. I love the protected bike lanes though, having a bike lane next to cars is very dangerous and although slightly raised, it doesn't protect children from veering off, which is why i love alternative 3.

Please keep in mind, that all bikeways do not require a camber or water runoff slope; please keep them level!

Please stop pushing these ridiculous configurations of our public streets. Unless the objection is to overcrowd the island and create backups and congestion, respect the input of those folks it impacts most- the people who live here and have done so for generations.

Raised bikeways prevent cars from using or encroaching on them. Safe by design.

So similar to "Alternative 1", just not raised? Sounds good so kids can safely ride to and from school. Seems fine.

Thank you for making Alameda more bike friendly! Let's get more people folks on people powered wheels :)

The change in biker behavior is the concern if this moves forward and the rest of Grand gets the alternative option. Better if we can remain consistent.

The intersection was just changed to more be more friendly to 1-way bike lanes and that already works. Since there is no alternative, keep it the way it is and take Alternative #2 for the other sections. Otherwise it should only be approved if Alternative #1 is simultaneously approved. A half-hearted approach that doesn't not build the full continuous route continuous, will fail.

The main downside of Alternative 1 for cyclists is going against the flow of traffic can be dangerous at driveways and intersections. People tend to look to the direction of traffic when backing out and turning. Alternative 2 would be safer in that regard in my opinion. However I still think Alternative 1 would preferable to the city council sproved option.

Very much for Alternative 2 or Alternative #3. To me, importantly is that bike flow coming from counter-car traffic direction is just too unsafe for so many crossings. (in my opinion). I'd be one of the ones making this crossing. Exiting in the morning, when traffic and exit opportunities are limited, will mean drivers exiting will be rushed and not as likely, or comprehensively able, to check in the counter flow direction (to the right). It's bad enough right now trying to time cars, bikes, and pedestrian traffic as is. Alternative 1 will be worse and unsafe. So I'm pretty strongly against Alt 1. Council approved at grade only without chicanes - but I feel it would be less safe than alt#2 and #3. All for increasing safety on Grand for pedestrians and bikes. Initial Council approved plan did not feel safer than existing.

what about one way on both sides of the street. Kids will do that anyway

Whatever you need to do to make it safe for children and pedestrians... prefer to narrow the street and optimize for safety (future bus should consider car lanes only and ideally no busses down Grand)

With all due respect to staff, asking this question makes no sense. Council already approved Segments A and B. I understand why there's interest in making more people happy about Segment B. But why try to draw out concerns about Segment A? It was councilmembers' direction in 2022 to do a two-way cycletrack on the east side of Segment A. You know the funding exists. You know the concept for Segment A is compatible with both the council-approved plans and alternative #1 for Segment B. Please just get started on Segment A already. And if there isn't staff time to get started on Segment A because of all of these rounds of new outreach, then staff leadership should weigh the pros and cons of trying to build consensus. Having the perfect plan is of zero use to middle school students on bicycles until it actually exists in reality.

Wood Middle school students need separation from traffic as they bike to school - a minimum raised bike lane if not a raised separated bike lane.

You already spent the money to redesign that section. You need to commit to your decisions and stick with them rather than constantly changing and redesigning and spending more of the taxpayers money.

You plan to move ahead, then ask our opinion? Shouldn't it be asking for community input first? Just exasperated with the way the city works, because we aren't really getting a say in anything. I do not like this plan. It should be one way each side in direction of traffic.

Alternative #1 (raised two-way bikeway) Comments

alternative 1 and 2 are...fine. They're just fine. It's an improvement over today, sure, but the reality is both cars and bike veer off sometimes which is REALLY dangerous, especially for children. instead we should protect bike lanes by adding in buffer (as in council approved design), which is why i like alternative 3.

Alternative 1 is much better than the current meandering roadway plan. I do worry about having 2 way cycle traffic on one side of the street and requiring motorists both at intersections and driveways look for cycle traffic (which moves more quickly than pedestrians) in both directions, rather than the same direction as motorist traffic.

Best one. Cheapest. Arguably safest. The little whiny babies on Grand street have less to complain about
Concern about turning vehicles not having the right visibility to see fast moving bicycles on the bike lane, in particular children. This could be addressed with a raised crossing, which would slow down cars.

Drivers coming out of driveways have to be mindful of bikers in both directions.

Excellent. My first choice. The 2 way bikeway will make it more obvious to pedestrians to give the bikers the right of way compared to a single lane bikeway.

Good approach to balance safety and cost. Support the continuity (two-way bikeway along the whole corridor).

Good but I like #2 better. I do like that it's consistent with surrounding bike lanes

Good option

Great to connect the existing two way cycle ways on each side of the island with a similar treatment.

I echo Alameda Bike Walk's concerns about timing (not wanting to delay improvements).

I like this approach since I have often ridden the length of Grand Street and I dislike the difficulty of getting into/out of bike lanes or crossing the street. (I have a lot of trouble getting into the protected lane on Fernside going towards the Harbor Bay Bike Bridge from the unprotected lane, for example. I don't trust crossing at the cross-walk and with my heavy cargo bike, the angles make getting into the lane that way difficult. So I'd prefer to have one entrance/exit for those riding the length of the street. I'd also like clear guidance on how to get out of the lanes/make turns that cross the street.

I love this idea and would be a regular user of that bikeway

I prefer this option of all the ones presented.

Intersections could be tricky

It seems like a great idea. Similar to the path along shoreline. Shoreline seems very safe and secure almost you don't notice the cars.

It would be ideal to have a consistent bikeway the whole distance of grand to avoid unnecessary street crossings. Raised two-way feels the safest which is why I voted for that, but I defer to the experts who know the numbers.

It would have greater negative impact on those of use who live on the east side of the street, as we'd have to clear 2 lanes of bike traffic pulling out of or into our driveways. Also, looking both directions is counterintuitive.

Like the continuity. Worry a bit about going contra flow during school rush hour. Hope the raised crossings for intersections are high enough to really slow drivers (I've seen many that don't). More buffer between bike lane and parked cars would be better.

Love it, please pick this one. I love the idea of a two way protected bike lane all the way down. We like to bike along shoreline, but the current connection to the protected bike lane on the North side of the island is a little scary to take my little one on.

Lower cost because less disruption to landscape area (trees and poles). Wider travel lane and more parking on both sides of street. This is important below Central because there are more apartments and homes without driveways

Most sensible option. Balances parking and cyclists needs, plus continues the 2-way bike lane from Shoreline.

Mostly prefer this alternative because it's the least expensive and fastest to build. Would prefer if car lanes are limited to the recommended 10' width as "Lanes greater than 11 feet should not be used as they may cause unintended speeding and assume valuable right of way at the expense of other modes.

Not good for cycling. Not intuitive for riding my bike and a pain to cross over to the other side of traffic. Bikes should be able to ride in the same direction as cars. It seems we give over to autos way too much.

Not intuitive to look both ways. More dangerous. Impacts those who live on east side and not much for those on the west side.

Please keep in mind, that all bikeways do not require a camber or water runoff slope; please keep them level!

Raised and separated bike lanes are safer by design. The city should have a network of them that facilitates mode switching.

Since I live on the east side of Grand, I oppose this because our side of the street would have all the bicycle traffic. Only our side of the street would have to dodge bikes while crossing a bike lane to reach the sidewalk; and have more problems looking both ways for bikes backing out of driveways. I've already had neck surgery four times. I cannot deal with this alternative. I guess that is why the line dividing the Bronze Coast from the Gold Coast runs down the middle of Grand? Gold Coast gets the privileges! Coincidentally, it's also the Mayor's side of the street.

The issue with this is the limited room bikes have to pass each other. It also fails to narrow the lanes of the road. People will not slow down unless the road is narrower to navigate. Infrastructure is a better way to achieve this rather than relying on enforcement. Police have better things to do.

This alternative is preferred. Less loss of parking spots, and bicycle riders get their protected bike lanes.

This can be a good option but only if a lot of funding is available and bike-friendly signal design is prioritized. Concerns related to turn movements and increased delay/wait time at signalized intersections expressed in earlier comments.

This design would work well for cyclists along the entire corridor as long as it's very well delineated and protected at intersections. It's pretty easy to imagine at an intersection like Grand and Central that motorists turning left will keep an eye on opposing traffic, put their foot down on the accelerator during a gap, and gun it right into a cyclist in the cycletrack.

Alternative #1 would retain relatively more on-street parking on Segment C and that does look useful for those blocks. There is more multi-family housing and non-residential uses on those blocks -- they'll make good use of that on-street public parking.

Parking retention on Segment B is a bad reason for Alternative #1. Yes, a number of residents are complaining about "their" parking. But everyone can see with their own eyes how little of the on-street parking on Segment B is actually used throughout the day. Counts in the 2022 staff reports confirm how few on-street parking spots are used along Segment B. How much time and money should the ~80,000 residents of Alameda put toward the ability for a couple people to have a free place to stash their 3rd car when they are too lazy to shift their other cars in their extra long driveway?

This is the most elegant solution and will be a great improvement to the Grand corridor. This is more aesthetically appealing than the previously approved approach and is overall a better solution to the street - much simpler and easier for everyone to navigate.

This is the safest approach for cyclists and this is the best way to encourage and support cycling.

This one is the obvious choice, because it achieves a protected two-way bike lane, is the second least expensive, the second quickest to build, and does not impose an unrealistic and unfair 60-75% parking loss on the more densely population areas of Grand St.

unsafe. Confusing (having to look right and left while exiting/merging) and complex during high traffic times (school hours). There will be accidents. Already bad as existing. Speed of bicycle approach from non-traffic flow direction will be a real problem.

When considering all the alternatives and the rationale for why we should be making these updates, this seems to make the most sense in terms of continuity of the bike lanes from one end of Otis to the other. Though it took some time to get there, I appreciate the city making an effort to solicit community feedback on this project given the overall impact it will have on not only bikers/pedestrians, but on the residents of Grand St as well.

Wider lane, more parking and less disruption to landscape

Yes

Alternative #2 (raised one-way bikeways) Comments

2nd best one. 2nd cheapest. Arguably safest. The little whiny babies on Grand street have less to complain about

alternative 1 and 2 are...fine. They're just fine. It's an improvement over today, sure, but the reality is both cars and bike veer off sometimes which is REALLY dangerous, especially for children. instead we should protect bike lanes by adding in buffer (as in council approved design), which is why i like alternative 3.

Alternative 1 is my preferred plan (although either 1 or 2 is better than the current meandering roadway plan). Alternative 2 is better than 1 since cycle and motorist traffic move in the same direction on each side of the street, which is more intuitive for motorists.

Better option

Better than #1 - but still gives over the space to cars.

Better. Only one direction (presumably) of higher speed crossing approach (bikes and cars).

Having two separate bikeways seems less efficient. On shoreline there is not always someone in the other direction. This means that one person can use the entire lane. Also it makes passing other bikers easier. This allows both family style bikers and racing types.

I could live with this because it not only treats both sides of the street equally, it teaches young cyclists the rules of the road: ride in the same direction as motor vehicle traffic; don't ride on the wrong side of the street. I still prefer enhanced Class 2 bike lanes with 4-way stops added at San Jose, and even other intersections to slow traffic. 4-way stops are a tried and true reliable method to break up long lines of traffic so pedestrians can cross more safely. Only the real threat of a moving violation for running a stop sign is going to make drivers slow down. Nothing else will be effective.

I could support this plan.

I feel its a little safer because lanes are going same direction as traffic. I love raised bike lane idea for both 1&2 you can see kids riding bikes and they won't be hidden behind parked cars.

I like this idea, but I'd be somewhat concerned about car doors on the passenger side opening into the bikeway area. Still, I find this significantly better than on-grade bike lanes, and would use these bikeways regularly.

I like this option, but it's pretty expensive and I don't see the expense being justified with the Alt 1 option on the table.

I think this is the most agreeable plan between the two sides of the issue. It's the least impact on parking

It seems hostile to make folks cross Grand twice when biking the full length of the corridor. When I think about kids trying to get to school I worry about this added danger.

Looks more balanced.

Much safer not having to watch 2 way bike traffic when backing out. A bike lane in each direction makes safer sense and is common practice.

My concerns with this one are the cost and whether or not it is easy to connect with the section south of Otis.

Narrow bike lanes and very narrow buffer. Council-approved plan had much wider bike lanes.

No advantages to this design

Not bad. My second choice.

Not wild about the narrow bike lanes, but still preferred over street level bike lanes. Seems like that the car lanes could be further reduced to 10'. From NACTO urban street design guide, "Lane widths of 10 feet are appropriate in urban areas and have a positive impact on a street's safety without impacting traffic operations. "

Preferred but didn't pick bc narrowest bike lane and still optimizing for cars

Preferred options. I suspect turning vehicles are more likely to see bicycles traveling in the direction of traffic. I'm still concerned with cars stopping pass the stop line and in the bike path. A bicycle traveling at speed might not be able to stop if a car enters the bike lane.

Road too narrow

Safer for all. Greater predictability for trained bike riders, drivers, and pedestrians, including especially for those with limited mobility.

Street too narrow.

Think this is better than #1.

This is my preference, but anything is better than nothing!

This is the best approach from all perspectives. It's a strictly safer way for bikes to travel and it narrows the road, which makes for safer traffic conditions as cars will be forced to navigate more slowly. The only issue is the plan to build past Otis drive with a 2-way bike lane. That ruins this option.

This method unnecessarily loses too many street parking spaces, creating a hardship. Very bad choice.

This option would be acceptable, but not as good as option #1

Too expensive relative to value added. Not worth losing more parking.

Totally unfair and unacceptable to impose a 60-75% parking loss on a busy street with numerous multi-family homes, apartments, churches and businesses. This could create unsafe conditions by forcing cars and delivery vehicles to double-park, block bike lanes, park on sidewalks and lawns, and crowd surrounding streets. I have submitted photos to city council members illustrating this point.

Would be okay.

Yes

Alternative #3 (raised one-way bikeways next to sidewalk) Comments

alternative 1 and 2 are...fine. They're just fine. It's an improvement over today, sure, but the reality is both cars and bike veer off sometimes which is REALLY dangerous, especially for children. instead we should protect bike lanes by adding in buffer (as in council approved design), which is why i like alternative 3.

Cost prohibitive, with limited benefits compared to alt 2.

Great but too expensive

I get that you all are trying to lay out multiple alternatives in order to highlight contrasts. Still, it's kind of annoying to see city funds going to pay consultants to create plans and budgets that everyone can see are not realistic.

I love this idea and would be a regular user of that bikeway

I really like this design, except that it eliminates the mature trees. But if Alameda needed a new road built somewhere, or revamping a road that does not have the mature trees of grand street, I would be in favor of this plan.

If space were unlimited, it would be nice to have the sidewalks and bike lanes separated, but since compromises have to be made in any case, I think this is the best option. That is because this allows for the bikeways to be separated from the street which is much more pleasant, but also because in the case that faster bikers need to pass the slower bikers, there is space to do that when pedestrians are not present. The cons to this option are that pedestrians tend to take up the entire paved area (bikeway included), so some signage advising to stay off the bike path would be helpful. Otherwise though, that's not a big enough of a problem to detract from this option.

Least favorite as it brings pedestrians and cyclists into closer proximity which is sometimes a bad idea.

Least preferred, but from an aesthetic human-centered design point of view, this seems like it would be the best design, but due to the cost and timing involved it would seem impractical and I'm wary that this means that practically this would never be built. Would also anticipate a lot of pushback from removal of mature trees.

Also concerned about potential pedestrian/bicycle conflict.

Most expensive

Most expensive moving trees and poles. Bikes might take more than their share and be on sidewalk

Nice idea in theory, but way too disruptive, time-consuming and expensive. Plus, seeing mature trees taken down would be tragic.

Not sure why this was even proposed. Not a reasonable option due to cost and disruptive work.

Obviously most expensive; will remove trees and who knows what else. But if it finally undergrounds all the heavy power wiring hanging over my cars and my side of the street, I'm all for it! Unfortunately it is unlikely to be finished in my lifetime.

Probably best plan, but I don't see us spending the money and enduring the direction.

Removing mature trees is Non stater....

Seems better progression of #2 but may be costly.

such an additional expense

This doesn't help anyone.

This is nicer than #2, but still I think a combined bikeways is preferable.

This is the best option if there is room.

This may be the most expensive and 'disruptive' BUT it's the best alternative for bikes. As I cyclist who rides all over the island and not just for exercise, the 2-way path is awful and does not feel safe.

This would be great and is very expensive. I'd rather use the funds on other bike infrastructure improvement projects (like replacing/improving the wooden bridge to Bay Farm Island as one example) or the many bike paths that make riding on paths unpleasant.

Too expensive but beautiful

Too expensive, takes too long. Pity to get rid of mature trees.

Too impractical.

When a bike lane is right next to a pedestrian sidewalk to I wonder about pedestrian intrusion into the bike lane.

Would be great, seems there is zero will for it. Older trees is not a very good excuse.

Overall Grand Street project Comments

Allow for some auto parking and install secure bike parking racks along street to replace auto parking being taken away.

alternative 1 and 2 are...fine. They're just fine. It's an improvement over today, sure, but the reality is both cars and bike veer off sometimes which is REALLY dangerous, especially for children. instead we should protect bike lanes by adding in buffer (as in council approved design), which is why i like alternative 3.

As an Alameda resident who uses a bike as my primary mode of transport, I think bollards are the safest and least stressful way to build a bikeway. The alternatives suggested seem less safe. I would strongly prefer protected bike lanes with bollards similar to the other protected bike lanes in Alameda

At the Mastic presentation, consultants cited three regional bodies in identifying Grand Street as a high-risk corridor. Those citations were incomplete - as no statistics were provided for APD traffic enforcement in that period.

1) if traffic enforcement in the same period has generated many moving citations - then those data would add weight to the high-risk assertion.

2) if traffic enforcement has been absent, then the city's presentations will continue to be incomplete without the necessary context for understanding the circumstances and conditions on Grand. From personal observations, a new Alternative 4 should be examined with equal attention - that is, that the city more aggressively manage enforcement of existing regulations on this high-use corridor.

Bollards are ineffective and, over time, are damaged or destroyed. The greater the buffer, the safer the cyclist (and all pedestrians).

Both bicyclists and car owners are citizens of Alameda, deserving of equal respect and consideration. As someone who lives in both of these worlds on a daily basis, I feel Alternative #1 is the fairest and most effective way to improve Grand Street's safety.

Definitely support improvements to Grand. It's pretty awful riding my bike down it and I find ways to avoid it now. Would rather see bike lanes on both sides of the street. As a cyclist, I don't feel safe being pushed in a 2-way lane with other cyclists. Cars need to accommodate bikes on the island. We bend over for cars!

First priority is safety, second priority is time to completion, third priority is cost. Rich people on Grand between Otis and Encinal are not to be taken seriously when they complain about loss of parking because literally anybody with eyeballs can see they're histrionic. Their other comments and "concerns" have likewise been falacious.

Good! Needs to happen to improve safety for cyclists of all ages and abilities.

Grand Street is currently in the exact same unsafe condition as it was when a majority of City Council members approved plans for Segments A and B last year. Slow Streets including San Jose Ave look exactly the same as before, with the same temporary barricades and no progress that the public can see toward permanent designs.

Yes, city staff want to make as many people happy as possible. Yes, the mayor wants to make as many people happy as possible.

But will this new process of design and outreach actually produce results that are real and results that are timely?

Grand Street is NOT a high-injury corridor! The data do not support this label! Pedestrians who were killed while crossing Otis near Grand by an AC Transit bus or Shoreline near Grand, after a cycle track was installed on Shoreline are not Grand Street casualties and changing Grand Street would not have prevented them. I am tired of the City of Alameda LYING about this to force wider bike lanes at the expense of auto lanes. Installing a few 4-way stops on Grand would be a far simpler, cheaper, and quicker way to slow down traffic, provide traffic breaks so residents could safely pull out of and into driveways; and add safety to the street for all. If there is enough traffic to justify traffic calming measures proposed by these "alternatives", surely there is enough traffic to qualify Grand Street for additional 4-way stops! They are PROVEN to increase pedestrian safety. All this other stuff is a naked pandering to the Bicycle Lobby and will not increase pedestrian or driver safety on Grand. Shame on Alameda!

Have a question on why in all of the alternatives, the street widths all exceed the NACTO recommended width of 10' in urban environments?

Please stop using plastic bollards and only use steel bollards? Plastic bollards seem frequently damaged and offer no real protection.

Additionally on sidewalk widths. Current widths of sidewalks are frequently too narrow. Especially if walking with family/company, it's awkward to walk with multiple people, particularly if strollers are involved or if people need to pass each other.

I have lived on Grand Street for 40 years. The total lack of traffic enforcement for the 25 mph speed limit is my main concern. This lack of enforcement seems to be pervasive throughout Alameda. Enhanced bicycle paths along Grand Street will undoubtedly benefit recreational bicycle riding, but they will not decrease automobile traffic and will not impact climate.

I love my bicycle but my block also has a need for a lot of street parking. There are more tenants moving into multi-family housing in my area and they all come with cars. Alternative #1 does a better job of preserving parking, while also providing the protected bike lanes cycling advocates say they want.

I love that all options involve making it safer for vulnerable road users I wish we didn't have to have such long conversations about each and every resurfacing. Protected bike lanes should be standard for all high speed and/or high traffic volume roads. Keeping people alive is more important than convenient places to park cars.

I love the ambition of alternative 3, but that timeline is too long. We need the strongest protection as soon as possible.

I wish it were in progress already and am frustrated by the delay.

In general, I think that it's nicer to bike through neighborhoods. So I'd prefer to have more dedicated streets for bikers. I'm Berkeley they have "bike boulevards." To me this is a better use of funds than improvements to a busy street.

It's too bad that the city didn't ask for input before this all began, and devised its own (terrible) plan. Then, it didn't follow its own rules. Shame on you.

Leave streets as they are with some designated bike lanes. These changes are ridiculous and make no sense. With all the over developing going on streets are becoming over congested for the first time in our history and these plans only worsen traffic. It's as if someone is purposefully ruining this city. Take a good look at SF and stop already!

Like the way it is. A big GRAND STREET with beautiful homes

Love it! Can't wait to have a safe North-South route for everyone!

Love love love it. There is very limited bike infrastructure going north-south right now and we desperately need this. Moving in the right direction. Infinitely better than the meandering roady way (so-called chicane plan). Either 1 or 2 (or 3) construct safe, reasonable cycle lanes. The chicane plan is actually unsafe as demonstrated by many studies showing them inappropriate for streets with multiple driveways and intersections.

My kids and family bike this route daily, I am glad additional time and input was allowed.

Needs to be build ASAP.

Please expedite however possible. This is such an important street and shouldn't take so long to make safer.

Please keep ugly white bollards to a minimum they are not maintained throughout the city and are blight. Please have a plan for maintaining bike lanes.

Please move forward on the previously council-approved project with paving in 2024, as the near term alternative, then also continue pursuing grant funding for more robust upgrades via the raised bikeway proposals but only in addition to and not instead of the existing project. The safety needs on Grand Ave are immediate and priority should be given to whatever work can be delivered the soonest.

Raised bikeways, or protected bikeways at a minimum are my main concerns for the project. I really need a safe north-south mid-island crossing to shift more trips for my family out of cars and onto foot/bikes.

See earlier comments on support for Segment A, also pasted below.

I support this project. Safety for all road users is a priority. Far too many people die on U.S. roads every year, including kids walking and biking to school and others aiming to move around their neighborhood. Further, I support the city's data-driven approach of investing in safety improvements along high-injury corridors, including along Grand Ave.

I am also supportive of this project from a quality of life perspective. I moved to Alameda in part to be able to bike and walk to my destinations. This project will improve my personal mobility and will help ensure others have safe mobility options. Lastly, I support the balanced approach of providing high-quality bike infrastructure while still retaining access (including parking) for residents. Studies show that high-quality biking infrastructure increases property values.

<https://trec.pdx.edu/research/project/1330>

see my previous comment

So excited for bike improvements on Grand.

The best alternative would be to spend the money repaving the entire street, put a stop light at Grand and San Jose, have countdown lights at every intersection so a bike knows how much time they have, keep the striping as is in good shape and ENFORCE CURRENT VEHICLE, BICYCLE, AND PEDESTRIAN LAWS.

The city had a golden opportunity to ask the neighbors what they wanted BEFORE it developed alternative plans, even if it were just for show. The city squandered that opportunity. Why is the city so eager to spend money, even if it comes from the Fed? It's wasteful & unnecessary. I would like to voice a complaint against Bike Walk Alameda forcing their agenda on city politicians. They don't live on Grand Street, yet want to control what happens here (and everywhere else, for that matter). 501C3s can't have lobbying as their main goal, and they do just that. Get them out of city politics.

The objective should be clear. More bikes being used, fewer cars on the road, and a safer road. Safe pedestrians. Parking and costs should be non-issues. They're not what this project was about. We have plenty of parking everywhere, need less with good biking infrastructure, and residence can more than afford this quality of life improvement.

The residents on Grand who value parking over safety sadden me. My wish is that we make this corridor serve all its users, not just the personal auto users. It's loony that people feel so entitled to park their private property in public space – for free – and then play the aggrieved party when the city endeavors to protect kids going to school. While these residents are gifted at making their voices loudest, by lawsuit or booing city staff during meetings, I hope the safety improvements are implemented.

The sooner we get this done, the better. Grand Street is plenty wide enough to accommodate these improvements and it will be a safer street for everyone!

There are no safe protected ways to get a bike from the North to the South side of the island. Prevents a lot of mode switching by families.

This bike safety project is so important for the Alameda cycling network. Thank you city staff! Whichever alignment is selected, ideally the whole corridor will have the same treatment. Tacking back and forth across multiple 1-side 2-side cycleways is unintuitive and dangerous

This process has been disjointed at best and has felt as if decisions were being driven based on arbitrary deadlines and budget availability vs. what is actually best for people who use Grand St as well as residents. What resulted have been ugly back and forths, project delays, and likely cost overruns.

Not only this, but because of the piecemeal approach to how the entire project has been handled (factoring in daylighting and the new intersections at Otis and Shoreline as well), bits of work have been undertaken and completed, which will now have to be re-done to match the master plan, namely the Otis intersection.

While I'm not a planning professional, I do understand that there can be a lot of influencing factors on how infrastructure projects are completed. That said, this process has strained my trust of those in charge of making decisions for the growth of the city. Hopefully this (painful) process is a learning for the city and lessons can be learned for how to best engage residents and neighborhoods on public works projects. I do believe that the residents of the Island want to be engaged and are willing to work toward compromise solution if given the appropriate forum.

This should be a priority for the city. This projects connects thousands of resident to the existing bike network. The current grand bike lane is unsafe to all, but very unsafe to children.

under no circumstances do I want to see the original approved plan implemented. I would rather it stay the current lay out than have that plan implemented.

Very needed.

Very pleased to see this project moving forward

Would like it to stay the way it is but I know bike people rule. My children rode their bikes to school and the swimming pool on the sidewalk and used a bell (required back then). Council plan has a narrow zig zag travel lane and loss of a lot of parking.

Yes please, get started asap!!

Yes this is great. I've been hesitant to let my kids ride to Wood. Unfortunately one has already graduated but another is going there in a couple years. This project would give me much more confidence to encourage her to ride there.

I drive the morning drop off to wood South on Grand frequently and with the amount of traffic on grand it feels dangerous for the kids cycling. One big issue is all of the unprotected left turns. Cars block the intersection waiting to turn left and other cars then swerve into the bike lane to go around them. I've seen some near misses with the kids riding to school. How does this plan address this issue? Will there be a center turn lane? Why are there not protected left turn signals at major intersections such as otis and grand and encinal and grand? The amount of people turning left onto otis east bound from grand southbound in the morning is high, and since there's no left turn signal they are waiting till the end of the signal and running the red light. This creates a dangerous situation for cyclists and pedestrians crossing. Please address this issue. Please observe traffic during school drop off and pick up times.